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**Abstract** (200-250 words)

Introduction, Methods, Results & Conclusions.

Strongly grounded in theory and have a clear developmental focus. We are particularly interested in research focusing on less studied populations or that examine contextual variation in developmental processes. In addition to empirical research articles, JoA also publishes systematic Review Articles and papers that focus on areas of methodological import. (50 words).

Introduction: In recent years, there has been a growing awareness of the exacerbation of the risks to teenagers who live in closed religious communities and especially among Israeli Ultra-Orthodox (Haredi) Jewish communities. The purpose of this study is to identify unique risk factors of Ultra-Orthodox adolescents and prediction risk behaviors among these adolescents. In order to identify in advance situations and populations at risk and to focus the activity in the area of ​​prevention and intervention in this area.

Methods: The study involved 333 Ultra-Orthodox adolescents at-risk (53% male, 47% female) aged 13-18 living in three localities with a large Ultra-Orthodox population. Most of the adolescents had dropped out of their educational framework or were in the process of doing so or being moved to alternative settings. 15% of them dropped out of the educational system completely. Data collection was conducted between March and June 2021 by Ultra-Orthodox staff, using “snowball method”.

Results: The regression analysis indicated that the traditional risk factors, specifically having friends who do drugs, being a boy, and having a history of sexual trauma explaining the phenomenon. Adding the unique risk factors in closed religious communities in the second step of the analysis significantly added being of a new religious family and difficulties in managing religious demands at school were significantly associated with more risk behaviors beyond the contribution of traditional risk factors. Sexual trauma and friends doing drugs were identified as risk factors especially among girls.

The findings provide social work and education professionals with greater insight for interventions, helping them to focus their work and encounter disengagement in its early stages both in the community and outside professionals.
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**Introduction**

The Introduction should provide a clear statement of the paper’s goal and a strong grounding in the literature, including all key constructs. It is important that the introduction clearly frames the study in a developmental framework. (36 words)

Considerable professional and academic literature examines the factors contributing to the phenomenon of at-risk youth (Belfield and Levin 2007; Brekke 2014; Chen, 2018; Etzion & Romi, 2015; Rumberger and Lim 2008), particularly at-risk youth in minority groups (Marks, Woolverton & García, 2020; Neblett Jr, Rivas‐Drake & Umaña‐Taylor, 2012), and explores possible strategies for addressing it (Case, 2017; De Vries, Hoeve, Assink, Stams & Asscher, 2015; Gazit & Perry-Hazan, 2020; Lifshitz, 2017). Studies in this field emphasize the social and developmental context in which minority youths grow up, including school, family and community as likely to increase or mitigate the risk (Juarez et al., 2006; Marks, Woolverton & García, 2020; Makarova & Birman, 2015).

Recent years have witnessed growing awareness of the heightened risks adolescents living in religious minority groups and the need to relate to the cultural and religious context in the provision of the service (Itzhaki, Itzhaky & Yablon, 2018a; Kali & Romi, 2021; Ubani et al., 2020; Unger, 2006). Closed religious communities (CRC) characterized as "collective societies", distinguished from "individualistic societies" by the relationships between the individual and the group. "Collective societies" characterized by high level of cohesion and support. Group members are expected to conformity to the societal norms, placing the group needs above their personal needs and perceived themselves first as a group member and secondly as an individual (Hofstede, 1980; Kali & Romi, 2021; Itzhaki et al., 2018b). The process of identity formation which is a major developmental task for adolescents (Erikson, 1968) is deferent and the individual youth is expected to accept the collective identity. Kuusisto (2010, 2011) reported about the tension between expectation and norms of the CRC and the culture of the wider secular society. Typically, exposure to modern Western lifestyles has been a major concern in these CRC. In Israel there is an increase concern of at-risk youth in the ultra-Orthodox (Haredi) community. The lack of skills and knowledge community members receive to cope with the outside secular world and the gradual disengagement from family and community support circles create risks for ultra-Orthodox (UO) youth, and challenges for them, their parents, and their service providers (Keli et al., 2019; Itzhaki et al., 2018b; Itzhaki-Braun, 2021; Itzhaki-Braun & Yablon, 2022; Nadan et al., 2019). Professionals concern that they may not provide the appropriate service, according to culture or social norms, to this population (Juarez et al., 2006; Marks et al., 2020; Seider & Graves, 2020).

**Youths from the UO Jewish Minority Community in Israel**

The UO community in Israel accounts for about 13% of the Israeli population (Cahaner & Malach, 2021), and at least 17% of the adolescents in this sector are known by the authorities as being 'at-risk' situation (Blass, 2015). Families in this highly religious community are typically large, patriarchal and authoritarian (Lahav, 2015). This community, generally comprised of large households (average: seven children per family) is among the poorest in Israel, with approximately half its members (44%) living below the poverty line (CBS, 2021). Individuals from this community separate/distinguish themselves from secular society in a variety of ways: by living in closed or separate neighbourhoods, maintaining separate education system, by having clearly defined dress codes for men and women, and by maintaining a rigid observance of Jewish law in their personal and social lives (Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani-Aidan, 2020).

Vast differences exist between CRC’ educational frameworks and the outside world’s norms and values. UO educational frameworks strongly emphasize proper religious behavior, such as wearing modest clothing and intensive religious studies (Cahaner, 2020; Malchi, 2020). Students encountering difficulties adjusting to these standards can potentially drop out of this demanding educational environment. Such students are eventually integrated into alternative community educational-therapeutic frameworks or find themselves without any formal educational framework (Chernovitsky & Feldman, 2018; Kali & Romi, 2021; Palay, 2021). This process of dropping out often accompanied by a process of gradual disengagement from the UO community and their connections with their parents (Elfassi et al., 2016; Itzhaki et al., 2018b; Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani-Aidan, 2021) and can also be a precipitating factor for involvement in risk behaviors, including drug and alcohol use, criminal activity, and sexual encounters potentially vulnerable to abuse.

There is no flexibility in the family and community expectations of behaviors in other social arenas, such as dating and exposure to non-religious media. Adolescents who fail to conform face blame, rejection, and exclusion from family and community (Kali & Romi, 2021). Facing constant expansion of the phenomenon of at-risk UO youth, the community’s leadership has recently become increasingly/gradually willing to receive assistance from non-community professionals (Malchi, 2020; Weissblai, 2019).

Few studies were conducted among at-risk OU youths over the last decade due to the closure of the community to researchers and professionals external to the community. Most of them focused on boys/male adolescents (Itzhaki et al., 2018a; 2018b; Itzhaki-Braun et al., 2020; Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani, 2020; Lifshitz, 2017), or were qualitative (Kali et al., 2019; Kali & Romi, 2021; Malchi, 2020; Nadan et al., 2019; Saban, 2020). The current study analyzes this issue quantitively and refers to gender differences.

***Research Goal*** not sure where is the right place for this paragraph.

This current study focuses on at-risk youth from the UO community in Israel. We examine, first – the extent to which the factors contributing to risk behaviors among adolescents that previously identified in the professional literature for the general population are also contribute to risk behaviors among adolescents in this unique community; And second, whether there are additional unique factors to the risk behaviors of these adolescents, arising from the socio-cultural context of this community, which may add an explanation to the risk behaviors among this group. We will examine gender differences in this area.

**Theoretical framework: the ecological theory, social capital, and culture**

The study is based on three main theoretical approaches – the ecological theory, the social capital concept, and the cultural context:

1. The ecological perspective characterizes the interdependence of the individual, family, educational institutions, and the community/society systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1989; Hawkins et all., 1992; Chen, 2018).
2. "Social capital" (Bourdieu, 1977; Colman, 1988; Putnam, 2001) refers to the actual or potential resources that an individual can access within a specific community. Having social capital can provide access to a group collective resource (Bourdieu, 1984; Kali & Romi, 2021). Social capital also refers to the assets one obtains through an exchange of resources, following the connections the individual makes with other people and with social networks (Colman, 1988; Itzhaki et al., 2018a).
3. The cultural context provides a more holistic perspective of process and relationships within the context of the community beliefs, values and norms (Veeran & Morgan, 2009).

Investment in identifying risk factors based on these three theoretical approaches is intended to enable early identification of at-risk UO youth and for preparation of intervention programs that are suitable for the characteristics and needs of this population (Resnick & Burt, 1992; Chen, 2018).

**Factors contributing to risk behaviors**

Risk behaviors are considered to be significant negative behaviors that threaten adolescent health and express negative adjustment to educational settings or to the society norms (DiClemente & Wingood, 2000; Erickson, Patterson, Wall, & Neumark-Sztainer, 2005; Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani-Aidan, 2021). Risk behavior among youth includes behaviors such as: smoking, alcohol use, truancy, school drop-out, interpersonal violence, marijuana use, carrying a weapon, and risky sexual behavior (Scott, Munson, McMillen, & Ollie, 2006; Sinha, Cnaan, &Gelles, 2007). These behaviours pose a significant danger and a threat to adolescents' further psycho-social development (Melkman, 2015). These adolescents experience gradually a process of disconnectedness from society, and their alienation is associated with behavioral-social symptoms, such as dropping out from educational frameworks, delinquency, and drug abuse (Grupper & Romi,2014; Kali & Romi, 2021).

Risk factors are variables or situations that exist in the youth's environment that increase the likelihood/possibility of negatively influencing the youth's development or behavior (Chen, 2018). Based on Bronfenbrenner's theoretical framework (1989) several variables have been identified that affect youth risk behaviors, at the level of the individual, family, school framework, peer group and community. A significant part of the variables that appear in the literature were examined in our study as variables that contribute to the risk behavior of UO youth.

At the individual level, the individual's personal and emotional characteristics are an important resource for coping with risky situations. Impulsivity and emotional state (Juarez et al., 2006) and ADHD (Budman & Maeir, 2022; Resnick, 2000) as well as exposure to extreme situations, such as sexual harassment (Marks et al., 2020) found as contribute to risk behaviors. In the current work, we examined the emotional difficulties, ADHD, and exposure to sexual harassment to the risky behaviors of the youth.

At the family level, parents have a pivotal role in amplifying or reducing the adolescent's exposure to risky situations. The relationship of youth with their parents has a significant contribution to involvement in risky behaviors. Several factors have been identified as contributing to risk behavior, including parental neglect and loose supervision, low parental involvement in school and conflicts between parents (Morley, et al., 2000) and parental expectations and conditional negative regard to adjustment (Juarez et al., 2006; Itzhaki-Braun et al., 2020) as contributors to risk behaviors. Alongside, parental support is a significant resource in coping with difficult situations (Motti-Stefanidi & Masten, 2017; Marks et al., 2020). Family resources and status were found to contribute to risk among religious minority groups - since the family is a new family in the community and the existence of another dropout in the family increases the risk (Ben Yair & Rosenal, 2014). At the same time, living with parents (Clubb et al., 2001) and a close relationship with parents contributed to reducing the risk among youth from religious minority groups (Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani-Aidan, 2021). In our study we examined loose parental supervision, low involvement in school, being the family new in the religious community and the existence of a sibling dropping out of school as contributors to the risk behaviors of UO youth.

At the level of the school system, a setting in which the youth spend a significant part of their time and the experiences there are of great significance to their personal development, variables of low academic achievement and early school dropout (Brooks, 2006) have been identified as contributors to the risk. The risk is also increased by unfair treatment and demands from school staff (Marks et al., 2020). On the other hand, the existence of a supportive significant adult has been identified as a factor that reduces the risk (Wright & Masten, 2015).

In the context of the peer group, variables of friends involved in maladaptive behavior have been identified as risk factor (Duncan & Raudenbush, 2001). The contribution of these four variables to risk behaviors of UO youth was also examined in the current study.

At the community level, community resources and the degree of cohesion in it are perceived as increasing or mitigating risk behaviors of the adolescent growing up in it (Chinman et al., 2005). So is the location in a distressed neighborhood as well as the existence of depriving social structures (Duncan & Raudenbush, 2001). Alongside this, religious belief or Involvement in community religious activities have been identified as a risk-reducing factor (Butler-Barnes, 2017; Cattelino et al., 2014; Clubb et al., 2001; Kyle, 2013; Sinha et al., 2007), and the same applies to a sense of community cohesion and belonging to the community (Clubb et al., 2001 ; Elfassi et al., 2016; Itzhaki-Braun & Sulimani-Aidan, 2021; Klonover et al., 2022; Saarelainen, 2018) among youth who belong to religious communities. Kali & Romi (2021) point to the process of social reevaluation of the individual and the family social capital, following changes in the adolescent behavior as a possible mechanism for marginalization of at-risk youth in CRC. In the present study, the strength of religious belief and its contribution to risk behaviors of the youth in the study were examined.

**Material and Methods**

***Methods***

Methods must provide a clear description of recruitment, sampling methods, and final sample, including the year(s) and country of data collection. All measures must be fully described and cited appropriately, including appropriate descriptive statistics. Methods for handling missing data (at the measure and analysis level) should be described.  A statement of compliance with ethical guidelines and review must be included. (60 words)

*Population*. The study involved 333 at-risk UO adolescents (53% male, 47% female) aged 13–18 living in three localities with large UO populations in Israel. The adolescents had dropped out of their educational framework (73%) or were in the process of doing so, or being moved to alternative frameworks (43%); 15% had left the educational system completely. Most participants (77%) lived with their parents. The adolescents grew up in families with relatively unusual characteristics for the UO community: a majority (68%) grew up in newly religious families (15% among the general UO population), and 26% had divorced parents (20% among the general OU population). A significant proportion of participants have siblings studying in non-UO institutions (43%) or siblings who dropped out of the educational framework (33%).

*Procedures.* Data was collected between March and June 2021 by UO staff using the “snowball method". Student participants were recruited through staff in alternative educational-therapeutic frameworks for at-risk UO youth and local UO street counselors. Parental consent was obtained before questionnaires were given to the adolescents who expressed interest in participating in the study. The procedure and the questionnaire were ethically improved by the Legal Advisor of the Ministry of Education.

*Instruments.* Data was gathered on several key factors – socio-demographic characteristics of the youth and their families, the connections between the youths and their parents, dimensions of integration in educational frameworks, and at-risk youth behaviors in general and in the UO community context.

1. *Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants and their families.* The socio-demographics characteristic of the adolescent and their family questionnaire included questions, such as age, gender, country of birth, place of residence, definition of parents' religiosity, whether the parents are new religious family, parents' marital status (married / unmarried), number of siblings, place of residence (in the parents' house / not in the parents' house), did one of the siblings drop out of school. Based on the CBS 2020 social survey questionnaire (CBS, 2020).
2. *Parents' involvement in their children's lives.* Two questions were asked: whether their parents know where they spend the afternoons and whether they know what is happening at school, based on the questionnaire developed by Friedman and Fischer (2003).
3. *School integration*. Several questions were included regarding encountering difficulties in integrating into school framework, including number of schools they attend elementary school, number of schools they attend high school, is the respondent currently studying in any educational setting, been diagnosed with ADHD, the difficulties in the last school: in managing discipline at school, in getting along with religious requirements, with other students, is there someone from school staff to turn to when help is needed; difficulties during the last year: educational difficulties, social difficulties and emotional difficulties, based on questionnaires for identifying risk factors for at-risk youth (Lifshitz, 2017) and the School Climate Questionnaire for Students of the National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education (NAMEE, 2018), adapted to the specific characteristics and needs of the UO community.
4. *Risk behaviors.* The questionnaire includes eight questions on - returning home late, involvement in fights, drinking alcohol, smoking cigarettes, drug consumption, do friends of the respondent use drugs, did the respondent was arrested by the police, and did he have a meeting with a probation officer, based on the HBSC questionnaire (Harel-Fisch et al., 2019). Additional question was taken from this questionnaire, whether the respondent been sexually assaulted.
5. *Maintaining a religious lifestyle*: Two questions were asked: is the Internet used? And how would the respondent define his religious situation, based on the CBS 2020 social survey questionnaire, (CBS, 2020).

*Data Analysis*. Overall, 7.37% of the data were missing. Little’s Missing Completely At Random (MCAR; 1988) was performed to analyze the pattern of missingness, which revealed that the data were not MCAR, χ2(1) = 9.81, p = .002. Using the missing\_compare function of the finalfit R package, we explored the pattern of missing data between participants with and without data on the three primary outcome measures ¬– dropped out of school (yes, no), emotional difficulties, and the number of risk behaviors. Out of the 57 comparisons we performed, only two significant patterns were detected: participants with missing data on the “dropped out of school” measure were more likely boys than girls, p = .012, and participants with missing data on the emotional risk measure were less likely to endorse ADHD, p = .004. Given the pattern of missing data, we employed the Multiple Imputation (Rubin, 2009) procedure to handle missing data via the mice R package (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2010). In multiple imputations, missing data are imputed to create 50 complete datasets, analyses are performed on each dataset, and a pooled result is reported such that analyses comprised data on all cases (i.e., n = 333). The algorithm used to predict missing data in binary measures was logistic regression following a preprocessing lasso variable selection step, and for ordinal and/or quantitative measures, we used random forest estimation.

Next, we examined the presence of multivariate outliers by the Minimum Covariance Determinant approach using the Routliers R package. We detected 39 multivariate outliers. Hence, robust analyses were selected to avoid biasing models’ results. Specifically, to predict the likelihood of dropping out of school (yes, no), we conducted a hierarchical robust logistic regression using the glmrob function of robustbase R package, with Huber-type robust estimators; to predict the number of risk behaviors (0 thru 8 problems) we conducted a hierarchical robust negative binominal regression (an analysis best fitted for count data with negative binominal distribution) using the robmixglm R package and nbinom family. In the first step of these analyses, we introduced measures that were highlighted as potential risk factors for at-risk youth: parental family status (married, unmarried), whether parents know where the adolescent hangs out, whether parents are involved in what happens at school, living with parents (yes, no), sibling/s dropped out of school (yes, no), switched elementary school (yes, no), switched junior high school (yes, no), academic difficulties, having someone (adult) to turn to at school, friends who do drugs (yes, no), gender (boys, girls), ADHD (yes, no), sexual trauma (yes, no) and severity of emotional difficulties. In the second step of the analyses, we added measures that might serve as unique risk factors in CRC: being a new religious family (yes, no), difficulties managing religious demands at school, fragile faith, and Internet exposure (yes, no). In the third and final step of the analyses, we added the 2-way interactions between gender and all other variables. To facilitate interpretation and avoid multicollinearity, quantitative measures were centered around their grand mean and dichotomous measures as 0.5 and -0.5 (i.e., effect coded with a 1-point difference between values). Interaction terms that still cause multicollinearity were excluded from the analyses; significant interactions were probed by simple slopes test using the interactions R package.

**Results**

Results should reflect the problem statement in the Introduction, use the same names for constructs used in the Methods section, accurately describe the analytic techniques used, and refer to clearly tabled results and/or figures.  Please table descriptions of complex multivariable analyses rather than reporting them in the text.  Per APA guidelines, effect sizes should be reported whenever possible.(58 words)

**Predicting the number of risk behaviors**

Results are presented in Table 1. The analysis indicated that the traditional risk factors explained 22.36% of the variance. Specifically, having friends who do drugs, being a boy, and having a history of sexual trauma were all significantly and uniquely linked with more risk behaviors. Two marginally significant results also emerged, indicating that switching junior high school and having parents that do not know where the adolescent hangs out are associated with more risk behaviors. Adding the unique risk factors in CRC in the second step of the analysis significantly added 4% to the explained variance of risk behaviors, *Δχ2*(4) = 17.33, *p* = 0.0017. The analysis revealed that being of a new religious family and difficulties in managing religious demands at school were significantly associated with more risk behaviors above and beyond the contribution of traditional risk factors.

Table 1 insert here (460 words)

On top of that, the model revealed two significant interactions with participants’ gender: friends who do drugs × gender, and sexual trauma × gender. As portrayed in Figure 1, for girls but not for boys, exposure to friends who do drugs (*b* = 0.89, *z* = 4.24, *p* = 0.00002) and/or sexual trauma (*b* = 0.66, *z* = 4.45, *p* < 0.00001) significantly increases the number of risk behaviors (*b* = 0.22, *z* = 1.65, *p* = 0.099; *b* = 0.08, *z* = 0.77, *p* = 0.441, respectively, for boys). Overall, the model explained 32.58% of the variance.

Figure 1 insert here

**Discussion and Conclusions**

Discussion of the results should clearly reflect back on the literature cited in the introduction, draw a clear conclusion, and suggest future areas of research.  Limitations of the current work should be clearly and succinctly described. (36 words)

In our study we examine several variables contribute to risk behaviors among at-risk UO youth, understanding that the context of living in a CRC may be unique. The findings indicate that a significant part of the phenomenon was indeed contributed by factors out of the special context of the UO community - newly religious family (Ben Yair & Rosenal, 2014), cannot manage religious demands at school and having fragile religious faith – factors that identified as contributing to risk among CRC. These three factors are related to three central cycles of the UO youth at risk, the family, the educational framework, and the individual:

*Teenagers in newly religious families* - the resource of parents, as "newly religious" parents, who joined the community at a later stage of their lives is a complicated. Parents are in a situation of "immigration" to a new cultural community. They are not familiar enough with the education system and usually do not have a high-level religious education to be familiar and involved in their children's religious studies (Assari & Caldweel, 2019; Kaplan, 2007). They are not familiar enough with the nuances between different types of schools to adapt to the characteristics of their children. Furthermore, the family sometimes disconnects herself from the old social ties but has not yet create new social support networks within the new community (Kaplan, 200). Without this resource, the family is cut off from information that may help deal with the difficulties that their children encounter. The UO community's dual attitude towards newly religious families – on one hand, there is an attempt to bring more members to the community and on the other, the fear or lack of appreciation of the new comers to community, also makes it difficult for these families, and sometimes it adopts stricter and more demanding religious behavioral standards in its way of life, in order to regain its social status and confirm that indeed the family cut herself off from her past. This strict attitude also makes it difficult for their children who were not always partners in making the decision to move to the UO community (Kaplan, 2007; Saban, 2020).

*Ultra-orthodox schools' strict requirements* – UO schools have strict requirements both in clothing, daily behavior and religious behavior (Cahaner, 2020; Malchi, 2020). Students who find it difficult to meet these requirements are removed from school (Chernovitsky & Feldman, 2018; Kali & Romi, 2021; Palay, 2021). Beyond the fear that their behavior will affect other students, one of the main reasons is the lack of tools among the UO schools' staff and a cohesive educational approach regarding the ways of dealing with teenagers who do not meet the behavioral requirements of the educational frameworks which are not removal from the framework (Budman & Maeir, 2022) Finkelman, 2011; Itking-Ofer, 2011; Lifshitz, 2017).

*Fragile religious faith* - The tendency of UO schools to expel students who deviate from the behavior appropriate to the religious framework is also one of the explanations for more dropping out among teenagers with fragile religious faith. The loosening of faith damages the sense of belonging to the community, and the community systems alienates the youth - the community education frameworks and the family that is afraid of eroding its position in the community (Kali & Romi, 2021(.

Alongside this, the findings point at a considerable part of the phenomenon examined – risk behaviors among UO at-risk youth - is explained by variables that were previously identified in the professional literature – being a boy, moving from junior high school, and experiencing sexual trauma and friends do drugs – the last two exist especially among girls. However, these variables take on a special meaning in the context of the UO community.

*Boys in the UO community* - face more demands, both in the religious field (observing "mitzvot"), and at an early stage they go to boarding schools. In addition, in the UO education system for boys, mainly teachers with high religious knowledge are employed, but these teachers are usually not skilled in dealing with behavioral or emotional problems and lack appropriate professional training (Finkelman, 2011; Itking-Ofer, 2011; Lifshitz, 2017). The main dropouts among UO boys occur at two key junctures: during the transition between schools at the end of the 8th grade, due to the difficulty of finding a suitable setting, and in the months following the transition, due to academic and behavioral-religious adjustment difficulties in a new demanding setting that does not fit the unique characteristics or needs of the boy. The departure of one setting due to a difficulty (educational, behavioral, social or religious) of the boy, since his parents usually do not have the guidance and knowledge where to find suitable educational framework, accompanied by the continuation of transitions between several frameworks (Palay, 2021).

*UO at-risk Girls* - One of the worrisome findings in the study is regarding the girls and their unique difficulties. Two unique risk factors were identified - the experience of sexual trauma and having friends who smoke drugs. It is noted that the risk processes are especially accelerated among UO girls and the process of their rehabilitation in the community is more challenging compared to boys due to the damage to the good name in the community (Kali et al., 2019). Studies among girls are more limited, but it appears that the tight social supervision in the area of ​​modesty leads to the quick labeling of girls as "deviants" from the behavioral norms accepted in the community and they quickly reach the state of exclusion accompanied by self-punishment feelings, guilt and shame.

*The experience of sexual trauma* *among OU girls* is accompanied by the silencing of sexual abuse in UO society. The difficulty of revealing sexual abuse in UO society is particularly complex due to the tendency not to expose problems within society/family and the fear of harming the girl's future and the family's good name, which may result in difficulties in the integration of the family into prestigious educational institutions and damage to the quality of the children's matchmaking. This silencing often leads to lack of treatment and the accompanying by emotional difficulties among the girl that may worsen her situation and lead to behavioral and emotional deterioration, dropping out of school and risky behaviors (Saban, 2020).

One of the questions is what can be recommended to the educational teams in the community's schools without harming community values? The findings offer social work and educational professionals greater insights about emphases and needs within the OU community. In recent years there are initial steps, (which should be expanded and professionalized) both in fields of prevention and treatment by community professionals and associations. There is a need to expand the awareness and sensitivity of the educational teams at schools, and to formulate an orderly attitude regarding the appropriate way of handling students who do not cope well with the strict requirements of the OU schools. Along with this, it is important to expand the professional tools available to the educational teams to deal with emotional and behavioral difficulties within schools and in the public non-UO social and educational systems.

איך מצטטים מקור בעברית בטקסט באנגלית

**References**

Assari, S., & Caldwell, C. H. (2019). Parental educational attainment differentially boosts school performance of American adolescents: Minorities’ diminished returns. *Journal of family & reproductive health, 13*(1), 7-13.

Belfield, C., & Levin, H. M. (Eds.). (2007). *The price we pay: Economic and social consequences of inadequate education.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Ben Yair, Y., & Rosenal, N. (2014). Immigrants in their country: ultra-orthodox youth in situations of risk and social disconnection. *Society and Welfare 34*, 51 – 71.

Blass, N. (2015). Inequality in the education system: Who opposes it and who benefits from it?. *State of the nation report: Society, economy and policy in Israel*, 497-539.‏

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Harvard

University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social science information, 16*(6), 645-668.‏

Brekke, I. (2014). Long-term labour market consequences of dropping out of upper secondary school Minority disadvantages. *Acta Sociologica, 57*(1), 25–39. doi:10.1177/0001699313495056.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. *Annals of Child Development,*

*6*,187–249.

Brooks, J.E. (2006). Strengthening resilience in children and youths: Maximizing

opportunities in the schools. *Children and Schools, 28*, 69–76.

Budman, J., & Maeir, A. (2022). Mothering a Child with ADHD in the Ultra-Orthodox Community*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(21), 14483-14502.

Butler-Barnes, S. T., Martin, P. P., & Boyd, D. T. (2017). African American adolescents’ psychological well-being: The impact of parents’ religious socialization on adolescents’ religiosity. *Race and Social Problems, 9*(2), 115-126.‏

Buuren, S. v., & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2010). mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in R. *Journal of statistical software*, 1-68.

Cahaner, L. (2020). *Ultra-Orthodox society on the axis between conservatism and modernity.*The Israel Democracy Institute.

Cahaner, L. & Malach, G. (2021). *Statistical Report on Ultra-Orthodox Society in Israel 2021*. The Israel Democracy Institute.

Case, A. D. (2017). A critical-positive youth development model for intervening with minority youth at risk for delinquency. *American journal of orthopsychiatry, 87*(5), 510-519.‏ <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000273>

Cattelino, E., Glowacz, F., Born, M., Testa, S., Bina, M., & Calandri, E. (2014). Adolescent risk behaviours and protective factors against peer influence. *Journal of Adolescence, 37*(8), 1353-1362.‏

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2020). *The social survey questionnaire*.

Chen, G. (2018). Youth at-risk: Research, prevention, and implementation. *Israeli Criminology, 7*, 53–78.

Chernovitsky, M. & Feldman, D. (2018). *The backyard of education in Israel*. *The Ultra-Orthodox education system. Situation and policy recommendations*. The Berl Katzenelson Foundation and Partnership for the Future of Israel.

Chinman, M., Hannah, G., Wandersman, A., Ebener, P., Hunter, S. B., Imm, P., & Sheldon, J. (2005). Developing a community science research agenda for building community capacity for effective preventive interventions. *American journal of community psychology, 35*(3-4), 143-157.‏

Clubb, P. A., Browne, D. C., Humphrey, A. D., Schoenbach, V., Meyer, B., Jackson, M., & RSVPP Steering Committee. (2001). Violent behaviors in early adolescent minority youth: results from a “middle school youth risk behavior survey”. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 5*(4), 225-235.‏

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 95–121. doi: 10.1086/228943

De Vries, S. L., Hoeve, M., Assink, M., Stams, G. J. J., & Asscher, J. J. (2015). Practitioner review: effective ingredients of prevention programs for youth at risk of persistent juvenile delinquency–recommendations for clinical practice. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 56*(2), 108–121.

Duncan, G.J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (2001). Neighborhoods and adolescent development:

How can we determine the links? In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Does it take a*

*village?* (pp. 105 –136). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Elfassi, Y., Braun‐Lewensohn, O., Krumer‐Nevo, M., & Sagy, S. (2016). Community sense of coherence among adolescents as related to their involvement in risk behaviors. *Journal of Community Psychology, 44*(1), 22-37.‏

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. Norton.

Etzion, D., & Romi, S. (2015). Typology of youth at risk. *Children and Youth Services Review, 59*, 184–195.

Finkelman, Y. (2011). Ultra‑Orthodox/Haredi Education. In: .*International Handbook of Jewish Education:* (pp. 1063–1080). *Springer.*

Friedman, Y. and Fischer Y. (2003). *The parents and the school: attitudes and level of involvement*. Henrietta Szold Institute.

Harel-Fisch, Y., Steinmetz, N., Tessler, R., Maor, R., Buniel-Nissim, M. and Walsh, S. (2019). *Health behaviors in school-aged children (HBSC). A world health organization (WHO) cross-national study*. Bar-Ilan University & The Ministry of Interior.

Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., & Miller, J.Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol

and other drug problem in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 64–105.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture’s consequences: International differences in work related values*. SAGE.

Itkin‑Ofer, M. (2018). The Best of Both Worlds? Rabbi Menachem Bombach, educational reform, and the quest to integrate ultra‑orthodox Jews into Israeli society. *Kedma: Penn’s Journal on Jewish Thought Jewish Culture and Israel.* *2*, 60-72.

Itzhaki, Y., Itzhaky, H., & Yablon, Y. B. (2018a). Adjustment of high school dropouts in closed religious communities. *Child & Youth Care Forum* (47), 1, 81-100. Springer US.‏

Itzhaki, Y., Itzhaky, H., & Yablon, Y. B. (2018b). The contribution of parental and societal conditional regard to adjustment of high school dropouts. *Journal of Adolescence, 62*, 151-161.‏

Itzhaki-Braun, Y. (2021). The Art of Community Social Work in the Ultra-Orthodox Community. *The British Journal of Social Work, 51*(1), 114-131.‏

Itzhaki-Braun, Y., Itzhaky, H., & Yablon, Y. B. (2020). Predictors of high-school dropout among Ultraorthodox Jewish youth. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1911.‏

Itzhaki‐Braun, Y., & Sulimani‐Aidan, Y. (2021). Risk and protective factors among at‐risk ultraorthodox Jewish youth in Israel: A contextual model of positive adjustment. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 29*(2), 425-435.‏

Itzhaki-Braun, Y., & Yablon, Y. B. (2022). Leaving the Yeshiva High School and losing parental support: the case of male ultra-orthodox dropouts in Israel. In *Youth Without Family to Lean On* (pp. 242-255). Routledge.‏

Juarez, P., Schlundt, D. G., Goldzweig, I., & Stinson, N. (2006). A conceptual framework for reducing risky teen driving behaviors among minority youth. *Injury Prevention, 12*(suppl 1), i49-i55.‏

Kaufman, S. (2020). Youth in chance. *Family.* October 2020.

Kali, A., & Romi, S. (2021). Social Re-Evaluation Model: A Mechanism for Evaluating the Social Capital of at-Risk Adolescents in an ultra-Orthodox Collective Society. *Child & Youth Services*, 1-25.‏

Kali, A., Romi, S., & Court, D. (2019). The experiences of at-risk adolescents in the Haredi Society in Israel. *Journal of Social-Educational Work, 49/50,* 29-56.

Keesing, R., Gemara, N., & Pollak, M. (2020). Parental and professional perspectives of child risk and protection in Israel’s Ultra-Orthodox community. In *Context-informed perspectives of child risk and protection in Israel* (pp. 81-104). Springer, Cham.‏

Klonover, E., Maytles, R., Trachtingot, I., & Bergman, Y. S. (2022). Sense of community, meaning in life, and satisfaction with life among Ultra‐Orthodox Jews: A mediation model. *Journal of Community Psychology*.‏ 1-8.

Kuusisto, A. (2010). Social networks and identity negotiations of religious minority youth

in diverse social contexts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 33*(5), 779–796.

Kuusisto, A. (2011). Growing up in affiliation with a religious community: A case study of seventh-day adventist youth in Finland (Vol. 3). Waxmann Verlag.

Kyle, J. (2013). Spirituality: Its role as a mediating protective factor in youth at risk for suicide. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health, 15*(1), 47-67.‏

Lahav. Ch. (2015). *Processes and transformations in the characteristics of risk and disconnection of religious-Orthodox adolescents treated within the youth promotion units*. Society and youth administration. Ministry of Education. [Heb].

Lifshitz, C. C. (2017). Fostering employability among youth at-risk in a multi-cultural context: Insights from a pilot intervention program. *Children and Youth Services Review, 76*, 20–34.

Little, R. J. A. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *83*, 1198-1202.

Malchi, A. (2020). *Alternative educational settings for Haredi boys*. The Israel Democracy Institute.

Makarova, E., & Birman, D. (2015). Cultural transition and academic achievement of students from ethnic minority backgrounds: A content analysis of empiricalresearch on acculturation. *Educational Research, 57*, 305–330. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2015.1058099

Marks, A. K., Woolverton, G. A., & García Coll, C. (2020). Risk and resilience in minority youth populations. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 16*(1), 151–163.

Morley, E., Rossman, S., Kopczynki, M., Buck, J., & Gouvis, C. (2000). *Comprehensive Responses to Youth at Risk: Interim Findings from the SafeFutures Initiative: Summary*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.‏

Motti-Stefanidi, F., Masten, A.S. (2017). A resilience perspective on immigrant youth adaptation and development. In *Handbook on Positive Development of Minority Children and Youth*, (Eds.) N.J. Cabrera, & B. Leyendecker, (pp. 19–34). Cham, Switz.: Springer.

Nadan, Y., Gemara, N., Keesing, R., Bamberger, E., Roer-Strier, D., & Korbin, J. (2019). ‘Spiritual Risk’: A parental perception of risk for children in the ultra-Orthodox Jewish community. *The British Journal of Social Work, 49*(5), 1198-1215.‏

NAMEE, (2018). *School climate questionnaire for students*. Climate and pedagogical environment survey. The National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education.

Neblett Jr, E. W., Rivas‐Drake, D., & Umaña‐Taylor, A. J. (2012). The promise of racial and ethnic protective factors in promoting ethnic minority youth development. Child development perspectives, 6(3), 295-303.‏

Palay, N. (2021). Yes we can: Charedi dropout prevention? *Tzarich Iyun: Groundbreaking Context. Ultra-Orthodox Thought &Ideas.* February 2021.

Peck, N. Law, A. and Mills, R.C. (1987). Dropout Prevention: what we havelearned. Educational resources information center/counseling and personnel services (ED279 989).

Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian journal of policy research, 2*(1), 41-51.‏

Resnick, G., & Burt, M.R. (1996). Youth at risk: Definitions and implications service

delivery. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66*, 172–188.

Resnick, M. D. (2000). Protective factors, resiliency, and healthy youth development. *Adolescent medicine: State of the art reviews, 11*(1), 157-164.‏

Rubin, D. B. (2009). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys* (Vol. 81). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Rumberger, R., & Lim, S. A. (2008). *Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research* (p. 15). Policy Brief: California Dropout Research Project.

Saarelainen, S. M. K. (2018). Lack of belonging as disrupting the formation of meaning and faith: experiences of youth at risk of becoming marginalized. *Journal of youth and theology, 17*(2), 127-149.‏

Saban, R. (2020). "Teach the youth according to his path". At-risk youth in Ultra-Orthodox society. Dissertation for Master's degree in public policy department. The Hebrew University.

Seider, S., & Graves, D. (2020). *Schooling for critical consciousness: Engaging Black and Latinx youth in analyzing, navigating, and challenging racial injustice*. Harvard Education Press.‏

Sinha, J. W., Cnaan, R. A., & Gelles, R. J. (2007). Adolescent risk behaviors and religion: Findings from a national study. *Journal of adolescence, 30*(2), 231-249.‏

Ubani, M., Hyvärinen, E., Lemettinen, J., & Hirvonen, E. (2020). Dialogue, worldview inclusivity, and intra-religious diversity: Addressing diversity through religious education in the Finnish basic education curriculum. *Religions, 11*(11), 581.

Ungar, M. (2006). Nurturing hidden resilience in at-risk youth in different cultures. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and adolescent Psychiatry, 15*(2), 53.‏‏

Veeran, V., & Morgan, T. (2009). Examining the role of culture in the development of resilience for youth at risk in contested societies of South Africa and Northern Ireland. *Youth & Policy*, (102), 53-66.‏

Weissblai, A. (2019). *The authorities’ treatment of ultra-Orthodox youth at risk and at risk of dropping out of the education system*. Knesset Research and Information Center.

Wright, M. D., & Masten, A. S. (2015). Pathways to resilience in context. In L. Theron, L. Liebenberg, & M. Ungar, (Eds.). Youth Resilience and Culture: Commonalities and Complexities. (pp. 3–22). Springer. [MU].

Juarez, P., Schlundt, D. G., Goldzweig, I., & Stinson, N. (2006). A conceptual framework for reducing risky teen driving behaviors among minority youth. *Injury Prevention, 12*(suppl 1), i49-i55.‏ doi: 10.1136/ip.2006.012872

1. Ashkelon Academic College, Sderot Ben Zvi 12, Ashkelon 78211. Israel. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Haredi Institute for Policy Studies, Kanfei Nesharim 35, Jerusalem 9546448. Israel. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)