

# Ethnic identity formation among post-high-school religious *mechina* gap-year programs in Israel

Zehavit Gross

Bar-Ilan university

Gai Halevy (✉ [gaiha@herzog.ac.il](mailto:gaiha@herzog.ac.il))

Herzog college

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** Ethnic identity, identity formation, identity development, Israeli Modern Orthodox, emerging adulthood

**Posted Date:** May 10th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-508945/v1>

**License:** © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

The aim of this study is to test changes in ethnic identity from two points of view: Marcia's identity status model and ethnic identity literature. Based on 135 participants who completed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) questionnaires at two times intervals, stability was found at the mean level, while stability, progression and regression were found at the individual level. Transitions from moratorium into achievement were found more than into diffusion. Status changes derived mainly following changes in the commitment component. In line with Erikson's theory, the results highlight the effect of the sociocultural context on the identity formation process, and the need to examine changes in identity formation processes over time, both at the mean level and the individual level. These findings could be relevant to other countries, which are going through similar processes of demographic changes in which the minority challenges the hegemony of the majority.

## Introduction

In a global world characterize by multicultural societies, ethnic identity is increasingly identified as a critical component of the self, especially during adolescence (Roberts et al., 1999) and emerging adulthood (Phinney, 2006). Specifically, ethnic identity development was found to have significant consequences for the psychosocial, academic, and health outcomes of ethnic minority adolescents (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). The insight that different identity statuses could be found in different periods or sociocultural contexts (Côté & Levine, 2002), suggests that Modern-Orthodox communities in Israel could be an interesting case for studying ethnic identity formation. The aim of this article is to show changes in ethnic identity of post high school students in a religious gap year program from two points of view. First, in terms of ethnic identity components: exploration and commitment in order to compare results with ethnic identity development literature. Second, in terms of identity status model (Marcia, 1980) since it is central model in identity formation literature and although used by Phinney (1989) in order to describe ethnic identity development, it is missing from research on ethnic identity. This point of view could offer comparison to identity formation literature in two issues: first, the debate whether this process is dynamic or stable – an issue which was also explored in ethnic identity literature; second, the question of which of Marcia's models, is best embodied to ethnic identity process among Modern-Orthodox students in a gap year program – an issue which is still relatively limited in ethnic identity literature. Israeli context is important since the demographic changes in which the minority of 20% in 1948, is no longer a minority and challenges the hegemony of the majority, a process which could be similar in other countries.

### Ethnic Identity

Starting in the 1960s, research of ethnic identity from different disciplines has generated a range of definitions. In a review article from 1990, psychologist Jean Phinney examined how ethnic identity has been defined and conceptualized, its measurement indicators and consequent empirical findings. In that article, Phinney (1990) identifies two bodies of work: conceptualizations based on ego identity (Erikson,

1968; Marcia, 1980) and social identity literature (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Phinney found that ethnic identity was not exclusively an intrapsychic developmental construct (Marcia, 1980) but also a process embedded in context, which leads to a sense of connection to one's ethnic group (Phinney, 1992; Roberts et al., 1999). Thus, Phinney (1992) describes ethnic identity as an individual self-conception that is derived from one's knowledge of membership in a social group with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. The components of ethnic identity are therefore self-identification as a group member, a sense of belonging, and ethnic behaviors and practices (Phinney, 1992).

Phinney (1989) presents three stages in the development of ethnic identity, that built on and expand upon Marcia's identity status model (1966). The latter identified two dimensions of ethnic identity formation: exploration and commitment. In the first stage, to the "unexamined" stage, the individual is in a state of "diffusion" – an absence of exploration and commitment – or "foreclosure" – commitment without previous exploration. In the second stage, the individual is in "moratorium," namely in the process of exploration, during which he/she reads about the ethnic group they belong to, ask questions and discusses this ethnic identity with friends and family members. In the third stage, the individual assumes an ethnic identity – commitment following exploration. Phinney & Chavira (1992) found that progression towards an assumed ethnic identity occurs mainly between the ages of 16 and 19.

A prominent debate in the literature about identity formation is whether this process is dynamic or stable. The notion that this was a progressive process (e.g., Marcia, 1993; Waterman, 1982) – namely, the transition from low statuses (diffusion and foreclosure) to high statuses (moratorium and achievement) – has been challenged in the past decades, leading van Hoof (1999) to conclude that most studies indicate greater stability than change within identity formation literature. Recent studies vary in their findings (e.g. Klimstra et al., 2010; Kroger, 2007; Kroger, Martinussen, & Marcia, 2010; Meeus, 2011), suggesting that the complex process of identity formation is both progressive and regressive (e.g. Kroger, 2015; Fadjukoff et al., 2016), rather than linear or predictable.

Longitudinal research from the past 15 years has examined the extent to which ethnic identity formation is dynamic or stable by using the two factors of MEIM (Roberts et al., 1999), namely, exploration and commitment/affirmation. These studies yielded inconsistent results. For instance, French, Seidman, Allen and Aber (2006) found that the level of ethnic identity commitment among African American and Latinx American youth increased during the transition from junior high school to high school. In a longitudinal study with four time points, Syed and Azmitia (2009) found an increase of both exploration and commitment throughout the college years. Some of these findings are compatible with Tsai and Fuligni (2012) who compared ethnic identity development at two time points – at the end of high school and two years into college – and found a decrease in exploration on the one hand, and stability in commitment on the other. Dissimilarly, Kiang, Witkow, Baldelomar, and Fuligni (2010) conducted a longitudinal study among European, Latino, and Asian American from the age of 14 until 17 and found no change in both exploration and affirmation.

These findings are again different to Zhou et al. (2019) who found in a longitudinal study among ethnic and racial minority students during their first 2 years of college a moderate increase in both ethnic identity exploration and commitment. These findings stand in contradistinction to Lu, Benet-Martínez, and Robins (2020) whose ten year longitudinal study among Mexican American found a decrease in both exploration and affirmation, especially among the boys.

Another aspect of the identity formation process that is examined in the literature concerns the models, in terms of Marcia's statuses, that best embody this process. Three main models have been examined and illustrated thus far. The first model (Stephen et al., 1992) is MAMA (M = moratorium, A = achievement), which describes an iterative process with a period of moratorium followed by commitment. The second model (Pulkkinen & Kokko, 2000) is FAFA (F = foreclosure, A = achievement) which describes an iterative process of different forms of commitment. The third model (Côté & Schwartz, 2002) is MDMD (M = moratorium, D = diffusion), which offers the option of an iterative process with a period of moratorium that leads to diffusion. Whereas a range of longitudinal studies have been published to explore the question of stability versus change in the components of ethnic identity formation, there is still relatively limited research that applies Marcia's identity status model onto this question.

## Ethnic identity in Israel

The effects of socio-historical context on adolescent's identity development, as presented in Erikson's theory (Côté & Levine, 1988; Schachter, 2005; Schwartz, 2005), has thus far been examined mainly with university students in North America and Europe (Schwartz, 2005). More broadly, academic journals place greater emphasis on the American context (Neblett et al., 2019). Following Côté & Levine's (2002) framework, which proposes that different identity statuses will be found in different periods or sociocultural contexts, Modern-Orthodox communities in Israel offer an interesting case for studying ethnic identity formation.

Israeli society features unique ethnic identity divisions, with their specific characteristics within Modern-Orthodox communities. First, the Jewish Israeli society is broadly divided into two key ethnic identities: Mizrahim (Jews from Africa and Middle Eastern countries) and Ashkenazim (Jews of European and American origin). Yet due to mixed marriage and the lack of spatial segregation between these ethnic groups (Lewin-Epstein & Cohen, 2019), many Jewish Israelis can identify as belonging to both. In addition, the Israeli ethos, perpetuated by a national hegemonic discourse, denies the existence of ethnic stratification within the Jewish population (Biton, 2011; Cohen & Gordon, 2018; Sasson-Levi & Shoshana, 2013). With regards to the Modern-Orthodox society, some of the differences between Mizrahim and Ashkenazim refers to the ancient different customs and religious practices adopted by each group in each diaspora, such as differences in the texts and melodies used during services of prayer, customs of foods served, and even additional festivals.

Religious state schools in Israel, which are affiliated with the Modern-Orthodox movement, are essentially "Ashkenazi" (Gross, 2003), since they are based on European models of Jewish education which were

established on the tension between the need of keeping traditional Jewish education and the need to become integrated in the Modern World. This hegemonic model was expressed by Ashkenazi pedagogical methods within Jewish education as well as Ashkenazi religious practices such as prayer text and melodies. In 1978, the policy of the Ministry of Education was changed and slowly, after parental struggles, there was a change in religious practices in schools. There has been little empirical research into ethnic identity formation within the Modern-Orthodox education in the past three decades, which highlights the significance of the current research.

The first of the religious *mechina* gap-year programs, whose students are the research population of this study, was launched in 1988. As of yet, there has been no empirical research on the formation of ethnic identity within religious *mechina* gap-year programs. This study fills this gap while exploring the different components and changing status of ethnic identity formation during the religious *mechina* gap-year program in the aforementioned, important institution. In so doing, the study aims to contribute to the developmental literature of ethnic identity, in Israel.

## Research Questions

In light of the above theoretical and empirical discussions, the current study addresses the following questions:

**1. Does ethnic identity among the *mechina* gap-year students change over the course of the program, or is it stable? Where changes take place, are they progressive or regressive?**

Although research has dealt with this question, there is no conclusive answer to date. Moreover, this question has not yet been examined in an Israeli context. We therefore explore if the specific context of the one year *mechina* program engenders changes in students' ethnic identity.

**2. Which models of the ethnic identity statuses best capture the participants' experience? What are the observable changes in ethnic identity status in terms of exploration and commitment among participants?**

As discussed earlier, little longitudinal research which relates to the issue of a model of the ethnic identity formation process has been carried out yet. According to Phinney (1989) the development is linear, starting from diffusion moving to either foreclosure or moratorium and to ethnic identity achievement.

**3. Does ethnic descent account for differences in the distribution of ethnic identity status types?**

We examine the extent to which the *mechina* program and ethnic descent affect ethnic identity in terms of identity status. According to the literature, ethnic minorities exhibit more pronounced identity features than ethnic majorities (Syed & Azmitia, 2009; Yoon, 2011). Yet in Israel, Modern-Orthodox educational institutions are essentially "Ashkenazi" (Gross, 2003) and the Israeli ethos denies the existence of ethnic

stratification within the Jewish population (Biton 2011, Sasson-Levi & Shoshana, 2013). How will differences between ethnic minorities and majorities manifest then in such a unique context?

## Methods

### Sample

The research population was defined as Modern-Orthodox *mechina* students in Israel. The religious *mechina* gap-year programs were established to give an opportunity for male religious high-school graduates to prepare for a full three-year military service, in which they will be met with a new and potentially confronting non-religious way of life. This preparation includes such courses as religious faith and Israeli history and society, equipping participants with tools to cope with the challenges of serving as soldiers in a non-religious army.

Despite its significance, most ethnic identity research has focused thus far on adolescence and only few studies have critically engaged with the development of ethnic identity during the period of emerging adulthood (Lu et al., 2020; Syed & Azmitia, 2009; Tsai & Fuligni, 2012; Zhou et al., 2019). Given the limited longitudinal research about ethnic identity formation beyond late adolescence, longitudinal studies during the transition into adulthood are critically needed.

## Measures

### Demographic variables

Demographic questions included following Phinney & Ong's (2007) recommendation, the parents' ethnic origin when 50% of the parents were of Ashkenazi descent; 34.6% of Mizrahi descent; 11.5% of mixed descent; and 3.9% did not answer this question.

### Ethnic identity

Participants completed the 12-item version of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Roberts et al., 1999). Designed by Phinney (1992), the MEIM is a self-reporting tool comprised of two factors: 7 items measure levels of commitment, affirmation and belonging and 5 items measure exploration. The questionnaire's response format ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). According to Roberts et al. (1999), the reliability of the MEIM is 0.84 Cronbach's alphas for the first factor and 0.70 for the second factor.

The exploratory factor analysis of our data revealed a discrepancy in the classification of two items: item 3 ("I have clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me"), which was classified by Roberts et al. (1999) as commitment, affirmation and belonging, featured in our own data as the second factor, namely, exploration (.689). Likewise, item 7 ("I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me") which Roberts et al. classify as commitment, affirmation and belonging, was found better suited to the second factor in our research (.386, as opposed to .286 for the first factor).

Since these outcomes are in line with Phinney's (1992) original division, we decided to classify the two items (3 and 7) as exploration. Subsequently, reliability for the exploration factor was 0.73, and 0.85 for the commitment, affirmation and belonging factor.

Finally, given the significance of ethnic labeling to the formation and maintenance of group identity (Ashmore et al., 2004; Phinney & Ong, 2007), both measures of our questionnaire included an open question inviting participants to label themselves in relation to their ethnic identity. This question likewise follows the MEIM (Phinney, 1992; Roberts et al., 1999).

## Procedure

Approval for the study was obtained from the ethics committee of the School of Education at Bar-Ilan University as part of the author's Ph.D. dissertation. At the planning stage, 16 institutes were identified as religious *mechina* gap-year programs. Following a consultation process with several rabbis who are highly familiar with *mechina* programs, five were selected to as broadly representing the mainstream *mechina* programs. Of the five, two program directors rejected our invitation to partake in the research; one offered no explanation for his refusal and the other explained he did not allow students to be asked about their ethnic identity. The remaining three directors gave their consent. Our sample followed geographical lines, including students from Southern (1), Central (2) and Northern (3) Israel. In addition, our sample was based on to the total number of students attending each *mechina*: two medium-sized *mechina* programs, (1) and (2) have approximately 50 students each, and a large *mechina* (3) has approximately 100 students. The duration of each program is 10 months, taking place between September and July. Subsequently, students have the option of postponing their military service by an additional 6 months to extend their *mechina* studies.

The current study included students from two academic years who completed questionnaires both at the start and the end of the academic year. In total, 135 participants completed the questionnaires at the two points of measurement. 23% of the participants completed *mechina* 1; 23% were from *mechina* 2; and 54% were graduates of *mechina* 3.

## Results

In the first question we tested if there was stability or change in the ethnic identity of research participants between the survey measures. To do so, two paired t-test were used; there were no significant differences between the measures in both commitment and exploration (Table 1). These results point to a stability of the ethnic identity formation process. No demographic variables were found to have influence on this question.

In order to adjust the results of ethnic identity, which was measured using the commitment and exploration components, to Marcia's model, K-Means cluster analysis was used. Cluster analysis is a statistical classification technique, which identifies groups of individuals or objects that are similar to each other but different from individuals or objects in other groups. K-Means method is the most suitable

method in the case of a priori theory (Norusis, 2010). In the current study we used this technique in order to identify ethnic identity statuses by means of the two ethnic identity components, commitment and exploration. Since we know that the identity status model includes four statuses – diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium and achievement, K-Means method was used and four clusters were specified in relation to the two measures. However, only three statuses were identified from these four clusters in the two measures: diffusion, moratorium and achievement, the latter is represented by the other two clusters. Subsequently, K-Means method was used again and three clusters were specified. These statuses were identified within the two measures, with significant differences between the measures (Table 2).

With regards to our first research question, K-Means test points mainly to stability (71 participants, 52.6%) but also to both progression from low to higher status (27 participants, 20%) and regression from high to lower status (37 participants, 27.4%).

The results of the cluster analysis help us answer the second research question as well, namely which model/s of the ethnic identity formation process best capture the participants' experience? In contrast to the results of the repeated measures which point to a stability in the mean, the results at the individual level demonstrate transitions from achievement to moratorium (AM), from moratorium to both achievement (MA) and diffusion (MD), and from diffusion to moratorium (DM).

In order to examine what changes the three type of statuses undergo in terms of exploration and commitment between the survey measures, two repeated measures were used. Significant differences were found between the measures in both commitment ( $F(1,2) = 18.198, p < 0.001; \eta^2 = 0.22$ ) and exploration ( $F(1,2) = 22.503, p < 0.001; \eta^2 = 0.25$ ).

Post Hoc t test reveal that students who were in diffusion in the first measure significantly increase in exploration and decrease in commitment. Students who were in moratorium in the first measure significantly decrease in exploration and increase in commitment. No significant change was found among students who were in achievement in the first measure (Table 3).

In attempt to understand which component, exploration or commitment, affects the status changes between the two measures, we found that change in the identity achievement type relates only to commitment; while there was no change in exploration, the progression to achievement ( $n = 7$ ) was derived from an increase of 1.18 points in commitment, and the regression from achievement ( $n = 28$ ) was derived from a decrease of 0.42 points in commitment.

The regression from moratorium to diffusion ( $n = 8$ ) was derived mainly from a decrease of 0.72 points in commitment, while the progression to moratorium ( $n = 21$ ) was derived from a decrease of 0.34 points in commitment.

Our third research question asked whether ethnic descent accounts for differences in the distribution of ethnic identity status types between the measures. Chi-square tests revealed a significant relationship between ethnic identity distribution and student descent.

This is true for Ashkenazi (Table 4) students [ $\chi^2(1, 4) = 22.606, p < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = 1.44$ , power = 1.00], Mizrahi (Table 5) students [ $\chi^2(1, 4) = 18.439, p = .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = 1.70$ , power = 1.00] and the overall (Table 2 above) sample [ $\chi^2(1, 4) = 45.860, p < .001$ ; Cohen's  $d = 1.43$ , power = 1.00].

## Discussion

The current research set to explore the development of ethnic identity among *mechina* students in Israel. Our first research question concerned stability versus change in the ethnic identity of participants between the survey measures. The results reveal a difference between the mean level and the individual level. Similarly, to other studies (Kiang et al., 2010; Quintana, 2007; Yip, Seaton, & Sellers 2006), we found stability in terms of identity components at the mean level. Yet at the individual level, alongside the dominance of stability in identity statuses, we also found evidence for progression and regression in the ethnic identity formation process. In addition, we identified three ethnic identity statuses among participants: diffusion, moratorium, and achievement. The foreclosure status did not appear in either of the two measures and moratorium became the frequent status in the second measure. This result is similar to Syed & Mitchell (2013) who found moratorium to be the dominant status in the emerging adulthood period, and in line with Kroger et al. (2010) who found that 42% of their research participants at the age of 19 were in moratorium.

With regards to the second question, results attest to transitions from achievement to moratorium (AM), from moratorium to both achievement (MA) and diffusion (MD) and from diffusion to moratorium (DM). These findings support the MAMA model (Stephen et al., 1992), which describes an iterative identity formation process with a period of moratorium followed by commitment. Likewise, our results are in line with the MDMD model (Côté & Schwartz, 2002), which proposes an iterative process with a period of moratorium leading to diffusion. This study thus supports the recent understanding in the literature that identity formation is a complex process which includes both progression and regression (e.g. Fadjukoff et al., 2016; Kroger, 2015). Nevertheless, our findings are inconsistent with Phinney and Chavira (1992) who found that adolescents between the ages of 16 and 19 show only progression towards ethnic identity achievement.

Findings from the current study provide a start of explanation to the contradictory findings in the literature regarding the question of stability versus change in identity formation literature. As shown in Table 3 above, students who were in achievement status in measure 1 were stable in both exploration and commitment. In addition, students who were in moratorium status in measure 1 had decreased in exploration since they moved to either the achievement status (MAMA model) or diffusion status (MDMD model). Finally, students who were in diffusion status in measure 1 had an increase in exploration and decrease in commitment since they moved to the moratorium status (MDMD model).

The finding that commitment is the component responsible for both progression and regression in ethnic identity processes supports the claim that affirmation/commitment is a process which depends greatly on sociocultural context (Umaña-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009). This quite a unique finding

henceforth strengthen the importance of research of identity formation, generally, and ethnic identity formation, particularly, among variety of sociocultural contexts.

Interestingly, with regards to the third research question, while the literature on ethnic identity development stresses its relevance mainly for ethnic minorities (Phinney & Baldelomar, 2011; Syed & Azmitia, 2009; Yoon, 2011), we found no difference between Ashkenazi students and Mizrahi students at the beginning of the academic year. Likewise, there was no difference in the distribution of ethnic identity status types among these groups between the two measures. This result can be attributed to the unique sociocultural context in Israel, where the national ethos and hegemonic discourse broadly deny the existence of ethnic stratification within the Jewish population (Biton 2011, Lewin-Epstein & Cohen, 2019; Sasson-Levi & Shoshana, 2013), thus influencing identity perceptions of *mechina* students. Another explanation can be a result of the struggle on the hegemonic culture in Israel, when the Mizrahim became demographically from a minority of 20% in 1948 toward being the majority, a fact that express well recently in the Israeli music and in the political field. This explanation could be relevant to other countries, which undergo similar demographic changes and increase the importance of empirical study in these countries.

## Theoretical implication

This study utilized two methods for the measurement of changes (in ethnic identity formation): at the mean level, change was tested by taking the mean scores of the sample, whereas at the individual level we examined whether mean scores reflected most individuals in the sample (Klimstra et al., 2010; Meeus, 2011). These two methods yielded different results. By using cluster analysis to combine the two factors and then test the individual change of each participant in terms of Marcia's model, we were able to more sensitively understand changes in ethnic identity formation process, while comparing our own results with the literature on identity formation process. In conclusion, our findings join similar studies, which consistently point to changes in ethnic identity formation during emerging adulthood (Lu et al., 2020; Meeus, 2011; Syed & Azmitia, 2009; Tsai & Fuligni, 2012, Zhou et al., 2019).

## Limitations and recommendation for future research

The results of our study have several limitations. First, ethnic identity was measured by MEIM, which consists of three components: exploration, belonging, and behavior. These components reflect two factors (Phinney, 1992), the first identified by Roberts et al. (1999) as affirmation, belonging, and commitment, and the second as exploration of, and active involvement in group identity. Later, Phinney & Ong (2007) named these two factors: exploration and commitment, leaving only six questions in their revised questionnaire. Two questions arise from the way ethnic identity has been explored by the original MEIM: first, are belonging and commitment, which derive from different theoretical fields the same factor? Second, are there two or three factors in total? Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) provides inconsistent results about the number of factors (e.g. Fisher et al., 2020; Gaines et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2019) and we decided to limit the EFA to two factors, following Roberts et al. (1999) As such, our findings must be treated with caution.

A second limitation of the research is that our examined population cannot be generalized from due to its unique sociocultural context. Additionally, the sample size is not big enough since gaining access to students in *mechina* gap-year programs proved challenging. Future research should continue to examine ethnic identity formation process within different social contexts, while aspiring to achieve larger samples. Finally, it is important to focus on other domains of identity formation, such as religious identity, as highlighted by Erikson (Markstrom-Adams & Smith, 1996), as well as on the relationship between distinct identity domains (Phinney & Baldelomar, 2011).

The extensive research carried out between 1990 and 2020 (e.g. Fisher et al., 2020; Gaines et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2019) about the factorial question of the MEIM and the changes introduced in this questionnaire highlight the need to rethink about the extent to which this instrument can accurately test Phinney's (1990) theoretical framework. In this study we focused on quantitative changes to the ethnic identity formation process, exploring whether it is progressive, regressive, or stable. Yet it is equally, if not more important to question and uncover the conditions that lead to progressive, regressive, or stable processes. The latter can only be explored using qualitative research methods.

## Declarations

### Consent to participate:

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

### Conflict of interest:

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

## References

- Arnett, J. J. (2011). Emerging adulthood(s): The cultural psychology of a new life stage. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *Bridging cultural and developmental approaches to psychology: New Syntheses in theory, research and policy*. (pp. 255 – 275). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ashmore, R., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130 (1), 80-114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.80>
- Biton, Y. (2011). "Mizrahis and Law: Absence as Existence". *Mishpatim*, 41 (3),

315–377 (Hebrew).

Cohen, Y., & Gordon, N. (2018). Israel's bio-spatial politics: Territory, demography and effective control. *Public Culture*, 30 (2), 199-220.

<https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-4310888>

Côté, J. E., & Levine, C. (1988). A critical examination of the ego identity status paradigm. *Developmental Review*, 8 (2), 147-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(88\)90002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(88)90002-0)

Côté, J. E., & Levine, C. G. (2002). *Identity formation, agency, and culture*. Nahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Côté, J. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2002). Comparing psychological and sociological approaches to identity: identity status, identity capital, and the individualization process. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25 (6), 571-586.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.2002.0511>

Erikson, E. H. (1968) *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fadjukoff, P., Pulkkinen, L., & Kokko, (2016) Identity formation in adulthood: A longitudinal study from age 27 to 50, *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 16 (1), 8-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2015.1121820>

Fisher, S., Zapolski, T. B., Wheeler, L., Arona, P. G., & Barnes-Najor, J. (2020). Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measurement invariance across adolescence and diverse ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence*, 83 (1), 42-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.07.006>

French, S., Seidman, E., Allen, L., & Aber, J. (2006). The development of ethnic identity during adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 42 (1), 1 – 10.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.1.1>

Gaines Jr., S. O., Bunce, D., Robertson, T., Wright, B. with Goossens, Y., Heer, D.,

Lidder, A., Mann, A., & Minhas, S. (2010). Evaluating the psychometric properties

of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) within the United Kingdom.

*Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 10 (1), 1-19.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15283481003676176>

Gross, Z. (2003). The social roles of the Religious Zionist Education. In: A. Sagi &

D. Shwartz (Eds.), *Hundred Years of Religious Zionism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Vol. (pp.129-186).

Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press (Hebrew).

Kiang, L., Witkow, M., Baldelomar, O., & Fuligni, A. (2010). Change in ethnic

identity across the high school years among adolescents with Latin American,

Asian, and European backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39 (6), 683-693.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9429-5>

Klimstra, T. A., Hale, W. W., Raaijmakers, Q. A. W., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W.

(2010) Identity formation in adolescence: Change or stability? *Journal of Youth and*

*Adolescence*, 39 (2), 150-162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9401-4>

Kroger, J. (2007). *Identity development: Adolescence through adulthood*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)

Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Kroger, J. (2015). Identity development through adulthood: The move toward

“wholeness.” In K. C. McLean & M. Syed (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of identity*

*development* (pp. 65–80). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.013.004

Kroger, J., Martinussen, M., & Marcia, J. (2010). Identity status change during

adolescence and young adulthood: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33 (5),

683 – 698. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.11.002>

Lewin-Epstein, N., & Cohen, Y. (2019). Ethnic origin and identity in the Jewish

population of Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (11), 2118-2137.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1492370>

Lin, L., Shi, D., Snyder, L. A., Lee, T. and Taylor, W. D. (2019). Structure and Measurement Invariance of Ethnic Identity for Native American College Students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1652-1660. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01651>

Lu, C., Benet-Martínez, V., & Robins, R. W. (2020). The Development of Ethnic Identity from Late Childhood to Young Adulthood: Findings From a 10-Year Longitudinal Study of Mexican-Origin Youth. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11 (5), 709-717. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619887699>

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3 (5), 551-558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0023281>

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. (pp.159-187). New-York: Wiley.

Marcia, J. E. (1993). The ego identity status approach to ego identity. In J. E. Marcia, A. S. Waterman, D. R. Matteson, S. L. Archer, & J. L. Orlofsky (Eds.), *Identity: A handbook for psychosocial research*. (pp. 3-21) New York: Springer.

Markstrom-Adams, C., & Smith, M. (1996) Identity formation and religious orientation among high school students from the United States and Canada. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19 (3), 247-261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.1996.0023>

Meeus, W. (2011). The study of adolescent identity formation 2000-2010: A review of longitudinal research. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21 (1), 75-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00716.x>

Neblett Jr., E. W., Roth, W. D., & Syed, M. (2019) Ethnic and racial identity development from an interdisciplinary perspective: Introduction to the special issue.

*Emerging Adulthood*, 7 (2), 79-84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696819834366>

Nelson, J. C. (2012). *The sum of the parts: How perceived peer acceptance and parental culture affect multi-ethnic identity and self-esteem*. A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Communication in the Faculty of San Diego State University.

Norusis, M. J. (2010). Cluster Analysis. In: M. J. Norusis, PASW Statistics 18 Statistical Procedures Companion (pp.361-391). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9 (1), 34–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431689091004>

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (3), 499-514. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499>

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7 (2), 156-176.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/074355489272003>

Phinney, J. S. (2006). Ethnic identity exploration in emerging adulthood. In J. J. Arnett & J. L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adulthood: Coming of age in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. (pp. 117-134). Washington: American Psychological Association.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/11381-005>

Phinney, J. S., & Chavira, V. (1992). Ethnic identity and self-esteem: An exploratory longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15 (3), 271-281.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971\(92\)90030-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(92)90030-9)

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic

- identity: Current status and future direction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54 (3), 271-281. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271>
- Phinney, J. S., & Baldelomar, O. A. (2011). Identity development in multiple culture context. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *Bringing cultural and developmental approaches to psychology: New syntheses in theory, research and policy*. (pp. 161-186). New-York: Oxford University Press.
- Pulkkinen, L., & Kokko, K. (2000). Identity development in adulthood: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34 (4), 445 – 470. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2296>
- Quintana, S. (2007). Racial and ethnic identity: Developmental perspectives and research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54 (3), 259 – 270. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.259>
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Mase, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19 (3), 301-322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431699019003001>
- Sasson-Levi, O. & Shoshana, A. (2013). "Passing" as (non)ethnic: The Israeli version of acting white. *Sociological Inquiry*, 83 (3), pp. 448-472. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12007>
- Schachter, E. P. (2005). Context and identity formation: A theoretical analysis and a case study. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20(3), 375-395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558405275172>
- Schwartz, S. J. (2005). A new identity for identity research: Recommendations for expanding and refocusing the identity literature. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20 (3), 293-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558405274890>

- Stephen, J., Fraser, E., & Marcia, J. E. (1992). Moratorium-achievement (Mama) cycles in lifespan identity development: Value orientations and reasoning system correlates. *Journal of Adolescence*, 15 (3), 283-300. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971\(92\)90031-Y](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(92)90031-Y)
- Syed, M., & Azmitia, M. (2009). Longitudinal trajectories of ethnic identity during the college years. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 19 (4), 601–624.
- Syed, M., & Mitchell, L. L. (2013). Race, ethnicity, and emerging adulthood: Retrospect and prospect. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1 (2), 83-95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00609.x>
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In Worchel, S., Austin, W. G. (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson.
- Tsai, K. M., & Fuligni, A. J. (2012). Change in ethnic identity across the college transition. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(1), 56–64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025678>
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Gonzales-Backen, M. A., Guimond, A. B. (2009). Latino adolescents' ethnic identity: Is there a developmental progression and does growth in ethnic identity predict growth in self-esteem? *Child Development*, 80, 391–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01267.x>
- van Hoof, A. (1999). The identity status approach: In need of fundamental revision and qualitative change. *Developmental Review*, 19 (4), 622-647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/drev.1999.0499>
- Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology*, 18 (3),

341-358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.18.3.341>

Yip, T., Seaton, E. K., & Sellers, R. M. (2006). African American racial identity across the lifespan: Identity status, identity content, and depressive symptoms. *Child Development, 77* (5), 1504-1517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00950.x>

Yoon, E. (2011). Measuring ethnic identity in the Ethnic Identity Scale and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17* (2), 144-155. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023361>

Zhou, X., Lee, R. M., & Syed, M. (2019). Ethnic identity developmental trajectories during the transition to college. *Developmental Psychology, 55*(1), 157–169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000634>

## Tables

Table 1: Differences in commitment and exploration between survey measures (N=135).

	Measure 1		Measure 2		t-test	Cohen's d	Power
	M	SD	M	SD			
Commitment	1.77	0.65	1.84	0.72	t(134)=-1.121	0.10	0.21
Exploration	2.58	0.61	2.54	0.57	t(134)=-0.909	0.07	0.13

Table 2: Classification of participants into ethnic identity status in measure 1 and measure 2, and frequency of transitions between the measures (N=135).

	measure 1	measure 2	Origin in measure 1
Achievement	63 (46.7%)	41 (30.4%)	A=35, M=5, D=1
Moratorium	37 (27.4%)	72 (53.3%)	A=28, M=23, D=21
Diffusion	35 (25.9%)	22 (16.3%)	M=9, D=13

Table 3: Differences of the three type of statuses in terms of exploration and commitment between the survey measures (N=135)

Status in first measure	Factor	Measure 1		Measure 2		t-test	Cohen's d	Power
		M	SD	M	SD			
A	ex	2.93	0.44	2.84	0.44	t(62)=1.485	0.20	0.35
	com	2.29	0.37	2.25	0.60	t(62)=0.413,	0.08	0.10
M	ex	2.69	0.36	2.31	0.63	t(36)=4.068***	0.74	0.99
	com	1.10	0.44	1.67	0.67	t(36)=4.425***	1.01	0.99
D	ex	1.84	0.37	2.23	0.43	t(34)=-5.235***,	0.97	0.99
	com	1.55	0.43	1.26	0.48	t(34)=3.73***,	0.64	0.96

A=Achievement, M=Moratorium, D=Diffusion, ex=exploration, com=commitment

\*\* <0.001

Table 4: Classification of Ashkenazi participants into ethnic identity status in measure 1 and measure 2 and frequency of transitions between the measures (N=66).

	measure 1	measure 2	Origin in measure 1
Achievement	34 (51.5%)	21 (31.8%)	A=18, M=3
Moratorium	17 (25.8%)	40 (60.6%)	A=16, M=13, D=11
Diffusion	15 (22.7%)	5 (7.6%)	M=1, D=4

Table 5: Classification of Mizrachi participants into ethnic identity status in measure 1 and measure 2 and frequency of transitions between the measures (N=44).

	measure 1	measure 2	Origin in measure 1
Achievement	17 (38.6%)	10 (22.7%)	A=9, M=1
Moratorium	13 (29.6%)	23 (52.3%)	A=8, M=7, D=8
Diffusion	14 (31.8%)	11 (25%)	M=5, D=6