HYPOTHESES

Based on the literature presented above, the following hypotheses concern differences between school types in the identification and social distance between Arabs and Jews.

Hypothesis 1A: According to Social Identity Theory, we hypothesize that Arabs attending mixed schools are more likely, that those attending all-Arab schools, to identify as Palestinian and/or Arab rather than Israeli. The logic is that in mixed settings one’s ethnic identity is accentuated whereas in homogenous settings, it is taken for granted.

Hypothesis 1B: The same logic suggests that when compared to those attending all-Jewish schools, Jews attending mixed schools are more likely to identity in collective (rather than personal) terms.

Hypothesis 1C: Multicultural schools aim to strengthen the national identity of Palestinians. Therefore, we hypothesize that when compared to Arabs attending Hebrew mixed schools and all-Arab schools, those who attend multicultural schools are more likely to identify as Palestinian.

Hypotheses 2A-2C pertain to differences between school types in attitudes towards cross-ethnic interaction.

Hypothesis 2A: When compared to Jews, Arabs in general, as minority group members, will have more desire for interaction with majority group members than vice versa.

Hypothesis 2B: when compared to students who attend homogenous schools, both Arab and Jewish students who attend mixed schools would be more prone to interact with outgroup members, since they already experience it.

Hypothesis 2C: When compared to students attending homogenous schools, and Hebrew mixed schools, students who attend multicultural schools, both Jews and Arabs, will be more likely to interact with outgroup members, because these schools advocate for multicultural ideology.

Hypotheses 3A and 3B concern the association between identification and attitudes towards cross-ethnic interaction.

Hypothesis 3A: When compared to Arab students who identify as Palestinians, those who identify as Israelis will be more likely to interact with outgroup members, since they see themselves as part of the broader inclusive category.  
Hypothesis 3B: When compared to Jewish students who emphasize their Israeli identity, those who emphasize their Jewish identity, will have less desire for social contact with Arabs, as they choose primarily exclusive category.

1. DATA AND VARIABLES

The study population consisted of 6th-7th graders and 10th graders in 14 Israeli schools: The mixed Hebrew schools. In 2017, the population consisted 7 multicultural schools, and about 45 Hebrew – mixed schools. Data collection was carried out during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years. In general, five of the multicultural school in Israel are elementary schools in which students study from kindergarten to the 6th grade. We focused on 6th graders in these schools since collective identification evolve with age and 6th graders were the oldest cohort which had enough cases. However, since research has shown that identity development changes over age and can be controlled by age, we have decided to include a small representation to high school ages. Thus, the study sample includes 602 students in 28 classes in 14 schools: four multicultural, four Hebrew mixed schools, and three all-Arab and three all-Jewish schools as reference groups. It consisted 55.8% girls, 44.2% boys, 44.4% Jews and 55.6% Arabs.

I have attempted to sample the different types of schools in communities that are similar socioeconomically and geographically, although this was not always possible because there are very few multicultural and Hebrew-mixed schools, which are not necessarily located nearby. In addition, the socio-economic level of these schools’ population differs as previous studies show (Shwed et al., 2018, Levy & Shavit, 2015).

Hence, I first approached all multicultural schools and focused on the four – two of them belong to the ‘Hand in Hand’ school chain, and the other two are other initiatives. The Hebrew mixed schools were selected according to their geographic location, and the proportions of Arab students, so they would be as similar as possible to the multicultural school population – in 3 out of 4 of the Hebrew schools the proportions of Arabs were more than 30%. In the 4th school, the porportions were lower, but it was chosen due to its location to the nearby multicultural school.

**Procedures**

The students were asked to complete a questionnaire which was phrased according to the regulations of the chief scientist of the ministry of education. I had several rounds of pretest before the questionnaire was delivered to students, in order to check its accessibility, time it takes to fill it up, and clarity of its language. The questionnaires were all self-administered.

The questionnaires were originally developed in Hebrew and translated into Arabic and then double-checked by Arab native speakers. Pretest were conducted in both Arab and Jewish segregated schools. Problematic items were revised or removed and so that language equivalence between Hebrew and Arabic versions will be as best as possible. The surveys were distributed in each class by the researcher (Jewish) and an Arab research assistant, to allow students to ask questions and comment in their mother tongue. Response rate was high – about 95% in total, and no differences was detected between school types and grades. Each student answered autonomously. In segregated schools, either Arab or Jewish, we distributed questionnaires in one language, Arabic or Hebrew respectively. In mixed schools, students were allowed to choose between the two versions. Many Arab students in Hebrew schools chose the Hebrew version, as some of them are more fluent in written Hebrew than in Arabic.

**Variables, Measurement, and Descriptive Statistics**

**Independent variables**

Social identification

1. We used both open-ended and closed-ended questions to measure identification. The open-ended questions give respondents an opportunity to describe themselves without dictating to them answer categories. I employ the modification of twenty statement test (TST) model (Watkins, Yau, Dahlin, & Wondimu, 1997) for children (seven lines instead of twenty) as applied in Garza and Ringer’s study (Garza, 1987). The respondent received a page with seven blank lines, each beginning with “I \_\_\_\_\_” and which he/she completes freely. After completing the first page, the respondent ranks his/her answers according to their subjective importance to him/her.

Respondents responded to the open-ended stimuli with a total of about 300 different self-descriptions. All answers were transcribed (the Arabic answers were translated into Hebrew) and coded. Then codes were classified by type: (1) personal description and characteristics such as Happy, strong. (2) tastes—things that I do or don’t like (“I like football”. (3) relations—people I like or respect (like Bibi); (4) religious affiliation (am Muslim); and (5) national affiliation (am Palestinian). Each of the descriptions was coded independently by the researcher and the research assistant and minor differences were resolved after we discussed the issues and reached a consensus. We then created five dummy variables indicating that a response was personal, tastes, relations, national or religious.

2. The second measure of identity provided respondents with a list of five identification categories: Arab, Palestinian, Israeli, Muslim, Christian, and Jewish, and asked them to score the extent they felt that they belonged to each on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Christian and Muslim categories are not included in this analysis since students weren’t asked directly to which specific religion they belong. Therefore we couldn’t compare their sense of belonging to different groups, with their religion.

3. A single ethno-religious identification: This item is based on Smooha's index (2013, 2015, 2017). The respondents were asked to choose only one category to describe themselves—Arab, Arab Israeli, Israeli, Jewish, Palestinian, Arab Palestinian, or Palestinian in Israel. Since the same questionnaires were handed to both Jewish and Arab students in all types of schools (we didn’t want to create distinction when distributing the forms in a mixed setting), the single ethno-religious identification question entails a wide range of categories that some are considered mutually exclusive in Israel. (For instance – offering the category ‘Jewish’ to Arabs in Israel, or the category ‘Palestinian to a Jew).

Social Distance

4. To assess individual attitudes toward the outgroup members, I used the Bogardus social distance scale (Bogardus, 1933). The respondents were asked to what extent they were willing to (1) socialize in places where Jews/Arabs also hang out; (2) have a Jewish/Arab neighbor in their building or street; (3) study in the same class with Jews/Arabs; (4) host an Arab or Jew in their home; and (5) have a Jew/Arab as a good friend. Arabs were asked about Jews and vice versa. I have created a mean of the five items for each respondent.

**Control variables**

1. School type: Each school was coded according to its type: multicultural (1), Hebrew mixed (2), Arab segregated (3), and Hebrew segregated (4). In the next step a dummy variable was created for each.
2. Parents' education: We asked the students whether their parents had attended university/college. The answers were 1—yes, 2 – no, 3 – don’t know regarding each parent. A high rate did not know how to answer (3) - a common phenomenon as children do not always know what their parents’ education is. For each parent we created two dummy variables - one representing higher education, and the other representing the “don’t know” category. We first included both variables in the analysis (higher education and don’t know) and then included only the higher education dummy variable. The results were similar in both analyzes, indicating that most of the don’t know data refer to parents with no higher education.
3. Grade Level: 6th and 7th graders were coded as 0, 10th graders were coded as 1.
4. Gender: Self-reported male (1) or female (0)
5. Standard of Living: Respondents were asked eight questions concerning their standard of living: whether there was a cleaning person in their home; whether they had traveled abroad in the last two years; and if their home had a vacuum cleaner, a dishwasher, a dryer, air conditioning, satellite TV, and tablet or PC. Each item was given a value of 1 when it was in the possession of the household (and 0 otherwise). The index was constructed by adding the values for each item weighted by its relative scarcity. That is, in the scarcity index of living standard, each item was given a weight calculated as 1–p, where p is the proportion of households in the total population who possess the item.
6. Nationality (Arab): The respondents were not asked in the survey to write whether they are Jewish or Arab, in order not to force prior national affiliations that might affect their answers. We wanted to keep the questionnaire as not nationally contaminated as possible. However, they were identified according to their school type (in segregated - either Arab or Jews, according to its type. In mixed according to the language they speak at home – if they marked ‘Arabic’ as one of the answers they were coded as Arabs. If Hebrew and Russian / English, they were coded as Jews.
7. Level of religiosity: each respondent was asked to mark his/her level of religiosity on a scale from 1 (secular) to 5 (very religious).

Descriptive statistics of the data used in the analysis for the entire study sample, by school type, are presented in Table 1. As seen segregated schools are completely homogenous in this sample. The proportion of Arabs in each school type varies greatly, with multicultural schools that aspire to create parity exhibiting a mean of 63.9% per cent Arabs, and the Hebrew schools with 30.1% per cent Arabs on average. The low number of Arabs in Hebrew schools is understood, as these schools serve mostly Jewish population, and Arab students are the minority. The low number of Jews in multicultural schools reflect some of the schools’ and cohorts. In the multicultural high school sampled (10 graders), only 11.45% of the students are Jews, and in one of the multicultural schools located in an Arab settlement, only 38.3% of the students sampled were Jews. Class size is similar with about 22 students on average. 10th grade was over sampled in Arab segregated schools, which affected gender proportions as girls percentages are higher the older they are. In Hebrew segregated schools girls’ proportions were also bigger due to particular cohorts lack of symmetry in some schools. among the Jewish population, or the fact that many

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: Descriptive statistics of students’ sample | | | | | |
|  | **Jewish segregated** | **Arab Segregated** | **Hebrew-Mixed** | **Multicultural** | **Total** |
| **Nationality (Arabs)** | 0 | 100 | 30.1 | 63.9 | 55.6 |
| **Gender (Boys)** | 37.5 | 39.8 | 49.3 | 50 | 44.2 |
| **Educated Parents** | 34.8 | 23.5 | 26.7 | 58.1 | 34.9 |
| **Grade Level (10th grade)** | 20.5 | 67.9 | 21.2 | 24.3 | 37 |
| **N of respondents** | 112 | 196 | 146 | 148 | 602 |
| **Distribution** | 24.6 | 24.3 | 32.6 | 18.6 | 100% |

**SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS – PARENTS**

1. DATA AND VARIABLES

The purpose of the collecting data from parents was to understand selection effect. Since this data isn’t longitudinal and wasn’t collected from the parents of students’ sample, it is the Lesser of Two Evils, as it attempts to give some information about general parents population who chooses one school or another. I have intended to sample big enough number of parents as possible from each school and nationality.

The study population consisted of 264 respondents - 145 Jews, 119 Arabs, of which the majority are females (77.1%). Data collection was carried out during November 2018 to June 2019, in 13 schools: two all-Arab schools, three all-Jewish schools, four mixed multicultural, and four Hebrew mixed schools. The numbers of the surveyed parents differ in the mixed schools as I attempted to sample both Jewish and Arab parents. In addition, sampling parents in multicultural schools yielded more responses, as I have also surveyed parents of children in the new Jaffa multicultural school that I personally know.

Data was gathered in multiple ways –by approaching parents’ meetings in different schools and randomly asking to fill it up either in Hebrew or Arabic (as they choose). The second way was through school principals who agreed to send an online survey to parents via email and ask them to answer the questionnaire. The third way was through personal contacts with parents who filled the form online.

**Procedures**

The questionnaires given to parents were based on the students’ questionnaires, which were originally developed in Hebrew and translated into Arabic, and then double-checked by Arab native speakers. Each parent could have chosen either the Arab or Hebrew version, however many Arab parents preferred Hebrew questionnaires (42% Arab parents in total, 36.7% out of the Arab parents in multicultural schools, 88% of the Arab parents in Hebrew-mixed schools), as they are commonly more fluent in written Hebrew than in Arabic. Each parent answered autonomously.

**Variables, Measurements, and Descriptive Statistics**

**Independent variables**

Social identification

1. **A single ethno-religious identification**: Similar to the question asked in the children questionnaire, respondents were asked to choose one definition only to describe themselves—Arab, Arab Israeli, Israeli, Jewish, Palestinian, Arab Palestinian, or Palestinian in Israel. Since the same questionnaires were handed to both Jews and Arabs (we didn’t want to create distinction when distributing the forms in a mixed setting), the question entails a wide range of categories that are considered mutually exclusive in Israel.
2. **Sense of belonging:** similar to the questions asked in the children questionnaire, the second measure of identity provided respondents with a list of five identification categories: Arab, Palestinian, Israeli, Muslim, Christian, and Jewish, and asked them to score the extent they felt that they belonged to each on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

Social Distance

1. Attitudes toward the outgroup members: Based on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933), respondents were asked to what extent they were willing to (1) socialize in places where Jews/Arabs also hang out; (2) have a Jewish/Arab neighbor in their building or street; (3) work in the same place with Jews/Arabs; (4) host an Arab or Jew in their home; and (5) have a Jew/Arab as a good friend. Arabs were asked about Jews and vice versa. A mean variable was calculated for each respondent.

**Control variables**

1. Education: Respondents were asked to choose their level of education – graduated from primary school, graduated from high school, own a matriculation diploma, graduated from non-academic high school, studied BA but didn’t graduate, hold BA degree, hold MA degree, another diploma.
2. Gender: Self-reported mother (1) or father (0).
3. Income: Respondents were asked to mark whether their total net income is (1) much higher, (2) higher, (3) similar, (4) lower, (5) much lower than the average net income of Israeli households (15,000 NIS).
4. Religiosity: Respondents were asked to choose their lever of religiosity on a scale of 1 to 5.
5. Nationality (Arab):
6. School type: Each school was coded according to its multicultural type (1), Hebrew mixed (2), Arab segregated (3), and Hebrew segregated (4). In the next step, a dummy variable was created for each.

Descriptive statistics of the data used in the analysis by school type, are presented in Table 2. As seen segregated schools are completely homogenous in this sample. Multicultural schools were over sampled as said, but the number of Jews and Arabs is somewhat equal. The relatively equal number of Arab parents in the Hebrew-mixed school sample isn’t representative and is a result of the efforts to reach a minimal sample. The low percentages of men in the sample are since mothers tend to be more involved in the children’s education, and moreover in the Israeli-Arab society. Academic education variable reveals a great difference between all school types, as parents who send their children to study in multicultural schools are more educated, than parents in Hebrew-mixed schools. However, the high percentage of educated parents in the Jewish-segregated schools isn’t representative to Israeli-Jewish population as the official percentages stands on 32%. Income and religiosity level variables show the same patterns –Arab segregated schools’ parents are more religious, and their income is below Israeli average. The Hebrew-mixed schools’ parents’ population is not so religious (1.87 in average), similar to multicultural schools and the Jewish segregated schools’ populations (which is not representative apparently).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2: Proportions of control variables by school type (in percentages) | | | | | |
|  | **Jewish Segregated** | **Arab Segregated** | **Hebrew-Mixed** | **Multicultural** | **Total** |
| **Nationality (Arabs)** | 0 | 100 | 41 | 45.1 |  |
| **Gender (Men)** | 22 | 6 | 24 | 28 |  |
| **Academic education** | 86.1 | 18.18 | 15.25 | 72 |  |
| **Income** | 2.28 | 4.06 | 3.51 | 2.72 |  |
| **Religiosity** | 1.47 | 3.69 | 1.87 | 1.75 |  |
| **N of respondents** | 36 | 34 | 60 | 133 |  |

Proportions of the same variables broken by nationality in mixed schools in Table 3 reveal the differences and similarities between Jews and Arabs who attend these institutions. First, the percentages of Jewish and Arabs academically educated parents seem to resemble in each school type. 86.3% of Jewish parents and 76.7% of the Arab parents in multicultural schools while the proportions of academically educated parents in Hebrew-mixed schools are much lower (13.89% of the Arabs, 17.39% of the Jewish parents).

In addition to academic education, income level of Jews and Arabs is similar in each school. (2.66 average of Jewish parents in multicultural schools, 2.77 average of Arab parents) compare to 3.42 among Jewish parents and 3.67 average of Arab parents in Hebrew-mixed schools. However, religiosity level of Arab parents in both school types, is relatively low compare to Arab general population, but higher than those of Jewish parents.

This data reveal that there is a socio-economic difference between Hebrew-mixed schools’ to multicultural schools’ population as the former are less educated, and have a lower income level than the latter. In addition, it seems that while Arabs in general tend to be more religious than Jews, the Arab parents who enroll their children to mixed schools are less religious (but still more than Jews), which can explain their choice in integration with Jewish majority.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3: Proportions of control variables in mixed schools by ethnicity | | | | | |
|  | **Jews Multicultural** | **Arab Multicultural** | **Jews -Hebrew-Mixed** | **Arabs-Hebrew-Mixed** | **Total** |
| **Academic education** | 86.3% | 76.7% | 13.89% | 17.39% |  |
| **Income** | 2.66 | 2.77 | 3.42 | 3.67 |  |
| **Religiosity** | 1.25 | 2.37 | 1.56 | 2.36 |  |
| **N of respondents** | 73 | 60 | 36 | 24 |  |

**RESULTS**

**Differences between students attending mixed and homogenous schools**

I begin the analysis by studying the variables that are related to the type of school that Arab and Jewish students attend.

The multinomial logit model shown in Table 4 indicates that among Arabs, educated families and those with a higher standard of living are significantly more likely to enroll their children in multicultural schools than in segregated Arab schools (the reference category on the dependent variable).

Enrollment of Arabs in Hebrew mixed schools are more likely among non-academically educated families and those with a low level of religiosity. It appears that the less religious Arab families are more open for encounters with Jews and their supposedly more liberal culture. In addition, Arab children in Hebrew schools are associated with a higher standard of living than those of Arabs who attend segregated schools, (but lower than those of Arabs who study in multicultural schools), which may occur since they live in mixed communities and integrated with a more Israeli standard of living.

Regarding Jews, it appears that students from highly educated families are more likely to attend multicultural schools than segregated schools, while Jewish enrollment in Hebrew mixed schools is associated with a lower standard of living. It resonated with previous literature findings, claiming that middle-upper class parents, both Jews and Arabs are those who enroll their children in multicultural schools (Bekerman & Tatar, 2009).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Binary Logit Regression of the log odds studying in a Hebrew-mixed or multicultural school, by nationality** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Arabs Multicultural** | **SE** | **Jews Multicultural** | **SE** | **Arabs Hebrew-mixed** | **SE** | **Jews Hebrew-mixed** | **SE** |
| Intercept | -3.065\* | .600 | -1.316\* | .549 | .587 | .608 | .597 | .430 |
| Gender (boy) | .011 | .331 | .338 | .387 | .711 | .384 | .310 | .291 |
| Educated parents | 1.296\* | .300 | 1.123\* | .347 | -1.529\* | .539 | -.090 | .302 |
| Standard of living | 1.378\* | .321 | 0.20 | .278 | .389 | .393 | -.1544\* | .268 |
| Religiosity | -.053 | .132 | -.547\* | .244 | -1.033\* | .184 | .209 | .175 |
|  | **17.8%** |  | **7.5%** |  | **16%** |  | **16.9%** |  |

1. **Testing the hypotheses**

I now turn to test the hypotheses, beginning with those concerning differences between school type and ethnicity in identification.

Hypothesis 1A stated that Arabs attending mixed schools are more likely, than those attending all-Arab schools, to identify as Palestinian and/or Arab rather than Israeli, and Hypothesis 1B states that Jews attending mixed schools are more likely to identity in collective terms. Hypothesis 1C states that Arabs who attend multicultural schools are more likely to identify as Palestinian.

Figure 1 displays the proportions of Arabs and Jews who, in the open-ended questions responded with each of five different categories of identifications. The Figure shows that both Arab and Jewish students, when answering freely, identify in terms of their personal attributes, tastes, and relations with friends and families. Only a minority identify in terms of religion or nationality. However, there is a significant difference (p < 0.05) between Jews and Arabs in these latter identifications. While 19.9% of the Arab students mentioned national identification and 20.8% religious identification, only 3.4% and 2.2% of the Jews did so. One possible explanation is that since Jews are the majority in Israel, their national and religious identity is taken for granted and they do not feel a need to mention it.

Figure 2 breaks national and religious identification of Arabs and Jews by school type. As seen, Arab students in multicultural schools mention national identification more often than Arabs in other school types, while Arabs who study in segregated schools mention religious identity somewhat more often than their peers in other school types. However, the differences between students in the three school types in their free form national and religious identifications, are statistically insignificant

When I examined the content of terms Arab students used in their questionnaires, it appeared that while those who study in Hebrew mixed schools use the term ‘Arab’, students in multicultural and segregated school use either ‘Arab’ or ‘Palestinian’ identification. Whereas Arab identity is considered less radical and more culture related, identification with the Palestinian group is perceived as more nationalistic and radical in Israeli society.

This finding is consistent with the hypothesis, as it appears that the Arab minority group distinct itself, however the terms of distinction differ in each school type.

Regarding the Jewish students, it seems that in general very few mention national categories, but the percentage of students who do so in segregated schools is still lower than in mixed schools, where Jews and Arabs meet each other daily. This is consistent with hypothesis 1B.

Table 5 presents binary logistic regression estimating the effect of school type on the log odds of mentioning national or national and religious identifications in the open questions. The regression is estimated for Arabs. Given the small number of Jews who mentioned either national or religious affiliation, it was not possible to estimate a comparable regression for them. The regression controls for respondent's age, gender, religiosity and parents’ education.

The first column examines the effects on the log odds of national-religious identifications (whether the respondent mentioned either national or religious identification) and the second column examines the effect on the log odds of national identification.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Binary Logit Regression of the log odds for mentioning national or national-religious identification among Arab students** | | |
|  | 1. **National-religious** | 1. **National only** |
| **Age** | 1.445\* (.316) | 2.495\* (.436) |
| **Boys** | -.410 (.268) | -1.065\* (.339) |
| **Educated Parents** | .691\* (.291) | .792\* (.336) |
| **Multicultural School** | .383 (.348) | 1.239\* (.414) |
| **Hebrew Mixed** | .780 (.482) | 1.472\* (.606) |
| **Religiosity** |  | .000 (.155) |
| **Constant** | -2.110\* (.574) | -3.433\* (.728) |
| **Pseudo R2** | 14.7% | 24.7% |

The findings demonstrate that studying in mixed schools (whether multicultural or Hebrew-mixed versus segregated) is associated with higher odds for mentioning national and religious identifications, however they are significant when examining national affiliations only. These results go hand in hand with social identity theory, predicting that daily intergroup contact emphasizes Arab group members’ collective identification.

Students’ older age is also associated with identifying with collective affiliations (national-religious and national), which is consistent with the literature on self-identification processes mentioned above (E. Erikson, 1968; Jean S. Phinney, 1989). However, when I examine the model on younger and older groups separately, the other coefficients remained in the same direction.

In addition, the relative odds of mentioning either national-religious or national identification are higher among girls and children whose parents hold academic degree. Regarding gender, the difference between both equations suggest that girls are more associated with mentioning national affiliations than boys, however, when religious and national components are combined, the effect of gender is small and insignificant. Girls are therefore carriers of their ethnic-national heritage but not religious identity.

1. **Second measurement - Sense of belonging**

In the second measurement of identification, students were asked to rate their sense of belonging to different groups – Arab, Israeli, Jewish and Palestinian. As seen in Figure 4, Arab students’ average sense of belonging to the Arab group is the highest (4.40) and the lowest to the Israeli group (2.55). In addition, there are significant differences between multicultural and segregated Arab schools compared to mixed Hebrew schools in Arab students’ sense of belonging to the three national categories. While in multicultural and Arab schools, they express a high sense of belonging to the Palestinian group (4.15, 4.30 respectively) their Arab peers who study in Hebrew school score it much lower (2.07). By contrast, Arab students who attend Hebrew schools exhibit a high sense of belonging to the Israeli category (4.16) while in multicultural and segregated schools’ the comparable score is much lower (2.41, 2.24). The degree of belonging to the Arab group, which is considered a politically neutral category, is similar in the three school types.

The sense of belonging among the Jewish students to the Israeli and Jewish groups (Figure 5) is quite similar and relatively high (4.47, 4.29) and there are but small differences between the school types. The most striking one is that in multicultural schools, Jewish students are less likely to exhibit a strong degree of identification with either of the two categories than Jews in the other two school types. There are several possible explanations for these results: first, that Jewish parents who enroll their kids in multicultural schools are more secular and more opposed to Israel’s nationalist Jewish regime; Second, the bilingual schools’ agenda strengthen Palestinian identification, and to some extent de-legitimizes the identification as either Jewish or Israel.

Table 6 presents binary logistic regression coefficients estimating differences between school types in Arabs’ the sense of belonging to the Arab, Palestinian and Israeli groups, while controlling for respondent's age, gender, religiosity and parents’ education. The degree to which respondents expressed a sense of belonging was recoded into binary categories representing high and low sense of belonging (1, 2, 3=0; 4, 5=1).

The results are consistent with descriptive results. Arab pupils who study in Hebrew mixed schools have higher odds to have stronger sense of belonging to the Israeli group, and weaker sense of belonging to the Palestinian group, compared to their peers in multicultural and Arab segregated schools. Religiosity however, is associated with sense of belonging to Arab and Palestinian group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6: Binary Logit Regression of odds for sense of belonging to Arab, Palestinian and Israeli groups among Arab students** | | | |
|  | **Belong Palestinians** | **Belong Israeli** | **Belong Arab** |
| **Age** | -.021 (.308) | -.826 (.299) | -.328 (.352) |
| **Multicultural**  **School** | -.172 (.358) | .295 (.350) | -.232 (.410) |
| **Hebrew Mixed** | -2.189\* (.490) | 1.787\* (.461) | -.464 (.498) |
| **Boys** | .162 (.283) | .099 (.279) | -.147 (.311) |
| **Religiosity** | .341\* (.128) | -.169 (.126) | .394\* (.146) |
| **Educated parents** | .319 (.324) | -.447 (.330) | .129 (.360) |
| **constant** | -.023 (.531) | -.121 (526) | .739 (.598) |
| **Pseudo R2** | 15.7% | 15.5% | 4.2% |

These results strengthen the finding indicated above regarding SIT. Although studying in segregated and multicultural are quite similarly associated with higher level of identification with Arab and Palestinian groups, students in multicultural schools, have higher odds to emphasize their national category when asked freely, which may be the result of their daily encounter with Jewish students.

Table 7 presents binary logistic regression coefficients estimating the odds to have sense of belonging to Jewish and Israeli groups among Jewish students, as a function of school type, while controlling for the respondent's school type, age, gender, religiosity and parents’ academic education. The results indicate that religiosity and parents’ education are the main determinants when predicting students’ sense of belonging to the Jewish group, and their direction, as expected, is in opposite directions - while being more religious is associated with higher sense of belonging to the Jewish group, parents’ higher education is less associated with high sense of belonging to the Jewish group as academic education goes hand in hand with secular and liberal beliefs. With regards to the Israeli group, none of the effects are statistically significant.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Binary Logit Regression of odds for sense of belonging to Jewish and Israeli groups among Jewish students** | | |
|  | **Belong Jews** | **Belong Israeli** |
| **Age** | .011 (.589) | -.600 (.597) |
| **Multicultural**  **School** | .242 (.530) | -.522 (.611) |
| **Hebrew Mixed** | .464 (.496) | .383 (.613) |
| **Boys** | -.584 (.370) | .179 (.425) |
| **Religiosity** | .795 (.294)\* | .203 (.278) |
| **Educated parents** | -.757 (.375)\* | -.029 (.435) |
| **constant** | .221 (.562) | 1.337 (.632) |
| **Pseudo R2** | 10.6% | 2.8% |

1. **Third measurement: Choosing one identification**

The columns presented in figure 6 show that the most common identification of Arab students in general (the total is presented in the right column) is Arab-Palestinian (33%). However, distribution according to school types reveals differences between them. The most common identification among multicultural and Arab school students’ is Arab-Palestinians (33% and 37.2%, respectively), while the most common identification among Hebrew schools’ students is the hyphenated Arab-Israeli category (61.4%). In other words, Hebrew schools’ Arab students tend to perceive themselves as both Israeli and Arab, and to choose less ‘politically radical’ identification in Israel as compared to Arab students in multicultural and Arab schools.

The category ‘Palestinian in Israel’, which combines both national affiliations, is the largest among segregated schools’ students (26.5%) and low among Hebrew-mixed and multicultural school’s students (2.3%, 7.7%).

Next, I created dummy variables to indicate whether respondents incorporated Israeli or Palestinian identification components.Incorporating Israeli component suggest recognizing belonging to Israel, in an essential or a formal citizenship manner. Including Palestinian component suggests affiliation to the Palestinian people. Figure 7 shows the results in total and by school type:

While 81.8% of the Hebrew-mixed school students incorporate Israeli components in their identification, only 44.4% of the segregated school students’ do so, and, surprisingly enough, even less in multicultural schools: only 30.8% of multicultural schools’ student incorporated in their identification Israeli component.

The results in Smooha's annual indices of 2015 (2017) indicates that a clear majority (81.5%) of the Arab citizens incorporate Israeli components in their identity, compared to 17.6% who deny their 'Israeliness'. 58% of the Arabs incorporate Palestinian component in their identity, compared to 42.5% who do not. According to Smooha, there is a correlation between choosing an exclusive Palestinian identity and having no Jewish friends or being harmed by Jews. Results in our sample suggest that choosing less Israeli and more Palestinian identification isn’t necessarily related to having contact with Jews, as multicultural school students who study with Jews daily, choose Palestinian identity nonetheless. Both groups of students who study in mixed settings ‘behave’ differently than the pattern suggested by Smooha. Evidently, a different explanation is necessary. This explanation can be related to students’ political and multicultural perception, according to Palestinian identity as the minority’s oppressed identity should be maintained and strengthen even further in light of a bi-national meeting. Their Israeli identification, In addition, isn’t being adopted although they study with Jews daily, since the boundaries between the Palestinian and Israeli identifications are rigid and mutually exclusive.

In figure 8, Jewish students’ single identification by school type is presented. The distribution show that while majority of students in multicultural schools choose the ‘Israeli’ identification, those who study in Hebrew-mixed and segregated schools choose the ‘Jewish’ identification. Smooha’s indices (ibid) show that those who prefer Israeli on Jewish identity, are more secular and politically left wingers, which explains the differences between school types.

In sum, the three measurements of identification (free form, sense of belonging and one identification) show similar patterns. Arabs who study in multicultural schools tend to identity as Palestinians, while Arabs who study in Hebrew mixed schools tend to identify as Israelis. Jews who study in multicultural schools, identify less as either Israeli or Jewish than their peers in Hebrew - mixed or segregated schools.

Nevertheless, both Jews and Arabs who study in mixed schools, tend to emphasize their national identification more than their peers in segregated schools. However, the Arab students emphasize different collective affiliations in different schools– ‘Arab’ in Hebrew mixed schools and ‘Palestinian’ in multicultural schools. This finding reinforces Social Identity Theory that expects more identity salience due to the encounter.

Regarding students’ level of identification with various categories, two explanations can be offered to understand differences across types of schools. The first is a selection effect, suggesting that certain types of families choose certain types of schools. The second is that schools socialize their students to develop identifications of one type or another. To determine it, I have measured parents’ attitudes and identifications in order to examine if there is any correlation between parents’ and student’s data. Important to mention that the data we are using is not optimal as it is not longitudinal, and the parents surveyed are not related to the students’ sample.

**PARENTS DATA**

**First measurement – A single ethno-religious identification among parents:**

Figure 9 show percentages of parents’ single identification. Distribution by school types reveals differences between them. While the most common identification among Arab parents who send their children to study in Hebrew-mixed schools is the hyphenated Arab-Israeli category (73.9%), in multicultural schools we can identify more diversity in parental choices.

Among the Jewish parents, Figure 10 shows that in multicultural schools parents choose the Israeli category as their main identity, which is considered more secular in Israel, in the Hebrew-mixed schools the division between both identities is much more equal, indicating a stronger Jewish importance among them.

**Second measurement – sense of belonging:**

Descriptive results (by nationality) indicate that Arab parents feel a stronger sense of belonging to the Arab group (82.4%) and much less to the Israeli one (31.6%) (Figure 10).

Nevertheless, when comparing results in different school types, there are **significant** differences between multicultural and segregated Arab schools’ parents, when compared to mixed Hebrew schools in their sense of belonging to the three national categories. While in multicultural and Arab segregated schools, Arab parents express a strong sense of belonging to the Palestinian group (4.24, 4.36) and to the Arab group (4.61, 4.82), Arab parents who send their children to study in Hebrew school score both Palestinian and Arab belonging lower (3.0, 3.95). Belonging to the Israeli group, however, is the opposite – while the average score among Hebrew-mixed schools’ parents is 4.09, Arab parents who send their children to study in multicultural and segregated schools scored it much lower (3.09, 3.19).

When compared to students’ data, similar trends are identified in parents’ sense of belonging to the Palestinian and Israeli groups. Sense of belonging to the Arabs group however, although was quite similar among students in all school types, differed among parents, as those who send their children to study in Hebrew-mixed schools scored it lower than others. This might indicate their desire to distance themselves from Arab culture.

Sense of belonging to Jewish and Israeli groups among Jewish parents appears to be the lowest among multicultural schools’ parents, as they are less likely to exhibit a stronger degree of identification with either of the two categories than others.

The result indicate that selection effect is very strong - Arab parents who send their children to multicultural schools tend to incorporate Palestinian components in their identity, whereas those who send their children to study in Hebrew mixed schools tend to incorporate Israeli components. Jewish parents, who send their children to study in multicultural schools, feel less belonging to the Israeli and Jewish group.

To sum, students’ identification patterns is probably transmitted from parents who mostly choose school type in a manner that is consistent with their own identification. Most Arab parents, due to the geographic segregation is Israel, don’t have many options and send their children to all-Arab schools. However, the other two school types offer parents options to socialize their children’s identity in a manner consistent with their own.

1. **Attitudes towards outgroup members**

I now test hypotheses 2A-2C. Hypothesis 2A states that when compared to Jews, Arabs have more desire for interaction with Jews than vice versa. Hypothesis 2B states that when compared to students who attend homogenous schools, both Arab and Jewish students who attend mixed schools would be more prone to interact with outgroup members. Hypothesis 2C states that when compared to students attending homogenous schools, and Hebrew mixed schools, students who attend multicultural schools, both Jews and Arabs, will be more likely to interact with outgroup members.

Figure 13 presents mean of Jews and Arabs attitudes towards contact with each other and the average score of the five by school type and students’ nationality.

When analyzing the results, it seems that in general Arabs are more willing to interact with Jews than the opposite (3.77, 3.47) which resonates with the literature on minority-majority relations and the asymmetric desire to have contact. However, splitting it according to school types, shows meaningful differences.

In segregated schools both Arab and Jewish students’ willingness to interact with outgroup members is the lowest as compared to other school types; but Arabs’ willingness is higher than those of Jews (3.45 in average among Arabs, 3.09 among Jews). The desire of Jewish students in Hebrew mixed schools for interaction with Arabs is much lower than their Arab peers (3.41 vs. 4.76). However, the fact that Jewish students in Hebrew mixed schools are more willing to have interaction compared to Jews in segregated schools, suggests that having contact might decrease social distance to some extent. Another possibility is that those who attend Hebrew mixed schools are more willing a priori to interact with Arabs. Namely, that school differences in the scale reflects a selection effect.

The Arab minority group in the Hebrew mixed schools is much keener to have contact with Jews, compared to their Jewish peers in these schools, but also compare to the Arab students in segregated schools, either due to its minority position in school and its small number or because of selection effect.

In multicultural schools however, we can see a reversed pattern. Jewish students are not only more open for interactions with Arabs than their Jewish peers in segregated and Hebrew-mixed schools (4.41), but surprisingly, they are also more willing to have contact with Arabs than their Arab peers (4.030). The trend of minority-majority relations we know from literature worldwide is overturned in multicultural schools, where the hegemonic majority group shows more willingness to decrease social distance than the minority group. In addition, Arab students attending multicultural schools differ significantly in their attitudes from their Arab peers in both Hebrew-mixed and segregated schools. Their desire for contact is higher than those who study in segregated schools, but lower than those in Hebrew-mixed schools.

Moreover, when the same questions were examined among the Arab parents’ population (Figure 14), there were no significant differences between them and their desire to have interaction was similar. This difference might indicate schools’ effect on students’ mutual attitudes.

I now test hypotheses 3A-3B. Hypothesis 3A states that when compared to Arab students who identify as Palestinians, those who identify as Israelis will be more likely to interact with outgroup members, since they see themselves as part of the broader inclusive category.  
Hypothesis 3B states that when compared to Jewish students who emphasize their Israeli identity, those who emphasize their Jewish identity, will have less desire for social contact with Arabs, as they choose primarily exclusive category. In order to examine the effect on attitudes on outgroup members I used a linear regression (table 5). Segregated schools are the reference category.

The first **Jews on Arabs** equation present linear regression coefficients predicting Jewish students to have positive attitudes towards contact with Arabs. The first model shows, unsurprisingly, that Jews who study in mixed schools, especially multicultural are more likely to have positive attitudes towards contact with Arabs, much more than their Jewish peers who study in segregated schools. Age seems to be an important factor as 10th grade students are more likely to positive attitudes, significantly. Gender, parents’ education and level of religiosity don’t seem to have significant effect on positive attitudes. Since the Hebrew schools sampled, whether segregated or mixed belong to the public school system, and not to the religious public schools, religiosity’s lack of effect is understood. In the second model adding Jewish / Israeli component (one identification) doesn’t seem to have significant effect on attitudes.

The first model in the **Arab on Jews** equation present linear regression coefficients predicting positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. Results show that studying in Hebrew mixed schools contributes to positive attitudes towards contact with Jews the most, much more than studying in multicultural and segregated schools. Age seems to be an important factor, as studying in 10th grade is contributing to positive attitudes, significantly. Level of religiosity reduces positive attitudes, significantly. Arab boys are associated with less positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. However, having educated parents contributes to positive attitudes (both variables are not significant).

Model 2 and 3 adds identification variables as explanatory variables for positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. The first model controls for Palestinian or Israeli components (whether the respondent chose a single ethno-national identity which included Israeli or Palestinian component), and the second adds sense of belonging to Israeli and Palestinian groups (to what extent the respondent feel sense of belonging to each group).

The results of model 2 indicate that when controlling Israeli / Palestinian identification components, studying in a mixed school, especially Hebrew-mixed, contributes to positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. Educated Parents as well as being in tenth grade contribute to positive attitudes. Level of religiosity on the other hand, reduces the odds for positive attitudes. Palestinian identification component reduces the odds to have positive attitudes towards Jews, but the result isn’t statistically significant. However, Including Israeli component increases the odds for positive attitudes towards contact with Jews, significantly. Boys’ are associated with lower attitudes towards contact but the result isn’t significant.

Model 3 adds another identification measurement (sense of belonging to Israeli / Palestinian group) and shows that mixed schools’ effects remains positive (positive attitudes towards interaction with Jews) and statistically significant (although lower) in both types of schools. The effect of age, gender, parents’ education and religiosity is similar to the first model and significant. The additional identification measurements are showing the same trend – higher sense of belonging to the Israeli group increases positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. Sense of belonging to the Israeli group measurement has a stronger effect on attitudes than the Israeli component. Higher sense of belonging to the Palestinian group decreases positive attitudes towards contact (but coefficients are very low and insignificant).

When comparing both groups – Jews and Arabs, the effect of age shows an opposite pattern – while Jewish children in older ages decreases desire to have contact with outgroup members, Arab children in older ages increases their desire to have contact with Jews. This might be a reflection of the statues que of the relations between both groups. The Jewish majority reflects the ethnic statues que, while Arab minority members reflect how they would like the statues que to be.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Linear Regression predicting desire to have contact with out group members as a function of type of school** | | | | | |
|  | **Jews on Arabs – model 1:** | **Jews on Arabs – model 2:** | **Arabs on Jews – model 1:** | **Arabs on Jews – model 2:** | **Arabs on Jews – model 3** |
| **Multicultural School** | 1.161\* (.208) | 1.190\* (.208) | .482\* (0.163) | .492\* (.162) | .484\* (.154) |
| **Hebrew Mixed** | .343\* (.163) | .377\* (.164) | 1.128\* (0.218) | .949\* (.222) | .811\* (.231) |
| **Age** | -.534\* (.194) | -.503\* (.194) | .308\* (0.140) | .370\* (.141) | .407\* (.134) |
| **Boys** | -.042 (.150) | -.039 (.151) | -.153 (0.126) | -.157 (.127) | -.150 (.121) |
| **Educated Parents** | .145 (.158) | .137 (.157) | .256 (0.144) | .280 (.142) | .385\* (.136) |
| **Religiosity** | -.058 (.093) | -.024 (.098) | -.233\* (0.059) | -.196\* (.058) | -.191\* (.056) |
| **Jewish component** |  | -.913 (.537) |  |  |  |
| **Israeli component** |  | -.716 (.545) |  | .388\* (.133) | .314\* (.133) |
| **Palestinian component** |  |  |  | -.182 (.145) | -.087 (.143) |
| **Belong to Palestinian group** |  |  |  |  | .040 (.054) |
| **Belong to Israeli group** |  |  |  |  | .202\* (.045) |
| **Constant** | 3.263 (0.211) | 3.993 (.556) | 4.023 (0.251) | 3.815 \* (.285) | 3.095\* (.354) |
| **R2** | **17.1%** | **18.5%** | **21.2%** | **24.2%** | **31.4%** |

While hypothesis 3A is confirmed, as Arabs who identify with Israeli category express more positive attitudes towards contact with Jews. However, hypothesis 3B is rejected, as it seems that identification with Jewish compared to Israeli categories, don’t have significant impact on attitudes towards contact with Arabs.

**Discussion**

The questions of this research were what the relation between social identification and social distance between Arabs and Jews, and school type is, and whether social identification is related to social distance.

Our first hypothesis stated that Arabs attending mixed schools are more likely to identify as Palestinian and/or Arab rather than Israeli, that Jews attending mixed schools are more likely to identity in collective terms and that Arabs who attend multicultural schools are more likely to identify as Palestinian following school’s multicultural agenda.

The results are partially in line with these hypotheses. In general, due to their position as a minority group, Arab students’ collective identification is more salient, especially in multicultural schools, much more than Jewish students. Nevertheless, Arabs who study in Hebrew mixed schools tend to identify as Arabs and Israelis, two categories that are perceived as less oppositional in the Israeli political climate. While this marks their ethnic uniqueness on the one hand, it also denotes an inclusive civil component, intimating their desire to integrate. Those who study in multicultural or segregated schools, in contrast, tend to identify as Palestinians and eschew the Israeli civil component. Palestinian identification is considered a negation of Israeli identity and a radical political act. In practice the two definitions contradict each other, and it seems that in each school type Arab students ‘choose sides. In Hebrew mixed schools’ Palestinian identification is less legitimized since the school’s ideology has a bias towards Hebrew-Jewish-Zionist logic. In contrast, in multicultural schools’ Palestinian identity is considered the desired identification; therefore, Israeli and Jewish identification are less dominant.

Jewish students’ collective identification isn’t salient in any school type, because they are the hegemonic majority in Israel, therefore their identification is taken for granted. In addition, data showed significant differences between Jewish and Arab students, who attend different schools in their identification patterns. However, Jewish students in mixed schools differ extensively from each other. Those who attend multicultural schools feel lower attachment to collective identification than their peers in segregated and Hebrew mixed schools. Lower level of identification with Jewish and Israeli categories, and second, that those schools play a role in discouraging collective Jewish identification since Jewish and Israeli identities are considered less legitimate and oppressive.

However, in order to figure out whether school or selection effect is contributing to the trends mentioned, parent’s data was also included. The data reveal that identification trends among students are similar to those of parents, therefore selection mechanism exist in each school type. Nevertheless, since both Jews and Arabs who study in mixed schools, tend to emphasize their national identification when asked freely to describe themselves, more than their peers in segregated schools, reinforces Social Identity Theory. The encounter between both groups contributes to their own distinguished social identity.

The second hypothesis stated that Arabs in general, as minority group members, will have more desire for interaction with majority group members than the opposite, and that students who attend mixed schools in general, both Jews and Arabs, would be more prone to interact with outgroup members, especially those who attend multicultural schools.

At first glance, the results regarding social distance follow the hypothesis - Arabs are more willing to interact with majority group members than the opposite as expected, and students who attend segregated schools are less keen on interaction than their peers in mixed schools. Contact theory is seemingly reaffirmed. However, zooming in on the trends within mixed schools is quite surprising. The gap between Arab and Jewish students in Hebrew mixed schools desire to interact is wide, but the trend in itself is consistent with the pattern reported in the literature. However, the reverse pattern of this phenomenon in the multicultural schools is interesting, when Jews have more desire to have contact with minority members than the opposite, especially due to parents’ data which shows that they hold very positive views, without significant differences between Jews and Arabs. This trend indicate that while identification patterns are related to parents selection effect, regarding social distance Arab parents a priori attitudes towards interaction with Jews are similar, but among the children it is different. Although it is difficult to indicate whether school type effect identification patterns, it appears that school context is meaningful when it comes to social distance.

This finding is interesting considering the friendship’s patterns found by Shwed, Kalish and Shavit (2018), identifying more homophily among multicultural school students, than among their peers in Hebrew mixed schools. On the one hand, we can see that less homophily doesn’t necessarily go hand in hand with positive attitudes, at least from the majority’s point of view – since cross-national friendships are more common in Hebrew mixed schools while Jewish attitudes are far more reluctant to make contact than what their Jewish peers in multicultural schools express. Behavior and attitudes are not necessarily intertwined, which contradicts Pettigrew’s fifth condition to contact theory – the need for friendships. Nevertheless, Arabs’ more moderate attitudes towards Jews in multicultural schools contribute to the understanding of the counter-intuitive findings of Shwed et al.

The third hypothesis was that Arabs who identify as Israelis will be more likely to interact with outgroup members, and that compared to Jewish students who emphasize their Israeli identity, those who emphasize their Jewish identity, will have less desire for social contact with Arabs.

Regarding Jews, data indicate that identification with Jewish category indeed predicts lower desire for contact with out group members, but that relation isn’t significant. The type of school students attend, seem to be more significant in determining it, and it is probably a mediating variable.

The first part of the hypothesis regarding Arabs is seems to be right - social distance decreases if the respondent includes Israeli components in their identification or feel a strong sense of belonging to the Israeli group. On the other hand, the inclusion of Palestinian components or sense of belonging to Palestinian group is negative but insignificant. It appears that in line with previous theories, identification with majority group increases the desire to have contact with its members. Multicultural schools’ mission is therefore complex – on one hand, they wish to set and preserve the distinct identities of their students, yet on the other, to reduce social distance. It seems that these schools succeed to a certain extent, since students are much more prone to contact than their counterparts in segregated schools, however, the effect is not symmetrical. Jewish students in multicultural schools declare they want more contact with their Arab peers than the opposite, and since social distance is related to Israeli identification, we can assume that preserving Palestinian identity in school, might cancel or damage the desire to interact with Jews.

The current study invites more thorough research on the connection between demographic factors (education, income, level of religiosity) and the different strategies minority and majority group parents adopt. On the surface it seems that a multicultural approach attracts Jewish middle-class families who gain symbolic assets from interacting with minority members, and Arabs who are willing to ‘pay the price’ of an accentuated and declared Palestinian identity. Arabs from lower classes, so it seems, perceive integration with Israeli culture and identity as a source of power and strength therefore encouraging their children to integrate in those aspects as well.

The most important limitation of the current study is that in cross-sectional studies, selection bias makes causal conclusions difficult, therefore highlighting the need for longitudinal studies to clarify the nature of developmental effects of schools’ ideology on students in terms of social identification and distance.