ED 262 113   UD 024 407

AUTHOR   Ichilov, Orit
TITLE   Citizenship Orientation of Two Israeli Minority
              Groups: Israeli-Arab and Eastern-Jewish Youth.
PUB DATE   Aug 83
NOTE   37p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Acculturation; *Arabs; *Citizenship Responsibility;
              Cultural Pluralism; *Jews; *Minority Groups;
              *Political Attitudes; Sociocultural Patterns;
              Youth
IDENTIFIERS   *Eastern Jews; Israel; *Israeli Arabs

ABSTRACT
              The purpose of this study was to examine and compare
how Israeli-Arab and Eastern-Jewish adolescents view the role of the
citizen. Both groups share a minority status within Israeli society,
but have different socializing environments and different political
and cultural status. The study population consisted of 118
Israeli-Arab and 279 Eastern-Jewish adolescents ages 16-18. They were
asked to rate 36 questionnaire items according to their importance
for good citizenship. The data indicate that, overall, Arab
respondents tended to assign less importance than their Jewish
counterparts to all the items describing good citizenship. As
expected, Arab youth assigned greater importance to the non-political
than to the political dimension of good citizenship. Within the
active and the passive categories the items which were considered
important by them reflect a minimal commitment to the State and its
institutions. Eastern-Jewish adolescents did not differ in their
civic orientations from the general Israeli public. They assigned
greater importance to the political, rather than to the non-political
dimension of good citizenship, and stressed passive orientations more
than active-participatory ones. No differences were found concerning
the measured civic orientations between boys and girls in both
groups. (Author/CR)

CITIZENSHIP ORIENTATIONS OF TWO ISRAELI MINORITY

GROUPS: ISRAELI-ARAB AND EASTERN-JEWISH YOUTH

Orit Ichilov

School of Education

Tel-Aviv University

August, 1983

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine and to compare how Israeli-Arab and Eastern-Jewish adolescents view the role of the citizen. Both groups share a minority status in the various social spheres within Israeli society.

The study population consisted of 118 Israeli-Arab, and 279 Eastern-Jewish adolescents ages 16-18. They were asked to rate 36 items according to their importance for good citizenship.

The data indicates that Arab youth assigned greater importance to the non-political than to the political dimension of good citizenship. Within the active and the passive categories the items which were considered important by them, reflect a minimal commitment to the State and its institutions.

Eastern-Jewish adolescents did not differ in their civic orientations from the general Israeli public. They assigned greater importance to the political, rather than to the non-political dimension of good citizenship, and stressed passive orientations more than active-participatory ones.

No differences were found concerning the measured civic orientations between boys and girls in both groups.

CITIZENSHIP ORIENTATIONS OF TWO ISRAELI MINORITY
GROUPS: ISRAELI-ARABS AND EASTERN-JEWISH YOUTH

Introduction

In western democracies participatory-related dispositions being to develop early in life, and during adolescence reach a level of maturity which is comparable in many ways to that of adults (Hess & Torney, 1967; Easton & Dennis, 1969; Langton, 1969; Jennings & Niemi, 1974). Variations, however, are great, and have been found to be associated with a variety of cultural and socio-economic factors operating in the adolescents' social milieu.

In contrast to the extensiveness of the literature on the socialization of majority group members into the dominant political culture (for example: Dawson & Prewitt, 1969; Dennis, 1973), only a few studies have examined the development of civic orientations among marginal and minority group members (for example: Greenberg, 1970, 1973; Hirsch, 1971, Jaros et. al., 1968). Little attention has been given to the development of citizenship orientations in conflict situations within pluralistic societies, where lack of consensus exists among groups over fundamental values and issues.

The purpose of this study is to compare citizenship orientations of Israeli-Arab[1] and Eastern-Jewish youth, focusing upon socio-cultural rather than upon developmental aspects. In other words, we wish to test the hypothesis that the differential socializing environments in which Israeli-Arab and Eastern-Jews grow, and the differential location of Arabs and Jews within Israeli society, will give rise to different citizenship orientations.

The two groups share a marginal minority status within Israeli society, yet the problems concerning their integration into the political and cultural

spheres differ drastically.

In order to understand the similarities and differences in the socializing environments of Israeli-Arabs and Eastern-Jews, it is necessary to examine the status and particular relations with the Jewish majority of both groups within the Israeli context.

Israeli-Arabs and Eastern-Jews: A profile of two minority groups. Israel is the only country in the Middle East where Arabs constitute a minority. The Israeli-Arabs which now comprise about 15% of Israel's entire population, have remained within the State's borders following the establishment of the State in 1948 The Jewish majority was, thus, faced with the reality of a large enemy-affiliated Arab minority within the Jewish-Zionist state which is at war with their brothers across the borders. During the first years of its existence, Israel was also faced with influx of Jewish immigrants, the majority of which came as refugees from the traditional Moslem Arab countries in North Africa and the Middle East. The official ideological position concerning the Arab minority, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, was to grant them equal civic rights and to integrate them within the Jewish state. The desireable model for Arab integration was that of cultural pluralism which encourages the creation of ethnic enclaves, allowing minorities to preserve their native culture, and accepting their partial or full participation in the affairs of the larger community.[2]

The official ideological position concerning the integration of Eastern-Jews is stated in the Law of Return, which grants all the ingathering Jewish exiles

full citizenship and equal rights upon arrival in Israel. The desireable model for the integration of Eastern-Jews was that of the melting pot, which aspires to the evolvement of a totally new national culture and character, out of the diverse cultural traditions of the various Jewish ethnic groups.[3]

The major ethnic divisions in Israel are, thus, within the Jewish community, and between the Jewish majority and the Arab minority. Within the Jewish majority there are two ethnic blocks, which differ from each other in socio-economic status and cultural traditions: the Jews of western origin (i.e., Europe-America) who form the dominant group; and Jews of eastern origin (i.e., Middle Eastern, Asian and North African origin), who although now comprise over 50% of Israel's entire population, do not proportionally share in the national income, educational attainment, central political positions and prestigeous occupations.

While the acceleration of integration, not merely desegregation, of the various Jewish ethnic groups into Israeli society has been declared a central national goal, it is fair to state that except for fringe elements on both sides, neither Jews nor Arabs has ever really aspired to integration. Institutional separateness and minimalistic demands upon the Arab citizen, have characterized the relations between the central government and the Israeli-Arab minority. For example, unlike all Israeli citizens, including minorities such as the Druz, for whom military service is obligatory, Arabs do not serve in the army. This is done both for security reasons, and in order to avoid a situation of having the Israeli-Arabs fight against their own kin. Their exemption from this central civic duty limits their civil rights, since army verterans enjoy special privileges in housing, loans, and work opportunities.

The major difference between the two minority groups is related to the realm of national values and symbols. Eastern Jews can readily form an Israeli identity, based on the Zionist ideology which considers the various Jewish subgroups as a single nation. However, the identification of Israel as a Jewish-Zionist state, and the definition of the Israeli Arab as an enemy-affiliated minority, makes the goal of democratic pluralism difficult to attain. The four conditions outlined by Smooha and Hoffman (1976/77) for cooperative coexistence, namely: Consensus over basic symbols and values, cultural autonomy, proportionate equality of resources and interpersonal accomodation, seem to be lacking in the case of the Israeli-Arab The national flag, anthem and symbol; the official Jewish holidays, Hebrew as an official language, and the fundamental Law of Return[4] are not an acceptable form of Israeli identity for the Arab minority. The lack of a general diffuse Israeli identity creates a situation where there can be no shared ideology, and the conflict between the Arab and the Jewish groups is over the very basic consensus.

Arab cultural autonomy, which could potentially foster an alien national identity, has been discouraged. Proportionate equality of resources and opportunities is not feasible when most of Israel's resources go to national security needs, immigrant absorption, and settlement. Interpersonal accomodation is also difficult to achieve in a situation where no common ideology exists, national identity is salient to both groups, and there is a general atmosphere of mutual alienation and distrust.

The difficulties of Israeli-Arabs to identify with the State have been documented in several studies. A survey conducted among Israeli-Arabs in 1974 revealed that only 40% of the respondents recognized without reservations Israel's right to exist, while 55% of them viewed the establishment of the State in 1948 as illigitimate. Similarly, only 25% of Arab respondents in 1974 felt more at home in Israel than

they would in an Arab country (Smooha and Hoffman, 1976/77), and only 22% thought
that young Arabs have a future in Israel (Hoffman, 1976).

The Jewish side of Arab-Jewish relations show great ambivalence toward the
Arab minority. In a study of the stereotyping patterns of Israeli Jewish youth
Binjamini (1969) found that the Arab image was generally negative, even more so
than the German image. Some studies report feelings of hatred and distrust among
Israeli respondents toward Arabs (Lévy & Guttman, 1976; Stock, 1968; Peres, 1971;
1976; Slann, 1973), and lack of differentiation between fellow Arab citizens and
Arab citizens of enemy countries (Zohar, 1972). Other studies report of a general
liberal attitude among Israeli youth toward the Arab minority. However, these
studies also report that only 45% of the respondents would find it acceptable to
have an Arab mayor in a mixed population city, and only 12% would allow Arabs to
run for any political office on an equal footing with Jewish political leaders
(Pukan & Moskovitz, 1976). Numerous studies show that eastern Jews display greater
social distance and hostility towards the Arabs than Jews from western background.
One common explanation for this phenomenon is that the Jews from Arab and Islamic
countries suffered from inferior status and maltreatment in their countries of
origin (Peres, 1971; Slann, 1973). Another explanation is that given the similarities
betwhen eastern Jews and Arabs in cultural traditions, darker skin complexion and
stronger Middle Eastern accent, eastern Jews are eager to divest themselves of
any association with Arab elements.

In the other social spheres, greater similarities exist between Arabs and
eastern Jews. Geographic isolation is common to both groups. Israeli Arabs
are geographically separated in 2 Arab cities, 103 villages, and 40 Beduin camps.
The 10% who live in a few mixed cities, generally live in separate neighborhoods

(Smooha, 1976). Similarly, the majority of eastern Jews is concentrated in development towns, and in separate neighborhoods within the cities.

On the municipal level, about two thirds of the Israeli Arabs are governed by locally elected Arab officials, and most of the development towns are governed by locally elected eastern Jewish officials. However, both groups are underrepresented in the central government and institutions. Nevertheless, the Arab and Jewish communities enjoy extensive governmental services in health, education, welfare, and economic development. Services in the Arab sector are implemented through separate departments in the various ministries. This does not, however, represent autonomy, since services in the Arab sector are ultimately controlled by Jewish officials in the central government. Given their low representation in the central political institutions, both groups have very limited impact in the national arena where important decisions are made.

The State has discouraged the formation of political parties on national and ethnic bases. The few Jewish ethnic parties which were established during the first years of statehood, have rapidly disappeared from the political scene, and the Arabs were discouraged from forming political parties and institutions of their own. Some Arabs are represented through minority parties which are affiliated with the Israeli Labor Party. Rakah[5], the Communist Party, which expresses Arab interests and represents a legitimate way of protesting the Zionist regime, has steadily gained from 20% of the Arab votes in 1965, 37% in 1973 to 49% in 1977 (Smooha, 1976). It is interesting to note that Rakah also includes the Black Panthers, a militant group of eastern Jews, which wish to protest their inferior status within Israeli society

The number of years of schooling in the Arab sector is lower than in the Jewish population, and the rate of illiteracy is four times higher than among Jews. The Law of Compulsory Free Education for children ages 5-15, equally applies to Arabs

and Jews. However, while 59% of the relevant Jewish age group participates in high school education[6], only 19% of the equivalent group among Arabs attends high school. Eastern Jews are overrepresented in the lower status vocational high schools, and are underrepresented in the academically-oriented high schools which lead to the attainment of a matriculation certificate. Both Arabs and eastern Jews are under-represented in the institutions of higher education. However, unlike the case of eastern Jews, there is little readiness to integrate Arab university graduates in occupations of higher status. They have fewer opportunities for employment outside of teaching or some other jobs in the Arab sector (Klinberger, 1969). This situation is frustrating. Arab intellectuals who have become most modernized and thus less tied to the family, religious and village traditions, many times express their frustrations and alienation from the rejecting Jewish society, by identifying them-selves with various militant forms of Arab nationalism.

Even though Arabs have their own school system which is controlled by a separate department within the Ministry of Education and Culture, all state schools are officially open to them as well. In reality, however, there is only one mixed school in Haifa, in which Jews and Arabs study in separate classes tailored to the language and curriculum needs of each group. Several other high schools in the Jewish sector have admitted a small number of Arab students (Kramer, 1978). Integration of eastern Jews in the educational system, on the other hand, has become a major national goal. Integrated junior high schools which bring together a highly heter-ogeneous student population both ethnically and academically speaking, gradually became part of the Israeli educational scene since 1968. However, the cultural traditions and history of eastern Jews are hardly mentioned in text books which stress the western cultural traditions of the majority group. Similarly, little

attention is given in the Jewish schools to transmitting knowledge about Arab culture, religion and values, and sensitive issues such as Arab nationalism are avoided.

Even though both groups have been exposed to processes of modernization, traditional orientations predominate especially in the Arab sector, and the extended family and the immediate community play an important role.

The minority status of eastern Jews is clearly shown in studies of inter-ethnic relations in Israel. Eastern Jews often report of feelings of frustration due to what they perceive as social injustice and discrimination (Peres, 1968; Wingrod, 1960; Bar-Yosef, 1969). They express greater readiness for social contacts with members of the western group than the other way around. This asymetrical willingness to associate, is also a source of frustration among eastern group members. Studies indicate that both eastern and western Jews in Israel tend to express higher regard for the western group (Shuval, 1956, 1962; Peres, 1968, 1976; Rim, 1968; Biniamini, 1969; Hoffman, 1970). In Israel, ethnic grc dentification is stronger among members of the eastern group than among westerners (Peres, 1968; Kfir et. al., 1975). Apparently, solidarity and identifi-cation with the group help marginal group members to withstand the rejection and hostility of outgroups (LeVine & Campbell, 1972).

In an attempt to theoretically conceptualize the major ethnic divisions in Israel, it is helpful to use Coser's distinction between realistic and non-realistic conflicts (Coser, 1956). Non-realistic conflict functions primarily as means of displacement or projection of frustrations that may be intragroup or individual in origin. Realistic conflict, on the other hand, assumes that groups do have incom-patible goals and conflicting interests. An additional distinction within the category of realistic conflict is that of communal versus non-communal conflict.

Communal conflict takes place within the context of shared values and ends, while non-communal conflict exists when there is no community of ends between the parties, and the conflict is over the very basic consensus of the relationship.

Concerning both minority groups, some components of a realistic conflict with the majority are visible. The Israeli-Arabs are defined as an enemy-affiliated minority. They present a threat in a situation of Israel's struggle for existence in the midst of a hostile Arab world. As for eastern Jews, competition over national resources and a struggle between two different cultural traditions, are representative of a realistic conflict. The fact that easterners now form over 50% of Israel's entire population, might foster the sense of threat among western group members. However, while the conflict between eastern and western Jews takes place within a framework of shared values and ends, the conflict between Arabs and Jews clearly is non-communal in nature.

Inspite of the great similarities between Israeli-Arabs and eastern Jews in cultural traditions, and their marginal status in the various social spheres within Israeli society, the prospects for future integration seem brighter for eastern Jews Being part of the Jewish people, all avenues for integration are in principle open to them, and their marginal status might be a temporary one. It is more difficult to conceive of a solution to the problems of the Arab minority, and for their chances of being an autonomous minority within a democratic-pluralistic context. Peace between Israel and its neighboring Arab states might transform their status from that of an enemy-affiliated minority to that of a group which can be trusted, granted greater autonomy, and afforded with greater opportunities for participation on the national level. However, it will not alleviate their difficulties to fully identify themselves as Israelis, given the Jewish nature of the state.

The majority of both groups have reacted to their marginal status by instrumental adaptation, and militant responses were relatively scarce. Separateness together with minimalistic demands upon the Arab citizen by the Israeli government, have enabled many Arabs to compartmentalize their Arab and Israeli identities, being pro-Arab without necessarily being anti-Israel. Among eastern Jews, instrumental adaptation is reflected in their passive acceptance of their status, and in their desire to be integrated into the dominant western culture.

Dimensions of citizenship orientations. Almond and Verba (1963) maintain that the specific contents of the citizen's role are closely related to the structure of local and national political institutions and to the prevalent political culture. They define political culture as "The political system as internalized in the cognitions, feelings and evaluations of its population... The political culture of a nation is the particular distribution of patterns of orientations toward political objects among the members of the nation" (IBID, p. 13). Following this approach the citizen role can be seen on the one hand as determined by the political culture, and on the other hand as one of its manifestations.

Almond and Verba see the political process in a democratic society as following two directions: "input" processes, which refer to the demands put upon the system by the people; and "output" processes which refer to acts of legislation, policy making, and the like, which flow from the system. Distinguishing also between attention to purely political objects and attention to general and non-political objects, Almond and Verba classify three types of political cultures and three corresponding citizenship orientations. A participant political culture, which stresses "input" processes; a subject political culture, which stresses obedience to the "output" processes; and a parochial political culture which, unlike the former two, emphasizes attachment to

nonpolitical objects and bodies. These three types of political cultures and their corresponding citizenship orientations usually exist side by side but receive different emphases in different societies, and among the various sub-groups within a particular society.

Based on the analysis of Almond and Verba, the dimensions of citizenship that were examined in the present study include first, the extent to which the citizen's role is viewed as specific and restricted to the political sphere, or as broader and diffuse, consisting of the whole of an individual's obligations to his fellow men and to the society and the community in which one lives. Secondly, the extent to which adolescents regard the citizen role as entailing primarily active participation and involvement in the political process, or as consisting chiefly upon passive affiliation, stressing obedience and loyalty.

Studies of citizenship orientations among Israeli Jewish youth revealed that urban youth tended to describe the citizen's role as limited and specific, rather than as diffuse and inclusive, and as defined essentially in terms of the individual's attachment to political frameworks, officials and processes. Also, obedience and loyalty were stressed much more as compared with active participatory orientations (Ichilov & Nave, 1981). In the kibbutz, on the other hand, the citizen's role was equally balanced between political and non-political characteristics, and between active participation and loyalty and compliance (Ichilov, 1981). It seems that in the kibbutz, being a small and a cohesive community, social life is not as fragmented as in the city, and the private and public spheres are interrelated, thus fostering more balanced civic orientations than in the city.

Girls in the city and the kibbutz tended to attach greater importance than boys to the political aspect in the citizen's role, and to emphasize the active-participatory dimension.

The alienation of Israeli Arabs from the major ideology and symbols of the Jewish-Zionist state, their limited autonomy, the differential opportunity structure for Arabs and Jews, and the traditional structure of Arab society, leads us to expect that parochial orientations would be more pervalent among them than political ones. In other words, attachment to the family and community would be emphasized more than attachment to political officials, institutions and processes. The minimal demands upon the Arab citizen by the Israeli government leads us to expect that passive obedience would be more pronounced among them than active participation in the Israeli political sphere.

Coming from a traditional background, and sharing a stronger ethnic identity than westerners, eastern adolescents might assign greater importance to the non-political dimension in the citizen's role than adolescents of western origin, but less so than their Arab counterparts. They would also attach greater importance to passive obedience than to active participation, but less so than their Arab counterparts.

We might also expect that girls in both groups would reflect stronger parochial and passive political orientations than boys, given the traditional role of women, and their minimal participation in the public and political spheres.

Hypotheses

Based upon the aforementioned similarities and differences between Israeli-Arabs and eastern Jews in Israel, the following hypotheses were formulated concerning citizen-ship orientations in both groups:

1. Eastern adolescents will characterize the good citizen primarily by political traits, whereas Arab youth will attach greater importance to the non-political dimension of good citizenship.

2. In both groups, the passive political dimension will be attributed with greater importance than the active participatory dimension. However, this tendency will be stronger among Arab than among eastern Jewish respondents.

3. Girls in both groups will project stronger passive and non-political orientations than boys. This tendency, however, will be stronger among Arab than among eastern Jewish girls.

The Study

Research population. The study population consisted of 118 Arab and 276 eastern Jewish high school students ages 16-18. The Arab respondents live in an Arab village located in the center of the country, and attend an all-Arab high school. The Jewish respondents included students in both academic and vocational high schools in the greater Tel-Aviv area.

The percentage of boys in the Arab group was 52.5% and the percentage of girls was 47.5%. In the Jewish group the percentages of boys and girls were 49.6% and 50.5% respectively. All the Arab respondents were Moslems, and 94.3% of them defined their nationality as Arab, while 3.3% as Palestinian.

In the Arab sub-sample most parents are employed in agriculture, or in blue-collar, un-skilled jobs in the city. 71.7% of the fathers of the eastern respondents were employed in low-status occupations, and 43% of the fathers have completed only partial of full elementary education.

The research questionnaire and data collection. The research instrument consisted of 36 items describing "the good citizen." The items included equally political and non-political characteristics. The political items reflected the citizen's passive as well as active relationships to political officials, institutions and processes. For example, loyalty to the state reflects a passive political orientation, and regular participation in the elections and party membership, reflecting active participation. The non-political items included personal traits such as honesty and truthfulness, and characteristics reflecting the relationships of the citizen to particularistic frameworks, such as the family and place of work.

This list of items which has been used by Ichilov & Nave (1981), and Ichilov (1981), was drawn based upon instruments used by Jennings & Niemi (1974), and Oppenheim & Torney (1974). In addition, items were constructed based upon content analysis of 60 compositions by 11th and 12th graders on the subject "the citizen and democracy in Israel."

Subjects were asked to classify these items into five categories such that the first category included the four characteristics valued as most important for good citizenship, the second category included eight characteristics considered important, the third category twelve somewhat important characteristics, the forth eight characteristics regarded as unimportant, and the fifth category, the four least important characteristics. This rating procedure was selected because it forces the respondents to weigh the importance attached to each item in relation to all other items. This is especially important when studying a concept like citizenship which is often enveloped in cliches and slogans (Jennings & Niemi, 1974: 123). Had subjects been asked to rate each item separately, it is likely that most of them, especially in the Jewish sector, would have assigned high ratings to all.

In order to minimize the effects of possible threat and social desireability, questionnaires in the Arab sector were administered by Arab personnel.

Findings

We first examined how each of the 36 items characterizing good citizenship was rated by Arab and eastern respondents. In Table 1, item means, standard deviations, ratings, and the percentage of respondents who considered the item as important and unimportant are presented.

Insert Table 1 about here

Each item was graded on a scale ranging from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important). Among Arab respondents the items' mean scores ranged from 1.850-4.198, and among eastern respondents from 1.317-3.914. Overall then, Arab respondents considered the various items as less important for characterizing the good citizen as compared with eastern respondents. The item "reads newspapers regularly," was rated as the least important by both groups. However, concerning most of the items' scores significant differences were found between the two groups. Overall 13 items were found to be significantly more important among Arab respondents, 14 items were rated more important by Eastern respondents, and for 9 items no significant differences were found between the mean scores of the two groups.

Examination of the contents of the items which were rated as more important by Arab respondents, clearly reflect their minimal commitment to the State and its political institutions and processes.

Obedience of laws, loyalty to the State and to the government, and respect and honor for the State have been rated by Arabs as significantly less important than by eastern respondents. Regular participation in the elections which was rated 13th by eastern respondents, was rated 30th by their Arab counterparts. The item "an active political party member," on the other hand, was rated 2nd in importance by Arab respondents, and only 30th by eastern Jews. Discussing politics with others, was also attributed with greater importance by Arab than by eastern respondents.

Items representing parochial orientations such as "devoted to his family," and "a good neighbor," and items representing general characteristics which are not necessarily political such as "truthful," "tolerant of others' views," and "a person of principle," were attributed with greater importance by Arab than by eastern respondents.

In order to have a clearer overall view of the items' ratings by Arab and eastern respondents, the items were classified into two major categories: political and non-political. The political category was further subdevided into active versus passive civic orientations. The data processing refers sometimes to the political dimension, and sometimes to its sub-categories. In Table 2, the distribution of mean scores concerning these four dimensions is shown.

Insert Table 2 about here

It was expected that Arab respondents will assign higher rating to non-political items than to political ones, and that they would attribute greater importance to items reflecting passive civic orientations than to those projecting active participation. As can be seen in Table 2, the majority of Arab respondents have rated the four categories of items within the range of 2.5-3.5, while the ratings of the easterners tended to be more differentiated. Also, while 33% of the eastern respondents have rated the political dimension within the range of 1.00-2.49, only 0.8% of the Arab respondents did so, and while 68.5% of the eastern respondents have rated passive civic orientations within that range, only 6.8% of the Arabs have rated them similarly. Contrary to our expectations, then, the majority of Arab respondents have rated political and non-political items similarly. However, as expected larger percentage of the Arab respondents have rated the passive dimension higher than the active one. Passive political orientations were also considered more important than active ones by members of the eastern group.

Differences in civic orientations between boys and girls in both groups were then
examined. In Table 3, mean scores and standard deviations of the various dimensions
among boys and girls in both groups are presented. In Table 4, F values based on analyses
of variance are shown. Analyses were carried out separately, once for all political
items, once for the active and for the passive dimensions, and once for all non-political
items.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

As can be seen in Tables 3 & 4 contrary to expectations, no significany differences
by sex concerning the various dimensions were found. In other words, boys and girls
have rated the four categories of items similarly. As expected, the political dimension
was significantly more important for eastern respondents, and the non-political dimension
was more important for Arab respondents. However, contrary to expectations, the passive
political dimension was significantly more important for eastern than for Arab respondents.
Also, no significany differences between the two groups were found in the active-participatory
dimension, which was assigned with medium importance by both groups.

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare the perception of the citizen's
role among Israeli-Arab and Eastern-Jewish youth in Israel. As we have seen, great
similarities exist between these two minority groups in cultural traditions and in their
marginal status in the various social spheres within Israeli society. The major difference
between the groups lies in their ability to identify themselves as Israelis, given the
Jewish-Zionist nature of the State and the definition of Arabs as an enemy-affiliated

minority; also in their prospects for future integration.

The research findings revealed that over all, Arab respondents tended to assign less importance than their Jewish counterparts to all the items describing good citizenship. The major difference in civic orientations among Arab and eastern youth was found to be in the perceived importance of the political and non-political dimensions. As expected, Arab youth attributed the non-political dimension with greater importance than the political one. In other words, they viewed personal characteristics and committment to the family and community as more important for good citizenship than both passive and active attachment to the political sphere. This predominance of the non-political dimension might reflect the more traditional orientations of Arabs, which stress the centrality of the extended family and the community. It could also be related to their minority status within Israeli society. Studies have shown that group affiliation among minority group members is important primarily in situations of hostility between groups, and when the channels for social mobility and integration seem to be blocked (Glazer & Moynihan, 1963; Kramer & Leventman, 1961).

Within the political dimension, contrary to expectations, Arab youth has similarly rated the active and the passive dimensions, assigning to both a fairly low importance. However, examination of the contents of each dimension clearly reveals a pattern of instrumental adaptation. The items which were considered important represent possible channels of influence, and minimal commitment to the State and its institutions. Party membership, for example, was considered much more important than regular participation in the elections. Given the massive support of Rakah in the Arab sector, it seems that Arabs have greater faith in their ability to promote their interests via party membership, than through the elections. Their minimal commitment is clearly shown in

the low importance which they have attached to the respect for the State and its institutions.

The civic orientations of eastern youth resemble those of urban Jewish adolescents, who tended to assign greater importance to the political rather than to the non-political dimension of good citizenship, and stressed passive orientations more than active-participatory ones (Ichilov & Nave, 1981). Similar patterns of citizenship orientations have been found among Israeli adults as well. Etzioni-Halevy and Shapira (1977) characterized Israeli citizens as being engaged in "spectator" rather than in "gladiatorial" political activities. These characteristics of the political culture, seem to be transmitted to the younger generation through the various agents of political socialization. Eastern adolescents, thus, do not differ in their civic orientations from the general Israeli public. This might reflect their acceptance of the political culture, and their desire to become integrated into it.

Contrary to expectations, no differences were found between boys and girls in both groups. A possible explanation might be that girls who participate in secondary education in these traditional groups which do not encourage women to study, must be ambitious and talented, and project the same civic orientations as boys.

Notes

1. The Arab sample consisted of Arabs holding Israeli citizenship, who have remained within the borders of Israel following the establishment of the State. It does not include residents of the West Bank and of the Gaza Strip who are not Israeli citizens.

2. During the first years of statehood this ideology was not put into effect. The Israeli-Arabs were under martial law, and their civil rights were very limited.

3. In reality Jews of eastern origin were required to integrate into the dominant western culture. Their cultural traditions were considered incompatible with the ideal of developing a modern western state.

4. The national symbols represent Jewish themes. The national flag shows the Star of David, and the national emblem shows the Menorah of the temple. The national anthem describes the yearning of the Jews during two thousand years of exile, to return to their homeland. Its last verse is "to be a free nation in our country, the land of Zion and Jerusalem."

5. The official name of the party is: Equality (Rakah), Black Panthers and Jewish-Arab Circles.

6. Which in Israel is tuition-free but not compulsory.

References

Almond, G.A.; Verba, S.,

1965   The Civic Culture, Boston: Little, Brown.

Bar-Yosef, R.,

1969   "The Morrocans: Background To The Problem,"

Molad, 17: 247-251 (Hebrew).

Biniamini, K.,

1969   "The Images of the Israeli, The American, The German and

The Arab as Viewed by Israeli Youth," Megamot, 16(4):

305-314 (Hebrew).

Coser, L.A.,

1956   The Functions of Social Conflict, Glencoe, Ill.:

Free Press.

Dawson, R.E.; Prewitt, K.,

1969   Political Socialization, Boston: Little, Brown.

Dennis, J. (Ed.),

1973   Socialization to Politics, New York: Wiley.

Easton, D.; Dennis, J.,

1969   Children in the Political System, New York:

McGraw Hill.

Etzioni-Halevy, E.; Shapira, R.,

1977   Political Culture in Israel, New York:

Praeger.

Glazer, N.; Moynihan, D.P.,

1963   Beyond the Melting Pot, Cambridge, Mass.:
        M.I.T. Press.

Greenberg, E.S.,

1970   "Orientations of Black and White Children to Political
        Authority," Social Science Quarterly, 51: 561-71.

1973   "Black Children and The Political System," pp. 257-299
        In J. Dennis (Ed.), Socialization to Politics, New York:
        Wiley.

Hess, R.D.; Torney, J.V.,

1967   The Development of Political Attitudes in Children,
        Chicago: Adline.

Hirsch, H.,

1971   Poverty and Politicization, New York: Free Press.

Hoffman, Y.,

1970   "The Ethnic Identity of Jewish Youth in Israel," Megamot,
        17: 5-15 (Hebrew).

1976   Identity and Intergroup Perception in Israel: Jews and Arabs,
        (Occasional papers on the Middle East No. 7); Haifa: The
        Institute of Middle Eastern Studies.

Ichilov, O.,

1981   "Citizenship Orientations of City and Kibbutz Youth in Israel,"
        International Journal of Political Education, 4: 305-317.

Ichilov, O.; Nave, N.,

1981   "The Good Citizen as Viewed by Israeli Adolescents,"
        Comparative Politics, 13(3): 361-376.

Jaros, D.; Hirsch, H.; Fleron Jr., A.J.,

1968   "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in An
        American Sub-Culture," American Political Science Review,
        62: 564-575.

Jennings, M.K.; Niemi, R.G. (Eds.),

1974   The Political Character of Adolescence, Princeton, N.J.:
        Princeton University Press.

Kfir, D.; Chen, M.; Lewy, A.,

1975   Ethnic Affiliation Among Junior High School Students,
        Tel-Aviv: School of Education, Tel-Aviv University
        (Hebrew).

Klinberger, A.F.,

1969   Society, Schools and Progress in Israel, Oxford:
        Pergamon Press.

Kramer, R.,

1978   Intergroup Contacts Between Jews and Arabs in an Israeli High
        School (Unpublished M.A. Thesis), Tel-Aviv: School of Education,
        Tel-Aviv University.

Kramer, J.R.; Leventman, S.,

1961   Children of The Gilded Ghetto, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Langton, K.P.,

1969   Political Socialization, London: Oxford

        University Press.

LeVine, R.A.; Campbell, D.T.,

1972   Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes

        and Group Behavior, New York: John Wiley.

Levy, S.; Guttman, L.,

1976   Values and Attitudes of Israeli Youth, Jerusalem:

        Institute For Applied Social Research (Hebrew).

Oppenheim, A.M.; Torney, J.V.,

1974   The Measurement of Child's Civic Attitudes in Different

        Nations, New York: Wiley.

Peres, Y.,

1968   Ethnic Identity and Inter-Ethnic Relations (Unpublished

        Ph.D. Dissertation), Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

1971   "Ethnic Relations in Israel." In M. Curtis (Ed.),

        People and Politics in the Middle East, New Bronswick,

        N.J.: Transaction Press.

1976   Ethnic Relations in Israel, Tel-Aviv: Sifriat Poalim

        (Hebrew).

Pukan, Y.; Moskowitz, A.,

1976   Teaching the Israeli-Arab Conflict: A Study of Pupils'

        Attitudes, Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture

        (Hebrew).

Rim, Y.,

1968   "National Stereotypes Among Children," Megamot,

        16: 45-50 (Hebrew).

Shuval, J.T.,

1956   "Patterns of Intergroup Tension and Affinity," UNESCO

        International Social Science Bulletin, 8: 87-90.

1962   "Emerging Patterns of Ethnic Strains in Israel," Social

        Forces, 40: 323-330.

Slann, M.,

1973   "Jewish Ethnicity and Integration of an Arab Minority in

        Israel: A Study of the Jerusalem Incorporation," Human

        Relations, 26: 359-370.

Smooha, S.,

1976   "Arabs and Jews in Israel: Majority-Minority Relations,"

        Megamot, 22: 397-422 (Hebrew).

Smooha, S.; Hoffman, J.E.,

1976/7 "Some Problems of Arab-Jewish Coexistence in Israel,"

        Middle East Review, pp. 5-14.

Stock, E.,

1968   From Conflict to Understanding, New York: Institute

        of Human Relations Press.

Wingrod, A.

1960   "Change and continuity in a Moshav of Morrocan Immigrants,"

        Megamot, 10: 322-355 (Hebrew).

Zohar, N.,

1972   The Arab Image in Israeli Readers (Unpublished M.A. Thesis),

Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Table 1: Item Ratings, Mean Scores, and Percentage of Arab and Eastern Respondents

Who Rated Item as Very Important and As Unimportant

Items which were rated as significantly more important by Arab Respondents*	Israeli-Arabs (N=118)					Eastern-Jews (N=276)				
	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Rating as very important	% Rating as unimportant	Rating**	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Rating as very important	% Rating as unimportant	Rating**
Tolerant of Others' Views	2.161	0.982	31.3	0.9	4	3.124	0.958	5.7	6.2	20
Devoted to His Family	2.345	0.904	22.1	-	6	3.477	1.280	9.1	27.9	29
Discusses Politics with others	2.726	0.879	7.1	2.7	13	3.829	1.049	13.9	33.7	34
Sticks to his Opinions	3.046	0.980	5.6	7.4	20	3.792	0.948	1.6	24.0	33
A Good Neighbor	3.066	1.054	8.5	6.6	22	3.877	0.977	1.5	31.3	35
	2.496	0.862	13.0	0.9	8	3.565	0.970	2.1	18.3	31
Is Not Afraid to Speak his mind	2.164	0.913	24.1	1.7	5	3.186	1.026	4.6	8.8	24
An Active Political Party Member	2.000	1.000	39.1	0.9	2	3.487	1.056	2.1	20.9	30
A Good and Faithful Friend	2.586	0.939	11.7	3.6	10	3.356	0.993	2.6	13.9	27
Truthful	2.391	0.949	18.2	2.7	7	2.878	0.917	6.9	3.7	14
Does not Take Advantage of People weaker than himself	2.073	0.868	26.6	0.9	3	3.175	0.965	2.1	10.1	22
Ready to Compromise on occassion	3.065	0.993	6.5	7.5	21	3.670	0.918	1.1	19.7	32
A Person of Principle	2.676	1.028	14.4	6.3	12	3.300	1.093	7.4	12.6	26
Items which were rated as significantly more important by Eastern-Jewish Respondents*										
Obeys the Laws of the State	3.430	1.241	9.6	21.9	28	1.317	0.668	77.7	0.5	1
Participates Regularly in Elections	3.473	0.936	2.7	12.7	30	2.857	1.095	10.2	8.7	13
Loyal to the State	2.500	0.912	13.9	1.9	9	1.697	0.847	50.8	0.5	2
Always Ready to Volunteer in Public Affairs	3.046	1.265	16.5	12.8	19	2.492	0.993	16.8	2.5	7
Honest	2.866	1.127	16.1	4.5	16	2.510	0.990	15.8	2.6	9
Cares About What Happens in the Country	3.245	1.076	6.6	11.3	27	1.934	0.873	35.9	1.0	4

Table 1 continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Items which were rated as significantly more important by Eastern-Jewish Respondents*	Israeli-Arabs (N=118)					Eastern-Jews (N=276)				
	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Rating as very important	% Rating as unimportant	Rating**	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Rating as very important	% Rating as unimportant	Rating**
Active in Municipal Affairs	3.785	1.055	1.9	28.0	34	2.826	0.924	4.2	3.7	11
	3.772	0.883	-	20.2	33	3.129	0.960	3.1	7.2	21
Always ready to Help Others	3.991	1.098	1.9	43.5	35	2.805	0.919	6.8	3.7	10
Ethical	3.439	1.074	6.5	14.0	29	2.990	1.020	6.2	8.2	18
Reads Newspapers Regularly	4.198	0.899	-	46.2	36	3.914	0.963	0.5	32.1	36
	2.752	0.954	10.1	1.8	14	2.389	1.085	23.8	4.1	5
	3.131	1.074	7.5	13.1	25	2.471	0.972	16.8	2.1	6
Considerate of Others	3.721	1.047	1.9	26.0	32	2.984	1.003	7.9	6.3	17

Items which were rated as equally important by both groups*										
Behaves According to Social Norms	2.983	1.121	8.8	11.4	18	2.969	1.127	9.2	11.7	16
Reliable	2.982	1.022	8.0	7.1	17	3.035	0.831	2.0	4.0	19
Does not "Pull Strings"	3.105	1.229	11.4	14.9	24	2.839	1.113	11.9	9.8	12
Performs His Duties to the State	1.850	0.815	38.9	-	1	1.779	0.854	44.2	1.0	3
Self-Disciplined	3.148	0.861	3.5	5.2	26	3.168	1.011	5.6	8.2	23
Takes an Interest in what's Happening in the State	2.655	1.171	15.0	9.7	11	2.500	0.826	10.2	0.5	8
Gets Along with People	3.518	0.984	0.9	17.3	31	3.430	0.933	1.0	15.5	28
Dedicated to his Job	3.081	0.841	4.0	3.0	23	3.228	0.903	1.6	9.0	25
	2.758	0.846	8.1	-	15	2.942	1.099	5.8	11.6	15

* According to t-tests measuring differences between items' mean scores.

** Rating was done by mean-scores-ordering of the various items. Items are rated 1-36 in both groups with 1=Most Important and 36=Least Important.

33

Table 2: Distribution of Mean Scores Assigned by Arab and Eastern Respondents to
Political and Non-Political Items (Percentages)

Mean Scores	Israeli-Arabs (N=118)				Eastern Jews (N=276)			
	Political Items			Non-Political Items	Political Items			Non-Political Items
	Overall	Active	Passive		Overall	Active	Passive	
Most Important 1.00-1.49	--	--	--	--	0.5	--	1.0	0.5
1.50-2.49	0.8	6.8	6.8	0.8	32.5	9.4	67.5	3.9
2.50-3.49	99.2	79.7	90.7	98.3	64.0	64.4	30.3	78.3
Least Important 3.50-5.00	--	13.6	2.5	0.8	3.0	26.2	1.5	17.2

Table 3: <u>Mean Scores and Standard Deviations For Political</u>

<u>and Non-Political Items Among Arab and Eastern</u>

<u>Boys and Girls</u>

Independent Variables \ Dependent Variables		Political Dimension	Active Dimension	Passive Dimension	Non-Political Dimension
Arab Boys	Mean Score	2.98	3.08	2.87	2.89
	SD	0.20	0.38	0.27	0.17
Arab Girls	Mean Score	2.99	3.12	2.90	2.90
	SD	0.18	0.41	0.23	0.15
Eastern Boys	Mean Score	2.71	3.17	2.34	3.15
	SD	-0.37	0.46	0.46	0.36
Eastern Girls	Mean Score	2.66	3.07	2.34	3.24
	SD	0.45	0.55	0.51	0.45

Table 4: Summary of Analyses of Variable (F Values)

Independent Variables	Political Dimension	Active Dimension	Passive Dimension	Non-Political Dimension
Sex	0.840	0.828	0.007	1.838
Group	56.024*	0.149	125.689*	69.969*
Interactions				
Sex x Group	0.916	1.482	0.198	0.914

* $p \leq 0.05$