

Running head: ORTHODOX HIGH SCHOOL SEXUALITY EDUCATION

MODERN ORTHODOX JEWISH SCHOOL TEACHERS' AND ADMINISTRATORS'
PERSPECTIVES ON IN-SCHOOL SEXUALITY EDUCATION:

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF APPLIED AND PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

OF

RUTGERS,

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

SHIRA DEBORAH DONATH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

May 2023

APPROVED:

Kenneth Schneider, Ph.D.

Nancy Fagley, Ph.D.

DEAN:

Arpana G. Inman, PhD

ORTHODOX HIGH SCHOOL SEXUALITY EDUCATION

Copyright 2023 by Shira Donath

ABSTRACT

Sexuality education prior to marriage is one of the strongest predictors of marital satisfaction in the Modern Orthodox Jewish community (Maybruch, 2012). Sexuality education within the Modern Orthodox community typically takes place in a formalized way immediately prior to marriage (Lerner, 2007); however, community advocates call for addressing matters pertaining to sexuality prior to that stage of life, as individuals are exposed to sexual material and asking questions about sexuality at steadily younger ages (Debow & Woloski-Wruble, 2007). While some argue that discussing sexuality in high schools with the assumption that students are presently engaging in sexual behaviors or are struggling with their sexual identities will condone and perhaps encourage sexual behavior, which would be in contradiction to Jewish law (Maryles, 2016), others assert that teaching students the skills to grapple with the tension between their personal struggles and Jewish legal expectations should be a core value and goal in Modern Orthodox education (Kahn, 2022). This study explored the perspectives of administrators and faculty within Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools in North America (MOH) regarding in-school sexuality education through surveys conducted online. Thirty administrators and 27 faculty members completed the respective surveys. Most of administrators surveyed (93.3%) and most of faculty members surveyed (96.3%) indicated they thought MOH should offer sexuality education, and 81.5% of faculty members indicated that questions pertaining to sexuality were generated by students with whom they interacted; however, 27.3% reported being provided with talking points from the administration to address these questions and 18.5% reported previous training in sexuality education. Faculty survey data presented two statistically significant findings: 1) Having previous training in sexuality education exhibited a significant, moderate negative relationship with efficacy teaching Halachot (Jewish law) regarding sexuality; and 2)

Total years teaching exhibited a strong statistically significant positive relationship with the opinion that MOH should offer sexuality education. Further results and their discussion are presented.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of individuals whom I would like to thank, who have helped me through my graduate school journey. Thank you to Ken Schneider, the chair of my dissertation committee, for agreeing to support and guide me every step of the way. To both Ken and Nancy Fagley, the second member of my dissertation committee, thank you for asking questions that pushed me to improve the quality of my writing and research. I am incredibly grateful to both of you for your time, kindness, and flexibility.

Thank you to Dr. David Pelcovitz, Yoetzet Halacha Bracha Rutner, Rabbi Chanan Strassman, and Dr. Devora Scher, for your time and contributions to this project.

To my professors and supervisors who saw potential within me and helped me to find it within myself, thank you.

Thank you to my family for your support and encouragement. Specifically, thank you to my parents who have stepped in whenever needed in order to help me get to where I am today. You have gone above and beyond to support me (like my mother's flying in for a day (!) just to do carpool for me when Jeremy was out of town, so that I could get to class on time.)

To my in-laws, thank you for giving me the gift of Jeremy, for your support over the years, and for being loving grandparents to our children.

To my children, Yael, Leora, Shmuel, and Aharon, thank you for being who you are. I love you more than you will ever know.

Jeremy, thank you for being my teammate. "It's all an adventure and comes with a breathtaking view." I couldn't have done this without you.

"Mah Ashiv L'Hashem" (Psalms, 116:12). I feel incredibly grateful to God for the gifts in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv

LIST OF TABLES.....viii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

 Sexuality Education in America1

 A. Religion as a Factor in Sexuality Education.....1

 B. Current Landscape of Sexuality Education in Modern Orthodox Jewish High Schools2

 C. The Experience of Teachers in Modern Orthodox Jewish High Schools.....5

 D. Purpose of Study.....6

II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....7

 A. History of Sexuality Education in America7

 B. Religion as a Factor in Sexuality Education.....16

 a. Sexuality Education in the Modern Orthodox Community17

 C. Teacher Efficacy22

 a. Teacher Efficacy in the Context of Sexuality Education.....22

III. METHOD23

 A. Participants.....23

 a. Administrator Participants23

 b. Faculty Participants.....23

B. Measures26

 a. Administrator Surveys26

 b. Faculty Surveys.....26

C. Procedure26

D. Interviewer’s Background.....27

IV. RESULTS29

 A. Administrator Survey.....29

 B. Faculty Survey30

V. DISCUSSION35

 A. Administrator Participants36

 B. Faculty Participants36

 C. Administrator Perspectives37

 C. Faculty Perspectives.....38

 D. Limitations39

 E. Suggestions for Future Research.....40

REFERENCES42

APPENDICES51

 A. Administrator Survey.....51

 B. Faculty Survey52

 C. Descriptive Statistics- Relevant Courses Themes.....58

 D. Psychometric Properties of Subscales59

 E. Response Rates by Faculty to Individual Items on the Adapted National
 Teacher Preparedness Survey 60

2. Teacher Preparedness Percentages	64
F. Informed Consent.....	70
G. Recruitment Materials.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Sociodemographic Characteristics of Administrator Participants	23
Table 2 Sociodemographic Characteristics of Faculty Participants	25
Table 3 Report by Administrators on Implementation of Sexuality Education.....	29
Table 4 Report by Faculty Members on Implementation of Sexuality Education	32
Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for the Subscales of the Adapted National Teacher Preparedness Survey	33
Table 6 Pearson's r Correlation Matrix for Subscales and Demographic Factors.....	34

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Sexuality Education in America

Sexuality education in American public schools is fraught with disagreement as to its content, delivery, and its very existence (Pearsall, 2001). After a long and complex history, there is still no consensus on the types of sexuality education programs that should be employed in public schools in America, as each state differs in its regulations and curricula requirement (Guttmacher Institute, 2022). Not all states require medically accurate curricula, and many that do have such a requirement, allow parents to opt-out of lessons containing material pertaining to sexuality education (Guttmacher Institute, 2022). Under the U.S. Constitution, parents hold the legal right to direct the education of their children, including the election of non-public schooling (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Private schools are not bound to the same legalities regarding sexuality education as are public schools; yet, they are similarly tasked with providing quality education overall to students. However, the discussions in independent schools mirror those taking place in public schools, as to the right way to convey information about sexuality, if at all (Fields, 2012).

Religiosity as a Factor in Sexuality Education

Often these conversations are influenced by the values and opinions of the many stakeholders of the school, including school faculty and students' families. Schools that are sponsored by a religious doctrine add another layer of complexity onto the subject of sexuality education, as religious beliefs may have an impact on the approach to sexuality education. Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools find themselves grappling with exactly this issue (Schwartz, 2019): if and how to provide an education pertaining to sexuality that appeases

anxious or oppositional parents, that conveys factually correct information, while simultaneously presenting the lessons within the context of Modern Orthodox Jewish values?

Modern Orthodoxy is a term whose meaning is debated amongst scholars, with multiple opinions regarding both the history of Modern Orthodoxy, as well as the evaluation of leaders and institutions that fall within and outside of the camp of Modern Orthodoxy (Eleff, 2016).

Modern Orthodox Jews believe in the divinity of the Torah (Bible) law and adhere to accompanying Torah interpretations of rabbinic law (halakha), while participating in the modern secular world (Lamm, 1986.) Saul Berman, an American scholar and Modern Orthodox rabbi, writes (Berman, 2001) about the tensions the Modern Orthodox community experiences:

The Modern Orthodox experiment begins with the assumption that Orthodoxy can preserve its integrity and passion, and even be enriched, by its intersection with modernity, and that the interaction will allow Orthodoxy to bring to the broader world a clearer vision of the grandeur of Torah. On the other hand, this approach does not deny that there are areas of powerful inconsistency and conflict between Torah and modern culture that need to be filtered out in order to preserve the integrity of halakha.

Current Landscape of Sexuality Education in Modern Orthodox Jewish Schools

While curricula addressing sexuality education from a Modern Orthodox Jewish lens do exist (Debow 2007), there is little published data as to the implementation of these curricula, or to the experience of teachers in addressing this topic. Limited published data indicate sparse sexuality education in Modern Orthodox high schools (Maybruch, 2012). Additionally, anecdotal evidence describe a scant landscape for sexuality education in Modern Orthodox schools. In an unpublished undergraduate honors thesis study, Charendoff (2019) writes that most of women aged 18-24 who had attended Modern Orthodox high schools interviewed for the study, indicated

little to no high school sexuality education other than discussion of prohibitions against intergender physical interaction outside of marriage (known within the community as *shomer negiah*.) In an unpublished undergraduate honors thesis study, Levisohn (2019) describes a more varied picture of sexuality education, with some individuals reporting having learned about consent, contraception, healthy relationships, and STI's, in addition to Jewish laws related to sexuality.

Two goals have been articulated as to why Modern Orthodox Jewish schools should address sexuality education: namely, to address sexuality-related issues with which students are currently struggling, as well as to prepare students for a future sexual relationship- specifically within marriage (Kahn, 2022). While some argue that discussing sexuality in high schools with the assumption that students are presently engaging in sexual behaviors or are struggling with their sexual identities will condone and perhaps encourage sexual behavior, which would be in contradiction to Jewish law (Maryles, 2016), others assert that teaching students the skills to grapple with the tension between their personal struggles and Jewish legal expectations should be a core value and goal in Modern Orthodox education (Kahn, 2022). Additionally, some have suggested utilizing the framework of Jewish laws in areas of sexuality as the context in which to discuss sexual ethics, body awareness, and body autonomy, amongst other topics relevant to Jewish law, allowing for the transmission of foundational knowledge regarding sexuality that does not promote behavior contradicting to Jewish legal expectations (Kahn, 2022b). Blau (2007) notes that adolescents who are exposed to sexual material in the media but do not have guidance in reconciling the messaging with Jewish values and legal expectations, will struggle to integrate their experiences and identities as both sexual and religious beings. Modern Orthodox

individuals reflecting on their experiences of high school sexuality education substantiate these concerns (Charendoff, 2019).

In addition to the abovementioned differing perspectives on sexuality education relating to the students' immediate concerns of sexuality, another complexity in this decision-making process regarding sexuality education stems from the diversity of religious standards within the Modern Orthodox Jewish community. Waxman (1993) outlines the Modern Orthodox Jewish community as containing at least two distinct populations: one that utilizes the term Modern Orthodox to indicate an approach to Judaism that is meticulously observant of Jewish law and traditions, yet is philosophically modern, while another utilizes the term Modern Orthodox to indicate behavioral modernity, representing a group connected to Orthodox tradition in a general sense, but lacking meticulousness in Jewish law and placing less of an emphasis on philosophy. One of the many manifestations of this polarity within the Modern Orthodox community can be found within Modern Orthodox high schools. In some schools identifying as Modern Orthodox, students regularly engage in sexual activity, whereas in other schools identifying as Modern Orthodox, most students delay interpersonal sexual activity until marriage, furthering the difficulty inherent in developing a centralized curriculum (T. Sinensky, personal communication, May 11, 2022). Additionally, the hesitancy to address sexuality education within Modern Orthodox schools may be amplified by the discomfort of acknowledging that this topic is immediately relevant for students (Segal, 2019).

In segments of the Modern Orthodox community in which the communal norm is to delay interpersonal sexual activity until marriage, arguments have still been made that delaying conversations about sexuality until immediately before marriage can have damaging consequences, as individuals not only struggle to reconcile the leap from a requirement of total

abstinence from intergender physical contact to encouragement and celebration of intramarital sexual activity, but also lack foundational knowledge in areas of anatomy, physiology, sexual ethics, and sexual health (Kosman, 2021). Premarital educators in the Modern Orthodox community recognize the tendency to delay discussions of sexuality until immediately before marriage as stemming from Jewish legal concerns regarding inappropriate thoughts [*hirhurim*] and promiscuity [*pritzut*], yet simultaneously express concern that premarital preparation classes (referred to in the community as *chattan* and *kallah* classes) are insufficient to adequately prepare individuals for beginning a sexual relationship (Kahn, 2022b).

The Experience of Teachers in Modern Orthodox Jewish High Schools

Research has demonstrated teacher efficacy as a key contributor to student learning and success (Midgley et al., 1989 & Caprara et al., 2006). The area of sexuality is one that has been noted as of particular importance for teacher efficacy, as learning about sexuality is not only an academic experience, but one that impacts the student's self-identity (Allen, 2009). Teacher preparedness is one of the most influential factors on the comprehensiveness of sexuality education curricula (Hammig, 2011), yet teachers report feeling unprepared to address the topic of sexuality education (Blad, 2014). Within the Modern Orthodox Jewish community, individuals have advocated for a sexuality education curriculum taught by teachers who are screened, trained, and supported (Kahn, 2022). An administrator at a large Modern Orthodox Jewish high school indicated that even if teachers are provided with a quality sexuality education curriculum, schools cannot follow through with providing this education for students if teachers are not comfortable teaching this subject (B. Rutner, personal communication, Dec 12, 2021).

Purpose of Study

In addition to the observable paucity of scholarly research on the topic of sexuality education within the Modern Orthodox Jewish community, educators who would like to facilitate progress this area of education have noted their hesitation to proceed until formal research is conducted, in order to better understand the current landscape and guide their decisions (Friedman, 2022). The aim of the current study was to understand Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools' administrator and faculty perspectives on and preparedness to teach sexuality education, as well as answer the following questions:

1. Do administrators and faculty think sexuality education should be offered in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools?
2. Do Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools implement sexuality education?
3. What tools, if any, do these schools use to assist with implementation (curricula, etc.)?
4. What is the professional background of the faculty members who address this topics with students?
5. In what contexts is sexuality education addressed?
6. Do Modern Orthodox Jewish faculty feel capable of and comfortable with addressing this topic?

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

History of Sexuality Education in America

While the current study focused on sexuality education within a subset of private schools, understanding the backdrop of sexuality education in the public arena provides helpful context. Public schooling in America has a long, complex, and nuanced history (Kober, 2020). By design, educational policy and curricula are determined at the state and local level, allowing for increased autonomy of states and districts, presenting both opportunities and challenges (Neem, 2017). The history of sexuality education within public schools in America adds another layer of intricacy to this history. While little literature exists about sexuality education prior to the 20th century, moral education as a component of public schooling, which would eventually become intertwined with sexuality education, stemmed from early roots laid as education became formalized in the colonial era (Pearsall, 2001).

In the American colonial era, schools were often housed in churches and students taught by ministers (Komline, 2020). Additionally, McGuffey readers, written by William Holmes McGuffey, with a Calvinist viewpoint, were the primary textbooks used in early public schools (Ellenwood, 2006). McGuffey readers, both in content and in tone, placed a strong emphasis on moral character development (Brown, 2002). This moral education paved the way towards sexuality education, as both became topics with which the federal government decided to involve themselves (Moran, 1996).

In 1873, The Comstock Laws, pushed forward most forcefully by Andrew Comstock, were passed by the United States Congress under the Grant administration, which outlawed the

distribution of birth control, as the laws characterized contraception as “obscene” (Wardell, 1980). The early twentieth century saw changes in American citizens’ public behavior, and “many Americans had reached a state of outrage over the moral decline in the nation. Prostitution, drunkenness, and a general moral laxity were resulting in serious problems of crime and disease” (Huber, 2009).

In 1905, Prince A. Morrow founded the Social Hygiene Movement in an attempt to educate the public about physical, social, and ethical components of sexuality (Bigelow, 1916). Although sexuality education had existed prior to the Social Hygiene Movement, the newly introduced approach to sexuality education distinguished itself in that it placed a heavy emphasis on medical information, and much of the course content was developed by physicians, who viewed the Social Hygiene Movement not solely as a moral project, but as a public health one as well (Morrow, 1904).

“The New Standard” was released in 1908, outlining the need to put an end to a moral double standard for men and women, as well as the need to educate children regarding sexuality (Blair, 1980). In an age in which the public discourse surrounding sexuality held that sex was primarily for the purposes of procreation, Margaret Sanger, a feminist, writer, and nurse, publicly spoke about the need to recognize the “recreation” of sex (Reed, 2003). Sanger and Maurice Parmelee, a member of the Franklin Deleanor Roosevelt administration who shared similar views, advocated for the stance that children should be taught all aspects of sexuality so they can make informed, responsible decisions about sexuality and marriage. Sanger became an advocate for birth control, arguing that women should be able to engage in sexual activities without concern of pregnancy.

As these movements were taking hold, the federal government was also becoming increasingly involved in social problems and viewed itself as an agent for social change (Pestritto & Atto, 2008). In an effort to stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, the government instituted sexuality education in the U.S. Army, both for actively serving soldiers, as well as for veterans.

John Dewey, a progressive educator and psychologist, led the country's Progressive Education Association towards a new perspective theorizing that children's education should allow children to reach their full potential by arming them with information and the full capacity for responsible decision making (Martin, 2003). In his writings, Dewey expressed that social reform was only possible through widespread public education. "Education is a regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and that the adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction" (Dewey, 1897).

Progressive educators advocated for experiential learning, both in and out of the classroom. Learning to navigate all aspects of life necessarily required learning to navigate sexuality. Stanley G. Hall's (1904) identification of the time period of "adolescence" recognized a time at which humans are biologically able to reproduce but lack the degree of rational decision-making to responsibly do so. Hall therefore stressed the need to teach "sexual restraint" during adolescence.

Ella Flagg Young, the first female superintendent of a Chicago public school district and first female president of the National Education Association decided to challenge the status quo of sexuality education in Chicago public schools and instate a sexuality education program that

had never been tried before. In 1911, The Vice Commission of Chicago approved both scientific and moral sexuality education in schools for children who have already reached puberty.

The first formalized public school education program, initiated by Young in the 1913-1914 school year, consisted of three sessions, taught by trained professionals. The first session addressed relevant medical information, the second session addressed “venereal disease,” and the third session addressed “personal continence until marriage.”

Parents publicly protested these sessions and the Chicago public school board of education voted a loss of confidence in Young’s leadership abilities. Following the very public debate that took place in Chicago, other school districts implemented sexuality education in a quieter manner, without obtaining school board approval. The newer, less adversarial approach integrated sexuality education into existing classes such as biology and home economics, and according to a 1920 survey, 40% of all high schools in America reported implementing some form of sexuality education (Carter, 2001).

In 1936, the courts ruled that birth control could not be considered “obscene,” legalizing the distribution of birth control in America (Tuhus-Dubrow, 2007). In 1946, Planned Parenthood put out its first statement on sexuality education, with knowledge of and access to birth control at the center of its suggested curriculum. The first birth control pill was introduced to the public in 1959 (Galvin, 1998), which was then incorporated into sex education curricula, as well.

The federal government continued to employ sexuality education programs for its soldiers in an effort to prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and therefore try to keep the army at its strongest (Cutler, 1988). However, it was becoming increasingly clear that efforts were needed to educate women as well, as the number of women who responded to a

survey acknowledging that they had engaged in premarital sex more than doubled between 1920 and 1950 (Tolson, 1999).

In 1922, the Public Health Service published a manual describing the goal of including sexuality education as part of a holistic education on developing as a whole human being. “Sex education advocates began using a new argument for premarital abstinence: that sex in marriage would be more fulfilling if individuals remained abstinent when single” (Huber, 2009).

The content of sexuality education classes continued to shift, depending on the perceived needs of the time. The 1940’s saw a shift towards a focus on sexually transmitted diseases because of an outbreak of gonorrhea and syphilis and the corresponding discovery of penicillin as a known treatment option.

During the 1940’s and 1950’s, conversations surrounding marriage began to change and questioned the nature of the husband-wife relationship. “Family Life Education” began in public schools, in which topics such as relationships, home finance, marriage, and child rearing became part of the accepted school curriculum. This led to a natural inclusion of sexuality education classes. This approach to sexuality education, however, focused on sexuality within and as a part of marriage (Kris, 1953).

The 1960’s brought on a sexual revolution that corresponded to a general sense of rebellion and shirking of a sense of authority and responsibility. Perhaps stemming from a distrust of government and opposition to the Vietnam War, “Sexual license became a political statement of defiance against the traditional morals and social system” (Huber, 2009).

In 1964, the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) was formed, which advocated for values neutral sexuality education (Reisman, 2000). In 1966, philosopher Joseph Fletcher published *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*, which proposed the idea that there exists no one absolute morality, and instead suggested that one's moral code should be dependent upon the context in which an individual finds himself. This idea became popular with sexuality education advocates.

In 1967, Patricia Schiller, one of the leaders in SIECUS, founded the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors and Therapists, which trained and set standards for sexuality educators (Engel, 1989). This training quickly gained popularity.

A number of legal changes took place in the 60's and 70's which impacted the content and aims of sexuality education in America. In 1965, the Supreme Court ruled that contraception was a "constitutional right" and Lyndon Johnson allocated federal funds towards "family planning services." In 1970, Richard Nixon created grants for comprehensive family planning and related health services, in what was called Title X. President Carter would later specify that a portion of this grant money must be allocated towards servicing unmarried teenagers.

In 1971, the White House hosted a conference on youth in America, which supported requiring all public elementary and secondary schools implement sexuality education of some sort into their curriculum. 1973 brought the court case of *Roe v. Wade*, which legalized abortion, and the 1977 Supreme Court decision of *Carrey v. Population Services International* established that minors could obtain contraception without their parents' knowledge or consent. These legal steps became part of the content of sexuality education curricula, as the focus turned towards preventing pregnancy as a result of teens' sexual experimentation, as opposed to preventing the experimentation itself (Rotskoff, 2001).

However, this shifting landscape came with opposition. A 1977 survey indicated that those who opposed premarital sex also opposed public school sexuality education. In the 1980's there was a resurgence of sexuality education because of the AIDS crisis; however, this time the focus was more on abstinence only education, in an effort to stop the spread of disease.

In 1981, opponents of Title X passed the American Family Life Act (AFLA), which funded “chastity” and “abstinence only until marriage” (AOUM) education. In 1983, the American Civil Liberties Union filed suit against the AFLA stating that it went against the separation of church and state. In 1985, a judge ruled that AFLA was unconstitutional. In 1988, the Supreme Court reversed this decision, but in 1993 a settlement was reached which required granted curricula to be submitted for review, in order to be screened for religious overtones and medical inaccuracies. In 1991, the first Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) for Kindergarten through 12th grade were published.

In 1996 the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act was passed, and a portion of the act included a stipulation that abstinence only education should be funded in states in which child poverty was a major problem. In 2002, another push towards AOUM sexuality education was presented through the Community Based Abstinence Education program, which funded such programs. During the 2008 presidential campaign, Barack Obama supported the idea of CSE and ran with that as part of his platform. Under the Obama administration in 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) launched a Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program (TPPP). One component of the TPPP funded studies examining the evidence on approaches to sexuality education and their outcomes, with the goal of identifying evidence based curricula for teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections prevention. As part of Obamacare, the Personal

Responsibility Education Program (PREP) was founded, granting financial incentives for well-rounded sexuality education curricula that include information on healthy relationships, positive adolescent development, financial literacy, parent-child communication skills, education and employment preparation skills, and healthy life skills, attempting to bring a more holistic approach towards sexuality education.

The Trump administration sought to reduce funding to the TPPP and entirely eliminate some of the previously granted funding for comprehensive sexuality education programs. Multiple lawsuits were filed against the HHS for unlawful dismantling of HHS programs, with justices ruling against HHS in the majority of cases. HHS established new streams of funding for abstinence-only “Sexual Risk Avoidance” (SRA) education. At the time of this dissertation’s writing, the Biden administration proposed a budget reallocating funds towards PREP and TPPP, in addition to further funding AOUM education.

After a long and complex history, there is still no consensus on the types of sexuality education programs that should be employed in public schools in America, and oversight is lacking as well. Most school principals report that local school districts and/or local government have the most influence on sexuality education curricula (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2000).

Currently, twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia require public schools to teach sexuality education. Thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia require students to receive instruction about HIV/AIDS. However, only eighteen of those states include a stipulation that the information provided to students must be medically, factually, or technically accurate. Twenty-five states and the District of Columbia require school districts to notify parents that sex education or HIV education will be provided, five states require

parental consent before a child can receive sexuality or HIV education, and thirty-six states and the District of Columbia allow parents to opt-out of sexuality or HIV education on behalf of their children (Guttmacher Institute, 2022).

Parents overall report wanting their children to be taught a wider range of information in their sexuality education courses than students report learning, and students report wanting greater focus on communication skills and an exploration of emotions related to sexuality (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2000). Support for broad sexuality education is shared by parents across a range of demographics and cultural backgrounds (Heller & Johnson, 2013), as well as political affiliation (Kantor & Levitz, 2017); however, increased religious observance has been found to have a negative correlation with support for comprehensive sexuality education (Bleakley et al., 2008; Heller & Johnson, 2013).

If the history of sexuality education in America has proven anything, it is that this is a highly contentious topic, about which individuals, families, and politicians feel very strongly. While uniformity can be indicative of a problem, the flexibility this inherently provides allows for adaptation to cultural norms and expectations.

Under the U.S. Constitution, parents hold the legal right to direct the education of their children, including the election of non-public schooling (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). States may regulate curricula of non-public schools, provided that the regulations follow particular guidelines:

The challenge to state legislators in regulating private schools, then, is to draft legislation that 1) respects the fundamental right of parents to direct the education of their children, 2) protects the state's interest in an informed citizenry but avoids interference with religious beliefs unless compelling interests are at issue, and then only in the least restrictive manner, and 3) avoids comprehensive regulation of private education that

would deprive parents of any choice in education. (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

As independent schools reserve the right to determine curricular decisions, “the chief role of independent schools in the context of sexuality education is to bring to the surface the core values of their communities and discuss how those values align with their missions and how those values may influence discussions and curriculum around sex and sexuality at their schools” (National Association of Independent Schools, 2017).

Religion as a Factor in Sexuality Education

While criticism has been aimed at the early approaches to sexuality education as influenced heavily by religion, it is possible that the blending of science and religion helped to advance sexuality education, by working within accepted frameworks of the time and paving the way for comprehensive sexuality education (Slominski, 2021). Whereas recent movements towards abstinence-only education stem from a desire to silence the conversation on sexuality, early sexuality education utilizing an abstinence-only approach was innovative in its allowing sexuality education to come into existence in the public sphere (Burnham, 1973). Additionally, it has been argued that pulling from both scientific and religious teachings allowed sexuality educators to tailor their approaches towards the specific audience before which they found themselves (Gardner, 1974).

In the 1920’s – 1930’s, pastoral counselors across religions began to train in how to address issues of sexuality, in response to a perceived decline in the state of religious marriages, and encouraged “family life education” to take hold (Slominski, 2021). Family life education grew within churches and provided a platform for ministers to provide teachings about sexuality and marriage in line with their faith (Davis, 2010).

The separation between church and state has necessitated a shift away from religion-based sexuality education in public schools; however, fusing sexuality education with religious teachings may prove particularly beneficial within private, faith-based schools.

Sexuality Education in the Modern Orthodox Community

Modern Orthodoxy is a term whose meaning is debated amongst scholars, with multiple opinions regarding both the history of Modern Orthodoxy, as well as the evaluation of leaders and institutions that fall within and outside of the camp of Modern Orthodoxy (Eleff, 2016). Nineteenth-century German Rabbis Samson Raphael Hirsch and Esrael Hildesheimer taught a view of Orthodox Judaism that encourages engagement with contemporary society. While the aforementioned rabbis did not use the term Modern Orthodoxy, their lines of thinking likely paved the way toward the development of the Modern Orthodox community as it is currently (Eleff, 2016). Twentieth century Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik is identified by many in the Modern Orthodox world as their spiritual leader and example of true Modern Orthodox leadership. Yeshiva University (YU) is looked to as the leading Modern Orthodox educational institution, featuring both undergraduate and graduate programs combining Judaic and general studies, as well as the largest Modern Orthodox rabbinical seminary, the Rabbi Isaac Elchonon Theological Seminary (RIETS). Organizations such as the Orthodox Union and the Rabbinical Council of America, while not employing the term Modern Orthodox, are often viewed as ancillary Modern Orthodox institutions due to their close ties to RIETS. Affiliation with Modern Orthodoxy is often self-proclaimed, and for the purposes of the current study, self-identification with the Modern Orthodox community was utilized as the operational definition for an individual or institution's Modern Orthodox affiliation.

Modern Orthodox Jews believe in the divinity of the Torah (Bible) law and adhere to accompanying Torah interpretations of rabbinic law (halakha), while participating in the modern secular world (Lamm, 1986.) Traditional Jewish values encourage modesty and discreetness in discussing matters of sexuality (Lichtenstein, 2007); yet, sexual satisfaction within the context of marriage is viewed as of paramount importance (Friedman, 1996).

The Talmud describes an approach to sexuality education within the home, relating the story of Rabbi Hisda educating his daughters about intimacy and sexuality (Shabbat 140b), and according to one interpretation providing explicit advice for enhancing the marital sexual relationship (Rashi, Shabbat 140b). The Talmud additionally describes a situation in which a rabbinic student, Rabbi Kahana, hid under the bed of his teacher while the teacher and his wife were engaged in sexual behavior (Berakhot 62a). In response to Kahana's teacher's realizing and admonishing him for this behavior, Kahana stated, "This is Torah, and I need to learn it." Presumably, Rabbi Kahana did not receive the type of explicit preparation for engaging in a sexual relationship as is described in the story of Rabbi Hisda and his daughters, and therefore, feeling a lack of sexuality education, went to extreme measures to educate himself in this area.

The tension of treating the topic of sexuality with utmost sensitivity, while also recognizing the need to address this area amongst the masses, was expressed by one of the leading Modern Orthodox rabbis of the 20th and 21st century, Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein:

[The discussion of sexuality] impinges upon intimate chambers in the life of almost any and every halakhically committed Jew or Jewess... On the other hand... it may appear to stand in violation of the Mishna's admonition, as elucidated by the Gemara (Hagiga 11b), against public discussion of the arcane aspects of proscribed sexual

liaisons... Where spiritual influence is at stake, a measure of trepidation persists (Lichtenstein, 2007).

Precisely this sense of ambivalence led to silence on the topic of sexuality within Modern Orthodox Jewish day schools until recent years (Maybruch, 2012). Rosenfeld (2007) writes that “The web of silence which has surrounded this realm of human experience, at least on a communal level, is potentially harmful.” Debow & Woloski-Wruble (2007) argue that while the prevailing practice within the Orthodox community has been to not address the topic of sexuality until immediately prior to marriage, it has become necessary to discuss issues of intimacy and sexuality at earlier developmental stages due to increased exposure to secular media presenting sexual material. Specifically, Debow & Woloski-Wruble (2007) posit that “This phenomenon [of increased exposure to sexual material] puts children at a high risk for conflict as they struggle to bridge their own traditional value system with that of a secular culture.” Regarding Modern Orthodox youth, Weil (2012) states, “Their teachers need to be open and clear about the Torah’s approach to sexuality, and to how essential a component of a healthy marriage it is, above and beyond the important mitzvah [commandment] of having children.” The sentiment that in order for individuals within a particular religious community to internalize messaging about sexuality that aligns with one’s religion, that individual needs to receive explicit instruction to that regard, is consistent with empirical data. Research has demonstrated that adolescents’ understanding and perspectives of intimacy and sexuality are greatly influenced by the media to which they are exposed (Hawkins et al., 2004). Additionally, studies have shown that youth view the internet as a private forum for seeking information about sexuality (Brown et al., 2009) and that youth seek sexual health information online more than any other type of information (Buhi et al., 2009). Therefore, there is insistence that the Modern Orthodox Jewish community should work to

establish means of explicitly teaching young people the values about intimacy that are in line with those of the community (Maybruch, 2012b).

Some may argue that it is the responsibility of parents to educate their children regarding matters pertaining to sexuality; yet, parents typically shy away from this task (Hutcherson, 2002). While premarital education courses (referred to within the Jewish community as *chattan* and *kallah* classes) that include information about intimacy and sexuality within the greater framework of Jewish laws relating to married life are taught to brides and grooms prior to their wedding (Lerner, 2007), earlier years of formal schooling provide the foundation upon which this later education rests (Maybruch, 2012).

Results of a national survey about marital satisfaction among Orthodox Jews conducted jointly by researchers in three leading Modern Orthodox institutions showed that individuals reported problems with intimacy and sexuality to be among the leading stressors within marriage (Schnall et. al, 2013). Sexual relationship education prior to marriage has been demonstrated to be a significant predictor of marital satisfaction in the Modern Orthodox Jewish community (Maybruch, 2012). Pelcovitz (2011) notes that stress within marriage related to the sexual relationship may be due to lack of sexuality education and advocates for enhanced sexual education techniques for sex educators.

Some Modern Orthodox Jewish schools do implement thorough and holistic sexuality education (Freedman, 2009 & Schwartz, 2019). Often, the courses that address the topics of sexuality and sexual ethics are ones discussing Jewish law in related areas and serve as a springboard for this conversation (Maybruch, 2012). A formalized comprehensive sexuality education curriculum was developed in 1999 titled “Life Values Curriculum: Health Education

for the Jewish Day School” (Debow & Woloski-Wruble, 2007). Life Values and Intimacy Education “reflects traditional values in the face of the prevailing cultural views” (Debow & Woloski-Wruble, 2008). Life Values and Intimacy Education layers Jewish beliefs onto existing domains outlined by the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), including Values and Personal Skills; Relationships; Human Development; Sexual Behavior; Sexual Health; and Society and Culture. Life Values and Intimacy Education provides teacher guidelines, lesson plans, sample letters to parents, and student handouts for grades 3-8, and also suggests how to adapt the curriculum for grades 9-12. Life Values and Intimacy Education provides a comprehensive toolkit for teachers in modern orthodox Jewish day schools who are tasked with addressing sexuality with their students. While the Debow & Woloski-Wruble (2007) curriculum is intended to be presented in a frontal teaching manner by a Judaic studies faculty member, an introductory curriculum for high school girls developed by Diamant (2007) utilizes a discussion-based approach within a health class.

While many advocate for sexuality education within modern Orthodox schools, studies asking individuals to report retrospectively about their sexuality education in high school suggest it is not implemented widely (Maybruch, 2012 & Levisohn, 2019). The hesitancy to address sexuality education within Modern Orthodox schools may stem from questioning whether the topic should be addressed within schools at all, coupled with the discomfort of acknowledging that this topic is immediately relevant for students (Segal, 2019). Additionally, teachers report not having sufficient guidance from school administration on how to best address topics related to sexuality with students, including what is “allowed” to be said, and therefore choose not to discuss matters in whole group discussions (Hartman & Samet, 2007). However, avoiding this topic in classes may have unintended consequences of students making choices related to their

sexual behavior they might regret, as a result of not having a basic understanding of sexuality and sexual ethics, as well as a safe space to explore questions related to these topics (Schwartz, 2019). Schechter (2011) argues for teaching “Understanding self, sexuality, and struggle” in modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, recognizing sexual development as one requiring attention independent of preparation for marriage.

Teacher Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to one’s belief in her abilities to handle complex tasks (Bandura, 1997). Studies have demonstrated teacher self-efficacy’s influence on quality of instructional design (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), student motivation (Midgley et al., 1989), and student academic performance (Caprara et al., 2006). It is important to note that teacher efficacy is not an objective measure, but rather a self-perception (Ross & Bruce, 2007). A factor in teacher efficacy as it relates to culturally sensitive teaching is teacher sense of preparedness (Moore, 2019).

Teacher Efficacy in the Context of Sexuality Education

Teacher preparedness is one of the most influential factors on the comprehensiveness of sexuality education curricula (Hammig, 2011), yet teachers report feeling unprepared to address the topic of sexuality education (Blad, 2014). Most teachers tasked with teaching sexuality education receive no formal education in the topic and those who report less formal training in sexuality education also report lower confidence in their ability to adequately teach this topic (Jacobs et al., 1995).

CHAPTER III

Method

Participants

Administrator Participants

A total of 45 individuals opened the administrator survey. Of the 45 participants, 14 answered just 0-4 questions and were thus excluded from analyses. Two did not work at Modern Orthodox schools and were therefore excluded. The final sample size for administrators was 30. Sociodemographic characteristics of administrator participants can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Administrator Participants

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Female	16	53.3
Male	14	46.7
School Demographic		
Single-Gender Female	9	30
Single-Gender Male	6	20
Co-educational	15	50
Identify as Modern Orthodox ^a	28	87
Method of Recruitment to Study ^b		
Email from Principal Investigator	16	59.26
Facebook Post	2	7.4
Whatsapp Message	7	25.93
Other	2	7.4

^a Reflects the number and percentage of participants answering “yes” to this question.

^b N = 27.

Faculty Participants

A total of 63 participants began the faculty survey; however, many did not complete the full survey. Participants who completed less than approximately 20% of the survey were removed from analyses due to missing data. Thus, the final sample for faculty members was 27 participants. Sociodemographic characteristics of faculty participants can be found in Table 2.

Table 2*Sociodemographic Characteristics of Faculty Participants*

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Female	16	59.3
Male	11	40.7
School Demographic		
Single-Gender Female	9	33.3
Single-Gender Male	1	3.7
Co-educational	17	63
Highest Educational Level ^a		
Associates	-	-
Bachelors	4	15.4
Masters	19	73.1
Doctorate	3	11.5
Identify as Modern Orthodox ^b	23	88.5
Position on School Faculty		
General Studies Teacher	8	29.6
Judaic Studies Teacher	14	51.9
Guidance	4	14.8
Other	1	3.7
Years on Faculty in Current School		
0-3 years	4	14.8
4-9 years	10	37
10+ years	13	48.1
Years on Faculty in Total ^a		
0-3 years	3	11.5
4-9 years	3	11.5
10+ years	20	76.9
Received Training in Sexuality Education ^{bc}	5	18.5
Method of Recruitment to Study		
Email from School Administrator	4	14.8
Facebook Post	4	14.8
Whatsapp Message	15	55.6
Other	4	14.8

^a N = 26.

^b Reflects the number and percentage of participants answering “yes” to this question.

^c When asked to describe training, 2 participants reported training with Dr. Yocheved Debow; 1 participant reported training in an MSW program; 1 participant reported training with JOFA/Chovevei/Drisha; and 1 participant reported training in an unspecified research group.

Measures

Administrator Surveys

The Modern Orthodox Jewish high school administrator survey about sexuality education was designed to evaluate the administrators' opinions as to what components of sexuality education should be taught in modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, as well as on teacher preparation and efficacy in this area. There were no investigator hypotheses. The survey contained 13 questions, some of which only appeared after certain response inputs. The administrator survey can be found in Appendix A.

Faculty Surveys

The faculty survey was designed to evaluate faculty members' opinions as to what components of sexuality education should be addressed in modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, as well as their preparation and efficacy. Part of the faculty survey was adapted from the Professional Learning Standards for Sex Education Assessment Tool to be culturally competent, shortened for brevity, and simplified for ease of use. Colleagues of the PI with both doctoral training in psychology and knowledge of the target population were consulted in the adaptation of the survey to ensure maintenance of survey quality and to ascertain inclusion of culturally relevant topics, as well as to develop subscales of questions by topic for the purpose of statistical review. The faculty surveys contained 84 questions, some of which only appeared after certain response inputs. The faculty survey can be found in Appendix B.

Procedure

School administrators and faculty were recruited through personal and professional contacts of the investigator. The study used purposive and snowball sampling. School

administrators were both asked to participate in the study, as well as to disseminate the survey to their faculty. A consent form to participate in the study was included in both administrator and faculty survey. All participants were informed that survey responses would be recorded in aggregate form to protect respondent identity and privacy. Participants who completed the survey were eligible to win a \$100 Amazon gift card from a lottery of participants upon study completion. Participants were notified of said lottery at beginning of survey. There was a total of one gift card prize for this study.

Investigator's Background

The PI is a current sixth year student in GSAPP's School Psychology doctoral training program. Prior to attending graduate school, the PI received certification as a Yoetzet Halacha, a graduate level certification in Talmudic laws pertaining to issues of Jewish married life, including intimacy and sexuality, as well as a co-curriculum from relevant fields, such as medicine and psychology. Yoetzet Halacha certification is conferred by Nishmat, a Modern Orthodox institution of women's higher education, with American trainees certified through the Miriam Glaubach US Yoatzot Halacha Fellows Program. Certified Yoatzot Halacha serve in a variety of capacities with the Modern Orthodox community; among them, school administrators and faculty. The PI additionally served as a faculty member of a Modern Orthodox Jewish high school prior to attending GSAPP. In the position of faculty member, the PI addressed sexuality education both within classroom discussions, as well as through consultation with the school administration on their sexuality education curriculum. The PI continues to present to Modern Orthodox Jewish school students on topics related to sexuality and Jewish law. It is acknowledged that the PI may have known some of the study participants through either of these avenues. However, given the voluntary nature of participant involvement and the exploratory

nature of the interview content, the interviewer's prior relationship to any participants was not believed to be a detriment to the study.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Descriptive and inferential analyses were conducted using Qualtrics XM [July 2022] and SPSS v.28.

Administrator Survey

Administrators were asked about their attitudes toward sexuality education and whether such education is currently offered in their schools. Results of this survey are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

<i>Report by Administrators on Implementation of Sexuality Education</i>		
Question	Yes (%)	No (%)
Do you think sexuality education should be offered in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools?	28 (93.3%)	2 (6.7%)
Do you have a teacher or teachers who are designated to address sexuality education with your students, either as part of a curriculum or informally? ^a	22 (73.3%)	8 (26.7%)
Does your school provide a curriculum or handbook for addressing sexuality education? ^b	8 (26.7%)	14 (46.7%)

Note. $N = 30$.

^a The following are the breakdown of classes reported by respondents to address sexuality education: *Halacha* [Jewish law] classes (38.7%); Health classes (36.5%); Guidance (19.4%); “Other” (25.8%). All “Other” contexts described relate to a Judaic class focused on Jewish life and/or Jewish values.

^b Two types of curricula were reported to have been provided: Life Values and Intimacy Education, developed by Yocheved Debow, and “in-house” curricula developed by administrators and faculty within the school.

To further understand their responses and attitudes, administrators were also provided with space on their survey to provide further information. Administrators were asked to provide some background information to understand the decision to not address sexuality education with their students. Six participants wrote the following responses: 1) “Unsure - I’m new at the

school. I would think it's because they don't feel it's appropriate to talk about it." 2) "The school is more than 75 years old, from a time when such matters were not discussed in the curriculum at all. More recently, the guidance department realized it was necessary to provide something, but the school's culture will not allow a public school-style curriculum." 3) "Scheduling constraints." 4) "Social and emotional learning is not currently focused on in the school but hopefully this will be changed in the next two years." 5) "I do not believe all girls in the school are even close to being sexually active. Keeping sexuality as a special part of marriage is our tradition." 6) "We have a very religiously varied student body and for the majority of our students, sexuality at this point is a moot point, most don't [sic] need to discuss this until they get closer to marriage."

Finally, they were asked if they had any additional thoughts to share about this topic. Five provided relevant responses: 1) "Our school has a lot of good intention, and sexuality does get addressed within the realm of Jewish Law, and the extent to which the focus is on sexual relationships themselves depends on the teacher. In our Health class, it's mostly about STDs. I'd love to [sic] see a more robust and clearly delineated approach to addressing it with our students, within SEL and led by faculty who are comfortable with that topic." 2) "Creating more sex education in Orthodox and Modern Orthodox schools of all kinds is critical, and I hope the PI continues to work in this area." 3) "These topics [sic] must be addressed by schools - the students are being exposed to the information anyway, so it would be better if they understood the Jewish approach as well." 4) "We need to do a much better job of this!" 5) "Some schools may need sexuality as part of the curriculum but for many, it would feel unnecessary for [sic] the kids perspective."

Faculty Survey

The first set of questions of the faculty survey had to do with whether Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools in North America implement sexuality education, attitudes toward doing so, what tools schools use to assist with implementation, in what contexts sexuality education is addressed, and whether there exists a desire for additional training. Results of the faculty survey related to these questions are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

<i>Report by Faculty Members on Implementation of Sexuality Education</i>			
Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	<i>n</i>
Do you think Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools should offer sexuality education?	26 (96.3%)	1 (3.7%)	27
Do you proactively address sexuality education either informally or as part of a formal curriculum?	17 (63%) ^a	10 (37%)	27
Are questions pertaining to sexuality generated by students with whom you interact?	22 (81.5%) ^b	5 (18.5%)	27
Did the school provide you with talking points to address these questions?	6 (27.3%) ^c	16 (72.7%)	22
If you address sexuality education formally in your classes, or if you address the topic informally, were you provided a curriculum or talking points from the school?	6 (30%)	14 (70%)	20
Does the school give you general guidelines for forming your own curriculum?	3 (21.4%) ^d	11 (78.6%)	14
Would you like more training in any of these areas?	24 (88.9%)	3 (11.1%)	27

^a When asked what subjects, 11 participants provided the following individual responses: Judaic Studies, Health, Advisory, History/Civics, Biology, and Informally. The distribution of responses can be found in Appendix C.

^b When asked how they address these questions, 5.7% indicated that they refer students to another faculty member; 40% reported responding with comprehensive, factual information; 20% reported encouraging student consideration of own values related to question at hand; and 8.6% indicated they review relevant halachot.

^c Of these, the following were listed as areas outlined by schools to include: Anatomy, Gender Identity, Sexual Health and Safety, Internet Safety, Healthy Relationships, Modesty, and Masturbation.

^d The following were expanded responses on provided guidelines: expectations of faculty responses to students vary based on the subject matter; all information provided should be scientifically accurate; and all information provided should conform to halacha.

The adapted National Teacher Preparedness Survey was divided into five subscales to facilitate statistical review: Healthy Relationships, Biology, Classroom Environment, Halacha, and Sexuality-Specific Content. Each subscale utilized items indicating both “capability” as well

as “comfort” on the dimensions in question. Descriptive statistics for the subscales are provided in Table 5. Additional psychometric properties of the subscales are provided in Appendix D.

Reliability was strong for all subscales, and all skewness and kurtosis results were within acceptable limits for a normal distribution. Response rates for all individual items are provided in Appendix E.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Subscales of the Adapted National Teacher Preparedness Survey

Subscale	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	α	Skew (<i>SE</i>)	Kurtosis (<i>SE</i>)
Healthy Relationships	2.50 (0.43)	.91	-0.79 (0.45)	-0.34 (0.87)
Biology	2.44 (0.49)	.90	-0.54 (0.45)	-0.21 (0.87)
Classroom Environment	2.22 (0.48)	.91	-0.33 (0.45)	-0.92 (0.87)
Halacha	2.22 (0.57)	.96	-0.20 (0.45)	-0.58 (0.87)
Sexuality-Specific Content	2.22 (0.52)	.91	-0.56 (0.45)	-0.32 (0.87)

Note. $N = 27$. M = Mean; α = Cronbach’s alpha; SD = Standard Deviation; SE = Standard Error.

To assess whether responses on the subscales might be related to certain demographic factors, point-biserial as well as product moment correlations were run between all of the subscales and participant gender (man or woman), whether they had received any kind of training in sexuality education (yes or no) as well as total number of years serving on faculty at any school. Results are presented in Table 6. Most of these correlations were not statistically significant, with the exception of training in sexuality education which exhibited a significant, moderate negative relationship with Halacha. Similarly, most individual item correlations were not statistically significant, with the exception of a strong statistically significant positive

relationship between total years teaching and the opinion that Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools should offer sexuality education ($p = .01$). These analyses were likely underpowered due to small sample sizes. That is, the small number of participants reduced the likelihood of detecting relationships, if they truly existed.

Table 6

Pearson's r Correlation Matrix for Subscales and Demographic Factors

	Health Relationships	Biology	Classroom Environment	Halacha	Sexuality-Specific Content
Gender	.23	.21	.22	-.11	.03
Training in Sexuality Education	.18	-.21	-.22	-.42*	-.18
Total Years Teaching	-.12	-.19	.09	-.10	-.29

Note. $N = 27$

* $p < .05$

CHAPTER V

Discussion

A descriptive study of Jewish Modern Orthodox high school administrators and faculty members in North America was conducted. School administrators and faculty were recruited through personal and professional contacts of the investigator. The study used purposive and snowball sampling. School administrators were both asked to participate in the study, as well as to disseminate the survey to their faculty. A consent form to participate in the study was included in both administrator and faculty survey.

The Modern Orthodox Jewish high school administrator survey about sexuality education was designed to evaluate the administrators' opinions as to what components of sexuality education should be taught in modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, as well as on teacher preparation and efficacy in this area. There were no investigator hypotheses. The survey contained 13 questions, some of which only appeared after certain response inputs.

The faculty survey was designed to evaluate faculty members' opinions as to what components of sexuality education should be addressed in modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, as well as their preparation and efficacy. Part of the faculty survey was adapted from the Professional Learning Standards for Sex Education Assessment Tool to be culturally competent, shortened for brevity, and simplified for ease of use. Colleagues of the PI with both doctoral training in psychology and knowledge of the target population were consulted in the adaptation of the survey to ensure maintenance of survey quality and to ascertain inclusion of culturally relevant topics, as well as to develop subscales of questions by topic for the purpose of statistical review. The faculty surveys contained 84 questions, some of which only appeared after certain response inputs.

Administrator Participants

A total of 45 individuals opened the administrator survey. Of the 45 participants, 14 answered just 0-4 questions and were thus excluded from analyses. Two did not work at Modern Orthodox schools and were therefore excluded. The final sample size for administrators was 30. The sample was split between self-identified males (46.7%) and self-identified females (53.3%). Most respondents worked in co-educational schools (50%), followed by single-gender female schools (30%), and lastly single-gender male schools (20%). Most (87%) self-identified as Modern Orthodox. More than half (59.26%) indicated recruitment to the study by an email from the principal investigator.

Faculty Participants

A total of 63 participants began the faculty survey; however, many did not complete the full survey. Participants who completed less than approximately 20% of the survey were removed from analyses due to missing data. Thus, the final sample for faculty members was 27 participants. That so many individuals began the survey but did not complete it may point to the discomfort felt by faculty members regarding this topic, whether due to personal discomfort, or due to hesitation stemming from uncertainty regarding what is “allowed” to be discussed with their students. The study attracted more self-identified female respondents (59.3%) than self-identified male respondents (40.7%). Most (63%) reported working in co-educational schools, 33.3% of respondents reported worked in single-gender female schools, and just 3.7% in single-gender male schools. Overall, the respondents reported high levels of education, as 84.6% of respondents indicated a Master’s degree or higher. Most respondents (88.5%) self-identified as

Modern Orthodox. Position on school faculty were predominantly Judaic Studies faculty (51.9%), followed by General Studies faculty (29.6%), and 14.8% Guidance Department faculty. The majority of respondents (76.9%) had been working in education for over 10 years. Relatively few respondents (18.5%) had prior training in sexuality education.

Administrator Perspectives

Most administrators (93.3%) reported thinking that sexuality education should be offered in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools; however, fewer (73.3%) reported having a teacher or teachers designated to address sexuality education with their students, either as part of a curriculum or informally. Only 26.7% reported providing either a curriculum or handbook to their faculty for addressing sexuality education. Two types of curricula were reported to have been provided: Life Values and Intimacy Education, developed by Yocheved Debow, and “in-house” curricula developed by administrators and faculty within the school. The discrepancy between the administrators’ held notion that schools *should* offer sexuality education and the support given to school faculty to carry out that task is notable. When the administrators who indicated that their schools do not designate faculty members to address sexuality education were asked to give context to that decision, primarily two answers were given: it simply hadn’t yet been done (status quo); or it seemed irrelevant or inappropriate for the student body. As sexuality education encompasses a wide range of topics, it would be helpful for school administrators to differentiate which components of sexuality education seem relevant to and appropriate for their students, and which are not. The taboo nature of the overall topic of sexuality education in some institutions may prevent students from learning valuable, relevant, and appropriate information that can be found in ancillary components of sexuality education. When given the opportunity to share additional thoughts, respondents indicated that either schools need to do a better job of

addressing this topic, or that sexuality education is not needed in Modern Orthodox Jewish schools. These responses likely represent the two approaches to sexuality education in the Modern Orthodox Jewish community, which aligns with research findings conducted in other religious communities.

Faculty Perspectives

Most faculty members (96.3%) reported thinking Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools should offer sexuality education. Many (63%) shared that they proactively address sexuality education with their students, and most respondents (81.5%) reported that students generate questions relating to sexuality. Few (27.3%) indicated that they had been given talking points or a curriculum to address these questions, and of those who had not been provided a curriculum or talking points, even fewer (21.4%) were given guidelines for forming their own curriculum. Most faculty members (88.9%) indicated that they would like further training in any of the areas included in the survey. Therefore it appears there are unmet needs, as viewed by the teachers who responded to the survey.

Few statistically significant correlations were found in the data; however, the statistically significant findings provided interesting information. Training in sexuality education exhibited a significant, moderate negative relationship with Halacha. That is, those who had prior training in sexuality education indicated they were less capable and comfortable with addressing sexuality education with their students from a standpoint that is consistent with Jewish law than those who had not. Further, when faculty members were asked to indicate how they address questions related to sexuality education that are generated by their students, only 8.6% indicated that they review relevant Jewish laws. These findings may point to the need to have training in sexuality education within the context of Jewish law available for faculty members of Modern Orthodox

Jewish high schools, to allow for an integrated educational approach. The other statistically significant correlational finding showed a strong statistically significant positive relationship between total years teaching and the opinion that Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools should offer sexuality education. More specifically, teachers with more than 3 years of experience teaching indicated that they thought Modern Orthodox Jewish schools should address sexuality education. It is possible that with increased time teaching, faculty members become increasingly aware of the need for sexuality education for their students.

Limitations

As this survey utilized purposive and snowball sampling, and therefore relied on “word-of-mouth” recruitment, it is possible that the individuals who learned about this study and were inclined to complete it were those interested in and supportive of sexuality education.

Additionally, although the survey was sent to nearly all Modern Orthodox high schools in the United States via their administrators, it was sent at a time in the calendar year when tri-state and surrounding area schools were still in session, yet many schools throughout the rest of the United States had already begun the summer recess. Therefore, school faculty outside of the Northeast of the United States were likely underrepresented. Additionally, survey data relied on self-report responses, and a measure to evaluate social desirability responses was not utilized. Therefore, although there was no incentive to biased responding, it may have existed in the data. As noted earlier, the majority of respondents, both in the administrator and in the faculty surveys, worked in co-educational institutions. As co-educational schools tend to have a student body that is less traditional and less staunchly committed to Jewish legal observances, the data may overrepresent perspectives from faculty members working with that student population. Lastly, the overall

sample size of both surveys was relatively small, which may have underpowered statistical analyses.

Suggestions for Future Research

Although sexuality education in the United States has been studied extensively, and some data on the perspectives of teachers regarding sexuality education has been gathered, no academic study until the present one has examined teacher and faculty perspectives on sexuality in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools in America. Further research in this area would provide more background to help inform decision making regarding both teacher training and curriculum development. As indicated previously, it is the opinion of the investigator that due to the sensitive nature of the topic at hand, valuable, relevant educational content may be dismissed as inapplicable to students. It is possible that administrators are not familiar with the vast array of topics included under the umbrella of sexuality education. It may prove useful to provide trainings for administrators of Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools on the topic of sexuality education, in order to assist administrators in making informed decisions regarding what topics are relevant and needed for their students. This may additionally help to address the administrators who reported the reasoning for not providing sexuality education was that it had not yet been done. Training in this area could help administrators to bring more intentionality to their curricular design when it comes to the topic of sexuality education.

Additionally, there was a large discrepancy between the number of administrators who thought that schools should offer sexuality education and those whose schools offer support to school faculty to carry out that task. Faculty reported this discrepancy in almost identical numbers. Administrators may not recognize the need for support and guidance for faculty in this

area, and administrators may also not recognize the extent to which there is an implementation gap. Future studies may find it beneficial to examine why there is such a discrepancy between thinking sexuality education should happen and providing the support to implement sexuality education, in order to determine if addressing potential barriers could improve implementation.

As faculty reported wanting further training in sexuality education, the data suggest that trainings for faculty are warranted. As the data from both previous studies as well as the current one suggest that ongoing supervision and support on this topic may be beneficial for teachers, this is an additional avenue to explore.

The current study did not explicitly ask administrators who indicated they thought sexuality education should take place in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools but did not designate faculty to address the topic and/or provide a curriculum if they would be open to introducing sexuality education if provided with adequate tools, such as an agreeable curriculum and/or training and supervision for designated faculty. This would additionally be a helpful area for further research.

References

- Berman, S. (2001, February 1). *The Ideology of Modern Orthodoxy*. Sh'ma Journal: A Journal of Jewish Ideas. <http://shma.com/the-ideology-of-modern-orthodoxy/>
- Bigelow, M. A. (1916). *Sex education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Blad, E. (2014). New Teacher-Preparation Standards Target Sex Education. *Education Week*, 33(30), 14.
- Blair, K. J. (1980). *Clubwoman as feminist: True womanhood redefined: 1868-1914*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Blau, R. T. (Ed.). (2007). *Gender relationships in marriage and out*. KTAV Publishing House, Inc.
- Bleakley, A., Hennessy, M., & Fishbein, M. (2010). Predicting Preferences for Types of Sex Education in US Schools. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 7(1), 50–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-010-0008-z>
- Brown, R. (2002). Book Review: Transitions in American education: A social history of teaching. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 33, 494-496.
- Brown, J., Keller, S., & Stern, S. (2009). Sex, sexuality, sexting, and sex ed: Adolescents and the media. *Prevention Researcher*, 16(4), 12–16.

- Buhi, E. R., Daley, E. M., Fuhrmann, H. J., & Smith, S. A. (2009a). An Observational Study of How Young People Search for Online Sexual Health Information. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(2), 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480903221236>
- Burnham, J. C. (1973). The Progressive Era Revolution in American Attitudes Toward Sex. *The Journal of American History, 59*(4), 885. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1918367>
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(6), 473–490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001>
- Carter, J. (2001). Birds, bees, and venereal disease: Toward an intellectual history of sex education. *Journal of the History of Sexuality, 10*, 213-249.
- Charendoff, R. (2019). *Navigating the Laws of Shomer Negiah in a Secular World: A Qualitative Study on The Sexual Health of Modern Orthodox Jews*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. Northwestern University.
- Cutler, J. C. (1988). Venereal disease control by health departments in the past: Lessons for the present. *American Journal of Public Health, 78*, 372-376.
- Davis, R. L. (2010). *More Perfect Unions: The American Search for Marital Bliss* (1st ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Debow, Y. (2007). Of Marriage: Relationships and Relations. In R. Blau (Ed.), *Life Values and Intimacy Education: Methods and Messages* (pp. 243-291). Yeshiva University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*.

New York: The Macmillan Company.

Eleff, Z. (2016). *Modern Orthodox Judaism: A Documentary History*. The Jewish Publication Society.

Ellenwood, S. (2006). Revisiting character education: From McGuffey to narratives. *Journal of Education*, 187, 21-43.

Engel, R. (1989). *Sex education – The final plague*. Gaithersburg, MD: Human Life International.

Epstein, S. (2012, November 29). *Teaching Sex Ed to Young Modern Orthodox Women*. Jewish Women's Archive. <https://jwa.org/blog/teaching-sex-ed-to-young-modern-orthodox-women>

Fields, J. (2012). Sexuality Education in the United States: Shared Cultural Ideas across a Political Divide. *Sociology Compass*, 6(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00436.x>

Freedman, S. G. (2009, December 12). *In a Manhattan Classroom, Judaism Meets the Facts of Life*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/12/nyregion/12religion.html>

Friedman, A. P. (2022). *Marital Intimacy* (20th Anniversary Edition). Israel Bookshop Publications; 20th Anniversary Edition.

Friedman, C. (2022, February 21). *Sex Ed in Jewish High Schools*. Parsha with Chana. <https://parshawithchana.substack.com/p/sex-ed-in-jewish-high-schools?s=r>

Friedman, J. (2021, March 8). *The elephant in the room: sex education in our Jewish schools*.

Plus 61J Media. <https://plus61j.net.au/featured/elephant-room-sex-education-jewish-schools/>

Frydman, S. D. (2022). The quick shift: Orthodox Jewish women's early marital sexual experience. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2022.2027361>

Gardner, J. F. (1974). *Microbes and Morality: The Social Hygiene Crusade in New York City, 1892–1917* (Dissertation). Indiana University.

Guttmacher Institute. (2022, January 1). Sex and HIV Education. Retrieved from:

<https://www.guttmacher.org/print/state-policy/explore/sex-and-hiv-education>

Hall, S. G. (2022). *Adolescence Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology Sex, Crime, Religion and Education : Two Volumes*. D. Appleton and Company.

Hammig, B., Ogletree, R., & Wycoff-Horn, M. R. (2011a). The Relationship Between Professional Preparation and Class Structure on Health Instruction in the Secondary Classroom. *Journal of School Health*, 81(9), 513–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2011.00621.x>

Hawkins, A. J., Carroll, J. S., Doherty, W. J., & Willoughby, B. (2004). A comprehensive framework for marriage education*. *Family Relations*, 53(5), 547–558.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0197-6664.2004.00064.x>

Heller, J. R., & Johnson, H. L. (2013). Parental opinion concerning school sexuality education in a culturally diverse population in the USA. *Sex Education*, 13(5), 548–559.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2013.775063>

- Jacobs, W. J., & Wylie, W. E. (1995). Who Teaches Health Education in Texas Secondary Schools? *Journal of School Health*, 65(9), 365–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.1995.tb06234.x>
- Kahn, S. (Host). (2022, February 21). Teaching A Jewish Sexual Ethic in High School: A Panel Discussion [Audio podcast episode 100]. In *Orthodox Conundrum*. Jewish Coffee House. <https://jewishcoffeehouse.com/teaching-a-jewish-sexual-ethic-in-high-school-a-panel-discussion-100/>
- Kahn, S. (Host). (2022, March 7). The Consequences of Not Properly Teaching About Jewish Intimacy and Sex [Audio podcast episode 102]. In *Orthodox Conundrum*. Jewish Coffee House. <https://jewishcoffeehouse.com/the-consequences-of-not-properly-teaching-about-jewish-intimacy-and-sex-102/>
- Kaiser Family Foundation. (2000, September). Sex Education in America. Retrieved from: <https://www.kff.org/wp-content/uploads/2000/09/3048-sex-education-in-america-a-view-from-inside-the-nations-classrooms.pdf>
- Kantor, L., & Levitz, N. (2017). Parents' views on sex education in schools: How much do Democrats and Republicans agree? *PLOS ONE*, 12(7), e0180250. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180250>
- Komline, D. (2020). *The Common School Awakening: Religion and the Transatlantic Roots of American Public Education* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Koren, K. (Host). (2022, January 11). Not So Stranger Danger: When It's Happening In Your Own Home [Audio podcast episode 54]. In *Soul Sessions with KK*. https://open.spotify.com/episode/4ArZBeTtwG9Fu3gLsX2ZgA?si=QIxD4dYtRB-Dfl_uEj7j1Q

- Kosman, F. (2021, September 30). Frum Sex-Ed (PANEL) [Audio podcast]. In *The Franciska Show*. <https://thefranciskashow.libsyn.com/frum-sex-ed-panel>
- Kricheff, S. (2008, January 16). *Orthodox Schools Test the Waters With 'Intimacy Education' Classes*. The Forward. <http://www.forward.com/culture/12470/orthodox-schools-test-the-waters-with-intimacy-01117/#ixzz1JDseZJiE>
- Kris, M. (1953). *When children ask about sex*. New York: The Child Study Association of America.
- Lamm, N. (1986). *Faith and Doubt: Studies in Traditional Jewish Thought*. KTAV Publishing House.
- Levisohn, A. (2019). *"You Know Yourself, You're Not Gonna Do That": How Modern Orthodox Teens Learn About and Navigate Norms of Sexual Contact*. [Undergraduate Senior Thesis]. Brandeis University.
- Lichtenstein, A. (2007). Of Marriage: Relationships and Relations. In R. Blau (Ed.), *Gender Relations: In Marriage and Out* (pp. 1–34). Yeshiva University Press.
- Martin, J. (2002). *The Education of John Dewey*. Columbia University Press.
- Maryles, H. (2016, September 1). *Sex education in religious schools*. *The Jerusalem Post*. <https://www.jpost.com/blogs/emes-ve-emunah/sex-education-in-religious-schools-466557>
- Maybruch, C. (2012). Relationship Education for Modern Orthodox Jewish adolescents as a Factor of Marital Satisfaction: A Quantitative Study (Order No. 3537536). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1323562696).

- Maybruch, C., Pirutinsky, S., & Pelcovitz, D. (2014). Religious Premarital Education and Marital Quality Within the Orthodox Jewish Community. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy, 13*(4), 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332691.2014.953655>
- Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to Junior High School. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(2), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.2.247>
- Moran, J. P. (1996). 'Modernism gone mad': Sex education comes to Chicago, 1913. *Journal of American History, 83*, 481-513.
- Morrow, P.A. (1904). *Social diseases and marriage: Social prophylaxis*. New York: Lea Brothers & Co.
- National Association of Independent Schools (2017). *Sexuality Education: An Overview for Independent Schools*.
- Neem, J. N. (2017). *Democracy's Schools: The Rise of Public Education in America (How Things Worked)*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O. U. (2014, February 4). *In National Survey, OU Finds That Orthodox Jewish Marriages Are Stronger Than In Society as a Whole*. Orthodox Union.
https://www.ou.org/news/in_national_survey_ou_finds_that_orthodox_jewish_marriages_are_stronger_tha/
- Pearsall, S. M. (2001). The state of the union: Sexuality in American history. *Gender & History, 13*, 374-379.

Pestritto, R. J., & Atto, W. J. (2008). *American progressivism*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Reed, M. (2003). *Margaret Sanger: Her life in her words*. Fort Lee, NJ: Barricade.

Reisman, J. A. (2000). *Kinsey: Crimes & consequences* (2nd ed). Crestwood, KY: Institute for Media Education.

Rotskoff, L. E. (2001). Sex in the schools: Adolescence, sex education, and social reform. *Reviews in American History*, 29, 310-318.

Schwartz, R. (2019, July 31). *Straight Talk on Teen Sexuality and Halacha*. NY Jewish Week.
<https://www.jta.org/2019/07/31/ny/straight-talk-on-teen-sexuality-and-halacha>

Segal, A. (2019, June 18). *Sex, Drugs, and Orthodox Students on Campus*. NY Jewish Week.
<https://www.jta.org/2019/06/18/ny/sex-drugs-and-orthodox-students-on-campus>

Slominski, K. L. (2021). *Teaching Moral Sex: A History of Religion and Sex Education in the United States* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.

Tolson, J. (1999, December 27). Sex, pills, and women's lib. *U.S. News & World Report*, 127(25), 52-53.

Tuhus-Dubrow, R. (2007, July 30). Sanger vs. Sanger. *Nation* 285(4), 38-42.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement, State Regulation of Private Schools, Washington, D.C., 2009.

Wardell, D. (1980). Margaret Sanger: Birth control's successful revolutionary. *American Journal of Public Health, 70*, 736-742.

Waxman, C. I. (1993). Dilemmas of Modern Orthodoxy: Sociological and Philosophical. *Judaism.*

https://web.archive.org/web/20060219212642/http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0411/is_n1_v42/ai_13796421/print



Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
152 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854
848.445.6111
gsapp.rutgers.edu

Appendix A

Administrator Survey

Thank you in advance for sharing your honest thoughts and opinions.

1. Does the high school at which you work identify as a Modern Orthodox high school? (Y/N)
2. Is your school: a) co-educational; b) single gender male; c) single gender female (MC)
3. Please select your gender: a) male; b) female; c) other; d) choose not to disclose.
4. Do you personally identify as a Modern Orthodox Jewish individual? (Y/N)
 - a. If not, please describe your religious identity:
5. Do you think sexuality education should be offered in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools?
6. Do you have a teacher or teachers who are designated to address sexuality education with your students, either as part of a curriculum or informally?
 - a. If yes, in what area of study is sexuality education addressed formally?
 - i. Halacha
 - ii. Health
 - iii. Guidance
 - iv. Other (SA)
 - b. If yes, does your school provide a curriculum or handbook for addressing sexuality education? (Y/N)
 - i. If yes, which curriculum (SA)
 - c. If no, please provide some background information to help us understand this decision. (SA)
7. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share about this topic? (SA)



Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
 152 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854
 848.445.6111
gsapp.rutgers.edu

Appendix B

Faculty Survey

Thank you in advance for sharing your honest thoughts, opinions, and experiences.

- 1) Do you think Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools should offer sexuality education? (Y/N)
- 2) Do you proactively address sexuality education with students, whether informally or as part of a formal curriculum?
 - a) If yes, in which subject(s)/courses?
- 3) Are questions pertaining to sexuality generated by students with whom you interact? (Y/N)
 - i) If yes, how do you address these questions? (Checkboxes- Select all that apply)
 - (1) Respond with comprehensive factual information.
 - (2) Refer the students to another faculty member.
 - (3) Encourage student consideration of own values related to question at hand.
 - (4) Review relevant halachot.
 - (5) Redirect questions and change the subject.
 - (6) Other
 - ii) If yes, did the school provide you with talking points to address these questions? (Y/N)
- 4) If you address sexuality education formally in your classes, or if you address the topic informally, were you provided a curriculum or talking points from the school? (Y/N/NA)
 - i) If yes, please list topics the curriculum includes. (SA)
 - b) If no, does the school give you general guidelines for forming your own curriculum? (Y/N)
 - i) If yes, what are those guidelines? (SA)
 - ii) If no, what processes do you utilize to determine what should be included in the curriculum? (SA)
- 5) Do you have any general thoughts you would like to share with us about your views on teaching sexuality education in a Modern Orthodox high school? (SA)
- 6)

Please select the most accurate answers to the following: How CAPABLE are you of describing benefits of sex education for students?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing benefits of sex education for students?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat

	<input type="radio"/> Very <input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships, involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very

How COMFORTABLE are you in describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships, involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of teaching students communication skills?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in teaching students communication skills?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of defining consent?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining consent?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very

How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very

How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing pregnancy options, including parenting, adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing pregnancy options, including parenting, adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing sexually transmitted diseases and how they can and cannot be transmitted?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing sexually transmitted diseases and how they can and cannot be transmitted?	<input type="radio"/> Not At All <input type="radio"/> Somewhat <input type="radio"/> Very

- 7) Please select your gender: a) male; b) female; c) other; d) choose not to disclose.
- 8) Do you personally identify as a Modern Orthodox Jewish individual? (Y/N)
 - a) If not, please describe your religious identity:
- 9) Please select your position on school faculty
 - a) Judaic studies teacher
 - b) General studies teacher
 - c) Guidance staff
 - d) Nurse
 - e) Athletics staff
 - f) Other [SA]
- 10) How many years have you served on faculty in current school? *If you are completing survey during summer months, please indicate years of school employment as if it were during previous school year.*
 - a) 0-3 years
 - b) 4-9 years
 - c) 10+ years

- 11) How many years have you served on school faculty in total? *If you are completing survey during summer months, please indicate years of school employment as if it were during previous school year.*
- a) 0-3 years
 - b) 4-9 years
 - c) 10+ years
- 12) Did you receive training of any kind in sexuality education? (Y/N)
- a) If Yes, please describe training.
- 13) Please select your highest degree (MC)
- a) Associates
 - b) Bachelors
 - c) Masters
 - d) Doctorate
- 14) What teaching or educational certificates do you hold? (SA)
- 15) Would you like more training in any of these areas? (Y/N)

Appendix C

Descriptive Statistics – Relevant Courses Themes

Question	
Q3: In which subject(s)/courses [do you address topics related to sexuality education]?	
Themes/Subthemes	Frequency
Judaic Studies	17
Talmud/Halacha [Jewish Law]	6
Tanach [Bible]	3
Jewish Values/Identity	4
Judaic Studies Other	4
Health	4
Advisory	1
History/Civics	2
Biology	1
Informally	2

Appendix D
Psychometric Properties of Subscales

Subscale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Healthy Relationships	10	.91
Capability	5	.83
Comfort	5	.89
Halacha	12	.96
Capability	6	.92
Comfort	6	.91
Biology	8	.90
Capability	4	.83
Comfort	4	.82
Classroom Environment	14	.91
Capability	7	.82
Comfort	7	.85
Sexuality-Specific Content	12	.91
Capability	6	.83
Comfort	6	.86

Appendix E

Table E1

Response Rates by Faculty to Individual Items on the Adapted National Teacher Preparedness Survey

Question	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How CAPABLE are you of describing benefits of sex education for students?	34	1	3	2.32	0.59
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing benefits of sex education for students?	34	1	3	2.35	0.69
How CAPABLE are you of describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	35	1	3	2.63	0.65
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	34	1	3	2.62	0.60
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	34	1	3	2.15	0.74
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	34	1	3	2.21	0.73
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	34	1	3	2.18	0.72
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	34	1	3	2.24	0.70
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse?	27	1	3	2.30	0.72
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse?	27	1	3	2.00	0.62
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	27	1	4	3.48	0.70
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	27	1	3	2.48	0.58
How CAPABLE are you of actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	27	1	3	2.00	0.73
How COMFORTABLE are you in actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	27	1	3	1.93	0.78

How CAPABLE are you of tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	27	1	3	2.22	0.64
How COMFORTABLE are you in tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	27	1	3	2.30	0.67
How CAPABLE are you of describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships, involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners?	27	1	3	2.30	0.67
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships, involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners?	27	1	3	2.48	0.64
How CAPABLE are you of teaching students communication skills?	27	1	3	2.37	0.57
How COMFORTABLE are you in teaching students communication skills?	27	2	3	2.67	0.48
How CAPABLE are you of helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	27	1	3	2.41	0.57
How COMFORTABLE are you in helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	27	1	3	2.59	0.57
How CAPABLE are you of defining consent?	27	2	3	2.59	0.50
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining consent?	27	1	3	2.56	0.58
How CAPABLE are you of explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	27	1	3	2.22	0.70
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	27	1	3	2.26	0.71
How CAPABLE are you of describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	27	1	3	2.37	0.63
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	27	2	3	2.63	0.49
How CAPABLE are you of defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	27	1	3	2.19	0.74
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	27	1	3	2.15	0.77
How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	27	1	3	2.07	0.68
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	27	1	3	2.22	0.75

How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	27	1	3	1.89	0.80
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	27	1	3	1.93	0.73
How CAPABLE are you of using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	27	1	3	2.22	0.64
How COMFORTABLE are you in using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	27	1	3	2.11	0.70
How CAPABLE are you of defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	27	1	3	2.37	0.74
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	27	1	3	2.37	0.74
How CAPABLE are you of listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	27	2	3	2.52	0.51
How COMFORTABLE are you in listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	27	1	3	2.56	0.58
How CAPABLE are you of using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	27	1	3	2.52	0.64
How COMFORTABLE are you in using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	27	1	3	2.30	0.72
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	27	1	3	2.37	0.63
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	27	1	3	2.37	0.69
How CAPABLE are you of explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	27	1	3	2.44	0.64
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	27	1	3	2.44	0.64
How CAPABLE are you of explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	27	1	3	2.19	0.68
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	27	1	3	2.30	0.61
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	27	1	3	2.19	0.68
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	27	1	3	2.22	0.70

How CAPABLE are you of describing pregnancy options, including parenting, adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	27	1	3	2.19	0.62
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing pregnancy options, including parenting, adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	26	1	3	2.35	0.69
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	27	1	3	1.89	0.64
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	27	1	3	2.00	0.73
How CAPABLE are you of describing sexually transmitted diseases and how they can and cannot be transmitted?	27	1	3	1.93	0.78
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing sexually transmitted diseases and how each can and cannot be transmitted	27	1	3	2.15	0.77

Note. 1 = Not at All. 2 = Somewhat. 3 = Very. *n* = sample size; *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation.

Table E2
ORTHODOX HIGH SCHOOL SEXUALITY EDUCATION
Teacher Preparedness Percentages

	Not At All	Somewhat	Very
How CAPABLE are you of describing benefits of sex education for students?	5.9%	55.9%	38.2%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing benefits of sex education for students?	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%
How CAPABLE are you of describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	8.6%	20%	71.4%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing the importance of teachers' maintaining professional boundaries when teaching sex education?	5.9%	26.5%	67.6%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	20.6%	44.1%	35.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the roles, responsibilities, and required reporting procedures of a mandated reporter?	17.6%	44.1%	38.2%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	17.6%	47.1%	35.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the differences between positive vs. shaming approaches to teaching sex education?	14.7%	47.1%	38.2%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not	14.8%	40.7%	44.4%

limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse? How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior outside of marriage, including but not limited to masturbation, sexual contact, and intercourse?	18.5%	63%	18.5%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	3.7%	40.7%	55.6%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining Torah views on sexual behavior within marriage?	3.7%	44.4%	51.9%
How CAPABLE are you of actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	25.9%	48.1%	25.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in actively involving parents, caregivers, and other trusted adults in a sex education program?	33.3%	40.7%	25.9%
How CAPABLE are you of tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	11.1%	55.0%	33.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in tailoring lesson plans to match the age and developmental stages of students?	11.1%	48.1%	40.7%
How CAPABLE are you of describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships, involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners?	11.1%	48.1%	40.7%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing distinguishing characteristics between healthy and unhealthy relationships,	7.4%	37%	55.6%

involving family, friends, and/or romantic partners? How CAPABLE are you of teaching students communication skills?	3.7%	55.6%	40.7%
How COMFORTABLE are you in teaching students communication skills?	0%	33.3%	66.7%
How CAPABLE are you of helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	3.7%	51.9%	44.4%
How COMFORTABLE are you in helping students set and respect personal boundaries in relationships?	3.7%	33.3%	63%
How CAPABLE are you of defining consent?	0%	30.7%	59.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining consent?	3.7%	37%	59.3%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	14.8%	48.1%	37%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining bodily autonomy and how it relates to consent and sexual abuse prevention?	14.8%	44.4%	40.7%
How CAPABLE are you of describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	7.4%	48.1%	44.4%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing strategies to help students identify a trusted adult?	0%	37%	63%
How CAPABLE are you of defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	18.5%	44.4%	37%
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining and explaining the difference between sexual orientation and sexual identity?	22.2%	40.7%	37%
How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions	18.5%	55.6%	25.9%

regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint? How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding homosexuality from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	18.5%	40.7%	40.7%
How CAPABLE are you of responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	37%	37%	25.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to student questions regarding gender non-conforming identities from an Orthodox Jewish standpoint?	29.6%	48.1%	22.2%
How CAPABLE are you of using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in using language that is sensitive to students questioning their sexual orientation and sexual identity?	18.5%	51.9%	29.6%
How CAPABLE are you of defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	14.8%	33.3%	51.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in defining gender identity and sex assigned at birth?	14.8%	33.3%	51.9%
How CAPABLE are you of listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	0%	48.1%	51.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in listing physical, social, and emotional changes that occur during puberty?	3.7%	37%	59.3%
How CAPABLE are you of using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	7.4%	33.3%	59.3%

How COMFORTABLE are you in using medically accurate terms for sexual and reproductive anatomy, including all external genitals?	14.8%	40.7%	44.4%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	7.4%	48.1%	44.4%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining the function of the individual sexual and reproductive body parts and how they typically work?	11.1%	40.7%	48.1%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	7.4%	40.7%	51.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining fertilization, implantation, conception, and how pregnancy occurs?	7.4%	40.7%	51.9%
How CAPABLE are you of explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	14.8%	51.9%	33.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in explaining methods of contraception, including the latest medical advances?	7.4%	55.6%	37%
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	14.8%	51.9%	33.3%
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of using birth control?	14.8%	48.1%	37%
How CAPABLE are you of describing pregnancy options, including parenting, adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	11%	59.3%	29.6%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing pregnancy options, including parenting,	11.50%	42.3%	46.2%

adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?			
How CAPABLE are you of responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	25.9%	59.3%	14.8%
How COMFORTABLE are you in responding to questions about halachot of adoption, surrogacy, and abortion?	25.9%	48.1%	25.9%
How CAPABLE are you of describing sexually transmitted diseases and how they can and cannot be transmitted?	33.3%	40.7%	25.9%
How COMFORTABLE are you in describing sexually transmitted diseases and how they can and cannot be transmitted?	22.2%	40.7%	37%



Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
152 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854
848.445.6111
gsapp.rutgers.edu

Appendix F

Informed Consent

CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Study: Sexuality Education in Modern Orthodox Jewish High Schools

Principal Investigator: Shira Donath, Psy.M.

This online consent form is part of an informed consent process for a research study and it will provide information that will help you decide whether you want to take part in the study. It is your choice to take part or not. Ask questions if there is anything in the form that is not clear to you. If you decide to take part, instructions at the end of document will tell you what to do next. Your alternative to taking part in the research is not to take part in it.

Who is conducting this research study and what is it about?

You are being asked to take part in research conducted by Shira Donath who is a graduate student in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology. The purpose of this study is to understand Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools' administrator and faculty perspectives on and preparedness to teach sexuality education. We anticipate approximately 30 subjects will take part in the research.

What will I be asked to do if I take part?

This study involves survey-based research using Qualtrics. For school administrators, participation in the study involves one ~5 minute survey. For school faculty participation in the study involves one ~15 minute survey.

What are the risks and/or discomforts I might experience if I take part in the study?

No deception is involved, and the study involves no more than minimal risk to participants (i.e., the level of risk encountered in daily life). All responses are treated as confidential, and no identifying information will be collected as part of the survey. All data will be pooled and presented in aggregate form only. If any questions make you feel uncomfortable, you can skip those questions or withdraw from the study altogether. If you decide to quit at any time before you have finished the survey, your answers will NOT be recorded.

Are there any benefits to me if I choose to take part in this study?

Participant time and consideration in responses are greatly appreciated and will contribute to the broad understanding of sexuality education in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools. It is possible that subjects will receive no direct benefit from participation. However, participants

may personally benefit from better understanding their perspectives and sense of preparedness with regards to teaching sexuality education. Furthermore, key stakeholders of Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools, such as heads of school, teachers, parents, and students may benefit from the results of the study so as to better understand the current perceptions and experiences of administrators and faculty as a whole. Study results will be provided to participants upon request.

Will I be paid to take part in this study?

You will not be paid to take part in this study. However, each participant will be offered the opportunity to be entered in a lottery in which they have a chance to win a \$100 Amazon gift card for their participation in the study. The lottery will be conducted after all participants have completed their surveys. All participants who complete the survey will have an equal opportunity in the lottery. Winners will be contacted by secure Rutgers email if they are a lottery winner. There will be a total of one lottery prize for this study.

How will information about me be kept private or confidential?

All efforts will be made to keep your responses confidential, but total confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. We will use Qualtrics to collect and forward your anonymous responses to us. We will not receive any information that can identify you or other subjects. We will download your responses to a secure file that requires a password to access. Only study staff will have access to the password. Responses will be deleted from the file after analysis is complete and study findings are professionally presented or published. No information that can identify you will appear in any professional presentation or publication.

What will happen to information I provide in the research after the study is over?

The information collected about you for this research will not be used by or distributed to investigators for other research.

What will happen if I do not want to take part or decide later not to stay in the study?

Your participation is voluntary. If you choose to take part now, you may change your mind and withdraw later. In addition, you can choose to skip questions that you do not wish to answer. If you do not click on the 'submit' button after completing the form, your responses will not be recorded. However, once you click the 'submit' button at the end of the form, your responses cannot be withdrawn as we will not know which ones yours are.

Who can I call if I have questions?

If you have questions about taking part in this study, you can contact:

Principal Investigator:

Ms. Shira Donath, Rutgers University
Graduate School of Applied & Professional Psychology
314-780-7954 (P)
sdd121@gsapp.rutgers.edu

Dissertation Faculty Advisor:

Dr. Kenneth Schneider, Rutgers University
Graduate School of Applied & Professional Psychology

(732) 445-2000 X106 (P)
schneid@gsapp.rutgers.edu

If you have questions, concerns, problems, information or input about the research or would like to know your rights as a research subject, you can contact the Rutgers IRB or the Rutgers Human Subjects Protection Program via phone at (973) 972-3608 or (732) 235-2866 or (732) 235-9806 OR via email irboffice@research.rutgers.edu, or you can write us at 335 George Street, Liberty Plaza Suite 3200, New Brunswick, NJ 08901.

Please print out this consent form if you would like a copy of it for your files.

If you do not wish to take part in the research, close this website address. If you wish take part in the research, follow the directions below:

By beginning this survey, I acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older and have read and understand the information. I agree to take part in the research, with the knowledge that I am free to withdraw my participation in the research without penalty. Below you may begin the survey.



Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
152 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854
848.445.6111
gsapp.rutgers.edu

APPENDIX G

Recruitment Materials

Email to School Administrators:

Dear [Insert Name of Administrator],

I hope this email finds you well. I am currently a 5th year doctoral student at Rutgers University's Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology. My dissertation is focused on studying sexuality education in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools. As part of my dissertation, I have developed school administrator and faculty surveys to better understand administrator and school faculty perspectives on and preparedness to address sexuality education with their students.

To complete the 5 minute survey for school administrators, please [click here](#). Additionally, if you could please forward the following survey to your school faculty, I would so appreciate it. (Link [here](#).) The faculty survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. All participants who complete the survey will be offered the opportunity to enter a lottery for a \$100 Amazon gift card. No identifying information will be collected through the survey, and all data is collected in aggregate form to protect the identity of respondents.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

All the best,

Shira Donath, Psy.M.

WhatsApp Message:

My name is Shira Donath and I am currently a 5th year doctoral student at Rutgers University's Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology. My dissertation is focused on studying sexuality education in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools. As part of my dissertation, I have developed school administrator and faculty surveys to better understand administrator and school faculty perspectives on and preparedness to address sexuality education with their students. If you are an administrator in a Modern Orthodox Jewish high school in the USA, please [click here](#) to complete a survey. If you are a faculty member in a Modern Orthodox

Jewish high school in the USA, please [click here](#) to complete a survey. All participants who complete the survey will be offered the opportunity to enter a lottery for a \$100 Amazon gift card. No identifying information will be collected through the survey, and all data is collected in aggregate form to protect the identity of respondents. Feel free to reach out if you have any questions: sdd121@gsapp.rutgers.edu. Please forward this message to anyone to whom this is relevant. Thank you!

Facebook Post:

Calling all Modern Orthodox Jewish high school administrators and faculty members! I am conducting a research study on sexuality education in Modern Orthodox Jewish high schools through Rutgers University's Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology. As part of my dissertation, I have developed school administrator and faculty surveys to better understand administrator and school faculty perspectives on and preparedness to address sexuality education with their students. If you are an administrator in a Modern Orthodox Jewish high school in the USA, please [click here](#) to complete a survey. If you are a faculty member in a Modern Orthodox Jewish high school in the USA, please [click here](#) to complete a survey. More information can be found in the links. Please forward this message to anyone to whom this is relevant and feel free to reach out with any questions. Thank you!