

A Year of Study in an Israeli
Yeshiva Program: Before and After

Shalom Berger

January 1997

Doctoral Dissertation

The Azrieli Graduate School of Jewish Education and
Administration, Yeshiva University.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Full time Torah study in a yeshiva in Israel, once considered an exotic experience for a modern Orthodox high school graduate, is now a commonplace phenomenon in North American Jewish education. Fewer than twenty-five years ago when the Orthodox journal Tradition asked Jewish educators to comment on the Jewish day school, none discussed study in Israel post high school (Wurzburger 1972). In answer to questions such as "How can a Jewish day school better prepare its students for the competing lifestyles and ideologies of the campus?" or "How can a Jewish day school improve the quality of the religious life of its students and deepen their commitment to Torah?" the respondents discussed curricular change, in-service training, youth groups, and even visiting Israel during high school. The assumption was that few graduates, if any, would be willing to postpone college to further their Jewish education.

The situation today is very different. Interviews with administrators in some of the largest modern Orthodox high schools in the New York metropolitan area, indicate up to 90% of their graduates choose to attend one year post-graduation Israel programs (Waxman 1995). Upwards of one thousand high school graduates a year come to Israeli

yeshiva programs prior to beginning college level study back in the United States.

This educational development has been welcomed and encouraged by Jewish teachers and administrators (Blau 1988, Goldmintz 1991). Signed editorials in popular Jewish newspapers (Rosenblatt 1994, Goell 1995) call for expanding these programs and recommend participation in them. For some time now, almost without dissent, the "year in Israel" programs have been viewed as an essential part of the yeshiva experience for university-bound adolescents (Kupchik 1987). Walter Ackerman (1989), writing about a wide range of Israel programs, argues that:

Jewish schools in America look to programs in Israel as a means of strengthening the Jewish identification of their students; as an experience which affirms and strengthens the bond with the Jewish people; as an opportunity to create some sort of relationship with the Jewish state; and as a source of motivation for continued study and activity at home. Israeli educators and agencies see these various programs as the first stage of a process they hope will culminate in aliya. (p. 97)

Recognizing the central place that post high school Israel study has for its graduates, many yeshiva high schools now feature Israel guidance departments that rival their college guidance departments in stature, assisting seniors in choosing among available programs, in the application process, in arranging for financial assistance and in working out transfer of credit to American universities. Today, schools, parents and the students themselves expect that as a matter of course the majority of

graduates will spend the year after graduation in a yeshiva program in Israel (Bernstein 1992).

Recently, some reservations have been expressed regarding the universal approbation given to the year in Israel program. One American high school administrator has expressed doubt as to whether one year in Israel has any effect on students (Krauss 1990). An American educator in Israel has questioned whether the sheer popularity of the year in Israel has diluted the experience to such an extent that it is no longer a new, powerful experience, rather it has become another year of high-school education in a slightly different setting (Amsel 1990). Nevertheless, the director of one Israeli institution that offers a program for American high school graduates argues that coming immediately after high school, at a critical stage in their lives, leaves a marked effect on their lives "back home" (Lichtenstein 1987a).

While the evidence that these educators bring to support their arguments is anecdotal, the questions are important ones. Yeshivot gevohot, post high school yeshiva programs, aim to inculcate in their students a desire for and commitment to shmirat mitzvot, particularly dedication to continued Torah study (Lichtenstein 1987b). Studies have indicated that traditional yeshivot have been largely successful in realizing these goals (Helmreich 1982).

American Jewish educators are sending their students to Israel to study and experience Judaism in the hope that students will return with greater commitment to these ideals (Goldmintz 1991, Blau 1988), as well as a strengthened devotion to the State of Israel (Kupchik 1987).

This study will examine the accomplishments of the Israel yeshiva programs with regard to North American modern Orthodox yeshiva high school graduates. To what extent does commitment to Judaism and the State of Israel grow during the year of study in an Israeli yeshiva? Should schools, teachers, and administrators who seek to strengthen this commitment be encouraging graduates to attend these programs?

Background: The Yeshiva

Judaism places tremendous emphasis on education, which traditionally has meant Torah study for men (Maimonides Talmud Torah 3:3). Morning prayers open with birkhot hatorah, blessings over Torah study, and include a Talmudic passage that promises particular reward for Torah study (Mishna Pe'ah 1:1). Such study typically takes place in a yeshiva, literally, the place of "sitting", where one sits and studies.

The Talmud relates the beginnings of the elementary school system with the approbation that were it not for the efforts of Yehoshua ben Gamla, the Torah would have been forgotten (Bava Batra 21a). On a post secondary level, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai is credited with saving Jewry in the midst of the destruction of the Second Temple, by arranging for "Yavneh and its scholars", the major center of Torah learning, to be spared (Gittin 56a-b).

For almost two thousand years since that time, as Jewish communities spread across the globe, yeshivot were established along with them. First to Babylon, then to North Africa and Europe, Torah study traveled with the exiles' migrations (Helmreich 1982). Much as a young, avid sports fan today knows North American geography by where various teams are located, the interested young Talmud scholar

recognizes European cities and countries by the rishonim and aharonim (early and late Talmudic commentaries) who learned and taught there.

The processes of modernization and secularization that took place in Europe in the second half of nineteenth century, brought about a crisis in the traditional Jewish community. One reaction was the establishment of a new type of educational institution: the higher level yeshiva (Friedman 1992). This yeshiva differed from its predecessors in that it was not community based. Rather, it drew students from a broad Jewish population. Friedman (1992) explains that this new type of educational institution

comprises a community of young people, a kind of youth society, which intentionally develops the consciousness of a religious elite. The yeshiva society is characterized by a social and economic moratorium; it is isolated from everyday affairs and maintains a direct and unmitigated affinity for religious culture, as expressed...in the literature of Halakha and Musar. (p. 182)

This new type of yeshiva, which offered a total Torah environment to its students, was reestablished in Israel and the United States after World War II, and became the dominant educational pattern for boys within traditional Orthodox society (Friedman 1992).

With over 350 yeshivot and more than 45,000 pupils in Israel today, some claim that there are more students actively engaged in Torah study now than there were at any

prior point in Jewish history (Birnbaum and Persoff 1989).

One higher level yeshiva stood in contrast with this response to societal change. The Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, the nucleus around which Yeshiva University grew, was established in 1897 as the first advanced yeshiva in the United States (Klaperman 1969). It differed from its predecessors not only in location, but in philosophy as well (Telushkin 1991). The school's motto was "Torah U'Madda", Torah and science. The idea that Torah scholarship could and should be joined by secular learning, almost as a religious imperative, was certainly not a traditional idea (Lamm 1990). Still, the success of Yeshiva University in teaching its graduates to participate and even excel, in both the traditional Jewish and modern American worlds, responded to an essential need in the American Jewish community (Rakeffet-Rothkoff 1972). In a short time in major Jewish population centers there was parallel growth of similarly constructed elementary and high schools whose day was divided between secular and Judaic studies. These schools were highly Zionistic (Schiff 1966). Soon the movement with which these schools were identified became known as "modern Orthodoxy", and the schools that espoused these ideals of Torah U'Madda and religious Zionism became known as "modern Orthodox day schools".

Yeshiva University differed from the traditional

European yeshiva in other ways as well. Aside from the opportunity for the established young scholar to devote himself to the study of Torah lishma (Torah for its own sake) in the "Yeshiva Program", there were other options for the young man who chose to pursue a degree at Yeshiva College. Teachers' Institute (TI, now the Isaac Breuer College, IBC) offered a curriculum of Judaic studies that included Bible, Jewish history, Jewish philosophy and Jewish literature, a wider range than the traditional study of Talmud, which led to a Teacher's diploma aside from the Bachelor of Arts degree the student would receive in Yeshiva College. The James Striar School (JSS) was established to allow students with little or no background in Judaic studies to pursue a college degree while learning about their Jewish heritage. Such students were often highly motivated and "mainstreamed" into the yeshiva program or the Teachers' Institute before their graduation from college (Gurock 1988).

A major innovation in contemporary Jewish education is Yeshiva University's Stern College for Women which opened its doors making available a curriculum of Torah U'madda to the female graduates of the modern orthodox day school system. While its Judaic studies curriculum is not identical with that of the traditional male yeshiva, it offers an opportunity for women to develop religiously with college

level Judaic studies courses as they advance in their secular studies (Klaperman 1969). Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik's involvement in teaching women Talmud, first in the Maimonides school in Boston, then in Stern College (Weiss 1990), has led to a proliferation of schools in the modern Orthodox community that teach Talmud to women.

With the developing popularity of yeshiva study in Israel in the early 1980's, Yeshiva University began a joint Israel program that allows students attending yeshivot in Israel to be officially registered as Yeshiva University students (Mrs. Linda Derovan, personal interview, May 20, 1996). Aside from supporting the official position of Yeshiva University in support of Zionist ideals, the joint Israel program is also a prime opportunity for Yeshiva University to recruit students. A recent survey of Yeshiva University students found that 73% have studied in Israel, most prior to beginning college. Almost a third of these students were not planning to attend Yeshiva University before their year of study in Israel and decided to do so in order to continue their religious studies (Marttila and Kiley 1993).

The Students

A typical North American graduate of a modern Orthodox day school likely has attended twelve years of "double schedule" schooling, dividing his day between Judaic studies (often in the morning) and secular studies. Even with the school day extended to accommodate this load, with elementary school typically until 4:00 or 4:30 PM, and high school until 5:00 or 6:00 PM, it is difficult for the average student to get the full flavor of the traditional yeshiva experience with its sole commitment to Judaic studies. As active participants in the "modern" world, a wide range of diversions, from sports to "the stock market game", keep the modern Orthodox day school student from experiencing the singleminded directness of purpose that his counterpart in the traditional yeshiva, whose major emphasis is on Torah study, undergoes (Helmreich 1982). Many educators in modern Orthodox schools, hoping that exposure to an all encompassing Torah environment will instill a greater sense of long-term commitment and responsibility in their students, strongly recommend that their students devote a year to study in a yeshiva with a total Jewish environment before beginning their university studies (Blau 1988, Goldmintz 1991). As few modern Orthodox day school graduates will attend such a program in the United States,

this has meant encouraging high school graduates to travel to Israel for a year of study.

The Israel yeshiva experience

While American day school educators strongly recommend study in a yeshiva in Israel, it must be noted that the yeshiva programs available to the North American yeshiva graduates in Israel are not all the same. The yeshivot themselves highlight many of the characteristics that are unique about them in order to attract a student body that will be most successful in a given yeshiva's environment. The differences in stress on commitment to the State of Israel, willingness to accept the validity of secular education, and attitudes towards the non-religious community are some of the major differences that might influence a student to choose to study in one yeshiva rather than in another.

For the American day school graduate there is a fairly clear-cut distinction. Such students, often with acceptances to the college of their choice (and deferrals) in hand, fully plan to attend university following their year in Israel. Many are even on "joint programs" in which their American universities grant college credit for their Israel study. Clearly, few of these students will come to Israel to

attend traditional European style yeshivot where secular study is anathema (Lamm 1990). In fact, many of the traditional "European-type" yeshivot, often bearing the names of the European communities in which they originated (eg. Mir, Ponevezh), are philosophically at odds with the education these modern Orthodox American day school graduates received in the United States. These yeshivot often are non-Zionist, objecting to a secular government in the Holy Land (Heilman and Friedman 1991). Above all, the modern-Orthodox day school graduate is unwilling to enter an environment which rejects the values and culture of American society which is part of his very being. A colleague, having completed a BA/MA program in English literature at an Ivy League university, came to Israel to attend "the best" yeshiva, in order to study for Rabbinic ordination. Upon arriving at a traditional yeshiva, he was told that his first priority was to forget all of the shtuss (foolishness) that he has acquired in university. He left and began his studies at a yeshivat hesder, completing his smicha (ordination) at Yeshiva University.

Still, there are several options for the student planning a year of study in Israel. Many day school graduates who choose an Israeli yeshiva program (as opposed to a program for Americans in Israel) choose a yeshivat hesder. A yeshivat hesder is one that allows Israeli

students to combine their military service with traditional yeshiva study. These yeshivot are usually highly Zionist and are geared towards a mature, self-motivated student. Popular yeshivot hesder include Yeshivat Hakotel in Jerusalem, Yeshivat Har Etzion in Alon Shvut, Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh near Kibbutz Yavneh, and Yeshivat Sha'alvim on Kibbutz Sha'alvim. Each of these programs has about 50-80 foreign students, who make up approximately 25% of the student body of the yeshiva (Birnbaum and Persoff 1989).

Other options include programs geared specifically towards American students. Such programs offer a more structured schedule, a more formal guidance program and in general are more sensitive to the needs of the American high school graduate who is likely away from home for an extended period for the first time. American programs in Israel include Beit Midrash L'Torah (BMT), Yeshivat Ohr Yerushalayim and Yeshivat Sha'arei Mevasseret Zion, all with between 40 and 100 students. All of these programs are in Jerusalem or on its outskirts (Birnbaum and Persoff 1989).

Although each yeshiva has its own distinct approach and emphasis, certain generally applicable statements can be made about the two distinct types of program that the male modern Orthodox American high school graduate most often chooses (Birnbaum and Persoff 1989).

Yeshivot Hesder. The yeshivat hesder is similar to the traditional yeshiva in its scholastic emphasis on Talmud study, but differs radically from its traditional counterpart in that it represents the commitment of religious Zionism to the State of Israel (Birnbaum and Persoff 1989).

These institutions are designed primarily for Israelis. The Israeli hesder students commit themselves to a five year course made up of two six-to-nine month stints in the army that interrupt their yeshiva studies. Ideologically, the schools and their students have come to grips with the reality and pressing need to defend the State of Israel, while they remain committed to the centrality and importance of Torah study as a way of life (Lichtenstein 1981).

When recruiting American students, these yeshivot emphasize that aside from strict academics, it is expected that the atmosphere fostered by the yeshiva will imbue in its foreign students "responsibility for one's fellowman, the unity of the Jewish People, and the centrality of Erez Yisrael," (Yeshivat Sha'alvim n.d.) or "a deep love of Israel, together with an insight into the social problems of the nation of his forefathers" (Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh 1991).

These goals are not by any means secondary. While the daily schedule of prayer and study does not, at first

glance, indicate an emphasis on anything other than religion and academics, a closer examination of the schools' educational design shows how these goals are achieved. On an ordinary day in a yeshivat hesder, from morning services at 6:30 or 7:00 AM until the time that most students leave the beit midrash (study hall) at about 11:00 PM, most of the day has been spent, not in lectures, but in private study groups. The American student is, on some level, removed from an atmosphere of American values and culture, and thrust into an environment of Israeli life. The language he hears and is forced to speak is modern Hebrew. His roommate likely is an Israeli who is his agemate and is preparing to serve in the Israeli Defense Forces. His afternoon hevruta (study partner) may well be a recent immigrant from Ethiopia or the Soviet Union.

Shabbat meals and High Holy Day services, most of which are experienced in the company of several hundred fellow yeshiva students, are sharply different from those he participated in during his high school years in the United States, where the score of the World Series game may have been significantly more important than the Yom Kippur service of the kohen gadol (the High Priest). Virtually every day and night in the yeshivat hesder, the North American modern Orthodox day school graduate is bombarded with experiences that can have significant impact on him

over an extended period of time. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the American student will have many compatriots with whom he interacts. The argument of some educators is that even these programs no longer offer the total immersion effect that they did before they became so popular.

The yeshiva is also structured to expose the student to older students who share the study hall. These kollel members play an important role, serving as informal role-models (Helmreich 1982). While most are Israeli, some of the kollel students are individuals who are, themselves, graduates of North American modern Orthodox high schools, who attended a yeshivat hesder and have returned after graduation from college to live or to study.

All this, of course, is aside from the formal educational structure of lectures in Talmud, Bible and Jewish philosophy, and field trips to selected regions in Israel with Bible or mishnayot in hand.

American Programs in Israel. The academic objectives of the American programs in Israel are largely similar to those of the yeshivot hesder. The daily schedule is comparable in many ways, beginning with morning tefilot (prayers), followed by study sessions, lectures, and meals. There are differences, though. The language of instruction is invariably English, and all of the students come from similar backgrounds.

According to Rabbi Michael Sussman, formerly Israel advisor for Yeshiva University and now director of the overseas program in the yeshivat hesder in Ma'ale Adumim, the emphasis in the American programs appears to be more on academic and religious growth of the individual, and less on commitment to Zionism and the State of Israel (personal interview May 9, 1996). In fact, these yeshivot advertise that "small classes, individualized educational programming and a varied, vibrantly interactive student body nurtures the unique aspects of your personality while encouraging a deeper and more meaningful commitment to Torah study," (Yeshivat Ohr David n.d.) or how the "Yeshiva environment of intensive study and conscientious ethical behavior leads each student to a strong personal commitment to religious study and practice" (Beit Midrash L'Torah n.d.). One student attending a Zionist-oriented program for Americans in Israel added the following comment to his questionnaire. "I think

that Israel was mentioned way too much in this questionnaire. One can be a perfectly halachic [sic] abiding Jew even if he/she despises Israel." Although this student expresses his position rather harshly, no students attending yeshivot hesder offered similar comments.

These yeshivot do, on various levels, encourage their students to involve themselves in the Israeli community through volunteer work and arranged visits to different Jewish communities, but it is a different experience from meeting, studying and socializing with Israelis as a natural part of the program. While there is an attempt to bring in some smicha students to act as role models in the beit midrash, none of these institutions has a permanent kollel of graduate students who live in Israel.

The American programs in Israel are popular for North American day school graduates for a variety of reasons. They are "smaller, more intimate and have more levels of study for weaker students than the average Yeshivat Hesder" (Helfgot and Zucker 1990). Virtually all of these programs are located in or around Jerusalem, which is a preference of many North American students who expect to be in Israel for only one year. Still, as they are directed towards a specific uni-cultural group, many of the "Israel experience" opportunities that exist in the yeshivot hesder, such as living and interacting with Israelis, or speaking Hebrew on

an everyday basis, are more difficult to find in these programs.

Women's Programs in Israel. The differences between programs for men and programs for women in Israel reflect differences in attitude regarding Jewish education for men and women generally. While there is a difference of opinion in the mishna with regard to the obligation of Torah study on women, the accepted position discouraged Torah education for women (Maimonides Hilkhos Talmud Torah 1:13). It was accepted that women had to learn those laws that applied to them, such as kashrut and shabbat, but these were usually learned in practice from working at home together with their mothers.

A major change came about with the development of the Bais Yaakov movement, begun by Sarah Shneirer with the approval of leading Torah authorities of the last generation. Responding to the waves of secularism that were sweeping across Europe, she developed a program of study that would keep the Jewish girl somewhat knowledgeable and in the fold (Kahn 1989).

Today, at least in the modern Orthodox community, this innovation has been extended to offer the full range of learning opportunities to women. Still, a male high school graduate is expected by his yeshiva in Israel to center his daily routine around Talmudic literature, almost to the

exclusion of all else. In women's institutions, whether Talmud is a required course or offered as an option, the emphasis is on a wide range of Judaic studies rather than the uni-dimensional study of Talmud.

This difference, as well as other traditional gender stereotypes, creates an environment for women in Israel programs that differs from that of their male peers. According to Mrs. Linda Derovan, a Yeshiva University Israel advisor, the women are expected to be more involved in activities outside the walls of the Bet Midrash, ranging from preparing their own meals to being involved in hesed projects. There are fewer opportunities to interact with "graduate students" in the beit midrash, as the movement to stay in yeshiva or to return after college for continued study is much smaller in the women's programs (Personal interview, May 20, 1996).

Since many traditional communal activities are male centered, the women can at best be passive, rather than active participants. The yamim noraim experience cannot be as engaging when it is not the school's tefilla.

The Israel yeshiva experience for the male American day school graduate can be one of two experiences. It can be either a continuation of Diaspora education or a new Israel educational experience. These different attitudes mirror, to

a certain extent, differing attitudes towards Judaism and Israel that exist in Israel and the diaspora (Liebman and Cohen 1990).

In describing the philosophy of their short-term programs, Nurit Orchan (1991) of the World Zionist

Organization Youth and Hechalutz department explains: "The Israel Experience," as presented by Diaspora educators and organizations, is an experience of the "Land of Israel" rather than the "State of Israel." They can only accept and identify with [the State] in a way similar to that in which Italian-Americans look to Italy as a motherland, but not as a focus for total identification. Yet even this is problematic, as Jews have been in America prior to the establishment of a Jewish sovereignty and their direct cultural roots are not necessarily linked with the Land of Israel. Teaching our particular values to youth from abroad becomes problematic in light of this background. Our job is to integrate the Land of Israel and the State of Israel. (p. 16)

This difficulty in dealing with American students is handled differently by the different programs in Israel. According to Linda Derovan, Yeshiva University's Israel advisor (personal interview, May 20, 1996), the hesder yeshiva integrates the American student into the lifestyle of religious Israeli life. The American program in Israel operates largely as if it were an island of American religious life in Israel. Most of the women's programs are made up of Americans, but encourage interaction in Israeli society by offering less of the traditional closed off yeshiva environment.

Review of Literature

Research has been done in a number of areas that are closely related to this study. Some studies have been done on the effects of day schools and yeshivot in the United States on their students. Work has also been done on the impact of a year of overseas study on American students in general, and in Israeli programs (non-yeshiva) specifically.

Studies on effects of Jewish education in the United States

A number of studies have been done that focussed specifically on elementary day school graduates. Pollak (1961) analyzed the religious practices, participation in Jewish affairs, and retention of interest in Jewish studies of day school graduates based on responses of alumni (N=166) from six modern Orthodox day schools at least eight years after their graduation. He found that religious observance, measured by such items as keeping the Sabbath, attending synagogue and reciting grace after meals was quite weak. The typical graduate kept a kosher home, but ate non-kosher elsewhere. While many were active in communal Jewish

affairs, interest in Jewish learning was insignificant. Most did not acquire a Jewish library or subscribe to Jewish periodicals. Nevertheless, Pollak found that the extent that the graduates do comply with the criteria of Jewish living appears to be significantly related to varying elements in the graduates' background. Most important of these appear to be continued formal Jewish education, and the religious background of the spouses whom the graduates marry. No distinct pattern was found that correlated parents' affiliation with children's religious behavior.

Pinsky (1961), mailed questionnaires to all 760 of the graduates of the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School in New York from 1925 to 1949. About 70 percent of the respondents had continued in the high school, while the others attended public school after graduation. Analysis of the returned questionnaires (N=304) indicated that the graduates tended to remain Orthodox, observe rituals, maintain an interest in Jewish studies, and participate actively in Jewish organizational activities. Perhaps most important, he found that the greater the number of years of formal Jewish education, the stronger the identification with Jewish values and appreciation of the benefits of day school education.

The seeming contradiction between these two studies, Pollak's suggesting that day school education did little to

develop the student's long-term commitment to Jewish study and practice, and Pinsky's indicating much the opposite, can be explained by examining the limitations that existed in each of the studies. In Pollak's study, fewer than half of the respondents had received any Jewish education past the elementary school level. In addition, only 35 percent of the questionnaire recipients actually responded, raising questions about the validity of the entire study. In Pinsky's study, only alumni of one particular school were studied, a school whose student body was drawn from a religiously committed population, and whose Judaic studies program was known to be strong. Here, too, the rate of response was low, with fewer than 50 percent of the questionnaires returned. It is reasonable to speculate that it is those former students whose standards of religious observance was weakest who would be reluctant to respond to such a survey.

With these limitations in mind, it is important to note that both authors saw education, particularly continued formal education, as one of the primary factors in establishing the future commitment of day school graduates to the Jewish community and Jewish practice.

In a more recent study, Shapiro (1988) surveyed 749 Jewish elementary school students in Atlanta, Georgia. Using Himmelfarb's (1974) instrument on both students and their

parents, he determined that family background, which consisted of parents' ritual observance, parents' residence-friendship patterns and parents' parenting behavior, made a large and significant contribution to "total Jewish identification". The number of hours of Jewish schooling made no significant independent contribution when family background was controlled for. Hours of Jewish schooling was one of the factors that explained religious observance, although it did not correlate with support for Israel or the Jewish intellectual subscale.

In studying the conclusions of Shapiro's study it must be noted that in examining Atlanta, a "typical" American Jewish community, rather than the larger communities of the Northeast where most of the other studies were focused, different results are not surprising. The "Traditional/Orthodox" group in Atlanta is certainly a very different one from the Orthodox Jews sending their children to the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School in New York. Similarly, the curriculum of a school that must respond to the needs of a very diverse population of Jews in an "out of town" community will likely be less intensive than its counterpart in a large Jewish community. Shapiro notes that it is possible that "hours of Jewish schooling" may not capture the effects of Jewish schooling (although other researchers found that it did); very likely the significance of hours of schooling differs

depending on the school and the community that it serves. Nevertheless it is surprising that support of Israel, an issue of general interest in all Jewish communities, should not be affected by attending a Jewish school.

Two studies that specifically targeted yeshiva high school graduates are Goodman's on religious attitudes (what he refers to as hashkafa) and Heimowitz' on Yeshiva of Flatbush graduates.

Goodman (1978) developed an instrument that offered a choice of Jewish, Christian and atheist statements. It was administered to 564 volunteers in colleges in New York and college age staff members in Jewish summer camps in the vacation areas around New York. Analysis of the returned questionnaires (N=515) indicated that there exists a moderately strong relationship between increased Jewish education and increased Orthodox hashkafa, although the hashkafa of yeshiva high school graduates was not found to be significantly higher than that of elementary school graduates. Only a minimal relationship was found between increased hashkafa and continued post-high school Jewish education, which Goodman suggests may indicate that most of a yeshiva high school graduate's hashkafa is formulated by the time he graduates.

Heimowitz (1979), limiting his study to Yeshiva of Flatbush graduates, found a high correlation between

continued formal Jewish education (beyond the high school level) and a wide range of religious behaviors, including synagogue affiliation, religious observance, attitudes towards Jewish education and personal study. The higher the level of Jewish education, the higher the degree of commitment to Jewish tradition and the Jewish community. This correlation was found to be true even for students from non-observant home backgrounds. With religious Zionism as one of the core ideals of the Yeshiva of Flatbush, the study showed that twenty-five percent of the graduates would consider aliya, with 5% already living in Israel.

Heimowitz' study is limited to an individual school, and the success that his study indicates for the Yeshiva of Flatbush system is open to question. True, "63 percent of graduates identify themselves as Orthodox Jews who observe the dietary laws, do not travel on the Sabbath and Jewish holidays and pray at least once a day". With no control group, this relationship does not indicate causality, and it is not clear that this moderate success can be directly linked to the academic success of the school. Community strength and peer relationships also may have strong long-term affect on the Jewish commitment of the Yeshiva of Flatbush graduate.

Once again, the available literature offers no firm conclusions about the efficacy of Jewish day school

education post elementary school.

Perhaps the most all-encompassing study is Himmelfarb's on the impact of Jewish education on the religious involvement of adults. Himmelfarb (1974) developed an instrument to examine the level of adult Jewish involvement, which he mailed to 5300 individuals with "distinctive Jewish names" in the Chicago area. After eliminating some of the 1418 returned questionnaires for technical reasons, he analyzed the remaining responses (N=1009). The study found that even attending all-day Jewish schools does not increase adult religious involvement over the level attained by those with no Jewish schooling unless there are more than six years of such schooling. Only students who completed twelve years of supplementary Jewish education (Sunday and afternoon schools) reported that they were more religiously involved as adults. A plateau is reached at 4000 hours of Jewish studies after which no greater religious involvement will be attained unless supported by other agents of socialization, such as marrying a religious spouse. Other informal Jewish education experiences, even intensive ones like a sleepaway summer camp, were found to have no lasting effect unless coupled with formal Jewish education.

Himmelfarb's study also indicated that parental religiosity is not the best predictor of any religious involvement measure. It is, nevertheless, important, for the

indirect contributions that it makes. It is the parents' religiosity that brings the student to attend a Jewish school, participate in Jewish organizations and marry a Jewish spouse, all of which act as best predictors of various religious involvement measures. The college years were found to be the most important time that long-term religious commitments were formed.

The low response rate of the study notwithstanding, by examining a truly random sample of Jewish adults, rather than the graduates of one particular institution, Himmelfarb's findings appear most conclusive in determining that extensive Jewish schooling has significant impact on adult religious behaviors, successfully accentuating religious values to which the student was predisposed, and even "converting" students from irreligious backgrounds to religious observance including keeping kosher, observing shabbat, and prayer.

The data collected in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey led to renewed discussion of the effects and effectiveness of American Jewish education. As the survey included a relatively small number of day school graduates and had few direct questions on Jewish education, conclusions based on it are far from clear. While some researchers found that the survey indicates a clear correlation between Jewish education and Jewish

identification (Fishman and Goldstein 1993) and conclude that Jewish day schools are the only schooling that slow the process of assimilation (Rimor and Katz 1993), others inferred from the data that there is no significant relationship between the type of education one receives and such basic issues as intermarriage (Mayer 1993).

This discussion led to two recent independent studies. Schiff and Schneider (1994a, 1994b, 1994c), attempting to create a larger sample of day school alumni, sent a questionnaire to graduates from 26 Jewish day schools in the United States. Of the 6,673 questionnaires that were received by these graduates, 55% were completed and returned (N=3,674). Their findings indicate "dramatically higher" Jewish organizational involvement among day school graduates in comparison with parallel groups of American Jews. Furthermore, their level of ritual observance and connection with Israel was found to be greater than that of their peers who did not attend day school. At the same time, their study found that the home environment of the Jewish day school student is much more Jewishly oriented than the homes of those who do not attend day school. It is the interaction of these complementary factors that create the major differences between Jews who attend day school and Jews who do not.

Cohen (1995) sampled Jewish parents (N=1464) and their

teen-age children (N=615) in order to examine the effects of different levels of Jewish education on Jewish involvement, while attempting to control for parental and other influencing factors. While admitting that even after controlling for many factors, the children who are sent to the more intensive educational programs likely bring with them unmeasured and unmeasurable Jewish resources, he concludes that Jewish education significantly affects its students. The more intensive the program, the greater the effect, with Orthodox day schools, where the students usually continue their studies through high school, offering the greatest impact.

Studies of overseas programs

On a theoretical plane, travel to a foreign country to study is a growth opportunity that cannot be replicated in one's familiar surroundings. Hansel and Grove (1984) argue that foreign study causes greater increases in learning and competence than could be expected through the normal maturing process. Experiential learning that takes place by "being there" rather than by learning about it stimulates motivation, memory, and, eventually, mastery. Being exposed to new tastes, sights, sounds, and smells, stimulates the mind, and, with proper support, when the new experience is learned, a greater sense of self-confidence is created.

There is more to foreign study than maturing and developing a sense of competence. Pfinster (1972), after reviewing a number of dissertations and articles that examined undergraduate college students who went to study abroad, concludes that the goals of such study include "developing self-awareness, gaining understanding of another culture, becoming more objective about one's own culture, becoming more sensitive to political and social issues at home and abroad, [and] developing greater competency in a particular language or area of study" (p. 12).

While this sounds reasonable in principle, it is only by examining actual overseas study experiences that the theory can be examined. In his own study of 126 Goshen college (Indiana) undergraduates, Pfinster (1972) found significant changes regarding awareness and tolerance of other cultures, people and their views. James (1976) reached similar conclusions in his study of 52 randomly selected American college students studying in European universities, with significant gains in self-confidence, self-esteem, appreciation of one's capabilities and worth, and understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of American culture in comparison to that of other countries.

Nevertheless, a number of other studies suggest alternate findings.

The Council on International Educational Exchange

studied college undergraduates (N=630) who were randomly selected from two American universities. These students were broken into three groups: those staying on their home campuses (control), those studying abroad (overseas sojourn) and those studying off-campus in the United States (domestic sojourn). The study found that significant changes took place among all students in the course of their year of study, mainly with regard to tolerance of other cultures' attitudes and views. The changes could not be attributed to location, however, rather to "individual receptivity, motivation, openness, personal psychology and chance experiences" (Hull, Lemke and Houang 1977, p. 49). No clear superiority of overseas programs was shown over domestic sojourn programs in effecting attitude change. In a number of instances, more change occurred on domestic sojourn programs than on overseas programs. For example, while overseas program participants were initially more interested in the local area of their travel than were the domestic sojourn students, upon return, the overseas students' interest in their place of study decreased until they were indistinguishable from returning domestic sojourn students. While off-campus program students in general felt that they would question their cultural and political values because of their experiences, domestic program students were significantly more certain that their experiences forced

them to do so. The authors suggest that language may be the key to some of these results, as students on overseas study programs without significant knowledge of the host language may have been unable to overcome the language barrier, frustrating their attempts to take full advantage of their foreign study opportunity.

One further study suggests that even if foreign study does successfully change attitudes, this attitudinal change may be short-lived. Nash (1976) compared 73 juniors in upper-level French classes in the University of Connecticut, 41 of whom were participating in the school's Junior Year in France program, with the rest remaining on the school's home campus. The study found greater development in areas of individual independence and self-reliance, as well as acculturation. In the course of the academic year the group in France showed an increased preference for speaking French, for eating French food, and had an increased interest in international affairs. Their counterparts in the United States did not experience these changes. A follow-up questionnaire given to the students upon their return to college after the summer, fewer than three months later, indicated that these changes did not persist.

McHugo and Jernstedt (1979) reviewed a number of studies of overseas students, and found the studies themselves fraught with methodological problems. They

concluded that while there are no clear research findings on foreign study experiences, there are patterns that are important to examine in evaluating such programs. They suggest dividing field experiences into three phases: selection (who will choose to attend a given program); immediate impact; and long-term transfer.

In their comprehensive review of research on the effects of the college experience in general, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) point out the "small body of research [that] has investigated the effects of a period of study abroad". They conclude that the results of these studies are inconclusive, and that "virtually without exception, however, these studies leave pre-study-abroad characteristics, attitudes, and values uncontrolled. The literature in this area of study is not distinguished for the rigor of its research designs and methods" (p. 306).

From these studies it is apparent that the ability of foreign study to change the attitudes of American students is unclear. Furthermore, it is not clear whether any change that does take place is significantly different from that which would have occurred as part of the normal maturing process had the student not gone to study abroad. This study, which includes information on the students' background, as well as a pre-test, a post-test, and a follow-up a year after the experience offers an opportunity

to follow McHugo and Jernstedt's suggestion and examine selection, immediate impact and long-term transfer with a more reliable research design.

There is room to suggest that the experience of the modern Orthodox day school graduate in a program of study in Israel has greater potential for success than do other foreign study programs. The student arrives in Israel with a knowledge of the language and an interest in the land that is much greater than that of participants in typical American exchange programs. Twelve years of day school education have preceded the student's decision to attend this program in Israel. Nevertheless, the one year student returns from the environment of the Israeli institution to the world of North America where he or she grew up.

Israel programs

Little work has been done on the effects of year-long Israel programs on their American participants. The most extensive study is that of Herman (1970) on American students in Hebrew University's School for Overseas Students in the 1960's. While Herman's study indicates that the Hebrew University program has significant impact on its participants, it must be noted that both Israeli and North American students were very different thirty years ago than

they are today. Study in Israel was viewed as unusual for a Jewish high school graduate. The programs for Americans in yeshivot in Israel did not exist as they do today. By and large an individual who chose to study in Israel was highly motivated, almost a pioneer in the eyes of his American contemporaries, as is indicated by the fact that almost half of the Hebrew University students studied came to Israel with the expressed intention of remaining there.

Herman's study found that the students' already overwhelmingly positive attitudes towards Jews and Israel were reinforced by their experiences at Hebrew University. Their positive attitude towards Israelis, though, declined somewhat. Their perception of themselves as Jews improved. Aside from a large number of students who came to the program with the express desire to move to Israel at some future time (twenty-seven of fifty-eight of the students), few students had made a decision to move by year's end. Still, a majority of the students indicated a heightened motivation to settle in Israel.

A substantially more limited study on Hebrew University students in the Overseas School was published by the Institute on American Jewish-Israeli Relations of the American Jewish Committee. Students from the 1987-88 academic year were studied (Friedlander, Talmon, and Moshayov 1991). This time, the study indicated that the

students' sense of being part of the Jewish people was heightened, though they developed little sense of being Israeli. The students felt that their contact with Israelis was limited, while their contacts with non-American students in the overseas program were excellent. A large majority of the students did not plan to settle in Israel. For them Israel represented a source of Jewish knowledge, education, behaviors and values, but not necessarily the place that a Jew should live.

There are significant differences between the subjects and settings of the Hebrew University studies and those of Israeli yeshiva programs. In hesder programs, the American students are integrated into Israeli society to a greater extent than in the contemporary Hebrew University program, while in the American programs, there is probably less integration. Students identifying themselves as Orthodox are in the minority at Hebrew University (only 12 percent; 52 percent described themselves as Conservative, 24 percent Reform); the overwhelming majority of students in the yeshiva programs would identify themselves as Orthodox.

In a study that examined returnees from various programs sponsored by the World Zionist Organization, Schulman (1988) questioned participants of both short and long-term programs in Israel. Aimed more at information gathering than analysis, the study concludes that virtually

all participants were positively affected by their programs and wanted to return to Israel. The yeshiva programs produced the highest percentage of participants who said they planned aliya or would be willing to volunteer to work in Israel. It should be noted that only 4,600 of the 25,000 surveys were returned. There were also a number of confusing conclusions, such as "our questionnaire demonstrates that the overwhelming percentage of those answering yes to the aliya question were participants of short-term Israel programs" vs. (two pages later) "it is clear that those visiting for a longer period of time are most likely to plan Aliya".

Most of the studies done on the "Israel experience" examine the more common short-term visit. Although these trips are quantitatively and qualitatively different from the year-long yeshiva programs, the studies find significant impact on the participants, even from trips of three weeks or less. Cohen (1995), for example, found that after controlling for Jewish schooling, youth groups and other factors, a trip to Israel in one's youth brings a 15% increment in the chances of scoring high on the Jewish involvement scale. In a more detailed analysis Cohen found that (not surprisingly) Israel travel affects Israel attachment much more than it does ritual practice, communal affiliation and association.

Israel, Aliya and American Jews

In attempting to evaluate the impact of Israel study on the American day school graduate, it is essential to understand the larger environment that the student is encountering. A number of studies indicate that even the Orthodox student from a Zionist background will find him or herself in an atmosphere very different from the American Zionist community with which the student is familiar.

Liebman and Cohen (1990) compared Israeli and American experiences of Judaism. Although they conclude that there will not be an emergence of two different Judaisms, they find no fewer than five general areas of difference between the Israeli and American Jewish communities, including attitudes towards religious life and perspectives on Land, State and Diaspora.

Their findings indicate that Israelis, even secular Israelis, perceive traditional Orthodox practice of religious ritual to be authentic Judaism. Under the influence of the philosophy of Rav Avraham Isaac Kook, "religious Zionists have transformed Eretz Yisrael into a pillar of Judaism" (p. 72). At the same time, the Land of Israel is not necessarily an integral part of the core

Jewish identity of American Jews. Furthermore, the concept of galut, of living in the diaspora, does not exist for American Jews.

Eliezer Don-Yehiya (1991), director of the Argov Center at Bar Ilan University, collected essays and studies presented in a conference on Israel-Diaspora relations. The topics, ranging from the historical to the political to the sociological, point to manifold differences in the perspectives of Israeli and Diaspora Jewry. In reviewing the contributions to the book, Don-Yehiya concludes that in the contemporary age the problem of "dual loyalty" has been solved for diaspora Jewry living in democratic countries. Those countries recognize the right of their citizens to hold various, even conflicting, loyalties. Similarly, American Jews have become comfortable identifying with Israel while remaining loyal American citizens. Nevertheless, "dual loyalty" has remained a problem in Israeli ideology, an "ideology [that] remains profoundly influenced by the premises of 'classical' Zionism, which argued that Jews are a nation apart, a nation that cannot and should not be integrated into the social and cultural life of other nations" (pp. 19-20).

It must be noted that these studies by-and-large examined the contrasts between the general Israeli and American Jewish communities. Some studies argue that

specific, similar, segments of each respective community will be more likely to find common ground.

Don-Yehiya (1994), compared religious groups in Israel with their counterparts in the United States, and found that these two fairly similar Jewish communities have developed different expressions of religious outlook and values. One of the most outstanding differences indicated was that while there have been comparable processes of religious resurgence in Israel and in the diaspora, outside of Israel they "are not generally combined with parallel tendencies to national and political radicalization". He ascribes this to the movement in Israel away from traditional moderate political positions that characterized all Orthodox Jewry prior to 1967. After the Six Day War, upper-level yeshivot were developed to serve the needs of the religious-Zionist camp, with Yeshivat Mercaz HaRav Kook, under the direction of Rav Zvi Yehuda Kook, the prevailing influence on them. These yeshivot, unique to Israel, were the cornerstone of a new religious and national outlook that not only perceived the State of Israel as the beginning of the Redemption, but believed in a "messianism of here and now" that totally rejects the legitimacy of Diaspora Jewish life.

According to Don-Yehiya, the only upper-level yeshiva in America that attracts modern Orthodox students is Yeshiva University, which, while supportive of Israel, is part and

parcel of the reality of contemporary Jewish diaspora life.

These findings fit with the philosophical underpinnings of the Jews in Israel and the world view of those in the diaspora. Schweid (1987) writes:

The substantial community of those who opted for emancipation ceased looking upon exile as a temporary situation and, indeed, ceased regarding it as exile at all. Those Jews took Zion to be a symbol of a vision of universal redemption, and they rejected the idea of a reestablishment of Jewish sovereignty. The Orthodox minority that totally rejected emancipation continued to adhere to the medieval view: acceptance of exile until the advent of the Messiah and a spiritual relationship to the land as the holy land. In the Zionists' view it was necessary to return to the land of Israel as to a physical national homeland. (p. 540)

With all indications that the American Jewish community has given up on the search for redemption in the physical return to the land of Israel, attempts have been made to explain American aliya to Israel.

Waxman (1989), in examining American aliya, opens with a lengthy description of Zion in Jewish culture and Messianism before he discusses which Americans make aliya and why they do so. On one level, his findings mirror the attitudes found in the previously mentioned studies, that the "Zionism" of American Jews is actually pro-Israel sentiment. Among one segment of the population, though, he finds a commitment that goes beyond the desire to have one's children visit Israel. Among the relatively small group of Jews who accept the "expansionist" approach that religious

life is compatible with contemporary society, there has been an increase in aliya. Waxman's explanation of the post-1967 American aliya, which he finds to be mainly Orthodox, is the desire of Orthodox Jews involved in modern society to live in a place where they perceive that their lives can be more fully Jewish. His second suggestion is that social structural settings of the Orthodox community facilitates aliya. "One such factor is a Jewish educational system that encourages spending a year during the post-high school level in studying in a yeshiva in Israel. That year frequently plants the seed, and as many parents of children who have studied in Israel know, a second year of study often determines aliya" (p. 135).

In reviewing studies on American aliya, Waxman (1995) again finds that American olim are disproportionately religiously observant, and describes attempts to explain this phenomenon sociologically. Suggestions range from the economic argument that government support for religious institutions allows the observant individual to lead a full Jewish life at less cost, to the above mentioned Orthodox social structures, particularly the experience of studying in Israel post-high school. Waxman concludes that "religious ideology and structure are important factors contributing to aliya, but they do not determine it. Obviously, if they did there would be a much higher rate of aliya at least from

American Orthodoxy" (p. 63).

Coming to Israel for a year of post high school study in a yeshiva is a three-pronged educational experience for the modern Orthodox high school graduate before college. On one level, it is a year of continued intensive Jewish education. Second, it is an experiential foreign sojourn of lengthy duration. Finally, it is an "Israel experience", one that challenges its participants with a culture that is so much like their own, but so different as well.

The literature has much to say with regard to each of these topics. Studies show that Jewish schooling makes significant impact on students; the more schooling, the greater the impact. At least for the short term, overseas study appears to have some influence on the average American college-age student. Israel visits, including visits of short duration, are viewed today as having significant impact on their participants. In this context it is reasonable to anticipate substantial change on participants in one-year post-high school yeshiva study programs in Israel.

The effects of the unique Israel yeshiva experience on American high school graduates have not been studied. While anecdotal observations of educators in America and Israel have raised questions about the impact that the Israel

yeshiva experience has on these students, the distinctive elements of these programs suggest that they may have significant, long-term impact on the participants. In the words of Aharon Lichtenstein (1987a):

Many of the Orthodox youth who come to Israel to study, who will ultimately exercise some kind of influence in the Diaspora, reach this country at what I would define as a more critical stage of their lives. They are, as it were, young lions, younger than those of other sectors, and what they experience here has a more marked effect on their lives "back home." They come here expressly to study. Many of them arrive immediately after graduating from high school, and the religious aspect of what they learn here dovetails with their studies at home when they return to the US. (p. 13)

This study will attempt to clarify in a formal manner, whether change occurs in the course of participation in one-year Israeli yeshiva programs, in what areas there is measurable change, and whether distinct programs affect students differently.

Rationale

Over the past half century, the modern Orthodox Jewish community of North America has made great strides in developing a viable educational system of day schools and high schools. Walter Wurzburger (1982), then editor of the Orthodox journal Tradition, asked twenty-two leaders of modern Orthodoxy to comment on "the state of Orthodoxy", and specifically to respond to the question "What have been Orthodoxy's greatest achievements and greatest failures on the American scene?". Virtually all noted the advancement of Jewish education, including day schools, Torah U'mesorah, and Yeshiva University, as Orthodoxy's greatest achievement. Several respondents noted the lack of appreciation for, and devotion to, the State of Israel as Orthodoxy's greatest failure. Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, for example, says simply:

Orthodoxy's greatest achievement has been the Yeshiva movement. Orthodoxy's greatest failure has been its lack of response to the commandment of the hour to touch every Jew and to rise to the challenge of the Jewish State. (p. 65)

Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein, in explaining Orthodoxy's inability to cope with many of today's problems suggests

that there are primarily two failings. Regarding the first,

Orthodoxy's narrowness, Lichtenstein writes:

Narrowness manifests itself in cultural insularity and limited horizons; in pettiness and smugness; above all, in misplaced priorities and skewed perspectives. This last is reflected in the prevalent attitude toward the State of Israel which is generally regarded favorably but not recognized as a momentous historical development.

With regard to the second failing, the quality of the leadership that Orthodoxy has produced, Lichtenstein argues that "it has produced almost no indigenous gedolim neither in the narrower sphere of halakha nor in the broad realm of public leadership" (p. 50).

It is thus interesting to note that while the advancement in Jewish education is universally viewed as having been instrumental in inculcating the values of Jewish observance and Jewish scholarship in modern Orthodox youth, it has not succeeded in producing true leaders for the Jewish community. Further, the perception is that it has failed in properly dealing with the development of the State of Israel.

The relatively recent opportunity presented by Israel study has been grasped by day school educators who hope to strengthen their students' commitment to Jewish values, thereby putting the centrality of the State of Israel on the agenda of the American Orthodox Jewish community today.

No examination has, as yet, been made of the role

yeshiva programs in Israel play in inspiring the North American modern Orthodox high school graduate to greater commitment towards Jewish observance, continued study of Judaism or to the State of Israel. Some have suggested that what was once a unique and moving experience has, by its sheer popularity, become just another year of Jewish day school education (Amsel 1990, Krauss 1990). Even granting that the year in Israel is educationally significant, no study has been done with regard to what areas of development are affected by Israel study, nor whether the choice of a yeshivat hesder as opposed to a yeshiva program for Americans in Israel will have different educational outcomes.

This study will examine the effect that a year of study in Israel, for men and women, has on the attitudes of North American high school graduates with regard to:

- attitudes towards support of the State of Israel
- commitment to Jewish observance
- commitment to continued Jewish study.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis: The Israeli yeshiva experience positively affects American modern Orthodox high school graduates regarding commitment to Jewish observance and Torah study.

Hypothesis: The Israeli yeshiva experience positively affects American modern Orthodox high school graduates regarding Hebrew language skills as well as attitudes towards Zionism and support of Israel.

Hypothesis: Differences among the various types of programs, including yeshivot hesder, programs designed for Americans in Israel and women's Israel programs, will lead to distinct outcomes on the respective participants.

Hypothesis: The intensity of the Israeli yeshiva experience is such that its effects will remain even after return to the United States and a year of college study.

CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

The Instrument

Since the researcher was unable to find a questionnaire that dealt with the specific hypotheses being studied, a new instrument was developed that would examine commitment to ritual practice, to continued Torah study, and to principles of Zionism and Israel. What began as a straight-forward 20 question test (i.e. Do you plan to make aliya?), developed into an instrument made up of more than 100 questions designed to explore cognitive, affective and behavioral issues that would allow for factor analysis and creation of scales at a later point.

The questions were based on issues that appeared central in previous studies by Heilman and Cohen (1989), Helmreich (1982), Himmelfarb (1975) and Erik Cohen (1991), among others.

In the year prior to the actual study, the questions were distributed to students attending Israel programs, as well as to alumni of such programs. Their reactions brought about a number of changes in the content and language of the

questions that would finally be presented. For example, the entire section on issues of personal modesty was added after a number of Israel alumni commented that the major affect that the year in Israel had on them was in this area. In order that those "sensitive" questions would be answered honestly, they were originally worded "How would you feel about your friend being physically intimate with their fiance?", etc. Upon students' objection that what others did was none of their business (an issue that demands investigation in itself), the wording was changed so that the students were asked how they, personally, would feel about being involved in such behavior.

The questions were then presented to educators in the United States and Israel, generally, but not exclusively, individuals who direct the programs that the participating students attend. Among the educators involved in this process were:

Rabbi Reuven Aberman, Senior Educator,
Midreshet Moriah, Jerusalem

Rabbi Norman Amsel, Ed.D., Director, One-Year programs,
Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan

Dr. David Bernstein, Director,
Midreshet Lindenbaum, Jerusalem

Rabbi Azariah Berzon, Rosh Yeshiva,
Yeshivat Sha'arei Mevasseret Zion, Mevasseret Zion

Rabbi Yosef Blau, Mashgiah Ruhani,
Yeshiva University, New York City

Dr. Steven Cohen, Professor,
The Melton Center, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Rabbi Yair Kahn, Director, Mehina Program,
Yeshivat Har Etzion, Alon Shvut

Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein, Ph.D., Rosh Yeshiva,
Yeshivat Har Etzion, Alon Shvut

Rabbi David Miller, Director,
Yeshiva University Gruss Kollel, Jerusalem

Rabbi Daniel Rhein, Dean of Students,
Beit Midrash L'Torah, Jerusalem

Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, Ph.D., Dean,
Ohr Torah Institutes, Efrat

Rabbi Moshe Chaim Sosevsky, Ed.D., Rosh Yeshiva,
Yeshivat Ohr Yerushalayim, Beit Meir

Upon receiving the questionnaires, these individuals were asked to comment on the validity of the instrument, and for permission to have it distributed to their students. Further changes were made. A particular issue that engendered some discussion was the appropriate way to describe the State of Israel. One position was that asking for a positive response to a question about "the modern State of Israel" carried with it connotations of approval of modern secular Western culture. "The present-day State of Israel" was a suggested alternative. Following discussions with other members of the panel, the word "modern" was retained in the final version.

Following this process, still in the year prior to actual distribution, the instrument was again presented to

students in Israel programs to participate in a trial run. Following some final, technical corrections, the final version (Appendix A) was printed.

Only minor changes were made in the questionnaire each time it was distributed. After taking the pre-test, some students complained that the instrument was very long, so questions about parental behavior were deleted in the post-test. A number of questions were added asking whether the student had participated in specific aspects of the program, and what impact their involvement had on them. In the follow-up one year later, where the majority of students were asked to voluntarily respond to the questionnaire by mail, it was particularly important to give the impression that answering it would not be too difficult, an optical illusion of putting all the questions on one sheet of paper was used.

Data collection

With the instrument complete, data collection began. While the addition of the section on personal modesty issues was an important one for the study, it created problems in distribution. Two programs, one men's and one women's agreed to allow for the questionnaire to be distributed only if that section was deleted. Aside from those schools, one other women's program declined to participate entirely, citing that section. The director's argument was "I wouldn't want my daughter to answer those questions, so I will not allow my students to, either". He later declined to allow it to be distributed without those questions, as well.

In the end, the questionnaires were distributed to students in four hesder programs, in three American programs and in four women's programs (Appendix F).

Generally speaking, the schools were very cooperative in allowing access to their students for the purpose of responding to the questionnaire. Arrangements were made to distribute them either as part of the orientation procedures, or at some other time during the first week of studies. While this was important in order to ensure that the students would not be sensitized to the Israel

experience before filling out the "pre-Israel" questionnaire, it meant that students who arrived a few days late or were recovering from jet-lag did not participate.

The post-Israel questionnaire was distributed in May, since most of the programs end in early June. As there are no comparable orientation meetings at this point in the year, the questionnaires were distributed at a time that students were perceived to have the time to fill them out, and would likely be gathered in a central place. This was either during lunchtime or after a particular shiur for the American students. This led to a situation where not all of the original students filled out the post-Israel questionnaires, while some shana bet students, who were not part of the original study, did so.

The population responding to the follow-up questionnaire one year later is made up of two distinct groups. While most of the students return to college in the United States, some remain in Israel as shana bet students. The ones who remained in Israel were approached in much the same manner as they were in the first two times the questionnaire was distributed. The ones who returned to the United States either received their questionnaires at their college dormitories or were mailed questionnaires with stamped, self-addressed envelopes before pesach (mid-April). The researcher assumed that most students would visit their

homes for the holiday or have their spring break at about that time.

When approached in Israel, the students were usually interested, even excited, to complete the instrument. On occasion they were rewarded with homemade brownies. Many asked to be sent results of the study upon its conclusion. Only two students began taking the test, and then, apparently uncomfortable with their answers, chose not to complete it. When the post-test questionnaire was distributed, many students asked if they could see their responses from their pre-test. They were invited to visit the researcher at home, and were told that if they had written their zipcode and phone number, their pre-test could be located. Only one student actually followed up on this offer.

The excitement and interest shown by the subjects of the study helps explain the relatively strong response rate one year later. Aside from the 119 shana bet students tested one year later in Israel, 377 questionnaires were sent to students in the United States, either to their home address or to their college dormitories. Of these, five were returned by the postal authorities for various reasons, eleven were returned uncompleted by the students, and 210 were received completed (57%). A further 151 questionnaires

were resent, this time yielding 64 completed questionnaires, for a total response rate of about 75%.

The Population

As indicated in the data collection section, the responses were collected in three waves: immediately before beginning Israel study (pre-test), after completing the year of Israel study (post-test), and one year later (follow-up). Students were approached at times when it was reasonable to assume that they would have time to respond to a questionnaire, and that most of the students would be present. For the responses one year later, students voluntarily returned the questionnaires in stamped self-addressed envelopes. Clearly, therefore, the respondents were not always the same.

In the pre-test there were 401 valid questionnaires returned by the students. The post-test netted 418 questionnaires. In the follow-up one year later, including both questionnaires collected from shana bet students in Israel and those returned by mail in the United States, a total of 393 valid questionnaires were received.

These discrepancies notwithstanding, according to the students' answers it would appear that the vast majority of the respondents are the same. 72% of the post-test respondents and 84% of the follow-up respondents answered a

definite YES to the question "did you fill out this questionnaire before?". Unfortunately, however, the students' concern for privacy did not allow for all of the matching respondents to be identified. For all that they were assured anonymity, many students were reluctant to give their birthday and zipcode, which would allow for pairing answers on respective responses. Only 45% of the respondents could be definitively matched based on the information received.

When examining the questionnaires that were returned, it became clear that a number of students "slipped in" in the post-test and in the follow-up study who were not representative of the students who created the baseline statistics in the pre-test. Specifically, some shana bet students received questionnaires and responded to them both in their Israeli schools in the post-test and while in college in the follow-up study. Although examination of the results of frequencies and crosstabulations showed little difference whether or not these students were included in the sample, in order to study as "pristine" a sample as possible, these students were excluded from the analysis. Thus, the post-test group studied is made up of 384 respondents, all students after one year of Israel study, with 315 respondents studied in the follow-up study group. Of the 315 follow-up study respondents, 196 responded from

their colleges in the United States, and 119 returned the questionnaires after a second year of study in Israel.

The background of the students responding remains fairly constant throughout the three waves, as do the types of Israeli institutions that they attend. About a third of the students come from New York area coeducational schools, and another third from New York area boys' high schools. Of the remaining students, 22-24% are from "out of town" co-ed schools, with the rest from New York area girls' schools.

In Israel, the students fell into roughly similar groups, with one-third attending yeshivot hesder, one-third in American programs in Israel, and one-third in women's programs. There was a slightly greater proportion of women in the pre-test.

The great majority of students who come on these programs expect to return to their college studies in the United States after completing their year in Israel. Only six percent of the students who indicated definite plans for the year following Israel study, expected to stay in Israel. Nevertheless, by the end of the year 28% of the students choose to continue their religious studies in Israel for at least another year (Table 1).

Table 1

Students' plans for the year after Israel study, before
and after the year in Israel

	Pre-test	Post-test
YU	48.7	40.5
Local school	18.0	14.8
Ivy League	27.3	15.9
Israel	6.0	28.8
	<u>N=300</u>	<u>N=358</u>

Scoring

In order to analyze the raw numbers, scales were created by interacting apparent face relationships of the variables and factor analysis. In factor analysis, the variables loaded onto twelve different factors, which themselves loaded onto four factors. The four factors can be described as:

Religious ritual behaviors and attitudes
Zionism
Ethical issues
Hebrew language

The scales that make of each of these four factors are the following.

Religious ritual behaviors and attitudes includes:

Ritual practice, i.e. prayers, ritual hand-washing, and fasting

Personal modesty, i.e. issues of modest dress and whether one would feel comfortable in mixed gender situations

Interaction with the secular world, i.e. whether one would attend a "dirty" movie, or eat kosher food in a non-kosher restaurant

Commitment to continued Torah study, i.e. plans to attend shiurim or have hevrutot.

Zionism includes:

Plans to move to Israel

Issues of National Religious belief, i.e. that the modern state of Israel is the national homeland of the Jewish people, that it is part of the process of redemption and that all Jews are obligated to support it

Issues of political nationalist conviction, i.e. that Israel should not relinquish territory or that settling the West Bank is a praiseworthy act.

Ethical issues include:

General ethical issues, i.e. honesty when taking tests and in paying taxes

Jewish ethical behaviors, i.e. charity, respect for the elderly.

Hebrew language includes:

Self-evaluation of speech and comprehension.

Following creation of these scales, the responses were tallied in order to establish tables ranking the respondents as "high", "medium", or "low" for a given scale. Based on frequencies from the pre-test, the respondents were divided between the two ends of the spectrum, with approximately 30% of the highest responses deemed "high", an equal number of the lowest responses deemed "low", leaving approximately 40%

of the responses as "medium". This recoding allows for a clear picture of the changes that take place pre- and post-Israel study.

CHAPTER III
RESULTS I: THE YEAR IN ISRAEL

The Factors

Religious ritual behavior

Ritual practice. As explained above, the ritual practice scale was created by combining responses on questions of ritual behaviors. These include netilat yadaim (ritual handwashing) in the morning and before eating, prayers in the morning and afternoon, reciting appropriate blessings after eating or after relieving oneself, and fasting on public fast days. As indicated in Table 2, more than twice the number of students score HIGH on this scale after their Israel experience.

Similar conclusions can be reached with regard to three other scales of ritual attitudes and behaviors.

Personal modesty. The personal modesty scale was created by combining responses to questions about appropriate dress and interaction with members of the opposite sex in public and private settings together, ranging from holding hands to intimacy.

Table 3 indicates more than a doubling of HIGH responses in the course of the year in Israel.

Interaction with the secular world. The scale of interaction with the secular world is made up of responses to questions that center on a willingness to eat kosher food in a non-kosher restaurant and attending movies that are rated R or have overt sexual content. The responses in Table 4 mirror those that were found with regard to ritual behavior and personal modesty.

While the last two categories are not ritual behavior in the strict sense of the word, they reflect attitudes towards religious ritual practice. Therefore, it is not surprising to find them loading on the same factor. It appears evident that people committed to a certain level of religious practice will most likely accept the mores that go with ritual behavior. For these Orthodox Jews, that means accepting halakha (Jewish law) not only as the guiding force in ritual behavior, but in social interaction as well.

Torah study. In view of this relationship between ritual behavior and religious social interaction, it is not surprising to find the same pre- and post- Israel results with regard to the activity that most likely directly affects the overall change in attitude. The scale of commitment to Torah study is made up of questions regarding plans and expectations to continue studying Torah on a regular basis with a study partner or in a lecture setting, during and after college, as well as after marriage. The centrality of an extensive Jewish library in the home also falls into this category.

As Table 5 indicates, the numbers are very similar to those of the previous scales.

Table 2

Frequencies of ritual practice scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	29.0	8.1
MIDDLE	37.9	22.6
HIGH	17.4	69.4
	<u>N=390</u>	<u>N=372</u>

Note. The ritual practice scale is made up of questions regarding netilat yadaim (ritual handwashing) in the morning and before eating, prayers in the morning and afternoon, reciting appropriate blessings after eating or after relieving oneself, and fasting on public fast days.

=====

Table 3

Frequencies of personal modesty scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	30.1	9.0
MIDDLE	41.1	27.0
HIGH	28.8	64.0
	<u>N=365</u>	<u>N=311</u>

Note. The personal modesty scale was created by combining responses to questions about appropriate dress and interaction with members of the opposite sex in public and

private settings, ranging from holding hands to intimacy.

Table 4

Frequencies of interaction with secular world scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	27.1	13.3
MIDDLE	43.8	38.0
HIGH	29.4	48.7
	<u>N=365</u>	<u>N=316</u>

Note. The scale of interaction with the secular world is made up of responses to questions that center on a willingness to eat kosher food in a non-kosher restaurant and attending movies that are rated R or have overt sexual content.

=====

Table 5

Frequencies of commitment to Torah study scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	30.4	11.2
MIDDLE	37.3	30.9
HIGH	32.2	58.0
	<u>N=391</u>	<u>N=376</u>

Note. The scale of commitment to Torah study is made up of questions regarding plans to continue studying Torah on a

regular basis with a study partner or in a lecture setting, during and after college, as well as after marriage.

Zionism

While examination of the data in the range of religious behaviors shows correlation between increased commitment and study in an Israeli yeshiva program, other areas of the students' development need not necessarily follow the same pattern. Nevertheless, as the data indicate, similar trends are found in the areas of commitment to Israel and to Zionist ideals.

Based on factor analysis, two separate scales were created that measure attitudes regarding the importance of living in Israel. One measures the intent of the student to move to Israel, and is made up of questions that directly ask whether the respondent sees him or herself moving to Israel, serving in the army, and raising a family in Israel. A second scale measures the theoretical importance that one sees in living in Israel, and includes such issues as whether halakha requires one to live in Israel, and whether it is better to live in a non-religious community in Israel than in a religious community outside of Israel.

Tables 6 and 7 show that there is a clear change in plans and attitudes pre- and post- the year in Israel. Both with regard to moving to Israel and regarding the importance

of aliya, the number of students scoring HIGH doubles in the course of the year.

Another scale that loaded with the Zionist ones is one that includes questions that dealt with nationalistic issues from a perspective of morality and Jewish law, and whether involvement in the settlement movement is a praiseworthy activity. The results that appear in Table 8 indicate that students become more supportive of nationalistic political positions in the course of the year, with a substantial increase in those responding HIGH.

It would be reasonable to expect that the ideological underpinnings of National Religious beliefs would show increases in concert with the increased centrality of Israel in the students' thought that develops in the course of the year. It is interesting, therefore, to note that students' responses indicate otherwise. The National Religious ideology scale shows virtually no change before and after the year in Israel (Table 9).

Table 6

Frequencies of plans for Aliya scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	34.7	15.1
MIDDLE	36.2	30.5
HIGH	29.1	54.3
	<u>N=392</u>	<u>N=370</u>

Note. The plans for aliya scale is made up of questions that ask whether the respondent sees him or herself moving to and raising a family in Israel, and serving in tzahal.

=====

Table 7

Frequencies of importance of Aliya scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	31.4	14.3
MIDDLE	35.2	26.7
HIGH	33.4	59.0
	<u>N=392</u>	<u>N=378</u>

Note. The importance of aliya scale measures the theoretical importance that one sees in living in Israel. It includes such issues as whether halakha requires one to live in Israel, and whether it is better to live in a non-religious community in Israel than in a diaspora religious community.

Table 8

Frequencies of support for nationalist positions scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	40.5	32.5
MIDDLE	31.0	25.6
HIGH	28.5	41.9
	<u>N</u> =390	<u>N</u> =363

Note. The scale of support for nationalist positions includes questions that deal with nationalistic issues from a perspective of morality and Jewish law, and whether the settlement movement is a praiseworthy activity.

=====

Table 9

Frequencies of National Religious ideology scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	35.2	33.2
MIDDLE	36.7	35.6
HIGH	28.1	31.2
	<u>N</u> =384	<u>N</u> =365

Note. The National Religious ideology scale includes questions about the perception of the State of Israel as the national homeland of the Jewish people, as the fulfillment of Biblical prophecies and part of the Redemption process,

and whether all Jews are obligated to support it.

Ethical issues

Yeshiva studies, which primarily focus on text study and ritual practice, do not ignore other issues. As much as ritual bein adam lamakom (between man and God) issues are dealt with, practical bein adam lahavero (between man and his fellow) issues are dealt with, as well (Mishna Kiddushin 1:10). It follows, therefore, that the same increase found with regard to ritual issues should surface when examining ethical ones.

In Tables 10 and 11, two scales are presented that indicate a different trend for these ethical issues from that which was found regarding the previous scales. The first scale is made up of responses to questions about honesty, for example, honesty in paying taxes or cheating on a test. The second scale includes issues such as giving tzdaka (charity) when asked, or offering one's seat to an aged person. In neither of these areas do the data indicate the profound increases over the course of the year that were found in examining the previous scales. While there is a minor increase in the first scale, there is actually an apparent decrease on the second one.

This finding is further confirmed by contrasting the change that takes place in the course of the year in ethical

matters with the other areas under study. As Table 12 indicates, in areas of ritual behavior or plans for aliya, more than 90% of students who scored HIGH on the pretest, remain in that position post-Israel, while the other students move up in varying degrees. Regarding ethical behavior, a full third of the students who score HIGH on the pre-test decline to lower levels after their year of study; of those students who originally scored MIDDLE almost as many score lower as score higher.

The students themselves are aware that their experience impacted on them in a more notable way in the areas of ritual behavior and Torah study than in the area of ethics. As Table 13 indicates, when asked in the post-test how the year affected them, more than half of the students said that their commitment in various areas of religious ritual increased "a lot," while only a third felt that way regarding interpersonal mitzvot.

Table 10

Frequencies of ethical behavior scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	25.4	20.9
MIDDLE	50.8	48.9
HIGH	23.9	30.2
	<u>N</u> =394	<u>N</u> =378

Note. The ethical behavior scale is made up of responses to questions on personal honesty, for example on paying taxes or cheating on a college exam.

=====

Table 11

Frequencies of Jewish ethical behavior scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	32.3	32.8
MIDDLE	30.2	36.5
HIGH	36.8	30.7
	<u>N</u> =399	<u>N</u> =381

Note. The scale of Jewish ethical issues includes issues as giving tzdaka (charity) when asked, or offering a seat to an aged person.

Table 12

Comparisons of the ritual behavior scale, the plans for Aliya scale and the ethical behavior scale to themselves respectively, before and after Israel study

Comparison of ritual behavior scale before Israel study to the ritual behavior scale after Israel study

		Before Israel			
		<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>	
After Israel	LOW	26.3	31.6	42.1	
	MIDDLE	4.5	28.4	67.0	
	HIGH	0.0	1.7	98.3	<u>N=205</u>

Comparison of plans for Aliya scale before Israel study to the plans for Aliya scale after Israel study

		Before Israel			
		<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>	
After Israel	LOW	25.4	42.3	32.4	
	MIDDLE	4.1	33.8	62.2	
	HIGH	3.3	6.7	90.0	<u>N=205</u>

Comparison of ethical behavior scale before Israel study to the ethical behavior scale after Israel study

		Before Israel			
		<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>	
After Israel	LOW	48.8	39.0	12.2	
	MIDDLE	17.6	59.3	23.1	

Hebrew language

One would hope that spending a year in a foreign country would, if nothing else, give a sense of the language and culture of the host country to a visitor. Here, the study indicates that students in a one-year program come away with a better comprehension of the Hebrew language. As Table 14 indicates, the Hebrew language scale, which is made up of questions asking the student for self-evaluation in different areas of Hebrew speech and comprehension, indicates a serious sense of development in the course of the year.

Table 14

Frequencies of the Hebrew language scale,
before and after Israel study

	Pre-test	Post-test
LOW	34.2	20.1
MIDDLE	32.7	27.7
HIGH	33.2	52.2
	<u>N=395</u>	<u>N=379</u>

Discussion

General effects

The findings of this study clearly support many of the assumptions that Jewish educators and leaders make about the effect of post high school Israel study. In virtually all areas of religious ritual practice, including issues of modesty which conflict with the American culture in which these students grew up, there is a substantial increase in students scoring HIGH. There are similar increases in commitment to continued Torah study, a key element in creating an enduring connection with the Orthodox Jewish community. Finally, commitment to live in Israel, support those who do, and even to speak Hebrew, increase in a parallel way.

There are two areas in which the data did not indicate comparable increases. With regard to both development of ethical behavior and accepting Israeli national religious ideology there is no indication of change.

Although the findings in these particular areas may be contrary to the expectations of some, contemporary Jewish scholars have already noted and discussed these issues.

In the realm of ethics, the failure of the Orthodox

community to produce members of higher ethical standing has been noted before. In his Editor's Notebook in the journal *Tradition*, Emanuel Feldman (1992), discussing the Orthodox community at large, admonishes:

While we have created many observant Jews, we have not created many religious Jews. When it is possible for a Jew to don tefillin, be rigorous in his kashrut, live a life marked by many humrot, and yet be lax in his ben 'adam la-havero, something is not right. Students of Torah are considered to have "succeeded" when they know this or that Gemara and are expert in certain areas of halakha. But the noblest internal possibilities of the Jew -- bitahon, awe, humility, courage, loyalty, hesed, 'ahava -- are by and large not an integral part of the learning program -- as if middot and general spiritual development will somehow take care of themselves.

Similarly, commitment to national religious Zionist ideology in the American Orthodox world has been in decline. Waxman (1994), comparing the present American Orthodox scene to that of 50 years ago, reports that "within much of American Orthodoxy in general, the ideology of religious Zionism is now much less frequently espoused" (p. xv). Among other things Waxman points out that "there seems to have been a decline in the *religious* celebration of Israel Independence Day within Orthodox congregations across the United States" (p. xvi).

The overwhelming sense that one gets when examining the results of this study is that during the year in Israel powerful changes occur in the day school graduate. It would appear that attitudes and behaviors that have been

encouraged by the day schools for twelve years have the opportunity to take root and grow in Israel. The students report a greater commitment to Torah, mitzvot and eretz yisrael, something that is not reported by their peers, day school graduates who did not continue their religious studies in Israel.

In order to understand this phenomenon, it is necessary to understand the relationship between two interacting elements: American day school education and the environment of the Israeli yeshiva program. These students come well prepared for yeshiva life. They have spent twelve years studying religious texts and ideology. Nevertheless, they report that their level of commitment and practice is relatively low as they begin their year of study post high school. In the Israeli yeshiva these students are surrounded by an environment in which the principles that they have studied are practiced on a day-to-day basis in a clear, noticeable way.

Schwab (1978) quotes Aristotle as dividing disciplines into three basic divisions: the Theoretical, the Practical and the Productive. The theoretical disciplines are those whose aim is to "know", that is, disciplines of information. The practical disciplines are those concerned with choice, decision, and action based on deliberate decisions. The

productive disciplines are those concerned with "making".

The theoretical disciplines are concerned with precisely these aspects of things which we cannot alter by making or make use of by doing. The productive disciplines are concerned with what is malleable, capable of being changed. The practical disciplines are concerned with another sort of malleability, [that] of human character...

Schwab laments

We ... have tended to fall into the habit of treating all disciplines proper to the school as if they were theoretical. We manage to maintain this preoccupation in the case of the practical disciplines by ignoring them...

For us in modern times, ethics and politics would include not only each individual effort to lead and examine a deliberate life and the governing and policymaking in high places, but also the difficult and terrifying business of being parents, of being teachers *deliberately* and not as automatons, and the responsible work of administration and policymaking at all levels, together with those parts of the social sciences which contribute to such activities. I need not add that of all the things schools might do, they do least of this. A few nursery schools, a very few teachers at the elementary school level, and some few men and women at the college level give thought and time and energy toward evoking in their students the competencies and habits that lead to the making of good choices and good decisions and help the person to act in ways commensurate with his decisions. But by and large, the time, the energy, and the resource of our public schools ignore the very existence of practical disciplines in the Aristotelian sense (pp. 17-18).

The yeshivot spend a tremendous amount of time encouraging students to absorb information and to learn to process and better analyze that information. Perhaps encouragement to make decisions and choose to change behavior patterns is not emphasized in the same way. It is

true that there is strong evidence of behavior change in this year-long process, but change in ritual behavior likely stems not from study, but from experience.

Students who have been learning halakha for twelve years prior to arriving in Israel, undoubtedly knew many of the halakhot that, based on their own testimony, they did not perform prior to arriving in Israel. Rabbi Michael Sussman, who as Yeshiva University's Israel advisor visited the different programs on a regular basis and dealt with many of the students on a personal level, claims that the yeshivot generally do not lecture their students on the importance of reciting asher yatzar or birkat hamazon. The yeshivot assume that these basic ritual behaviors are common practice (personal interview, May 9, 1996). The change that takes place during the year in these behaviors stems from being in an environment where these are the norms of conduct. The values of the yeshiva environment differ significantly from that of the students' community at home (Carney 1985). It is not the learning per se that brings about the change, rather it is the environment (of which, obviously, learning is an important factor).

It is important to note that this different lifestyle is not merely the lifestyle of the yeshiva, but is the lifestyle of the Israeli community in which the student lives. Certainly in the yeshivot which are in their own

communities or on enclosed campuses, the lifestyle all around is one that supports adherence to ritual practice, but even when leaving the precincts of the yeshiva, the student comes into contact with a society that is more observant than the American Jewish community. "Israeli society simply lends more social support, significance, and legitimacy to Jewish ritual practice than American society does" (Liebman and Cohen 1990, p. 140).

This all-encompassing atmosphere of religious ritually practiced Judaism as a norm of behavior, is a powerful force impacting on the American day school graduate all day, every day.

In the realm of ethical behavior, the yeshivot do not have the same opportunity to create a radically different community which will bring about cultural challenge, and potentially change in behavior. Although there are opportunities to distribute charity, the yeshivot do not bring in poor or elderly people upon whom the students can practice ethical behavior. In his study of yeshivot in America, Helmreich (1982) observed an emphasis on morality within the yeshiva; a show of concern for others, reminders not to speak badly of others, the etiquette of *mussar*. He left whether it extends to other areas as an open question, pointing out numerous "white collar" crimes allegedly committed by members of the Orthodox community. Helmreich

concludes that "if such behavior is as much a fact of life among the Orthodox as it is among others, then one must wonder if the yeshiva system has failed in its efforts to inculcate ethical behavior among its members" (p. 123).

Even more specifically, it is possible that yeshiva study in Israel may not be conducive to development of moral and ethical behavior. Liebman and Cohen (1990), discussing differences between American and Israeli Judaism, argue that mainstream Orthodoxy in Israel tends to particularism to the extent that "everything is viewed through a Jewish prism and judged from a Jewish perspective." Further, "th[is] rise of particularism has implications for the interpretation of 'moralism' as well. Emphasis on law (and ritual) means less of an emphasis on the centrality of ethics" (p. 146).

Thus, even the study of ethical texts, may not be able bring about change in an environment where "...religious Jews in Israel have also redefined the very term *morality* in particularistic rather than universalistic terms" (p. 146).

It is also possible that the numbers lie. What the statistics show us may not be a lack of advance in the area of ethical behavior, rather it may be an indication of the "raising of consciousness" of the students to the problems of certain behaviors, by which they were never bothered previously. The amount of charity given was perceived to be enough. If I turned away so I didn't see the elderly person,

it is all right. After a year of Torah study, the student has learned the Rashi that teaches "patoah tiftach", that one must give a poor person over and over again (Devarim 15:8), and the gemara that expounds "...v'yareita meielokeha ani Hashem" (Vayikra 19:32), that one must keep ethical mitzvot even when no one is looking, because God is always looking (Kidushin 32b). Perhaps students who have come to expect more of themselves, score themselves more severely on moral and ethical questions.

With regard to National Religious ideology, the atmosphere of the yeshiva might be expected by some to effect a change in the American student's position. Here, however, there is prior knowledge that is missing. While it is true that students react more favorably with regard to their plans to live in Israel, this reflects their new-found ability to function in a society that was foreign, and is now familiar. They meet people whom they perceive as role models, who have made aliya, and appreciate it as a value. There is rarely, however, an opportunity to grapple with issues of redemption and the place of the modern State of Israel in the redemptive process.

Back home, as Orthodox Jews in America, they were not taught to perceive Israel in ritualistic-religious terms (Waxman 1994). Unlike their modern, religious, Israeli

counterparts who grow up being taught by the followers of Rav Kook that they are active participants in a redemptive process they learn about in the Bible and the Prophets, American youngsters grow up praying on behalf of their favorite sports team.

After a year of study in Israel, the American youngster expresses the belief that it is possible, even desirable, to commit oneself to live in the State of Israel. Many students declare that for reasons of religious belief or national security, territory should not be turned over to the Arabs. This commitment, however, does not include an unequivocal acceptance of the unfamiliar dogmatic principles of religious Zionism.

The Different programs

In the hypothesis it was suggested that the various types of programs, hesder, American yeshivot and women's programs, would affect their students in diverse ways reflecting the distinct emphasis of each type of program. The data do not clearly support that supposition, but they nevertheless point to a number of important differences among these unique programs.

It appears that not all students come with the same intent. Table 15 indicates that most hesder students perceive the intense Torah study opportunity as being a major impetus for Israel yeshiva study; this is less the case for the women coming to Israel, and even less true for those students about to enter American programs in Israel. On the other hand, the fact that their friends were coming plays a much larger role in the decision to come for the American program students than it does for either the hesder students or the women.

Nevertheless, in the area of religious ritual behavior, all groups show marked increases in students scoring HIGH in the course of the year (Table 16). The differences among the groups, though, are large to begin with, and remain so in both posttests. Clearly, students attending hesder programs come with the strongest commitment to ritual practice, with

the women the weakest group. These trends remain throughout, as well.

In the area of Torah study, the hesder students again are the most strongly committed (Table 17). This time, though, it is the American program students who are by far the weakest group. Over the course of the year, while all groups show higher scores, the American program students score almost four times as well as they did in the pretest, and in the end they score more strongly than do the women. Given the admission of these students that their choice to study in Israel was not made with the specific intent to develop in the area of Torah study, this evolution points to the power of the Israeli yeshiva experience.

Table 15

Interest in an intense Torah study experience and importance of friends being in Israel by type of Israeli program

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Interest in Torah study</u>			
	<u>Great interest</u>	<u>Somewhat interest</u>	<u>Little interest</u>	<u>No interest</u>
American Program	41.8	35.2	16.5	6.6
Hesder Program	84.0	13.6	2.4	0.0
Women's Program	61.2	27.9	5.5	5.5
N=392				

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Importance of friends being in Israel</u>			
	<u>Great importance</u>	<u>Some importance</u>	<u>Little importance</u>	<u>No importance</u>
American Program	24.2	31.9	27.5	16.5
Hesder Program	14.4	28.8	20.8	36.0
Women's Program	15.2	24.2	30.9	29.7
N=392				

Table 16

Ritual behavior scale by type of Israel program before and after one year of Israel study

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Ritual behavior scale</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	41.2	34.0	24.7
Hesder Program	7.2	29.6	63.2
Women's Program	36.1	48.1	15.8
	<u>N=390</u>		
	Post-test		
American Program	5.2	20.0	74.8
Hesder Program	0.0	9.7	90.3
Women's Program	13.3	35.6	51.1
	<u>N=363</u>		

Table 17

Scale of commitment to Torah study by type of Israel program
before and after one year of Israel study

Scale of commitment to Torah study

<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	48.0	36.7	15.3
Hesder Program	12.9	34.7	52.4
Women's Program	30.4	41.8	27.8
<u>N=350</u>			
	Post-test		
American Program	14.4	27.1	58.5
Hesder Program	1.8	30.4	67.9
Women's Program	12.4	35.8	51.8
<u>N=367</u>			

A phenomenon not anticipated by the hypotheses appears regarding attitudes towards Israel and Zionism. As indicated previously, aliya plans, for example, rise during the year in Israel. The responses indicate that the students attending American programs begin with substantially less commitment to aliya than do those students attending hesder and Women's programs. Nevertheless, the post-test shows that those students do become strongly affected by their experience and indicate a much stronger commitment to aliya plans (Table 18). This is shown even more strongly in their attitudes towards the value of aliya, where the post-test indicates that they actually "catch up" to their peers attending yeshivot hesder (Table 19).

Given the make-up of the American programs in Israel, this finding is unexpected. In yeshivot hesder, the students interact with Israelis, attend many of their lectures in Hebrew, and have a more "Israeli" experience than do their peers in American programs, whose interaction is almost completely with fellow Americans. While most of the women's programs studied do not have regular interaction with Israeli students, they, too, are more integrated into Israeli society in the sense that they shop, prepare their own meals, are encouraged to do community volunteer work, and visit Israeli homes for shabbat more often than their male peers (Personal interview, Linda Derovan, Yeshiva

University's Israel advisor, May 20, 1996). Still, the greatest change takes place in the men's American programs.

Even in the area of National Religious ideology, the one area in which little change was found, the only group that shows substantial change is, in fact, the students in the American programs (Table 20), where again, in the post-test they rise to a level equal to that of their hesder yeshiva peers.

It is also interesting to note that in the areas of belief in the importance of aliya and of National Religious ideology, women score consistently higher than do the students in the men's programs. This finding is supported by the responses of women to the question in the post-test as to where they perceived change in the course of their year of study. Table 21 shows a substantially more positive response for women to the question of support for Israel than from either of the men's programs.

Table 18

Scale of plans for Aliya by type of Israel program before
and after one year of Israel study

<u>Aliya</u>	<u>Scale of plans for</u>		
	<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>
<u>HIGH</u>			
		Pre-test	
American Program	49.0	39.8	11.2
Hesder Program	26.8	36.6	36.6
Women's Program	32.9	33.5	33.5
	<u>N=392</u>		
		Post-test	
American Program	23.3	34.5	42.2
Hesder Program	13.6	27.3	59.1
Women's Program	8.2	30.6	61.2
	<u>N=360</u>		

Table 19

Scale of perceived importance of Aliya by type of Israel program before and after one year of Israel study

Perceived importance of Aliya scale

<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
---------------------	------------	---------------	-------------

Pre-test

American Program	40.0	31.6	28.4
Hesder Program	30.4	39.2	28.4
Women's Program	27.3	34.8	37.9

N=392

Post-test

American Program	14.7	29.3	56.0
Hesder Program	14.7	26.7	58.6
Women's Program	14.6	24.8	60.6

N=369

Table 20

Scale of support for National Religious beliefs by type of
Israel program, before and after one year of Israel study

Support for National Religious beliefs

<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
---------------------	------------	---------------	-------------

Pre-test

American Program	44.0	39.6	16.5
Hesder Program	44.8	29.6	25.6
Women's Program	22.8	40.5	36.7

N=357

Post-test

American Program	41.6	31.0	27.4
Hesder Program	39.3	32.1	28.6
Women's Program	19.2	43.8	36.9

N=355

Table 21

Change in support for the State of Israel and commitment to the Land of Israel by type of Israel program after a year of study in Israel

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Large increase</u>	<u>Some increase</u>	<u>No change</u>
---------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

Change in support for the State of Israel

American Program	46.0	33.1	15.3
Hesder Program	35.3	39.7	20.6
Women's Program	76.1	18.3	3.5

N=357

Change in commitment to Eretz Yisrael

American Program	57.1	31.7	8.7
Hesder Program	52.9	32.4	14.7
Women's Program	79.9	16.7	2.8

N=355

A parallel effect is found when examining the change in reported Hebrew language ability. An obvious assumption would be that the students in the most intensively Israeli environment would show the greatest increase in high scores. In fact, when examining Table 22 it appears that although the hesder students remain by far the strongest group with regard to reported Hebrew language skills, the students in the American programs report the greatest increase in students scoring HIGH.

It is difficult to determine whether these responses indicate a true development that is greater among students in non-Israeli programs, or whether it reflects the realistic awareness of the yeshivat hesder student that even after a year of interaction with Israelis, it is unlikely that they have a true mastery of the language.

Table 22

Hebrew language scale by type of Israel program, before and after one year of Israel study

<u>Hebrew language scale</u>			
<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	37.1	42.3	20.6
Hesder Program	17.7	33.1	49.2
Women's Program	42.9	27.6	29.4
<u>N</u> =395			
	Post-test		
American Program	22.7	24.4	52.9
Hesder Program	8.0	30.1	61.9
Women's Program	26.3	27.7	46.0
<u>N</u> =379			

Another area in which it would be reasonable to expect differences among the different groups is that of ethical behavior. While none of the yeshivot discourage ethical behavior, the women's programs encourage active participation in hesed projects, often requiring or scheduling time for students to work with elderly, disabled or others in need. The yeshivot hesder, on the other hand, really expect that the students devote themselves almost completely to their studies in the beit midrash.

In fact, while women do score higher than do men in the ethical scales (Tables 23 and 24), their increased high scores in the course of the year in the ethical scale are no greater than those of their male counterparts, and they backtrack just as do the men on the scale of Jewish ethical behavior.

The women perceive themselves that way as well, as indicated in Table 25, where they score themselves almost exactly as do the men when asked in the post-test how they perceive the impact of the year in Israel.

Table 23

Scale of ethical behavior by type of Israel program, before and after one year of Israel study

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Scale of ethical behavior</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	36.4	52.5	11.1
Hesder Program	24.0	49.6	26.4
Women's Program	17.6	51.6	30.8
	N=394		
	Post-test		
American Program	25.4	53.4	21.2
Hesder Program	14.3	53.6	32.1
Women's Program	19.6	43.5	37.0
	N=368		

Table 24

Scale of Jewish ethical behavior by type of Israel program,
before and after one year of Israel study

Scale of Jewish ethical behavior

<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
---------------------	------------	---------------	-------------

Pre-test

American Program	34.3	33.3	32.3
Hesder Program	39.2	32.0	28.8
Women's Program	25.6	28.7	45.7

N=399

Post-test

American Program	35.9	36.8	27.4
Hesder Program	37.9	41.4	20.7
Women's Program	26.8	31.9	41.3

N=371

Table 25

Change in concern with Mitzvot Bein Adam LeHaveiro and Bein Adam LaMakom by type of Israel program, after a year of study in Israel

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Large increase</u>	<u>Some increase</u>	<u>No change</u>
---------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------------

Change in concern with Mitzvot Bein Adam Lehaveiro

American Program	37.6	59.0	2.6
Hesder Program	31.0	60.3	7.8
Women's Program	31.6	61.0	7.4

N=369

Change in concern with Mitzvot Bein Adam LaMakom

American Program	56.4	39.3	2.6
Hesder Program	55.2	39.7	3.4
Women's Program	49.6	42.3	5.8

N=370

It would appear that different types of students choose the particular institutions that are best prepared to deal with them. The yeshivot hesder, which are primarily designed to meet the needs of the Israeli high school graduate preparing to begin army service cannot at the same time respond to the requirements of the American high school graduate who has not yet fully committed himself to Torah study and ritual practice. Thus, the evolution of programs that meet such needs is an important educational development.

The differences that were noted among the programs, particularly in the area of gender differences, deserve a study in themselves. There is a veritable library of literature on women and religious belief systems and religious practice. In the Orthodox Jewish community, there is certainly an issue of Jewish women feeling that they are spectators rather than active participants in many public rituals. Even in the area of Torah study, where in high school they may have been encouraged to behave as full participants, they find that a very different environment exists in the more traditional yeshiva setting in Israel.

The development in the course of the year in the area of Israel and Zionism tends to support our earlier contention that the Israel experience for these students does not change them, as much as it reinforces already

existing knowledge and belief structures. The most "Israeli" of the different experiences is the hesder yeshiva program, in which American students interact in the course of their daily routine with Israelis. Nevertheless, in the women's programs where there is some level of interaction, as well as the American programs in Israel where there is virtually none, there are changes of comparable, and on occasion greater, weight. A reasonable explanation for this phenomenon is that the educational experience is not inculcating new values in the participating students; rather, it is reinvigorating already known and latently accepted convictions. As such, even in a setting that does not allow for true integration with Israelis, the experience of living in Israel builds on existing beliefs to raise the level of faith and commitment of all the students.

In any case, it does appear that substantial change takes place in the course of the year in Israel in areas of religious ritual and Torah study as well as in the area of Zionist affiliation. Nevertheless, for men the greater emphasis of their year in Israel is yeshiva study, while for the women the main focus seems to be on the Israel experience. Women, who scored highest in support of Israel in the pre-test, claim the greatest increase in HIGH scores in the post-test (Table 21).

This is not unexpected given the differences among the

programs. According to Mrs. Linda Derovan, Israel advisor for Yeshiva University, the student in either a yeshivat hesder or an American program in Israel is expected to stay in yeshiva for shabbat, more often than not accompanied by the rosh yeshiva; it is only a special shabbat in which the women's programs offer the option of "staying in". The women, therefore, have a greater opportunity to experience Israel through travel and through meeting its people (Personal interview, May 20, 1996).

The lack of strength shown by the women's responses in the area of ethical behavior, points to the second of our earlier suggestions. It is difficult to imagine that the women's programs specifically should show little or no change, while the men's programs, where less emphasis is put on the development of ethical behavior. True sensitivity to acts of hesed, however, go hand in hand with an understanding of how little we are actually doing in the realm of bein adam lahavero, between man and his fellow. In the men's programs, the students are taught that their Torah study is the ultimate good in the context of Jewish behavior and practice. Their peers in the women's program are taught that there are other aspects of Jewish practice that are also important. The women, therefore, appear to expect more from themselves, and likely score themselves lower than do the men.

CHAPTER IV
OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

It is difficult to factor out all of the elements that impact on a student in an educational setting and isolate those particular elements that effect change. Because of this limitation, determining causality in educational research is frequently a perplexing, if not an impossible, task (Moore 1983). Nevertheless, it is important to examine some of the other factors that may contribute to the demonstrated change in order to determine whether they can be easily attributed to some outside element.

The Control group

The original plan was to distribute the pre-test simultaneously to students in Israel and the United States, in order to create a control group of day school graduates who chose not to attend Israel programs. Unfortunately, for technical reasons the American distribution was delayed until it became unfeasible. In order to create the likeness of a control group, modern Orthodox high schools across the United States were approached and asked to distribute the same questionnaire to their senior classes, creating an

entirely new sample of students, some of whom would attend Israel programs, while others would go directly to American colleges.

Given the sensitivity that women's programs had shown to certain issues in the questionnaire, the schools were asked to distribute them only to their boys. Eleven schools (Appendix F) agreed to participate (one did not). The questionnaires were sent to each of the schools individually, where faculty members in the schools supervised their distribution. The post-test for these students, one year after graduation, worked as did the follow-up study for the original group. Students in Israel were approached in their respective Israeli institutions, while students who did not come to Israel received their follow-up questionnaire either in their college dormitory, or at their homes during spring vacation.

As with the first group, the American high schools did not succeed in getting all of their senior classes to answer the questionnaire in the pre-test, and the post-test questionnaires that were sent to the entire graduating class were not all returned. Thus the respondents in the pre-test and in the post-test are not always identical. In order to encourage these students to respond (since they had never met the researcher carrying out the study, it was likely that they suspected it was really an in-house study), their

peers in Israel were asked to write letters to them, encouraging them to respond. (I think my favorite was the fellow who wrote "Rabbi Berger is a good guy and a Knick fan. He needs to get his doctorate -- SO ANSWER THIS!")

While the response rate of this group was not as high as the previous group, it was, nevertheless, comparable to that of similar studies (Schiff and Schneider 1994). Aside from the 194 responses that were collected in Israel in a manner similar to that described above for the original study group, 110 questionnaires were sent to students' homes during spring break. Three were returned by the postal service, and 49 completed questionnaires were received (45%). The second mailing to 58 students yielded 20 completed questionnaires, for a total of 69 completed questionnaires, a 63% response rate from American college students.

Examination of the responses of this group that answered the questionnaire first as high school seniors and one year after high school graduation shows that the changes indicated by the students' responses in the study group are unique to the students who study in Israel. Nevertheless, it must be noted that it is difficult to establish this with certainty. Although almost 60% of the students responding in the post-test indicated with certainty that they had taken the questionnaire while in high school, their reluctance to

give the personal identifying responses on the questions of birthday and zipcode limited the number of students that could definitely be matched to fewer than half the group (110 students). There is a further complication with this group. For those students who were not matched there is no way of ascertaining whether their plans for post high school study were actually fulfilled. That is to say, students who indicated that they were planning to go to college, may well have ended up in Israel, or vice versa.

Given these limitations, the responses still seem to indicate the previously noted changes in the group that attends Israel programs, while the group that remain in the United States for college (including students attending Yeshiva University), shows none of those changes.

In Table 26, for example it is clear that in the pre-test, the group attending programs for Americans in Israel, are by far the weakest group in the area of ritual behavior, far weaker than the students going to college straight from high school. This is evident in the first chart (Pre-test), which is based on the student's plans for post high school study. One year after high school graduation (Post-test), there is notable change in both groups in Israel, particularly the non-hesder students, while the college students weaken in their ritual behaviors.

This finding is consistent with the thrust of a study

done on yeshiva high school graduates in Brandeis University (Sokoloff 1994). Fifty students were interviewed, and their ritual practice pretty much matched that of their parents. The exceptions were the sixteen students who had spent a year studying in yeshiva in Israel. Virtually all of these students eat exclusively in the kosher cafeteria, and keep all the prohibitions of shabbat. More Israel alumni pray daily than the rest of the sample, and more have a daily hevruta.

In explaining the difficulties faced by the day school graduate in continuing their ritual practice, the prevalent suggestion was that "it was the environment at Brandeis that challenged their observances. Aliza said it is more difficult because she is not 'in a microcosm of people who believe in the same tenets.' One student who attended a girls' high school said it was much easier to observe the laws of negiah there" (p. 83).

Clearly, the environment and community that the yeshiva high school graduate finds in a secular university is very different from those that his or her peer finds in an Israeli yeshiva program.

Table 26

Scale of ritual practice by post high school study, during high school and one year after graduation

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Scale of ritual practice</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	50.0	31.3	18.8
Hesder Program	29.3	31.0	39.7
American College	32.0	20.0	48.0
<u>N=165</u>			
	Post-test		
American Program	6.2	23.0	70.8
Hesder Program	0.0	3.8	96.3
American College	42.3	26.8	31.0
<u>N=264</u>			

Regarding issues of personal modesty, similar differences are found between students who attend Israel programs and those who do not. As Table 27 indicates, issues that were of little significance prior to the year in Israel become matters of concern after the year is over. As was found with regard to ritual practice, the students who are going to attend the programs for Americans in Israel actually score lower while in high school than do those students who do not plan to study in Israel. By the time they are out of high school for a year, those students are much more concerned with appropriate sexual behavior. For the students in college, modesty becomes less of a concern.

This, again, dovetails with the findings of Sokoloff's study (1994), which devotes a full chapter to "Students' observances of the laws of Negiah and pre-marital sexual activity". Of the fifty students interviewed only eight avoided physical contact with members of the opposite sex. The four men who did so reported that they made the decision to do so after their year of study in Israel. On the other hand, eleven said that they were sexually active, and were willing to discuss the methods of birth control that they used.

Table 27

Scale of personal modesty by post high school study, during high school and one year after graduation

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Scale of personal modesty</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	46.0	38.0	16.0
Hesder Program	26.3	35.1	38.6
American College	40.8	20.4	38.8
<u>N=165</u>			
	Post-test		
American Program	18.4	25.4	56.1
Hesder Program	4.2	14.6	81.3
American College	42.3	33.8	23.9
<u>N=233</u>			

Table 28, deals with plans for aliya, and points to similar changes. With only minor differences between the college bound students and American program students in high school, just one year later it is the hesder and non-hesder students who are indistinguishable from one another regarding their aliya plans, while the college students have dropped slightly.

As noted in the previous section, given the substantial change that is found in ritual behavior and religious values, the lack of change in the area of ethical behavior pre- and post- Israel is unexpected. Nevertheless, Table 29 supports this finding. While major differences were not found among the three groups of students while in high school, the data suggest that students in Israel programs actually seem to regress following their year of study in Israel.

Table 28

Plans for Aliya scale by post high school study, during high school and one year after graduation

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Plans for Aliya scale</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	54.2	25.0	20.8
Hesder Program	33.3	31.6	35.1
American College	59.6	23.4	17.0
<u>N=161</u>			
	Post-test		
American Program	18.6	30.1	51.3
Hesder Program	16.7	33.3	50.0
American College	60.6	25.4	14.1
<u>N=262</u>			

Table 29

Jewish ethical behavior scale by post high school study,
during high school and one year after graduation

<u>Jewish ethical behavior scale</u>			
<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	Pre-test		
American Program	30.0	34.0	36.0
Hesder Program	28.8	33.9	37.3
American College	34.0	38.0	28.0
<u>N=168</u>			
	Post-test		
American Program	33.3	44.7	21.9
Hesder Program	32.9	38.0	29.1
American College	32.4	35.2	32.4
<u>N=264</u>			

Parental background

As noted previously, studies differ with regard to the influence of parental behaviors on the Jewish commitment of their children. While Shapiro (1988) found that the parents' background made a large and significant impact on their children, the studies of Pollack (1961), Himmelfarb (1974), and Heimowitz (1979) gave greater weight to hours, years or experiences in a framework of Jewish education.

In the pre-test, students were asked to respond to a series of questions regarding the religious practice of their fathers and mothers, which largely paralleled the questions that they answered about themselves. Items on ritual practice, Torah study and commitment to Israel were included, as well as questions on educational and socio-economic background. Most of the students responded, although a number indicated unwillingness to "report" on the behaviors of others. (My personal favorites were those students who were willing to respond to anonymous questions on their own sexual mores, but wrote "NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS!" when asked to approximate their family's annual income.)

When subjected to factor analysis, the questions on

parents loaded onto four factors: mother's ritual practice, father's ritual practice, parents' involvement with the world and parents' involvement with Israel.

The four scales created based on the factor analysis did not load with any of the scales of student responses, except for parent's involvement with Israel, which loaded together with student's Hebrew language scale. Not surprisingly, therefore, when crosstabulated with the students' responses, no clear pattern was indicated.

Similarly, when controlling for parents' own yeshiva backgrounds, there is no difference in their children's behavior and belief whether the parents themselves attended day school or did not. This finding supports the above mentioned studies that once the decision is made to send a student to day school, the education received there will impact on the student, irrelevant of the parents' background.

Certainly the students do not perceive that their parents' encouragement is an important factor in choosing to study in Israel. The students' answers indicated that fewer than half of the respondents felt that their parents' influence on their decision was any consequence.

When examining the responses of the control group and comparing parental background with the decision to attend school in Israel, no relationship was found between the

parents' education or ritual practice and the students' decision to study in Israel.

It should be noted, however, that the decision on where to attend school in Israel apparently is connected with parental background. As Table 30 indicates, parents who score HIGH on the ritual practice scale more likely send their sons to yeshivot hesder, programs that are attended by more committed students. This is not the case regarding attitudes towards Israel where there is no clear connection between parents' involvement with Israel and attending a particular program.

Table 30

Type of Israel program by father's ritual practice, by mother's ritual practice, and by parental Israel involvement scale

<u>Program type</u>	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	<u>Father's ritual practice</u>		
American Program	53.1	43.8	30.6
Hesder Program	46.9	56.3	69.4
	<u>Mother's ritual practice</u>		
American Program	48.4	53.5	27.3
Hesder Program	51.6	46.5	72.7
	<u>Parents' Israel involvement scale</u>		
American Program	42.2	38.3	47.5
Hesder Program	57.8	61.7	52.5

N=149

N=96

N=185

High schools

Another possible factor influencing students is the high schools that they attended prior to their Israel study. Students who graduate from different types of modern Orthodox high schools have different perspectives on religious issues. As Table 31 indicates, in such areas as ritual practice, commitment to continued religious study, and plans to move to Israel, there are widely varying perspectives depending on whether the students attended an all boys school, an all girls school, a coed school, or went to school outside the metropolitan New York area.

With regard to ritual issues and Torah study, the boys schools score substantially higher than do the girls or the students in coed schools. On the other hand, it is the students from outside of the New York metropolitan area who indicate a greater commitment to move to Israel than do any of the New Yorkers.

Table 31

Ritual practice, commitment to continued Torah study, and plans for Aliya by type of high school, prior to Israel study

	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	<u>Ritual practice scale</u>		
<u>High school</u>			
Coeducational	38.7	45.2	16.1
All boys	12.0	25.0	63.0
All girls	39.2	41.2	19.6
Outside of NY metro area	23.9	40.9	35.2

N=369

Commitment to continued Torah study

Coeducational	39.7	37.2	23.1
All boys	21.8	35.6	42.6
All girls	39.2	37.3	23.5
Outside of NY metro area	16.5	39.6	44.0

N=370

Plans for Aliya

Coeducational	40.7	36.6	22.8
All boys	35.4	37.4	27.3
All girls	37.3	33.3	29.4
Outside of NY metro area	22.8	31.5	45.7

N=371

Table 32, however, shows no evidence that the changes that take place during the year in Israel are tied to preconceptions from high school. Almost all of the changes parallel the original positions. Again the graduates of all boys high schools score higher than do the other students both in religious ritual practice and commitment to Torah study. Students from outside the metropolitan New York area still show the greatest commitment to move to Israel.

Table 32

Ritual practice, commitment to continued Torah study, and plans for Aliya by type of high school, after one year of Israel study

	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
	<u>Ritual practice scale</u>		
<u>High school</u>			
Coeducational	10.3	28.4	61.2
All boys	3.7	8.3	88.1
All girls	8.2	38.8	53.1
Outside of NY metro area	8.9	24.1	67.1

N=361

Commitment to continued Torah study

Coeducational	19.0	38.8	42.1
All boys	6.5	20.4	73.1
All girls	10.2	38.8	51.0
Outside of NY metro area	6.2	27.2	66.7

N=367

Plans for Aliya

Coeducational	19.7	31.6	48.7
All boys	15.0	33.6	51.4
All girls	13.3	28.9	57.8
Outside of NY metro area	8.5	24.4	67.1

N=359

CHAPTER V

RESULTS II: ONE YEAR LATER -- THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY

As indicated in earlier chapters, the year in Israel correlates with increased high scores on questions of attitudes and behaviors of American modern Orthodox high school graduates in a number of different areas of belief and conduct. It is reasonable to assume, nonetheless, that these changes, connected as they are with Israel and the environment of the yeshiva programs, would dissipate in the course of a relatively short period of time after leaving said environment. Studies of overseas programs (Nash 1976) indicate that changes that take place in intensive overseas programs fade away in the course of a single summer away from the unique overseas environment.

This assumption is a fairly common one, even among students who have experienced year long Israel study, as is clear from the tongue-in-cheek cartoon that appeared in the 1990 Purim edition of *Hamevaser*, a Yeshiva University student newspaper (Figure 1). The student enters the "Israel contraption" and comes out a clean-cut yeshiva student. Passing through the "YU contraption" returns the student to his original condition.

An examination of the data does not support this supposition with regard to students who study in Israel. Given the changes that took place in the course of their year in study, one might not anticipate that the trend to score HIGH continues even to grow slightly in response to the questionnaire in the follow-up study, one year after the original post-test.

Figure 1. A Hamevaser Purim perspective on Yeshiva University students pre- and post- Israel study.

Note. From Hamevaser, Purim 5750. Copyright 1990 by Hamevaser. Reprinted with permission.

The Factors

Religious ritual

The scales that loaded together, those of ritual behavior and attitudes connected with ritual behavior, all show similar trends. The ritual practice scale (Table 33), the scale of personal modesty (Table 34) and the scale of interaction with the secular world (Table 35), all show a tendency towards actual increase in the percentage of students scoring HIGH in the follow-up study. This unexpected effect can be explained by examining results of the same analysis and removing those students who chose to remain in Israel for a second year of study (shana bet students). When the shana bet students are removed, we find that the results on the follow-up study show only a slight "fall off" from the post-test immediately after the year in Israel. Only the scale of commitment to Torah study (Table 36), shows a serious "fall off". There is a straightforward explanation for this. While continuing individual ritual behaviors, or even continuing a newly accepted lifestyle is relatively easy, commitment to spend significant amounts of time daily in shiur or hevruta study is much more difficult

to maintain.

These results indicate the power of the Israel yeshiva experience. Supportive, as it is of prior, deep seated, religious beliefs, the changes that take place have potential to be much stronger than those of other overseas programs. Even the environment to which the student returns is, today, conducive to sustaining the changes that took place during the year of study in Israel. Certainly the student returning to Yeshiva University lives in such an environment. On-campus Jewish communities have developed in a number of secular colleges that also support a continuity of belief and action in these areas. Recently, Yeshivat Har Etzion has begun an internet project, its "Virtual Bet Midrash", that allows its alumni, and anyone else with Email access, to participate in lectures from the yeshiva in Israel. These connections all help explain the strong long-term connection that the alumni retain with their Israel programs.

Table 33

Frequencies of ritual practice scale, after Israel study,
one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later
without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	8.1	6.1	9.1
MIDDLE	22.6	21.5	28.9
HIGH	69.4	72.4	61.9
	<u>N=372</u>	<u>N=312</u>	<u>N=197</u>

Table 34

Frequencies of personal modesty scale, after Israel study,
one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later
without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	9.0	9.8	12.6
MIDDLE	27.0	19.6	26.3
HIGH	64.0	70.6	61.1
	<u>N=311</u>	<u>N=286</u>	<u>N=198</u>

Table 35

Frequencies of interaction with secular world scale, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	13.3	8.5	11.2
MIDDLE	38.0	30.4	39.8
HIGH	48.7	61.1	49.0
	<u>N</u> =316	<u>N</u> =283	<u>N</u> =196

Table 36

Frequencies of commitment to Torah study scale, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	11.2	11.0	16.9
MIDDLE	30.9	26.8	35.4
HIGH	58.0	62.3	47.7

N=376

N=310

N=195

Zionism

The power of the Israel yeshiva experience and the continued peer support and connections that the student keeps with the yeshiva in Israel, perhaps explain the endurance of the changes that take place during the year in Israel. One area in which a "fall off" might be anticipated is in the area of commitment to aliya and to Zionist ideals.

Examination of the scales that loaded on Israel factors indicates the same trend that was found in the area of ritual practice. Regarding plans for aliya (Table 37) and the perceived importance of aliya (Table 38), there appears to be an increase from the post-test to the follow-up study one year later. Upon removing the shana bet students, there is a small decrease in the responses to the follow-up study. This trend is clearer in responses to questions regarding the importance of aliya (Table 38), where there is a clear drop in those respondents scoring HIGH, and a parallel increase in respondents scoring LOW.

With regard to Zionist ideals (or issues that the students apparently perceive as being Zionist ideals), this trend does not repeat itself. The students' responses remain constant when asked about returning territory and Palestinian rights (Table 39), with no difference between

students returning shana bet and those who go to college in America. Similarly, regarding Religious Zionist principles where no change was found between the pre-test and the post-test, responses remain constant in the follow-up study as well (Table 40), with little difference between students who stay in Israel and those who do not.

As noted above, it is not unexpected to find more of an erosion in the responses of students in the area of Israel than in the area of ritual beliefs and behaviors. Whatever connection continues between the students and their Israel program, the lifestyle of yeshiva in Israel cannot be replicated in an American college environment. On those college campuses where students can find a community that supports the values of Israeli yeshivot it is possible that the values of ritual behavior and belief (many of which were developed specifically for Judaism to effectively function in the diaspora) will be retained. Maintaining the value of aliya is much more difficult.

In concert with what appears to be the operative factor in the Israel experience, the living community lifestyle, a "drop off" appears only in the area of moving to Israel itself. With regard to Zionist ideals, there appears to be little change. It is relatively easy for students to retain the same level of belief in the Zionist ideals that require no action that they have already accepted, even when living

in the United States.

Table 37

Frequencies of plans to come on Aliya, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	15.1	16.1	21.0
MIDDLE	30.5	22.8	27.2
HIGH	54.3	61.1	51.8
	<u>N</u> =370	<u>N</u> =311	<u>N</u> =195

Table 38

Frequencies of perceived value of Aliya scale, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	14.3	16.0	18.8
MIDDLE	26.7	25.2	27.1
HIGH	59.0	58.8	54.2

N=378

N=306

N=192

Table 39

Frequencies of support for Israeli nationalist positions, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	32.5	31.9	35.2
MIDDLE	25.6	27.0	22.8
HIGH	41.9	41.1	42.0
	N=363	N=304	N=193

Table 40

Frequencies of support for National Religious beliefs, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	33.2	35.4	29.1
MIDDLE	35.6	34.8	38.1

HIGH	31.2	29.8	32.8
	<u>N</u> =365	<u>N</u> =302	<u>N</u> =189

Ethical issues

The area in which very little change was found between the pre-test and the post-test was encompassed by the two ethical scales. The first included questions on issues of honesty, while the second focused on Jewish ethical issues, and queried about charity and standing up for an aged person. As Tables 41 and 42 indicate, we do find that a change takes place after the year in Israel. The percentage of students scoring HIGH actually increases following the year in Israel, whether shana bet students are included or not.

At first glance these results seem to point to the thesis suggested earlier, that the yeshiva experience does not impact on students in the area of moral ethical issues as it does in the area of religious ritual and belief. Any change derives from growth and maturity, rather than from the impact of study or the yeshiva environment on the student.

It is important, nonetheless, to reiterate another possible explanation for this phenomenon. It is possible that the demanding environment of the yeshiva leaves the students uncomfortable with their level of interactive social behavior. The students begin to realize that they are not reaching their potential in appropriate ethical

behavior. Students who leave the walls of the beit midrash are more likely to perceive themselves as living up to the accepted norms of behavior in their communities. The shana bet students, therefore, score themselves lower than do their counterparts who are no longer living in this environment. The fact that in the scale of Jewish ethical issues, the eight to nine percent increase in students scoring HIGH appears both with and without the shana bet students in the follow-up study, lends credibility to the argument that it is a maturation process, rather than the effect of study or environment that is operating on these students.

The question of effects on ethical behavior, remains, therefore, open to question.

Table 41

Frequencies of ethical behavior scale, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	20.9	15.3	15.2
MIDDLE	48.9	46.3	51.8
HIGH	30.2	38.3	33.0
	<u>N</u> =378	<u>N</u> =313	<u>N</u> =198

Table 42

Frequencies of Jewish ethical behavior scale, after Israel study, one year later with Shana Bet students and one year later without Shana Bet students

	Post-test	Follow-up with Shana Bet	Follow-up without Shana Bet
LOW	32.8	23.0	20.9
MIDDLE	36.5	39.0	39.3
HIGH	30.7	38.0	39.8

N=381N=313N=196

One Year Later: Different Choices

The discussion up to this point indicates that most of the changes that occur in the course of year-long Israel study remain one year later, even for the majority of students who do not remain in Israel. It is, nevertheless, important to examine the differences among students based on the choices they make in post-Israel study.

An obvious impression that one would have from the data is that given the correlation between the year in Israel programs and higher scores in certain areas of behavior and belief, the longer one stays in these programs, the greater those increased scores should be. Furthermore, upon returning to the United States for study, staying in an environment similar to that of the Israel programs such as Yeshiva University, should sustain the HIGH scores on the Israel scales in the strongest manner.

These assumptions are not strongly supported by the data. With regard to ritual behavior (Table 43), this assumption appears true. Yeshiva University students remain virtually the same one year after completing Israel study,

while students in secular colleges show a certain amount of movement from HIGH to MIDDLE. Students remaining in Israel show a parallel movement from MIDDLE to HIGH. In the area of personal modesty (Table 44) those students who score HIGH after their year in Israel remain HIGH one year later as well, whether they are in Yeshiva University, in secular colleges or in Israel for a second year. There is slightly more "fall off" in the MIDDLE students who score LOW one year later (Table 44) in secular colleges than there is in YU.

Regarding the scale of commitment to Torah study (Table 45), there is a change, with students remaining in Israel scoring higher while students returning to America, both in YU and in secular colleges, show declining scores.

It has already been noted that few of these students planned to stay in Israel a second year, and that many of the students who ended up attending Yeshiva University did not plan to do so at the beginning of their year of study. As such it is interesting that even before the year (Pre-test in Tables 43, 44, and 45), the students who finally did end up in these programs were, as a group, already scoring higher than their peers who would attend secular colleges, with the shana bet students being the strongest group. This finding demonstrates a tremendous amount of self-selection, and indicates that at least in the short term, it is the

kind of student who chooses to stay shana bet who will score HIGH on these scales, rather than that the shana bet experience will cause the student to score HIGH.

Table 43

Post Israel study by scale of ritual practice, before Israel study, after Israel study, and one year after later

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Scale of ritual practice</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
		Pre-test	
Yeshiva University	19.7	36.6	43.7
Secular College	34.6	48.1	17.3
Shana Bet	7.3	36.4	56.4
<u>N=178</u>			
		Post-test	
Yeshiva University	4.4	27.9	67.6
Secular College	15.4	28.8	55.8
Shana Bet	0.0	13.3	86.7
<u>N=180</u>			
		Follow-up study	
Yeshiva University	4.5	27.0	68.5
Secular College	15.7	32.5	51.8
Shana Bet	0.0	8.8	91.2
<u>N=308</u>			

Table 44

Post Israel study by scale of personal modesty, before
Israel study, after Israel study, and one year after later

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Scale of personal modesty</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
		Pre-test	
Yeshiva University	15.3	49.2	35.6
Secular College	39.6	35.8	24.5
Shana Bet	23.1	34.6	42.3
<u>N=164</u>			
		Post-test	
Yeshiva University	7.0	18.6	74.4
Secular College	11.5	42.3	46.2
Shana Bet	0.0	6.0	94.0
<u>N=145</u>			
		Follow-up study	
Yeshiva University	5.4	21.6	73.0
Secular College	21.4	33.3	45.2
Shana Bet	2.3	4.6	93.1

N=282

Table 45

Post Israel study by commitment to Torah study, before
Israel study, after Israel study, and one year after later

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Commitment to Torah study</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
		Pre-test	
Yeshiva University	22.2	38.9	38.9
Secular College	39.6	34.0	26.4
Shana Bet	17.0	34.0	49.1
		Post-test	
Yeshiva University	5.7	41.4	52.9
Secular College	11.8	37.3	51.0
Shana Bet	0.0	18.0	82.0
		Follow-up study	
Yeshiva University	13.5	38.7	47.7
Secular College	22.2	30.9	46.9
Shana Bet	0.0	12.3	87.7

N=178

N=192

N=306

As can be expected, attitudes concerning Israel are one area in which there exists a major difference between those students who choose to continue their studies in Israel and those who return to the United States. It is reasonable to assume that the students who make the decision to devote yet another year to study in Israel are predisposed to the effect of the Israel effect on them. As Table 46 indicates, about two-thirds of students in secular colleges scored HIGH on the value of aliya scale after their year in Israel, but only about half do after a year in college. There is a much smaller drop among YU students during the same period, while shana bet students are the only group that shows an increase in the respondents scoring HIGH.

Table 46

Post Israel study by value of Aliya scale, before Israel study, after Israel study, and one year after later

<u>Program type</u>	<u>Value of Aliya scale</u>		
	<u>LOW</u>	<u>MIDDLE</u>	<u>HIGH</u>
		Pre-test	
Yeshiva University	31.5	30.1	38.4
Secular College	27.8	37.0	35.2
Shana Bet	17.3	42.3	40.4
<u>N=179</u>			
		Post-test	
Yeshiva University	14.7	23.5	61.8
Secular College	17.0	17.0	66.0
Shana Bet	9.8	29.5	60.7
<u>N=182</u>			
		Follow-up study	
Yeshiva University	17.6	26.9	55.6
Secular College	19.8	28.4	51.9
Shana Bet	11.5	21.2	67.3
<u>N=302</u>			

One or two caveats should be mentioned in this context. The students who responded to the follow-up study in the United States, that is, after their year in college, responded voluntarily to a mailed request to complete the instrument. While the response rate of 75% is a good one, it is reasonable to assume that the strongest and most "connected" students responded.

Furthermore, as indicated in Table 47, the make-up of the "year after" figures are skewed, with a greater number of women attending secular college, and more yeshivot hesder students remaining in Israel for a second year.

Table 47

Post Israel study by Israel program attended

<u>Post Israel study</u>	<u>Israeli program</u>		
	<u>American program</u>	<u>Hesder program</u>	<u>Women's program</u>
Yeshiva University	21.8	42.3	35.9
Secular College	28.6	17.6	53.8
Shana Bet	27.7	51.3	21.0

N=366

CHAPTER VI
SOME MATCHED CASES

Although the scales that have been presented throughout this study make an impressive case in showing the marked change that takes place in the course of a year of Israel study, they also mask the actual responses of the students. After studying the scales, it is still unclear what percentage of students is committed to continued Torah study, or to move to Israel.

By examining the frequencies of certain individual questions and limiting them to the students who "matched", that is, who clearly responded to all three waves of questionnaires, a smaller sample is studied, but it offers a more accurate picture of changes in specific areas.

A number of examples will bear this out (For complete tallies of all students, see Appendix C, D and E.)

In answer to the question "How often do you wash netilat yadaim in the morning?" the percentage of students responding "always" more than doubles between pre- and post-Israel study (Table 48). Similar findings are evident with regard to morning prayers (Table 49), Grace after Meals (Table 50), and other ritual items.

In line with the analysis of the scales, these students assert that even a year later their newly found commitment to religious ritual practice remains as strong as immediately after their year of Israel study.

Table 48

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding ritual hand washing

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Always	30.0	62.1	67.4
Usually	11.4	17.1	11.3
Sometimes	23.6	12.9	7.8
Never	35.0	7.9	13.5
	<u>N=140</u>	<u>N=140</u>	<u>N=141</u>

Table 49

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding recitation of morning prayers

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Always	43.3	73.0	71.6
Usually	33.3	16.3	13.5
Sometimes	20.6	9.2	12.8
Never	2.8	1.4	2.1
	<u>N=141</u>	<u>N=141</u>	<u>N=141</u>

Table 50

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding recitation of Grace after meals

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Always	32.1	63.8	70.2
Usually	35.0	26.2	20.6
Sometimes	32.1	9.9	7.8
Never	.7	0.0	1.4

N=140

N=141

N=141

While the changes are not as marked, similar trends are evident in commitment to continued study of religious texts. When asked whether they intended to attend a daily shiur in college, or whether they planned to have a daily hevruta after college, there was a clear change in the responses of the students (Tables 51 and 52), showing a greater likelihood of continued daily Torah study. Responses to the question "What is the likelihood you will have a large collection of seforim?" also indicated a change of perspective on the part of these students (Table 53).

Again, the data indicate that the trends remain constant one year later.

Table 51

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding Hevruta study after college

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very likely	20.9	37.6	43.6
Somewhat likely	30.2	37.6	30.7
Somewhat unlikely	11.5	7.1	5.0

Very unlikely	22.3	13.5	10.0
Not sure	15.1	4.3	10.7
	<u>N</u> =141	<u>N</u> =141	<u>N</u> =140

Table 52

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding attending daily shiur in college

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very likely	46.4	64.5	67.9
Somewhat likely	28.6	22.7	14.3
Somewhat unlikely	5.7	3.5	2.9
Very unlikely	13.6	6.4	7.9
Not sure	5.7	2.8	7.1
	<u>N</u> =140	<u>N</u> =141	<u>N</u> =140

Table 53

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding will respondent have a large Jewish library

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very likely	47.5	65.2	66.0

Somewhat likely	39.7	27.7	29.1
Somewhat unlikely	3.5	.7	.7
Very unlikely	7.8	5.7	2.8
Not sure	1.4	.7	1.4
	<u>N=141</u>	<u>N=141</u>	<u>N=141</u>

Given the clear commitment to religious values of students who have experienced year-in-Israel yeshiva programs, it is to be expected that parallel changes will occur in the area of tzniut, personal modesty. Responses to questions such as "How comfortable would you be attending a movie with explicit sex? "... holding hands with your girl/boy-friend?" or "...being physically intimate with your fiancée?" all get responses, and changes to responses, that mirror those found regarding ritual behavior and Torah study (Tables 54, 55 and 56).

Table 54

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding attending a movie with explicit sex

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very comfortable	12.7	3.6	8.3

Somewhat comfortable	19.8	13.4	8.3
Not sure	2.4	2.7	0.0
Somewhat uncomfortable	27.8	21.4	23.5
Very uncomfortable	37.3	58.9	59.8
	<u>N</u> =126	<u>N</u> =112	<u>N</u> =132

Table 55

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding holding hands with girl/boyfriend

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very comfortable	39.4	11.6	17.4
Somewhat comfortable	26.0	17.0	10.6
Not sure	6.3	11.6	6.1
Somewhat uncomfortable	12.6	19.6	14.4
Very uncomfortable	15.7	40.2	51.5
	<u>N</u> =127	<u>N</u> =112	<u>N</u> =132

Table 56

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding being physically intimate with fiance

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very comfortable	19.7	6.3	10.6
Somewhat comfortable	15.7	6.3	8.3
Not sure	17.3	15.2	10.6
Somewhat uncomfortable	19.7	17.0	15.2
Very uncomfortable	27.6	55.4	55.3

N=127

N=112

N=132

Another area in which the year in Israel yeshiva programs affect their students is with regard to plans to support and perhaps eventually move to Israel. Even though most of these students have visited Israel prior to their year of study and have attended high schools which supported the State of Israel and celebrated Yom Ha'atzmaut, it is the year of living in Israel at this particular moment in their lives that appears to have a profound impact on them.

The responses in the areas of practical plans, i.e. "what is the likelihood that you will make aliya", Jewish law, i.e. "Halacha requires that one live in Israel", as well as ideology, i.e. "I can live a fuller Jewish life in Israel than I can in the US", all indicate the change that takes place during this year of Israel study (Tables 57, 58 and 59).

For the first time, though, there is an indication that the effects of the return to familiar diaspora life in America do have an affect on the attitudes of these returning youths. There is an apparent deterioration a year after the Israel experience in at least some of these measures.

Table 57

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding plans to move to Israel

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Very likely	9.9	35.0	29.3
Somewhat likely	34.0	45.7	40.0
Somewhat unlikely	22.7	9.3	11.4
Very unlikely	17.7	7.9	12.9
Not sure	15.6	2.1	6.4
	<u>N</u> =141	<u>N</u> =140	<u>N</u> =140

Table 58

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding whether Halacha requires one to live in Israel

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Strongly agree	8.7	23.4	18.6
Agree	24.6	35.5	35.0
Disagree	29.7	25.5	29.3
Strongly disagree	31.2	14.9	14.3
Not sure	5.8	.7	2.9

N=138

N=141

N=140

Table 59

Frequencies of matched respondents, before and after Israel study, and one year later regarding whether Israel offers a fuller Jewish life

	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow-up study
Strongly agree	21.4	49.3	49.6
Agree	33.6	33.3	29.1
Disagree	23.6	11.6	7.8
Strongly disagree	15.0	5.1	11.3
Not sure	6.4	.7	2.1
	N=140	N=138	N=141

CHAPTER VII

Limitations of the study

As has been mentioned in the course of describing this study, there are a number of issues that act as limitations to its design. The lack of a true control group does not allow for an actual basis for comparison between the study group and a group that has not shared the Israel experience. Nevertheless, the parallel group of high school seniors who were studied gives a good indication of what such a control group would have shown.

Ideally, the instrument used in this study would have reached all of the modern Orthodox students in Israel yeshiva programs. In fact, one major school in Israel declined to have its students participate. A number of smaller schools were not approached. Even in the schools that did participate, not all of the students were present when the questionnaires were distributed. This last issue led to a situation where the respondents were not identical in each of the three waves of distribution. With these limitations in mind, it should be noted that the students who did participate are approximately a full third of the

total number of such students who attend Israel programs. In addition, the responses of all students corresponds with the answers given by the "matched" students, those who took part in all three waves of the questionnaire's distribution.

The greatest limitation is one that can still be rectified. The conclusions reached in this study say little about the long-term correlation between Israel study and commitment to Jewish ritual observance and Torah study, or to actual aliya and commitment to Zionism. A longitudinal study is called for that will follow these students to college graduation and beyond.

Implications

The first and probably most critical implication of this study for the American educator is the importance of following up day school education with a year of study in an environment in which Jewish values are not only taught but are lived. In the areas of ritual practice and Torah study, this can, theoretically, be accomplished in settings other than Israeli yeshiva programs. For a community that perceives commitment to Zionist ideals and the State of Israel to be a value, there is a pressing need for students to continue their Jewish education specifically in Israel. In fact, since virtually no day school graduates choose to commit themselves to full time Torah study in yeshivot in the United States, the only realistic possibility of such continued study prior to college is in an Israeli program.

While the schools have begun to improve their Israel guidance facilities, the students still do not have the perception that their high schools put great emphasis on post-high school Israel study. According to their responses, more than half of the students coming to Israel feel that their high school's encouragement had little or nothing to do with their decision.

The choice of programs in Israel remains a very

personal one. While this study did not attempt to distinguish among specific programs in Israel, the different types of programs clearly meet varying needs within the community. In the past there was a greater variety of men's programs than women's; this has recently seen a turn-around, with several new women's programs opening, each aiming at a particular niche in the student market. It is the responsibility of the high schools to keep abreast of the changes and new options in order to direct their graduates appropriately. These choices are no less important, and no less personal, than the decisions that have to be made when choosing a college.

The year of study in Israel has become a very important part of the archetypal modern Orthodox American day school experience. Its very success, the very fact that today it is perceived by many Jewish educators as being an essential part of that educational experience, raises questions about the existing day school system. Why can't the development that takes place in Israel programs be replicated in high school settings? One student added the following personal comment on his questionnaire. "Being in Israel for a year really changes one's perspective about life and religion. All of a sudden one [sic] goals of making alot [sic] of money are replaced by a desire to learn Torah and our

religion. American high schools must learn to stress a love for religion, as opposed to their failures up to today."

In a personal interview in Jerusalem (March 10, 1996), Rabbi Yosef Blau of Yeshiva University suggested that so much emphasis is placed on the Israel experience that there isn't time or the sense of need to "do the job" on students in high school. It must be recognized, however, that there are significant numbers of students who choose not to attend Israel programs. High schools must find ways to succeed with these students as well. Several high schools have Israel representatives, oftentimes faculty members who have moved to Israel, whose job it is to assist the schools' graduates in Israel study programs. If keeping such contacts is truly important to the school, funding should be found in school budgets to allow for continued contact between faculty members and graduates on college campuses.

With regard to the Israel programs themselves, the question of the lack of development in the area of ethical behavior has not been explained satisfactorily. There remains a possibility that must be considered disturbing for Jewish educators, that perhaps prolonged yeshiva study, does not encourage appropriate ethical behavior. Tremendous effort must be made to clarify to students that religious practice includes not only bein adam lamakom, but bein adam lahavero as well. Students must also be taught that the

concept of a Chosen People is a responsibility and obligation, not a license for abuse of power.

The educational emphasis of the programs should be reexamined, as well. Are the yeshivot hesder satisfied with achieving results in the areas of ritual and Torah study at the apparent expense of heightening sensitivity to Israel? Are the women's programs satisfied with the opposite situation?

Halpern (1991) found that relating to Israeli students was the most formidable adjustment difficulty for American college students in Israel. Perhaps greater thought can be given to creating interaction with Israelis in programs that have both groups. Do Americans have Israeli study partners? Roommates? Should such interaction be required, or simply allowed to happen? As Table 60 shows, more than half of yeshivot hesder students who interact with Israelis on a daily basis report that the Israelis in yeshiva have either a positive or very positive influence on them. In the schools that do not have many Israelis more than half of the students report no influence from Israelis in their yeshivot. Women, forced by their schools and situation to venture out into Israeli society, report having been more favorably influenced by the country than men who are cloistered in the formal beit midrash setting.

Table 60

Effect of Israelis in Yeshiva and effect of general Israeli society by type of Israel program, after a year of study in Israel

<u>Program type</u>	Very positive	Positive	No effect	Negative	Very negative
	<u>Effect of Israelis in Yeshiva</u>				
American program	5.5	10.9	75.5	7.3	.9
Hesder program	16.2	43.4	28.7	11.0	.7
Women's program	17.2	25.4	55.2	1.5	.7

N=390

	<u>Effect of Israeli society</u>				
American program	10.5	50.0	17.5	18.4	3.5
Hesder program	13.5	45.1	27.1	11.3	3.0
Women's program	23.4	62.0	7.3	6.6	.7

N=394

Suggestions for Future Study

The information collected in this study should be studied by Jewish educators across the religious spectrum in Israel and in the diaspora. Nevertheless, this study can only be perceived as a beginning. These students responded to questionnaires a relatively short time after an intense experience. They either chose to stay in Israel or to return to a college environment that will be somewhat supportive of their new lifestyle. A follow-up study of these students when they are seniors in college will be helpful in evaluating the true impact of the Israel yeshiva experience, particularly in view of the fact that the students' articulated attitudes and behaviors do not always match their own professed philosophical underpinnings. Similarly, with the constant change of direction in the Israeli political situation, it is essential to monitor dedicated Zionists to see how current events effect their commitment.

Even more important is planning a longitudinal study of these students. In a personal interview (March 10, 1996), Rabbi Yosef Blau of Yeshiva University stated that he credits the Israel programs for the renewed commitment of Yeshiva University students to fill the beit midrash until

late at night. Mrs. Linda Derovan credits Israel programs for the present day attitude in the modern Orthodox Jewish community that Torah study is an integral part of Jewish life, and aliya is accepted as a religious reality (Personal interview May 20, 1996).

Recently, modern Orthodox communities in the United States have approached Israeli yeshivot requesting that they send teachers and kollel members to act as faculty in local schools and to create adult education programs. It would appear that the students who first attended these programs in the 1970's have come "of age," and that these programs are now creating long term ripple effects. Such a phenomenon is worth examining.

The place of women in higher Jewish education is another area that must be given serious study. There have been recent discussions (Feldman 1994) and studies (Granite 1995) devoted to women and traditional Jewish study, but no attempt has been made to examine the impact this has had on the women themselves, or its effect on the Jewish community. If, over the last twenty years, Israel study for men has affected the modern Orthodox community in profound ways, it is important to explore the potential impact that women's study will have.

For a serious Jewish educator, the most pressing need for continued study stemming from this work is to clarify

the ethics issue. Further study is needed to ascertain whether the lack of reported change in attitudes towards moral and ethical questions is connected with a heightened sensitivity to these issues or to an inherent problem in the yeshiva system. If there exists some innate problem in the yeshiva system, educators must work to develop methods of inculcating respect for mitzvot bein adam lahavero that will match the success that exists regarding mitzvot bein adam lamakom.

Conclusion

In examining four hundred American Orthodox high school graduates before and after a one year period of study in Israeli yeshiva programs, this study found increased HIGH scores in areas of religious ritual practice, commitment to continued Torah study and to Zionism. Two sub-areas in which no such change was evident were in the areas of moral and ethical behavior and accepting Israeli National religious beliefs. In reexamining a similar group a full year after the conclusion of the Israel program, there was a minor "drop off" in areas of commitment to Torah study and plans to move to Israel. On the whole, the changes that took place during the year in Israel remained.

Surveying a control group that included high school graduates who did not choose to study in Israel but went directly to American colleges, revealed no such changes.

In examining modern Orthodox high school graduates who travel to Israel for a year of yeshiva study, it is clear that they are a unique group. In contrast to most year-long foreign study sojourns, these students arrive in Israel with a twelve year preparation and a four thousand year heritage. The results of this study show major change that lasts even

a year after return to the United States, while comparable studies of other overseas programs do not reach such clear-cut conclusions.

At the same time, within the Orthodox Jewish community, these students are not so unique. Today high schools report that more than 90% of graduating seniors choose to attend such programs. The study found that the effects in areas of ritual practice, commitment to continued Torah study and Zionism are substantial, and remain strong even after return to the United States, whether the student goes to Yeshiva University or to a secular college. It follows that these are typical American modern Orthodox Jews of the present and the foreseeable future.

If the present trend of post high school Israel study continues, it bodes well for the future of the modern Orthodox Jewish community, both in the United States and in Israel.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, W. (1989). Strangers to the tradition: Idea and constraint in American Jewish education. In H.S. Himmelfarb and S. DellaPergola (Eds.), Jewish education worldwide: Cross-cultural perspectives. Lanham, MD: University Press.

Amsel, N. (1990). The Israel experience: A closer look from Israel. Ten Da'at, 5, 34-36.

Bernstein, D. (1992). Perspectives from abroad: Continuing the dialogue. Ten Da'at, 6, 24-25.

Bet Midrash L'Torah (n.d.). Recruitment pamphlet. (Pamphlet available from Bet Midrash L'Torah, 40 Duvdivani Street, Jerusalem, Israel).

Birnbaum, E. and Persoff, M. (1989). The Israel Yeshiva guide for overseas students. Jerusalem: OU/NCSY.

Blau, Y. (1988). Torah study for men in Israel. Ten Da'at, 2, 30.

Carmy, S. (1985). Rejoinder: Synthesis and the unification of human existence. Tradition, 21, 4, 37-51.

Cohen, E. (1991). The Youth and Hechalutz department English-speaking summer programs 1989-1990. Jerusalem: WZO.

Cohen, S. M. (1995). The impact of varieties of Jewish

education upon Jewish identity. Contemporary Jewry, 16, 68-96.

Don-Yehiya, E. (1991). Israel and diaspora Jewry. Jerusalem: Bar Ilan University.

Don-Yehiya, E. (1994). Does place make a difference?: Jewish Orthodoxy in Israel and the diaspora. In C. Waxman (ed.), Israel as a religious reality (pp. 43-74). Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Feldman, E. (1992). Observant Jews and religious Jews. Tradition, 26, 2, 1-3.

Feldman, E. (Ed.). (1994). Symposium on women and Jewish education. Tradition, 28, 3.

Fishman, S. and Goldstein, A. (1993). When they are grown they will not depart: Jewish education and the Jewish behavior of American adults. Research Report #8. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University.

Friedlander, D., Talmon, P. and Moshayov, D. (1991). The one-year program in Israel: An evaluation North American Jewish students in the Rothenberg School for Overseas Students at the Hebrew University. New York: The American Jewish Committee.

Friedman, M. (1992). The lost *kiddush* cup: Changes in Ashkenazic haredi culture -- A tradition in crisis. In Jack Wertheimer (Ed.), The uses of tradition: Jewish continuity in the modern era. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Goell, Y. (1995, June 2). Question of survival. The Jerusalem Post, p. 5.

Goldmintz, J. (1991). The post-high school Yeshiva experience: goals and benefits. Ten Da'at, 5, 32-34.

Goodman, I. M. (1978). Jewish education and religious attitudes: A correlation study of college-age Jewish students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University.

Granite, L. (1995). Tradition as a modality of religious change: Talmud study in the lives of Orthodox Jewish women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Drew University.

Gurock, J. (1988). The men and women of Yeshiva. New York: Columbia University Press.

Halpern, J. (1991). A comparative study of adjustment difficulties of American male and female students in Israeli institutions of higher learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, American University.

Hansel, B., and Grove, N. (1984). Why an AFS experience accelerates learning and the growth of competence. New York:

AFS International. (ERIC ED 257 732).

Heilman, S. C. and Cohen, S. M. (1989). Cosmopolitans and Parochials: Modern Orthodox Jews in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Heilman, S. C. and Friedman M. (1991). The Haredim in Israel: Who they are and what do they want. New York: The American Jewish Committee.

Heimowitz, J. (1979). A study of the graduates of the Yeshiva of Flatbush high school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University.

Helfgot, N. and Zucker, S. (1990). Guide to Israel Programs. Paramus, New Jersey: Frisch Yeshiva High School.

Helmreich, W. (1982). The world of the Yeshiva: An intimate portrait of Orthodox Jewry. New York: The Free Press.

Herman, S. (1970). American students in Israel. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Himmelfarb, H. (1974). The impact of religious schooling: The effects of Jewish education upon adult religious involvement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Himmelfarb, H. (1975). Measuring religious involvement. Social Forces, 53, 4, 606-618.

Hull, W. F., Lemke, W. and Houang, R. (1977). The American undergraduate, off-campus and overseas: A study of

the educational validity of such programs. Santa Barbara, California: University of California.

James, N. (1976). Students abroad: Expectations versus reality. Liberal Education, 4, 606-607.

Kahn, M. (1989). Jewish education for women. Ten Da'at, 3, 3, 9-11.

Klaperman, G. (1969). The story of Yeshiva University: The first Jewish university in America. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Krauss, E. (1990). The Israel experience: A closer look from America. Ten Da'at, 5, 32-33.

Kupchik, A. (1987). Focus on study in Israel. Ten Da'at, 1, 20.

Lamm, N. (1990). Torah Umadda: The encounter of religious learning and worldly knowledge in the Jewish tradition. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Lichtenstein, A. (1981). The ideology of Hesder. Tradition, 19, 199-217.

Lichtenstein, A. (1982). Symposium -- The state of Orthodoxy. A response. Tradition, 20, 1, 47-50.

Lichtenstein, A. (1987a). Israeli branches of diaspora religious movements: Indigenous development and potential influence in the diaspora. Forum on the Jewish People, Zionism and Israel, 60, 11-13.

Lichtenstein, A. (1987b). Yi'Udo shel ben HaYeshiva

V'Zipiyoteha Hemenu [The Yeshiva student's mission and its expectations from him]. Alon Shevut - Kesher Bogrim, 4, 9-34.

Liebman, C. S. and Cohen, S. M. (1990). Two worlds of Judaism: The Israeli and American experiences. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marttila and Kiley, Inc. (1993). Highlights from a survey of Yeshiva College undergraduates about college recruitment. New York: Marttila & Kiley.

Mayer, E. (1993, January). Jewish education and intermarriage among American Jews. Paper presented at the meeting of the international steering committee of the Association for Demographic Policy of the Jewish People.

McHugo, G. and Jernstedt G. (1979). The affective impact of field experience education on college students. Alternative Higher Education, 3, 188-206.

Moore, G. (1983). Developing and evaluating educational research. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Nash, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. The Journal of Higher Education, 47, 2.

Orchan, N. (1991). Philosophy and educational perspective of the short term programs division. In Eric Cohen, The Youth and Hechalutz department English-speaking summer programs 1989-1990. Jerusalem: WZO.

Pascarella, E. and Terenzini, P. (1991). How college

affects students: Findings and insight from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pinsky, I. (1961). The graduates of Rabbi Jacob Joseph School -- A follow-up study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yeshiva University.

Pfinster, A. (1972). Impact of study abroad on the American college undergraduate. Denver: Denver University. (ERIC ED 063 882).

Pollack, G. (1961). Graduates of the Jewish day schools: A follow-up study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Western Reserve University.

Rakeffet-Rothkoff, A. (1972). Bernard Revel: Builder of American Jewish Orthodoxy. New York: Jewish Publication Society of America.

Rimor, M. and Katz, E. (1993). Jewish involvement of the baby boom generation. Jerusalem: The Louis Guttman Israel Institute of Applied Social Research.

Riskin, S. (1982). Symposium -- The state of Orthodoxy. A response. Tradition, 20, 1, 61-65.

Rosenblatt, G. (1994, August 19-25). Leaving home for the Jewish homeland. The Jewish Week, p. 5.

Schiff, A. I. (1966). The Jewish day school in America. New York: Jewish Education Committee Press.

Schiff, A. I. and Schneider, M. (1994a). The Jewishness quotient of Jewish day school graduates: Studying the effect

of Jewish education on adult Jewish behavior. New York, Azrieli Graduate Institute.

Schiff, A. I. and Schneider, M. (1994b). The far reaching effects of extensive Jewish day school attendance: The impact of Jewish education on Jewish behavior and attitudes. New York, Azrieli Graduate Institute.

Schiff, A. I. and Schneider, M. (1994c). Fortifying and restoring Jewish behavior: The interaction of home and school. New York, Azrieli Graduate Institute.

Schulman, M. (1988). Israel returnees study: Interim report. New York: World Zionist Organization.

Schwab, J.J. (1978). Structure of the disciplines: Meanings and significances. In his Science, curriculum and liberal education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schweid E. (1987). Land of Israel. In A. Cohen and P. Mendes-Flohr (Eds.), Contemporary Jewish religious thought (pp. 535-542). New York: Scribner's.

Shapiro, Z. (1988). From generation to generation: Does Jewish schooling affect Jewish identification? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Sokoloff, L. (1994). On their own: The graduates of Orthodox Jewish day schools and their religious observances and views while at Brandeis University. Unpublished senior honors thesis, Brandeis University.

Telushkin, J. (1991). Jewish Literacy: The most

important things to know about the Jewish religion, its people and its history. New York: William Morrow.

Waxman, C. I. (1989). American Aliya. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Waxman, C. I. (1994). Introduction. In C. Waxman (ed.), Israel as a religious reality (pp.xiii-xviii). Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Waxman, C. I. (1995). In the end is it ideology?: Religio-cultural and structural factors in American Aliya. Contemporary Judaism, 16, 50-67.

Weiss, A. (1990). Women at prayer. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav.

Wurzburger, W. (1972). The Jewish day school: A symposium. Tradition, 13, 1, 95-130.

Wurzburger, W. (1982). Symposium -- The state of Orthodoxy. Tradition, 20, 1.

Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh. (1991). Recruitment pamphlet. (Pamphlet available from Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh, D.N. Evtach, Israel).

Yeshivat Ohr David. (n.d.). Recruitment pamphlet. (Pamphlet available from Yeshivat Ohr David, POB 23049, Jerusalem, Israel).

Yeshivat Sha'alvim. (n.d.). Recruitment pamphlet. (Pamphlet available from Yeshivat Sha'alvim D.N. Ayalon, Israel).

APPENDICES

Appendix A -- KEY QUESTIONS THAT APPEARED ON ALL
QUESTIONNAIRES.

Note: Gender specific questions appeared on only one set of questionnaires.

1. With what frequency do you perform the following Mitzvot?

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
a. Wash Netilat Yadaim in the morning	1	2	3	4
b. Put on Tefillin	1	2	3	4
c. Wear Tzizit	1	2	3	4
d. Daven Shaharit daily	1	2	3	4
e. Daven Shaharit daily with a Minyan	1	2	3	4
f. Wash Netilat Yadaim before bread	1	2	3	4
g. Daven Mincha (alone or with a Minyan)	1	2	3	4
h. Recite Bentching after eating bread	1	2	3	4
i. Recite Asher Yatzar after the bathroom	1	2	3	4
j. Fast on the Tenth of Tevet	1	2	3	4
k. Refrain from speaking Lashon Hara	1	2	3	4
l. Offer your seat to an aged person	1	2	3	4
m. Respond positively when asked for Tzdaka	1	2	3	4

2. Do you eat food that has a "K" and no obviously non-kosher ingredients?

1. YES 2. NO 3. NOT SURE
 3. What is the likelihood that you will --

	very likely	somewhat likely	somewhat unlikely	very unlikely	not sure
a. study for S'micha	1	2	3	4	5
b. enter the Rabbinat or Jewish education	1	2	3	4	5
c. have a daily Hevruta in college	1	2	3	4	5
d. have a daily Hevruta after college	1	2	3	4	5
e. attend a daily shiur in college	1	2	3	4	5
e. cover your hair after you get married	1	2	3	4	5
f. wear pants while you are in college	1	2	3	4	5
f. daven Mincha with a minyan at work	1	2	3	4	5
g. study in Kollel for at least a year	1	2	3	4	5
h. have a large collection of seforim	1	2	3	4	5
i. give 10% of your earnings to charity	1	2	3	4	5
j. be totally honest on your tax return	1	2	3	4	5
k. cheat in order to pass a college course	1	2	3	4	5
l. make Aliya	1	2	3	4	5
m. serve in the					

Israeli army	1	2	3	4	5
--------------	---	---	---	---	---

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	not sure
a. It is better to live among non-religious Jews in Israel than in a religious community outside of Israel	1	2	3	4	5
b. There is a unique spirituality to the Land of Israel	1	2	3	4	5
c. Today, learning in Israel for a year is an essential part of Jewish education	1	2	3	4	5
d. Halacha requires that one live in Israel	1	2	3	4	5
e. The act of living in Israel assures one a place in Olam Haba	1	2	3	4	5
f. I can live a fuller Jewish life in Israel than I can in the United States	1	2	3	4	5
g. The modern State of Israel is the national homeland of the Jewish people	1	2	3	4	5
h. Every Jew, whatever his or her ideology, is obligated to support the State of Israel	1	2	3	4	5
i. All Israeli Yeshiva students should serve in the Israeli army	1	2	3	4	5

strongly not
disagree sure

strongly
agree agree disagree

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| j. The modern State of Israel is the fulfillment of Nevuot of our prophets | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| k. The modern State of Israel is part of the process of the Redemption | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| l. It is Halachikly forbidden for Israel to relinquish any territory it presently controls | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| m. Jews settling in Judea and Samaria are involved in praiseworthy activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| n. If the Palestinians do not make peace with Israel, forcibly transferring them out of Eretz Yisrael is morally acceptable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

5. How often have you gone out on dates, if at all?

1. Never
2. Once or a few times
3. Several times
4. Many times

6. When thinking about whom to date, how important is it to you that your date --

	somewhat impor- tant	impor- tant	not impor- tant	not desir- able	not sure
a. intends to make Aliya	1	2	3	4	5
b. wears Tzitzit every day	1	2	3	4	5
d. will have a daily Hevruta after work	1	2	3	4	5
b. would not wear pants	1	2	3	4	5
c. wears skirts below her knee	1	2	3	4	5
d. will cover her hair when she marries	1	2	3	4	5
e. feels it is important that you learn Torah	1	2	3	4	5
f. feels it is important that they learn Torah	1	2	3	4	5
g. is ready to think about getting married	1	2	3	4	5
h. will hold hands with you	1	2	3	4	5

7. About how many children do you intend to have?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+ don't know

8. To what extent would you like your children's school to -

	to a great extent	somewhat	a little	not at all	not sure
a. emphasize Ahavat Eretz Yisrael	1	2	3	4	5
b. encourage support for the State of Israel	1	2	3	4	5
c. emphasize Torah sheba'al peh	1	2	3	4	5
d. encourage Torah Lishma	1	2	3	4	5
e. encourage dikduk b'mitzvot	1	2	3	4	5
f. separate boys and girls	1	2	3	4	5
g. separate religious and non-religious	1	2	3	4	5
h. offer equal learning opportunities to girls	1	2	3	4	5
i. encourage openness to non-religious Jews	1	2	3	4	5

9. How comfortable would you be in each of the following situations?

	Very Com- fort able	Somewhat Com- fort able	Somewhat Un- comfort able	Very Un- comfort able	Not Sure
a. talking to your friend during davening	1	2	3	4	5
b. eating cooked eggs in a non-kosher restaurant	1	2	3	4	5
c. eating raw salad in a non-kosher restaurant	1	2	3	4	5
d. wearing pants when going shopping	1	2	3	4	5
e. wearing a skirt above your knees on a date	1	2	3	4	5
d. attending a movie rated "R" for its sexual content	1	2	3	4	5
e. attending a movie with explicit sex	1	2	3	4	5
f. going "mixed swimming"	1	2	3	4	5
g. holding hands with your boy/girlfriend	1	2	3	4	5
h. being alone in a locked room with your boy/girlfriend	1	2	3	4	5
i. being physically intimate with your fiancée	1	2	3	4	5

10. What is your level of competence in Hebrew language in the following settings?

	excellent	good	fair	poor
a. understanding a Gemara shiur	1	2	3	4
b. understanding an Israeli in conversation	1	2	3	4
c. speaking to an Israeli	1	2	3	4
d. reading an Israeli newspaper	1	2	3	4
e. understanding Shemoneh Esrei	1	2	3	4

11. About how much time did you spend each week learning outside of official Sedarim?

1. 0-1 hour
2. 2-5 hours
3. 6-10 hours
4. 11+ hour

13. Did your father ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

- 1.NO 2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____

14. Does your father have S'micha?

- 1.NO 2.YES

15. Did your mother ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

- 1.NO 2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____

16. How many years did you study in day-school (elementary and high school)?

1. 1-4years
2. 5-8years
3. 9-11years
4. 12 years

17. Last year you were a:

1. Junior in high school
2. Senior in high school
3. Early admissions student
4. Student in One-year Israel program
5. Other (please explain)

18. Which high school did you attend? _____.

19. Where did you study this year?

- 1.YU 2.Local College 3.Ivy League 4.Shana Bet

20. What is the highest academic degree that each of your parents received?
(Circle one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
High School Diploma	1	1
BA/BS	2	2
Master's Degree (MA, MSW, MBA, etc.)	3	3
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)	4	4
PhD	5	5

21. What is the zip code of your home in America? _____.

Iyar 5754

Dear Student,

The attached questionnaire is the second part of a study that I am undertaking to examine the attitudes of Yeshiva high school graduates on a range of Jewish issues. In order for the study to be meaningful, I need your honest participation. I have tried to make the questions as interesting and understandable as possible. If you feel a need to explain any of your answers, feel free to make use of the margin or of this sheet for comments.

A questionnaire similar to this one was distributed to more than 400 Yeshiva high school graduates here in Israel, and to about 250 students in the United States. As I indicated earlier this year, your answers will be pooled with many others, and I can assure you that no attempt will be made to identify any particular respondent. Nevertheless, there are a number of personal questions. These demographic questions are included to assist in statistical analysis. Neither your school nor any individual will receive information that can be identified as being your answers. Similarly I would like to emphasize that the study will not compare specific schools, so while your answers will reflect on the impact that Israel has had on you and your peers, they will not reflect on the specific school that you attended.

I hope you find the questions interesting. If you would like to receive information on the results of this study, please put your name and address on this sheet (even if you did it last time).

Thank you for your help with this study.

Shalom Berger

Appendix C -- RESPONSES OF STUDENTS TO THE PRE-TEST
QUESTIONS N=403

1. With what frequency do you perform the following Mitzvot?

	Sometimes	Never	Always	Usually	
a. Wash Netilat Yadaim in the morning				28	14
b. Put on Tefillin			73	20	7
c. Wear Tzizit			54	23	17
d. Daven Shaharit daily			46	31	20
e. Daven Shaharit daily with a Minyan			19	43	37
f. Wash Netilat Yadaim before bread			42	24	29
g. Daven Mincha (alone or with a Minyan)			26	24	42
h. Recite Bentching after eating bread			36	26	35
i. Recite Asher Yatzar after the bathroom			38	11	17
j. Fast on the Tenth of Tevet			66	13	12
k. Refrain from speaking Lashon Hara			1	24	64
l. Offer your seat to an aged person			36	41	20
m. Respond positively when asked for Tzdaka			16	60	24

2. Do you eat food that has a "K" and no obviously non-kosher ingredients?

1. YES 39 2. NO 41 3. NOT SURE 21

3. What is the likelihood that you will --

	very not sure	likely	somewhat likely	somewhat unlikely	very unlikely	
a. study for S'micha		4	14	10	25	48
b. enter the Rabbinat or Jewish education		6	13	25	47	9
c. have a daily Hevruta in college		34	33	16	11	7

d. have a daily Hevruta after college	19	33	22	17	10
e. attend a daily shiur in college ⁴⁴	29	14	8	6	
f. daven Mincha with a minyan at work	16	28	26	15	15
e. cover your hair after you get married	28	30	12	17	12
f. wear pants while you are in college	30	20	9	35	6
g. study in Kollel for at least a year	4	10	23	55	9
h. have a large collection of seforim	41	41	11	4	4
i. give 10% of your earnings to charity	48	38	8	2	5
j. be totally honest on your tax return	50	31	7	4	7

	very likely	somewhat likely	somewhat unlikely	very unlikely		
not sure						
k. cheat in order to pass a college course	3	8	19	67	3	
l. make Aliya		13	30	22	15	20
m. serve in the Israeli army	6	15	23	46	10	

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	strongly disagree	not disagree		
sure						
a. It is better to live among non-religious Jews in Israel than in a religious community outside of Israel	4	12	43	19	22	
b. There is a unique spirituality to the Land of Israel	63	33	2	0	3	
c. Today, learning in Israel for a year is an essential part of Jewish education	42		40	10	1	8
d. Halacha requires that one live in Israel	19		21	36	9	26
e. The act of living in Israel assures one a place in Olam Haba	5	12	33	19	31	
f. I can live a fuller Jewish life in Israel than I can in the United States	22		31	22	6	19
g. The modern State of Israel is the national homeland of the Jewish people	50		37	4	3	6
h. Every Jew, whatever his or her ideology, is obligated to support the State of Israel	37	35	15	4	9	
i. All Israeli Yeshiva students should serve in the Israeli army	14	19	17	34	17	
j. The modern State of Israel is the fulfillment of Nevuot of our prophets	11		27	20	7	35

k. The modern State of Israel is part of the process of the Redemption	20	43	8	2	28	
l. It is Halachikly forbidden for Israel to relinquish any territory it presently controls	18	17	16	4	46	
m. Jews settling in Judea and Samaria are involved in praiseworthy activities	18		37	7	1	37
n. If the Palestinians do not make peace with Israel, forcibly transferring them out of Eretz Yisrael is morally acceptable	21	27	19	7	26	
5. How often have you gone out on dates, if at all?						
1. Never	2. Once or a few times	3. Several times	4. Many times			
17	30	24	29			
6. When thinking about whom to date, how important is it to you that your date --						
		very	somewhat	not	not	
not		important	important	important		
desirable	sure					
a. intends to make Aliya	9	26	49	8	10	
b. wears Tzitzit every day	40	36	20	0	3	
c. always davens with a minyan	26	46	26	0	2	
d. will have a daily Hevruta after work	19	36	38	2	6	
b. would not wear pants	14	28	2	45	11	
c. wears skirts below her knee	12	32	4	45	8	
d. will cover her hair when she marries	18	25	4	42	11	
e. feels it is important that you learn Torah	53	35	10	1	2	
f. feels it is important that she learn Torah	35	42	18	2	3	
g. is ready to think about getting married	19	29	33	11	8	

h. will hold hands with you 15 21 36 18 10

7. About how many children do you intend to have?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	don't know
0	0	3	19	30	9	3	3	33

8. To what extent would you like your children's school to --

	to a great extent	a somewhat	not a little	at all	sure
a. emphasize Ahavat Eretz Yisrael	72	22	4	1	2
b. encourage support for the State of Israel	76	18	4	1	2
c. emphasize Torah sheba'al peh	71	26	2	1	1
d. encourage Torah Lishma	77	19	2	0	1
e. encourage dikduk b'mitzvot	74	19	4	0	2
f. separate boys and girls	11	29	24	31	5
g. separate religious and non-religious	21	26	15	31	8
h. offer equal learning opportunities to girls	66	20	8	3	3
i. encourage openness to non-religious Jews	50	33	10	3	4

9. How comfortable would you be in each of the following situations?

	Very Uncomfortable	Not Sure	Very Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable	
a. talking to your friend during davening	13		32	36	17	3
b. eating cooked eggs in a non-kosher restaurant	7		9	11	73	1
c. eating raw salad in a non-kosher restaurant	12		19	25	42	2
d. wearing pants when going shopping	48		14	10	27	1
e. wearing a skirt above your knees on a date	41		20	17	20	2
d. attending a movie rated "R" for its sexual content	28		30	24	17	2
e. attending a movie with explicit sex	17		20	27	34	2
f. going "mixed swimming"	35		25	22	16	2
g. holding hands with your boy/girlfriend	41		27	12	15	5
h. being alone in a locked room with your boy/girlfriend	35		21	21	16	7
i. being physically intimate with your fiancée	24		15	16	29	16

10. What is your level of competence in Hebrew language in the following settings?

	poor	excellent	good	fair	
a. understanding a Gemara shiur	12	41	30	16	
b. understanding an Israeli in conversation	11	36	40		13
c. speaking to an Israeli	7	31	42	20	

d. reading an Israeli newspaper	3	12	39	47
e. understanding Shemoneh Esrei	36	42	18	4

11. This coming year, about how much time do you plan to spend each week learning outside of official Sedarim?

	1. 0-1 hour	2. 2-5 hours	3. 6-10 hours	4.
11+ hour				
	26	56	12	7

12. How much do the following characterize your parents' home?

(Circle one answer for your father and one for your mother, when applicable. If any questions do not apply to your home situation, skip to the next question.)

	<u>Father</u>		<u>Mother</u>			
	Sometimes	Never	Often	Sometimes	Never	Often
a. is extensively involved with Israel	39	52	10	41	50	
b. is proud of the collection of Seforim	35	32	33	52	32	
c. eats food with the letter "K" and no obviously non-kosher ingredients	36	37	26	38	35	
d. turns lights on on Shabbat	9	7	84	10	6	84
e. davens Shaharit every morning	11	23	65	76	11	13
f. davens Mincha daily	3	11	86	55	24	21
g. davens on Shabbat morning	49	34	17	89	5	6
h. wears Tzitzit daily				59	9	23
i. regularly studies Torah	12	45	43	38	45	17
j. washes Netilat Yadaim before bread	40	40	20	58	31	
k. eats cooked eggs in a non-kosher restaurant	13		15	72	14	
l. eats raw salad in a non-kosher restaurant	26		29	45	26	
m. covers her hair in public	17	33	50			
n. wears pants	36	32	31			

13. Did your father ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

1.NO
24

2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____
75

14. Does your father have S'micha?

1.NO	2.YES
88	12

15. Did your mother ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

1.NO	2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____
35	65

16. How many years did you study in day-school (elementary and high school)?

1. 1-4years	2. 5-8years	3. 9-11years	4. 12 years
2	3	8	87

17. Last year you were a:

1. Junior in	2. Senior in	3. Early	4. Student
5. Other			
(please	high school	high school admissions	in Israel
year	explain)	college	student in one-
			program
	5	88	6 0 1

18. Which high school did you attend? _____.

19. In which school do you intend to study next year?

YU	Local College	Ivy League	Israel
49	18	27	6

20. In which college do you intend to study?

YU	Local College	Ivy League
56	18	27

21. What is the highest academic degree that each of your parents received?
(Circle one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
High School Diploma	13	8
BA/BS	34	17
Master's Degree (MA, MSW, MBA, etc.)	41	32
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)	7	27
PhD	5	16

22. What is your parents' approximate annual income? (Circle one)

1. Less than \$50,000	4
2. \$50,000 - \$99,000	17
3. More than \$100,000	34
4. Don't Know	45

23. What is the zip code of your home in America? _____.

24. What is your date of birth? ___/___/___.

25. To what extent did each of the following contribute to your choice to study

in Israel this year, rather than study in the United States?

not sure	to a great extent	somewhat	a little
a. I wanted to postpone starting college	7	18	19
b. My closest friends were coming here	17	28	26
c. I could come and still get college credit	24	30	16
d. My parents recommended that I come here	16	29	22
e. My high school recommended that I come here	21	28	22
f. I was interested in intensive Torah study	63	25	8

Appendix D -- RESPONSES OF STUDENTS TO THE POST-TEST
QUESTIONS N=384

1. With what frequency do you perform the following Mitzvot?

Sometimes	Never	Always	Usually
a. Wash Netilat Yadaim in the morning		61	14
b. Put on Tefillin		89	9
c. Wear Tzizit	85	10	4
d. Daven Shaharit daily		74	16
e. Daven Shaharit daily with a Minyan		47	45
f. Wash Netilat Yadaim before bread		70	21
g. Daven Mincha (alone or with a Minyan)		54	29
h. Recite Bentching after eating bread		64	24
i. Recite Asher Yatzar after the bathroom		66	15

j. Fast on the Tenth of Tevet	75	15	9
k. Refrain from speaking Lashon Hara	2	31	64
l. Offer your seat to an aged person	33	53	14
m. Respond positively when asked for Tzdaka	9	61	31

2. Do you eat food that has a "K" and no obviously non-kosher ingredients?

1. YES 27 2. NO 49 3. NOT SURE 24

3. What is the likelihood that you will --

	very likely	somewhat likely	somewhat unlikely	very unlikely	
not sure					
a. study for S'micha	6	16	27	44	7
b. enter the Rabbinat or Jewish education	6	14	27	44	8
c. have a daily Hevruta in college	65	25	3	4	2
d. have a daily Hevruta after college	39	38	13	6	4
e. attend a daily shiur in college	59	25	8	4	
f. daven Mincha with a minyan at work	33	32	14	7	13
e. cover your hair after you get married	57	19	9	6	9
f. wear pants while you are in college	21	12	9	50	8
g. study in Kollel for at least a year	10	15	26	40	9
h. have a large collection of seforim	57	33	6	2	2
i. give 10% of your earnings to charity	50	38	5	1	6
j. be totally honest on your tax return	58	28	6	3	6
not sure	very likely	somewhat likely	somewhat unlikely	very unlikely	

k. cheat in order to pass a college course	2	6	17	70	5
l. make Aliya	31	37	11	6	15
m. serve in the Israeli army	8	15	21	45	12

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

		strongly agree	agree	strongly disagree	not disagree	
sure						
a. It is better to live among non-religious Jews in Israel than in a religious community outside of Israel	7	19	33	15	25	
b. There is a unique spirituality to the Land of Israel	77	19	1	0	3	
c. Today, learning in Israel for a year is an essential part of Jewish education	68		25	0	2	4
d. Halacha requires that one live in Israel	22		33	17	3	25
e. The act of living in Israel assures one a place in Olam Haba	9	17	27	9	39	
f. I can live a fuller Jewish life in Israel than I can in the United States	41		33	11	2	12
g. The modern State of Israel is the national homeland of the Jewish people	53		33	6	1	7
h. Every Jew, whatever his or her ideology, is obligated to support the State of Israel	34	37	14	3	12	
i. All Israeli Yeshiva students should serve in the Israeli army	16	22	30	12	20	
j. The modern State of Israel is the fulfillment of Nevuot of our prophets	13		22	20	70	39
k. The modern State of Israel is part of the process of the Redemption	29	42	5	1	24	
l. It is Halachikly forbidden for Israel to relinquish any territory it presently controls	27	23	13	3	35	

m. Jews settling in Judea and Samaria are involved in praiseworthy activities	38	35	4	1	22
n. If the Palestinians do not make peace with Israel, forcibly transferring them out of Eretz Yisrael is morally acceptable	24	24	19	8	25
5. How often have you gone out on dates, if at all?					
1. Never	2. Once or a few times	3. Several times	4. Many times		
17	35	20	28		
6. When thinking about whom to date, how important is it to you that your date --					
not desirable	sure	very important	somewhat important	not important	not important
a. intends to make Aliya	31	34	23	2	9
b. wears Tzitzit every day	66	22	8	1	4
c. always davens with a minyan	40	42	12	1	5
d. will have a daily Hevruta after work	36	45	12	1	6
b. would not wear pants	38	31	22	2	6
c. wears skirts below her knee	44	32	17	1	7
d. will cover her hair when she marries	36	32	19	2	10
e. feels it is important that you learn Torah	75	20	4	0	1
f. feels it is important that they learn Torah	53	33	11	1	2
g. is ready to think about getting married	37	37	15	3	7
h. will hold hands with you	6	7	33	44	10
7. About how many children do you intend to have?					

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	don't know
0	0	1	16	27	16	6	4	31

8. To what extent would you like your children's school to --

		to a great extent	a somewhat	not little	at all	
a. emphasize Ahavat Eretz Yisrael	81	15	3	0	1	
b. encourage support for the State of Israel	72	21	5	0	1	
c. emphasize Torah sheba'al peh	81	15	1	1	2	
d. encourage Torah Lishma	88	10	1	1	1	
e. encourage dikduk b'mitzvot	82	14	1	1	2	
f. separate boys and girls	25	37	19	13	7	
g. separate religious and non-religious	28	29	13	18	11	
h. offer equal learning opportunities to girls	59	24	7	3	6	
i. encourage openness to non-religious Jews	45	37	9	3	6	

9. How comfortable would you be in each of the following situations?

	Very Uncomfortable	Not Sure	Very Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable	
a. talking to your friend during davening	5		13	47	33	2
b. eating cooked eggs in a non-kosher restaurant	4	3	8	83	2	
c. eating raw salad in a non-kosher restaurant	7	10	27	54	2	
d. wearing pants when going shopping	24	11	14	44		7
e. wearing a skirt above your knees on a date	15	23	22	31	9	
d. attending a movie rated "R" for its sexual content	12	25	27	32	5	
e. attending a movie with explicit sex	7	11	25	54		3
f. going "mixed swimming"	12	15	29	38	6	
g. holding hands with your boy/girlfriend	16	20	38			10
h. being alone in a locked room with your boy/girlfriend	13	17	30	30	9	
i. being physically intimate with your fiancée	9	8	18	49	16	

10. What is your level of competence in Hebrew language in the following settings?

	poor	excellent	good	fair	
a. understanding a Gemara shiur	16	47	20	8	
b. understanding an Israeli in conversation	18	42	34		6
c. speaking to an Israeli	12	40	37	10	

d. reading an Israeli newspaper	3	19	43	35
e. understanding Shemoneh Esrei	49	39	11	1
11. About how much time did you spend each week learning outside of official Sedarim?				
1. 0-1 hour	2. 2-5 hours	3. 6-10 hours		
4. 11+ hour				
15	43	22	21	
12. Did you fill out a questionnaire similar to this one earlier this year?				
1.YES	2.NO	3.I DON'T REMEMBER		
72	18	10		

13. How did each of the following affect you this year?

	Very Positively	Very Positively	No Affect		
Negatively					
Negatively					
a. Teachers/Rabbeim	40	53	6	1	0
b. Older students	31	40	27	1	0
c. Peers	22	58	12	7	1
d. Dormitory life	15	43	29	12	1
e. Tiyulim	28	47	24	1	0
f. Israelis in Yeshiva	13	28	52	6	1
g. Israeli society	17	53	16	12	3

14. How often did you attend

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never
Not Sure				
a. Required shiurim	58	36	5	0
b. Voluntary shiurim	11	46	36	6
c. seder with a Hevruta	52	35	10	2
d. special lectures in Yeshiva	15	47	31	6
e. Shabbat in Yeshiva	30	36	30	4

15. During the past year, how did your dedication to each of the following change?

	Declined a lot	Declined Somewhat	Increased Somewhat	Increased a lot	No Change	
a. Kiyum Mitzvot Bein Adam L'haveiro			33	60	7	0
b. Kiyum Mitzvot Bein Adam LaMakom			52	41	5	1
c. Davening with <u>Kavana</u>			53	37	9	1

d. commitment to Torah study	62	32	4	1	1	
e. support for the State of Israel		54	29	13	2	3
f. commitment to Eretz Yisrael	64	26	9	1	1	

16. Since you arrived in Elul, have you visited America?

1. NO	2. ONCE	3. MORE THAN ONCE
38	56	6

17. Have your parents visited you in Israel this year?

1. NO	2. ONCE	3. MORE THAN ONCE
29	57	14

18. About how often did you speak to your parents this past year?

- | | |
|---------------------------|----|
| 1. Less than once a month | 2 |
| 2. Once a month | 5 |
| 3. every two weeks | 23 |
| 4. Once a week | 63 |
| 5. More than once a week | 8 |

19. Did your father ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

- | | |
|------|---|
| 1.NO | 2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____ |
| 26 | 74 |

20. Does your father have S'micha?

- | | |
|------|-------|
| 1.NO | 2.YES |
| 88 | 12 |

21. Did your mother ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

- | | |
|------|---|
| 1.NO | 2.YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____ |
| 35 | 65 |

22. How many years did you study in day-school (elementary and high school)?

- | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1. 1-4years | 2. 5-8years | 3. 9-11years | 4. 12 years |
| 1 | 2 | 8 | 89 |

23. Last year you were a:

- | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| 1. Junior in | 2. Senior in | 3. Early | 4. Student |
| 5. Other | | | |
| high school | high school | admissions | in Israel |
| (please | | student in | one-year |
| explain) | | college | program |
| | | | |
| 4 | 91 | 4 | 0 |
| | | | 0 |

24. Which high school did you attend? _____.

25. In which school do you intend to study next year?

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|------------|--------|
| YU | Local College | Ivy League | Israel |
| 37 | 16 | 17 | 31 |

26. In which college do you intend to study?

YU	Local College	Ivy League	Israel
57	20	21	2

27. What is the highest academic degree that each of your parents received?
(Circle one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
High School Diploma	11	4
BA/BS	33	21
Master's Degree (MA, MSW, MBA, etc.)	44	29
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)	8	29
PhD	4	18

28. What is the zip code of your home in America? _____.

29. What is your date of birth? ___/___/___.

Appendix E -- RESPONSES OF STUDENTS TO THE FOLLOW-UP
QUESTIONNAIRE ONE YEAR LATER N=315

1. With what frequency do you perform the following Mitzvot?

	Always	Usually	
Sometimes	Never		
a. Wash Netilat Yadaim in the morning	67	12	9
b. Put on Tefillin	90	6	4
c. Wear Tzizit	85	7	3
d. Daven Shaharit daily	76	11	11
e. Daven Shaharit daily with a Minyan	52	34	14
f. Wash Netilat Yadaim before bread	78	14	6
g. Daven Mincha (alone or with a Minyan)	58	19	18
h. Recite Bentching after eating bread	70	22	8
i. Recite Asher Yatzar after the bathroom	75	11	91
j. Fast on the Tenth of Tevet	81	10	8

k. Refrain from speaking Lashon Hara	2	33	61		
l. Offer your seat to an aged person	38	48	13		
m. Respond positively when asked for Tzdaka	17	62	20		
2. Do you eat food that has a "K" and no obviously non-kosher ingredients?					
1. YES	25	2. NO	58	3. NOT SURE	17
3. What is the likelihood that you will --					
not unlikely	sure	very	somewhat likely	somewhat likely	very
a. study for S'micha	10	20	25	35	10
b. enter the Rabbinat or Jewish education	11	16	28	38	8
c. have a daily Hevruta in college	69	15	10	5	1
d. have a daily Hevruta after college	45	33	10	7	5
e. attend a daily shiur in college	67	17	8	5	3
e. cover your hair after you get married	66	20	2	6	6
f. wear pants while you are in college	22	6	9	61	2
f. daven Mincha with a minyan at work	40	26	13	10	12
g. study in Kollel for at least a year	11	22	26	31	10
h. have a large collection of seforim	66	30	3	1	1
i. give 10% of your earnings to charity	61	31	2	0	5
j. be totally honest on your tax return	64	28	4	2	3
not unlikely	sure	very	somewhat likely	somewhat likely	very
k. cheat in order to pass a college course	2	7	18	71	2

l. make Aliya	29	39	12	8	12
m. serve in the Israeli army	6	19	21	41	14

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	strongly disagree	not disagree	
sure					
a. It is better to live among non-religious Jews in Israel than in a religious community outside of Israel	8	16	33	19	25
b. There is a unique spirituality to the Land of Israel	82	15	0	1	1
c. Today, learning in Israel for a year is an essential part of Jewish education	70		21	0	4
d. Halacha requires that one live in Israel	20		33	19	4
e. The act of living in Israel assures one a place in Olam Haba	9	12	26	12	39
f. I can live a fuller Jewish life in Israel than I can in the United States	48		28	11	3
g. The modern State of Israel is the national homeland of the Jewish people	51		31	6	5
h. Every Jew, whatever his or her ideology, is obligated to support the State of Israel	34	33	17	4	13
i. All Israeli Yeshiva students should serve in the Israeli army	15		23	33	11
j. The modern State of Israel is the fulfillment of Nevuot of our prophets	11		21	15	90
k. The modern State of Israel is part of the process of the Redemption	28		37	4	1
l. It is Halachikly forbidden for Israel to relinquish any territory it presently controls	23	23	12	4	38
m. Jews settling in Judea and Samaria					

are involved in praiseworthy activities	37	40	5	0	18			
n. If the Palestinians do not make peace with Israel, forcibly transferring them out of Eretz Yisrael is morally acceptable	22	24	17	8	31			
5. How often have you gone out on dates, if at all?								
1. Never	2. Once or a few times	3. Several times	4. Many times					
20	33	19	28					
6. When thinking about whom to date, how important is it to you that your date --								
not desirable	sure	very important	somewhat important	not important	not important			
a. intends to make Aliya	33	37	16	5	9			
b. wears Tzitzit every day	72	20	6	0	2			
d. will have a daily Hevruta after work	37	41	16	1	6			
b. would not wear pants	52	26	15	5	3			
c. wears skirts below her knee	60	17	18	3	2			
d. will cover her hair when she marries	52	22	15	5	6			
e. feels it is important that you learn Torah	84	13	2	1	1			
f. feels it is important that they learn Torah	61	30	7	1	2			
g. is ready to think about getting married	46	35	10	3	6			
h. will hold hands with you	2	9	24	59	5			
7. About how many children do you intend to have?								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	don't know

0 0 1 11 29 15 8 6 30

8. To what extent would you like your children's school to --

		to a great extent	a somewhat	not little	at	
not all	sure					
a.	emphasize Ahavat Eretz Yisrael	79	19	1	0	1
b.	encourage support for the State of Israel	67	24	5	1	3
c.	emphasize Torah sheba'al peh	84	14	1	0	0
d.	encourage Torah Lishma	91	7	1	0	1
e.	encourage dikduk b'mitzvot	89	9	1	0	2
f.	separate boys and girls	37	29	13	12	10
g.	separate religious and non-religious	31	29	29	10	16
h.	offer equal learning opportunities to girls	56	25	8	7	4
i.	encourage openness to non-religious Jews	55	29	29	6	4
						14
						7

9. How comfortable would you be in each of the following situations?

	Very Uncomfortable	Not Sure	Very Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Somewhat Uncomfortable		
a. talking to your friend during davening	4		11	45	39	1	
b. eating cooked eggs in a non-kosher restaurant	3	2	4	91	1		
c. eating raw salad in a non-kosher restaurant	5	6	21	67	1		
d. wearing pants when going shopping			23	5	7	64	2
e. wearing a skirt above your knees on a date	16	8	23	51	3		
d. attending a movie rated "R" for its sexual content	11	15	34	38	2		
e. attending a movie with explicit sex		6	9	23	62	1	
f. going "mixed swimming"	10	11	18	60	2		
g. holding hands with your boy/girlfriend	16		11	15	53	6	
h. being alone in a locked room with your boy/girlfriend	14	18	23	42	4		
i. being physically intimate with your fiancée	10	9	12	58	11		

10. What is your level of competence in Hebrew language in the following settings?

	poor	excellent	good	fair	
a. understanding a Gemara shiur		32	49	16	3
b. understanding an Israeli in conversation		25	48	21	6
c. speaking to an Israeli		14	45	31	10

d. reading an Israeli newspaper	5	23	42	30
e. understanding Shemoneh Esrei	54	39	6	2
11. About how much time did you spend each week learning outside of official Sedarim?				
1. 0-1 hour	2. 2-5 hours	3. 6-10 hours	4. 11+ hour	
21	28	16	35	
12. Did you fill out a questionnaire similar to this one last year?				
1. YES	2. NO	3. I DON'T REMEMBER		
84	9	8		

13. Did your father ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

1. NO 2. YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____
 24 76

14. Does your father have S'micha?

1. NO 2. YES
 87 13

15. Did your mother ever attend a Yeshiva or Day school?

1. NO 2. YES -----> If YES, how many years? ____
 33 67

16. How many years did you study in day-school (elementary and high school)?

1. 1-4years	2. 5-8years	3. 9-11years	4. 12 years
1	2	8	90

17. Last year you were a:

1. Junior in	2. Senior in	3. Early	4. Student
5. Other			
high school	high school	admissions	in Israel

(please explain)

student in	one-year
college	program

0	0	0	100	0
---	---	---	-----	---

18. Which high school did you attend? _____.

19. Where did you study this year?

YU	Local College	Ivy League	Shana Bet
35	12	14	37

20. What is the highest academic degree that each of your parents received?
 (Circle one for each parent)

	Mother	Father
High School Diploma	14	6
BA/BS	36	23

Master's Degree (MA, MSW, MBA, etc.)	41	26
Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)	5	26
PhD	4	18

21. What is the zip code of your home in America? _____.
22. What is your date of birth? ___/___/___.
mo. day year

Appendix F -- PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

In Israel:

Yeshivot Hesder

Yeshivat Hakotel, Jerusalem
 Yeshivat Har Etzion, Gush Etzion
 Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh, D.N. Shikmim
 Yeshivat Sha'alvim, D.N. Ayalon

American Programs

Beit Midrash L'Torah, Jerusalem
 Yeshivat Sha'arei Mevasseret Zion, Mevasseret Zion
 Yeshivat Ohr Yerushalayim, Beit Meir

Women's Programs

Bar Ilan Women's Beit Midrash, Ramat Gan
 Machon Gold, Jerusalem
 Midreshet Lindenbaum, Jerusalem
 Midreshet Moriah, Jerusalem

In America:

New York area schools

All boys

MTA, New York City
 Ohr Torah High School, Flushing, New York
 Torah Academy of Teaneck, Teaneck, New Jersey

Coeducational

Flatbush High School, Brooklyn, New York
 HAFTR, Cedarhurst, New York
 Ramaz Upper School, New York City

Schools outside the New York area

Block Yeshiva High School, St. Louis
 Hillel Academy, Miami Beach, Florida
 Hebrew Academy of Greater Washington, Silver
 Spring, MD
 Ida Crown Jewish Academy, Chicago
 Maimonides School, Brookline, Mass.

Appendix G -- GLOSSARY

Aharonim

lit. "the later ones." Commentaries on the Talmud from about the 16th century to the present.

Ahava

Love.

Aliya

lit. "going up." Moving to Israel.

Asher Yatzar

lit. "He who created." Refers to the blessing recited after performing bodily functions.

Ba'al Teshuva

lit. "one who has returned." A newly observant Jew.

Bein Adam LaHavero

lit. "between man and his fellow." Ethical, interpersonal commandments.

Bein Adam LaMakom

lit. "between man and God." Ritual commandments.

Beit Midrash

House of study.

Birkat Hamazon

Blessings recited after eating.

Birkhot HaTorah

Blessings recited before Torah study.

Bitahon

Faith.

Daven

To pray (Yiddish).

Eretz Yisrael

The land of Israel.

Galut

Diaspora.

Gedolim

lit. "great ones." Significant community scholars.

- Gemara
lit. "completion" or "tradition" (Aramaic). Popularly refers to the Talmud as a whole.
- Halakha (Halacha)
Jewish law (pl. Halakhot).
- Hashkafa
lit. "outlook." Jewish thought, philosophy.
- Hesder
lit. "an agreement." Refers to the agreement made between the Israeli army and Yeshiva leaders to allow for the creation of Yeshivot Hesder (see: Yeshivat Hesder).
- Hesed
Kindness, benefaction.
- Hevruta
A study partner (pl. Hevrutot).
- Humrot
Stringencies (in areas of Jewish law).
- Kashrut
Jewish dietary laws.
- Kavana
Intent; concentration on prayer.
- Kohen Gadol
The high priest.
- Kollel
Postgraduate Talmud study.
- Mashgiah Ruhani
Yeshiva supervisor.
- Middot
Ethical behavior.
- Mishna
Oral law; together with the Gemara makes up the Talmud (pl. Mishnayot).
- Mitzvah
Commandment (pl. Mitzvot).
- Mussar
Talks or text study encouraging higher levels of ethical

and moral behavior.

Negiah

lit. "touching." Refers to laws forbidding contact between the sexes.

Netilat Yadaim

Ritual hand washing.

Olim

Individuals who move to Israel (see: Aliya)

Pesach

Passover.

Rashi

Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki. Tenth century commentary on Humash and Talmud.

Rishonim

lit. "the early ones." Commentaries on the Talmud from the tenth to fifteenth centuries.

Rosh Yeshiva

The head of a yeshiva.

Seforim

Books, specifically books with Torah content.

Shabbat

The Sabbath.

Shana Bet

lit. "second year." Students who remain in Israel for a second year of study.

Shiur

Lecture (pl. shiurim).

Shmirat Mitzvot

Keeping the commandments.

Shtuss

Foolishness.

Smicha

Rabbinic Ordination.

Tanakh

Abbreviation of Torah, Nevi'im and Ketuvim. The Bible.

Tefilla
Prayer (pl. Tefilot).

- Tefillin
Phylacteries.
- Torah Lishma
Torah study for its own sake.
- Torah U'madda
lit. "Torah and science." The motto and philosophy of
Yeshiva University.
- Torah U'mesorah
lit. "Torah and tradition." An organization devoted to the
support and development of Jewish day schools in America.
- Tzahal
Abbreviation of Tzva Hagana L'Yisrael. Israeli defense
forces.
- Tzdaka
Charity.
- Tzniut
Modesty.
- Yamim Noraim
The High Holy Days.
- Yeshiva
A school whose curriculum is devoted to the study of
traditional Jewish texts (pl. yeshivot).
- Yeshivat Hesder
A Yeshiva whose Israeli students divide their five year
commitment between Yeshiva study and army service.
- Yeshivot Gevohot
High level yeshivot.
- Yom Ha'atzmaut
Israel independence day.

Appendix H -- PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Rabbi Yosef Blau, Mashgiah Ruhani of Yeshiva University, New York. At the Yeshiva University office, Gruss Center, Jerusalem Israel, March 10, 1996.

Mrs. Linda Derovan, Yeshiva University's Israel Advisor. At the Yeshiva University office, Gruss Center, Jerusalem, Israel, May 20, 1996.

Rabbi Michael Sussman, formerly Yeshiva University's Israel Advisor, today director of the overseas program at Yeshivat Birkat Moshe, the Yeshivat Hesder in Ma'aleh Adumim, and faculty member in Bnei Akiva's women's program in Jerusalem's Old City, May 9, 1996.

Appendix I -- LETTERS OF PERMISSION

