

“Ethnic Schema Typology”: A Bidimensional Model

Shmuel Shamai¹ and Zinaida Ilatov²

*Tel-Hai College, Upper Galilee, 12210, Israel and Shamir Research Institute,
University of Haifa, Israel, POB 97, Kazrin, Israel*

Telephone: ¹<972-54-7655123>, ²<972-54-4612156>

E-mail: ¹<shamai@research.haifa.ac.il>, ²<rres107@research.haifa.ac.il>

KEYWORDS Acculturation. BRSI. Ethnic Identity. Immigrants. Israel. Schema

ABSTRACT The paper deals with the re-construction and re-formation of ethnic identities during the acculturation process. “Ethnic identity schemata” have been developed to characterize four types of cultural identities among new immigrants from the former Soviet Union to Israel, who clearly differ from most segments of Israeli society, culturally and demographically. A random sample has been interviewed. The study has been conducted in a small Jewish town in Israel, inhabited by Israeli-born Jews and Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union. “Ethnic schema typology” identified four groups, namely, Russian (Soviet) identity, Israeli identity, Dual/Hybrid identity combining Russian and Israeli identities, and “undifferentiated” identity. Effects of language acquisition, language usage outside the home, Jewish religious identity, cultural practices, and sense of place were all related to “ethnic schema typology”. Profiles of the four groups have been explored on the basis of their common and particular characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

The paper deals with adult immigrant ethnic identities during their acculturation in the host society. According to developmental models of ethnic and personal identity, adults are considered as having formed their identity, whereas adolescents and young adults are still in a process of exploration (Erikson 1968; Phinney 1989; Glozman 2015). Immigrants arriving in host countries in adulthood formed their ethnic identity prior to immigration. This paper considers modification of adult immigrants’ ethnic identity in new cultural settings as re-construction and re-formation rather than as identity formation, in the context of acculturation in the host culture and enculturation in their heritage culture. The process of acculturation is generally thought to involve modifying self-identity as an individual

transitions from one cultural setting to another that has caused a variety of changes in people’s behaviors, attitudes, and values. “At a fundamental level...acculturation involves alteration in the individual’s sense of self” (Ryder et al. 2000: 49).

Acculturation, as a research area has been influenced mainly by Berry’s model of four acculturation strategies of assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization (Berry 1980; Berry et al. 1989; Berry 2003; Berry et al. 2006; Rudmin 2006; Schwartz et al. 2010). These four categories have been interpreted based on unidimensional, bidimensional or multidimensional approaches evaluating the process of acculturation.

Berry’s model and its implementations have been criticized. Rudmin (2003, 2006) emphasized that individuals were classified by Berry’s matrix of acculturation as high or low on receiving-culture acquisition and heritage-culture retention. An additional problem with this approach is its “collective blind bias” (Rudmin 2006:53), allowing consideration and “judgment” of some acculturation strategies as more positive and preferable than others. Berry’s model has been questioned (Del Pilar and Udasco 2004) also concerning the validity of marginalization as an acculturation strategy. Berry (1999) assessed marginalization as a failure to adjust to a new culture as opposed to integration that has been viewed as successful acculturation strategy. Assimilation and separation have been displayed

Footnote

Early draft of this paper was presented at the Crossroads in Cultural Studies, 4th International Conference. Tampere, Finland. 29 June, 2002.

Address for correspondence:

Shmuel Shamai
Tel-Hai College, Upper Galilee, 12210, Israel
and Shamir Research Institute, University of
Haifa, Israel, POB 97, Kazrin, Israel
Telephone: 972-54-7655123
E-mail: shamai@research.haifa.ac.il

by this model as two extremes of the same dimension, with somewhat negative connotations. Rudmin (2006) explained that this bias has stemmed from liberal ideology widespread within the academic community, especially Canadian and American academia, when dealing with acculturation studies. An important problem with Berry's model is that it adopts a "one size fits all" approach (Rudmin 2003).

Ethnic Identity Measurements

Approaches to measurements of racial and ethnic identity (R/EI) have developed from unidimensional to bi- and multidimensional, as the complexity and richness of the constructs have been revealed by research (Phinney et al. 1998; Phinney and Ong 2007; Schwartz et al. 2006, 2010; Gamst et al. 2011).

Unidimensional acculturation scaling is "based on the implicit assumption that a change in cultural identity takes place along a single continuum over the course of time. More specifically, acculturating individuals are seen as relinquishing the attitudes, values, and behaviors of their culture of origin while simultaneously adopting those of the new society" (Ryder et al. 2000: 49). According to this view, the more one adopts or receives the new host culture, the less she or he retains the culture of origin (Abe-Kim et al. 2001; Suinn 1998).

The bidimensional or multidimensional approach refers to the relationship between the mainstream and the heritage culture not as a "zero sum" phenomenon, but rather as two independent or at least partly independent identities (Zak 1973; Ryder et al. 2000). "In contrast to the unidimensional perspective, several theorists have conceived of acculturation as a process in which both heritage and mainstream cultural identities are free to vary independently... Individuals are capable of having multiple identities, each of which may independently vary in strength" (Ryder et al. 2000: 50). Moreover, "the foregoing acculturation strategies are not mutually exclusive, and an individual may use each of them to some degree in different domains of adjustment" (Eshel and Rosental-Sokolov 2000: 678). Phinney and Ong (2007) state that "theoretical evidence suggests that ethnic identity is a multifaceted construct that includes a number of dimensions" (p. 207).

In cross-cultural psychology and sociology of ethnic relations, a variety of theoretical models of acculturation have been developed. Due to the accumulation of research evidence and scientific debate in recent decades, the prevailing view of acculturation is as a non-linear, non-unidimensional, multi-domain, complex process (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez 2012; Berry 1999; Berry and Ataca 2007; Phinney and Ong 2007; Schwartz et al. 2006; Schwartz et al. 2010). Since the 1990s, efforts have also been made to address bicultural or multiple identities in the context of immigrant acculturation (Binning et al. 2009; Bracey et al. 2004; Renn 2004; Roccas and Brewer 2002; Rockquemore and Brunnsma 2008; Shih and Sanchez 2005, 2009; Glozman 2015).

Gamst et al. (2011) noted 26 measures of racial and ethnic identity that fall into major categories of measures developed for specific groups and measures developed for use with multiple groups or across groups. The existing models seem to suggest that the construct of R/EI is multidimensional, has unique elements within groups, has shared elements across groups, and has been experienced as a dynamic process by individuals who might oscillate between various states, stages, and phases (Gamst 2011: 90). However, the operationalization and measurement of racial and ethnic identity, especially among adult immigrants still present theoretical and empirical challenges (Ponterotto and Mallinckrodt 2007; Ponterotto and Park-Taylor 2007).

In the sociology of ethnic relations, the bidimensional or multidimensional approach to acculturation is similar to the concept of pluralism, meaning that it is possible for ethnic groups to preserve their distinctive cultural identities. From this point of view, ethnicity has been recognized as a legitimate way of group affiliation in the nation-state. On the one hand, one can be a "hyphenated-Israeli", "keeping the previous culture and combining it with the new identity" (Shamai 1987: 97). On the other hand, Ong et al. (2010) maintain that "ethnicity foreclosed individuals may believe that exploration of the meaning of their ethnicity within the larger society is not worth much time or effort, that they are capable of succeeding without identifying with their ethnic group" (p. 43).

Immigrants' identity dynamics in their encounter with the new social and cultural environment must be considered concerning two

main directions of possible change as the dominant cultural orientation, and the heritage cultural orientation (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez 2012). These two orientations apply to multiple domains (Nguyen and Benet-Martinez 2012) or dimensions (Ashmore et al. 2004; Phinney and Ong 2007).

Acculturation changes take place across a variety of life domains of immigrants as language use or preference, host language adjustment, social affiliation, cultural knowledge, beliefs, values, attitudes towards previous and host culture, cultural practice and self-identification (Zane and Mak 2003).

The current situation in acculturation research is challenging researchers in two ways. On the one hand, unprecedented rates of international migration flows around the world have prompted increased scholarly interest in acculturation and immigrant identity re-formation in the encounter with the host society. On the other hand, the acculturation constructs and measurements need revision.

Ethnic Schemata

This paper introduces “ethnic schemata” as a possible measurement. The suggested “ethnic schema typology”, based on the new use of Bem’s (1981) principles regarding “gender schemata typology”, is regarding the way immigrants structure their sense of belonging and ethnic group affiliation. The model suggested by Bem (1981) regarding “gender schemata typology” (BSRI), can be used to examine ethnic and racial identities more flexibly.

Originally, this schema referred to a stereotypically based pattern, organizing the world according to gender-related behaviors (Kretchmar 2015). Bem’s schemata (1981) based on a sample of only 50 male and 50 female Stanford undergraduates, who in fact determined the personality characteristics that were considered feminine or masculine by both females and males. Bem’s measurement categorized male or female behaviors correspondingly to the cultural definition of what it means to be male or female (Kretchmar 2015). According to this schema, individuals can process and assimilate information in line with their gender (sex-typed category), process and integrate information in line with the other gender (cross-sex-typed category), process and integrate traits and information from

both genders (androgynous category), and not show efficient processing of sex-type behavior (undifferentiated category).

Bem has been criticized for basing her instrument on the judgment of only a small group of university students who were not representative of the U.S. population (Lee and Kashubeck-West 2015). Some evidence pointed out that the BSRI measures showed little or no relationship to global self-images of masculinity and femininity (Spence and Helmreich 1981). Hoffman and Borders (2001) summarized several other critiques regarding the same BSRI inconsistent findings and replication failures.

With regard to the critique of the BSRI, this paper makes use of Bem’s basic concept in a different way. It does not use Bem’s inventory itself as developed in long and short versions, but rather adopts its a general approach to treating masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions rather than as opposite ends of a single dimension. Thus, it can be adapted to elicit ethnic identity. As in Bem’s (1981) presentation of principles of “gender schemata typology”, the “ethnic schema typology” suggested in this paper refers to the way immigrants structure their sense of belonging and attachment to the ethnic group they feel affiliated with. Ethnicity, like gender, is composed of schemata based on stereotypes. Findings have displayed that race and ethnicity stereotypes shape adolescents’ and young students ethnic and racial identities. Moreover, students have used stereotypes about other ethnic and racial groups as contrasts upon which their own ethnic or racial identities were constructed (Way et al. 2013; Öksüz et al. 2015).

Bem’s sex-typed, cross-sex-typed, androgynous, and undifferentiated categories, have been correspondingly transformed in this paper. The ethnic-typed individuals, who have retained their identity in line with their ethnic group, corresponded to sex-typed category. The cross-ethnic typed individuals who re-formed their identities in line with the host society corresponded to a cross-sex-typed category. Dual or hybrid typed individuals who represented both, home and host society, their ethnic identities, corresponded with the androgynous category. Individuals that did not show efficient processing of any ethnic-typed identity belonged to the undifferentiated category.

One can have different identities at different intensity levels. It means that one can have two different identities that are not necessarily in conflict with each other, or which may even support each other (Shamai 1991). The ethnic identities of immigrants have undergone transformations that depend on many variables, and among them are the pull and push factors of immigration, the level of cultural differences between the two places, and the social, cultural and economic power of the immigrants and the host society. It is important to consider individual backgrounds as a factor of identity dynamics including modifications in individuals' attitudes toward themselves and their social behaviors related to the groups with which they are in contact (Schwartz et al. 2013).

It is important to emphasize two aspects of acculturation process, that is, a variety of domains in which immigrants' identity differences and changes take place, and the interplay and inter-influence of acculturation processes occurring in these domains. This paper considers the Russian-speaking immigrants' identity changes as an open variety of possible profiles in reference to the dominant Israeli cultural orientation, and the Russian culture orientation. The authors explored these two orientations in a number of domains due to their crucial role in the Russian-speaking immigrants' acculturation processes of Hebrew language mastering, Russian or Hebrew use at home or outside and for use in such dominant culture products as watching news and movies, social affiliation (place of work), self-ascribed identity, and sense of place. One of the innovations of this study is the inclusion of the sense of place into the scope of the research.

Russian Jews

For Israel, immigration was the *raison d'être* of the Jewish state (Jones 1996: 9). New immigrants arriving in Israel are provided with economic rights and governmental support in housing, home appliances, personal goods, tax breaks, education, and job training. From 1989 to 2006, about a million Russian-speaking immigrants entered Israel and ultimately composed a fifth of the state's Jewish population.

The new immigrants from the former Soviet republics have had every opportunity to maintain and explore ties with their previous social,

professional, and cultural networks, impossible prior to "perestroika", and to generate new, transnational networks. A considerable number of immigrants to Israel are non-Jews, most of who entered Israel due to mixed marriages. The influx of non-Jewish immigrants from the FSU has posed a challenge to the Israeli authorities and to civic society.

Prior to the 1990s the Israeli government took responsibility for the national (general) policy on immigrant absorption. It established absorption centers for the wellbeing of the immigrants, providing housing, cultural and educational activities, and Hebrew classes.

Since the 1990s immigration policy was changed to the so-called direct absorption model, the government withdrew its comprehensive responsibility and supported the FSU immigrants economically and by other means, but did not try to orient their day-to-day life (Siegel 1998). The hidden message of this type of absorption was that the immigrants should assume this responsibility themselves. According to the model of direct absorption, the FSU immigrants were allowed to choose where to settle. They did so mainly in urban areas all over the country. Many immigrants could not afford expensive apartments in the major cities so they settled in small development towns. This changed the demographic as well as the cultural characteristics of many such towns, which previously were inhabited mainly by Oriental Jews (Gonen 1998; Siegel 1998).

According to one view, Israel never adopted pluralism as an official policy or as an educational policy (Bar-Yosef 1981; Horowitz 1991; Swirski 1990). "In Israel the dominant culture has always emphasized a unifying attitude towards Jewish immigrant groups in a perspective of Jewish nation-building" (Ben-Rafael 1996: 140). Immigrants were expected to blend in, abandoning their past heritage and culture (Shamai and Ilatov 2001).

Others felt that Israel became a more pluralistic state, which practiced cultural pluralism as regard to the 1990s wave of FSU immigrants (Smootha 1994). According to this view, the assimilation process belongs to the past, and a shift towards pluralism and multiculturalism has occurred (Eisikovits and Beck 1990).

Russian Jewish immigrants while their encounter with the receiving societies in various countries "have been tainted with intrinsic con-

flict over their identity and disposition viz-a-viz [the] established Jewish community..." (Remennick 2007: 371). In Israel since 1990 they have raised the issue of the proper balance between the need to preserve their previous culture and to integrate into new social and cultural environment (Iram 1992). The Israeli host society and the FSU immigrants were both adjusting to each other as part of the process of immigrant integration into a pluralistic society.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

A random sample of 200 adults was interviewed. The sample was taken from an updated list of adults in Kazrin, in the north of Israel. Only one person in a family was interviewed. The interview was conducted in Russian.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in a small Jewish town in the north of Israel. It is inhabited predominantly by Israeli-born Jews, with an average mix of Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews, but Jewish immigrants from the FSU who have settled in the town since 1990 compose about thirty-four percent of the population.

RESULTS

Demographic Background

The ages of the interviewees ranged from 18 to 86 years. The mean age was 50 years, and the median age was also 50 years. Of the interviewees, 87 (43.5%) were males and 113 (56.5%) were females. 23.5 percent of the interviewees had secondary education or less, and sixty-three percent hold an academic degree (including 2.5% with doctorates). About forty percent immigrated to Israel in 1990 and 1991, eighteen percent in 1992 and 1993, twenty percent in 1994 and 1995. The rest (23%) immigrated to Israel after 1996. For 57.5 percent of the sample, Kazrin was their first destination in Israel. The rest immigrated to Kazrin after residing 2.6 years on average in other places in Israel. Of the respondents, seventy-nine percent defined themselves as secular Jews, twelve percent of traditional Jews, 5.5 percent as (orthodox) religious Jews, and 3.5 percent did

not define themselves as Jewish. More than half (55%) were in the workforce, 13.5 percent were unemployed, and 19.5 percent were pensioners. The rest (12%) were students, disabled, housewives, or serving in the army. Most (72.5%) were married. The rest were single, and almost equally divided between bachelors, divorcees, and widow or widowers. This sample is similar to the national demographic division.

Ethnic Identities Schemata

Two questions were asked about respondents' ethnic identity:

1. To what degree do you feel like an Israeli?

The scale was between 1 (not at all) and 10 (very much).

2. To what degree do you feel like a Russian (or any other previous USSR country)?

The scale was between 1 (not at all) and 10 (very much).

The frequencies of these answers are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Israeli and Russian identity: Descriptive statistics

Degree	Israeli identity		Russian identity	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	22	11.1	100	50.8
2	5	2.5	11	5.6
3	13	6.6	14	7.1
4	10	5.1	9	4.6
5	34	17.1	24	12.2
6	18	9.1	7	3.6
7	15	7.6	4	2.0
8	23	11.6	6	3.0
9	19	9.6	4	2.0
10	39	19.7	18	9.1
Total	198	100.0	197	100.0
Median	6		1	
Mean	6.25		3.31	

Three respondents could not answer the question regarding their Israeli identity, and two of them also could not answer the question regarding their Russian identity.

The Israeli and Russian identities are different. The mode of the Israeli identity scale (as shown in Table 1) is 10, the highest rank while the mode of the Russian identity scale is 1, the lowest rank, which is "not having Russian identity at all". However, the Israeli identity mode is one-fifth of the sample, while the Russian mode

is one-half of the sample, indicating that Israeli diversification is much larger than the Russian.

The differences regarding mean or median (as shown in Table 1) also manifest that gap. The Israeli identity is much stronger than the Russian identity. Moreover, the Israeli identity has close to normal distribution. However, the Russian identity is skewed toward the lower values. The low Russian identity may reflect the negative attitudes of the immigrants toward their homeland. As Jews in the FSU, many of them suffered from the non-Jewish locals.

The next stage was to divide the two distributions according to the medians, thus, creating four subgroups of “ethnic schema typology”:

1. Mainly Russian identity: More than the Russian identity median and less than the Israeli identity median.
2. Mainly Israeli identity: More than the Israeli identity median and less than the Russian identity median.
3. Dual or Hybrid identity: More than the Russian identity median and more than the Israeli identity median.
4. No noticeable identity (“undifferentiated”): Less than Russian identity median and less than the Israeli identity median.

Fifty-one respondents (25.9%) were classified as “mainly Russian identity”, 67 (34.0%) were classified as “mainly Israeli identity”, 46 (23.4%) were classified as having dual identities, and 33 respondents (16.7%) were classified as “no noticeable identity”.

Characterization of the “ethnic schema typology” groups is as follows.

Age

The “undifferentiated” group was older (average age = 56 years) than the others (range between 47 to 49.5). The older the immigrants were, the less they associated with the local (Israeli) society. They were more exposed to Soviet anti-Semitism, and thus, they also do not have positive feelings and attachments to their previous homeland. The difference according to the analysis of variance test was not significant.

Education

The level of education was similar in the four groups. The percentage of academics ranged from sixty-one percent (“undifferentiated” and

“Dual/Hybrid”) to sixty-five percent (Israeli identity group). According to a Chi-square test, the difference was not significant. Thus, a level of education was not related to “ethnic schema typology”.

Languages

The respondents were asked to rank their level of Hebrew knowledge. 11.6 percent had no more than minimal Hebrew, 42.6 percent stated that their knowledge of Hebrew was enough to communicate with people in the shops, 23.9 percent indicated that they speak Hebrew fluently, but they hardly read or write Hebrew, and 21.8 percent were fluent in Hebrew. The differences among the groups were striking. Twenty-seven percent of the “undifferentiated” had no more than minimal Hebrew, compared to 12.7 percent of the “Russian identity”, 8.7 percent of the “Dual/Hybrid identity” and 4.5 percent of the “Israeli identity”. In the “Russian identity” group, 52.9 percent stated that their knowledge of Hebrew was enough to communicate with people in the shops (compared to 36% and to 41% for the other groups). Of the “Israeli identity” and the “Dual/Hybrid identity”, thirty percent stated that they were fluent in Hebrew, compared to 13.5 percent of the “undifferentiated”, and only 7.8 percent of the “Russian identity”. The Chi-square test was significant ($\chi^2=24.306$, $df=12$, $p=0.018$). Thus, the difference in their knowledge of Hebrew is connected to their “ethnic schemata” group.

Language at Home

Most (80.2%, $N=158$) spoke only their mother tongue (usually Russian) at home. Only the “undifferentiated” differed from the mean. 93.9 percent of them spoke their mother tongue at home, whereas seventy-four percent to seventy-eight percent of the other three groups spoke their mother tongue at home. Some (19.3%) spoke both Hebrew and their mother tongue. Six percent of the “undifferentiated”, twenty percent of the Israeli and Russian main identities, and twenty-six percent of the “Dual/Hybrid identity” spoke both languages. The Chi-square test was not significant. Thus, as can also be learned from descriptive data the language at home is not related to their placement in the ethnic schemata.

Language Outside the Home

The majority spoke both their mother tongue and Hebrew outside the home (71.6%, N=141). The rest were divided between only Hebrew (15.2%, N=30) and only the mother tongue (13.2%, N=26). The main differences among the groups referred to use of Hebrew only. 39.4 percent of the “undifferentiated” compared to eight percent and to fourteen percent of the other groups. The group that speaks both languages the most was the “Dual/ Hybrid identity” group, whereas the group that speaks only their mother tongue was the “Russian identity”. The Chi-square test was significant ($\chi^2=20.765$, $df=6$, $p=0.002$). These results are very much in line with the ethnic schemata concept.

Jewish Religious Identity

The respondents were asked to identify themselves as secular, traditional-Jewish (keeping some of the religious practices), or religious. Most (81.6%) classified themselves as secular. 93.6 percent of the “Russian identity” group, 71.2 percent of those with Israeli identity, and 84.8 percent of the “undifferentiated” were secular. The “Israeli identity” was (relatively) the most religious, with 19.7 percent (N=13) “traditional” and 9.1 percent (N=6) religious. The “Dual/Hybrid identity” and the “undifferentiated” are in-between with totals of 18.2 percent and 15.2 percent (respectively) of traditional and religious Jews. The Chi-square test was significant ($\chi^2=15.388$, $df=6$, $p=0.017$). The results point to the usefulness of the “ethnic schemata” as predictors of the religious identity variable.

Self-ascribed Identity

The respondents were asked in a semi-open question to identify themselves. They were asked, “How do you define yourself: A Jew, an Israeli, or otherwise?” Less than half (45.2%, N=85) defined themselves as Jews, 27.7 percent (N=52) described themselves as Israelis, and 11.2 percent (N=21) defined themselves as “Israeli-Jew”. The same number defined themselves as “cosmopolitans”. Only 4.8 percent defined themselves as “Russian”. A relatively high percentage of the “undifferentiated” defined themselves as “Jews” (63.6%, N=21). The “Dual/Hybrid identity” had the larger number of those who de-

finned themselves as “Israelis” (38.1%, N=16). The “Russian identity” group had a relatively higher percentage of “Russians” (18.8%, N=9), and “cosmopolitans” (12.5%, N=6). Two-thirds of those who define themselves as “Russians” were classified as “Russian identity”, and 42.9 percent of those who classified themselves as cosmopolitans were also classified as “Russian identity”. The Chi-square test was significant ($\chi^2=24.904$, $df=12$, $p=0.015$). Although these results fit the “ethnic schemata” for most of the interviewees, a relatively smaller group does not fit the schemata.

Place of Work

The sample was divided in terms of whether their sphere of activity was outside or inside the home. The “outside the home” category (61.3%, N=118) included mainly workers (N=108), and some students and soldiers (N=10). The category “in the home” (38.7%, N=74) included mainly pensioners and unemployed (N=71), and others (housewives and those who work at home). The following three categories ranged from sixty percent (Israeli identity) to 69.6 percent (“Dual/Hybrid identity”). In the “undifferentiated” group, 45.5 percent (N=15) were primarily active outside home. The Chi-square test was not significant.

Cultural Use

The respondents were asked about several aspects of their cultural consumption.

News in Hebrew

Respondents were asked, “Do you watch the news in Hebrew?” The answer scale was from 1 = never to 10 = always). Only 36 (18%) did not watch Hebrew news on TV. The mean was 4.62. The level of those who never watch news in Hebrew was the highest in the “undifferentiated” group (30.3%, N=10), and the lowest in the “Dual/Hybrid identity” group (8.7%, N=4). Among the “Israeli identity” group, 17.9 percent (N=12) did not watch Hebrew news on TV, and findings were similar among the “Russian identity” (19.6%, N=10) group.

The “Dual/Hybrid identity” and the “Israeli identity” groups had the highest level of exposure to Hebrew news on TV. The means were

5.30 and 5.24, respectively. The lowest mean was in the “undifferentiated” group (3.24), and the “Russian identity” mean was in the middle (4.02). The differences among the four groups were explored using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The differences were statistically significant overall ($F=42.72$, $df=3$, $p=0.003$). According to the Scheffe post-test, the difference between the “undifferentiated” towards “Israeli identity” was significant ($p=0.023$), and as was the difference between “undifferentiated” and the “Dual/Hybrid identity” which was also significant ($p=0.032$). In this case, the main difference was not between the “ethnic types”, but rather between the “others” (the “undifferentiated” and the “Dual/ Hybrid identity”).

Movies in Hebrew

Respondents were asked, “Do you watch TV movies in Hebrew?” The answer scale was from 1 = never to 10 = always. The amount of those who never watched movies in Hebrew was the highest in the “undifferentiated” group (63.6%, $N=21$). The averages in the other groups were similar to one another (29.9% “Israeli identity”, 30.4% “Dual/Hybrid identity” and 33.3% “Russian identity”).

The “Dual/Hybrid identity” and the “Israeli identity” had the highest level of exposure to Hebrew movies on TV. The means were 4.12 and 4.08, respectively. The lowest mean was in the “undifferentiated” group (2.23), and the “Russian identity” mean was in the middle (3.32). The differences across groups were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The overall test was statistically significant ($F=3.805$, $df=3$,

$p=0.011$). According to Scheffe post-test, the difference between the “undifferentiated” and “Israeli identity” was significant ($p=0.029$), as was the difference between “undifferentiated” and “Dual/Hybrid identity” ($p=0.042$). The “undifferentiated” group seemed to hold different views than the other groups.

Sense of Place

The respondents were asked about their sense of place, regarding Kazrin (the town they live in), toward the region they live in (Golan), toward the state they live in (Israel), and toward the state they emigrated from. They were asked to scale their attitudes on a scale, ranging from -5 (very negative feelings) to +5 (very positive feelings) (0 meant neutral feelings). The results are shown in Table 2.

The overall situation reflects positive feelings of most of the respondents in all four groups toward the different places. However, the feelings toward the current state of residence (Israel) were much better among the four groups than toward the previous state.

The data show that the “undifferentiated identity” group developed a strong affiliation to the town and the region they live in, and a somewhat weaker affiliation toward Israel, and even less toward their previous state. Moreover, their average scores were the highest regarding their levels of sense of place toward the town.

The “Dual/ Hybrid identity” group manifested a level of affiliation that was similar to the general mean, although their attachment to the region and state was somewhat weaker, and it was the highest of all groups in relation to the

Table 2: Sense of place and different identities: Selected statistics

	<i>Undifferentiated identity</i>	<i>Russian identity</i>	<i>Israeli identity</i>	<i>Hybrid identity</i>	<i>Total means</i>
<i>Means:</i>					
Town	4.61	3.51	4.49	4.22	4.19
Region	4.67	3.86	4.69	4.21	4.36
State	3.76	3.02	4.34	3.54	3.72
Previous State	2.64	2.43	1.67	2.91	2.33
Paired t-test (Current and Previous state)	$df=27$, $t=2.53$, $p=0.018$	$Df=43$, $t=2.32$, $p=0.025$	$df=47$, $t=7.48$, $p=0.000$	$df=32$, $t=2.14$, $p=0.040$	$df=153$, $t=7.26$, $p=0.000$
<i>Percentage of Negative and/or Neutral Feelings:</i>					
Town	0	16	5	4	6
Region	0	12	2	7	5
State	6	18	2	6	10
Previous State	21	32	42	18	30

previous state. The “Russian identity” and the “Israeli identity” manifested opposite patterns. Those with the Russian identity manifested the lowest level of attachment to their (current) town and region, and their current state, whereas those with the Israeli identity showed the strongest attachment to the region and the state, and an above average attachment to the town. The situation was reversed toward the previous state. Those in the “Israeli identity” group had a weaker (and the weakest) level of attachment, and in the “Russian group” the attachment was stronger than the average.

According to analysis of variance (ANOVA), the differences were significant with regard to the levels of sense of (current) place, town, region and state, towards town ($df=3$, $F=5.29$, $p=0.002$), toward region ($df=3$, $F=5.50$, $p=0.001$), toward Israel ($df=3$, $F=6.80$, $p=0.000$). The differences were not significant toward the previous state.

According to Scheffe post-test, the difference between the “Russian identity” and “Israeli identity” was significant regarding the three levels of town, region and state ($p=0.007$, $p=0.004$, $p=0.000$ respectively), and there was also significant difference between the “undifferentiated” and the “Russian identity” regarding town and region ($p=0.015$, $p=0.033$, respectively).

The differences between the levels of attachment to current and previous state were tested using a paired sample t-test. The differences with respect to the four groups were found statistically significant as shown in Table 2. Two main differences regarding sense of place were probed, between the current and the previous places of living, and among the four group types. In both cases differences were found, but more between current and previous places than among the four schema groups.

DISCUSSION

This paper introduces “ethnic schemata” as a modified measurement to explore acculturation as a process of cultural identity in transition, and thus, it corresponds to the existing theoretical approach to ethnic identity as a dynamic construct that changes over time and context (Phinney 2003; Phinney and Ong 2007; Scharz et al. 2010; Ashmore et al. 2004; Romero and Roberts 2003).

At the same time, the ethnic schemata typology proposed in this paper allows more neutral and non-judgmental discourse, since each ‘profile’ represents the existing and legitimate way immigrants structure their sense of belonging to the ethnic group they feel affiliated with. The ethnic schemata do not impose a four-fold matrix on research findings to embed them into pre-defined categories. On the contrary, it can be applied to exploring identity re-formation in various ethnic groups and host countries to capture an “on-the-ground” situation as it is.

This paper considers the immigrants’ identity changes as an open variety of available profiles in their reference to the two abovementioned cultural orientations, that is, towards the dominant Israeli culture as well as towards the heritage Russian culture. The proposed ethnic schema proposes an assumption that immigrants’ ethnic identity re-formation during the acculturation process may include the development of mainstream cultural identity, preserving of the previous identity, and their combination. The suggested measurement is able to embrace independence of the distinctive cultural identities, as well as bicultural identities and also people who are not attached to either culture. This flexibility is the major strength of the proposed measurement. A critical issue is its implementation and embodiment in the measurement of acculturation (Kang 2006).

According to the results presented in this paper, adult immigrants’ identity re-formation has been linked to interconnected acculturation processes across a variety of life domains such as host society language (Hebrew) acquisition, language use at home and outside, employment as a form of social affiliation, closeness to Jewish cultural traditions, and sense of place (regarding the host country and previous country).

A language serves a crucial tool for communication and establishing social networks, for all people and especially for immigrants. Fluency in the host country’s language has been found to be a significant predictor of an individual’s acculturation (Choi and Thomas 2009; Padilla and Perez 2003; Remennick 2003). Lovell (2012) argued that those respondents who reported speaking one or both of the official languages of Canada (English/French) in the home are almost two times as likely to report their ethnic identity as Canadian when compared to individuals who speak their native tongue. Burr and

Mutcher (2003) found that strong English language skills among older Mexican immigrants increase the likelihood of living independently and of being the head of a household. Higher levels of English proficiency predicted higher levels of acculturation (Lu et al. 2011) and immigrants' success in the labor market (Mahmud et al. 2008). The current paper underlines the importance of immigrants' proficiency in the official language to be a significant contribution to acculturating individuals' ethnic identity re-formation.

Social affiliation and diversity of social contacts of immigrants with other ethno-cultural groups in the host societies have been found to be important concerning an acculturation processes and immigrants' choices towards their ethnic belonging. Living mainly inside immigrant communities, accompanied by random and limited instrumental contacts with members of the host society, reduced the extent of official language proficiency as well as the measure of immigrants' incorporation into the host social environments (Burr and Mutcher 2003). Immigrants' employment outside of their communities serves a critical link between immigrants' acculturation and their identity changes (Leong 2001; Lu et al. 2011).

The Russian-speaking community in Israel is heterogeneous, as many of its members treat Jewish tradition with respect, and a small segment is observant. Significantly, a decade of studies into their self-reported reasons for immigrating to Israel indicate that more adduce Jewish than Israeli factors. A further explanation lies in the fact that a large number of FSU immigrants were exposed to numerous Jewish institutions, such as the Joint, Chabad, and various Hebrew classes, while still in the FSU during the 1990s. Not unexpectedly, those respondents took part in the current study, who reported their closeness to Jewish tradition inclined to indicate their ethnic self-ascribed identity as Israeli or Israeli-Jew in contrast to those who identified themselves as Russians. This evidence corresponds to Lovell's (2012) research regarding a definite link between religious affiliation and sense of belonging to the larger Canadian community. Immigrants reporting their religion as Christian were two times as likely to report their ethnic identity as Canadian, when compared to individuals who reported their religious affiliation as something other than Christian. Given that Christianity is the predominant religion in Cana-

da, those individuals who report being Christian feel more connected, and hence, more likely to report themselves as Canadian (Lovell 2012). However, other research of immigrants' acculturation in Germany revealed different data. For both females and males, religion had no effect on ethnic self-identification, the only exception being Muslim males and females who were less likely to describe themselves as integrated compared to the rest of the sample (Zimmerman 2006).

Ethnic identity research usually has not included sense of place in the list of domains in which acculturation processes take place. However, the current research considers sense of place as important not only regarding current residence but regarding remembered residence as well (Shamai and Ilatov 2005). Attitude to the current place of immigrants' living may be infused with memories of the homeland. According to Becker (2003), this was especially true for adult immigrants who had been in middle or later life at the time of immigration. Former homes in the country of origin and cultural traditions associated with them continued to inform how they viewed the current place of living (Becker 2003; Gay 2003; Horowitz et al. 2003; Shamai and Ilatov 2005).

CONCLUSION

Russian-speaking immigrants in Israel organize the information about themselves and their social and cultural environment resembling to their "ethnic schema typology", which according to this model, includes four subgroups:

1. Mainly Russian identity (ethnic-typed): The Russian identity is exclusively the leading identity.
2. Mainly Israeli identity (cross-ethnic typed): The Israeli identity is exclusively the leading identity.
3. Dual or Hybrid identity: Both the Russian and Israeli identities are strong.
4. No noticeable identity ("undifferentiated"): Both the Russian and Israeli identities are weak.

The data indicates that the Israeli identity is stronger than the Russian identity, but there is still strong affiliation to the previous language and culture. This affiliation has been represented by the four profiles (groups) of ethnic identity schemata that had both common and unique characteristics.

The “Russian identity” group had a minimal command of Hebrew knowledge. Only a third of them could speak fluent Hebrew, and most of them could not write well. Concerning language used at home, they spoke more Russian than Hebrew compared with other groups. They were more secular than any other group. Their self-ascribed identity was mainly Israeli and/or Jewish, but they had the highest percentage of respondents who classified themselves as “Russians” and as “cosmopolitans”. For most of them, their activity sphere was outside the home, more than the overall trend. They had relatively low exposure to Hebrew news and Hebrew movies on TV. Their level of sense of place was the lowest toward their current place. Toward Israel and the Golan, and Kazrin. Their percentage of negative or neutral feelings was also the highest. Their feelings toward their previous country were stronger than the average, and many of them had negative feelings toward that country. Their level of positive feeling toward their current country was stronger than their feeling toward the previous country.

The “Israeli identity” group had the highest command of Hebrew knowledge. They could speak fluent Hebrew, and most could write well. However, with regard to the language used at home, they were similar to the general trend’ while outside the home they spoke less Hebrew than the other groups, but they spoke both languages more than the average. They were more religious than the others. They described themselves as Jews. Most of them had an activity sphere outside the home, as was the overall trend. They had relatively high exposure to Hebrew news and Hebrew movies on TV. Their level of sense of place was high toward their current place, with the highest toward Israel and the Golan, and above average toward Kazrin. The percentage with negative or neutral feelings was very low. Their feelings toward their previous country were largely negative.

The “Dual/Hybrid identity” group had a high level of Hebrew knowledge. Exactly half spoke fluent Hebrew, and most of them could write well. About a quarter of them also spoke Hebrew at home, and most of them spoke both languages out of the home. Although four-fifths of them were secular, some were traditional and some religious. Their self-ascribed identity was mainly Jewish and/or Israeli and the rest described themselves as “cosmopolitans”. They

had the highest proportion of respondents whose focus of activity was outside the home. They had the highest proportion of respondents that watch the news in Hebrew on TV. This group also watched Israeli movies on TV more than any other group. Their sense of place was similar to the general trend in all respects.

The “undifferentiated” group was somewhat older, their knowledge of Hebrew was weak, and they spoke more Russian at home and more Hebrew outside the home than any other group. They were mainly secular Jews. Importantly, they mainly defined themselves as “Jews”. Their sphere of activity was more in their homes, in contrast with the other groups. They hardly watched the news in Hebrew on TV, and even fewer movies in Hebrew on TV. They had a very high level of sense of place toward the immediate surroundings (region and town), and above the average toward their current and previous state.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper proposes a modified measure to encompass the variety of possible ethnic-identity profiles of Russian-speaking immigrants during their acculturation in Israeli host society. In line with results presented by this study, some recommendations are suggested.

It is important to address bi- and/or multiple identities, which are inherent in immigrants, membership in two or even more, cultures.

Future research is recommended to replicate the ethnic schemata introduced by this paper in other immigrant settings to calibrate this instrument. Such research might help clarify the generality of the identity re-formation experience of acculturating immigrants.

Also, future work should continue to assess multiple acculturation domains to examine their interplay and importance for immigrant identity re-formation and ethnic profile development.

REFERENCES

- Abe-Kim J, Okazaki S, Goto SG 2001. Unidimensional approaches to the assessment of acculturation for Asian American populations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7(3): 232-246.
- Ashmore R, Deaux K, McLaughlin-Volpe T 2004. An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130: 80-114.

- Bar-Yosef R 1981. Desocialization and resocialization: The adjustment process of immigrants. In: E Krausz (Eds.): *Studies of Israeli Society (1): Migration, Ethnicity and Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, pp. 19-37.
- Becker G 2003. Meanings of place and displacement in three groups of older immigrants. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 17(2): 129-149.
- Bem SL 1981. Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88: 354-364.
- Bem SL 1987. Gender schema theory and the romantic tradition. In: P Shaver, C Hendrick (Eds.): *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7: 251-271. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berry JW 1980. Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In: A Padilla (Eds.): *Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 9-25.
- Berry JW, Kim U, Power S, Young M, Bujaki M 1989. Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38(2): 185-206.
- Berry JW 1999. Intercultural relations in plural societies. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 40: 12-21.
- Berry JW 2003. Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In: K Chun, P Balls-Organista, G Marin (Eds.): *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Application*. Washington: APA Books, pp. 17-37.
- Berry JW, Phinney JS, Sam DL, Vedder P 2006. Immigrant youth in cultural transition. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berry JW, Ataca B 2007. Cultural factors in stress. In: *Encyclopedia of Stress*. Oxford: Elsevier. pp. 672-678.
- Binning KR, Unzueta MA, Huo YJ, Molina LE 2009. The interpretation of multiracial status and its relation to social engagement and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65: 35-49.
- Bracey JR, Bamaca MY, Umaña-Taylor AJ 2004. Examining ethnic identity and self-esteem among biracial and monoracial adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(2): 123-132.
- Burr JA, Mutchler JE 2003. English language skills, ethnic concentration, and household composition: Older Mexican immigrants. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 58B: 83-92.
- Choi J, Thomas M 2009. Predictive factors of acculturation attitudes and social support among Asian immigrants in the USA. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 18(1): 76-84.
- Del Pilar JA, Udasco JO 2004. Deculturation: Its lack of validity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 10(2): 169-176.
- Eisikovits R, Beck R 1990. Models governing the education of new immigrant children in Israel. *Comparative Education Review*, 34(2): 177-195.
- Erikson EH 1968. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Eshel Y, Rosental-Sokolov M 2000. Acculturation attitudes and sociocultural adjustment of sojourner youth in Israel. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(6): 677-691.
- Gamst GC, Liang CTH, Der-Karabetian A 2011. *Handbook of Multicultural Measures*. Sage: Los Angeles.
- Gay BM 2003. Meanings of place and displacement in three groups of older immigrants. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 17(2): 129-149.
- Glozman J 2015. *Being Me In Canada: Multidimensional Identity and Belonging of Russian-speaking Immigrant Youths*. Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Family Relations and Applied Nutrition Guelph. University of Guelph: Ontario, Canada.
- Gonen A 1998. Settlement of the Immigrants: Geographical patterns. In: M Siron, E Leshem (Eds.): *Profile of an Immigrant Wave. The Absorption Process of Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union, 1990-1995*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, pp. 232-269 (Hebrew).
- Hoffman RM, Borders LD 2001. Twenty-five years after the Bem Sex-Role inventory: A reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34(1): 39-55.
- Horowitz T 1991. Awareness without legitimation: The Israel educational system's response to cultural differences. *Studies in Education*, 55/56: 9-18 (Hebrew).
- Horowitz T, Shamai S, Ilatov Z 2003. *Assimilation, Dialogue and Empowerment: Immigrants and Non-immigrants in Katzrin*. Tel Aviv: Ramot Publications – Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).
- Iram Y 1992. Russian and Ethiopian immigrants in Israel: A comparative perspective on educational absorption. *Education and Society*, 10(1): 85-93.
- Jones C 1996. *Soviet-Jewish Aliyah, 1989-92*. London: Frank Cass.
- Kang SM 2006. Measurement of acculturation, scale formats, and language competence their implications for adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(6): 669-693.
- Kretchmar J 2015. Socialization. Research Starters: Sociology. (Online Edition). From <F:\bem\Gender Socialization Discovery Service for Univ of Haifa.mht> (Retrieved on 22 November 2015).
- Lee D, Kashubeck-West S 2015. Factor structure of the Bem Sex-Role. *Journal of Asia Pacific Counseling*, 5(1): 1-22.
- Leong FTL 2001. The role of acculturation in the career adjustment of Asian American workers: A test of Leong and Chou's (1994) formulations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7(3): 262-73.
- Lovell KL 2012. Who Are You? Ethnic Identity in Canada. University of Calgary, Department of Sociology. From <http://theses.ucalgary.ca/bitstream/11023/153/2/ucalgary_2012_lovell_kerri.pdf> (Retrieved on 22 November 2015).
- Lu Y, Samarantunge R, Härtel C 2011. Acculturation strategies among professional Chinese immigrants in the Australian workplace. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49(1): 71-87.
- Mahmud S, Alam Q, Härtel C 2008. Skill shortage and underutilization of educated immigrants in the Australian labour market: A paradox. *European Journal of Management*, 8(2): 155-1167.
- Nguyen AMTD, Benet-Martinez V 2012. Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 20(10): 1-38.
- Öksüz Y, Güven E, Baba M, Kartal A 2015. Investigating primary school students' perceptions about differences through their drawings. *Turkish Studies*, 10(3): 529-544.
- Ong A, Fuller-Rowell E, Phinney JS 2010. Measurement of ethnic identity: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Identity. An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 10: 39-49.

- Padilla AM, Perez W 2003. Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 25(1): 35-55.
- Phinney JS 1989. Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9: 34-49.
- Phinney JS, Madden TJ, Santos LJ 1998. Psychological variables as predictors of perceived ethnic discrimination among minority and immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28: 937-953.
- Phinney JS 2003. Ethnic identity and acculturation. In: KM Chun, PB Organista, G Marin (Eds.): *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 63-82.
- Phinney J, Ong A 2007. Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54: 271-281.
- Ponterotto JG, Mallinckrodt B 2007. Introduction to the special section on racial and ethnic identity in counseling psychology: Conceptual and methodological challenges and proposed solutions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3): 219-223. doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.219
- Ponterotto JG, Park-Taylor J 2007. Racial and ethnic identity theory, measurement, and research in counseling psychology: Present status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3): 282-294.
- Remennick L 2003. What does integration mean? Social insertion of Russian immigrants in Israel. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 4(1): 23-49.
- Remennick L 2007. *Russian Jews on Three Continents: Identity, Integration, and Conflict*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Renn KA 2004. *Mixed Race College Students: The Ecology of Race, Identity, and Community*. Albany: State University of New-York Press.
- Rudmin FW 2003. Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, 7: 3-37.
- Rudmin FW 2006. Debate in Science: The Case of Acculturation. In: AnthroGlobe Journal. From <http://malinowski.kent.ac.uk/docs/rudminf_acculturation_061204.pdf> (Retrieved on 20 November 2015).
- Roccas S, Brewer MB 2002. Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6: 88-106.
- Rockquemore KA, Brunsma D 2008. *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Litterfield Pub Inc.
- Romero AJ, Roberts RE 2003. Stress within a bicultural context for adolescents of Mexican descent. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 9(2): 171-184.
- Ryder AG, Alden LE, Paulhus DL 2000. Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(1): 49-65.
- Schwartz SJ, Montgomery MJ, Briones E 2006. The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, 49: 1-30.
- Schwartz SJ, Unger JB, Zamboanga BL, Szapocznik J 2010. Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist*, 65: 237-251.
- Schwartz SJ, Waterman AS, Umaña-Taylor AJ, Lee RM, Kim SY, Vazsonyi AT, Huynh QL, Whitbourne SK, Park IJK, Hudson M, Zamboanga BL, Bersamin MM, Williams MK 2013. Acculturation and well-being among college students from immigrant families. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69: 298-318.
- Shamai S 1991. Sense of place: An empirical measurement. *Geoforum*, 22(3): 347-358.
- Shamai S 1987. Critical theory of education and ethnicity: the case study of the Toronto Jewish community. *Journal of Education*, 169(2): 89-114.
- Shamai S, Ilatov Z 2001. Assimilation and ethnic boundaries: Israeli students' attitudes toward Russian immigrants. *Adolescence*, 36(114): 681-695.
- Shamai SZ, Ilatov Z 2002. Ethnic Schema Typology-a Bidimensional Model of Ethnic Identity. Paper presented at the Crossroads in Cultural Studies, 4th International Conference. Tampere, Finland 29 June, 2002.
- Shamai S, Ilatov Z 2005. Measuring sense of place: The case of immigrants and Israeli born. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(5): 467-476.
- Shih MJ, Sanchez DT 2005. Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131: 569-591.
- Shih MJ, Sanchez DT 2009. When race becomes even more complex: Toward understanding the landscape of multiracial identity and experiences. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65(1): 1-11.
- Siegel D 1998. *The Great Immigration: Russian Jews in Israel*. New York: Berghahn books.
- Smootha S 1994. Point to discussion about the influence of the mass immigration from previous U.S.S.R., on the Israeli society. *Sociology - The News Bulletin of the Israeli Sociological Association*, 13: 6-7 (Hebrew).
- Spence JT, Helmreich RL 1981. Androgyny versus gender schema: A comment on Bem's gender schema theory. *Psychological Review*, 88(4): 365-368.
- Suinn RM 1998. Measurement of acculturation of Asian Americans. *Asian Americans and Pacific Islander. Journal of Health*, 6: 7-12.
- Swirski S 1990. *Education in Israel*. Tel Aviv: Brerot (Hebrew).
- Zak I 1973. Dimensions of Jewish-American identity: Psychological adaptation of Chinese Sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26: 451-470.
- Zane N, Mak W 2003. Major approaches to the measurement of acculturation among ethnic minority populations: A content analysis and an alternate empirical strategy. In: KM Chun, PB Organista, G Marín (Eds.): *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 39-60.
- Zimmermann L, Zimmermann KF, Constant AF 2006. Ethnic Self-identification of First-generation Immigrants. IZA Discussion Paper No. 2535. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor. From <<http://ftp.iza.org/dp2535.pdf>> (Retrieved on 22 November 2015).
- Way N, Hernandez MG, Rogers LO, Hughes DL 2013. "I'm not going to become no rapper": Stereotypes as a context of ethnic and racial identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 28(4): 407-430.