

What We Know About ... The Jewish Day School

Alvin I. Schiff

One of the unique phenomena in Jewish education in North America has been the growth and predominance of all-day schools. Dr. Alvin I. Schiff, Executive Vice President Emeritus of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York and distinguished professor of education at Yeshiva University has published widely on this subject. In this article, he summarizes what we have learned about this form of Jewish education.

AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CENTURY, WHEN HISTORIANS AND SOCIOLOGISTS WILL SCURRY TO analyze fully the development of the American Jewish community in the nineteenth century, one trend will be clearly outstanding—the phenomenal growth and staying power of Jewish all-day education (Schiff, 1966, 1974, 1987; Dubb & Dellar-Pergola, 1986; McMillan and Gerald, 1990). Given its relative costliness, especially when compared to the free public school—even in tandem with the cost of Jewish supplementary schooling—the flourishing of this institution during the mid 1900's and thereafter is nothing less than remarkable. This is particularly so in view of the decline of the Jewish supplementary school (Schiff, 1988, 1983, 1991).

Enrollment

In 1990, there were about 177,250 pupils (K-12) enrolled in 652 Jewish day schools and yeshivot in North America (158,381 pupils in 604 schools in the United States and 18,870 students in 48 schools in Canada), compared to 62,000 pupils (K-12) in 296 schools in North American in 1962, the peak year of enrollment (McMillan & Gerald, 1990). During the same period, enrollment in Jewish supplementary schools declined from 540,000 to 260,000 (Schiff, 1983; JESNA, 1985).

The 1990 Jewish day school population comprised about 40 percent of the total Jewish school enrollment in the United States and Canada, compared to eleven percent in 1962 (Schiff, 1983). The Greater New York experience sharpens the contrast even more. In 1940, the year marking the beginning of the Era of Great Expansion, the Jewish Day School enrollment was about 6% of the total Jewish school enrollment (Schiff, 1966). By 1978, the day school population surpassed sup-

plementary school enrollment; in 1990 it composed sixty percent of the total Jewish school population (Schiff & Kessel, 1991). This development appears even more extraordinary when one considers the reaction of Samuel Dinin to the early spurt of day school growth in the 1940's. In 1945, he wrote, "The Jews may get more than 0.8 percent of their children to attend all-day schools (the Protestant percentage); they are hardly likely to go above 2 or 3 percent (2 percent being the percentage of private school pupils in this country) for the whole Jewish child population of 800,000." Variety is a characteristic of this growth which involves virtually all of the ideological groupings in American Jewry—Hasidic, sectarian Orthodox, modern/centrist Orthodox, communal/traditional, Conservative, Reform, Yiddish, Zionist and general secular. The only feature common to all schools is the all-day format of Jewish and general studies under one roof.

Developed by Orthodox Jews against a backdrop of opposition and doubt by the rest of the Jewish community (Kramer, 1977; Parsons, 1983; Schiff, 1966), its degree of acceptance and support for the broad Jewish community is underscored by the fact that 14.3% of Jewish Federation dollars for local needs were allocated in 1989 to Jewish all-day education. This represents 56.4% of the total dollar allotment to local Jewish education services and programs (Liebman, 1990).

Eighty-three percent of the day school population is enrolled in Orthodox sponsored schools, equally divided between Hasidic/sectarian and modern/centrist institutions. (The fact that Orthodox Jews comprise less than 10% of the total Jewish population in the United States is powerful evidence of the role of Orthodox Jewry in the development of all-day Jewish schooling.) Ten percent of the enrollment is under Conservative auspices, 6% under communal (interdenominational, non-denominational or "other") sponsorship and 1% in Reform day schools.

Despite the reality that day schools exist in every Jewish community with five thousand or more Jews, the Jewish day school is mainly an urban, large Jewish community phenomenon (Schiff, 1983). For example, of the 80,000 pupils (K-12) in New York area day schools in 1990, only 6,455 were in suburban Long Island and Westchester where approximately 45% of the Jewish population resides (Schiff & Kessel, 1991). Ninety percent of the enrollment in North America is in the ten largest urban centers.

Greater New York alone accounts for well over one half of the total day school population. Ninety-five percent of the New York day school enrollment is in Orthodox schools. With rare exception, Orthodox families choose the all-day school format of Jewish education for their offspring, at least through high school grades.

Continental, 29% of the day school enrollment is in early childhood programs (N-K); 58% is in the elementary grades; and 13% is in high school classes. The percentage of students in high school grades is significantly higher in New York (25%) where the vast majority of secondary Jewish day schools are found (Schiff & Kessel, 1991).

Growth Factors

The initial spurt in day school growth in the 1940's and early 1950's was due essentially to three factors: 1) the zealous activity of a small selfless group of Orthodox Day School advocates; 2) the

effect of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel on the Jewish consciousness of American Jews; and 3) the influx of Eastern European Jews after World War II, especially between 1956 and 1958 (Schiff, 1966).

The reasons for day school growth since the 1960's are, interestingly, the opposite of the factors leading to the decline of the supplementary school enrollment. Whereas the birth rate among the general Jewish population has decreased in the last several decades, causing a drop in supplementary school enrollment, the high birth rate among the Orthodox, primarily the right-wing, modern Orthodox, has accounted for dramatic pupil increases in yeshivot and day schools.

The mobility of the Jewish population—particularly the out-migration of Jews from areas of second and third settlement—has often been accompanied by nonaffiliation with a synagogue in the new areas of residence, and, hence, fewer children enrolled in synagogue schools. On the other hand, the immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union, Israel, Iran and other Moslem lands has added children to the classroom registers of the day schools. Heightened Jewish consciousness (and the *teshuvah* movement) is another reason for the increase in the number of day school pupils.

In some areas, dissatisfaction with the public school has motivated parents to choose a Jewish day school for their children, while others prefer it because it is a private school (Schiff, 1987). Finally, a growing number of working mothers and single parents favor an all-day school environment, especially at the preschool levels.

Will these factors continue to motivate growth in the day school in the decades ahead? The proliferation of day schools has enhanced their viability by creating a positive image in the eyes of the community that the Jewish day school has come of age. The challenge is for day schools to capitalize on this image in their recruitment efforts, indeed, now may be a good time to convene a communal trans-ideological consultation on day school recruitment and retention.

As for future enrollment, one other question must be posed. Early childhood education is a significant aspect of overall day school growth. How can we ensure that greater numbers of early childhood graduates will continue on to Jewish all-day elementary schools? To achieve this all-important objective, Jewish family education, geared to the young parents of these children, must become a regular part of every early childhood day school program.

Governance and Finances

The overwhelming majority of Jewish day schools are independently sponsored by local communal groups. About 15% were organized by synagogues—for the most part, by Conservative or Reform congregations. Almost all day schools are loosely affiliated with one or more national or local organization. Locally, with the exception of some Orthodox yeshivot, they are associated with and receive services from the communal bureau of Jewish education. In the smaller communities and even in the intermediate and large communities, the day school often competes with the bureau for Federation funding.

Despite their local and national affiliations, the authority and power for policymaking and program implementation rest solely within each school's board of trustees and its professional administration. Ex-

institution was founded by a local group of interested parents and/or communal leaders (often with professional assistance from Torah Umesegora, United Synagogue or Yeshiva University) who are desirous of controlling the affairs of the school and of insuring the continuation of its ideological/philosophical orientation. Moreover, they are loath to give up their power since they are saddled with the financial responsibility for the conduct of their respective institutions.

The cost of day school operation is considerable—what with the dual curriculum and dual sets of instructional staffs and administration. Tuition fees have not kept pace with the skyrocketing costs of all-day education. Average per-pupil costs rose over ninefold in three decades, from approximately \$500 in 1962 to \$4,600 in 1990; they ranged from \$3,000 to \$12,000 depending upon locale and grade level of school (Pollack & Lang, 1984; Schiff & Kessel, 1991). High school costs are about 50% higher than the elementary grades.

The largest portion of the school income derives from tuition fees. About 40% of the pupils do not pay full tuition (Pollack & Lang, 1984). Moreover, the full fee does not usually cover the complete cost of a child's education.

Day school operation in America is big business. The aggregate cost of yeshiva/day school education in 1990 was approximately \$800,000,000. School boards raised approximately one third of this sum. Over the years, Federations have increased their support of all-day education via scholarship assistance and subsidies for teacher salaries and special programs. In 1989, Federation allocations to day schools (\$40,892,886) represented about 5% of the overall day school expenditure (Liebman, 1990).

The Post High School Yeshiva World

An aspect of Jewish all-day education that deserves mention is the development and remarkable growth in the Orthodox community of a dual-level system of full-time (as much as 18 hours per day) post-high-school undergraduate and graduate Torah and Talmud study. While there are no exact enrollment figures available for each of these levels of study, it is estimated that in 1990 there were about 6,000 Bais Midrash (undergraduate) students and 2,500 Kollel (graduate) students. In 1950, there were less than 100 students enrolled in these programs (Helmreich, 1982). The length of stay in the Bais Midrash is generally two to four years; and in the Kollel, one to twenty years. Most students spend three to five years in the Kollel. Tuition in both of these programs ranges from \$3,000 to \$6,000 per annum, but really depends solely upon ability to pay. Most students pay little or no tuition. More than that, the Kollel students regularly receive stipends averaging \$7,000 a year for room and board so that they can devote full time (morning, afternoon and evening) to study without having to worry about finances. Married students often receive as much as \$10,000 a year, supplemented by their wives' income, usually from teaching in a local yeshiva. The expenditures for this intensive post-high-school system of yeshiva education were estimated to be more than \$50,000,000 in 1990 (Joel Benitz, personal communication). The Yeshivot Gedolot—the post-high-school institutions—are organized into the Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic

Schools (AARTS), a group recognized by the Federal government as a national accrediting agency for Pell grants.

Personnel

Two problem areas have consistently concerned the leadership of Jewish day schools—a shortage of qualified Hebrew teachers entering the Hebrew teaching profession and the high rate of turnover of Hebrew teachers. Both problems are rooted in the matter of job satisfaction (Himmelshein, 1975; Rawin, 1981) largely derived from the level of remuneration and fringe benefits (Himmelshein, 1975; Pollack & Lang, 1984). To be sure, teacher salaries are significantly less than those paid to public school teachers (JESNA, 1985; Aron & Phillips, 1990; Well, 1975). Because of this condition, one researcher found that more than half of the teachers in his study sample planned to leave their positions within five years (Lebovitz, 1981).

In 1990, in Greater New York, for example, the average salary of male instructors for twenty hours or more of Jewish studies teaching per week was \$22,500 and for female teachers \$19,120. Salaries for principals averaged \$45,000. While the highest teacher salary was \$51,000, several principals and administrators earned in excess of \$100,000 (Schiff & Kessel, 1991).

Despite their personnel problems, the day schools seem to manage from year to year, hoping that next year will be an easier one financially. The personnel problems relating to supervision and administration are similar, yet different from those regarding teachers. There is a shortage of qualified personnel on both levels despite the significantly higher salaries (two to five times as much) for principals, driven up by supply and demand, by the feeling of lay leadership that they can attract highly qualified supervisory personnel if they can out-bid other schools. To be sure, the ability to hire higher caliber administrators depends solely on the availability of such personnel and not upon the salaries schools are willing to offer. That availability derives largely from a sufficient pool of qualified teachers who have supervisory potential and are willing to obtain the necessary training in supervision and administration.

The problems are different because of the difference in job requirements. Lay-professional relationships play an important role in the life of a day school principal. A study of the views of New York City elementary Orthodox Hebrew day school principals' role expectations as perceived by the principals themselves and their lay board chairs revealed that the principals' views of the scope of their decision-making functions were substantially greater than the board chairs' views of their decision-making power (Feuerstein, 1977). This difference was similar in the four areas of schooling examined—religious orientation, curriculum, finance and personnel. It was greatest in the area of curriculum and least in the area of religious orientation. Interestingly, while the lay board chairs' views of the decision-making power of the principal in establishing the religious philosophy of the school almost coincided with that of the principals, they differed widely in their views about the principal's authority to implement that philosophy via the curriculum. Generally, the principals and board chairs agreed that the area of finance is a board function and that religious orientation, curriculum and personnel are primarily principal functions (Feuerstein, 1977).

Another study demonstrated that directors who are formally evaluated by their boards of education at least once per year showed a greater desire to stay at their present positions than those who were not evaluated. There was no difference between directors with and without written job descriptions. Overall staying power of non-Orthodox day school principals was much greater at the time of the study (1987) than in earlier years. Average length of tenure is eight years and average number of positions held by present directors is two (Rosenthal, 1987).

Most day schools have two principals, one for Jewish studies and one for general studies. The relationship of these supervisors is critical to the smooth functioning of the school. Flatto (1987) showed that there is no relationship between the role expectations and the job satisfaction of the principals of the religious and secular departments.

Another study demonstrated that the older the principal is, the more experienced and the longer in the job, the greater the likelihood of role conflict perception between principals and between principals and boards of directors (Jordan, 1983).

Curriculum

While the common characteristic of all day schools is the dual program of Jewish and general studies under one roof, the Judaic curricula vary greatly. The general studies curriculum is generally not according to State requirements. In most schools, the morning hours are devoted to Jewish subjects when the students are presumably more alert.

The sectarian Chasidic and non-Chasidic all-boys yeshivot spend well over 60% of their instructional time on Jewish studies and concentrate almost solely on Pentateuch, the prayer service and codes in the early grades (Hebrew reading is taught in the kindergarten and sometimes even earlier) and on Talmud beginning with the fourth grade. These schools devote six days a week—between 30 and 40 hours—to Jewish studies where the language of instruction is often Yiddish. The sectarian girls schools teach Bible, Hebrew language, customs and ceremonies, Musar (ethics), Mishnah and Shulchan Aruch in a Judaic studies program ranging from 15 to 20 hours per week. About the same amount of time is scheduled for general studies.

The modern/centrist Orthodox schools divide instructional time equally between Jewish and general studies. The Judaic studies curriculum includes: Hebrew language arts, Pentateuch, Prophets, general studies, Jewish history, holidays and ceremonies, and Shulchan Aruch. Beginning with grade six Siddur, Jewish history, concentration is on Talmud for boys. During these periods, girls study or seven, the curriculum concentration is on Talmud for boys. Between fifteen and twenty Mishnah, Agaddah, Hebrew literature, Jewish history and current events.

Hours are devoted to the Hebrew studies program. The Solomon Schechter Schools and communal schools generally devote about one third of the instructional time (12 to 15 hours per week) to Judaic subjects including Hebrew language and literature, Bible, Jewish history, customs and ceremonies, current events and introduction to Talmud in the upper grades.

In the Reform day schools, Hebrew language and literature are taught as separate subjects. All other Hebraic studies are introduced as part of an interdisciplinary approach to classroom instruction. In all, between 5 and 15 hours are devoted to the Jewish dimensions of the program.

Curricula integration, by and large, is not practiced. In the first instance, Orthodox schools do not advocate it as a matter of principle. However, it is considered an ideological and practical desideratum for Conservative and Reform schools. Nevertheless, as one study demonstrated, these institutions do not integrate Jewish and general subject matter because of a fundamental philosophical problem—their acceptance of a "structure of discipline's view of knowledge and curriculum planning" (Solomon, 1979).

There is a surprising lack of scientific information regarding academic achievement in both Jewish and general studies. There are no standardized tests for achievement in Jewish studies. Yet, from all available evidence it is clear that Jewish day school graduates acquire themselves admirably in high school and university settings. This is due largely to school standards, stringent requirements regarding homework, the general climate of learning in the schools and parent involvement in their children's education. Moreover, the sheer volume of hours and the intensity of exposure of Judaic studies have a notable impact upon students, especially upon those continuing their all-day schooling through high school and beyond. In absolute (and certainly in relative) terms, they accumulate a significant body of Judaic knowledge, not unlike the Torah scholarship of yesterday in Eastern Europe.

Family and School

The role of family in day schools cannot be disregarded. Research in general education adequately confirms the importance of family influence on achievement (Coleman & Campbell, 1966; Cohen, 1971; Jencks, et al., 1972; Greedy & Rossi, 1966). This is so in Jewish schools, particularly with regard to the formation and strengthening of Jewish identity. One study demonstrated that family background "makes a large and significant contribution to total Jewish identification" (Shapiro, 1988). It showed that the most important predictors of total Jewish identification are parents' ritual observance, parents' residence-friendship patterns, the children's group activities and parents' parenting behaviors. Clearly, parents with positive Jewish attitudes and family styles prefer to send their offspring to a day school. The synergism between home and school is the key to the successful performance of the children (Heimowitz, 1979).

For high performance in every area of life, Benjamin Bloom (1985) has underscored the importance of the combination of a supportive "sacrificing home" and quality "time-on-task" in and out of school. Parental interest, motivation and support differ significantly according to ideological orientation. Sectarian Orthodox parents strongly support school policies. For them, there is no choice but to give their children the most intensive, religious Jewish educational exposure in home and in school. Modern/centrist Orthodox parents generally enroll their children in day schools because of the quality and intensity of the Jewish study program and because of their own Jewish concerns

(Nulman, 1955; Adams, Frankel & Newbauers, 1972/3; Schiff, 1966); yet, in the modern/centrist schools many parents are not themselves Orthodox or as religious as the school would like them to be. Consequently, they do not necessarily associate themselves with the religious philosophy of the schools. They are interested in having their children "feel Jewish" but not really "act Jewish" (Lasker, 1976/77).

In one study of modern Orthodox schools, the teachers and principals attributed greatest importance to goals of religious living. Most parents, on the other hand, indicated that goals of Jewish cultural living are most important and goals of religious living least important. Moreover, parents rated the importance of "a secular American orientation" much higher than the Jewish studies personnel (Gans, 1986).

In the non-Orthodox day school sector, parents enroll their children primarily because of excellence in general studies and not for "Jewish reasons" (Kapel, 1972; Kelman, 1979). This fact underscores the relationship between the deterioration of the public school system and greater parental interest in the non-Orthodox Jewish day school (Zeldin, 1990).

Day School Impact

Overall, the impact of day school education is significant, particularly when compared to Jewish supplementary schooling (Schiff, 1988). A follow-up study of graduates of selected Hebrew day and supplementary schools focused attention on the relative contribution of these institutions in maintaining Jewish identity and continuity (Hartman, 1976). The findings of this study demonstrate that: Hebrew day school graduates 1) perceive themselves and their parents as more religiously observant; 2) perceive their Jewish education as being more effective in enhancing both their own and their parents' religious behavior; 3) view interdating and intermarriage as more antithetical to their belief system. Hebrew day school graduates interdate much less and intermarry much less.

Graduates of both systems who express a higher degree of satisfaction with Jewish education also perceive themselves and their parents as more religiously observant. Hebrew day school graduates attend secondary or post-secondary schools of Jewish learning significantly longer and select Jewish education and/or Jewish communal work as future vocational choices to a greater degree (Hartman, 1976).

Long-term studies on the impact of Jewish day schooling indicate that it has significant influence on Jewish identity formation, even when a variety of factors including family background are controlled (Bock, 1976; Cohen, 1974; Himmelfarb, 1977). In the final analysis, one of the major reasons for the impact of day schools on attitudes and identification is the full-day Jewish climate in which students are immersed. This, after all, is one of the reasons for the establishment of day schools.

Summing up the day school phenomenon in Jewish life, it seems most appropriate to quote Ludwig Lewisohn (1950), author, novelist and critic, who in his later years became a strong devotee of the day school movement. He wrote in 1950:

The truest advance in recent Jewish history in the United States, the one altogether hopeful phenomenon, has been the initiation and the slow gradual spread of the day school movement. It arose, necessarily, from classical Jewish sources...

Fundamentals must be side by side with the acquisition of an exacting and elegant grasp of English and its literature. The usual [general] subjects of instruction must be augmented by Jewish history, symbol, ceremony, liturgy, with special attention in the grades to the development of the Yishuv, the community in Eretz Yisrael and the re-established commonwealth. All this can be accomplished in the [elementary] grade where a Jewish (day) high school is not practiced. The public grade schools take from six to seven years to teach so pitifully little that advanced educators see in these half-wasted years the chief symptom of the ills that afflict American education. They point authoritatively to the fact that in Europe boys and girls of seventeen to eighteen are ready for what we call graduate or professional studies.

Coming from such [day] schools Jewish children will be reasonably well educated for their age. The possession of one additional language, Hebrew, will make the acquisition of others in high school and college easier. Above all, these children will be, from the beginning, integrated Jews; that is to say, since they are Jews, integrated human beings. As such, as whole human beings, knowing their place in society and in the world, in the realms of man and God, they will be able to meet the non-Jewish world with ease, assurance, dignity. They will neither defensively overemphasize or fearfully underemphasize their Jewishness and their Judaism. They and they alone will be equals in temper, directness of all social approaches of the Catholics and Protestants with whom they will have to mingle and compete in the daily involvement of American life.

Bibliography

- Adams, L.J., Frankel, J. & Newbauers, N. (1972-73, Winter). Parental Attitudes Toward the Jewish All-Day School. *Jewish Education*, 42(1).
- Avon, I. and Phillips, B. (1990, June). *Findings of the Los Angeles Teacher Census*. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.
- Bloom, B. (1985). *Developing Talent in Young People*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bock, G.E. (1976). *The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-Cognitive Effects*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Cohen, D. (1971, November) Why Curriculum Doesn't Matter. *The New Leader*.

158. What We Know About...

- Cohen, S. M. (1974, July-October). The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and Practice. *Jewish Social Studies*, 36.
- Coleman, J. S. & Campbell, E. Q. (1965). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Dinin, S. (1945, October 5). The All Day School. *The Reconstructionist*.
- Dubb, A. E. & DellaPerghola, S. (1986). *First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, 1981/82 1982/83: United States of America*. (Research Report No. 4, Project for Education Statistics). Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, and New York: Jewish Educational Service of North America.
- Flake, Z. (1978). *Role Congruency and Job Satisfaction of Principals in Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Fuerman, H. (1977). *A Study of the Views of Principals in Elementary Orthodox Hebrew Day Schools in New York City Area: Expectations Held by Principals and their Lay Board Chairmen*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, New York.
- Gans, M. Z. (1986). *Parent and Educator Ratings of Goals of Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Denver.
- Greley, A. M. and Rossi, P. H. (1966). *The Education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Auline Publishing Co.
- Hartman, E. (1976). *A Follow-Up Study of Selected Hebrew Elementary Education Institutions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN.
- Heimowitz, J. (1979). *A Study of the Graduates of Flatbush Yeshiva High School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Helmreich, W. B. (1982). *The World of the Yeshiva: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox Jewry*. New York: Free Press.
- Himmelfarb, H. S. (1977, April). The Non-Linear Impact of Schooling: Comparing Different Types and Amounts of Jewish Education. *Sociology of Education*, 50.
- Himmelslein, S. (1975). *A Comparative Study of Teacher Satisfaction and Dissatisfactions Between Teachers in Selected Jewish Day Schools and Teachers in New York*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, I., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- JESNA. (1985, Winter). *Trends No. 9*.
- Jordan, C. B. (1983). *Perception of Role Conflict Problems Reported by Heads of Selected Private Schools: The Solomon Schechter Schools in North America*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston.
- Kapel, D. (1972, Spring). Parental Views of a Jewish Day School. *Jewish Education*, 41(3).
- Kelman, S. L. (1979, Spring). Motivation and Goals: Why Parents Send Their Children to Non-Orthodox Day Schools. *Jewish Education*, 47(1).
- Kramer, D. (1977). *History and Impact of Torah Umesorah and Hebrew Day Schools in America*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Lasker, A. A. (1976-77, Winter). Parents as Partners: Report of a Research Project. *Impact*, (35).
- Lazar, M. (1969). *Religious Academic Achievement of Boys and Girls of Hebrew Orthodox Day Schools as Related to Selected Variables*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, St. Louis.
- Lebovitz, C. (1981). *Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Among Jewish Teachers in Midwestern Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
- Lewisohn, L. (1950). *The American Jew: Character and Destiny*. New York: Farrar Straus and Company.
- Liebowitz, N. (1990, December). *Federation Allocations to Jewish Education 1985-1989*. Council of Jewish Federations, Research Department.
- McMillan, M. M. & Gerald, E. (1990, April). Characteristics of Private Schools: 1987-88. *F.J.D. Talks*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Nulman, L. (1955). *The Reaction of Parents to a Jewish All-Day School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Parsons, S. *The Role of Finkel Mendelowitz in the Founding and Development of Hebrew Day Schools in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Pollak, G. & Lang, G. (1984). *Budgetary and Financing in Jewish Day Schools—How It Exists? Jewish Education*, 53(2).
- Ravin, N. (1981). *The Effect of Individual and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction of Supplementing and Hebrew Day Schools' Hebrew Teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University, Washington D.C.
- Rosenthal, S. (1987). *An Analysis of Factors Affecting the Mobility of Private Non-Orthodox Jewish Day School Directors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, San Francisco.
- Schiff, A. I. (1966). *The Jewish Day School in America*. New York: Jewish Educational Committee Press.
- Schiff, A. I. (1974). *Jewish Day Schools in the United States*. *Encyclopedia Judaica Year Book*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.
- Schiff, A. I. (1983, March). *Jewish Education at the Crossroads: The State of Jewish Education*. New York and Jerusalem: The Joint Program for Jewish Education, in Conjunction with CJE, WJA, and JESNA.
- Schiff, A. I. (1983, Spring). On the Status of Jewish All-Day Education. *Jewish Education*, 51.
- Schiff, A. I. (1987). *The American Jewish Day School—Retrospect and Prospect*. *Religious Reporter*, 24(3).
- Schiff, A. I. (1988). *Jewish Supplementary Schooling in Greater New York: An Educational System in Need of Change*. New York: Board of Jewish Education.
- Schiff, A. I. and Kessel, B. (1991). *Jewish Education in Greater New York: Comparative Demographic Report 1970-1990*. New York: Board of Jewish Education.
- Shapiro, Z. (1968). *From Generation to Generation: Does Jewish Schooling Affect Jewish Identification?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Solomon, B. (1979). *Curricula Integration in the Jewish All-Day School in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Well, H. A. (1975). *Finances and the Jewish Day School: An Analysis of the Relationship of Teachers' Instructional and per Pupil Costs to Scholastic Achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Zalun, M. (1990, June). *In Yesterday's Shadow: Case Study of the Development of a Jewish Day School*. Presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.

Footnotes

¹Nationally, the majority of Orthodox day schools and yeshivot have a relationship with Torah Umesorah (The National Society for Hebrew Day Schools). Most modern/centrist Orthodox day schools and yeshivot are affiliated with Yeshiva University's Max Stern Division of Communal Service via the Torah Education Network (TEN). Conservative day schools are affiliated with the Solomon Schechter School movement of the United Synagogue of America. The thirteen Reform day schools are organized as PARDES—the Progressive Association of Reform Day Schools—an affiliate of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. In 1986, the transideological, pluralistic day schools which significantly grew in numbers during the 1960's and 1970's were organized into the Jewish Community Day School Network, RAVSAK.

Highlights

- In 1990, there were about 177,250 pupils (K-12) enrolled in 652 Jewish day schools and yeshivot in North America. This represents 40% of the total Jewish school enrollment in North America, compared to 11% in 1962.
- 14.3% of Jewish Federation dollars for local needs were allocated to Jewish all-day education in 1989. This represents 56.4% of the total dollar allotment to local Jewish education.
- 83% of the day school population is enrolled in Orthodox sponsored schools; 10% under Conservative auspices; 6% under communal sponsorship, and 1% in Reform day schools.
- 29% of the day school enrollment is in early childhood programs (N-K); 58% in elementary grades; and 13% in high school classes.
- Average per-pupil costs rose more than ninefold in three decades: from approximately \$500 in 1962 to \$4,600 in 1990 (ranging from \$3,000 to \$12,000).
- In 1989, Federation allocations to day schools (\$40,892,886) represented about 5% of the overall day school expenditure.
- There is a shortage of qualified Hebrew teachers entering the Hebrew teaching profession and a high rate of turnover.
- Lay-professional relationships play an important role in the life of a day school principal.
- There is a surprising lack of scientific information regarding academic achievement in both Jewish and general studies.
- The synergism between home and school is the key to successful performance of the children.

- * Long-term studies on the impact of Jewish day schooling indicate that it has significant influence in Jewish identity formation, even when a variety of factors including family background are controlled.

The Larger Context

Day school education stands as the one format with the best odds of educating Jewish children so as to produce knowledgeable, literate and committed Jews. But, will the same factors that have led to current parental choices, continue to motivate growth of these schools in the decades ahead? Will the centrist, modern Orthodox day schools be able to sustain their rapid growth? Will the non-Orthodox forms of Jewish day school education be able to grow? Will the state of and commitment to public education continue to influence the choice of Jewish day schools? These are but a few of the questions raised by this article.

What We Know About ... The Jewish Day School

Alvin I. Schiff

One of the unique phenomena in Jewish education in North America has been the growth and predominance of all-day schools. Dr. Alvin I. Schiff, Executive Vice President Emeritus of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York and distinguished professor of education at Yeshiva University has published widely on this subject. In this article, he summarizes what we have learned about this form of Jewish education.

AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT CENTURY, WHEN HISTORIANS AND SOCIOLOGISTS WILL SCURRY TO analyze fully the development of the American Jewish community in the nineteenth century, one trend will be clearly outstanding—the phenomenal growth and staying power of Jewish all-day education (Schiff, 1966, 1974, 1987; Dubb & Dellar-Pergola, 1986; McMillan and Gerald, 1990). Given its relative costliness, especially when compared to the free public school—even in tandem with the cost of Jewish supplementary schooling—the flourishing of this institution during the mid 1900's and thereafter is nothing less than remarkable. This is particularly so in view of the decline of the Jewish supplementary school (Schiff, 1988, 1983, 1991).

Enrollment

In 1990, there were about 177,250 pupils (K-12) enrolled in 652 Jewish day schools and yeshivot in North America (158,381 pupils in 604 schools in the United States and 18,870 students in 48 schools in Canada), compared to 62,000 pupils (K-12) in 296 schools in North American in 1962, the peak year of enrollment (McMillan & Gerald, 1990). During the same period, enrollment in Jewish supplementary schools declined from 540,000 to 260,000 (Schiff, 1983; JESNA, 1985).

The 1990 Jewish day school population comprised about 40 percent of the total Jewish school enrollment in the United States and Canada, compared to eleven percent in 1962 (Schiff, 1983). The Greater New York experience sharpens the contrast even more. In 1940, the year marking the beginning of the Era of Great Expansion, the Jewish Day School enrollment was about 6% of the total Jewish school enrollment (Schiff, 1966). By 1978, the day school population surpassed sup-

plementary school enrollment; in 1990 it composed sixty percent of the total Jewish school population (Schiff & Kessel, 1991). This development appears even more extraordinary when one considers the reaction of Samuel Dinin to the early spurt of day school growth in the 1940's. In 1945, he wrote, "The Jews may get more than 0.8 percent of their children to attend all-day schools (the Protestant percentage); they are hardly likely to go above 2 or 3 percent (2 percent being the percentage of private school pupils in this country) for the whole Jewish child population of 800,000." Variety is a characteristic of this growth which involves virtually all of the ideological groupings in American Jewry—Hasidic, sectarian Orthodox, modern/centrist Orthodox, communal/traditional, Conservative, Reform, Yiddish, Zionist and general secular. The only feature common to all schools is the all-day format of Jewish and general studies under one roof.

Developed by Orthodox Jews against a backdrop of opposition and doubt by the rest of the Jewish community (Kramer, 1977; Parsons, 1983; Schiff, 1966), its degree of acceptance and support for the broad Jewish community is underscored by the fact that 14.3% of Jewish Federation dollars for local needs were allocated in 1989 to Jewish all-day education. This represents 56.4% of the total dollar allotment to local Jewish education services and programs (Liebman, 1990).

Eighty-three percent of the day school population is enrolled in Orthodox sponsored schools, equally divided between Hasidic/sectarian and modern/centrist institutions. (The fact that Orthodox Jews comprise less than 10% of the total Jewish population in the United States is powerful evidence of the role of Orthodox Jewry in the development of all-day Jewish schooling.) Ten percent of the enrollment is under Conservative auspices, 6% under communal (interdenominational, non-denominational or "other") sponsorship and 1% in Reform day schools.

Despite the reality that day schools exist in every Jewish community with five thousand or more Jews, the Jewish day school is mainly an urban, large Jewish community phenomenon (Schiff, 1983). For example, of the 80,000 pupils (K-12) in New York area day schools in 1990, only 6,455 were in suburban Long Island and Westchester where approximately 45% of the Jewish population resides (Schiff & Kessel, 1991). Ninety percent of the enrollment in North America is in the ten largest urban centers.

Greater New York alone accounts for well over one half of the total day school population. Ninety-five percent of the New York day school enrollment is in Orthodox schools. With rare exception, Orthodox families choose the all-day school format of Jewish education for their offspring, at least through high school grades.

Continental, 29% of the day school enrollment is in early childhood programs (N-K); 58% is in the elementary grades; and 13% is in high school classes. The percentage of students in high school grades is significantly higher in New York (25%) where the vast majority of secondary Jewish day schools are found (Schiff & Kessel, 1991).

Growth Factors

The initial spurt in day school growth in the 1940's and early 1950's was due essentially to three factors: 1) the zealous activity of a small selfless group of Orthodox Day School advocates; 2) the

effect of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel on the Jewish consciousness of American Jews; and 3) the influx of Eastern European Jews after World War II, especially between 1956 and 1958 (Schiff, 1966).

The reasons for day school growth since the 1960's are, interestingly, the opposite of the factors leading to the decline of the supplementary school enrollment. Whereas the birth rate among the general Jewish population has decreased in the last several decades, causing a drop in supplementary school enrollment, the high birth rate among the Orthodox, primarily the right-wing Orthodox, has accounted for dramatic pupil increases in yeshivot and day schools.

The mobility of the Jewish population—particularly the out-migration of Jews from areas of second and third settlement—has often been accompanied by nonaffiliation with a synagogue in the new areas of residence, and, hence, fewer children enrolled in synagogue schools. On the other hand, the immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union, Israel, Iran and other Moslem lands has added children to the classroom registers of the day schools. Heightened Jewish consciousness (and the *teshuvah* movement) is another reason for the increase in the number of day school pupils.

In some areas, dissatisfaction with the public school has motivated parents to choose a Jewish day school for their children, while others prefer it because it is a private school (Schiff, 1987). Finally, a growing number of working mothers and single parents favor an all-day school environment, especially at the preschool levels.

Will these factors continue to motivate growth in the day school in the decades ahead? The proliferation of day schools has enhanced their viability by creating a positive image in the eyes of the community that the Jewish day school has come of age. The challenge is for day schools to capitalize on this image in their recruitment efforts, indeed, now may be a good time to convene a communal trans-ideological consultation on day school recruitment and retention.

As for future enrollment, one other question must be posed. Early childhood education is a significant aspect of overall day school growth. How can we ensure that greater numbers of early childhood graduates will continue on to Jewish all-day elementary schools? To achieve this all-important objective, Jewish family education, geared to the young parents of these children, must become a regular part of every early childhood day school program.

Governance and Finances

The overwhelming majority of Jewish day schools are independently sponsored by local communal groups. About 15% were organized by synagogues—for the most part, by Conservative Reform congregations. Almost all day schools are loosely affiliated with one or more national, local organization. Locally, with the exception of some Orthodox yeshivot, they are associated with and receive services from the communal bureau of Jewish education. In the smaller communities and even in the intermediate and large communities, the day school often competes with the bureau for Federation funding.

Despite their local and national affiliations, the authority and power for policymaking and program implementation rest solely within each school's board of trustees and its professional administration. Ex-

institution was founded by a local group of interested parents and/or communal leaders (often with professional assistance from Torah Umesegora, United Synagogue or Yeshiva University) who are desirous of controlling the affairs of the school and of insuring the continuation of its ideological/philosophical orientation. Moreover, they are loath to give up their power since they are saddled with the financial responsibility for the conduct of their respective institutions.

The cost of day school operation is considerable—what with the dual curriculum and dual sets of instructional staffs and administration. Tuition fees have not kept pace with the skyrocketing costs of all-day education. Average per-pupil costs rose over ninefold in three decades, from approximately \$500 in 1962 to \$4,600 in 1990; they ranged from \$3,000 to \$12,000 depending upon locale and grade level of school (Pollack & Lang, 1984; Schiff & Kessel, 1991). High school costs are about 50% higher than the elementary grades.

The largest portion of the school income derives from tuition fees. About 40% of the pupils do not pay full tuition (Pollack & Lang, 1984). Moreover, the full fee does not usually cover the complete cost of a child's education.

Day school operation in America is big business. The aggregate cost of yeshiva/day school education in 1990 was approximately \$800,000,000. School boards raised approximately one third of this sum. Over the years, Federations have increased their support of all-day education via scholarship assistance and subsidies for teacher salaries and special programs. In 1989, Federation allocations to day schools (\$40,892,886) represented about 5% of the overall day school expenditure (Lieberman, 1990).

The Post High School Yeshiva World

An aspect of Jewish all-day education that deserves mention is the development and remarkable growth in the Orthodox community of a dual-level system of full-time (as much as 18 hours per day) post-high-school undergraduate and graduate Torah and Talmud study. While there are no exact enrollment figures available for each of these levels of study, it is estimated that in 1990 there were about 6,000 Bais Midrash (undergraduate) students and 2,500 Kollel (graduate) students. In 1950, there were less than 100 students enrolled in these programs (Helmreich, 1982). The length of stay in the Bais Midrash is generally two to four years; and in the Kollel, one to twenty years. Most students spend three to five years in the Kollel. Tuition in both of these programs ranges from \$3,000 to \$6,000 per annum, but really depends solely upon ability to pay. Most students pay little or no tuition. More than that, the Kollel students regularly receive stipends averaging \$7,000 a year for room and board so that they can devote full time (morning, afternoon and evening) to study without having to worry about finances. Married students often receive as much as \$10,000 a year, supplemented by their wives' income, usually from teaching in a local yeshiva. The expenditures for this intensive post-high-school system of yeshiva education were estimated to be more than \$50,000,000 in 1990 (Joel Benitz, personal communication). The Yeshivot Gedolot—the post-high-school institutions—are organized into the Association of Advanced Rabbinical and Talmudic

Schools (AARTS), a group recognized by the Federal government as a national accrediting agency for Pell grants.

Personnel

Two problem areas have consistently concerned the leadership of Jewish day schools—a shortage of qualified Hebrew teachers entering the Hebrew teaching profession and the high rate of turnover of Hebrew teachers. Both problems are rooted in the matter of job satisfaction (Himmelshein, 1975; Rawin, 1981) largely derived from the level of remuneration and fringe benefits (Himmelshein, 1975; Pollack & Lang, 1984). To be sure, teacher salaries are significantly less than those paid to public school teachers (JESNA, 1985; Aron & Phillips, 1990; Well, 1975). Because of this condition, one researcher found that more than half of the teachers in his study sample planned to leave their positions within five years (Lebovitz, 1981).

In 1990, in Greater New York, for example, the average salary of male instructors for twenty hours or more of Jewish studies teaching per week was \$22,500 and for female teachers \$19,120. Salaries for principals averaged \$45,000. While the highest teacher salary was \$51,000, several principals and administrators earned in excess of \$100,000 (Schiff & Kessel, 1991).

Despite their personnel problems, the day schools seem to manage from year to year, hoping that next year will be an easier one financially. The personnel problems relating to supervision and administration are similar, yet different from those regarding teachers. There is a shortage of qualified personnel on both levels despite the significantly higher salaries (two to five times as much) for principals, driven up by supply and demand, by the feeling of lay leadership that they can attract highly qualified supervisory personnel if they can out-bid other schools. To be sure, the ability to hire higher caliber administrators depends solely on the availability of such personnel and not upon the salaries schools are willing to offer. That availability derives largely from a sufficient pool of qualified teachers who have supervisory potential and are willing to obtain the necessary training in supervision and administration.

The problems are different because of the difference in job requirements. Lay-professional relationships play an important role in the life of a day school principal. A study of the views of New York City elementary Orthodox Hebrew day school principals' role expectations as perceived by the principals themselves and their lay board chairs revealed that the principals' views of their decision-making functions were substantially greater than the board chairs' views of their decision-making power (Feuerstein, 1977). This difference was similar in the four areas of schooling examined—religious orientation, curriculum, finance and personnel. It was greatest in the area of curriculum and least in the area of religious orientation. Interestingly, while the lay board chairs' views of the decision-making power of the principal in establishing the religious philosophy of the school almost coincided with that of the principals, they differed widely in their views about the principal's authority to implement that philosophy via the curriculum. Generally, the principals and board chairs agreed that the area of finance is a board function and that religious orientation, curriculum and personnel are primarily principal functions (Feuerstein, 1977).

Another study demonstrated that directors who are formally evaluated by their boards of education at least once per year showed a greater desire to stay at their present positions than those who were not evaluated. There was no difference between directors with and without written job descriptions. Overall staying power of non-Orthodox day school principals was much greater at the time of the study (1987) than in earlier years. Average length of tenure is eight years and average number of positions held by present directors is two (Rosenthal, 1987).

Most day schools have two principals, one for Jewish studies and one for general studies. The relationship of these supervisors is critical to the smooth functioning of the school. Flatto (1987) showed that there is no relationship between the role expectations and the job satisfaction of the principals of the religious and secular departments.

Another study demonstrated that the older the principal is, the more experienced and the longer in the job, the greater the likelihood of role conflict perception between principals and between principals and boards of directors (Jordan, 1983).

Curriculum

While the common characteristic of all day schools is the dual program of Jewish and general studies under one roof, the Judaic curricula vary greatly. The general studies curriculum is generally not according to State requirements. In most schools, the morning hours are devoted to Jewish subjects when the students are presumably more alert.

The sectarian Chasidic and non-Chasidic all-boys yeshivot spend well over 60% of their instructional time on Jewish studies and concentrate almost solely on Pentateuch, the prayer service and codes in the early grades (Hebrew reading is taught in the kindergarten and sometimes even earlier) and on Talmud beginning with the fourth grade. These schools devote six days a week—between 30 and 40 hours—to Jewish studies where the language of instruction is often Yiddish. The sectarian girls schools teach bible, Hebrew language, customs and ceremonies, Musar (ethics), Mishnah and Shulchan Aruch in a Judaic studies program ranging from 15 to 20 hours per week. About the same amount of time is scheduled for general studies.

The modern/centrist Orthodox schools divide instructional time equally between Jewish and general studies. The Judaic studies curriculum includes: Hebrew language arts, Pentateuch, Prophets, general studies, Jewish history, holidays and ceremonies, and Shulchan Aruch. Beginning with grade six Siddur, Jewish history, concentration is on Talmud for boys. During these periods, girls study or seven, the curriculum concentration is on Talmud for boys. Between fifteen and twenty Mishnah, Agaddah, Hebrew literature, Jewish history and current events.

Hours are devoted to the Hebrew studies program. The Solomon Schechter Schools and communal schools generally devote about one third of the instructional time (12 to 15 hours per week) to Judaic subjects including Hebrew language and literature, Bible, Jewish history, customs and ceremonies, current events and introduction to Talmud in the upper grades.

In the Reform day schools, Hebrew language and literature are taught as separate subjects. All other Hebraic studies are introduced as part of an interdisciplinary approach to classroom instruction. In all, between 5 and 15 hours are devoted to the Jewish dimensions of the program.

Curricula integration, by and large, is not practiced. In the first instance, Orthodox schools do not advocate it as a matter of principle. However, it is considered an ideological and practical desideratum for Conservative and Reform schools. Nevertheless, as one study demonstrated, these institutions do not integrate Jewish and general subject matter because of a fundamental philosophical problem—their acceptance of a "structure of discipline's view of knowledge and curriculum planning" (Solomon, 1979).

There is a surprising lack of scientific information regarding academic achievement in both Jewish and general studies. There are no standardized tests for achievement in Jewish studies. Yet, from all available evidence it is clear that Jewish day school graduates acquire themselves admirably in high school and university settings. This is due largely to school standards, stringent requirements regarding homework, the general climate of learning in the schools and parent involvement in their children's education. Moreover, the sheer volume of hours and the intensity of exposure of Judaic studies have a notable impact upon students, especially upon those continuing their all-day schooling through high school and beyond. In absolute (and certainly in relative) terms, they accumulate a significant body of Judaic knowledge, not unlike the Torah scholarship of yesterday in Eastern Europe.

Family and School

The role of family in day schools cannot be disregarded. Research in general education adequately confirms the importance of family influence on achievement (Coleman & Campbell, 1966; Cohen, 1971; Jencks, et al., 1972; Greedy & Rossi, 1966). This is so in Jewish schools, particularly with regard to the formation and strengthening of Jewish identity. One study demonstrated that family background "makes a large and significant contribution to total Jewish identification" (Shapiro, 1988). It showed that the most important predictors of total Jewish identification are parents' ritual observance, parents' residence-friendship patterns, the children's group activities and parents' parenting behaviors. Clearly, parents with positive Jewish attitudes and family styles prefer to send their offspring to a day school. The synergism between home and school is the key to the successful performance of the children (Heimowitz, 1979).

For high performance in every area of life, Benjamin Bloom (1985) has underscored the importance of the combination of a supportive "sacrificing home" and quality "time-on-task" in and out of school. Parental interest, motivation and support differ significantly according to ideological orientation. Sectarian Orthodox parents strongly support school policies. For them, there is no choice but to give their children the most intensive, religious Jewish educational exposure in home and in school. Modern/centrist Orthodox parents generally enroll their children in day schools because of the quality and intensity of the Jewish study program and because of their own Jewish concerns

(Nulman, 1955; Adams, Frankel & Newbauers, 1972/3; Schiff, 1966); yet, in the modern/centrist schools many parents are not themselves Orthodox or as religious as the school would like them to be. Consequently, they do not necessarily associate themselves with the religious philosophy of the schools. They are interested in having their children "feel Jewish" but not really "act Jewish" (Lasker, 1976/77).

In one study of modern Orthodox schools, the teachers and principals attributed greatest importance to goals of religious living. Most parents, on the other hand, indicated that goals of Jewish cultural living are most important and goals of religious living least important. Moreover, parents rated the importance of "a secular American orientation" much higher than the Jewish studies personnel (Gans, 1986).

In the non-Orthodox day school sector, parents enroll their children primarily because of excellence in general studies and not for "Jewish reasons" (Kaplan, 1972; Kelman, 1979). This fact underscores the relationship between the deterioration of the public school system and greater parental interest in the non-Orthodox Jewish day school (Zeldin, 1990).

Day School Impact

Overall, the impact of day school education is significant, particularly when compared to Jewish supplementary schooling (Schiff, 1988). A follow-up study of graduates of selected Hebrew day and supplementary schools focused attention on the relative contribution of these institutions in maintaining Jewish identity and continuity (Hartman, 1976). The findings of this study demonstrate that: Hebrew day school graduates 1) perceive themselves and their parents as more religiously observant; 2) perceive their Jewish education as being more effective in enhancing both their own and their parents' religious behavior; 3) view interdating and intermarriage as more antithetical to their belief system. Hebrew day school graduates interdate much less and intermarry much less.

Graduates of both systems who express a higher degree of satisfaction with Jewish education also perceive themselves and their parents as more religiously observant. Hebrew day school graduates attend secondary or post-secondary schools of Jewish learning significantly longer and select Jewish education and/or Jewish communal work as future vocational choices to a greater degree (Hartman, 1976).

Long-term studies on the impact of Jewish day schooling indicate that it has significant influence on Jewish identity formation, even when a variety of factors including family background are controlled (Bock, 1976; Cohen, 1974; Himmelfarb, 1977). In the final analysis, one of the major reasons for the impact of day schools on attitudes and identification is the full-day Jewish climate in which students are immersed. This, after all, is one of the reasons for the establishment of day schools.

Summing up the day school phenomenon in Jewish life, it seems most appropriate to quote Ludwig Lewisohn (1950), author, novelist and critic, who in his later years became a strong devotee of the day school movement. He wrote in 1950:

The truest advance in recent Jewish history in the United States, the one altogether hopeful phenomenon, has been the initiation and the slow gradual spread of the day school movement. It arose, necessarily, from classical Jewish sources...

Fundamentals must be side by side with the acquisition of an exacting and elegant grasp of English and its literature. The usual [general] subjects of instruction must be augmented by Jewish history, symbol, ceremony, liturgy, with special attention in the grades to the development of the Yishuv, the community in Eretz Yisrael and the re-established commonwealth. All this can be accomplished in the [elementary] grade where a Jewish (day) high school is not practiced. The public grade schools take from six to seven years to teach so pitifully little that advanced educators see in these half-wasted years the chief symptom of the ills that afflict American education. They point authoritatively to the fact that in Europe boys and girls of seventeen to eighteen are ready for what we call graduate or professional studies.

Coming from such [day] schools Jewish children will be reasonably well educated for their age. The possession of one additional language, Hebrew, will make the acquisition of others in high school and college easier. Above all, these children will be, from the beginning, integrated Jews; that is to say, since they are Jews, integrated human beings. As such, as whole human beings, knowing their place in society and in the world, in the realms of man and God, they will be able to meet the non-Jewish world with ease, assurance, dignity. They will neither defensively overemphasize or fearfully underemphasize their Jewishness and their Judaism. They and they alone will be equals in temper, directness of all social approaches of the Catholics and Protestants with whom they will have to mingle and compete in the daily involvement of American life.

Bibliography

- Adams, L.J., Frankel, J. & Newbauers, N. (1972-73, Winter). Parental Attitudes Toward the Jewish All-Day School. *Jewish Education*, 42(1).
- Avon, I. and Phillips, B. (1990, June). *Findings of the Los Angeles Teacher Census*. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.
- Bloom, B. (1985). *Developing Talent in Young People*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bock, G.E. (1976). *The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-Cognitive Effects*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Cohen, D. (1971, November) Why Curriculum Doesn't Matter. *The New Leader*.

158. What We Know About...

- Cohen, S. M. (1974, July-October). The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and Practice. *Jewish Social Studies*, 36.
- Coleman, J. S. & Campbell, E. Q. (1965). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Dinin, S. (1945, October 5). The All Day School. *The Reconstructionist*.
- Dubb, A. E. & DellaPerghola, S. (1986). *First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, 1981/82 1982/83: United States of America*. (Research Report No. 4, Project for Education Statistics). Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, and New York: Jewish Educational Service of North America.
- Flake, Z. (1978). *Role Congruency and Job Satisfaction of Principals in Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Fuehrman, H. (1977). *A Study of the Views of Principals in Elementary Orthodox Hebrew Day Schools in New York City Area: Expectations Held by Principals and their Lay Board Chairmen*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, New York.
- Gans, M. Z. (1986). *Parent and Educator Ratings of Goals of Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Denver.
- Greley, A. M. and Rossi, P. H. (1966). *The Education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Auline Publishing Co.
- Hartman, E. (1976). *A Follow-Up Study of Selected Hebrew Elementary Education Institutions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN.
- Heimowitz, J. (1979). *A Study of the Graduates of Flatbush Yeshiva High School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Helmerich, W. B. (1982). *The World of the Yeshiva: An Intimate Portrait of Orthodox Jewry*. New York: Free Press.
- Himmelfarb, H. S. (1977, April). The Non-Linear Impact of Schooling: Comparing Different Types and Amounts of Jewish Education. *Sociology of Education*, 50.
- Himmelfarb, S. (1975). *A Comparative Study of Teacher Satisfaction and Dissatisfactions Between Teachers in Selected Jewish Day Schools and Teachers in New York*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, I., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- JESNA. (1985, Winter). *Trends No. 9*.
- Jordan, C. B. (1983). *Perception of Role Conflict Problems Reported by Heads of Selected Private Schools: The Solomon Schechter Schools in North America*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston.
- Kapel, D. (1972, Spring). Parental Views of a Jewish Day School. *Jewish Education*, 41(3).
- Kelman, S. L. (1979, Spring). Motivation and Goals: Why Parents Send Their Children to Non-Orthodox Day Schools. *Jewish Education*, 47(1).
- Kramer, D. (1977). *History and Impact of Torah Umesorah and Hebrew Day Schools in America*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, New York.
- Lasker, A. A. (1976-77, Winter). Parents as Partners: Report of a Research Project. *Impact*, (35).
- Lazar, M. (1969). *Religious Academic Achievement of Boys and Girls of Hebrew Orthodox Day Schools as Related to Selected Variables*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, St. Louis.
- Lebowitz, C. (1981). *Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Among Jewish Teachers in Midwestern Jewish Day Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
- Lewisohn, L. (1950). *The American Jew: Character and Destiny*. New York: Farrar Straus and Company.
- Liebowman, N. (1990, December). *Federation Allocations to Jewish Education 1985-1989*. Council of Jewish Federations, Research Department.
- McMillan, M. M. & Gerald, E. (1990, April). Characteristics of Private Schools: 1987-88. *F.D. Talks*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Nulman, L. (1955). *The Reaction of Parents to a Jewish All-Day School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Parsons, S. *The Role of Finkel Mendelowitz in the Founding and Development of Hebrew Day Schools in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Pollak, G. & Lang, G. (1984). *Budgetary and Financing in Jewish Day Schools—How It Exists? Jewish Education*, 53(2).
- Ravin, N. (1981). *The Effect of Individual and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction of Supplementing and Hebrew Day Schools' Hebrew Teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University, Washington D.C.
- Rosenthal, S. (1987). *An Analysis of Factors Affecting the Mobility of Private Non-Orthodox Jewish Day School Directors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, San Francisco.
- Schiff, A. I. (1966). *The Jewish Day School in America*. New York: Jewish Educational Committee Press.
- Schiff, A. I. (1974). *Jewish Day Schools in the United States: Encyclopedia Judaica Year Book*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.
- Schiff, A. I. (1983, March). *Jewish Education at the Crossroads: The State of Jewish Education*. New York and Jerusalem: The Joint Program for Jewish Education, in Conjunction with CJF, WJL, and JESNA.
- Schiff, A. I. (1983, Spring). On the Status of Jewish All-Day Education. *Jewish Education*, 51.
- Schiff, A. I. (1987). *The American Jewish Day School—Retrospect and Prospect*. *Religious Reporter*, 24(3).
- Schiff, A. I. (1988). *Jewish Supplementary Schooling in Greater New York: An Educational System in Need of Change*. New York: Board of Jewish Education.
- Schiff, A. I. and Kessel, B. (1991). *Jewish Education in Greater New York: Comparative Demographic Report 1970-1990*. New York: Board of Jewish Education.
- Shapiro, Z. (1968). *From Generation to Generation: Does Jewish Schooling Affect Jewish Identification?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Solomon, B. (1979). *Curricula Integration in the Jewish All-Day School in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Well, H. A. (1975). *Finances and the Jewish Day School: An Analysis of the Relationship of Teachers' Instructional and per Pupil Costs to Scholastic Achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Zalun, M. (1990, June). *In Yesterday's Shadow: Case Study of the Development of a Jewish Day School*. Presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Network for Research in Jewish Education, New York, NY.

Footnotes

¹Nationally, the majority of Orthodox day schools and yeshivot have a relationship with Torah Umesorah (The National Society for Hebrew Day Schools). Most modern/centrist Orthodox day schools and yeshivot are affiliated with Yeshiva University's Max Stern Division of Communal Service via the Torah Education Network (TEN). Conservative day schools are affiliated with the Solomon Schechter School movement of the United Synagogue of America. The thirteen Reform day schools are organized as PARDES—the Progressive Association of Reform Day Schools—an affiliate of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. In 1986, the transideological, pluralistic day schools which significantly grew in numbers during the 1960's and 1970's were organized into the Jewish Community Day School Network, RAWSAK.

Highlights

- In 1990, there were about 177,250 pupils (K-12) enrolled in 652 Jewish day schools and yeshivot in North America. This represents 40% of the total Jewish school enrollment in North America, compared to 11% in 1962.
- 14.3% of Jewish Federation dollars for local needs were allocated to Jewish all-day education in 1989. This represents 56.4% of the total dollar allotment to local Jewish education.
- 83% of the day school population is enrolled in Orthodox sponsored schools; 10% under Conservative auspices; 6% under communal sponsorship, and 1% in Reform day schools.
- 29% of the day school enrollment is in early childhood programs (N-K); 58% in elementary grades; and 13% in high school classes.
- Average per-pupil costs rose more than ninefold in three decades: from approximately \$500 in 1962 to \$4,600 in 1990 (ranging from \$3,000 to \$12,000).
- In 1989, Federation allocations to day schools (\$40,892,886) represented about 5% of the overall day school expenditure.
- There is a shortage of qualified Hebrew teachers entering the Hebrew teaching profession and a high rate of turnover.
- Lay-professional relationships play an important role in the life of a day school principal.
- There is a surprising lack of scientific information regarding academic achievement in both Jewish and general studies.
- The synergism between home and school is the key to successful performance of the children.

- * Long-term studies on the impact of Jewish day schooling indicate that it has significant influence in Jewish identity formation, even when a variety of factors including family background are controlled.

The Larger Context

Day school education stands as the one format with the best odds of educating Jewish children so as to produce knowledgeable, literate and committed Jews. But, will the same factors that have led to current parental choices, continue to motivate growth of these schools in the decades ahead? Will the centrist, modern Orthodox day schools be able to sustain their rapid growth? Will the non-Orthodox forms of Jewish day school education be able to grow? Will the state of and commitment to public education continue to influence the choice of Jewish day schools? These are but a few of the questions raised by this article.