RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND FAMILY VALUES AMONG AMERICAN JEWISH YOUTH[1]

Adam Gamoran
University of Wisconsin-Madison

This paper explores the possibility of a link between religious involvement and family orientation among American Jewish teenagers. Using data from a national sample of high school students, the analyses show that students who are synagogue and youth group leaders tend to be more family-centered than non-participants. But this association cannot be attributed to the effects of participation per se, for it is found to exist before the reported involvement took place. Students who became youth group leaders were already more family-oriented by their sophomore year of high school. Consequently, the paper suggests that the relation between religiosity and family views results from acceptance of Jewish tradition in general, which places strong emphasis on the family.

Several recent studies have shown that religiously active Americans tend to be more family-oriented (e.g., Hunt and King, 1978; Shrum, 1980; Bahr and Chadwick, 1985). This finding has been particularly consistent for American Jews (Lazerwitz, 1980; Cohen and Ritterband, 1981; Cohen, 1983; Brodbar-Nemzer, 1986). For example, Lazerwitz (1980) and Cohen and Ritterband (1981) found that Jews who attended synagogue more often planned to have more children. Researchers have attributed these findings to the ties between marriage, family life, and religiosity in traditional Jewish and Christian doctrines.

This paper addresses several questions about the connection between religiosity and family values among American Jews. How early does the association appear? Is it evident among teenagers, and does religious participation among teenagers strengthen family orientations? Using a national sample of 457 Jewish high school students, the paper examines changes in religious participation and values that occur between the tenth and twelfth grades. It links youth group and other synagogue activities with high regard for the family, attempting to identify conditions that lead young people to hold the family in high esteem.

RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND FAMILY VALUES

There are at least three ways in which religious involvement may increase the valuation of the family among American Jewish youth. First of all, one who is religiously active is likely to accept the religion's system of beliefs, including its major ideological components. For Jews, the traditional set of values includes a strong emphasis on the importance of marriage and the family. According to the Bible, "It is not good that a man should be alone" (Genesis 2:18), and the commentary adds, "Without a wife, a man is incomplete" (Midrash Genesis Rabbah 17, 2). The long-standing belief in the centrality of the family has remained a core value in American Judaism (Sklare, 1971; Farber, Mindel, and Lazerwitz, 1981; Brodbar-Nemzer, 1988). The importance of family is especially evident in the observance of life-cycle events which remain central to American Judaism. The brit (ritual circumcision), bar mitzvah, and Jewish wedding celebrate the family as much as they observe Jewish tradition. Young persons who embrace their Jewish heritage probably accept its view of the family.

Second, activities take place in Jewish institutions that may specifically affect participants' family values. Religious establishments continue to stress the family, among other traditional ideals. For example, "respecting and cherishing family and community" was rated as the sixth most important educational goal by a sample of Reform Jewish educators (Gertman, 1977). By constructing "family trees," holding intergenerational dinners, family retreats, and family Sabbath programs, Jewish schools and synagogues promote the family. Even in youth groups, where peer relations are paramount, the importance of family may be stressed by programs that teach about lifecycle events, male/female relations, and family and community responsibility.

Third, many rituals taught in Jewish schools, camps, and youth groups are intended to carry over to family practices, thereby strengthening family bonds. Much of Jewish practice is best carried out in a family unit. This is especially clear for the rituals most common among American Jews, such as the Passover seder, the lighting of Hannukah candles, and Sabbath evening observances (Cohen, 1983). If young persons are to celebrate these rites with regularity, they must take place at home. By instructing students in traditional customs and ceremonies, religious organizations may increase participants' family ties.

An association between religious participation and family values does not necessarily indicate a causal connection. Perhaps religious families are apt to be more tightly-knit. If so, children of those families may become both more religiously involved and more family-oriented, with both conditions having a common, third cause (origination in a close-knit, religious family) rather than religious involvement producing family concerns. Moreover, students' gender, socioeconomic backgrounds, and family structures (e.g., living with one or two parents) may further influence both religious participation and family values. Such conditions need to be taken into account in order to sort out the relations of central concern. Longitudinal data are needed to learn whether religious participation actually raises students' family orientations over time.

Finally, the association between religious participation and family orientation might not appear among high schoolers, in contrast to previous findings for adults. It could be that among adults, family circumstances produce religiosity rather than vice versa. Perhaps religious involvement increases after one becomes more family-centered. American Jews tend to join synagogues after they begin having children or after their children reach school age (Cohen, 1983, 1988). Consequently, there may be no difference in the family views of more or less religiously active teenagers, who have yet to reach the life stage when family orientation makes a difference for religiosity and religious involvement.

DATA AND METHODS

The data for this study come from High School and Beyond (HSB), a national survey sample of high school students. In 1980 data were gathered from about 30,000 high school sophomores, who were then re-surveyed in 1982. Within that sample, 457 students identified themselves as Jewish. This random sample of Jewish high schoolers constitutes the sample for this study. (Properly weighted, the Jewish subsample comes to 1.8% of the total sample.) Further details about the sample are reported by Jones et al. (1983).

The two key variables for this study are the extent of students' synagogue participation on the one hand and the strength of their family values on the other. Participation was measured by asking students in their senior year how actively they had participated during the past year in "church activities, including youth groups." Students indicated whether they had participated actively, had participated as leaders or officers, or had not participated. An indicator of family values was derived from a series of questions on students' values. Items on the importance of marrying, having children, having a happy family life, and living close to relatives versus moving away were used to construct a composite variable indicating a person's "family orientation." The scale ranged from -2 to 6, with higher positive scores signifying stronger orientations toward the family. Further information on these and other variables, as well as variable means and standard deviations, may be found in the appendix.

Time is another key dimension of the study, in that data on participation and family orientation were also obtained two years earlier, when the respondents were sophomores.[2] This design makes it possible to consider whether participation contributes to changes in family orientation over time, and to gauge the persistence of family orientation between grades ten and twelve.

The reliabilities of the family orientation scales were low, at .45 in the sophomore year and .43 in the senior year. Although unreliability in the dependent variable is not a source of bias, it results in less precise estimates, making it more difficult for effects to reach statistical significance. Hence, we should take care to attend to the substantive size of effects as well as to statistical significance. In light of the low reliabilities, the correlation of .50 between the sophomore and senior family orientation scores suggests stability on average over the two years.

The HSB survey also provided information on students' gender, socioeconomic backgrounds, and family structures. Variables indicating the latter included whether students lived with one or two parents, whether grandparents or other relatives lived in their households, and how many siblings they had (see appendix). I also used additional indicators of students' religious attitudes and behavior from the sophomore questionnaire. As sophomores (but not as seniors) students were asked how religious they considered themselves (from "very" to "not at all") and how often they had attended services in the past year.

I will first report the average family-orientation scores for senior-year youth group nonparticipants, participants, and leaders. Then, using ordinary least squares regression, I will adjust the raw averages for other variables, attempting to isolate the conditions that account for existing associations. In processing the regressions I used pairwise deletion of missing values, in order to maximize the size of this small sample. However, I also ran the regressions with listwise deletion, and found almost identical results. All analyses use the HSB weights for students who responded in both 1980 and 1982.

RESULTS

The first row in Table 1 shows that on the average, synagogue and youth group leaders have significantly higher family orientations than their non-participating peers. The difference, about half a point on the scale from -2 to 6, is a modest one; it represents about a third of a standard deviation on the scale, and would not be enough to move a respondent from "somewhat" to "very important" on any single family values item. Still, this finding indicates that as with adults, Jewish high-school seniors who are more involved with religious organizations tend to place more emphasis on family life. Students who participated

Table 1. Average Family Orientation Scores Among Jewish High School Seniors, 1982. Scale of -2 to 6, 6=High.

	Synagogue and Youth Group Participation		
	Non-Participant	Active Participant	Leader
Average Family Orientation	3.56	3.69	4.08*
adjusted for:			
Gender	3.56	3.69	4.07*
SES	3.56	3.69	4.07*
Family Structure	3.56	3.67	4.05*
1980 Religiosity and Participation	3.59	3.62	3.97
1980 Family Orientation	3.59	3.72	3.84

* difference from nonparticipants is statistically significant at $p < .05$

Note: Adjusted means are predicted values for the family orientation of the average student. They are computed from the sample means in Table A-1 and the regression coefficients in Table 2. Each adjustment incorporates the previous ones; i.e., means in row 2 are adjusted for gender as well as SES, etc. Tests for significance are those of the regression coefficients for contrasts between non-participants and participants, and between non-participants and leaders.

actively, but not as leaders, also scored slightly higher than non-participants, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 1 also shows that on the whole, students considered family matters rather important. To attain a score of 4.0, a student would have had to select at least one of the family items as "very important," and often two of them. Even a score of 3.0, lower than that of most non-participants, signifies family valuation of more than "somewhat important" on the average.

The next three rows of Table 1 show that measured personal and family conditions have little to do with the relation between religious participation and family values. Little change is evident in the average family orientation scores of non-participants, active participants, and leaders after adjustment for gender, SES, and family structure. This indicates that students of similar gender, SES, and family circumstances, would still differ in their senior-year family orientations according to the level of their synagogue and youth group participation.

Adjusting for 1980 religious commitment, however, noticeably reduces the gaps between nonparticipants and others. Table 2, which presents the regression results used to compute the adjustments in Table 1, shows that the key variable here is students' reported religiosity in their sophomore year. Neither youth group participation nor services attendance in 1980 affects 1982 family values significantly, but students who described themselves as more religious were more likely to be family-centered in 1982. At the same time, the effect of 1982 leadership is reduced by more than one-fifth, and is no longer statistically significant. It appears that religious attitudes are more closely linked than religious participation to family values.

The final row of Table 1 reveals that family orientation differences are further reduced when one takes prior family attitudes into account. After adjusting for 1980 family orientation scores, the gap between non-participants and leaders is only about half the size of the original difference. It is only a quarter of a point, a small difference on the scale, and is not statistically significant, so it is uncertain that there is any difference at all. These adjustments indicate that the difference in family values between those who become synagogue and youth group leaders, and those who failed to participate, already existed when these students were sophomores in high school. Subsequent participation added little if any further emphasis on the family.

Aside from prior family attitudes, the only other significant contributor to 1982 family orientation is the presence of additional rel-

Table 2. Effects on senior-year family orientation. Unstandardized regression coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. Minimum pairwise n=383.

MODEL						
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1982 Participation						
Active	.14	.13	.13	.10	.03	.13
	(.21)	(.21)	(.21)	(.21)	(.22)	(.19)
Leader	.52*	.52*	.51*	.49*	.38	.25
	(.24)	(.24)	(.25)	(.25)	(.27)	(.24)
Gender (1=female)		.05	.05	.07	.02	.13
		(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.16)	(.14)
SES			-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
			(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Family Structure						
Extended Family				.73*	.75*	.69*
				(.35)	(.35)	(.31)
Number of Siblings				-.07	.07	-.07
				(.06)	(.06)	(.05)
Single-parent Family				-.54*	-.51*	-.07
				(.22)	(.22)	(.20)
1980 Conditions						
Active Participation					-.08	.04
					(.19)	(.17)
Synagogue Attendance					.00	.00
					(.00)	(.00)
Religiosity					.37*	.06
					(.15)	(.14)
Family Orientation						.49**
						(.05)
Intercept	3.56	3.53	3.54	3.72	3.93	1.90
R^2	.01	.01	.01	.04	.05	.27

Note: Dependent variable is 1982 Family Orientation.
$^*p<.05$ $^{**}p<.01$

atives in one's household (Table 2, column 6). Students whose households included extended family members scored seven-tenths of a point higher in family orientation--nearly half a standard deviation--than did those who did not live with such relatives. This effect holds even among those who had similar family attitudes in their sophomore years. Students living in extended families continued to become more family-oriented during the last two years of high school.

Students who lived in single-parent families were less family-oriented on the average (Table 2, column 4). But this difference mostly disappears after adjustment for prior attitudes. Thus, like the difference between youth group non-participants and leaders, the gap between those who lived in one-parent and two-parent families already existed in the sophomore year, and did not increase significantly during the junior and senior years.

In one sense the findings for the effects of 1980 religious participation (Table 2, column 5) mirror those for 1982. In both cases, simply participating in synagogue and youth group activities, and attending services, are not associated with family orientation differences. Rather, it is youth group leadership that is positively associated with attitude differences. The effects of 1982 leadership and 1980 religiosity suggest that only a strong commitment makes a difference for family attitudes. More detailed data on the extent of students' participation--for example, precisely what activities they joined in--might show stronger effects on family orientation.

Although the HSB data contain no further information on youth group activity, we may get an indication of the importance of such participation to individual students by examining the other activities in which students took part. Presumably, synagogue and youth group participation would figure more strongly for students who participated in only that and no other extra-curricular activities. By contrast, students for whom the youth group was but one of many activities might be less affected.

For Table 3, I replicated the regressions of Table 2 with some new variables. I included participation in other activities by summing the total number of activities in which students said they were active, from the list used by HSB (see appendix). I also included the interactions between youth group participation and other activities, so that the coefficient for youth group participation in Table 3 represents the effect for students whose only reported extra-curricular activity was the youth group. Following the argument above, this value is expected to be larger than the coefficient reported in Table 2. Effects for students with additional involvement may be computed by adding the appropriate values for effects of other participation and the interactions.

Table 3. Effects on senior-year family orientation, including participation in other extra-curricular activities. Unstandardized regression coefficients (standard errors). Minimum pairwise n=383.

MODEL	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES				
1982 Participation				
Active	.17	.15	-.16	.19
	(.43)	(.43)	(.45)	(.46)
Leader	.88*	.82	.45	.30
	(.43)	(.49)	(.52)	(.46)
Other Groups	.02	.02	-.02	-.00
	(.04)	(.04)	(.05)	(.04)
Other x Active	-.01	-.02	.03	-.02
	(.09)	(.09)	(.09)	(.08)
Other x Leader	-.08	-.07	-.02	-.02
	(.09)	(.09)	(.09)	(.08)
Gender (1=female)		.05	-.00	.09
		(.16)	(.16)	(.15)
SES		-.00	-.00	-.00
		(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Family Structure				
Extended Family		.74*	.67	.66*
		(.35)	(.35)	(.31)
Number of Siblings		-.07	-.05	-.06
		(.06)	(.06)	(.05)
Single-parent Family		-.52*	-.49*	-.05
		(.22)	(.22)	(.20)
1980 Conditions				
Active Participation			.63	.45
			(.34)	(.30)
Other Groups			.12	.10
			(.07)	(.06)
Other x Active			-.26**	-.17
			(.10)	(.09)
Synagogue Attendance			.00	.00
			(.00)	(.00)
Religiosity			.39*	.07
			(.15)	(.14)
Family Orientation				.48**
				(.05)
Intercept	3.50	3.68	3.76	1.76
R^2	.01	.04	.08	.28

Note: Dependent variable is 1982 Family Orientation.
*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

The analyses in Table 3 suggest that family concerns are indeed more important to youth group participants who are not involved in other outside activities. The coefficients for both 1982 leadership and 1980 participation are noticeably larger when other activities are taken into account. At the same time, the negative coefficients for the interactions mean that participating in additional groups reduces the association between youth group involvement and family values. For example, column 1 of Table 3 shows that young Jewish leaders who did not take part in any other groups scored .88 points higher than non-participants. This contrasts with the gap of .52 uncovered earlier (Table 2, column 1). But leaders who were active in, say, six other groups, scored only .40 points higher than non-participants who belonged to the same number of other groups.[3] The fewer additional groups in which students participated, the larger the difference between youth group leaders and non-participants.

As before, though, these differences become non-significant when prior family attitudes are controlled. With a larger sample we could estimate these effects more precisely, and would be in better position to determine whether they are greater than zero. But even if they are nonzero, they appear rather small in the final columns of both Tables 2 and 3. On the basis of these data, little if any of the association between religious participation and family values can be ascribed to events taking place during the last two years of high school.

DISCUSSION

The preceding analyses showed that synagogue and youth group leaders exhibit stronger family orientations at the end of high school. As with adults, religiously active Jewish teenagers place greater emphasis on the family. This condition was not explained by differences in gender, SES, or family structure, although some of the latter make independent contributions to family attitudes. But prior religiosity and especially sophomore-year family attitudes did account for the apparent difference between leaders and non-participants. Even leaders who were not involved in other extra-curricular activities, who thus might be expected to display the strongest effects, were not significantly different from non-participants when all pre-existing conditions were taken into account.

These findings suggest nonetheless that the link between religiosity and family attitudes found previously among adults probably results in part from effects of religiosity on family views. Because the association exists prior to adulthood, it cannot be regarded as simply an artifact of life-cycle differences in religiosity. The fact that Jews join synagogues when they become parents is not enough to explain why adults who are religiously involved are more family-centered, because the connection appears much earlier in life.

Perhaps the most interesting finding of this study is how early the association between religious involvement and family attitudes is in place. The pattern of results suggests that students who will become Jewish leaders as high-school seniors are already more family-oriented by the time they are sophomores. How much earlier could one look for these effects to appear? The questions about family attitudes, especially those about marriage, family life, and childbearing, probably would not make sense much before age 16, when they were first posed in this data set. It appears that religiosity is associated with family attitudes as soon as those attitudes become matters of meaningful concern.

The observed association more likely reflects exposure to Jewish beliefs in general than the impact of specific programs. If family orientation were a response to particular programs and ideas, we would expect it to increase more among participants and leaders, who continue to be exposed to such activities. But if it reflects adoption of a more general religious outlook, then it might not be affected much by activities that take place as late as the end of high school, because by that time overall religious attitudes may be already well established. The fact that family orientation was more closely linked to overall religiosity than to participation also supports the conclusion that acceptance of the traditional belief system, rather than participation per se, produces the association. This conclusion is compatible with Farber, Mindel, and Lazerwitz's (1981) suggestion that traditional Jews retain the family-centeredness of pre-modern Jewish life more so than assimilated Jews.

To speculate, the process whereby family and religious views become linked may occur as follows: From an early age, children are schooled in religious precepts, both at home and in religious institutions. Those who accept the belief system tend to adopt a whole set of ideals, including a strong orientation toward the family. Such youngsters are also more likely to become youth group participants (correlation of sophomore religiosity and senior participation of $r = .13$) and leaders (correlation of $r = .19$). Participation, and especially leadership, constitute a step on the path toward greater family-centeredness. They may even contribute a small amount toward family values, although we cannot be certain of that with this small data set.

The data do not allow us to sort out the contributions of home and synagogue to early religiosity and family values. We discovered family contributions to family attitudes apart from religious involvement, in that respondents who lived in extended families increased their family orientations. But family values that may derive from religiosity were already in place by the time these data were collected. The data are consistent with the notion that early religiosity produced stronger family orientation by age 16. But we cannot tell where that religiosity came from. Nor can we determine whether families or religious institutions play the key role in leading more religious sophomores and more active seniors to value the family more strongly. Addressing these questions would require data from earlier periods of life and over a longer span of time. One would also probably need more precise data on specific synagogue activities to uncover the effects of religious participation.

CONCLUSIONS

Community leaders, educators, and politicians across the ideological spectrum frequently speak of a contemporary crisis in families and family values. While social scientists debate whether the American family is declining (e.g., Bane, 1976; Lasch, 1977), there is general agreement that the family as a social institution continues to undergo profound changes. Moreover, there appears to be a consensus view that strengthening family commitments would be beneficial to individuals and to society as a whole. The results of this study indicate that among American Jews, religious involvement and family values are linked as early as adolescence, a connection that is maintained through the end of high school and, based on other research, continues through adulthood. Consequently one might suggest religious affiliation as a way of increasing family stability, at least for Jews. This conclusion is speculative, however, because we cannot be certain that organized religious establishments actually fostered the link between religious involvement and family views. It may be instead that certain types of families create both religiosity and family-centeredness. Research on the contributions of synagogue and family to religious and family views is needed to disentangle these possibilities.

NOTES

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Research Network Conference on Jewish Education, Los Angeles, June 1987. The author is grateful to Hillel Gamoran, Leora Isaacs, Judith Seltzer, and the editors of this journal for helpful suggestions.

[2] The sophomore items are identical to the senior items except that sophomores were only asked whether they had participated in activities, and not also whether they had been leaders as in the senior questionnaire.

[3] This is computed by adding the coefficient for "Leader" to the sum of the products of the coefficients for "Other Groups" and "Other x Leader" times 6 (for leaders who belonged to six hypothetical groups), minus "Other Groups" times 6 (for non-participants who belonged to six groups). This works out to {[.88 + (6 x .02) + (6 x -.08)] - [6 x .02] =.40}.

REFERENCES

Bahr, Howard M., and Bruce A. Chadwick. 1985. "Religion and family in Middletown, USA. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47:407-414.

Bane, Mary Jo. 1976. *Here to Stay: Families in the Twentieth Century.* New York: Basic Books.

Brodbar-Nemzer, Jay Y. 1986. "Divorce and Group Commitment: The Case of the Jews." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:329-340.

_____. 1988. "The Contemporary American Jewish Family." Pp.66-87 in Darwin Thomas (Ed.), *The Religion and Family Connection: Social Science Perspectives*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

Cohen, Steven M. 1983. *American Modernity and Jewish Identity.* New York: Tavistock.

_____. 1988. *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cohen, Steven M., and Paul Ritterband. 1981. "Why Contemporary American Jews Want Small Families: An Interreligious Comparison of College Graduates." Pp. 209-231 in *Modern Jewish Fertility*, edited by Paul Ritterband. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Farber, Bernard, Charles H. Mindel, and Bernard Lazerwitz. 1981. "The Jewish American Family." Pp. 350-385 in *Ethnic Families in America*, Second edition, edited by Charles H. Mindel and Robert W. Habenstein. New York: Elsevier.

Gertman, Stuart A. 1977. *"And You Shall Teach Them Diligently."* New York: National Association of Temple Educators.

Hunt, Richard A., and Morton B. King. 1978. "Religiosity and Marriage." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17: 399-406.

Jones, C., M. Clark, G. Mooney, H. McWilliams, I. Crawford, B.Stephenson, and R. Tourangeaou. 1983. *High School and Beyond 1980 Sophomore Cohort First Follow-up (1982) Data File User's Manual.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Lasch, Christopher. 1977. *Haven in a Heartless World*. New York: Basic Books.

Lazerwitz, Bernard. 1980. "Religiosity and Fertility: How Strong a Connection?" *Contemporary Jewry* 4: 3-8.

Shrum, W. 1980. "Religion and Marital Instability: Change in the 1970's?" *Review of Religious Research* 21: 135-147.

Sklare, Marshall. 1971. *America's Jews*. New York: Random House.

APPENDIX

Variable Coding

HSB is a public-use data set. The portions used for this study are described by Jones et al. (1983). Here I will describe the codings I constructed, as well as the questionnaire items for the family-orientation scale. Table A-1 presents variable means, standard deviations, numbers of cases, and correlation coefficients.

Extra-curricular participation. I created dummy variables (1 = yes, 0 = no) for whether students had been active participants, leaders, or non-participants in "church activities, including youth groups" during their senior year. In the sophomore year I coded students in only two categories, since they were not asked about leadership in the 1980 questionnaire.

I created the indicator of participation in other activities by summing all the positive responses (not counting "church activities") to all the extra-curricular activities listed by HSB. These included athletics, band, cheerleading, hobby clubs, community organizations, and so on.

Family orientation. The family orientation scale included the following items, coded 0 for a response of "not important," 1 for "somewhat important," and 2 for "very important":

How important is each of the following to you in your life? b. Finding the right person to marry and having a happy family life. h. Living close to parents and relatives. k. Having children.

It also included the following, coded 0 for "not important," -1 for "somewhat important," and -2 for "very important": i. Getting away from this area of the country.

As suggested by Jones et al. (1983), persons who are eager to depart from their place of origin may be viewed as less family-oriented. Thus the scale ranged from -2 to 6. The alpha-reliability of the scale was .45 in the sophomore year and .43 in the senior year.

Gender. Students were coded 0 for male, 1 for female.

SES. Students' socioeconomic statuses were indicated by a linear additive composite variable. The composite was created by summing standardized values for father's occupation, father's education, mother's education, family income, and a list of home artifacts.

Table A-1. Means, standard deviations, number of non-missing cases, and pairwise correlation coefficients.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1) Active, 1982		**-.17**	**.17**	**.86**	**-.15**	.01	-.01	.01	.01	-.05	**.24**	.10	**.16**	.02	**.13**	-.03	.02
2) Leader, 1982			**.27**	**-.15**	**.86**	.07	-.05	-.02	.09	-.09	**.35**	.10	**.25**	**.18**	**.19**	**.10**	**.11**
3) Other Groups, 1982				**.35**	**.44**	**.10**	-.09	-.04	**.17**	**-.15**	**.29**	**.53**	**.37**	.09	**.19**	.02	.04
4) Other x Active, 1982					**-.13**	-.03	-.00	.01	.03	-.07	**.20**	**.22**	**.20**	-.00	.10	-.00	.02
5) Other x Leader, 1982						.02	-.04	-.01	.10	-.08	**.29**	**.15**	**.24**	**.14**	**.15**	.06	.07
6) Gender							-.04	.00	-.01	.07	**.12**	**.20**	**.14**	**.04**	**.15**	-.06	.02
7) SES								-.03	-.02	.08	.00	.03	.01	-.02	-.02	.06	-.02
8) Extended Family									**.10**	.03	**.10**	-.00	.04	-.05	-.01	-.00	.09
9) Number of Siblings										-.03	.09	.02	**.11**	**.14**	.04	.02	-.04
10) SingLe-parent Family											**-.11**	**-.10**	**-.10**	-.07	-.07	**-.22**	**-.13**
11) Active, 1980												**.33**	**.81**	**.22**	**.19**	.00	.06
12) Other Groups, 1980													**.62**	.03	.09	-.03	.03
13) Other x Active, 1980														**.17**	**.17**	-.05	-.02
14) Synagogue Attendance															**.51**	**.12**	.08
15) Religiosity																**.24**	**.17**
16) Family Orientation, 1980																	**.50**
17) Family Orientation, 1982																	
Mean	.18	.12	3.53	.80	.66	.46	2.53	.05	2.02	.16	.32	2.19	.96	16.96	-.37	3.59	3.64
Standard Deviation	.38	.33	2.55	1.99	2.05	.50	13.11	.23	1.43	.36	.47	1.74	1.76	28.72	.61	1.55	1.55
N	399	399	399	399	399	444	444	443	437	443	427	427	427	439	440	429	418

Note: Bold-faced coefficients are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Family Structure. I coded students as living with extended family members (1 = yes, 0 = no) if they reported having grandparents or other relatives living in their households. Students were coded as members of single-parent families (1 = yes, 0 = no) if they did not live with a mother or female guardian, or had neither a father nor a male guardian.

Other Religiosity Variables. In the base year questionnaire only, students were asked, "Do you think of yourself as a religious person?" I coded the responses as 1 for "yes, very;" 0 for "yes, somewhat;" and -1 for "no, not at all."

Also in the base year only, students were asked, "In the past year, how often have you attended religious services?" I coded responses as follows: "not at all" = 0; "several times a year or less" = 3; "about once a month" = 12; "two or three times a month" = 30; "about once a week" = 52; and "more than once a week" = 104. The values for synagogue attendance thus represent the approximate number of times per year a student attended religious services.