Identificational Integration of Second Generation Russians in Estonia[1]

Gerli Nimmerfeldt[*]

Abstract

This article takes a look at integration processes of second generation Russian youth in Estonia at identity level which is often referred to as identificational integration. The focus is set on two dimensions of the identificational integration: identification with one's own ethnic group and identification with the majority group in host country. First the role and place of identity in theoretical approaches to integration processes is explored. The second task of the article is to demonstrate the shortcomings of widespread theories and commonly used research instruments for studying the identificational integration. For that purpose the hypotheses on identificational integration that stem from literature and presume that national level belongingness either replaces or replenishes ethnic identity are put on test. The analysis is based on both survey data and follow-up face-to-face interviews conducted with 18-35 year old Russians born in Estonia to parents of whom at least one have migrated to Estonia during Soviet times. Conducted analysis on ethnic identity of Russian youth and their sense of belonging to the majority group reveal a need for an enhanced approach to conceptualising and operationalising the identity level integration processes.

Keywords: Second generation, integration, ethnic identity, national identity, Estonian Russian youth.

Introduction

Increasing globalisation and widespread immigration from the 1950s onward have resulted in a new multicultural reality in Europe that threatens the traditional nation-state model of state building. Throughout Europe arguments have recently been heard against cultural, religious and linguistic diversity. The fear of multiculturalism is expressed in estimations that 'too much diversity' disrupts a national identity, breaks down society´s cohesion, dissipates common core values in society and undermines participatory institutions such as the welfare state (Vertovec & Wessendorf 2004). Immigrants are described as a potential security risk, as cultural others, as socially marginal, and as foreigners to the community, which is defined through shared loyalty towards the state and shared rights guaranteed by the state (Wimmer & Schiller 2002). Thus, migration and the consecutive integration of immigrants are considered to be problematic for the homogeneity of a nation-state and a temporary deviation from the normality of unique national belonging (Gustafson 2005, Castles 2002). From this perspective, the aftermath of transnational migration is often seen to be assimilation instead of integration. Immigrants are expected to settle permanently and adapt to the host country in a way that does away with these exceptions in normality, they are supposed to give up those cultural, social, linguistic characteristics that may distinguish them from the majority group and develop a sense of belonging to the society and a loyalty to the nation-state where they have settled. And this holds true both for nation-states where the nation had never been imagined as plural and for traditional immigrant societies, which themselves consist of former immigrants. Although the cultural assimilation demand is diminished in contemporary multicultural policies of immigrant integration, the national understanding is still reflected there by the expectation that immigrants or at least their children will develop a sense of belonging and a loyalty to just one state and society.

This article proceeds from an approach to integration processes, that does not assume the opposition of cultural diversity and social cohesion built on a shared sense of belongingness. Understanding the integration of immigrants and their descendants as the process by which they are incorporated into both the structures and the society of the receiving state, this article will look at these processes at the identity level, which is often referred to as identificational integration. Several

---

* E-Mail: gerli@iiss.ee

scholars have pointed out that the process of integration has different and interrelated dimensions and the process has been broken up into a different number of successive steps. Gordon (1964) made the distinction between seven types or stages of assimilation, starting with cultural assimilation, which leads to the next and most crucial stage called structural assimilation, which then is followed more or less automatically by marital, identificational, attitude receptional, behavioural receptional and civic assimilation. Gordon's distinction is often collapsed into three or four dimensions of integration and most commonly the analytical framework for studying integration processes focuses on structural, cultural, social (also called interactive (Reinsch 2001) and identificational integration dimensions (Heckmann & Schnapper 2003).

Integration at the identity level has been much less thoroughly studied than structural integration or acculturation processes. The individual's identification with several different groups in social system has been explored and an innumerable quantity of studies on collective identities can be found, starting from local identity and ending with the European identity. However, only a few of them are conducted in the context of immigrant integration in society in general and in connection with the second generation's socio-psychological adaptation more specifically. In case of the latter, the discussion both in the US and Europe has been dominated so far by indicators of structural integration, i.e. position in education and the labour market (Thomson and Crul 2007). Another dimension of integration that is often targeted is the acculturation process, which is seen as one of the premises for structural integration.

The emphasis on structural integration and acculturation processes stems in great part from the theoretical frameworks employed for conceptualising integration, according to which the socio-economical mobility is considered to be of major importance in adaptation processes. Another reason that has caused the identificational dimension of integration to be neglected or then only superficially explored in integration studies is the fuzziness of the concept of identity and the fact that identity aspects are less quantifiable and their interpretations are more grounded in the national context and discourse, making them especially hard to include into comparative quantitative studies. Using survey data further simplifies the research done on identity, since often only the categorical identity question is employed that gives the respondent the option to pick predetermined identity categories, in worst cases making only one choice possible.

This article takes a look at identificational integration of the descendants of immigrants, the so-called second generation who is born in the host country to parents of whom at least one has migration in their background. First, the role and place of identity in theoretical approaches to integration processes and definitions for identificational integration will be explored. Later in the article, the focus is set on two dimensions of the identity level integration: identification with one's ethnic group and identification with the majority group in the host country. The main task of the article is to demonstrate the shortcomings of widespread theories and commonly used research instruments for studying the identificational integration by way of the example of second generation Russians in Estonia. The need for an enhanced approach to conceptualising integration at the identity level will be shown first through the analysis of the strength and formation of ethnic identity among Russian youth. While attempting to test the hypothesis on identificational integration that stems from literature and presumes that national level belongingness either replaces or replenishes ethnic identity, this article also aims to point out that measuring the identificational integration by using self-categorisation with predetermined identity categories alone is not the best suitable operationalisation for this dimension of integration. Either an additional qualitative study for exploring the meaning of each category used in survey in the eyes of the target group or an enhanced operationalisation of identificational integration for the survey instrument is needed.

Empirical data

The analysis reported in this article is based on both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data on second generation Russians originates from a survey conducted in Estonia between January 2007 and March 2008 within the framework of the international research project 'The Integration of the European Second Generation' (TIES)[2]. The TIES survey instrument was adapted to the Estonian

2 The TIES project is coordinated by the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES), University of Amsterdam. The project comprises an international standardized survey of second generation immigrants from Turkey, Ex-Yugoslavia, and Morocco in eight European countries (France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Austria, The Netherlands, Switzerland and Sweden) (see more about the TIES: http://www.tiesproject.eu/).

situation and to the new target group of Russians by the researchers from the Institute of International and Social Studies and the fieldwork was implemented by the survey bureau OÜ Faktum & Ariko. The target group of the survey consists of second generation Russians (*i.e.* Russian youth aged 18-35, who were born in Estonia but whose parents (at least one of them) have immigrated to Estonia), and of a comparison group of Estonians of the same age. The method used for survey data collection was face-to-face interviews at the respondents' homes. Interviews were held in respondents' mother tongue. In total, 1,000 interviews (488 with Estonian youth and 512 with Russian youth aged 18-35 years) were conducted in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve.

In addition, a comparison to previous empirical studies done in Estonia and elsewhere (including other TIES countries) is provided in order to put the results for the second generation youth into the context of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia and to compare the results with descendants of labour migrants in Europe. The main source for comparison data on the Estonian Russian population is collected in the framework of Integration Monitoring (IM) 2008. IM is a regular nationwide survey for monitoring the integration processes in the Estonian society in different domains. The last survey, which was carried out in April, 2008, covered 1,505 respondents aged 15-75 years of whom 992 were Estonians and 513 Russian-speakers, among them 426 of Russian origin and the rest representing other ethnic groups[3].

Besides the results of an additional qualitative study[4] conducted in January, 2009, follow-up face-to-face interviews with the TIES survey respondents are used for illustrating and interpreting the survey results. The qualitative study aimed to take a closer look at the relationship between acculturation and identificational integration and comprised 18 interviews with Russian youths from Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve. During the interviews participants were asked open ended questions about their identity, their feelings and attitudes toward languages, as well as the frequency of use of different languages in their daily lives.

Theoretical framework

In the literature regarding immigrant integration, two basic theoretical models emerge: linear integration and segmented integration. Identificational integration is seen by the classical linear model, first formulated by Robert Park (1950) and further elaborated by Milton Gordon (1964), as the last step in the adaptation process of immigrants and is defined as 'a development of the sense of peoplehood based exclusively on host society' (Gordon 2005: 102). Integration at the identity level is understood as the gradual diminishing in the salience of ethnic and linguistic markers and the end point of these processes is considered to be the formation of a self-image as an unhyphenated member of a host society. Accordingly, the identity change is assumed to happen over generations and it entails the replacement of one's ethnic identity by the national identity shared with the majority ethno-cultural group.

Evidence of the decline in ethnic identities and loyalties accompanied by growing identification with the national identity category among the descendants of immigrants has been provided through an ample quantity of studies based on research on Europeans who migrated to the US before the 1960s and their descendants. These studies have concluded that widespread intergenerational social mobility and intermarriage lead to the decline in ethnic identity over three or four generations because of assimilation into the American mainstream. Such an identificational assimilation is expressed by the change in the nature of the ethnic identity, which turns into an optional, familial, leisure time form of symbolic ethnicity (Gans 1979, Alba 1990, Waters 1990). However, the new waves of immigrants and the so-called 'new' second generation have given reason to question the straight-line nature of integration processes. Integration no longer seems to be simply a matter of time and social mobility. Also, the decline in ethnic identity parallelled with a growth in identification with the mainstream society over the generations has been proved not to happen for some groups (Esser 2004, Heckmann & Schnapper 2003, Rumbaut 1994).

According to the segmented assimilation theory, the integration process at the identity level for the second generation might follow three models of identity formation. The first scenario is to follow the 'linear ethnicity' line of assimilation into a native majority ethnic category. This model corresponds to the assimilation process with the end goal of adaptation to the core society and culture, seen as one of the strategies by the linear assimilation theory. The second option for the second generation is to retain the ethnic identity of their parents and the third pattern is to develop a 'reactive' native minority ethnicity. The latter means embracing the oppositional values of native racial minorities, rather than the native majority, while they distance themselves also from their own ethnic group and immigrant community (Portes & Zhou 1993, Portes & Rumbaut 1996, 2001).

The approach to the identificational integration based either on the linear or segmented assimilation theory or their elaborations has mostly focused on ethnic identity and the processes by which it is retained or rejected. One can also find several studies on national identity formation in general, less in case of immigrants and their descendants, where identificational integration is assumed to lead to the creation of a shared national identity, which requires certain commonalities, such as a shared language and core cultural values. Even less attention is paid to the way in which the identification with the host society and country is formed as complementary to or parallel with self-identification with one's ethnic group and the parents' country of origin.

These studies, which have combined ethnic identity with identification at a national level, commonly use the concept of hyphenated identity. The notion of the hyphen is employed to articulate the combination of ethnic and national identities leading to self-identifications reported like 'Italian-Canadian' or 'Mexican-American' (Mahtani 2002). It has been demonstrated how the allegiances to ethno-cultural majority and minority are combined into a hybrid identity which can be considered just as a label symbolising a relatively vague ethnicity or then expresses a feeling of pride and enrichment from being part of two cultures (Gallant 2008, Hébert *et al.* 2008). These kind of hybrid identities are considered to be more characteristic to immigrants in traditional immigration countries where, in contrast to the European context, the discourses of nation building rest less on a homogenised national image of a country and its population. Instead, multiculturalism and difference as well as the immigrant background of the population are deeply embedded in national level identity[5] (Mackey 2002, quoted in Creese 2005). Second, the hyphenated identity comprises mostly the identification on a cultural basis, hence it is often also called bi-cultural identity, characterised by the blending of national norms and values and the majority group's culture elements with those of one's ethnic culture (Crul & Vermeulen 2003). The concept either termed as 'hybrid', 'creolised' or 'hyphenated' has gained more prominence also in European scholarly discourses about minorities and immigrants, where the hyphen in identity formation is defined in terms of multiple national attachments and cultural aspects of identity are considered to be plural and fluid (Caglar 1997).

In the more recent research on European second generation integration, one can notice a growing tendency towards conceptualising the identificational integration in a way which does not assume that identification with one's ethnic group and heritage and identification with the majority group in the host society are averse in their nature. Accordingly, instead of concentrating mainly on the ethnic identity decline, retention or replacement by the national identity of a host country, immigrants' and their descendants' identity is increasingly approached as a multicomponential and multidimensional concept. In these studies, usually the definition of the identificational dimension offered by Heckmann and his colleagues (Heckmann & Schnapper 2003, Bosswick & Heckmann 2006) is followed. Integration at the identity level is said to be the subjective membership in a host society, indicated by the formation of feelings of belonging to and identification with different groups in society, particularly ethnic, regional, local and national groups. Here, at least at the conceptual level, the focus is not on the ethnic-cultural identity formation per se, but on the formation of a sense of belonging that could be connected to different groups in society.

Despite of the definition used, the majority of empirical studies still focus on ethnic and national identity as general measures for a person's identificational integration and the operationalisation of the identificational integration remains in most cases at the level of categorical identity measurement. This leads to the evaluation of integration at the identity level by using a classification of immigrants and their descendants according to whether they identify only with their ethnic group or with the titular group in the host society or whether they feel to be affiliated to both (cf. van Niekerk 2007). In the European context, for some immigrant groups the religious identity, instead of ethnicity or together with it, is seen as one of the major indicators of identificational integration (Buijs & Rath 2006, Foner & Alba 2008).

5 In Europe, if some kind of hyphenation is used, it has a different appearing, for example German Turks, which still highlights the ethnic identity as nominative part of the construct and the reference to host country is used as an adjective.

Hence, in empirical studies on the identity of minority groups the identity is most commonly explored via self-categorisation. In the self-categorisation theory, the self-identification with different identity categories is considered to be equal to the identity structure and the self-categorisation process is explained as an accentuation of the similarities between the self and other in-group members on the one hand, and the differences between the self and out-group members on the other (cf. Turner *et al.* 1987, Abrams & Hogg 1990). Others see self-identification as a group member as only one of the prerequisites for identity formation in addition to positive feelings and attachment to one's group of origin (Phinney 1990, Karu & Valk 2001). Whatever the theoretical conceptualisation of identity includes, the most widely used operationalisation in quantitative studies is still based on self-categorisation.

Similarly, in the TIES survey identification with different groups is measured by asking a question about the intensity of feelings of belonging simultaneously to a variety of identity categories, including national, ethnic, religious, local and supra-national ones. For the purpose of the analysis presented in this article, identity as a multicomponent construct is operationalised as a bi-dimensional one that accounts for bonds and identifications with one's ethnic group of origin on the one hand, and with the majority group in the host country on the other[6]. In accordance with the traditional operationalisation of identificational integration, these two dimensions of identity are explored via self-categorisation. For this purpose, two items of the TIES survey are used: (1) the ethnic identity of second generation measured by the sense of belonging to their ethnic origin group (labelled 'Russians'), and (2) the identification with the majority group at the national level similarly measured by asking about the youth's sense of belonging to the titular group of the respective host society (labelled 'Estonians')[7].

Ethnic identity

Several previous studies have demonstrated that among Estonian Russians their ethnic identity is rather weak, especially in comparison to ethnic Estonians, and it is less salient in the identity structure compared to the identification with family and everyday social networks. According to the survey data of IM 2008, 56% of Russians said that they feel they are Russians with certainty, while among Estonians the share of those who certainly consider themselves to be Estonians was 66%. The Estonian TIES survey data brings forth the differences between the two groups even more sharply. Ethnic identification is much stronger among Estonian respondents compared to the second generation Russians. 28% of Russian respondents reported their sense of belonging to Russians to be very strong and 43% evaluated their affiliation to be strong, while 65% of Estonian respondents indicated very strong and 24% strong sense of belonging to their ethnic group. The share of respondents who feel that they belong to their ethnic group either weakly, very weakly, or not at all were very small for Russian youths and basically non-existent among Estonians (Table 1).

Results of the follow-up qualitative study with second generation Russians also support the outcomes of previous studies, according to which ethnic identification is not the most salient dimension of the Estonian Russians' identity (Vihalemm & Masso 2004, Nimmerfeldt 2006, Nimmerfeldt *et al.* 2007). When respondents were asked to define themselves spontaneously, none of them referred to their ethnic group, nor did they define themselves through ethno-cultural characteristics. Other identity dimensions, mainly related to social roles and relationships associated with studies, occupational groups, family relations and roles, friends, often also hobby activities, were most frequently presented in the Russian youths' self-presentations. But if respondents were asked to sort cards with different groups according to whether they feel connected to them or not, then the card 'Russians' was never left in the row 'not mine', albeit when they were asked to rate the groups along the strength of feelings of belonging, then 'Russians' was not the group with the highest score. Instead, groups formed on the basis of linguistic similarities (*Russian-speakers*), a similar citizenship status (*Estonian*

---

6 For an overview of the TIES survey results on identifications with different groups in society, see the country report on the TIES project in Estonia, where the role and relevance of territorial, civic, cultural, ethnic and religious identity categories in the identity structure of Estonian and Russian youths are explored and compared (Nimmerfeldt 2008).

7 The survey item was worded as follows: People can think of themselves as members of various groups in the society. The following questions are about how you think of yourself in this respect. How strongly do you feel that you belong to these groups? INTERVIEWER GIVES A CARD and asks for each item: To what extent do you feel… Russian; Estonian; Inhabitant of the city; Estonian citizen; European; Orthodox/Lutheran and Catholic. Scale for evaluating the strength of the feelings of belonging included: very strongly; strongly; moderately; weakly; very weakly; not at all.

citizens) and groups comprising all the people living in Estonia (*Estlanders*, in Estonian: *Eestimaalased*) despite of their ethnic origin were felt to be more closer connected.

Table 1. The strength of feelings of belonging to one's ethnic group among Estonian and Russian respondents, %

	Russians	Estonians
Very strong	27.6	64.5
Strong	42.7	24.3
Moderate	25	11
Weak	3.3	0.2
Very weak	0.6	-
Not at all	0.8	-
N	508	485

Source: TIES survey in Estonia

The relatively weak ethnic identity of Estonian Russians is explained by some as one of the legacies of the Soviet times. Brubaker (1996) argues that during Soviet times, ethnic background was not the main basis for self-definition. The main markers of identity were politics and ideology, and not culture that created a sense of civil and political unity with the state and among the citizens of the Soviet Republics. Previous studies indicate that before the restoration of Estonian independence, Estonians were identifying themselves as members of an ethnic group, while Russians preferred the category 'Soviet'. Soviet identity was regarded as a combination of political and civic identities, relying on a certain ideology and value system, common experience, history, newly formed traditions, symbols and norms, semantic space and communicational instrumentation. It defined the place and role of the state, as well as the population within the state. Even though the Soviet identity co-existed alongside the ethnic identities of the Soviet Republics, the Russian ethno-cultural identity was not expressed until 1987 (Jakobson 2002).

Vihalemm and Masso (2002) argue that among Estonian Russians the transformation of Soviet identity during the first decade of independence has followed three possible trajectories: (1) into a local civic identity, either in its narrower political or wider socio-territorial sense (expressed by identity categories of Estonian citizen or inhabitant of Estonia); (2) into a minority identity, either based on ethno-cultural or linguistic self-identifications (expressed by identity categories of Estonian Russian or Russian-speaker); (3) into a diaspora identity. This is a group of Russians who have not found an identifying framework in the Estonian context that offers a substitute to the previous Soviet identity, and who reject the identifying categories related to citizenry or population of Estonia, instead preferring an extra-territorial identity, rather than a minority identity. Aksel Kirch and colleagues (Kirch *et al*. 1997) claim that the diaspora identity category – 'Russians of the near abroad' – was internalised among one-third of the older generation of Estonian Russians and was also reflected among younger groups.

Vihalemm and Kalmus (2009) consider one of the reasons behind the relatively weak ethnic identity among Russians in Estonia to lie in the fact that ethnic belonging is strongly embedded in social networks, however, Estonian Russians have less social capital and pay less attention to the reproduction of personalised social networks. The reasons for this are found both in the Soviet time legacy, as well as in the experiences of dramatic loss of social status after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Russians' social networks were centred on formal organisations, which disappeared or were reorganised, and during the transformation period when Estonians employed their social networks to adapt to the transitional changes, Russians in Estonia found their social capital and networks to be 'unusable'.

All this could explain why the feelings of belonging to one's ethnic group labelled 'Russians' among Russians in Estonia have not been as strong as ethnic identity is among ethnic Estonians. But the relevance of these hypotheses for the second generation is yet to be tested. The second generation Russians, aged 18-35 years included in our study, mostly have no experience of socialisation during Soviet times and, therefore, the replacement of Soviet identity with something new is not essential to them personally, though the previous Soviet identity of their parents could have some impact on their identity formation. Still, in the case of the second generation Russians in Estonia the question

is more about identity construction than about replacement or transformation. The given brief scan of the Estonian Russians' identity formation explains why in Estonia we cannot test the hypothesis of assimilation theories about ethnic identity decline among the second generation. According to IM 2008 data, the strength of ethnic identity over generations is not statistically different. 56% of first generation and 52% of second generation Russians feel that they certainly belong to the ethnic identity category labelled as Russians. For both generations, the share of those respondents who do not feel affiliated to that group is the same – 11%.

Identification with the majority group

As was mentioned before, in the TIES project the other dimension of the second generation's identity formation concerned, *i.e.* the identification at a national level, is measured by asking for the youth's sense of belonging to the titular group of the respective host society. The underlying assumption here is that the feeling of belonging to a national identity category reflects the sense of belonging to the host society and country in a similar way and to an equal extent that the feeling of belonging to one's ethnic group indicates the strength of the ethnic identity. We doubt this assumption, especially in the context of Estonia, and in the following we will demonstrate why.

TIES survey results indicate that among the second generation Turks in Europe identification with the identity category labelled as the titular group in the host society is relatively high. In most European cities included in the study[8], 40-45% of second generation Turks feel affiliated to the national category strongly or very strongly and more than half of the respondents feel that they belong strongly or very strongly to the respective national identity category in Frankfurt and Zürich. At the same time, ca five per cent or less feel a weak belonging at the national level and only three to seven per cent of interviewed Turks reported no feelings of belongingness at all to this category (Schneider & Crul 2009).

TIES survey results for second generation Russian youths in Estonia for the same question show an entirely opposite picture: only six per cent feel that they strongly and one per cent very strongly belong to the group labelled 'Estonians', while 45% of respondents reported no feelings at all of belonging to that category. The rest of the sample was divided between three scale points as follows: 11% of respondents feel Estonian very weakly, 19% weakly and 18% moderately.

The IM survey conducted in 2008 allows us to compare the TIES survey results for second generation youths with the Russian-speaking population in Estonia. The results of IM confirm our doubts about the national identity category being ethnically overloaded. From all the Russian-speaking respondents aged between 15-75 years, only four per cent feel certainly to belong among Estonians and ten per cent rather feel they belong, while 43% reported that they rather do not belong, and 35% said they certainly do not belong to this category. Eight per cent of respondents said that it is hard to identify themselves in this way.

Why is there such a big difference in survey results for Estonia compared to other TIES countries? Why don't Russians in Estonia feel they belong to the titular group at the national level similarly to Turks in Europe? The answer to this question lies in the different meanings of the same identity category. In the TIES project, the hypothetical meaning of national identity, of being Austrian, *etc.* is expected to be either connected to the citizenship status, place of birth and living, context for socialisation and 'enculturation', or to the ethnic origin and descent (Schneider and Stojić 2008). TIES survey data analysis shows that citizenship status is not significantly associated to the Russian youths' feelings of belonging to the group labelled 'Estonians'. The majority of respondents don't feel to belong to Estonians at all or do feel weakly or very weakly, irrespective of what kind of formal citizenship status they have (Nimmerfeldt 2008). And since all our respondents were born and have grown up, thus, gone through their socialisation in Estonia, we can assume based on survey data that the national identity category 'Estonian' is mainly a reference to ethnicity and much less to the other listed aspects expected to be connected to national level identification.

This statement was also clearly confirmed by the qualitative follow-up study. During the interviews respondents were asked to sort cards presenting different groups according to whether they feel they belong to them or not. Among the groups there was also 'Estonians'. As a rule, the interviewed Russians sorted the card with the group 'Estonians' out as a group where they don't feel they belong and the explanation to this choice was that you have to be born as an Estonian to be Estonian –

---

8   TIES survey was implemented in 8 countries and altogether in 15 cities: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Berlin, Frankfurt/M, Paris, Strasbourg, Wien, Linz, Zürich, Basel, Stockholm, Brussel, Antwerpen, Madrid, Barcelona.

meaning that Estonians are those whose parents and grandparents are Estonians. Often also the language was mentioned as one of the determining factor and here they did not mean that it is enough to know the Estonian language to become Estonian, but that you have to speak it as native Estonian. The latter requirement is seen by Russian youths as impossible to meet, because of the requirement to have Estonian born ancestry for generations. As one of the respondents put it when he was asked about what differentiates Russians from Estonians: '… imperfect Estonian language skills. It doesn't matter how well she or I may learn to speak the Estonian language, we will never speak it as Estonians, we will still be different because of the imperfectness and we will not be accepted by Estonians as Estonian' (*Russian man from Tallinn*).

Some respondents also referred to stereotypes and mentioned that Estonians are those who act and look like Estonians. Less pronouncedly presented, but not totally absent, was the less essential view of identity according to which an Estonian is a person who considers themselves to be Estonian. All in all the main messages from the qualitative study were that the Russian youths feel that they can never become Estonians even if they would want to, although this kind of desire was not shown by any of the respondents. The obstacles are regarded to be mainly the exclusive nature of an Estonian's national identity and their reluctance to attenuate the strictly, essentially defined borders.

Concurrently, outside of Estonia the same people are considered to be Estonians whether they go to Russia or somewhere else. Many of the respondents pointed it out also during our study, giving examples of their experiences of being considered to be Estonians by people in other countries, including by Russians in Russia. And this external categorisation applies both to Russians with an Estonian citizenship and passport, as well as to those without it. It was also mentioned that they do consider themselves somehow to be Estonians as well while they are abroad, even though the same people don't identify with this category otherwise. But there were references to situations when they identify themselves as Estonians, for example, while filling in some kind of forms or they present themselves as Estonians if someone asks where they come from. This illustrates the ambivalence of second generation Russians' identity at the national level.

The slight identification with the majority group's nominal identity category on the part of Estonian Russians can be explained by the exclusive nature of national identity in Estonia. During the period of re-establishing independence, as well as after, the Estonian identity was actively constructed as an ethno-cultural group, united by native origin, common culture, history, national traditions, feelings, language, preservation of and pride in their culture and traditions, a deep connection with the Estonian territory and landscape. The Estonian ethnic and political identity shaped a common semantic field: 'Estonian' was interpreted as belonging to the Estonian nation in an ethno-cultural sense (Jakobson 2002).

Proceeding from the above, we argue that self-identification with the predetermined national identity category 'Estonian' is not suitable for testing the hypotheses about ethnic identity replacement or replenishment by national level belongingness among second generation Russians. The part of identificational integration that involves the formation of a sense of belonging to the host country and society cannot be measured by using the identity category labelled as a titular group in society, at least not in the context of Estonia. First and foremost because of the fact that the national identity category in its essence really denotes ethnic identity, therefore, using it for measuring integration would implicate that by integration a replacement of one ethnic identity by another is understood.

The ethnic connotation of the term 'Estonian' has been taken as self-evident by the domestic policy-makers, public media and scholars, and the term is also used in everyday language for referring to ethnic Estonians only. For that reason in Estonian integration studies, several other possible group nominators for self-categorisation have been used in order to measure the sense of belongingness at the national level, such as 'Estonian citizen', 'Estonian inhabitant' or a term '*Eestimaalased*'. During the follow-up interviews we asked about the meanings of these terms for second generation Russian youths and we got very diverse interpretations. The given meanings varied greatly among the respondents and in some cases were surprisingly different from the widespread meaning of these terms for Estonians in the Estonian language. A good example for the latter mentioned findings is the term '*Eestimaalased*', which in Estonian by definition denotes all people living in Estonia, but which had a very different meaning for Russian youths, ranging in meaning from 'farmers' to being a synonym for the ethnicity nominator 'Estonian'. An example for the diversity of meanings is also the category 'Estonian citizen', which for some respondents only refers to legally defined citizenry and is used to identify one's formal belongingness to the polity, while for others it means being part of the society and community irrespective of one's legal status. In the case of second generation Russians in Estonia, using citizenry as a national level identity category is made even more ambiguous by the

fact that nearly half of the target group doesn't have Estonian citizenship[9]. The category 'Estonian inhabitant' is also ambiguously understood by Russian youths and it is problematic for measuring the subjective level of membership in the society and emotional attachment to the country. It might be used for identifying one's bonds with the country purely geographically as a place of residence, but it could also signify one's attachment to the country and its society at a more emotional level. Due to the spatial constraints, we cannot report in detail the results of this qualitative study here, we can only conclude based on the interview results that all the above mentioned category labels have their limits for measuring self-identification at the national level reflecting the sense of belonging to host country and its society.

This doesn't mean that they are not suitable at all – they do reflect important aspects of the attachment, connectedness and the sense of belongingness to the country and its society. But only together with a qualitative study that aims to explore the meanings of these categories for a target group can we have some idea about which aspects of belongingness have been indicated. Besides self-categorisation to different groups in society, we should examine the formation of emotional attachment to the host country and its society using some additional method to the self-categorisation. It can be either a qualitative study helping us to formulate the survey items or interpret the results, or we could include an enhanced operationalisation of this aspect of identificational integration into survey instruments as it is proposed elsewhere (Nimmerfeldt forthcoming). The additional measurement uses a block of seven statements on different aspects of the sense of belonging, based on feelings of being at home in the country of residence and on feelings of being accepted by and part of its society. Both aspects of belongingness are crucial in the respect of social cohesion in society and on a more personal level for the psychological well-being of the second generation.

Conclusions

This article aimed to critically assess both the theoretical and methodological approaches to identificational integration processes of the second generation on the example of Estonian Russians. According to the definition, identificational integration is understood as the membership in a host society at a subjective level. This sense of membership is considered to be indicated by the formation of feelings of belonging to and identification with different groups in society, most commonly ethnic (or religious) and national groups. The operationalisation of the identificational integration remains in most empirical studies at the level of categorical identity measurement, giving information about self-categorisation into different groups in society. The conducted analysis based on both survey data and follow-up interviews reveals a need for an enhanced approach to conceptualise and operationalise the identity level integration processes in the case of the second generation.

In this article, the objective was to empirically test the association between two of the most studied dimensions of identitifcational integration, assumed in the literature either explicitly or implicitly: identification with one's ethnic group and identification with the majority. Analysis of ethnic identity formation among Estonian Russians aimed to show that classical assumption about ethnic identity decline over generations is hard to test because ethnic identity didn't form the main basis for self-definition for the first generation Russians in Estonia. Instead, the Soviet identity was the most dominant identificational marker for them. Thus, in case of Estonian Russians no decline in ethnic identity is revealed. The analysis indicates that ethnic identity among Russian youth in Estonia is relatively weak compared to Estonians at the same age, but the strength of ethnic identity over generations among Russians is not statistically different.

Another hypothesis stemming from integration theories presumes the weak ethnic identity to be accompanied by stronger identification at a national level. This we couldn't test properly since the operationalisation commonly used in empirical studies, which we followed here, proved to be problematic for measuring the sense of belongingness to the country and its society. The majority of Russian youths don't feel that they belong among Estonians at all or they do feel it weakly or very weakly. The analysis shows that neither the citizenship status nor any other factors assumed to have impact on national level identification are significantly associated with the feelings of belonging to the group labelled 'Estonians'. Additional qualitative data analysis explains the weak sense of belongingness at a national level, measured via self-categorisation to the titular group, through the fact that the national identity category 'Estonian' is mainly a reference to ethnicity. Russian youths

9   For an overview of citizenship statistics in Estonia and the legal status of TIES survey respondents look the country report on TIES project in Estonia (Nimmerfeldt 2008).

feel that they can never become Estonians. The obstacles are regarded to be mainly the exclusive nature of the Estonian national identity and their reluctance to attenuate the strictly, essentially defined borders.

Consequently, the part of identificational integration that involves the formation of a sense of belonging to the host country and its society cannot be measured by using self-identification with a predetermined category of national identity labelled as the titular group in society. Other categories may arise for measuring the sense of belonging, but based on the results of the qualitative study we argue that this aspect of identificational integration should not be explored via the self-categorisation method only. An additional qualitative study or an enhanced survey instrument should be included.

References

Abrams, D. & Hogg, M. (1990). Self-Categorization and Social Identity, in D. Abrams & M. Hogg (eds), *Social Identity Theory* (10-28). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Alba, R. (1990). *Ethnic identity. The Transformation of White America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bosswick, W. & Heckmann, F. (2006). *Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities*. European Foundation of the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Buijs, F. J. & Rath, J. (2006). *Muslims in Europe: The State of Research*. IMISCOE Working Paper. http://www.imiscoe.org/publications/workingpapers/documents/MuslimsinEurope-Thestateofresearch.pdf

Caglar, A. S. (1997). Hyphenated Identities and the Limits of 'Cutlure', in T. Modood & P. Werbner (eds), *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community* (169-185). London and NY: Zed Books Ltd.

Castles, S. (2002). Migration and Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization, *The International Migration Review* 36(4): 1143-1168.

Creese, G. (2005). Negotiating Belonging: Bordered Spaces and Imagined Communities in Vancouver, Canada, paper published in Working Papers Series: Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, No. 05-06. Vancouver Centre of Excellence.

Crul, M. & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The Second Generation in Europe, *The International Migration Review* 37(4): 965-986.

Esser, H. (2004). Does the 'New' Immigration Require a 'New' Theory of Intergenerational Integration?, *International Migration Review* 38(3): 1126-1159.

Foner, N. & Alba, R. (2008). Immigrant Religion in the US and Western Europe: Bridge or Barrier to Inclusion?, *International Migration Review* 42(2): 360-392.

Gallant, N. (2008). Identity and Political Participation among Young Second Generation Immigrants, *Canadian Diversity* 6(2): 47-49. INRS: Urbanisation, Culture et Société.

Gans, H. J. (1979). Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2(1): 1-20.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation and American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, M. M. (2005): The Nature of Assimilation, in Kivisto, P. (ed.), *Incorporating Diversity. Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age*. Paradigm Publishers (95-112). (Reprinted from Milton M. Gordon (1964): *Assimilation in American life*. Oxford University Press).

Gustafson, P. (2005). International Migration and National Belonging in the Swedish Debate on Dual Citizenship, *Acta Sociologica* 48(1): 5-19.

Hébert, Y., Wilkinson, L. & Ali, M. (2008). Second Generation Youth in Canada, Their Mobilities and Identifications: Relevance to Citizenship Education, *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice* 17(1): 50-70.

Heckmann, F. & Schapper, D. (2003). Introduction, in F. Heckman & D. Schnapper (eds), *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies: National Differences and Trends of Convergence* (9-14). Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius.

Jakobson, V. (2002). Collective identities constructed in the Russian press, in M. Lauristin, & M. Heidments (eds), *The challenge of Russian minority. Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia* (175-184). Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Karu, K. & Valk, A. (2001). Ethnic Attitudes in Relation to Ethnic Pride and Ethnic Differentiation, *The Journal of Social Psychology* 141(5): 583-601.

Kirch, A., Kirch, M. & Tuisk, T. (1997). Vene noorte etnilise ja kultuurilise identiteedi muutused aastatel 1993-1996 [Changes in ethnic and cultural identity of Russian youth in years 1993-1996], in P. Järve (ed.), *Vene noored Eestis: sotsioloogiline mosaiik* [*Russian youth in Estonia: Sociological mosaic*] (47-67). Tallinn: Projekt VERA and Avita.

Mackey, E. (2002). *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mahtani, M. (2002). Interrogating the Hyphen-Nation: Canadian Multicultural Policy and 'Mixed Race' Identities, *Social Identities* 8(1): 67-90.

Nimmerfeldt, G. (2006). *Identiteet ja vähemuste sotsiaalne kohanemine: Teoreetiline raamistik reaktiivse identiteedi käsitluse operatsionaliseerimiseks.* [Identity and Social-psychological Adaptation Strategies: Theoretical Framework for and Operationalisation of Reactive Identity Approach]. MA dissertation. University of Tallinn: Department of Government.

Nimmerfeldt, G. (2008). Collective Identities of Russian and Estonian Youth, in *Integration of Second Generation Russians in Estonia: Country report on TIES survey in Estonia:* (107-132). IISS. Available at the webpage of TIES project: http://www.tiesproject.eu/

Nimmerfeldt, G. (forthcoming): Sense of Belonging to Estonia, in R. Vetik and J. Helemäe (eds), *Segregation, Disparity, Reactivity: the Russian Second Generation in Two Estonian Cities*. Amsterdam University Press-IMISCOE Series.

Nimmerfeldt, G., Taru, M., Vetik, R. & Vihma, P. (2007). *Noored Maardus ja Maardu noorte silmade läbi* [Youth in Maardu and Maardu through the eyes of youth]. Research report of project 'Identity, social and political activity and integration attitudes among youth in Maardu'. IISS/Maardu City Government. http://www.maardu.ee/public/files/maardu_noored.pdf

Park, R. E. (1950). *Race and Culture*. Glencoe: Illinois.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research, *Psychological Bulletin* 108: 499-514.

Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies. The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. University of California Press.

Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74-96.

Reinsch, P. (2001). *Measuring Immigrant Integration. Diversity in a European city*. Ashgate.

Rumbaut. R. G. (1994). The Crucible within: Ethnic Identity, Self-Esteem, and Segmented Assimilation among Children of Immigrants, *International Migration Review* 28(4): 748-794.

Schneider, J. & Crul, M. (2009). An introduction to the TIES survey, presentation held at TIES Stakeholders Conference, Amsterdam, 11-13 May 2009. Available at the webpage of TIES project: http://www.tiesproject.eu/

Schneider, J. & Stoj i , S. (2008). Second Generation Identities. First comparative results from TIES, presentation held at TIES Academic Conference, Amsterdam, 11-13 December 2008. Available at the webpage of TIES project: http://www.tiesproject.eu/

Thomson, M. & Crul, M. (2007). The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7): 1025-1041.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D. & Blackwell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: a Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

van Niekerk, M. (2007). Second-Generation Caribbeans in the Netherlands: Different Migration Histories, Diverging Trajectories, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7): 1063-1081.

Vetrovec, S. & Wessendorf, S. (2004). Migration and Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Diversity in Europe: An overview of issues and trends. IMISCOE working paper.

Vihalemm, T. & Kalmus, V. (2009). Cultural Differentiations of the Russian Minority, *Journal of Baltic Studies* 40(1): 95-119.

Vihalemm, T. & Masso, A. (2002). Patterns of Self-Identification among Younger Generation of Estonian Russians, in M. Lauristin & M. Heidments (eds), *The challenge of Russian minority. Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia* (185-198). Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Vihalemm, T. & Masso, A. (2004). Kollektiivsed identiteedid siirdeaja Eestis (Collective identities in post-communist Estonia), in V. Kalmus, M., Lauristin & P. Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt (eds), *Eesti elavik 21. sajandi algul: ülevaade uurimuse 'Mina. Maailm. Meedia.' tulemustest* [Estonian life world in the beginning of the 21st century: Survey 'Me. World. Media.' Report] (45-55). Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Waters, M. (1990). *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wimmer, A. & Schiller, N. G. (2002). Methodological Nationalism and beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences, *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–334.

Gerli Nimmerfeldt is a researcher at the Institute of International and Social Studies and a PhD student in Government and Politics at Tallinn University. Her main research interests are related to inter ethnic relations, the socio-cultural integration of immigrant youth and identity building processes.