
RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AS CULTURAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT: SECTOR DIFFERENCES IN CHICAGO'S JEWISH SCHOOLS

ADAM GAMORAN
MATTHEW BOXER

University of Wisconsin - Madison

This paper uses the case of Jewish schools in Chicago to explore the role of religious schools in the development of cultural capital among youth. The authors focus on three sectors of Jewish schools (Orthodox day schools, non-Orthodox day schools, and non-Orthodox supplementary schools) as contexts for learning and expressing Jewish practices, affiliations, and beliefs, which are understood to be markers of cultural capital for the Jewish community. Survey results from 834 students in grades 7-12 revealed that family and school environments are independently associated with cultural capital development. Generally, the contributions of families are more prominent than the impact of schools, but both school type and learning opportunities also contribute to cultural outcomes.

Most research in the sociology of schooling focuses on cognitive outcomes. Following the accepted wisdom, many sociologists duly emphasize the contributions of families and schools to cognitive development. Yet schooling also has cultural outcomes: the practices, attitudes, and beliefs that play important roles in the transition from youth to adulthood, and that provide access to particular cultural groups. Dominated by the seminal writings of Bourdieu (1977a, 1977b, 1984), the literature on cultural reproduction also recognizes the dual contributions of families and schools. This essay examines the emergence of adolescent religious identity as a form of cultural capital development, drawing on a pilot study of Jewish schools in the Chicago area. Three sectors of Jewish schools are included: Orthodox day schools, the most religiously observant and intensive group; a non-Orthodox day school, sponsored by the Conservative movement, which advocates an intermediate level of observance; and non-Orthodox supplementary schools, which are attended on weekends and/or

weekday afternoons and are sponsored by the Conservative, Reform, and Reconstructionist movements, with the latter two as the most religiously liberal of the Jewish denominations. The analysis considers the roles of both family affiliation and practices, and school type and curriculum, as potential influences on young persons' Jewish cultural capital, as represented by their commitment and capacity to engage with the traditions and practices of the Jewish people.

The focus on cognitive outcomes of education to the exclusion of other outcomes has been heightened by the current emphasis on high standards for students' academic performance, but cultural outcomes also deserve attention. Although generally overlooked in today's debates about standards as a means to improve the quality of schooling, cultural outcomes also contribute to the development and future opportunities of young persons. In the case of religious identification and activities, research on adolescents is sparse, but a recent review concluded that greater religious participation among teenagers is positively associated with a variety of indicators of health and well-being (Bridges & Moore, 2002). The question of whether and how schools and families reproduce cultural outcomes, including religious practices and attitudes, is thus of broad interest.

Survey research on education and cultural transmission has been limited by two shortcomings: cross-sectional data and inadequate measures of cultural capital (Nagel & Ganzeboom, 2003). This study is also cross-sectional, so the findings must be considered speculative rather than conclusive. However, the study uses new, richer measures of Jewish affiliation, practices, and commitment than are commonly found in either research on Jewish identity or in studies of cultural capital more generally. The contributions of the study thus lie in framing the problem of Jewish identity development as a matter of cultural capital transmission, and in providing evidence on the associations among family, school, and young persons' religious expressions.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION AS CULTURAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

Research on American Jewish identity has always reflected a concern with cultural transmission, though not explicitly so. Through the centuries, Jewish distinctiveness was preserved through an *us-them* mentality, a sense that Jews were different and isolated from other social groups. This worldview has deep roots in Jewish tradition (for example, a daily prayer praises God for setting us apart from other nations) and was thoroughly reinforced by government restrictions on the rights and activities of Jews. By contrast, the pluralism and relative tolerance of American society has elim-

inated most of these external pressures for group identification. In this context, what mechanisms will preserve the Jews as a distinctive cultural and religious group?

CONCEPTIONS OF JEWISH IDENTITY

As early as the 1950s, the American Jewish Committee (a cross-denominational Jewish advocacy organization) commissioned a number of studies of the social and religious character of American Jewry. The most important of these early studies was led by Sklare (Sklare & Greenblum, 1967), focusing on a Midwestern suburb referred to as "Lakeville." While the Lakeville study addressed a number of potential measures of Jewish identity, the key areas of focus related to ritual practices. Most of the research emphasized ritual practices, education, organizations, and synagogue life. Home life was seen through the lens of observance of *mitzvot* (Jewish commandments). In this research tradition, Jewish identity was viewed largely as a matter of belonging to a synagogue, affiliating with a particular denomination, and engaging in Jewish ritual practices.

As the Jewish population became more dispersed throughout America, some writers argued that measures of association with Jewish organizations, including but not limited to synagogues, were more important indicators of Jewish identification than ritual observance (Elazar, 1976). Although rituals, denominational preference, and synagogue membership continued to serve as key indicators of Jewish identity, membership in community groups and informal Jewish networks were also noted (Cohen, 1988; Goldscheider, 1986; Kobrin & Goldscheider, 1978). One can also observe a shift in thinking about Jewish identity by comparing the National Jewish Population Surveys of 1970, 1980, and 1990, which moved from a focus on religious and synagogue-based items to wider areas of Jewish activity and affiliation (Kosmin et al., 1991; Massarik & Chenkin, 1973).

According to Horowitz (2002), this shift occurred for two reasons. First, under the traditional view that religious ritual observance is the key marker of Jewish identity, when a person acts in a way he or she perceives as Jewishly motivated (e.g., volunteering in a soup kitchen), but the action does not fit standardized notions of Jewish action (such as performing a ritual), conventional surveys miss an important element of Jewish identity. Second, Jews have not fit the classical model of assimilation in that they retained group cohesion even as they attained higher levels of economic status, became farther removed from the immigrant generation, and became less religiously observant. Clearly something other than religious ritual observance was the cause (Horowitz, 2000, 2002). Horowitz (2000) also pointed out that Jewish identity is not static, but may change over the life course in connection with life-cycle events or other critical moments

(Schoenfeld, 1998).

These considerations led Horowitz (2000) to postulate a broader conception of Jewish identity, in which ritual practice is only one dimension, and not necessarily the most important one for a given individual. Horowitz characterized the dimensions of Jewish identity as:

- Religious activities (e.g., ritual practices)
- Cultural affiliation (e.g., displaying religious symbols, membership in religious organizations)
- Subjective attitudes (e.g., centrality of religious identity)

The present study adapts Horowitz's scales by distinguishing affiliations and practices of the family from affiliations and practices of the young person. Subjective attitudes are measured only for the young person. The aim of the present analysis is to examine the associations between family and adolescents' affiliations and practices, and to explore the role of Jewish schools in contributing to Jewish affiliation, observance, and commitment among adolescents. These attitudes and activities are regarded as markers of cultural capital.

CONCEPTIONS OF CULTURAL CAPITAL

In the classic work, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Bourdieu (1984) studied members of French society, examining their preferences for and familiarity with types of music, art, and cinema. Bourdieu found that an individual's taste is conditioned strongly by his or her social status, in that members of higher social strata are more likely to prefer and be familiar with the music, art, and cinema associated with high culture and less likely to prefer and be familiar with more popular productions; similarly, the reverse is found for members of lower social classes. Because social elites set societal standards for what constitutes high culture and what is relegated to the realm of popular culture, it would be expected that the preferences of the social elites would be established as cultural ideals of high culture.

Bourdieu argued that members of different social classes are taught to appreciate culture differently through their varied structural locations, such as families, schools, acquaintances, and public institutions. In short, members of different social classes acquire preferences that closely resemble the preferences of those people and social structures with which they associate in their formative years. Thus, members of higher social classes tend to develop preferences and familiarity with high culture, whereas members of lower social classes will tend to develop preferences and familiarity with more popular culture (Bourdieu, 1977b). Bourdieu (1977a) argued that the

effect is cumulative, with greater impact for individuals for whom exposure to cultural experiences occurs early and frequently in formative years. Moreover, the greater resources of the higher social classes ensure greater access to cultural events and items, and therefore greater opportunities for exposure to high culture, which tend to reinforce the developed preference of social elites for high culture and enable them to differentiate themselves from members of lower social classes (Bourdieu, 1984; Kraaykamp, 2003; Weber, 1978).

The end result of differential socialization of social classes is that social elites tend to pursue and attain higher levels of various cultural markers. As such, socialization produces a form of capital, measured in terms of an individual's ability to engage in the culture of his or her society. Bourdieu called this cultural capital and defined it as the general cultural knowledge, skills, and background pertaining to the culture of the social elite. Appreciation of and ability to participate in high society, therefore, are developed by accumulating cultural capital through exposure to various cultural events and items. The more an individual immerses in society, the more he or she can develop cultural capital.

Bourdieu's *Distinction* (1984) focused on the greater cultural capital of social elites compared with non-elites in France, but other scholars have applied the concept to other populations as well; indeed, any culture or subset of a culture could be said to have its own cultural capital. Just as Bourdieu defined cultural capital in French society in terms of taste in music, art, and cinema, other societies may have different measures. It is in this respect that Jewish practices, affiliation, and commitments are considered as a form of cultural capital for the community of Jews.

CULTURAL CAPITAL AND EDUCATION

Much of the literature on cultural capital focuses on the contributions of family cultural capital to young people's educational attainment (De Graaf, 1986; DiMaggio, 1982; DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985), but our interest is in the reverse: How do families and schools produce cultural capital? A few studies have addressed this question. Bourdieu and Darbel (1990) focused on the relation between arts education and a facility with high culture in the arts. They found that family differences were much more important than school differences in cultivating a taste for the arts, but speculated that in the field of literature, school instruction may play a larger role in developing cultural capital. A key difference between arts and literature instruction was that arts was a marginal subject, whereas literature was taught systematically and with the same principles of classification that were reflected in prominent cultural distinctions. Building on these ideas, Nagel and

Ganzeboom (2003) developed three hypotheses about the relations between families, schools, and cultural capital. First, following Bourdieu and Darbel, they argued that school differences are more powerful than family differences. Second, they suggested that family influences would remain stable throughout childhood, but school influences would become stronger as the young person moved toward adulthood. Third, they hypothesized that school influences on cultural capital would be stronger among young persons who had a stronger foundation of cultural capital based in the family. That is, family and school effects would compound one another in generating cultural capital.

This study of Jewish cultural capital also proposes three hypotheses, which are modified from those proposed by Nagel and Ganzeboom (2003) to fit the case of Jewish schools in the United States:

Hypothesis 1: Families and schools are independent sources of cultural transmission, as reflected in adolescent Jewish identity. Families are the site of most ritual activities, but schools are the site in which formal knowledge is generated.

Hypothesis 2: Family effects are stronger than school effects. Despite the role of schools in generating formal knowledge, the family remains the earliest and most powerful source of cultural transmission. This is especially likely in the case of Jewish cultural capital because most of a young Jew's religious activities occur in the context of a family and a community.

Hypothesis 3: Schooling effects depend on family effects, but not in the manner depicted by Bourdieu and Darbel (1990) and Nagel and Ganzeboom (2003). Whereas they saw family and school effects as mutually reinforcing, it seems likely that Jewish school experiences may compensate for the lack of family religious practices and affiliations among the least Jewishly active families. Thus, this study hypothesizes that school effects will be more powerful when family conditions are least conducive to cultural capital development.

To explain the basis for these hypotheses, details are provided about the varieties of Jewish family life and Jewish schooling in the United States.

Family life, school knowledge, and cultural capital. What sorts of school knowledge may foster cultural capital (religious activities, affiliation, and commitment) among American Jewish youth? An individual with knowledge of a social group's ideas, traditions, texts, and practices is able to participate as a member and identify with the group for which these cultural

tools have value. Considered in this way, Jewish learning is a clear example of cultural capital development. Knowledge of Jewish religious texts, for example, is a precondition for understanding Jewish theology. Knowledge of Hebrew, the traditional Jewish language, allows one to read Jewish religious texts and begin to understand them. In turn, understanding of the texts renders them meaningful to the reader. Understanding the texts and associating them with Jewish history and heritage may promote identification with Judaism as a whole. Furthermore, Jewish education has historically been group centered. Holtz (1984) argued that the social context in which Jewish study has traditionally occurred encourages identification with the Jewish community by establishing peer groups:

Most traditional Jewish “reading” occurs in a social context – the class, or the study session....Reading thus becomes less an act of self-reflection than a way of communal identification and communication. One studies to become part of the Jewish people itself. (p. 18)

At the same time, Jewish family and communal life provides the contexts in which Jewish practices take place. The home is the site of many important Jewish rituals, including those related to the observance of the Sabbath, which is celebrated every week with family meals accompanied by a variety of rituals. The Sabbath and other holidays are also observed by synagogue attendance. Judaism is a communal religion: A quorum of 10 adults (adult males, for the Orthodox) is required to recite certain prayers and many rituals require the involvement of several people. When a child is born, he or she is traditionally named in a formal ritual before a gathering of friends and family. A marriage ceremony requires an officiant and two witnesses to sign the marriage contract. Each of these events is typically accompanied by a celebratory feast. Even when one dies, Jewish law dictates that the body must be accompanied at all times until burial. The person accompanying the body traditionally recites psalms to honor the memory of the deceased. Virtually all rituals associated with life-cycle events are based on family and communal participation.

Jewish rites are usually performed in Hebrew. Thus, one who has knowledge of Hebrew is better equipped to participate in the rituals. Furthermore, with the development of Zionism as a political ideology, the founding of the State of Israel, and the establishment of Hebrew as one of its official languages, Jews can express their desire for a return to their ancestral homeland and support for Israel through learning and speaking Hebrew. Hebrew is typically learned through formal instruction in a Jewish school, along with much of Jewish lore and tradition, so Jewish schooling and Jewish family life are intertwined as they transmit the cultural capital

of Judaism. However, a young person whose family engages in minimal Jewish practice may still have an opportunity to participate in rituals and engage in Jewish communal activities if he or she is enrolled in a Jewish school.

The formal curriculum of Jewish schools. Traditionally, Jewish study has meant the study of Jewish texts, particularly sacred texts. These begin with the *Torah*, or the five books of Moses, and the remainder of the Hebrew Bible, which consists of two additional sections called *Nevi'im* (Prophets) and *Ketuvim* (Writings). The Bible is referred to as the Written Law, as contrasted with the Oral Law, a set of rabbinic commentaries on the Bible including the *Mishna* and *Gemara*, which together constitute the *Talmud*. The Talmud began as an oral tradition – hence the name, Oral Law – and was codified over a period of several hundred years. It was followed by centuries of further commentaries and exegeses of the Written and Oral Law, a process that continues to this day. Today, these texts are central to instruction in Orthodox Jewish schools, and to instruction in Jewish day schools, both Orthodox and non-Orthodox (Gamoran, 2001). They appear less prominently in the curriculum of non-Orthodox supplementary schools (schools that meet for a few hours on the weekend or afternoons), whose students tend to be less religiously active.

Hebrew is another curricular topic that may be uniquely related to cultural capital. As the traditional language of the Jewish people, Hebrew study may stimulate a special sense of cultural affiliation and belonging, as well as providing a critical tool necessary for the full expression of most ritual practices. Whereas Hebrew is universally featured in the curricula of Orthodox and non-Orthodox day schools, exposure varies among supplementary schools. Beyond the sacred texts and language, Jewish schools offer instruction in a variety of Jewish topics including history, literature, philosophy, ethics, and so on.

Although Jewish schooling may contribute to Jewish identity, the causal process may run in the opposite direction as well. A person who is more involved in Jewish ritual, who affiliates culturally, and for whom Jewishness is central, may be more likely to seek out educational opportunities that address these topics. In addition, a young person from a committed Jewish family may be sent to a school with a rich Jewish curriculum, and may have a strong Jewish identity, without a causal connection between schooling and identity. Our study will not sort out these causal ambiguities. Rather, this study takes a first step by exploring whether an association exists between family, school, and individual aspects of Jewish identity as a form of cultural capital.

DATA AND METHODS

To address questions about the relation between Jewish education and cultural capital among young people in Jewish schools, this study draws on data collected from 9 schools in the Chicago area in 1999-2000. Response rates ranged from 64% to 83% of students in Grades 7 through 12 in the 9 schools. Six of the schools are supplementary schools, meeting on weekend mornings and/or weekday afternoons for between 2 and 5 hours per week. The supplementary schools included Reform, Reconstructionist, and Conservative schools (relatively liberal Jewish denominations). From these schools, 321 students responded to the survey. The remaining 3 schools are day schools. Of these, 1 is a non-Orthodox school with 170 respondents, and 2 are Orthodox (the most observant of the major denominations) with a combined total of 343 respondents. Overall, 834 students responded to the survey. The data were originally collected as a pilot study to develop survey instruments for a larger and more representative study (Schneider, 2003), but the diversity of the sample and the new indicators of family, school, and adolescent religious identification offered a unique opportunity to explore the issues raised, despite the limited scope of the sample.

INDICATORS OF JEWISH CULTURAL CAPITAL

Students were asked questions about several religious rituals and cultural affiliations that are commonly used indicators of Jewish identity. These items were separated into four categories of items that refer to the students' personal practices and affiliations and those of their families. The student-specific items are used as indicators of young persons' Jewish cultural capital, and the family items as indicators of Jewish cultural capital residing in the family.

- Student's ritual practices (times in past year attended Jewish worship services, fasted on Yom Kippur, avoids handling money on Sabbath, keeps kosher)
- Family's ritual practices (family attends Passover seder, family lights Hannukah candles, family lights candles on Friday nights, family keeps separate dishes for dairy and meat)
- Student's cultural affiliations (times in past year followed news from Israel, times in past year listened to tape/CD for Jewish content, times in past year read book for Jewish content, times in past year used internet for Jewish content, wears or displays Jewish sign, times in past year performed volunteer work with a Jewish organization, important to student to marry a Jew, important to student to continue Jewish education past high school, number of Jewish friends)

- Family's cultural affiliations (family observed Israel Independence Day, family had Christmas tree, family has relatives in Israel, religion of others in neighborhood, important to parents for student to marry a Jew, parents have definite rules about Friday night dinner)

For each item, students were asked whether they or their families engaged in the described Jewish ritual activities and cultural affiliations, and, in some cases, the extent to which they did so. For ease of comparison and index construction, each item score was converted into a z -score. Missing items were imputed as the mean values for the student's specific denominational preference and school type (supplementary school, non-Orthodox day school, or Orthodox day school). The four scales, constructed as the means of the z -scores, have reliabilities of .76 and .68 for students' and families' ritual practices, and .83 and .74 for students' and families' cultural affiliations, respectively (see Appendix A). These indices are refinements of those developed by Horowitz (2000), who established ritual practices and communal affiliations as reliable measures of Jewish identity, without specifically distinguishing between individual and family practices.

An additional identity index was constructed based on Horowitz's research to reflect the subjective centrality of Jewishness to respondents' lives. This index incorporated the attitudes toward Judaism as reflected by the following statements: "I am proud to be a Jew"; "I have a clear sense of what being Jewish means to me"; "I have a strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people"; "I have a special responsibility to take care of Jews in need around the world"; "Overall, the fact that I am a Jew has very little to do with how I see myself"; "It is important for me to have friends who share my way of being Jewish"; "When faced with an important life decision, I look to Judaism for guidance"; "There is something about me that non-Jews could never understand."

The centrality of Jewishness index values was determined by taking the average value of responses to items in the index. Responses ranged from *strongly agree*, coded as 4 on the survey, to *strongly disagree*, coded as 1. (Negative items were reverse-coded.) The scale for this index ranges from 1 to 4 with a mean of 2.88, and its reliability is .83.

FAMILY VARIABLES

Indicators of families as sources of Jewish cultural capital include the two scales described above: family ritual practices and family cultural affiliations. In addition, the analysis takes note of students' reported denominational preferences: Orthodox, Traditional, Conservative, Reform,

Reconstructionist, or “Just Jewish.” Due to small numbers in the Traditional and Reconstructionist categories, combined categories were created for Orthodox/Traditional ($n = 302$) and for Reform/Reconstructionist ($n = 204$) along with Conservative ($n = 221$) and “Just Jewish” ($n = 79$). (Preliminary analyses revealed similar patterns of survey responses for Orthodox and Traditional respondents, and for Reform and Reconstructionist respondents.) A small number of missing cases ($n = 10$) and students who reported another religion ($n = 18$) were included with “Just Jewish” in the reference category for regression analyses. Omitting these cases entirely does not affect the results in any meaningful way.

The analysis includes two additional background measures as control variables: students’ grade in school and students’ gender. Students’ cultural capital is likely to increase the longer they remain in Jewish schooling, and gender has been shown in past research to be associated with Jewish identity (Cohen, 1995).

SCHOOL VARIABLES

The three types of schools in our sample – supplementary schools, Orthodox day schools, and non-Orthodox day schools – represent substantially different learning environments. Supplementary schools, which meet in the afternoon and/or on weekends, generally offer between 2 and 6 hours of instruction per week, while day schools may offer that much instruction per day, 5 days per week. Supplementary school students typically attend 1 day per week for Judaic studies and most attend 1 or 2 additional days per week for Hebrew study, but for the vast majority, Hebrew study is limited to Grades 3 or 4 through Grades 7 or 8. Day schools commonly divide their days between Jewish and secular studies, often with the morning devoted to Judaic studies and Hebrew and the afternoon (or part of the afternoon) set aside for secular topics. Orthodox day schools presumably give more attention to Jewish study topics than non-Orthodox schools, although this has not been documented. Overall, the difference in the intensity of Jewish study between day schools and supplementary schools is expected to be larger than the difference between the Orthodox and non-Orthodox schools, due to the substantial difference in time available for instruction.

For a more direct measure of students’ opportunities to engage in Jewish study in school, the analysis draws on students’ responses to survey questions about several topics that are commonly covered by the curriculum of Jewish schools. These topics are grouped into four categories:

- Jewish texts (*Torah, Nevi'im, Mishna, Talmud*, and modern Jewish literature)

- Jewish ritual practices (*Shabbat*, *Shavuot*, *Tisha B'av*, how to pray, content of the *Siddur* [prayer book], marriage, and death/mourning)
- Hebrew (reading out loud, understanding what is read, and speaking)
- Other Jewish study topics (Jewish history, Israel, comparative religion, and ethics, values, and philosophy)

An additive scale was constructed for each, based on whether students responded yes or no to the question, “Have you had an opportunity to learn the following subjects in school?” Because the scales were highly correlated, they are combined into a single scale of opportunity to learn for the regression analyses. This scale ranges from 0–27 with a mean of 19.5 and a standard deviation of 6.6. Means for supplementary, non-Orthodox day, and Orthodox day schools are 15.4, 22.7, and 22.1, respectively, confirming our supposition that the main difference in extent of Jewish study lies between the supplementary school and both types of day schools. Our measure is not fine-grained enough to capture more precise differences in intensity, ideology, or instructional approach that likely occurred between the Orthodox and non-Orthodox day schools.

METHODS

The analysis relies on ordinary least squares regression to examine patterns of association between students’ family and school environments on the one hand, and their self-reported Jewish cultural capital as reflected in ritual practices, affiliations, and centrality of Jewishness on the other. Multilevel analyses of students within schools would have been preferred, but the sample did not contain enough schools for that approach. By introducing dummy variables for school types (Orthodox day and non-Orthodox day versus supplementary school), the analysis takes school sector into account, though it does not focus on differences within sectors. In a few cases of special interest, within-sector analyses were performed; these are noted without presenting the full results because they did not yield substantially different findings from the main results.

Six regression models were estimated for each of the three dependent variables. The first two examine family associations (denominational preference and family rituals and affiliations), the second two examine school associations (school type and opportunity to learn), the fifth model combines the family and school variables, and the last model adds interaction terms between family rituals and affiliations and opportunity to learn. Missing cases on the indicator of opportunity to learn, combined with a small amount of missing data on the dependent variables, reduced the sample from 834 to 635 for the analysis of ritual practices and affiliation, and

620 for the analysis of centrality of Jewishness, or about 74% to 76% of the original sample. Means and standard deviations for variables in the regression models are listed in Appendix B.

Table 1

Associations with Student's Ritual Practices

Dependent Variable: Student's Ritual Practices

Independent variables	<u>Model</u>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender (1=female)	.057 (.037)	.053 (.033)	.089* (.039)	.088* (.039)	.057 (.032)	.055 (.032)
Grade in school (7-12)	.051* (.013)	.037* (.011)	.030 (.017)	.029 (.017)	.017 (.014)	.015 (.014)
Denomination						
Reform/Reconstructionist	-.155* (.064)	-.031 (.058)			.097 (.058)	.107 (.058)
Conservative	.639* (.065)	.391* (.061)			.388* (.059)	.388* (.059)
Orthodox/Traditional	1.193* (.066)	.802* (.065)			.664* (.066)	.653* (.066)
Family ritual practices		.230* (.034)			.185* (.034)	.072 (.085)
Family cultural affiliation		.268* (.038)			.208* (.038)	.166 (.096)
School type						
Non-Orthodox day school			.846* (.054)	.776* (.060)	.291* (.057)	.276* (.058)
Orthodox day school			1.231* (.054)	1.169* (.058)	.464* (.067)	.455* (.067)
Opportunity to learn (OTL)				.009* (.003)	-.00005 (.003)	.004 (.003)
Family ritual x OTL						.007 (.005)
Family affiliation x OTL						.002 (.005)
Constant	-1.048	-.748	-.993	-1.134	-.794	-.854
Adjusted R ²	.623	.704	.582	.586	.727	.729

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. $p < .05$.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents results for ritual practices. The first two columns show important family contributions to young persons' own participation in these signals of religious and cultural identity: Both denominational preference and family practices and affiliations are significantly related to the respondent's performance of Jewish rituals. With family practices and affiliations taken into account (Model 2), the results show no difference between Reform/Reconstructionist and "Just Jewish" respondents, whereas the practices of Conservative and Orthodox respondents are progressively greater. This is to be expected since progressively greater adherence to Jewish law is what defines Conservative and Orthodox Jews.

Models 3 and 4 reveal significant associations between ritual practices and school variables (school type and opportunity to learn). Note that the significant association between learning opportunities and ritual practices holds with controls for school type, that is, it is an association that occurs within sectors. Tests for differences across sectors (not shown) indicated that the coefficient for opportunity to learn does not vary significantly across school types. Regardless of which type of school a student attended, the opportunity to learn more Jewish subjects was associated with engaging in more ritual practices.

Are these associations independent of family characteristics, or are they merely a reflection of family preferences? Model 5 shows that the school type associations persist when family background is taken into account, but the opportunity to learn coefficient is no longer significant, nor are the interactions reported in Model 6. This means the association between opportunity to learn and ritual practices reflected family differences, not the effects of schooling.

The results are somewhat different for respondent's cultural affiliations, another indicator of Jewish cultural capital that is examined in Table 2. As in Table 1, Models 1-4 show that both family and school characteristics are associated with higher levels on the dependent variable. In the case of affiliation, however, unlike the results for rituals, the association with opportunity to learn remains statistically significant even after taking family conditions into account, whereas the school type indicators are nonsignificant. Another difference between Tables 1 and 2 is that whereas both family rituals and family affiliations contribute to the respondent's ritual performance, only family affiliations are associated with the young person's own affiliations (compare Model 5 in Tables 1 and 2). In Model 6, the interaction terms are again nonsignificant. Overall, Table 2 shows that regardless of school type and family differences, students who had opportunities to learn more Jewish subjects expressed greater Jewish affiliation.

Table 2

Associations with Student's Cultural Affiliation

Dependent Variable: Student's Cultural Affiliation

Independent variables	<u>Model</u>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender (1=female)	.109* (.039)	.104* (.035)	.133* (.041)	.131* (.040)	.105* (.035)	.102* (.035)
Grade in school (7-12)	.078* (.014)	.061* (.012)	.078* (.018)	.077* (.017)	.053* (.015)	.050* (.016)
Denomination						
Reform/Reconstructionist	.092 (.068)	.215* (.062)			.256* (.065)	.267* (.065)
Conservative	.599* (.069)	.355* (.065)			.338* (.066)	.340* (.066)
Orthodox/Traditional	.866* (.070)	.499* (.070)			.443* (.073)	.436* (.073)
Family ritual practices		.091* (.037)			.068 (.037)	-.066 (.095)
Family cultural affiliation		.395* (.041)			.361* (.043)	.383* (.107)
School type						
Non-Orthodox day school			.570* (.057)	.430* (.062)	.040 (.064)	.029 (.064)
Orthodox day school			.693* (.056)	.568* (.060)	.114 (.074)	.110 (.075)
Opportunity to learn (OTL)				.019* (.004)	.010* (.003)	.013* (.004)
Family ritual x OTL						.008 (.005)
Family affiliation x OTL						-.001 (.005)
Constant	-1.241	-.922	-1.166	-1.447	-1.093	-1.128
Adjusted R ²	.411	.524	.364	.391	.534	.535

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. $p < .05$.

The coefficient for opportunity to learn, the most direct measure of school cultural capital, is statistically significant but appears small, at .010. What does this mean in substantive terms? If the association were causal, an increase of one standard deviation on the opportunity scale (6.6) would result in an increase of just over one tenth of a standard deviation on the

Table 3

Associations with Student's Centrality of Jewishness

Dependent Variable: Student's Centrality of Jewishness

Independent variables	Model					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender (1=female)	.113* (.046)	.110* (.045)	.145* (.050)	.145* (.050)	.105* (.045)	.108* (.045)
Grade in school (7-12)	.076* (.016)	.066* (.016)	.088* (.022)	.087* (.022)	.064* (.020)	.066* (.020)
Denomination						
Reform/Reconstructionist	.418* (.079)	.490* (.079)			.423* (.082)	.421* (.083)
Conservative	.686* (.081)	.542* (.083)			.551* (.083)	.547* (.083)
Orthodox/Traditional	.919* (.081)	.700* (.089)			.764* (.093)	.755* (.094)
Family ritual practices		.080 (.047)			.101* (.047)	.141 (.120)
Family cultural affiliation		.209* (.052)			.248* (.054)	.129 (.135)
School type						
Non-Orthodox day school			.217* (.070)	.112 (.077)	-.262* (.081)	-.270* (.082)
Orthodox day school			.340* (.069)	.248* (.075)	-.255* (.095)	-.263* (.095)
Opportunity to learn (OTL)				.014* (.004)	.005 (.004)	.007 (.005)
Family ritual x OTL						-.002 (.006)
Family affiliation x OTL						.007 (.007)
Constant	1.535	1.724	1.843	1.642	1.793	1.745
Adjusted R ²	.280	.313	.146	.158	.324	.323

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. $p < .05$.

affiliation scale (.64), a small but non-trivial effect. Put differently, the difference between a typical supplementary school student's curricular exposure (mean of about 15) and the average for a day school student (about 22) is associated with a difference in Jewish cultural affiliations of a little over one tenth of a standard deviation. Although this is a perceptible association,

it is smaller than those of the family variables. For example, a difference of one standard deviation on the family cultural affiliations scale is associated with more than a third of a standard deviation difference in student cultural affiliations. Thus, although the opportunity to learn measure is significant, it is very small compared to the more salient family factor.

Table 3 presents the same set of models for the third dependent variable: subjective centrality of Jewishness. Whereas Models 1-4 appear similar to the other dependent variables, a striking difference appears in Model 5: Controlling for family conditions, students in supplementary schools exhibit higher levels of centrality of Jewishness than those in either type of day school. This association is obscured when examining school characteristics alone (Models 3 and 4), because students in supplementary schools have lower levels of family religious practices and affiliations on average. But among those with similar levels of family religiosity, supplementary school students exhibit more positive attitudes about their Jewishness. The gaps between supplementary school and other students are nearly four tenths of a standard deviation on the centrality scale (.67), a substantial difference. Although day school students exhibit higher centrality of Jewishness on average, the Jewish self-assurance expressed by supplementary school students is actually higher than would otherwise be expected considering their generally less Jewishly intense family environments.

The negative coefficients for day school students compared to those in supplementary schools could reflect a ceiling on the centrality of Jewishness scale. Such a ceiling could prevent the day school students from expressing as much centrality as would otherwise be warranted by their religious backgrounds. However, while responses on centrality of Jewishness are highly skewed among the Orthodox day school students, they conform to a roughly normal distribution among the non-Orthodox day school and the supplementary students. At least for the comparison of supplementary to non-Orthodox day school students, therefore, evidence of higher centrality of Jewishness for supplementary students appears to be a substantive finding rather than an artifactual one.

As before, neither of the interaction terms is statistically significant. Supplementary analyses (not shown) confirmed that the interactions are also insignificant when examined within each school type separately.

Looking across the dependent variables, it appears that our analysis is least successful in explaining variation in centrality of Jewishness, with an adjusted R^2 of .324 for Model 5, compared with .727 for ritual practices and .534 for affiliations. This may suggest that a young person's ideas and sense of self are more independent of school and family than are his or her activities. It may also reflect the fact that the analysis lacks a direct measure of family centrality of Jewishness, whereas the models for students' rituals and affiliations include more direct family-level counterparts.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, our results show support for two of our three hypotheses. First, school conditions and family environments are independently associated with Jewish cultural capital as reflected in young persons' ritual performances, Jewish affiliations, and centrality of Jewishness. The combined model (Model 5) revealed several significant family associations and at least one significant school indicator in each case. Second, adolescents' Jewish cultural capital appears more closely linked to their family environments than to their schooling experiences. This result, also, was anticipated. The family effects are more consistent throughout, and when they are included separately, the family variables explain more variance than the school variables. Differences between denominational preferences were invariably larger than differences between school types, and in the one case of a significant association for opportunity to learn, its effect was dwarfed by the family variables.

The third hypothesis predicted that richer school contexts would compensate for families that engage in relatively few Jewish activities, and that this would be reflected in negative interaction terms between opportunity to learn and family rituals and affiliations. This hypothesis contrasted with that of Nagel and Ganzeboom (2003), who proposed that family and school conditions have compounding effects, reflected in positive interaction terms. The results supported neither of these positions: Family and school associations are independent, with no interactions one way or the other. Perhaps families and schools have both compounding and compensating effects, which cancel out each other and make it appear as if there is no interaction. Or, perhaps neither process is occurring.

The finding of more powerful family than school effects is consistent with many years of research in the sociology of schooling (Coleman et al., 1966). That body of research focuses mainly on the association between socioeconomic circumstances and educational achievement, whereas the association examined here is between family religious resources and the possession of religious cultural capital, but the pattern is the same. While religious schools provide a vehicle for the transmission of religion and culture, they do not supplant families. In the case of Jewish schools, neither day schools nor supplementary schools can stand alone as forces for transmitting identity or preserving Jewish continuity from one generation to the next, and the results suggest that Jewish cultural capital is more a product of the Jewish family and home than of the Jewish school. As Meyer (2003) commented,

Jewish knowledge deepens Jewish commitment, but it does not create it....Jewish experiences...create the emotional matrix within which cognitive

learning can be lodged....The emotional matrix is first created and then principally sustained in the home....What the school can do is expand upon it. (p. 152)

The findings in this study are consistent with Meyer's view, although longitudinal data will be required to sort out the causal and temporal patterns.

This study could also be extended fruitfully by examining a wider range of religious and/or cultural groups. To what extent do Catholic, other Christian, and Islamic schools, for instance, transmit the cultural capital of their respective traditions? Catholic schools typically devote far less time to formal religious instruction than do Jewish day schools. Does this mean they play a smaller role in fostering cultural capital? One study found that Catholic supplementary education (catechesis) and Catholic parochial schools were about equally effective in promoting Catholic religious identification (Elford, 1994). Is this because formal religious instruction in Catholic schools is relatively limited? Because family environments matter far more than schools? Or because religious schooling has different effects for students in a majority religion (Christian, in the case of the United States) than for students in religious minorities (e.g., Judaism and Islam in the United States)? Answers to questions such as these would shed light on how young persons develop their religious identities, an important but generally unacknowledged issue at a time when noncognitive growth is almost forgotten in the press for academic standards.

REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, P. (1977a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 489-511). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977b). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Darbel, A. (1990). *The love of art: European art museums and their public*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bridges, L. J., & Moore, K. A. (2002). *Research brief: Religious involvement and children's well-being: What research tells us (and what it doesn't)*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Cohen, S. M. (1988). *American assimilation or Jewish revival?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cohen, S. M. (1995). The impact of varieties of Jewish education upon Jewish identity: An intergenerational perspective. *Contemporary Jewry*, 16, 68-96.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- De Graaf, P. M. (1986). The impact of financial and cultural resources on educational attainment in the Netherlands. *Sociology of Education*, 59, 237-246.
- DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 189-201.
- DiMaggio, P., & Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1231-1261.
- Elazar, D. J. (1976). *Community and polity: The organizational dynamics of American Jewry*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

- Elford, G. (1994). *Toward shaping the agenda: A study of Catholic religious education / catechesis*. Washington, DC: Educational Testing Service.
- Gamoran, A. (2001, December). *Learning in Jewish schools: Perceptions of adolescents*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies, Washington, DC.
- Goldscheider, C. (1986). *Jewish continuity and change: Emerging patterns in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Holtz, B. (Ed.). (1984). *Back to the sources*. New York: Summit Books.
- Horowitz, B. (2000). *Connections and journeys*. New York: United Jewish Appeal-Federation of New York.
- Horowitz, B. (2002). Reframing the study of contemporary American Jewish identity. *Contemporary Jewry*, 23, 14-34.
- Kobrin, F., & Goldscheider, C. (1978). *The ethnic factor in family structure and mobility*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Press.
- Kosmin, B. A., Goldstein, S., Waksberg, J., Lerer, N., Keysar, A., & Scheckner, J. (1991). *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.
- Kraaykamp, G. (2003). Cumulative advantages and inequality in lifestyle: A Dutch description of distinction in taste. *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 38, 121-143.
- Massarik, F., & Chenkin, A. (1973). United States National Jewish Population Survey. *American Jewish Year Book*, 73, 264-306.
- Meyer, M. A. (2003). Reflections on the educated Jew from the perspective of Reform Judaism. In S. Fox, I. Scheffler, & D. Marom (Eds.), *Visions of Jewish education* (pp. 149-161). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagel, I., & Ganzeboom, H. B. G. (2003). Participation in legitimate culture: Family and school effects from adolescence to adulthood. *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 38, 102-120.
- Schneider, B. (2003). *Report on the Cooperative Research Project of Chicago Area Jewish Schools*. Chicago: The Jewish School Study Team.
- Schoenfeld, S. (1998). Six methodological problems in forecasting the impact of Jewish education on Jewish identity. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 64, 87-101.
- Sklare, M., & Greenblum, J. (1967). *Jewish identity on the suburban frontier: A study of group survival in the open society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

The authors are grateful for helpful comments from William Carbonaro, Maureen Hallinan, Annette Hochstein, and Barry Holtz on earlier versions of this paper. Research for this paper was supported by the Mandel Foundation and by the Center for Research on Educational Opportunity, University of Notre Dame. The data were collected through a cooperative research project of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, the Community Foundation for Jewish Education, the Associated Talmud Torahs, the Mandel Foundation, and the University of Chicago, and funded by a grant from the Spencer Foundation.

This article was presented as a paper at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Center for Research on Educational Opportunity (CREO) at The University of Notre Dame on November 9-10, 2002. A collection of conference papers is scheduled to be published in an upcoming book from Notre Dame Press.

Adam Gamoran is Professor of Sociology and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a consultant to the Mandel Foundation. Matthew Boxer is a graduate student in sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Dr. Adam Gamoran, Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison, WI 53706.

Appendix A

Scale Items, Means, and Reliabilities

Student cultural capital	Item range	Item mean	Scale reliability
Student ritual practices			.7574
Times attended Jewish worship services in past year	0-5	2.90	
Fasted on Yom Kippur	0-1	.81	
Avoids handling money on Sabbath	0-1	.45	
Keeps kosher	0-5	3.05	
Student cultural affiliation			.8257
Follow news from Israel	0-5	3.05	
Listen to audio recordings for Jewish content	0-5	1.53	
Read books for Jewish content	0-5	1.33	
Use internet for Jewish content	0-5	1.32	
Wear/display Jewish sign	0-3	1.35	
Perform volunteer work through Jewish organization	0-5	1.15	
Important to respondent to marry a Jew	1-4	2.90	
Important to respondent to continue Jewish education past high school	1-4	2.56	
Number of Jewish friends	0-7	3.90	
Subjective centrality of Jewishness			.8347
Proud to be a Jew	1-4	2.57	
Strong sense of being Jewish	1-4	2.21	
Strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people	1-4	2.23	
Strong sense of responsibility to Jews in need around the world	1-4	1.88	
Being Jewish has to do with how student views self (reverse coded)	1-4	2.78	
Important to have Jewish friends	1-4	1.80	
Look to Judaism for help with important decisions	1-4	1.42	
Something about me that non-Jews cannot understand	1-4	1.37	
Family environment	Item range	Item mean	Scale reliability
Family ritual practices			.6756
Family attends seder	0-3	2.74	
Family lights Hanukkah candles	0-8	7.70	
Family lights candles on Friday night	0-3	2.14	
Family keeps separate sets of dishes for dairy and meat	0-1	.59	

Family cultural affiliation			.7374
Family observed Yom Ha'atzmaut	0-1	.52	
Family had Christmas tree (reverse coded)	0-3	.24	
Family has relatives in Israel	0-1	.64	
Religion of people in neighborhood	1-5	2.68	
Important to parents that student marry a Jew	1-4	3.17	
Parents have definite rules about Friday night dinner	0-1	.58	
<hr/>			
Opportunity to learn	Item range	Item mean	Scale reliability
<hr/>			
All subjects			.9101
Jewish texts			.8301
Torah	0-1	.87	
Prophets	0-1	.78	
Mishna	0-1	.69	
Talmud (Gemara)	0-1	.70	
Modern Jewish Literature	0-1	.62	
<hr/>			
Jewish rituals			.8604
Shabbat	0-1	.89	
Shavuot	0-1	.83	
Tisha B'av	0-1	.78	
How to pray	0-1	.79	
Content of prayer book	0-1	.77	
Customs of marriage	0-1	.70	
Customs of death/mourning	0-1	.70	
Customs of circumcision	0-1	.69	
<hr/>			
Hebrew			.8794
Reading out loud	0-1	.88	
Reading comprehension	0-1	.83	
Speaking	0-1	.82	
<hr/>			
Other Jewish studies			.7988
Jews in the Middle Ages	0-1	.76	
American Jewish history	0-1	.66	
Holocaust	0-1	.94	
History of Zionism and modern Israel	0-1	.73	
Jewish philosophy	0-1	.52	
Kabbalah (Jewish mysticism)	0-1	.29	
Comparative religion	0-1	.54	
Varieties of contemporary Jewish practice and thought	0-1	.58	
Tzedakah (charity)	0-1	.87	
Tikkun Olam ("repairing" the world)	0-1	.72	
Ahavat Yisrael (care about Jews around the world)	0-1	.75	

Appendix B

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables in Regressions

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation
Student ritual practice	-.034	.755
Student cultural affiliation	-.009	.643
Centrality of Jewishness	2.882	.674
Gender (1 = female)	.50	.50
Grade in school (7-12)	9.01	1.63
Reform/Reconstructionist	.287	.453
Conservative	.266	.442
Orthodox/Traditional	.332	.471
Just Jewish/other/missing	.110	.313
Family ritual practice	-.008	.702
Family cultural affiliation	-.032	.652
Non-Orthodox day school	.222	.416
Orthodox day school	.373	.484
Supplementary school	.405	.491
Opportunity to learn	19.550	6.606