



of the individual but rather as memories to recall lovingly in the future. Without interaction with others, there would be no learning of any language. In this sense, language is the outcome of participating in communities of practice — not a bad metaphor for learning in general and Jewish learning in particular. If we truly understood this, then “text” (our favorite tool for Jewish learning) would reclaim its etymological meaning (from the Latin) “to weave.” Rather than being something that is transferred from teachers to the minds of individual students, text would become a social, interactive “weaving.” Indeed these theories call upon educators to pay special attention to social processes as opposed to abstract ideas.

What we wrongly call “informal” seems to be characterized by gaiety — that is, working on the

borders between play and reality. Characterizations such as a female perspective, caring and dialogue, an emphasis on making meaning through narrative, and an inclusion and tolerance of difference — all point to directions different than those suggested by recent developments within formal education.

In short, I believe that developing so-called informal education agents has more to do with reviewing the present paradigms that guide our educational thinking than with recruitment, training techniques, and assessment, which seem to hide the paradigms that bind us.

Dr. Zvi Bekerman teaches Anthropology of Education at the Melton Center and the School of Education, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Informal Education and Jewish Identity Development

Bethamie Horowitz

For the past few years we’ve seen a lot of emphasis in both the Jewish press and Jewish communal policy on the importance of Jewish education as a way of influencing or ensuring Jewish identity and Jewish continuity. Certainly I believe that Jewish education plays a crucial role. However, much of what we hear is not about Jewish education in its fullest sense—it’s about schooling and especially day schools.

There has been a blossoming of Jewish day schools around the country and that is a welcome communal development. But what is sometimes lost in the current climate is the very important impact and potential of what has come to be called informal Jewish education, especially its role in the Jewish identity development of American Jews who do not attend day schools.

Recent research supports the important role of Jewish education separate from formal schooling. Informal Jewish educational experiences such as summer camps, youth groups, Israel trips, and involvements in Jewish college programs among others, play an exceedingly important role in the Jewish development of Jewish individuals. We need to keep reminding the community that Jewish education is much bigger than schooling.

What role do “involuntary” and “voluntary”

Jewish experiences play in the development of Jewish identity in adulthood? Although we typically differentiate Jewish educational experiences by calling them *formal* and *informal*, for the purposes of thinking about Jewish identity formation, I would like to redirect our attention to the issue of motivation. *Involuntary* experiences are those experiences a child has because of the circumstances of his or her background, *before the child has any say* in the matter. For example, parents make decisions about children’s schooling and camp. And they create the emotional climate in the home (especially around holiday celebrations). *Voluntary* experiences, on the other hand, are those that a person *chooses* to undertake. These typically begin in adolescence and continue through adulthood. Teenagers choose to attend camp, to belong to a youth group, to go on a Jewish teen trip, to partake of Jewish college experiences. During adolescence and early adulthood, a child’s parents cease to be the primary decision makers about their child’s Jewish experiences. During this period a teenager’s own motivation comes to play a central role in how or whether to be Jewishly involved.

I prefer to distinguish between involuntary and voluntary experiences rather than formal versus informal because the former focuses our attention to

the core issue of Jewish identity development. The involuntary experiences can be viewed as what a person inherits by virtue of his or her upbringing, while the voluntary experiences represent the series of choices that a person makes with regard to Jewishness. The question of inheritance and desire lies at the heart of our challenge as American Jews today. Each of us needs to integrate both sorts of experiences in order to discover a Jewishness of our own.

Connections and Journeys, a recent UJA-sponsored study I directed, examines the relationship between these two Jewish educational experiences (voluntary and involuntary) and the current Jewish connection and engagement of American Jewish adults born between 1946 and 1976. Two broad swaths of people were included: those who had been raised in intensive Jewish settings (typically, but not exclusively, Orthodox) and those with a less intensive Jewish upbringing.

The pattern of Jewish education and socialization was quite different for these two groups. Those from more intensive Jewish backgrounds were more strongly influenced *earlier* in their lives. They typically came from families where the parents were deeply committed to Jewish life and conveyed this at home, in their educational choices (day school), and in their communal and synagogue involvement. This early training (involuntary) seems to have been the main factor shaping their Jewishness in adulthood. Later "voluntary" experiences (like youth groups, trips to Israel, and college activities) had less influence, because these people were already very involved in Jewish life; these later experiences did not create much "added value" over and beyond what had already been encouraged by day school (which in this population often continued

through high school). We could call this the "early and often approach."

In contrast, the adults who came from less intensive Jewish backgrounds were most strongly influenced by later, "voluntary" experiences during their adolescence and early adulthood, including being involved in Jewish youth groups, Jewish studies and Hillel-like activities in college, or having a significantly positive relationship or experience being Jewish.

What I learned through this study is that there is no one way to raise a Jew. We tend to think that people who get their Jewishness "early and often" (and, let us add, healthily — without emotional trauma) are already on the road to internalized Jewish identity. But it is important to understand that just because people miss out on intensive Jewish exposure early in their lives does not mean that they will not have such experiences during adolescence and adulthood. In fact, what appears to have the greatest impact is the voluntary experience.

Jewish identity development involves a process of exposure — internalizing and ultimately reflecting on both the early involuntary experiences that happen to a child and become part of one's inheritance (or baggage), and what a person acquires later out of desire. In terms of identity development, both experiences are important — what we are given and what we ultimately choose. The mystery of Jewish identity formation is that we don't know for any given person if and when desire will kick in. The best strategy, then, is to create a set of opportunities that maximize *both* sets of experiences.

Bethamie Horowitz is the author of Connections and Journeys: Assessing Critical Opportunities for Enhancing Jewish Identity, published by the UJA-Federation of New York (2000).

Living Words III ...

Living Words III, a *Sh'ma* collection of high holiday sermons will be available mid-June. Get ready for the holidays with the inspired words of some of our most interesting teachers. To order (\$18.00 includes postage), contact Rachel at: bookorders@JFLmedia.com, (800) 568-SHMA x217, or order at www.JFLBooks.com.

Time to Bulk Up!

Is your synagogue or school board wrestling with the challenges of Jewish education? Order bulk copies of this *Sh'ma* issue on informal Jewish education, or the October 2000 issue addressing the future of Jewish Day Schools to stimulate discussion and direction. For more information, contact Erica at: (877) 568-SHMA x 200 — erica@jflmedia.com.

Interests: Jewish adolescent identity development, experiential Jewish education, qualitative research methodology. Dissertation: Giving Voice to a Generation: Role of the Peer Group in the Identity Development of Jewish Adolescents in the United States. David Bryfman completed his PhD in Education and Jewish Studies at NYU in 2009. David has worked in formal and informal Jewish educational institutions in Australia, Israel, and America. He completed his undergraduate and Masters degrees in education in Melbourne, where he was also active in youth movement and Jewish student life. He has lived and studied in Israel, participating in the Institute for Youth Leaders from Abroad, the Melton Senior Educators Program at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and at Pardes. The discourse on Jewish identity and education is sufficiently ingrained and ubiquitous in American Jewish culture that it has an almost timeless quality to it. In fact, the concept of "Jewish identity" was seldom invoked by Jewish educators prior to Erik Erikson's popularization of the term in the 1950s and 1960s. The "assumption that Jewish identity is the goal of Jewish education" holds only where Jewish identities are weak "in America among the non-Orthodox majority. For Russian-speakers "few of whom are Orthodox" the "desired outcome of Jewish education" is not identity as much as cultural content and knowledge. The combination of formal and informal Jewish education and strong Jewishly connected social circles produces the most strongly connected Jewish adults, especially in day school that lasts from elementary through teen years, supplementary school when combined with Jewish summer camps and teen programs, and colleges with many Jews and Jewish educational opportunities. Some are the children of weakly identified Jewish parents; some of these Jewishly "impoverished" families, in terms of Jewish social capital, are intermarried families, especially where the mother does not identify as a Jew. Weak Jewish identification... Informal education. Teaching children is both one of the most difficult and rewarding tasks an organization can set itself. Fostering a sense of heritage, a respect for tradition and a love for both must be done in a manner that respects both the child and the matter. A wide array of fascinating and enjoyable activities, specially designed educational programs, a specially trained professional staff and a nurturing environment " these are all trademarks of the FJC's educational network. And state-of-the-art facilities ensure the children are captivated whilst being prepared for life within an expanding network of Jewish communities. Informal education. One of the most important developments in Jewish education is the huge increase in participation in Jewish summer camps, youth groups, organized youth trips to Israel, and family and adult education. Summer camps are places where Jewish youth can interact with one another in uniquely Jewish environments. Camps allow participants to see the value of living as more than cultural Jews. They experience the power of group observance, and gain their own Jewish identity, independent of that of their parents. Jewish youth groups are also instrumental in giving Jewish children the education they need to be committed Jews. Like camps, youth groups have many purposes beyond that of education. Formal and informal Jewish education is the rallying cry.