

JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE DIASPORA: A STUDY OF DIASPORIC JEWS IN THE
ISRAEL DEFENSE FORCES (IDF)

BY

ALAN M. TEITLEMAN

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Communication

May, 2015

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Randall G. Rogan, Ph.D., Advisor

Ananda Mitra, Ph.D., Chair

Ruth Ann Strickland, Ph.D.

DEDICATION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The field research component of this study would not have been made possible without the assistance and guidance of Dr. Allan Loudon, Dr. Dee Oseroff-Varnell, and Dr. Mike Hazen of Wake Forest University.

In Israel, I would like to thank the following individuals and organizations for their assistance throughout the research process: Lt. Col. Eric Setton, Pinchas Becher, Ben Packer, Josh Flaster, The Jerusalem Heritage House, Keren Libi, HaBayit Shel Benji, Chayal el Chayal, Yashar L'Chayal, and the Michael Levin Lone Soldier Center. Special thanks goes to Akiva Werber and the city of Jerusalem for countless hours of in-person meetings, referrals, and suggestions as to ways to improve the research and recruit participants.

At Wake Forest I would be remiss without thanking my esteemed committee including Dean Randall Rogan who as my advisor helped me articulate the direction and even overall topic of my research. His constant emails and weekly Tuesday meetings helped keep me on task and I would be lost without his vital assistance. Dr. Ananda Mitra for agreeing so readily to assist with the diaspora literature and research, agreeing to chair my committee, and helping me keep perspective throughout my graduate career at Wake Forest. Dr. Ruth Ann Strickland, who has now served on two of my committees – first at Appalachian State during my MPA as well as on this second thesis at Wake Forest. Dr. Strickland's mentorship both on research as well as my teaching pedagogy has proven invaluable to me as she helped me become a better educator and writer. Additional thanks are owed to Dr. Kline Harrison, associate provost for helping fund this research through

the Global Affairs office and for allowing me the opportunity to show him around Jerusalem during his trip to the holy land during my research time in Israel.

Finally, I would like to thank the Town of Hamilton, North Carolina for their patience with me as their employee and for taking a chance on me as their Director of marketing and economic development despite my frequent jaunts out of the country and long distance work relationship.

This research is dedicated to my parents – Michael and Maria Teitleman who have always supported my academic pursuits and never gave up on me – even when I gave up on myself. Their sacrifices made throughout my life have enabled me to do what some might never thought possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Title Page	i
B. Dedication and Acknowledgments	ii
C. Table of Contents	iv
D. List of Abbreviations	v
E. Abstract	vi
F. Introduction	1
G. Chapter 1: Literature Review	5
H. Chapter 2: Methodology	31
I. Chapter 3: Results	38
J. Chapter 4: Discussion	46
K. References	57
L. Appendices	62
M. Vitae	85

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IDF – Israel Defense Forces.

Machal or מ"ל – “Mitnaveh Chutz L'Aretz” or “Volunteers from Outside the Land”.
Used to describe both organizations who assist in training lone soldiers for IDF service as well as the soldiers themselves.

NIS – New Israeli Shekel. Unit of Currency in Israel. Currently valued at 1 USD = 3.7 NIS (as of November 2014).

Zahal or צה"ל - “Tzeva Haganah L'Yisroel” or “The Israeli Defense Forces.

ABSTRACT

JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE DIASPORA: A STUDY OF DIASPORIC JEWS IN THE ISRAEL DEFENSE FORCES (IDF)

by

Alan M. Teitleman

Wake Forest University, 2015

Under the Supervision of Professor Randall G. Rogan

This study evaluates a group of non-native Israel Defense Forces volunteers who come from the Diaspora. These young men and women vary in age from 18 to 30 and serve in fully integrated units within the Army hierarchy comprised of Israeli conscripts. Unlike many of their diasporic counterparts who work regular jobs, go to college, etc., these young men and women leave comfortable homes in order to serve between 18 months and 3+ years in the military for little pay. Understanding the underlying motivational factors of these lone soldiers, testing their levels of bicultural integration during and after military service, and identification of variables that limit their integration and bicultural identity post-release are the cornerstones of this research. Diasporic Jewish identity and Israeli-American relationships are evaluated to compare and contrast these volunteers from their counterparts.

In depth interviews and surveys were given to $n=64$ lone soldiers in Israel as well as $n=87$ former soldiers recently leaving the service, some in Israel and others back in the Diaspora. The results of these questionnaires were constructed using the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), Bicultural Identity Integration Survey Version I (BIIS-I),

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R), Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI), and an adapted East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM) scales. The results showed that while multiple domains of identity and differences between current and former soldiers exist, the largest predictor of both high level bicultural integration and the decision to stay in Israel after military service is dictated by language skills. A best practices guide is provided as a compilation document to provide the IDF and State of Israel guidance as to ways to improve satisfaction and long term integration of these former lone soldiers into Israel.

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly globalized and interconnected world, many individuals have internalized multiple cultures. These multicultural, or bicultural individuals span multiple generations and bring to the table many talents and abilities. According to the US Census, nearly 25% of Americans have lived in other countries and have likely adopted various components of a second culture (U.S. Census, 2012). Additionally, they also have issues related to adoption of conflicting cultural norms than those which they grew up with. The purpose of this research is to document and evaluate various measures of identity and the biculturalism phenomenon of American lone soldiers serving in the Israeli Defense Forces, their motivations, and resiliency of their affect toward the duality of their cultural identities after their release from the military.

General Overview

The core components this research investigates are identity, diaspora, biculturalism, and acculturation. Given the age range of post-adolescent young adults, these volunteer soldiers provide a glimpse of self-motivated individuals who actively seek out various components of their identity and culture, even though some of those components come into conflict with each other. Predominant liberal Western culture that these volunteers grew up in clashes with the harsher realities of a more conservative Middle Eastern culture that they place themselves into by serving in the armed forces of the Israel Defense Forces.

Previous Research and Practical Application

Issues relating to identity of biculturals has often plagued social science researchers, not knowing whether to consider these diasporic individuals as betwixt and between two cultures as predominant Jewish literature states, or as having varying levels of positive attributes that make these individuals flourish inside and outside of their diasporic communities. By identifying how these individuals perceive themselves, their motivational factors will become clear and using a control group of former soldiers who presumably had those same factors coming in to service will identify whether or not a drop off in bicultural identity and integration levels occur for soldiers once they leave the military. Research into this phenomenon has multiple components for praxis – helping bridge the gap between diasporic Jews and Israelis, developing a stronger sense of cohesion between the two as well as benefits of identification of characteristics that make volunteer soldiers more or less likely to acculturate properly, saving much time, money and possible negative publicity should a non-conformist soldier act inappropriately under the banner of his service to the IDF. Finally, how individuals manage their bicultural identity has longer term implications to their respective host and home countries in retaining productive and positive citizenry. Most research to date has focused on various ethnic individuals coming to the United States and adopting to Western culture. This research focuses on an inverted cultural adaptation more heavily associated with westernized Americans choosing to return to their biblical host culture, by serving in the military and for some, integrating into society after their military service.

Scales Utilized

For the purposes of bicultural identity construction and acculturation, I utilize various measures spanning the social psychology, communication, and sociological fields. Scales included in the research are the Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI), a 15 item, 5-point Likert scale that analyzes language skills, discrimination and prejudice, intercultural relations, cultural isolation and work challenges (3 items each) of bicultural individuals, the 2005 Bicultural Identity Integration Scale (BIIS-1), a 8-point Likert scale that evaluates cultural blendedness (4 items) and cultural harmony (4 items), the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), a 5 item, 7-point Likert scale which identifies how individuals perceive their life, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) a 14 item, 4-point Likert scale that measures ethnic identity using self-report with subscales on affirmation and belonging; ethnic identity achievement; ethnic behaviors; and other group orientation, as well as an adapted East Asian Ethnic Acculturation Measure (EAAM) which comprises of a 29 item, 10-point Likert scale that analyzes multiple domains of assimilation, integration, marginalization, and separation of bicultural individuals and various demographic questions to evaluate differences within and between test groups, comprising three distinct groups – current lone soldiers, former lone soldiers that remained in Israel, and former lone soldiers who left Israel to return to America.

The first chapter of this thesis begins with a literature review of relevant theoretical bases for the research. The second chapter explains the methodology used in the study and how

data is collected. The third chapter provides the results of the data and the fourth and final chapter develops conclusions and implications for future studies.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

Diaspora

The term diaspora has been used in many forms over the years and as a result is imprecise (Gold, 2002). The two definitions used for this term for the purposes of this research are: a) The dispersion of the Jews beyond Israel (Vitkin, 1908), or in a more generic sense, b) The movement, migration, or scattering of a people away from an established or ancestral homeland (Webster, 2013). Robin Cohen (1997, pp. 26) identified a list of criteria defining diaspora. Diaspora involves: dispersal or travel from an original homeland to two or more foreign regions; a collective memory or myth of an idealized homeland; a commitment to the maintenance of the homeland, including a movement for return; a strong, long-term, group consciousness and identity; a belief in a shared fate; a range of possible relations (from troubled to enriching) with the host society; and finally, a sense of empathy and solidarity with co-ethnics in other places of settlement (Gold, 2002). The main emphasis among organizational scholars has been on the concept's core characteristics, or coherent and enduring distinctiveness (Albert and Whetten, 1985).

Diaspora can have a duality of meaning in this research. Diasporic individuals can be American Jews who are temporarily in Israel with the dominant culture being Western/American identity identification, or can also be the traditional model of Jews who for various reasons are outside of Israel and are diasporic individuals with cultural traits that are more identified with Middle Eastern/Israeli culture. Jews feel an affinity toward Jerusalem, and as an extension – all of Israel for many reasons. Religious Jews feel that the Messiah will come to Jerusalem and prepare for his coming through the

religious doctrine of “Teshuva, Tefilah and Tzedekah” – repentance, prayer, and charity. Zionists feel that due to the many exiles and genocide faced by Jews historically that a Jewish national homeland is necessary for the existence of the ethnicity. Historically speaking, the Crusades resulted in the forced conversion and massacre of Jews. English, Spanish, and French Jews met expulsion and terrorization during the 1200-1400's. Russia's Jews faced Pogroms in the late nineteenth century and of course Europe's Jews were mass exterminated by the Nazi's during the Holocaust during the 1930's and 1940's. Following the establishment of the state of Israel in 1940's, almost all of Arab-controlled Middle Eastern countries expelled Jews often with no notice and without the right to possessions. Understanding just who and what a Diasporic individual is and the multiple components to diasporic identity has great relevance to the next central component of this research, acculturation of individuals to various cultures.

Identity

Identity has become a popular frame through which to investigate a wide array of phenomena. Identity loosely refers to subjective meanings and experience, to our ongoing efforts to address the twin questions, ‘Who am I?’ and—by implication—‘how should I act?’ (Cerulo, 1997). While this may seem a simple and self explanatory concept, it is actually far more complex. Who am I takes on both singular and plural self definitions of individuals all the way to large social categories (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Jewish identity, is likewise quite complicated. While local groups of Jews created identities based on their geographic region after the Babylonian exile, many maintain a

strong sense of identity toward Israel and their ancestral homeland. Identity implies certain forms of (often positive) subjectivity and thereby entwines feelings, values and behavior and points them in particular (sometimes conflicting) directions (Alverson, et al, 2008). This may partially explain the attitudes of many Diasporic Jews toward Israel. While the vast majority of Jews in the diaspora are highly assimilated into host cultures, the relative newness of the Holocaust, historically frequent expulsions of Jews from lands worldwide, and the belief in a Jewish democratic state may explain why organizations such as AIPAC (American Israel Political Action Committee) have such a significant amount of political leverage in a country where Jews constitute right around 2% of the total electorate (U.S. Census, 2010).

Symbolic interactionists believe that the identity is not an objective fact, but it is built through multiple interactions between the social actors. In the interactionist view, the concept of self is built and changed within our social life (Branc, 2007). Cooley came up with the theory that the self develops in relation to the other people as part of the social environment, a process that develops over time beginning during childhood and is moderated by how others interact and relate to us (MacDonald, 2002). According to Berger and Luckmann, gaining an identity means establishing your place in the world. Identity has three major components: individual, relational and collective (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Individual identity refers to self-definition on an individual level, including goals, values, religious beliefs and standards for behavior. Relational identity focuses on the roles of an individual with regard to others the societal norms that exist –

e.g. a parent, customer, or spouse, but also how those roles are defined by the individual. Collective identity refers to people's identification with groups and social categories with which they belong, the interpretation of those entities, and the feelings, beliefs and attitudes that result in that association (Schwartz, 2011).

Additionally, Erik Erikson, stimulated by the difficulties which some World War II veterans encountered upon reentering society, became interested in problems associated with acute identity diffusion. Over time and through clinical experience he came to believe that the pathological difficulties which some veterans had in leaving one role (soldier) and entering another (civilian) were psychologically similar to the problem which some adolescents experience as they leave childhood and move through the transition of adolescence into adulthood. From this experiential framework has evolved a psychology of adolescent identity formation (Adams, Bennion, & Huh, 1987). This tie in between ego development and identity helps explain how individuals choices are dictated by a number of factors some years in the making. For lone soldiers who leave Western society and join their cultural breatheren in Israel at the end of their adolescence and beginning of adulthood, this stark difference in identity construction becomes even more evident, with some of these individuals returning to their home cultures and others adopting a more dominant culture that clashes with their well ingrained identity, often leading to integration and reconciliation issues related to their identity. He emphasized the role of culture and society and the conflicts that can take place within the ego itself, and during the fifth stage of development (up until the age of 18), the transition from

childhood to adulthood is critical. Children become more independent, and start to look at the future in terms of career, relationships, families, etc. The individual wants to belong to a society and fit in. Success in this stage will lead to the virtue of fidelity. Fidelity involves being able to commit one's self to others on the basis of accepting others even when there may be ideological differences (McLeod, 2009).

What did Erikson mean by identity? Drawing on psychoanalytic thinking with an emphasis on ego development, he derived several definitions of identity. Based on the notion that the ego organizes a coherent personality endowed with a sameness and continuity perceived by others, Erikson (1968) stated:

“Ego identity then, in its subjective aspect, is the awareness of the fact that there is a self sameness and continuity to the ego’s synthesizing methods, the *style of one’s individuality*, and that this style coincides with the sameness and continuity of one’s *meaning for significant others in the immediate community*” (p. 50).

Acculturation

Acculturation is the process of learning and adapting to a new culture (Berry, 2003). A fundamental premise in hermeneutics and semiotics, which Kramer's Dimensional Accrual and Dissociation (DAD) theory accepts as true that identity depends on difference. Most importantly, Kramer's DAD theory emphasizes how various cultures communicate in generalized terms from idolic to symbolic to signalic communication styles that helps explain intercultural differences that influence intercultural and interethnic relations as well as acculturation processes. So too do meaning, communication, and learning. If everyone assimilates into a monoculture that would

mean that identity, meaning, and communication would cease to be (Kramer, 1992, 1997a, 2003). According to Kramer's DAD theory, religious identity for a predominantly idolic person, is not perceived by them as arbitrary, not even questionable. By comparison, a predominantly symbolic person may be able to convert from one religious faith to another but such a change in identity has very profound emotional consequences. For a signalic person where everything is arbitrary, changing churches is like shopping. It is a matter of personal choice and convenience, a matter of membership. In fact some individuals may choose not to belong to a religious community entirely without much concern. But for an idolic person religious identity is not at all an issue of membership or choice. It is inherent to who one is. So acculturation varies from one person to another depending on what worldview they manifest. Studies suggest that individuals' respective acculturation strategy can differ between their private and public live spheres (Berry, 2006). For instance, an individual may reject the values and norms of the dominant culture in his private life (separation), whereas he might adapt to the dominant culture in public parts of his life (i.e., integration or assimilation).

In the last 25 years, a wealth of acculturation studies has supported the conceptualization of acculturation as a bilinear, two-directional, complex process (Sam & Berry, 2006). Said another way, rejecting one's heritage (or ethnic minority) culture and replacing it with the dominant culture is not the only way to acculturate. Two issues facing the bilinear model of acculturation are the *dominant* cultural orientation and (2) the *heritage* cultural orientation (Kim & Abreu, 2001; Miller, 2007). Dominant cultural orientation is

the extent to which one is involved with the host country and mainstream culture, where heritage orientation is that individual's involvement with the ethnic minority culture and non-dominant culture. Categorically, these two cultural orientations apply to multiple dimensions or domains: language use or preference, social affiliation, daily living habits, cultural traditions, communication style, cultural identity/pride, perceived discrimination/prejudice, generational status, family socialization, and cultural knowledge, beliefs, or values (Zane & Mak, 2003; Nguyen, 2013). Berry's research on acculturation and immigration sums up the question I ask in the framework of this research:

What happens to individuals, who have developed in one cultural context, when they attempt to live in a new cultural context? If culture is such a powerful shaper of behaviour. do individuals continue to act in the new setting as they did in the previous one, do they change their behavioural repertoire to be more appropriate in the new setting, or is there some complex pattern of continuity and change in how people go about their lives in the new society? The answer provided by cross-cultural psychology is very clearly supportive of the last of these three alternatives (Berry, 2006, p. 6).

Berry concludes that:

“psychological acculturation is influenced by numerous group-level factors in the society of origin and in the society of settlement. What led the acculturating group to begin the process (whether voluntary, whether on their own lands or elsewhere) appears to be an important source of variation in outcome. However, other factors have also been identified as contributing: national immigration and acculturation policies, ideologies and attitudes in the dominant society, and social support” (Berry, 2006).

Likewise, Jews straddle the line between these two components of acculturation in many ways with regard to holidays, religious involvement, shared language of bible in Hebrew, etc. The old traditions of Jewish religion and ethnicity are sometimes very different than

modern Western culture. Many Diasporic Jews have left many components of their heritage culture behind and replaced it with their dominant culture. As seen by high intermarriage rates, low religious affiliation levels and sometimes an outright rejection of their culture, the Jewish Diaspora mimics many other cultures who lose battles with assimilation (Desilver, 2013). An active movement works against this assimilation, with many Jewish organizations promoting bringing Jews back to their ancestral homeland for short term trips and education on the history of Israel and political activism and public diplomacy (hasbara) on Israel's behalf. Other non profit organizations such as Nefesh B'Nefesh, Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel (AACI), and others help integrate diasporic Jews into Israeli mainstream society who decide to permanently relocate to Israel.

Biculturals

The growing prevalence of biculturals in the United States and globally, has fueled a boost in scholarship on the psychology of biculturalism (Williams, 2012). More strictly defined, bicultural individuals are those who have been exposed to and have internalized two cultures (Benet-Martínez, in press; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). A key finding in this emerging literature concerns the extent to which individual differences in identity management influence the experience of biculturalism (Cheng, 2013). From the acculturation literature, biculturalism develops as one of four possible acculturation strategies: (a) the integration strategy (i.e., biculturalism) refers to involvement in both dominant and ethnic cultures, (b) the assimilation strategy is involvement in the dominant

culture only, (c) the separation strategy is involvement in the ethnic culture only, and (d) marginalization is involvement in neither culture (Berry, 2003). For instance, a bicultural individual may have a blended or fused identity (e.g., someone who sees himself/herself as a product of both Jewish and American cultures and accordingly identifies as Jewish American) and also alternates between speaking mainstream English and Yiddish depending on the context. Thus, researchers should be aware that labels such as “blended” and “alternating” do not tap different types of bicultural individuals but rather different components of the bicultural experience (i.e., identity vs. behaviors, respectively). In other words, blending one’s two cultural identities is not incompatible with alternating between different cultural behavioral repertoires (Schwartz, 2011). Many people are bicultural and are likely to affiliate with one racial or ethnic group but adopt perspectives from both their minority cultural group and the larger host culture. Becoming bicultural, both for immigrant families and for the larger host society, is a difficult and sometimes painful process, requiring the integration of multiple, often conflicting messages concerning stability and change from different people and social systems (Smokowski, 2011). Bicultural Identity Integration is not a unitary construct, but instead it encompasses two different and psychometrically independent dimensions (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005): (a) cultural blendedness versus compartmentalization – the degree of dissociation versus overlap perceived between the two cultural orientations (e.g., “I see myself as a Jew in the United States” vs. “I am a Jewish-American”); and (2) cultural harmony versus conflict – the degree of tension or clash versus compatibility perceived between the two cultures (Schwartz, 2011).

Understanding these components helps provide a framework of the construction of identity bicultural individuals who are Diasporic Jews who leave their homes and return to their biblical homeland adopt and adapt to the changes in culture that exist between the diasporic communities and their putative place of origin.

Bicultural Identity studies

Numerous studies have been conducted on bicultural identity. A 2002 article by Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, and Morris proposed that cultural frame shifting—shifting between two culturally based interpretative lenses in response to cultural cues—is moderated by perceived compatibility (vs. opposition) between the two cultural orientations, or bicultural identity integration (BII). Three studies found that Chinese American biculturals who perceived their cultural identities as compatible (high BII) responded in culturally congruent ways to cultural cues: They made more external attributions (a characteristically Asian behavior) after being exposed to Chinese primes (statements associated with Chinese cultural cues) and more internal attributions (a characteristically Western behavior) after being exposed to American primes. However, Chinese American biculturals who perceived their cultural identities as oppositional (low BII) exhibited a reverse priming effect. This trend was not apparent for noncultural primes. The results show that individual differences in bicultural identity affect how cultural knowledge is used to interpret social events (Benet-Martinez, 2002). A follow up study a decade later conducted by Saad et. al. concluded that evidence shows that bicultural experience enhances creativity, and that for culture-related domains, this effect is particularly evident

among biculturals who blend their two cultural identities. These cultural cues can shape cognitive processes, such as creativity (Saad, 2012). Similarly, testing these components on lone soldiers will help identify their management of a duality of identity while in Israel serving in the IDF as well as post-release from the military and assimilation into their host or home cultures once again. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these diasporic individuals who stay in Israel not only integrate into society, but make substantial contributions in technology, government and Hasbara.

Additionally, a meta analysis of 83 studies and 23,197 participants by Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2013) show a significant, strong, and positive association between biculturalism and adjustment (both psychological and sociocultural). This biculturalism-adjustment link is stronger than the association between having one culture (dominant or heritage) and adjustment. Thus, results clearly invalidate early sociological accounts of this phenomenon, which portrayed bicultural individuals as “marginal” and stumped between two worlds.

The Establishment of the State of Israel – Zionism taking practical shape

The state of Israel, formally recognized in 1948 as a country, has been the ancestral homeland of Jews dating back to the Bible. Liturgical prayers call for “our [the Jews] return to Jerusalem”. In fact, the most frequently utilized prayer for Jews, known as the Amidah or the “Standing [prayer]”, also known as the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Hebrew: "The Eighteen"), is the essential component of the Jewish services. It is said three times a day

(four times on holidays, and five times on Yom Kippur). A section of the prayer reads:

“Return in mercy to Jerusalem Your city and dwell therein as You have promised; speedily establish therein the throne of David Your servant, and rebuild it, soon in our days, as an everlasting edifice. Blessed are You L-rd, who rebuilds Jerusalem” (Siddur Tehillat Hashem, 2013).

The prayer is recited with such intense concentration that no matter where a person recites it - it is said standing up, feet together, facing Jerusalem. There are dozens of prayers, all with ties to the old testament that refer to the land of Israel and Jerusalem as the location of the coming of Moshiach (Messiah) and the homeland and birthplace of Judaism. Every year during the Passover Service the Seder (Hebrew: Order) is ended with the statement: “Next Year in Jerusalem”.

The father of modern Zionism was Theodore Herzl. Herzl and the other founders of Zionism were influenced by the political ideals of their time and place – especially socialism and nationalism – as they sought an opportunity for Jews to build their own lives on their own land (Herzl, 2001). Since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, the Zionist dream of the “ingathering of exiles” has partially come to fruition. A consciously created system of culture, education, military experience and language (ancient Hebrew rejuvenated for use in a modern society) was devoted to the task of building common themes to unite the newly formed country (Zerubavel, 1995). Kibbutzim, or communal living areas were also the norm in early established Israel. Recently, the number of fully functional socialist Kibbutzim has dropped to a single active kibbutz, although many hybrid kibbutzim are still in existence today. Due to the necessity of absorbing a lot of

Jews from both areas of axis-controlled holocaust era locales as well as Middle Eastern Jews who were expelled from Arab countries, Israel has always been a melting pot of cultures with an underlying strong nationalistic identity. If one were to go to Ben Yehuda Street in Jerusalem – a very popular youth hangout with lots of bars and restaurants, it would only take one a very short time to hear someone start singing Hatikvah (“The Hope” - Israel's National anthem) or Yerushalayim Shel Zahav (“Jerusalem of Gold” - Israel's unofficial anthem) and see virtually every person near them join in – many with tears in their eyes by the end of the song.

Jews overall have been able to keep a strong sense of community, even in the Diaspora as marginalization of Jewish residents occurred. Each subgroup took on both nationalistic and assimilated characteristics, which resulted in “Italian Jews”, “South African Jews” or “American Jews” (Dimont, 1978). This position of partial assimilation and partial marginalization as described by Park (1950) resulted in distinct Jewish communities as well as isolation from their non-Jewish neighbors. These groupings of individuals are frequently labeled “betwixt and between” and neither fully assimilating to their host country or the country from where they came. Jews, therefore walk a fine line between their assimilation into diasporic cultures and ethnic world whence they came. These individuals frequently struggle for a sense of belonging, often conflicted between the values and norms of their host country and that of their homeland.

Israel currently has a Jewish population of 6,042,000 according to the Israeli Central

Bureau of Statistics as of 2013 (Globes, 2013). The entire Jewish population of the world is estimated at 13,746,000 (Jewish Virtual Library, 2012). Israel therefore represents nearly half of the world's Jewish population, within an area of 8,500 square miles, or smaller than the state of New Jersey for comparison sake. Within this tiny country, a collision of cultures exists. Middle Eastern, European, Former Soviet Union, South American, North American, and Central American Jews each have significant constituencies within the country. Even with that occurring, the country has been fairly cohesive in terms of identity, conservative political ideology, and outward appearance, which is quite contrary to Jews living in the Diaspora who live in fragmented communities, have significantly different socioeconomic standards and are far left of their Israeli counterparts politically (Michaelson, 2012, Liebler, 2013).

American Jews, and to a lesser extent virtually all Diasporic Jews feel a closeness to the state of Israel for many reasons (Eilfort, 2013). First, the relative newness of the state of Israel, established less than 70 years ago, makes most individuals alive for the majority of the history of the country. Speaking from a net-outward migration perspective, those leaving home countries and moving to various places in the diaspora can only be 2 to 3 generations separated from Israel. Despite lessening percentages of Diasporic Jews affiliating with the religious side of their Judaism, and some research that suggests that younger Jews are losing that closeness to the state of Israel mostly due to shifting political attitudes and high intermarriage rates, their ethnic connection and relative support for the state of Israel has stayed constant the past 3 survey cycles according to

various researchers and studies (Cohen, 2007; Sasson, 2010; Desilver, 2013).

Furthermore, even research critical of the alleged weakening of Diasporic-Israeli relations has shown that a single trip to Israel has a complete reversal effect in young Jews aged 18-35 on issues of alienation, separation, and closeness to Israel (Cohen, 2007). Those Jews who are religiously involved have clearer ties to the country, frequently traveling there for Holidays – the Shalosh Regalim – three times Jews are supposed to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem – Sukkot (Booths), Pesach (Passover), and Shavout (Weeks). Students in Yeshivot (Jewish Seminaries) almost always study in Israel for 1-3 years post High School graduation. Jewish day school students are now frequently having 8th grade graduation trips to Israel as a class trip. Their more secular counterparts have different support mechanisms. The traditional pro-Israel model of support from organizations like the American-Israeli Political Action Committee (AIPAC) have maintained relatively stable in recent years. Newer organizations that build bridges between diasporic and Israeli Jews have grown in influence over the years and are responsible for bringing hundreds of thousands of diasporic Jews to Israel. The largest organization, called “Birthright” or “Taglit” in Hebrew, is responsible for taking upwards of 400,000 Jews, of whom about 80% of participants are from the United States and Canada to Israel for a free ten day trip. A major feature of the free trip is a 5-to-10-day mifgash (Hebrew for 'encounter') with Israeli peers, almost exclusively soldiers serving in the Israel Defense Forces, who join the tour to exchange with their diaspora counterparts. Chabad, a religious outreach organization for Jews of all backgrounds, follows the traditions of holidays as if they were in Israel, even when practicing in remote

locales such as Greensboro, North Carolina or Montgomery, Alabama where Jews make up some of the smallest percentages of the population. Similar to Taglit, Masa (Hebrew word for “Journey”) offers significant scholarships and programming for longer term (5-12 month) academic, social service, Jewish learning, and other projects experiences in the country. As of 2013, they offer over 300 various programs touching on every aspect of Israeli culture and academic study imaginable (Masa Israel Journey, 2013). It is hard to find a young, self-identified, Jewish man or woman who hasn't been to Israel at least once in the under 35 category.

Despite overt friendship between Israeli and Diasporic Jews, major differences exist. Israeli Jews, so constantly concerned with not only political isolation but also existential threats that could threaten to annihilate the country - and in doing so potentially wipe half of the world's Jewish population off the map in one time as well as be as great or worse of a catastrophe of the Holocaust which killed an estimated 6 million Jews over a 12 year period – fail to understand how outside communities do not see their perspective. Diaspora Jews, longtime financiers of the Jewish state, are likewise at times spent-financially and emotionally of defending their Israeli brethren both literally and figuratively in public relations battles that are waged on a daily basis.

North American Jews, in particular have existed in some of the most favorable conditions the past century, despite the fact that transnational groups are treated suspiciously by host nations. The social mobility exhibited by Jews in this part of the diaspora can at times be

a source of jealousy for others who have not had the same opportunities in smaller countries and locales.

The differences in political realities, socioeconomics and safety issues have created major ideological battles between those Jews who live in the diaspora and their Israeli brethren. Frequently, top Jewish organizations in the United States such as the Jewish Agency For Israel (JAFI) and the North American Jewish Federations condemn strongly actions taken by policy makers in Israel that seek to limit identification of Jews to that which is Halachically (Jewish law) driven, unlike current Israeli government practices of allowing anyone with a Jewish grandparent who does not practice a religion other than Judaism to return to Israel and claim expedited citizenship. In 2012, the Ministry of Absorption was thoroughly chastised for the creation of television ads imploring Israelis abroad to come back home, insinuating that their Jewish identity would die in the diaspora and their children would assimilate to secular or alternative religions.

The IDF: A historical framework

Prior to the establishment of the official state of Israel, the Haganah served as a paramilitary force to keep the zone secure that was to be designated Israel by the UN Partition plan. On May 14, 1948, the very day the state of Israel was declared, David Ben Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, declared the establishment of the IDF as his first order (IDF Online, 2013). The order was quite timely, as within a month six Arab countries attacked the nascent country in what is known as the War of Independence. On

Independence Day, May 14, 1948, Israel's Jewish population was 665,000 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2007). In under a year, over 210,000 Jews immigrated from over fifty countries to Israel; by the end of 1950, the population totaled 1.37 million, of whom 1.2 million (87 percent) were Jews. The challenges were enormous: a long and bloody war, an acute food and housing shortage, an influx of immigrants in need of absorption by a nucleic group of pre-independence settlers, very little cash in the coffers, and limited international support; nonetheless, the government was intent on fully addressing the nation's needs in the name of the *mamlachtiut*, that is, statism (Seidman, 2010). Since 1948, the IDF has been involved in seven official wars and dozens of smaller military operations that have all been deemed a victory for Israel by military historians. The Israeli Defense Forces and Israel as a country has always relied heavily on outside support in terms of funding, with the United States contributing an estimated 3 billion dollars annually. Almost all current U.S. aid to Israel is in the form of military assistance (Sharp, 2013). Much of this military aid is restricted, with 74% of aid required to be spent on American military products. Much of the remaining military funding goes to defensive technology, including 211 million to Iron Dome (missile interception system), 150 million for David's sling, and a combined 120 million to Arrow II and III systems (Sharp, 2013). Israel is not a one way partner always on the receiving end of assistance, however. Israel is a strategic military ally of the Western world in an otherwise undemocratic and totalitarian region. Israel has also historically been a buffer in areas of public diplomacy, working with countries the United States has little connection to, and is usually the first country to send aid to countries suffering from natural disasters (Rosen,

2013).

Lone Soldiers (Chayalim Bodedim): Framework

Lone soldiers have been a part of the history of the IDF since before the IDF formally existed. Jews from the diaspora came to Israel's aid and volunteered their time, service, and money for every military operation since the creation of the state. Currently, there is no formalized process for lone soldiers to come to Israel, although in the recent years some organizations are starting to develop programs that bring soldiers to Israel en masse and provide support services. Various organizations offer pre-army training (Mechina) programs and some offer support throughout the enlistment period. Some are religiously affiliated and some secular. Other volunteers come to Israel on birthright trips and opt to stay after for service in the IDF. Recently, lone soldiers became an international phenomenon when two lone soldiers were killed during Operation Protective Edge in July, 2014. Those soldiers, Max Steinberg from Los Angeles and Sean Carmelli from Houston, Texas were both killed during intensive fighting with the terrorist organization and Palestinian political faction of Hamas in the Gaza strip. On average at any given point in time, there are approximately 5,000 lone soldiers as defined by the Misrad HaBitachon (Ministry of Defense).

Although the actual number of lone soldiers who are not Israeli citizens is considerably lower, usually between 2,000-2,500 (Ministry of Defense, 2013). Of those, according to Friends of the Israel Defense Forces, 740 are American (FIDF, 2014). According to an

IDF spokeswoman, 8,217 foreign-born personnel enlisted between 2009 and August 2012. The most represented countries of origin were Russia and the United States, with 1,685 and 1,661 recruits respectively. (Rudoren, Jodi, 2012). Lone soldiers do have special designations and privileges not offered to regular conscripted soldiers in the IDF. Major benefits include double pay, extra “Yom Sidurim” (English: Day of order - Free days the army allots for soldiers to handle personal affairs), gift cards to clothing stores courtesy of the army and soldier welfare non-profit organizations, a rent allowance of 1100-1300 NIS per month and a beginners Hebrew language immersion class (Ulpan) called Mikveh Alon. The salary for a regular combat soldier in the IDF stands at 700 NIS per month, equating to a little under \$200 US dollars. Lone soldiers who are in combat units receive twice this amount of salary, hardly enough to pay for a few weekend nights of partying when they are off base.

These lone soldiers, known as Chayalim Bodedim, serve for a minimum of 18 months in integrated military units. Although volunteers, they are for the most part treated the same as any conscripted soldier in terms of promotions and punishments. Very few Chayalim Bodedim have completed their service without having to spend weekends on base as punishment or even put in army jails for insubordination or going AWOL.

Soldiers serving as Chayalim Bodedim come from across the Diasporic Jewish world. The majority, though, come from North America - Canada and the United States specifically, as those countries host some of the largest populations of Diasporic Jews.

The next highest concentration of lone soldiers come from Russia and the former Soviet Union. The central question of why these lone soldiers leave frequently comfortable homes and put off college or professional careers to serve in a foreign country's military is central to this study. Is it Zionist indoctrination from families or communities from which they came? A sense of longing for a country that is “For Jews, By Jews”? Familial connections to the atrocities of the Shoah (Holocaust)? Or something else?

Due to the very nature of the Zionist and Israeli experience, the biblical deference to Jerusalem and surrounding areas, the conflict in the Middle East, and many years of antisemitism and Jewish nationalism, it is no wonder why many Jews are polarized on the issue of Israel. Spiritual and religious Jews feel that they are in exile living outside of the land of Israel. Diasporic Jews, however who are vastly secular have taken on the characteristics of their home countries and feel far less connection with Israel. It is this very notion that Jews who are in Israel are “home” or have made “Aliyah” (gone higher) are different than their diasporic brethren. One component of Henri Tajfel's ingroup/outgroup theory can be described as:

Discrimination between ingroups and outgroups is a matter of favoritism towards an ingroup and the absence of equivalent favoritism towards an outgroup. Outgroup derogation is the phenomena in which an outgroup is perceived as being threatening to the members of an ingroup” (Hewstone, 2002).

This practical application can apply bilaterally to both diasporic Jews and Israeli Jews. Diasporic Jews tend to view Israelis with a level of disdain, considering them to be less successful, educated, and socially aware, while Israeli Jews characterize their diasporic

brethren as self-hating, liberal, and unconcerned with the reality that Israeli life brings about (e.g. security threats from neighboring countries that North American and European countries do not face). However, despite the relative success that diasporic Jews have experienced the past 65 years, Israel is most definitely the ingroup. Even the most radical of pro-peace Jewish activists still has an affinity toward the country and understands the religious connection to the land, something that can never be said about diasporic living. Similarly, categorization of people into social groups increases the perception that group members are similar to one another. A byproduct of this is the outgroup homogeneity effect – which refers to the perception of members of an outgroup as being homogenous, while members of one's ingroup are perceived as being diverse (Leyens, 1994; Quattrone, 1980). Likewise, most Diasporic Jews can be labeled as liberal, while Israelis are conservative. Israelis view North American Jews in particular as very weak-willed and spineless, while North Americans view Israelis as unrefined and violent (Cohen, 2007; Berg, 2013; Ben Shalom, 2013).

Gaps in existing literature

There is a notable gap in literature of Israeli/Diaspora relations with regard to the military component of identity and how the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) may act as an effective bridge linking not only new immigrants who serve in the military, but also lone soldiers who volunteer their service to the State of Israel's army. These outside volunteers leave comfortable homes behind and put off employment and college careers for significant amounts of time in order to defend the Jewish state. Previous studies have dealt with

generic Israeli/Diaspora relations, feminist studies of female lone soldiers, acceptance of North American Olim (Immigrants) into Israeli society, and emigration of Israelis outward to the diaspora. No literature has reviewed the military as a cohesive agent that potentially bridges diasporic and Israeli Jews together on a large scale and tests the long term efficacy of such integration. The results of the previous research were mixed. The article on female lone soldiers focused mostly on initial motivations coming in to the army and did not follow up with any longer term components or issues related to integration or biculturalism (Russo, 2004). A doctoral dissertation by a student at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee revealed that culturally North American Olim create separate networks apart from their Israeli neighbors and do not fully assimilate into the predominant Israeli culture (Ellman, 2002). This research too, ignores the key variable of military service acting as a bridge between the diasporic and Israeli identities. No single study has evaluated the effect of military service on diasporic identification and bicultural adaptation.

Benefits of research

Understanding how bicultural individuals straddle the line between two identities frequently in conflict can help improve the body of literature in group/out group identification of social identity theory, discussed by Henri Tajfel in research question 1 and 3, social perception theory in research question 2 as well as Diasporic, identity and biculturalism scholarship in all three of the research questions. Most of the previous research has focused on a small segment of immigrants and their adaptation to American

culture. This is a case study of diasporic individuals returning to their ancestral homeland and adopting the cultural competencies to function within a highly regimented military structure. and cultural studies. Information gleaned from the survey instrument will be tabulated according to the various scales used and then will be cross referenced surveys of mainstream diaspora opinion Survey of Jewish Opinion 2012 as well as the Hebrew Union College studies in 2011. The benefits to this research are as follows: First and foremost, applying the theoretical frameworks and subsequent scales to the condition of lone soldiers in the IDF who are Diasporic Jews. Understanding their motivations, intentions, and backgrounds can help explain and possibly predict certain aspects of how these lone soldiers come to make their decision to volunteer in a foreign country's army and by extension a test of how Zionism is resilient. On a more focused scale, the research should assist the military in developing instrumentation such as entrance testing for potential Machal soldiers to determine with some level of accuracy whether or not they will be successful in the military structure as well as future integration prospects of those soldiers staying in Israel post-release from the army. Further extrapolation can identify how a home country can maintain a bond with diasporic citizens in terms of identity and biculturalism and how bridging those gaps can assist home countries in reviving economies and recruiting and retaining productive citizens. Israel, despite having a strong economy, suffers significant “brain drain” with a significant minority of academics and scientists leaving for positions outside of the country and out-migration comparable to other industrialized countries, despite it's small population and geographic size (Fisher, 2013).

In short, this research focuses on how volunteer soldiers in the Israel Defense Forces construct their identity and how they are similar to and different from both their dominant diasporic identities as well as adopted Israeli identity. The research into biculturalism and specifically the BII instrument is relatively new and still undergoing changes based on theory and observation. However, it is the most accurate instrument available and has been tested on various groups of biculturals over the past decade with relatively high reliability and consistency. Various measures contained in the research will isolate and identify the various dimensions of identity construction and biculturalism components as it relates to initial decision making to join a foreign military, the assimilation and acculturation attitudes during military service, and post-release changes in levels of biculturalism for those who stay in Israel and those who go back to America. By testing levels of acculturative stress, having open ended questions to identify components of the military's successes and failures in creating a cohesive identity that lasts long term, and gleaning differences between soldiers satisfaction in general may provide a framework that shows how to best incorporate these highly motivated young biculturals into the society long term.

Research questions/hypotheses

1. What are the core motivational and bicultural identity factors that make young men and women leave home countries in order to serve in the IDF? Just who are these young men and women and which sectors of American Diasporic Jewry do they come from?

2. Does the effect on integration change with immediacy of service in the IDF? Are there different levels of self reported bicultural acceptance between those former soldiers who left Israel after the military and those who remained in the country?
3. If differences do in fact exist between current and former soldiers, what changes integration levels and what barriers exist to high long term integration levels? i.e. Is there something in the military service, a shared experience between all of these young men and women that either assists or acts as a barrier to having these soldiers stay in Israel and adapt to the culture fully? Do changes over time in these experiences significantly impact the identity constructs that provided the initial motivation for these young soldiers to come 6,000 miles and volunteer in the military in the first place?

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Site of Study

The primary location for the study was conducted in Israel. For a six month period between January and July 2014, volunteer soldiers were asked to complete a survey instrument at various locations in Israel, including local centers that provide welfare assistance to lone soldiers, housing organizations, and military bases where soldiers are stationed. A secondary online site was used to survey former soldiers as well as otherwise inaccessible in-person soldiers, some of whom are still in Israel and the remainder in the United States (see Appendix 2 for the survey instrument).

Participants

The sample of participants are comprised of young men and women aged 18-30 who are American citizens who are currently serving or have previously served in the Israel Defense Forces as a non-citizen volunteer. A total of 360 individuals were identified and recruited via various methods including in person interviews, online/social media recruitment and at lone soldier centers and venues across the country using a snowball effect (see Appendix 1 for sample recruitment card) and $n=151$ of them were qualified respondents who met the inclusion criteria and completed the survey. Of those, the minority ($n = 64, 42.4\%$) are current volunteers and majority ($n = 87, 57.6\%$) were former volunteers. The sample was heavily weighted toward males ($n = 114, 75\%$) over females ($n = 38, 25\%$), which was expected given the military nature of this study. The vast majority of participants ($n = 113, 75.3\%$) were located in Israel during their

participation in the study while a minority ($n = 37, 24.7\%$) were located in the United States. The inclusion criteria for participants were: American, 18-30 years olds who began their service the year 2007 or later AND labeled as a "lone soldier" by the Ministry of Defense. The exclusion criteria were: Non-American, under 18 years old or over 30 years old, service began before the year 2007 OR not labeled as a "lone soldier" by the Ministry of Defense. All participants were voluntary participants, and their identities are not known or traceable through the data. The procedures for identification, recruitment, and consent were approved by the Institutional Review Board at Wake Forest University, #IRB00021518. The total universe of potential participants is somewhere between an estimate of 3,453 (FIDF figures 740 enlisted US soldiers multiplied by the 7 year window of the study) to 3,875 (IDF figures on foreign born enlisted personnel extrapolated to cover the 7 year study window), resulting in a participation rate of 3.9-4.4%.

Data

The methods used for this research are fairly standard. The study focuses on current and recently released lone soldiers who are both in Israel and in the Diaspora. In person surveys were conducted for current soldiers in Israel, utilizing Qualtrics based online data collection. Study participants were given a series of questions on their identity construction, scales which encompass Identity, Biculturalism, and Diasporic components, comprised of both quantitative and qualitative measures. Former soldiers were asked to answer an additional group of questions concerning the ease or hardship of maintaining their bicultural identity post-army release, especially for those who do not stay in Israel

after their military service. Soldiers who are no longer in the IDF were recruited by former soldiers compiling lists of their Machal groups, online social media pages and groups and a additional snowball effect from known current and volunteer soldier recruitment method was used. The website LoneSoldierStudy.com was purchased and linked directly to the qualtrics survey page for the duration of the study period.

Responses were tabulated and cross referenced with responses from current and former soldiers, and those inside or outside of Israel post-service in the military to see which identity factors have underlying predictive ability for determining motivations and success rates of this bicultural integration phenomenon. Data was stored in a HIPPA-secured, password protected Qualtrics account. Data is only reported in aggregate format and no personally identifying information will be published (see Appendix 2 for the informed consent).

Scales

In order to best test the individual and collective components of identity, assimilation, and biculturalism, a number of scales were used in this research. This research utilizes a hybrid version of numerous sales to identify construction of identity, biculturalism and satisfaction scales. The development and validation of a scale to measure global life satisfaction, the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) a 5 item, 7-point Likert scale assesses global life satisfaction and does not tap related constructs such as positive affect or loneliness. The SWLS has been shown to have favorable psychometric properties, including high internal consistency and high temporal reliability. Scores on the SWLS

correlate moderately to highly with other measures of subjective well-being, and correlate predictably with specific personality characteristics (Diener, 1985). An adapted East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM) instrument, developed by Declan Barry, which is a 29 item, 10-point Likert scale and measures ranges of assimilation, adaptation, acculturation and isolation. These scales combined provide insight into how individuals construct their identity and how their bicultural identities may change over time. The Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI), is a 15 item, 5-point Likert scale that analyzes language skills, discrimination and prejudice, intercultural relations, cultural isolation and work challenges of bicultural individuals, the 2005 Bicultural Identity Integration Scale (BIIS-1), a 8-point Likert scale that analyzes how much a bicultural individual perceives his/her two cultural identities as compatible versus oppositional, and finally the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) a 14 item, 4-point Likert scale that measures ethnic identity using self-report with sub-scales on affirmation and belonging; Ethnic Identity Achievement; Ethnic Behaviors; and Other Group Orientation, and various demographic questions to evaluate differences within and between test groups, comprising three distinct groups – current lone soldiers, former lone soldiers that remained in Israel, and former lone soldiers who left Israel to return to America.

The BIIS-1 is adequately internally consistent (α blendedness =0.69, α harmony =0.74). Unfortunately, a complete version of BIIS-2 which was established more recently and tested new realms of bicultural identity was not available for this research despite repeated attempts to contact the author. The alphas for the conflict and distance scales

were .74 and .69, respectively. Surprisingly, the correlation between scores on these two scales was close to zero (.02). These results indicate that bicultural individuals can perceive their ethnic and mainstream cultural orientations to be relatively dissociated while not feeling that they conflict with each other. Similarly, bicultural individuals can see themselves as having a combined identity (e.g., “I feel Chinese American”) while simultaneously perceiving the two cultural orientations as being in conflict with each other (e.g., “I feel caught between the two cultures”). The independence of cultural distance and conflict found here may suggest a modification of the original conceptualization of the BII construct. BIIS-1 Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .381$ for this research on identity and biculturalism of Diasporic Jews in the IDF, and as such is not a reliable measure.

For the MEIM-R, the overall Cronbach's alpha was .82 (with an alpha of .75 for the exploration item scores and .74 for the commitment item scores). These alpha levels are similar to those found in Phinney and Ong's (2007) study. In their study, the MEIM-R's exploration item scores had an alpha of .76, the commitment item scores had an alpha of .78, and the overall MEIM—Revised alpha was .81. MEIM-R: Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .889$ for this research on identity and biculturalism of Diasporic Jews in the IDF.

The RASI includes 15 items tapping culture-related challenges in the following five life domains: language skills (e.g., being misunderstood because of one's accent), work (e.g., having to work harder than nonimmigrant/minority peers), intercultural relations (e.g.,

having disagreements with others for behaving in ways that are “too American” or “too ethnic”), discrimination (e.g., being mistreated because of one's ethnicity), and cultural/ethnic makeup of the community (e.g., living in an environment that is not culturally diverse).

Reliability and Validity for the RASI scale is strong as well, with alphas for the Language, Discrimination, Intercultural Relations, Cultural Isolation, and Work scales of .84, .80, .75, .68, and .68, respectively. The average interscale correlation for this measure was .23 (range: .04–.52), indicating that our proposed acculturation stress domains are, for the most part, interrelated components of a broader construct (acculturation stress) (Benet-Martínez, Haritatos, 2005). RASI Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .821$ for this research on identity and biculturalism of Diasporic Jews in the IDF.

A meta-analysis of 60 studies that assessed the reliability of the SWLS found a mean Cronbach alpha of 0.78 with 95% confidence intervals ranging from 0.766 to 0.807. In the original validation study, Diener et al found a 2-month test-retest correlation coefficient of 0.82. Studies since have reported 0.80 and 0.84 for 1-month intervals; 0.54 for a 4-year interval; and 0.51 for 5-year averages with a 7-year interval between. Lower test-retest reliability as time passes is consistent with expectations for variability in life circumstances and thus life satisfaction. The original validation studies correlated the SWLS with 10 other measures of subjective well-being. Most measures correlated at $r = 0.50$ or higher for each of more dissatisfied than those not the 2 samples from the original

work. Numerous subsequent studies have found comparable or higher correlations with other populations when interviewer ratings, informant reports, or other objective measures are used (Corrigan & Wright, 2013). SWLS Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .855$ for this research on identity and biculturalism of Diasporic Jews in the IDF.

EAAM reliability/validity. Reliability calculated using Cronbach's alpha led to coefficients of 0.77, 0.76, 0.74, and 0.85 for assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization subscales of the EAAM, respectively. Assimilation item-total correlations ranged from 0.41 to 0.62 with an average correlation of .049. Separation item total correlations ranged from 0.34 to 0.62 with an average correlation of 0.48. Integration item-total correlations ranged from 0.42 to 0.59 with an average correlation of 0.51 and Marginalization item-total correlations ranged from 0.49 to 0.63 with an average correlation of 0.57, showing adequate consistency for each of the four sub-scales. Significant negative correlations were found between assimilation and separation ($r = -0.39, p = 0.000$) and integration and marginalization ($r = -0.40, p = 0.000$). Integration was significantly positively correlated with assimilation ($r = .46, p = 0.000$) (Barry, 2001). EAAM: Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .667$ for this research on identity and biculturalism of Diasporic Jews in the IDF.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

ANALYSIS

Answering Research Question 1.

What are the core motivational and bicultural identity factors that make young men and women leave home countries in order to serve in the IDF? Just who are these young men and women and which sectors of American Diasporic Jewry do they come from? As a preliminary step in the analysis of the data, responses to question 8 were coded (motivational factors for joining the IDF) and sorted based on categories determined by the responses to establish what, if any, core biculturalism factors that may be evident based on the responses. Of $n = 123$ respondents, they broke down as follows: Love of Israel and Zionism was most frequently cited ($n=42$, 34%), followed by a desire to defend people/homeland/family ($n=33$, 27%) and self improvement motivations came in third ($n=16$, 13%). Desire to become bicultural ($n=10$), religious reasons ($n=7$), excitement/thrill/adventure ($n=6$), military experience ($n=5$), career benefits ($n=2$), Taglit/Birthright ($n=1$) and Language skills ($n=1$) then followed.

The next step was to evaluate holistically the top three motivational factors, to establish if any differences exist in the top motivational factors. This results in a total of 284 responses with one significant change. While the top motivational factors remain Love of Israel/Zionism ($n=68$, 24%), Defense of People/Homeland/Family ($n=46$, 16%), Self Improvement ($n=44$, 16%), and the desire to become Bicultural/Assimilation ($n=41$, 14%), the fifth largest motivational factor overall goes from religious reasons ($n=20$, 7%)

to the desire for military experience ($n=40$, 14%). The final motivational factors to round out the research include Excitement/thrill/adventure ($n=14$, 5%), career benefits ($n=6$, 2%), Language skills ($n=4$, 1%) and finally Taglit/Birthright Israel ($n=1$, <1%). Although there is little surprise in the responses to motivational factors, as a composite fewer than 15% list the desire to assimilate/acculturate or adopt Israeli culture as a motivating factor. One factor that had received a lot of publicity recently in the media following the death of two American lone soldiers was the “Taglit/Birthright” factor, where the Israeli government had been accused of recruiting lone soldiers by taking diasporic Jews on free 10 day trips and indoctrinating them to the point that they join the military (Benedikt, 2014) but the results clearly show only one respondent who listed the phenomenon as having been a factor for joining the IDF out of nearly 300 motivational factors.

A strong differential exists for soldiers based on previous Israeli experience, with over $\frac{1}{4}$ of respondents having never visited Israel or only visited once prior to joining the IDF, while 13% reported that they had traveled to the country over ten times. The breakdown of responses ($n=152$) to the question of: “*Prior to coming to Israel to serve in the IDF, how many times have you been in Israel?*” is as follows: 0 trips ($n=10$, 6.6%), one trip ($n=32$, 21.1%), two trips ($n=28$, 18.4%), three trips ($n=28$, 18.4%), four trips ($n=11$, 7.2%), ten or fewer responses each for five to nine trips and ($n=20$, 13.2%) respondents having traveled to Israel ten or more times prior to joining the IDF.

Additional analysis of length of time in the country prior to military services shows

similar results, where one-fifth of soldiers report having spent less than three months cumulatively ($n=30$, 20%), over one-third spending between three months and one year ($n=59$, 39%), and under half ($n=63$, 42%) report having spent over one year in the country prior to enlistment on the question of “*Cumulatively, how much time have you spent in Israel prior to joining the IDF?*”¹

Respondents were asked about their current level of religious observance and if that level had changed since the start of their army service. A surprisingly high percentage of Jewish volunteers do not subscribe to any sect of Judaism ($n = 39$, 25.8%) with the largest plurality coming from modern orthodox Jews ($n = 53$, 35.1%). In the United States, traditional categories of Jews include reform, conservative, orthodox and unaffiliated, although Israeli Jewish identity and categories of religious involvement are more complicated. Based on recent Pew research as well as the desire for more in depth analysis, six categories of Jewish-religious observance – as well as a category for non-Jewish volunteers were included. From most religious to least, Ultra Orthodox ($n=11$, 7.3%), Modern Orthodox ($n=53$, 35.1%), Conservadox ($n=20$, 13.2%), Conservative ($n=15$, 9.9%), Reform ($n=9$, 6%), “Just” Jewish ($n=39$, 25.8%), and the category of non-Jewish was also added ($n=4$, 2.6%).

¹ A discrepancy exists between the number of trips to Israel and cumulative length of time in Israel spent prior to joining the military since many soldiers who come to Israel have to wait until the next draft, which occurs 3-4 times a year, depending on the unit. This explains why soldiers who have never been to Israel prior to joining the IDF reported longer times in the country than would normally be expected.

Respondents noted a differential on how their religious views changed over time since the start of their military service. Nearly half of respondents reported changing their views ($n=76$, 50.3%) in one direction or the other while the remaining half indicated no change ($n=75$, 49.7%). Of the half that changed, there was a near split down the middle as to those who were more ($n=35$, 23.2%) and those who were less religious ($n=41$, 27.2%) as a result of their time in the military. A slight plurality reported becoming less observant since their start time in the IDF.

Answering Research Question 2

Does the effect on integration change with immediacy of service in the IDF? Are there different levels of self reported bicultural acceptance between those former soldiers who left Israel after the military and those who remained in the country?

Former soldiers were asked if they felt more integrated into Israeli society during or after their military service or if there was no change. Results showed that of $n=80$ respondents who are former lone soldiers, ($n=38$, 48%) felt more integrated during their time in the army, ($n=20$, 25%) felt more integrated after their time in the army, and ($n=22$, 28%) felt no change between their integration levels.

In evaluating the Hebrew language skills (reading, writing, speaking) of lone soldiers in Israel versus those who have returned to the US, there was surprising little difference between the self reported language skills of respondents. An expectation is that former

soldiers will have higher Hebrew language skills than their in-service counterparts, especially given the narrow time frame of this research and the fact that all outside of Israel respondents have already completed their military service, including Hebrew language classes whereas current soldiers vary in the time frame of their service with some beginning and some nearing completion. Former lone soldiers would have been released as long as go as 2009, allowing up to a maximum five year gap between their service time and interview. Respondents across the board reported higher Hebrew comprehension skills in reading, speaking and writing outside of Israel than in Israel. Former lone soldiers in Israel hold the highest mean scores and current soldiers in Israel have the lowest reported proficiency.

Rating reading proficiency Israel-residing respondents ($n=108$) reported a Mean of 3.68 on a 1-5 scale with 1 being the lowest proficiency and 5 being the highest. Out of Israel respondents ($n=36$, $M=4.00$) scored higher on this metric.

Speaking proficiency results showed higher overall Mean of 4.19 and broke down with in Israel respondents ($n=105$, $M=4.11$) reporting lower proficiency than out of Israel respondents ($n=37$, $M=4.41$).

Writing scores were lowest across the board, with a overall Mean of 3.44 and broke down with in Israel respondents ($n=100$, $M=3.33$) reporting lower proficiency than out of Israel respondents ($n=30$, $M=3.63$).

The next step in the analysis of the data was to evaluate the five scales (RASI, BII, EAAM, SWLS, MEIM-R) against both in/out of Israel respondents as well as current/former soldiers.

Comparing current to former soldiers resulted in statistically significant differences on the RASI language skills and EAAM separation sub scales. A *t*-test analysis revealed significant differences between the participants residing in Israel and those outside of it. These groups were found to differ in three components of the RASI scale: language skills, $t(132) = 4.64, p < .001$, cultural isolation, $t(129) = -2.19, p = .037$, and work limitations, $t(126) = 2.04, p = .043$, as well as the separation component of the EAAM scale, $t(129) = 2.49, p = .014$.

A *t*-test analysis revealed significant differences between current and former lone soldiers in two of the sub scales: the language skills component of RASI, $t(133) = 3.89, p < .001$, and the separation component of EAAM, $t(129) = 3.96, p < .001$.

A *t*-test was then run on the variables concerning intentions of soldiers when they first entered the IDF compared to now. Although slight changes existed, and based upon raw data respondents were more likely to respond that they were not going to remain in Israel after service than when they entered, the data was not statistically significant and indicates that respondents did not change their attitudes between the start of their IDF service and the time of their interview which runs counter to expected outcomes, $t(148) =$

1.473, $p = .143$.

Another variable examined was the manner in which the volunteer came to Israel, i.e. whether they came as part of an organized group or whether they arrived on their own, to test the differences between those groups and see if there is any benefit of those who came with a program which would indicate a larger support network and resources at their disposal. The results showed no significant difference between those soldiers who came individually and those who arrived as part of a group or organization $t(149) = .257$, $p = .797$.

Analyzing differentials between self identified Zionists and non-Zionists showed significant results on the MEIM-R scale. A t -test analysis revealed a difference in the MEIM-R scale between those who identified as Zionists and those who did not, $t(23.39) = 2.71$, $p = .012$.

Another variable that was evaluated as to the difference in identity was the differentials between US-born volunteers and other American volunteers who were born outside of America. That t -test analysis revealed a difference between individuals born in the US and outside the US in the MEIM-R scale, $t(127) = 2.01$, $p = .047$.

Answering Research Question 3.

If differences do in fact exist between current and former soldiers, what changes

integration levels and what barriers exist to high long term integration levels? Is there something in the military service, a shared experience between all of these young men and women that either assists or acts as a barrier to having these soldiers stay in Israel and adapt to the culture fully? Do changes over time in these experiences significantly impact the identity constructs that provided the initial motivation for these young soldiers to come 6,000 miles and volunteer in the military in the first place? The data obtained in this study showed no statistically significant differences between current and former soldiers, the opposite of which was hypothesized. Since no significant difference exists between these subgroups of research participants, research question 3 becomes moot.

Additional Analysis

Gender was thought to be a potential variable in evaluating bicultural identity. A *t*-test analysis revealed a difference of gender between males and females in the language skills component of RASI, $t(134) = -2.67, p = .009$.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

This study was conducted with numerous facets in mind. First, to evaluate how and why Diasporic Jews choose to join the Israeli military. Using those motivational factors and correlating them with identity and bicultural scales, evaluating differences between the groups to see if patterns emerge as to why some soldiers stay in Israel after the army and why others choose to leave and finally to develop a best practices manual to promote higher levels of bicultural integration between American diasporic Jews and the Israeli military and culture.

As such, participants were asked to respond to both qualitative and quantitative questions regarding their motives and motivational factors for joining the IDF, a series of demographic questions, scales used to identify bicultural behavior, and descriptive narratives of their personal experiences during and after their serves that affected their integration levels and choices on whether to remain in the country or leave. Self-reported data from these respondents were used to draw conclusions about how these variables are related to one another. Results suggest that there are significant differences in individuals' motivations, religious leanings, language skills, political ideology, and Hebrew language ability in reading, writing and speaking.

Diasporic identity has always been a matter of contention between Israel and it's diaspora. Jews in Israel argue that only by being in a majority-Jewish state can one feasibly maintain a compelling Jewish identity that frequently gets watered down outside of the

confines of the state of Israel. Jewish identity is compounded by differences of scholarly opinion as to whether Judaism is a religion, ethnicity, culture, or a combination of the previously mentioned three constructs. This research continues to show how different identity constructs affect the decision making process of young Jews from the diaspora.

This research looks at a diasporic group of Jews in America and evaluates their motivational factors and identity constructs in deciding to return “home”, a place that for many they had never been. Zionist underpinnings of the cultural Jew explains how otherwise religiously unaffiliated young men and women pick up arms for a foreign country in order to defend Jews around the world. Religious Jews have clear liturgical ties to the land and feel the biblical obligation to rebuild a home in a country that has been war torn for centuries but for the past 66.5 years has finally been returned to Jewish control and Israeli governance. The rising threat of Islamist activity both in the middle east and around the world has made headlines and brought the concern to each and every Jew's doorstep. It is no surprise that some heed the call to serve on the front lines against a enemy that threatens the democratic ideals of a Westerner and the ethnic/religious beliefs of a cultural Jew.

There was an interesting divergence from the breakdown of religious affiliation of American Jews to the percentage of adherents of those sects joining the Israeli military. According to the last National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) conducted in 2000-2001, 10% of Jews identify as Orthodox (or variants thereof), 26% as Conservative, 35%

as Reform, and 2% Reconstructionist, with the remaining 27% considering themselves to be unaffiliated or “just Jewish”. A Pew study conducted in 2013 showed similar breakdowns of affiliation, that Reform Judaism continues to be the largest Jewish denominational movement in the United States. One-third (35%) of all U.S. Jews identify with the Reform movement, while 18% identify with Conservative Judaism, 10% with Orthodox Judaism and 6% with a variety of smaller groups, such as the Reconstructionist and Jewish Renewal movements. About three-in-ten American Jews (including 19% of Jews by religion and two-thirds of Jews of no religion) say they do not identify with any particular Jewish denomination. Pew Research Center also notes that among Jews of no religion, attachment levels to Israel are net negative (55% not very/not at all, 33% somewhat, 12% very) compared to religiously affiliated Jews (23% not very/not at all, 40% somewhat, 36% very). Comparatively, the sample obtained in this study showed a much higher percentage of religiously-oriented and non-affiliated Jews joining the military - 42% Orthodox, 23% Conservative, 6% Reform and 26% unaffiliated/”just” Jewish, showing a push to the two extremes of Jewish identity, with the military attracting higher percentages of both orthodox and non-religious/unaffiliated Jews than their respective numbers and connections to Israel would seem to indicate.

One of the largest findings of this study, both quantitatively and qualitatively was that the language skills of soldiers and Hebrew courses offered by the army are both inadequate and have the largest effect on inhibiting long term integration into Israeli society. The cultural barriers that exist between diasporic Jews and the Israeli bureaucratic system is

large enough to dissuade numerous soldiers from maintaining residence in Israel and instead forces them to go back to the United States.

From the limited sample size, the results ostensibly bode decently well for Israel. Of all the soldiers interviewed and surveyed, the percentage of those who left Israel is relatively low, and a bit lower than previous estimates had established. Of the 87 former lone soldiers interviewed, only 37 were outside of Israel, representing 42.5% of former soldiers as Israeli “drop outs”, slightly below the 50% margin typically used. Some soldiers also leave Israel immediately after their service for a number of months or a few years and return later to make aliyah. However, this in and of itself is a problem. The soldiers who come and join the IDF, with the exception of those who seek military experience alone, regardless of the locale, should have a much higher integration rate. As a result, the IDF should endeavor to change the environment for lone soldiers as an integration-building effort to lower the dropout rate and increase the overall satisfaction of soldiers, both current and former. These recommendations are included later in chapter 4 under “Best practices guide for foreign-born volunteers in the Israel Defense Forces”. The overall responses on one scale, the SWLS showed lower satisfaction levels across the board which should not be ignored. With ranges of the mean between 4.51 to 5.17 on a 7 point scale, overall satisfaction with life is lower than on comparative research, and represents values neutral on questions that gauge positive life satisfaction and runs contrary to research showing the vast majority of Israelis and Americans are satisfied with their life.

In all, the motivational and bicultural factors that promote the initial decision of joining the military reflect the varied traditions of Jewish identity and diasporic literature. Many of these young soldiers have distant relatives in Israel, were educated in Zionist households and schools that taught Israel was a home belonging to all Jews and must be defended, and in traditional post-adolescent behavior, were seeking adventures and experiences that would help them grow mentally, physically and spiritually. It is clear that while some of these needs are being met, they are not done so systematically or in a way that helps promote the long term integration of the majority of these young men and women.

In order to evaluate barriers to long term integration, the final step in the analysis was to take the responses from former lone soldiers, anecdotal evidence from conversations and relevant literature and evaluate them holistically to provide insight that might allow to allow Israel to improve it's relations with lone soldiers and increase the rate in which lone soldiers choose to remain in Israel. Although the statistics show that very few soldiers changed their minds about staying in Israel between the time they joined and the time that they left the army, Israel is a country that is dependent on foreign investment and support. The concept of making Aliyah is both religiously driven and government promoted and in some ways permeates the facets of Israeli identity as very few Israelis are native Sabras. In order to best facilitate support structures during army service and promotion of long term residencies of former lone soldiers, a best practices manual is included below to increase positive affect and likelihood that those who wish to remain in the country will

do so free of extraneous barriers.

Best Practices Guide for foreign-born volunteers in the Israel Defense Forces

Action Items to be undertaken by the IDF:

- Establish a standardized testing system for placement based on language skills of soldiers in Michve Alon ($n=32$).
- Provide mandatory language immersion courses for new recruits, and lengthen the course time from four to six months. Ensure that all soldiers are performing at Level “Bet” prior to the completion of Michve Alon ($n=30$).
- Increasing the financial compensation of lone soldiers to promote a normal standard of living ($n=25$).
- Increase the length of time of service by the increased amount of time of the language immersion course ($n=21$).
- Establish mashah kitot for soldiers based on language skill to eliminate language barriers and confusion on expectations and promote effective communication between the soldier, mashah and army ($n=20$).
- Update and put relevant information on the internet to reach prospective and current soldiers, utilizing social media to reach additional volunteers ($n=20$).
- Strengthen internal controls and procedures for benefits afforded to lone soldiers including yom siddurim, flights during their month off to visit family, salary benefits and housing allowances. Coordinate items not provided directly by the army or state so that soldiers are not spending days dealing with outside

organizations to receive the benefits and rights that are due to them ($n=18$).

- Establishing a formalized adopted family program to help lone soldiers have a semblance of normalcy during their service and also promote Israeli cultural support networks instead of lone soldiers predominantly going to American areas and drinking during off times ($n=16$).
- Establishing contact and promoting active working relationships with Kibbutzim that lone soldiers can live at during their service ($n=14$).
- Actively promote and support current and establish additional lone soldier organizations that support in-service soldiers and promote long term integration ($n=14$).
- The potential start of an American/Foreign gdud (battalion) ($n=13$).
- Teaching more about Israeli culture and exposing lone soldiers (as well as Israelis) to activities and events that promote cultural awareness and history ($n=12$).
- Full coverage in a Kupat Cholim (Healthcare coverage – Israeli has socialized medicine for all citizens) instead of substandard army medical services and limited accessibility ($n=11$).
- Promote a MOS system that allows soldiers to have some level of choice in assignments and fields that interest them instead of random assignment ($n=10$).

Besides this manual, it should be noted that responses of in-Israel soldiers and former soldiers were lower, but not by a statistically significant margin than those in the United

States on the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS). ($M = 4.86$ in Israel, $M = 4.94$ in United States). Recent coverage of societal issues in Israel, the high cost of living, and a fragmented society lead to lower SWLS figures, and SWLS scores are below average for all research subjects, showing a greater need for assistance in positive life building of these individuals. Many soldiers expressed a desire for improving their personal lives, even when the primary factor was support of Israel, Jews, or military experience, which they did not seem to benefit from during their army time. Even if nothing else, these individuals who are split in their loyalties to their home and host countries could use a leg up on developing work and life skills to grow into productive adults.

Limitations

Limitations with the study include the fact that soldiers were only interviewed at one point during or after their IDF service and that certain attitudes frequently change even within the service time. A future study could take into account changes over time by incorporating a longer term, longitudinal study of a cohort of soldiers from the time they enter the army and follow up until a few years after they are released.

In addition, no questions dealing with education level, or any questions pertaining to other military involvement (rejection from US military, etc.) which came up numerous times in informal conversations with lone soldiers were incorporated into the research. Also, no question on which unit soldiers served in were asked as another possible data point in explaining differences in attitudes between units and differences between

combat/combat support/non-combat units which are not standardized in the IDF. Additionally, questions related to dating/relationship status came up numerous times in conversation during the study period but was not tested. Anecdotally, soldiers who had active girl or boyfriends in Israel during their service were much more likely to stay in Israel, adding a social variable that was not considered during the survey creation phase.

The survey was complex and long which resulted in a high dropout rate. Some soldiers skipped certain questions (oftentimes the longer scales used in this research), presumably due to uncertainty of how they directly applied to the lone soldier phenomenon and time limitations.

The unavailability of the updated BIIS-2 full survey resulted in a less thorough examination of the constructs included in the BIIS research, once that newer scale is published a more thorough evaluation of the construct can be tested.

Conclusion

The results of this exploratory study begin to examine the effects of military service on diasporic Jewish identity and biculturalism tendencies. Identifying and analyzing motivational factors, bicultural identity/multiethnic scales and satisfaction with life results begin to identify those who choose to serve in the IDF and live in Israel – at least temporarily. The development of specific military scales would be beneficial to future research in this area as the military service of citizens is the cornerstone of Israeli identity

culture, and even survival. Further, by being able to measure group identity across groups, researchers will be better able to distinguish how other constructs interact with group identity in general and how they interact with identity specific to a certain type of group. For example, social identity theory hypothesizes that a stronger group identity will lead to more group bias (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). With the ability to measure identity equivalently across groups, researchers will be able to determine if this is true of all types of groups, or if the relationship between identity and bias is stronger for some types of groups than others. Studies have been moving away from an initial focus on cultural differences and dynamics between groups toward an interest in how various cultures are negotiated and played out within the individual (Phinney, 1999). This shift calls for complex studies that acknowledge the interplay between personality, cultural, and sociocognitive variables. The present study takes such an approach in trying to understand individual variations in bicultural identity integration (BII), using 5 established scales that were tested against a range of variables involving lone soldiers serving in the IDF.

I hope that this work encourages future research on the subject of bicultural individuals and integration into the adopted culture. While this is a first step in identifying and evaluating the underlying motivations of diasporic Jews entering the IDF, research into this field can cross multiple boundaries – how countries can compete to recruit and retain citizens, and even understanding some of the underpinnings on how individuals are called to take personal action in affairs that are seemingly unrelated to them. With the recent

insurgence of the Islamic State and upwards of 15,000 outside individuals joining Islamic forces in Syria and Iraq, motivational factors can provide insight into how individuals view themselves, their root identity and/or bicultural factors, and what causes them to leave their home countries and fight for a country or idea that they have little personal connection to. This research shows the complexity of identity within the Jewish mindset across different cultures. Future research into this field is key to identifying and predicting the behaviors of individuals in relation to military service, globalization and citizen recruitment as well as issues of duality of loyalty to home and host countries in bi and multicultural individuals.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G, Bennion, L, & Huh, K. (1987). Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual. Logan: Utah State University Laboratory for Research on Adolescence.
- Albert S. and Whetten, D. (1985) 'Organizational Identity', *Research in Organizational Behavior* 7: 263–95.
- Alvesson, M., Ashcraft, K., & Thomas, R. (2008) 'Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies'. *Organization*, 15: 5–28.
- Ben Shalom, R. (2013). Crude and Rude. *Jerusalem Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/Crude-and-rude-319579>
- Benedikt, A. (2014, July 22). What Makes an American Kid With Shaky Hebrew Decide He Is Ready to Die for Israel? Retrieved August 1, 2014.
- Benet-Martinez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame-switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 492–516. doi:10.1177/ 0022022102033005005
- Berg, R. (2013). Getting behind Israeli 'frankness'. *BBC News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-22089936>
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). *Immigration youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berry, J.W. (2006). Stress perspectives on acculturation. In D.L. Sam & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 43–57). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Branc, S. (2007). Inter-Ethnic Relations and the Construction of Identity. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Studia Europaea*, 52(3), 117-125. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/214226300?accountid=14868>

- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83-93.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2007). Israel in statistics 1948-2007. Retrieved from: http://www1.cbs.gov.il/statistical/statistical60_eng.pdf
- Cerulo, K. (1997) 'Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions', *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 385–409.
- Cheng, C.-Y., & Lee, F. (2013). The Malleability of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(8), 1235–1240. doi:10.1177/0022022113490071
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Global Diasporas. An Introduction*. University of Washington Press.
- Cohen, S. (2007). *Beyond Distancing: Young Adult American Jews and Their Alienation from Israel*. Retrieved from: http://www.acbp.net/pdf/pdfs-research-and-publications/Beyond_Distancing.pdf
- Desilver, D. (2013, 11 01). *Jewish essentials: For most american jews, ancestry and culture matter more than religion*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/10/01/jewish-essentials-for-most-american-jews-ancestry-and-culture-matter-more-than-religion/>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71.
- Dimont, M. I. (1978). *The Jews in America*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Eilfort, Y. (2013). Why do Jews love Jerusalem? Retrieved from: http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/256076/jewish/Why-Do-Jews-Love-Jerusalem.htm
- Ellman, J. (2002). *North American Jews in Israel: The cultural distinction and identity of american-anglo olim*. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.
- Erikson, E. H. (1956). The program of ego identity. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 4, 56-121.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Fisher, M. (2013). Israel's brain drain crisis. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/10/15/israels-brain->

drain-crisis/

- Globes (2013). On eve of Independence Day, population exceeds 8 million. Retrieved from: <http://www.globes.co.il/serveen/globes/docview.asp?did=1000836411>
- Gold, S. (2002). The Israeli Diaspora. Retrieved from EBSCOHost. September 10, 2013.
- Herzl, T. (2001). Der Judenstaat, cited by C.D. Smith, Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. 4th ed., p. 53
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup Bias. In Richard J. Crisp. Social Psychology. New York, NY: Routledge. pp. 323–344.
- IDF Online (2013). In the beginning. Retrieved from: <http://www.idfblog.com/about-the-idf/history-of-the-idf/in-the-beginning/>
- Jewish Virtual Library. (2013). *Latest population statistics for Israel*. Retrieved from http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Society_&_Culture/newpop.html
- Kim, B. S. K., & Abreu, J. M. (2001). Acculturation measurement: Theory, current instruments, and future directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 394-424). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kramer, E. M. (1992). Consciousness and culture. In E. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Consciousness and Culture: An Introduction to the Thought of Jean Gebser*. (pp. 1-60). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Kramer, E. M. (1997). *Modern/Postmodern: Off the Beaten Path of Antimodernism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Kramer, E. M. (Contributing Editor). (2003). *The Emerging Monoculture: Assimilation and the "Model Minority"*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Leyens, J., Yzerbyt, V., Schadron, G. (1994). *Stereotypes and Social Cognition*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 104–107. ISBN 0803985843.
- Liebler, I. (2013). *Candidly Speaking: An end to Jewish life in the Diaspora?* www.JPost.com. Retrieved November 5, 2013, from <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Candidly-Speaking-An-end-to-Jewish-life-in-the-Diaspora-330505>
- MacDonald, Geoff, (2002), *Handbook of Self and Identity*, Guilford Press, Hardcover.

- Martinez, V., J.; Haritatos (2002). "Bicultural Identity Integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents". *Journal of Personality* 73: 1015-1050.
- Masa Israel Journey (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.masaisrael.org/>
- McLeod, S. A. (2008). Erik Erikson. Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/Erik-Erikson.html>
- Michaelson, J. (2012). Why Are American Jews So Liberal?. *The Jewish Daily Forward*. Retrieved October 5, 2013, from <http://forward.com/articles/153882/why-are-american-jews-so-liberal/?p=all>
- Miller, M. J. (2007). A bilinear multidimensional measurement model of Asian American acculturation and enculturation: Implications for counseling interventions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 118-131.
- Nguyen, A.-M. T. D., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2013). Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44, 122-159.
- Quattrone, G., Jones, E. (1980). The perception of variability within in-groups and out-groups: Implications for the law of small numbers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38 (1): 141–152. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.38.1.141. ISSN 0022-3514.
- Rosen, B. (2013). Philippine Envoy Thanks Israeli Government, NGOs as Aid and Assistance Continues." *Www.JPost.com*. Jerusalem Post, 13 Nov. 2013. Web.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rudoren, J. (2012, August 14). Enlisting From Afar for the Love of Israel. *The New York Times*.
- Russo, Yocheved Miriam. (2004, August 22). Lone soldiers: Metro Israel edition. *Jerusalem Post*, pp. 12.
- Saad, C., Damian, R., Benet-Martinez, V., Moons, W., Robins, R. (2012). Multiculturalism and Creativity: Effects of Cultural Context, Bicultural Identity, and Ideational Fluency. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 4(3) 369-375 DOI: 10.1177/1948550612456560
- Sasson, T. (2010). Still Connected: American Jewish Attitudes about Israel. *Berman Jewish Policy Archive*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=5822>

- Schwartz, S. (2011). Handbook of Identity Theory and Research, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_35, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Seidman, G. (2010). From Nationalization to Privatization: The Case of the IDF. *Armed Forces & Society* 34:1-34.
- Sharp, J. (2013). U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf>
- Siddur Tehillat Hashem. Kehot Publication Society, Brooklyn NY. Retrieved from: http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/867674/jewish/Translation.htm
- Smokowski, P., Bacallao, M. (2011). *Becoming Bicultural : Risk, Resilience, and Latino Youth*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebib.com>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup behavior* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- U.S. Census (2012). Available at <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Census (2010). *Jewish Population – 2010*. Available at <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0077.pdf>
- Vitkin, J (1908). *Conquest of Land and Labor*. Available at http://www.benyehuda.org/vitkin/articles_03.html
- Websters dictionary (2013). Definition of Diaspora. Available at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diaspora>
- Williams, A. (2012). A mixed bag: Examining the college experience of multiracial students. *INSIGHT Into Diversity*, April/May, 24-25. Retrieved from <http://www.insightintodiversity.com/images/downloads/digitalissues/aprilmay2012/pageflip.php>
- Zane, N., & Mak, W. (2003). Major approaches to the measurement of acculturation among ethnic minority populations: A content analysis and an alternative empirical strategy. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 39-60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Zerubavel, Y. (1995). *Recovered roots: Collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix 1. Sample Recruitment Card

**Help us understand and better
the lives of lone soldiers.**



Take the study at
www.lonesoldierstudy.com
(15-25 mins to complete)

Questions ?
Call Alan Teitleman at
050-421-2404
or email Alan@cajconsultants.com

Appendix 2. Survey Instrument

Lone Soldiers in the IDF survey

Q1 Informed Consent *Volunteers in the IDF Study Description* You are invited to participate in a research study that defines how individuals perceive their own Identity and what if any impact that identity has on decision making and life choices. Participants will be recruited via links on online social media sites including facebook and twitter, in person requests at locales across Israel, and through email lists to qualified potential respondees to a qualtrics-based survey website. In this study we will ask you to complete a single questionnaire pertaining to your current status within the IDF, demographic questions, and a series of questions on communication and identity variables to better understand how diasporic and putative place of origin (the accepted place of origin for a group of people i.e. Israeli) identities interact. If you do not wish to participate, close your internet browser and no responses will be recorded. Completing the questionnaire should take between 10 and 20 minutes. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Additionally, you may also choose to not answer any question(s) you do not wish to for any reason. If you decide to discontinue your participation in this study, simply close out of your internet browser and your responses will not be recorded. Possible risks and benefits. Information collected in these surveys will remain anonymous and you are not asked to identify yourself at any point in the survey process. The risks from participating in this study are not more than would be encountered in everyday life. While we cannot promise you any direct benefit from your participation in this study, we hope it will provide a research document in an aggregate form that will assist researchers in understanding how construction of Identity impacts decision making within the context of Aliyah, Zionism, and Biculturalism. Confidentiality/Anonymity The identities of research participants through their answers will be unknown to the principal and co-investigators. If study participants have questions or concerns about the study or your rights as a research subject, please contact Dr. Randall Rogan at 336 758-5409 or Alan M. Teitleman, MPA at teitam12@wfu.edu or 336-306-8452. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 336-758-5888. Signatures Selecting "I agree" below indicates your consent to participate. Participants are advised to print a copy of the consent form for their record.

Q9 I have read and understand the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

- I agree (1)
- I disagree (2)

<p>Wake Forest University Institutional Review Board IRB Number: IRB00021518 Date Approved 11/25/2013 Version Valid Until: 11/24/2014</p>
--

Q7 Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item. Please be open and honest in your responding. 7 - Strongly agree 6 - Agree 5 - Slightly agree 4 - Neither agree nor disagree 3 - Slightly disagree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly disagree

	1 - Strongly Disagree (1)	2 - Disagree (2)	3 - Slightly Disagree (3)	4 - Neither Agree nor disagree (4)	5 - Slightly Agree (5)	6 - Agree (6)	7- Strongly agree (7)
In most ways my life is close to my ideal. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conditions of my life are excellent. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with my life. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I could live my life over, I	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

would change almost nothing. (5)							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q8 Please list the top three reasons why you joined the IDF:

Q9 Please detail the support you have received (or lack thereof) during your decision to join the IDF (i.e. family, friends, community, school, etc)

Q10 Are you/Were you labeled by the Ministry of Defense as a Lone Soldier (Chayal Boded)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q11 What is your current age?

- 17 (1)
- 18 (2)
- 19 (3)
- 20 (4)
- 21 (5)
- 22 (6)
- 23 (7)
- 24 (8)
- 25 (9)
- 26 (10)
- 27 (11)
- 28 (12)
- 29 (13)
- 30 (14)

Q13 Were you born in the United States?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q13 What country is your father from?

Q14 What country is your mother from?

Q15 Are you a current or former lone soldier?

- Current (1)
- Former (2)

Q16 Are you currently residing in Israel or outside of Israel (Chutz L'Aretz)?

- Israel (1)
- Outside of Israel (2)

Q17 Are either of your parents Israeli by birth or citizenship?

- No (1)
- Yes, Mother only (2)
- Yes, Father only (3)
- Yes, both parents (4)

Q18 Prior to coming to Israel to serve in the IDF, how many times have you been in Israel?

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 (6)

- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10+ (11)

Q19 Cumulatively, how much time have you spent in Israel prior to joining the IDF?

- No time (1)
- up to 1 month (2)
- 1-3 months (3)
- 3-6 months (4)
- 6 months - 1 year (5)
- 1-2 years (6)
- 2-5 years (7)
- 5+ years (8)

Q20 What is your current level of religious observance?

- Not Jewish (1)
- "Just" Jewish (2)
- Reform (3)
- Reconstructionist (4)
- Conservative (5)
- Conservadox (6)
- Modern Orthodox (7)
- Ultra Orthodox (8)

Q21 Has your level of religious observance changed since starting the IDF?

- No (1)
- Yes, Less Observant (2)
- Yes, More Observant (3)

Q22 Are you Ashkenazi Or Sefardi?

- Ashkenazi (1)
- Sefardi (2)
- Both (3)

Q23 When you joined the IDF, did you intend on staying in Israel after and making Aliyah?

- Yes, stay only and not make aliyah (1)
- Yes, stay and make aliyah (2)
- No, go back to the US (3)
- Unsure (4)

Q24 Now that you are either in the IDF or released from service, do you plan or did you stay in Israel/Make Aliyah/Go home?

- Yes, stay only and not make aliyah (1)
- Yes, stay and make aliyah (2)
- No, go back to the US (3)
- Unsure (4)

Q25 Did you come to Israel and join the IDF on your own or as part of an organization (NBN, Garin Tzabar, etc)

- On own (1)
- Part of organized group (2)

Q26 Do you consider yourself a Zionist?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q27 Overall, please describe your political ideology.

- Very Liberal (1)
- Liberal (2)
- Moderate (3)

- Conservative (4)
- Very Conservative (5)
- APolitical (Apathetic toward politics) (6)

Q41 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q29 When did you begin your service in the IDF

	Before 2007 (1)	2007 (2)	2008 (3)	2009 (4)	2010 (5)	2011 (6)	2012 (7)	2013 (8)	2014 (9)
Year (1)									

Q30 How long has your family lived in your home country (i.e. the US)?

- 1-10 Years (1)
- 10-20 Years (2)
- 20-30 Years (3)
- 30-40 Years (4)
- 40-50 Years (5)
- 50 Years + (6)

Q31 Has anyone else in your family served in the military (of any country)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q32 If you answered yes to the previous question, Identify who served and what country they served on behalf of

- Father, US (1)

- Father, Israel (2)
- Father, Other (3)
- Mother, US (4)
- Mother, Israel (5)
- Mother, Other (6)
- Siblings, US (7)
- Siblings, Israel (8)
- Siblings, Other (9)
- Other relative, US (10)
- Other relative, Israel (11)
- Other relative, Other (12)

Q33 What was the primary source of information you had on joining the IDF? (Who or what source told you about serving in the IDF when you first began considering coming to Israel)

Q34 If you are a current soldier, what is your current primary living situation? (If a former soldier, what was your primary living situation during your IDF service)?

- Live Alone (1)
- Live with other soldiers in an Apartment (2)
- Live with family (3)
- Lone Soldier center/Hostel (4)
- Friends (5)
- Other (6)

Q35 What is the most influential self definition as a person? (i.e. what is it that makes you "tick" or major identity factor that distinguishes yourself from others).

Q36 Rate your Hebrew proficiency: Reading ability

- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)

- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)

Q37 Rate your Hebrew proficiency: Speaking ability

- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)

Q38 Rate your Hebrew proficiency: Writing ability

- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)

Q10 Answer the following questions as if you are an American Jew who is living in the US. Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1 = definitely not true to 8 = definitely true

	1= Definitel y Not True (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8= Definitel y True (8)
I am simply a Jew who lives in North America (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I keep Israeli	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

and American cultures separate (2)								
I feel Israeli American (3)	<input type="radio"/>							
I feel part of a combined culture (4)	<input type="radio"/>							
I am conflicted between the American and Israeli ways of doing things (5)	<input type="radio"/>							
I feel like someone moving between two cultures (6)	<input type="radio"/>							
I feel caught between the	<input type="radio"/>							

Israeli and American cultures (7)								
I don't feel trapped between the Israeli and American cultures (8)	<input type="radio"/>							

Q4 Please rate the following statements a 5-point scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

	1 = Strongly Disagree (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 = Strongly Agree (5)
It's hard for me to perform well at work because of my Hebrew skills (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I often feel misunderstood of limited in daily situations because of my Hebrew skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(2)					
It bothers me that I have an accent (3)	<input type="radio"/>				
I feel discriminated against by mainstream Americans because of my cultural/ethnic background (4)	<input type="radio"/>				
I have been treated rudely or unfairly because of my cultural/ethnic background (5)	<input type="radio"/>				
I feel that people very often interpret my behavior based on their stereotypes of what people of my cultural/ethnic background are likeliness (6)	<input type="radio"/>				
I have had disagreements with people of my own cultural/ethnic group (e.g	<input type="radio"/>				

friends or family) for liking American ways of doing things. (7)					
I feel my particular cultural/ethnic practices have caused conflict in my relationships. (8)	<input type="radio"/>				
I have had disagreements with Americans for having or preferring dress of my own ethnic/cultural group (kippa/tzitzit) (9)	<input type="radio"/>				
I feel that there are not enough people of my own ethnic/cultural group in my living environment (10)	<input type="radio"/>				
I feel that the environment where I live is not	<input type="radio"/>				

<p>multicultural enough; it doesn't have enough cultural richness. (11)</p>					
<p>When I am in a place or room where I am the only person of my ethnic/cultural group, I often feel different or isolated. (12)</p>	○	○	○	○	○
<p>Because of my particular ethnic/cultural status, I have to work harder than most Israelis (13)</p>	○	○	○	○	○
<p>I feel that the pressure that what "I" do is representative of my ethnic/cultural group's abilities. (14)</p>	○	○	○	○	○
<p>In looking for a job, I sometimes feel that my cultural/ethnic status is a limitation.</p>	○	○	○	○	○

(15)					
------	--	--	--	--	--

Q5 Please rate the following statements using a 10- point scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)

	1 = Strongly Disagree (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	8 (8)	9 (9)	10 = Strongly Agree (10)
I write better in Hebrew than in my native language (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I am in my apartment/house, I typically speak Hebrew (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I were asked to write poetry, I would prefer to write it in Hebrew (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I get along better with Israelis than Americans (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that Israelis understand me better than Americans do	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(5)										
I find it easier to communicate my feelings to Israelis than to Americans (6)	<input type="radio"/>									
I feel more comfortable socializing with Israelis than I do with Americans (7)	<input type="radio"/>									
Most of my friends at work are Israeli (8)	<input type="radio"/>									
Most of the music I listen to is American (9)	<input type="radio"/>									
My closest friends are American (10)	<input type="radio"/>									
I prefer going to social gatherings where most of the people are American (11)	<input type="radio"/>									
I feel that Americans treat me as an equal more so than Israelis	<input type="radio"/>									

do (12)										
I would prefer to go out on a date with an American than with an Israeli (13)	<input type="radio"/>									
I feel more relaxed when I am with an American than when I am with an Israeli (14)	<input type="radio"/>									
Americans should not date non-Americans (15)	<input type="radio"/>									
I tell jokes both in Hebrew and in my native language (16)	<input type="radio"/>									
I think as well in Hebrew as I do in my native language (17)	<input type="radio"/>									
I have both American and Israeli friends (18)	<input type="radio"/>									
I feel that both Israelis and	<input type="radio"/>									

Americans value me (19)										
I feel very comfortable around both Americans and Israelis (20)	<input type="radio"/>									
Generally, I find it difficult to socialize with anybody, Israeli or American (21)	<input type="radio"/>									
I sometimes feel that neither Americans nor Israelis like me (22)	<input type="radio"/>									
There are times when I think no one understands me (23)	<input type="radio"/>									
I sometimes find it hard to communicate with people (24)	<input type="radio"/>									
I sometimes find it hard to make friends (25)	<input type="radio"/>									
Sometimes I	<input type="radio"/>									

feel that Israelis and Americans do not accept me (26)										
Sometimes I find it hard to trust both Americans and Israelis (27)	<input type="radio"/>									
I find that both Israelis and Americans often have difficulty understanding me (28)	<input type="radio"/>									
I find that I do not feel comfortable when I am with other people (29)	<input type="radio"/>									

Q6 Please rate the following statements using the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (3) Agree (4) Strongly agree

	(1) Strongly Disagree (1)	(2) Disagree (2)	(3) Agree (3)	(4) Strongly Agree (4)
1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

its history, traditions, and customs. (1)				
2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

means to me. (7)				
8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group. (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs. (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q39 Questions for former soldiers only: Thinking back to your time in the IDF, do you think you were more integrated into Israeli society then or now?

- More integrated during army (1)
- Same (2)
- More integrated after army (3)

Q40 What are some of the issues you encountered after your time in the IDF that hurt your integration into Israeli society?

Q41 Is there anything specifically you can think of that the army or the country itself could have done to help integrate you into Israeli society easier?

VITAE

Alan M. Teitleman, M.P.A., M.A.

EDUCATION

Wake Forest University, Winston Salem, NC

Master of Arts, Communication, May 2015. GPA: 3.72. 33 S.H. Thesis: *Jewish Identity in the Diaspora: A Study of Diasporic Jews in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF)*.

Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Master of Public Administration, Concentration: Public Management, May 2012. GPA: 3.86. 42 S.H. Capstone: *Careerists and Contractors - A Service Provider Comparison of Attitudes: Benefits, Drawbacks, and the Public Interest*

Bachelors of Science, Political Science, Concentration: Public Management and Community and Regional Planning, August 2010 . GPA: 3.41. 122 S.H.

David W. Butler High School, Matthews, NC

H.S. Diploma, Honors, 2003

GRADUATE COURSEWORK

Public Administration/Policy/Political Science

Research Methods

Seminar in Public Administration

Public Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation

Budgeting and Fiscal Administration

Public Personnel Administration

Public Utilities and Infrastructure

Public Management

Local Government Administration

Organizational Theory and Behavior

The European Union

Contemporary European Public Administration Methods

European Government and Politics

Communication Sciences

International Communication

Theory Research Design in Communication Science

Rhetorical Theory

Empirical Research Methods

Research in Real Life

Proseminar in Communication (x2)

Thesis Research I and II

Crisis Communication

Independent Research Coursework

MPA/MPP effectiveness study (Dr. Joel Thompson)

Capstone Research (Dr. Mike Potter, Dr. Yongbeom Hur and Dr. Ruth Ann Strickland)

Political Communication (Dr. Allan Louden)

Construction of Identity and Terrorism – Inspire Magazine analysis (Dr. Randall Rogan)

Thesis (Dr. Randall Rogan, Dr. Ananda Mitra, Dr. Ruth Ann Strickland)

Other Coursework

Planning Theory and Process (Dr. Jana Carp)

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Yeshiva Ohr Somayach, Jerusalem, Israel

Talmudic Law, June-July 2012

Yeshiva Aish HaTorah, Jerusalem, Israel

Talmudic Law, December 2010-January 2011

Torah Academy, Philadelphia, PA

1999-2000

Politz Hebrew Academy, Philadelphia, PA

1998-1999

Abrams Hebrew Academy, Yardley, PA

1991-1998

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

Instructor

Department of Communication, Central Piedmont Community College, Fall 2015-Present

- Taught 3 sections of COM-110 (Introduction to Communication)

Department of Arts, Communication and Social Sciences, South Piedmont Community College, Spring 2015

- Taught 3 sections of COM-231 (Public Speaking)
- Taught 1 section of POL-120 (American Government)

Lab Instructor

Department of Communication, Wake Forest University, 2012-2013

- Taught 6 sections of COM-110 (Public Speaking)

Department of Government and Justice Studies, Appalachian State University, 2010-2012

- Taught 2 sections of PS-2130 (State and Local Government)
- Taught 2 sections of PS-1200 (Current Political Issues)

Graduate Teaching Assistant/Assistant Director of Forensics

Department of Communication, Appalachian State University, 2011-2012 (Instructor Sean Ridley)

Department of Government and Justice Studies, Appalachian State University, 2010-2011
(Dr. James Barnes, Dr. Ruth Ann Strickland)

Research Assistant

History Department, Appalachian State University, 2008-2009 (Dr. Scott Jessee)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Director of Marketing and Economic Development

Town of Hamilton, North Carolina, March 2013-Present

Appointed to the newly created position to plan, implement, oversee, and evaluate marketing and economic development strategies on behalf of the town of Hamilton. Focal points include grant writing, development of a town Master Plan, technological advancements including E-Gov2.0 and event coordination between other municipal agencies and non-profits. Provide updates to town council, mayor, staff, and citizenry on actions taken on a monthly basis. Writes press releases and marketing material on behalf of the government to local and regional media.

Consultant/Senior Partner

CAJConsultants, LLC, Raleigh, NC, January 2008-December 2014

- Implement campaign and strategic goals by candidates for elected office and non-profit organizations
- Current and former clients include: Judge John Tyson, Judge Eric Levinson, Judge Kris Bailey, Representative Jim Gulley, Clerk of Court Diane Deal, County Commissioners Neil Cooksey, Richard Stone, Paul Standridge and Roger Lane

Realtor/Broker

Teitleman Realty, Mint Hill, NC, June 2006 – January 2013

- Assisted clients to assist in relocation services
- Acted as a liaison between banks and clients who were in the pre-foreclosure stage
- Researched and provided statistical information on demographics and trends for specific areas and clients
- Coordinated efforts between government agencies, banks, realtors, and end clients to ensure a flawless process

Chief of Staff, Office of State Representative Jim Gulley

North Carolina General Assembly, Raleigh, NC, May 2005 – February 2007

- Worked directly with other legislators to pass legislation to benefit North Carolina's citizens
- Managed the day to day operations of a legislative office
- Provided constituent services for residents of House District 103
- Wrote speeches, legislation, memos, legislative updates, and position papers on behalf of Representative Gulley

CIVIC INVOLVEMENT

Mentor, City of Jerusalem (Sulam L'Atid), 2014

Board of Directors, Watauga Humane Society, 2008-2011

Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Member, (Mecklenburg County) 2007-2008
City of Charlotte, Neighborhood Matching Grants Review Team Board Member, 2007-2008
Board of Directors, Kids Voting - Mecklenburg, 2006-2008
Charter Member, Mint Hill Chamber of Commerce, 2006
Volunteer, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Charlotte, 2005-2007
Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Member, (Union County) 2003-2004

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Member, American Political Science Association, 2003-Present
Member, American Association of Political Consultants, 2003-Present
Member, International City/County Management Associations, 2003-Present
Member, North Carolina Planning Association (NCAPA), 2004-Present
Member, American Planning Association (APA), 2005-Present
Member, National, State, and Local Board of Realtors, 2006-2013
Member, National Communication Association (NCA), 2012-Present
Member, International Communication Association (ICA), 2012-Present
Member, Carolinas Communication Association, 2014-Present
Member, North Carolina Community College Faculty Association 2015-Present
Commissioned Notary Public in North Carolina, 2004-Present
Licensed Real Estate Broker, State of North Carolina, 2006-2013
Conference Reviewer, National Communication Association – Political Comm. Division, 2013, 2014
Department Representative, Graduate Student Association, Wake Forest University. 2013-2014.
Conference Reviewer, International Communication Association – Political Comm. Division, 2014
Textbook Reviewer, Macmillan Education - Bedford/St Martin's, 2015.

AWARDS

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society (top 5% of all graduate students), 2012
Commissioned Kentucky Colonel, Honorary, 2009
ASU Local Government Alumni Scholarship, (\$1000) 2005

RESEARCH

Interests

Political Trends in State and Federal Elections
Modern Public Administration
Special Interests Influencing Local Government Administration
Modern Israeli Politics
Media Influences on Public Opinion and Policy
Construction of Identity (Diaspora vs putative place of origin studies)
Terrorism and Conflict Studies

PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Teitleman, Alan, Diasporic Jews in the Israeli military: A mixed methodological study on biculturalism and identity. ICA conference presenter. 2016.
King, Amy and Teitleman, A. Creating Community in the Online Public Speaking Class

Through Visual Presence. Forthcoming.

Teitleman, Alan, *Diasporic Jews in the IDF: A study of Americans in the Israeli Military*. NCA conference presenter. 2015.

Teitleman, Alan, Guest lecturer to Millennium Charter Academy on life in Israel and academic research, Mount Airy, NC. 2014

Hazen, Michael, Teitleman, A., Stoltz, N., Dai, M., *Advertising by Countries in U.S. Print Publications: Competitive Nation Branding*. ICA submission. 2013

Teitleman, Alan, *Careerists and Contractors - A Service Provider Comparison of Attitudes: Benefits, Drawbacks, and the Public Interest*, SSRN. 2012

Teitleman, Alan and Thompson, J., *A comparative study on the teaching methods and attitudes of adjunct and full time MPA/MPP faculty in North Carolina*, SSRN. 2011

Teitleman, Alan and Moore, J., *Summary and Analysis – North Carolina General Election Early Voting*, SSRN. 2008

INTERVIEWS

JTA (syndicated internationally), Israeli Expats and voting in the 20th Knesset election, 2015.

News 14 Carolina, Israeli-Hamas war, 2014.

Winston Salem Journal, “Marriage Ban Likely to Pass”, 2012.

Bulgarian National Radio, Israeli politics and Iran, 2012.

National Public Radio (NPR) "South Carolina Smear Campaigns Turn High-Tech", 2008.

News 14 Carolina, Nick Mackey Poll, 2008.

News 14 Carolina, Voting Error in Mecklenburg/Wake Counties, 2008.

WBTV – Charlotte, Nick Mackey Sheriff appointment poll, 2007.

GRANTS

Central Piedmont Community College – Tier A funding. \$1300. 2015.

Wake Forest University – Provosts Research Grant. \$1500. 2013.

Wake Forest University - Department of Communication, IDC grant. \$300. 2013

NATIONALITY

United States, Israel