The Relationship between Integration Dimensions among Second Generation Russians in Estonia

Gerli Nimmerfeldt*, Jennie Schulze & Marti Taru

Abstract

This article examines the relationship between structural, cultural, social and identificational integration dimensions among second generation Russians in Estonia on the basis of TIES data. The relationship between structural integration and other dimensions is established through cluster analysis, which involves the analysis of the difference between means across clusters. In addition, a bivariate correlation analysis is used to determine the relationship between cultural, social, and identificational dimensions. The results raise questions regarding the pertinence of linear assimilation theory in the Estonian case. While the cluster analysis reveals a positive relationship between structural and cultural integration, higher levels of social and identificational integration are not correlated with higher levels of structural and cultural integration. Second generation Russians retain a strong ethnic identity and socialise primarily with other Russians. A bivariate correlation analysis reveals that there is a relationship between cultural, social and identity-related dimensions. Feelings of belonging to Estonia and distance from both Russia and Russians in Russia are stronger among those with good Estonian language proficiency. Respondents with strong Estonian language skills also tend to be more socially integrated and to have more Estonian friends.

Keywords: integration, second generation, Estonian-Russians, linear assimilation theory.

Introduction

As a result of increasing globalisation and immigration in the past several decades, both scholars and policymakers have been forced to confront the question of how to successfully integrate immigrants into their host societies. This has led to an active research agenda in the area of immigration and integration studies, as well as to the growth of policy programs across countries designed specifically to tackle the challenges of creating a cohesive society out of this new multicultural reality.

The theoretical literature breaks down the concept of minority integration into four distinct dimensions: structural, cultural, social, and identificational integration. This has opened up a research agenda geared towards uncovering the relationships between these various integration dimensions. 'The Integration of the European Second Generation' (TIES) project has tried to uncover the underlying relationship between different dimensions of integration by operationalising these dimensions in a standardised survey.

In the Estonian context, both policymakers and academics have fallen into the trap of making a priori assumptions about the relationship between various dimensions of integration. Both policymakers and academics tend to conflate cultural and identitificational integration in Estonia. Language has been one of the most divisive issues in Estonian society, owing in large part to the importance of the Estonian language for the Estonian national identity, as well as to resentment over the Russification policies of the Soviet period. Policymakers have argued that titular language learning

* E-mail address of the corresponding author: gerli@iiss.ee

among ethnic Russians is the best way to integrate Russians into the social and political structures of Estonian society and to create a common national identity (Vihalemm & Lauristin 1997: 282). The Integration Program 2000-2007 envisioned integration occurring on the basis of the Estonian language and, arguably, the new Integration Program 2008-2013 still views proficiency in the Estonian language as the central component of integration and the key to better relations between the ethnic Estonian and Russian communities. This approach is questionable in light of the riots that occurred on April 26-28, 2007, following the removal of the Bronze Soldier, a Soviet war memorial, from downtown Tallinn. Many of the Russian protestors were youth, who could speak the Estonian language, signaling that language learning is not sufficient for creating a common national identity or feelings of belonging to Estonia among ethnic Russians.

Through an analysis of the TIES data in Estonia, this article makes two primary contributions to theoretical and empirical literature on the integration of second generation Russians in Estonia. It explores the relationship between different integration dimensions and evaluates whether the linear model of assimilation applies to second generation Russians in Estonia. Establishing a clearer picture of how integration dimensions are related opens up a new research agenda for comparing the integration of second generation Russians to other second generation minority groups in Europe. After first giving a theoretical overview of the development of integration as a concept, as well as the standard operationalisation of the different dimensions of integration, this article will describe the operationalisation of these dimensions in the TIES data set and the use of cluster analysis and bivariate correlation analysis to examine the relationship between integration dimensions. Finally, the article will present the results of the analysis and the implications of these results for future research.

Defining and measuring 'Integration'

The term 'integration' has been used and defined in a variety of ways by both scholars and politicians. In general, integration refers to the process by which immigrants are incorporated into both the structures and the society of the receiving state. The integration process involves the interaction between individual members of the immigrant group and the ethnic majority group, as well as between those groups and the institutions and policies of the receiving state. The early theoretical literature on minority integration grew out of the question of how to incorporate immigrants into their host societies and focused primarily on large settler societies, such as the United States (Warner & Srole 1945, Gordon 1964). Drawing on the theories and lessons of these pioneering works, as well as of more recent studies on 'new immigrants' in these traditional immigrant societies (Porter & Rumbaut 1996, 2001; Alba & Nee 2003), scholars have developed an active research agenda on the integration of various minorities into European nation-states (Vermeulen & Penninx 2000, Heckmann *et al*. 2001, Heckmann & Schnapper 2003a, Thomson & Crul 2007, Crul & Schneider 2010).

While scholarship in the United States and Canada has centered on the concept of 'assimilation', European scholars have utilised the concept of 'integration' as something distinct and different from 'assimilation'. This attempt at redefinition is as much the result of the normative push away from 'assimilation' in Europe on the part of policymakers and practitioners, as the desire for theoretical clarity. In this reconceptualisation, the primary difference between assimilation and integration is that assimilation is viewed as a one-way process by which immigrants must adopt the customs and cultural practices of the host society, whereas integration is defined as a two-way process of acceptance and cultural evolution among both the immigrant group and the host society. This reconceptualisation on the part of European scholars has sparked a healthy debate between scholars on each side of the Atlantic regarding the usefulness of proliferating terms, as well as disagreement over the meaning of assimilation in the American context[1]. While this article tests the assumptions of

1 See Alba & Nee 1997; Barkan 1995; Glazer 1993; and Morowska 1994.

linear assimilation theory, developed in the context of North America, it adopts the term 'integration' to describe the process of inclusion in Estonian society. In Estonia as well as in other European countries, 'assimilation' is understood both by policymakers and in public discourse as the process by which minorities become 'more Estonian'. The Russian minority in Estonia also perceives integration programs as government attempts to assimilate them in order to ensure the dominance of the ethnic majority culture. Nevertheless, the work on assimilation in North America is still relevant for developing the concept of integration and its various sub-dimensions.

While there is some variation across studies, scholars generally agree that there are four distinct dimensions of integration: structural, cultural, social or interactive, and identificational (Heckmann & Schnapper 2003b: 10)[2]. These dimensions have received varying attention in the American and European contexts. Due to the nature of race relations in American cities, the social or interactive dimension has been the primary focus, whereas in Europe, the participation of immigrants in democratic institutions has received greater attention (Faist 2000). This article examines the relationship between all four dimensions.

Structural integration involves the acquisition of rights and equal access to the major institutions of society. These institutions include the labour market, education and housing systems, welfare state institutions, including the health care system, and citizenship (Bosswick & Heckmann 2006: 9). Access to these institutions is crucial to an individual's socio-economic status as well as to opportunities for future advancement. The alternative to inclusion into the main institutions of the host society is integration into ethnic subsystems or transnational systems based on internationally extended rights (Heckmann 2006: 16). While some scholars argue that this alternative decreases social mobility (Penninx & Martinelli 2004, Wiley 1970), others have argued that it is possible to reach parity in socio-economic life chances through participation in either ethnically controlled sub-economies (Wilson & Portes 1980, Portes & Bach 1985, Portes & Manning 1986, Waldinger 1996) or through participation in transnational networks (Bosswick & Heckmann 2006). Labour market integration is typically measured by participation in the labour market, income level, and occupational position. Educational attainment is measured through the highest level of education achieved. Better labour market positioning and higher income, as well as a higher level of educational attainment are evidence of higher levels of structural integration. The acquisition of citizenship, positive attitudes toward naturalisation, as well as voter participation and political mobilisation are evidence of legal integration. Lower levels of residential segregation and ethnically mixed neighborhoods, as well as interaction within those neighborhoods are measures of integration in the housing sector (Heckmann 2006).

Cultural integration or acculturation refers to the process of cognitive, behavioural and attitudinal change that occurs when individuals from different cultures come into contact (Gibson 2001: 19). Acculturation can occur either through changes in one group that make it more similar to another, or as a result of changes in both (or more) groups that shrink the differences and distance between them (Alba & Nee 1997: 834). While acculturation primarily concerns the immigrants and their descendants, it is also an interactive, mutual process that changes the society as members of the receiving society are forced to learn new ways of relating to and adapting to the needs of immigrants. Cultural integration does not necessarily entail migrant groups having to give up the cultural elements of their home country. Bicultural competences and personalities are an asset for both individuals and the receiving society (Heckmann 2006: 16). Following Gordon's (1964) model of linear assimilation, cultural integration is typically operationalised along two dimensions: 1) adoption of the ideals, values, and behaviors of the receiving society; and 2) the retention of the ideals, values, and beliefs

2 Bosswick & Heckmann (2006) later renamed these four dimensions structural, cultural, interactive, and identificational; Gordon (1964) identified seven different dimensions of assimilation (cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitude receptional, behavioural receptional, and civic); Esser (2000) proposed a four dimension scheme and labeled them acculturation, placement, interaction and identification; Penninx (2004) divides the integration process into three distinct dimensions legal-political, socio-economic, and cultural-religious.

of the immigrant's culture of origin (Phinney *et al*. 2001, Berry 2005). Measuring cultural integration involves examining titular language proficiency, religious practices, and participation in ceremonies, traditions, and customs (Williams & Ortega 1990).

Social or interactive integration is defined as the degree to which members of different groups are segregated and the degree to which they interact. Social integration involves both the frequency and strength of contact between different societal groups and is measured in terms of participation in networks that span intergroup divides (Jandt 1998). Indicators of social integration include the ethnic composition of social networks, friendships, partnerships, marriage and membership in voluntary organisations (Bosswick & Heckmann 2006: 10).

Research on identity integration focuses primarily on ethnic and national self-identifications and examines identity patterns according to whether individuals identify only with their ethnic group (culture or country of origin), only with the national group (majority group or its culture) or with both (Gordon 1964, Gans 1979, Alba 1990, Waters 1990, Phinney 1990, Berry 1997). Identificational integration is most often explored through nominal self-identification or through self-categorisation, which together with the two-dimensional approach leads to the classification of immigrants or their descendants along a continuum, spanning from a strong ethnic identity combined with a weak national identity, to a strong national identity combined with a weak ethnic identification. Hyphenated identity, which includes identification along both dimensions, is situated in between the two poles. In more recent studies, identificational integration is understood as membership in a society at the subjective level, indicated by a feeling of belonging to and identifying with different groups in society, particularly on ethnic[3], regional, local and national levels (Bosswick & Heckmann 2006: 10).

We depart from this approach by arguing that identity is not only reflected in identifications with different groups but also in the creation of a sense of belonging to one's resident country and its society based on the feelings of being at home and being accepted as a full member of that society (Nimmerfeldt 2011). In addition to the sense of belonging to the resident country, the identification with one's ethnic group and the connection to the country of origin are also used as indicators of identificational integration. Finally, social identities based on identifications with co-ethnics living in the kin-state are treated as important aspects of identificational integration that indicate transnational identifications.

The relationships between integration dimensions

Previous research on integration falls into one of two primary categories: those who support the linear assimilation theory and those who question it. The linear model, which has traditionally been used to describe classic settler societies in the US and Canada, assumes a causal, more or less automatic, and positive relationship between migrants' structural integration and their social and cultural adaptation in and identification with the host state and society. The model assumes that migrants with higher levels of native language proficiency and human capital have better opportunities to integrate into the mainstream economy. This, in turn, leads to more social contact with majority members, more exposure to host societies' norms and values, and possibly reduced levels of discrimination. As a result, identity integration is expected to happen as the endpoint of the incorporation process, or, as Gordon (1964) prominently asserted, "If structural assimilation occurs along with or subsequent to acculturation, *all other types of assimilation will inevitably follow*" (80-81). Research on immigrant integration has often focused on groups who follow this linear pattern of immigrant adaptation (Heitmeyer *et al*. 1997).

3 In the European context, religious identity, instead of ethnicity or in combination with it, is one of the major indicators of identificational integration (see e.g. Buijs & Rath 2006; Foner & Alba 2008).

In the wake of accelerating globalisation in the post-Cold War era, the utility of linear models of assimilation has been called into question. While linear assimilation theory was based primarily on the experiences of the 1880-1927 wave of US immigration and the descendants of those immigrants, newer waves of immigration do not follow the linear pattern. Migratory movements have become more heterogeneous with regard to both individual and context level determinants of integration (Castles & Miller 1993, Alba 2003, Alba & Nee 1997). Present migration flows encompass groups ranging from low to highly skilled, from economically motivated to those fleeing from oppression, and from sojourners to settlers. Many of today's immigrants are politically or ethnically motivated and possess comparatively large amounts of individual resources, most importantly education. Second, while classical settler societies have long been the preferred destinations of permanent migrants, receiving countries have become more heterogeneous in terms of both their policies towards immigrants and public attitudes towards immigration (Cornelius *et al*. 1992, Lahav 2004). Finally, the reproduction of immigrants' ethnic identities has become less costly and more likely in many ways. This is due to both decreasing assimilative pressure in host societies as a result of increasing legitimacy for both diversity and pluralism and globalisation, which facilitates contacts between immigrants and their countries of origin (Gans 1992, Glick-Schiller *et al*. 1995). Both of these factors make the development of bicultural or hybrid identities more likely (Crul & Vermeulen 2003). Consequently, settlement and return are no longer the only two options available for immigrants and transnationalism exists as a viable alternative to linear assimilation (Remennick 2002). In addition, ethnic and transnational communities may aid structural integration by providing either resources or an alternative to integrating into the mainstream (Faist 2000, Glick-Schiller *et al*. 1992).

In response to new patterns of immigration to the United States, Portes and his colleagues developed the theory of segmented assimilation, an alternative model that is based primarily on post-1965 immigrants. While the linear assimilation theory assumes that higher levels of integration in one dimension lead to higher levels of integration in other dimensions, segmented assimilation theory does not make this assumption. These scholars argue that the integration processes of immigrants have not always followed this linear pattern and that integration models must take into account the different starting positions of immigrants. Depending on their levels of human capital, immigrants may integrate into the mainstream, the underclass, or their own ethnic community. The ethnic community may promote social mobility by providing socio-economic opportunities, as well as resources for integrating into mainstream institutions (Portes 1999, Portes & Rumbaut 1996, 2001).

Bean, Stevens and Wierzbick (2003) argue that the relationship between socio-cultural and structural aspects of integration is not sequential as implied in linear assimilation theory, but rather involves multiple contingencies and dynamic interplays. Brown and Bean (2006) propose three possible identificational integration trajectories based on the relationship between racial/ethnic self-identification and socio-economic status: 1) reactive identity, which involves becoming more racial/ethnic as a result of experiencing discrimination; 2) symbolic identity, which involves becoming more prominently but superficially racial/ethnic as a result of achieving success; or 3) selective identity, whereby individuals become more racial/ethnic in some ways in order to facilitate economic achievement. In general, these studies argue that the relationship between socio-economic and identification integration is curvilinear. Ethnic identification is strongest among those of either the lowest or the highest social class. While reactive ethnicity is most likely to arise among those in the lower class, the highest classes have the most interest in their socio-cultural heritage and the greatest freedom to assume an ethnic identity without fear of discrimination. The working and middle classes generally stand to gain the most from assimilation and might therefore shed much of their ethnic identity.

Moreover, scholars have begun to reach a consensus that progress in one dimension of integration may not be correlated with progress in other dimensions, and that integration among the second generation may take a variety of forms (Thomson & Crul 2007: 4). While these theoretical foundations

are useful, ethnic Russians in Estonia are not immigrants in the traditional sense. Most ethnic Russians migrated to the Estonian territory during the 1950s and 1960s, when Estonia was part of the Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, ethnic Russians living in Estonia became a minority as a result of border changes and, therefore, cannot be considered voluntary immigrants. While during the 1990s, 110 000 Russian-speakers (18% of the population of Russian speakers living in Estonia in 1989) chose to return to Russia through Moscow's repatriation policies, many ethnic Russians chose to remain in Estonia as a result of superior socio-economic conditions and opportunities (Hallik 2010: 10). Consequently, this article uses traditional theories of integration to illuminate processes taking place in Estonian society, however, in the Estonian case we are talking about the integration of an ethnic minority as opposed to the integration of immigrants in the traditional sense. The fact that ethnic Russians in Estonia are not traditional immigrants has raised a number of challenges for the Estonian elite, as well as debates in Estonian society regarding the rights of ethnic Russians as a minority. Most ethnic Russians, aside form the Old Believer community who settled around Lake Peipsi in the end of 17th century, are not considered a national or historic minority, but treated as immigrants under Estonian law.

When Estonia regained its independence in 1991, the Estonian elite adopted a restorationist approach to the state, which reinstated the Citizenship Act of 1938. The 1992 Citizenship Act granted automatic citizenship to all those who were Estonian citizens before June 16, 1940, and their descendants. Estonian citizenship is acquired by birth if at least one parent holds Estonian citizenship. Roughly two-thirds of the 1,5 million Estonian inhabitants were restored Estonian citizenship in 1992. All others were forced to naturalise. Persons desiring Estonian citizenship must pass two examinations: the Estonian Language examination and the examination on the knowledge of the Constitution of the Republic of Estonia and the Citizenship Act. In addition, they must take an oath of loyalty. In the early 1990s, these examinations were a significant barrier to naturalisation due to poor Estonian language skills among non-Estonians, and this remains a significant obstacle to naturalisation today. As a result, Estonia has a large number of stateless persons or persons with undetermined citizenship as well as a significant number of those with Russian citizenship[4]. Since 1992, a total of 152 205 persons have acquired Estonian citizenship through the naturalisation process[5].

Empirical data, methods and variables

The empirical analysis is based on the survey data on second generation Russians gathered as a part of the international research project 'The Integration of the European Second Generation' (TIES)[6]. The target group consists of second generation Russians aged 18-35 who were born in Estonia, with at least one parent born outside of Estonia, and a comparison group of Estonians of the same age[7]. The survey was designed to measure the integration of second generation immigrants across the four

4 As of February 1, 2011, 15,8% of the total population of 1 365 118 is Estonian residents without Estonian citizenship. 97 080 or 7,1% of the whole population is residents with undetermined citizenship and 118 212 or 8,7% of the whole population is residents with the citizenship of another state. Among the latter, the biggest group is composed of citizens of the Russian Federation (95 570). Source: Population Register, Ministry of the Interior, published at: http://estonia.eu/about-estonia/society/citizenship.html.

5 Source: the statistics published at the webpage of Police and Border Guard, available at: http://www.politsei.ee/dotAsset/163198.pdf.

6 TIES is a collaborative and comparative research project on the descendants of immigrants from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia and Morocco who live in major cities in eight European countries (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland). For more about TIES: http://www.tiesproject.eu/.

7 Additional sampling criterion included ethnic self-identification respectively as Russian or Estonian.

dimensions of integration (structural, cultural, social, and identificational)[8]. This article investigates the relationships between these four dimensions among Russian respondents. The analysis proceeds in two steps for determining the relationship between structural integration and other dimensions. First, a hierarchical cluster analysis is used to divide the respondents into groups based on various indicators of structural integration. The clusters are formed using the chi-square method for computing the degree of similarity/distance between respondents as well as a within-group-linkage method for placing each respondent into a cluster according their degree of similarity to other respondents. Respondents located in the same cluster exhibit similar levels of structural integration as other respondents in the same cluster and dissimilar levels with respondents located in other clusters. This method returns the most homogenous groups of cases, which enables these clusters to be categorised as ideal types. This analysis produced three clusters: a most structurally integrated group, a somewhat structurally integrated group and a least structurally integrated group. These clusters are then used to map the relationship between structural integration and the other dimensions of integration. ANOVA and F-tests are used to determine whether the statistical indicators of cultural, social, and identificational integration vary significantly across the three clusters. Finally, bivariate correlation analysis is used to examine the relationships between cultural, social and identificational dimensions.

Structural integration

Structural integration is operationalised using three variables: the highest completed level of education, labour market positioning (employment status and occupational category), and legal status. Both access to higher education and access to higher occupational positions influence many other aspects of labour market integration, including income, prestige and job security, as well as other facets of structural integration, such as, participation in welfare and housing systems (Lindemann 2011, Kalter *et al*. 2007).

Educational attainment is measured in terms of the highest level of education achieved. The highest level of education reported by the respondents is coded into a five-category variable, which in addition to differentiating between primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education, also makes a distinction between vocational education acquired after basic education and the completion of vocational education after secondary education[9]. The five levels of education are: 1) basic education or less (primary education, basic education and vocational education acquired together with basic education); 2) vocational secondary education (vocational education and professional secondary education both acquired after basic education); 3) general secondary education; 4) vocational education based on secondary education (vocational education and professional education both acquired after secondary education); 5) higher education (professional higher education, and Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees).

8 The method used for survey data collection was face-to-face interviews at the respondent's home in the respondent's mother tongue. In total, 1000 interviews (488 with Estonian youth and 512 with Russian youth) were conducted in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve. For more about the methodological background of the TIES survey in Estonia see Nimmerfeldt 2008a.

9 In the Estonian education system, primary and lower secondary education are not differentiated. They form the basic level of education with nine grades. After ninth grade, the educational system divides into three tracks: general secondary education, vocational secondary education and vocational training as a continuation of basic education. Until 1999, students could also choose secondary specialised education (professional secondary education). Students from all three tracks can compete for admission to higher education, including universities and institutions of professional or vocational higher education, or they can pursue post- secondary vocational education. In reality, the chances to continue studies at the tertiary level, which includes professional higher education and academic higher education are much lower for students who have not completed general secondary education, because admission to higher education institutions is based on scores obtained on the national examination. In general, the national examination scores are lower for vocational school graduates compared to graduates from general secondary schools (Lindemann & Saar 2011: 59-62).

Labour market integration is measured through an aggregate variable consisting of the employment status and current occupational position of the respondent. Respondents fall into two employment status categories: those who are active in the labour market and those who are not. The latter are divided into three subcategories: those who are unemployed, those who are still studying, and those who are on parental leave. The sample includes only those who have completed their education. Respondents who are employed are divided into four categories according to their occupational status based on their current job: 1) professionals (i.e. managerial, professional and specialist positions); 2) service workers (i.e. clerks); 3) skilled workers; and 4) unskilled workers (i.e. operators and labourers)[10].

Legal integration is operationalised through both the current citizenship status of the respondent and the way Estonian citizenship is acquired, resulting in four citizenship status categories: 1) Estonian citizenship by naturalisation; 2) Estonian citizenship by birth; 3) Russian citizenship; and 4) persons without any citizenship[11].

Cultural integration

The most commonly used measurement of cultural integration is titular language knowledge. The TIES survey measures titular language skills along four dimensions (understanding, communicating, reading and writing). Respondents are asked to evaluate their skills on along these dimensions on a 6-point scale ranging from 'excellent' to 'very bad'. The analysis is run using a language proficiency index that is a composite of these four dimensions. At the extremes, respondents who indicate excellent Estonian language skills across all four dimensions are assigned a score of 4, whereas those who indicate very bad Estonian language skills across all four dimensions are assigned a score of twenty-four.

Social integration

Two indicators of social integration are used. The first is the number of current friends with Estonian ethnicity coded along a five point scale: 1) none; 2) very few; 3) some; 4) many; and 5) most. The second indicator is a sum index computed on the basis of three questions regarding the ethnicity of the respondent's first, second and third best friend resulting in a four category variable of best friends' ethnicity: 1) no best friends of Estonian ethnicity; 2) one out of three best friends is Estonian; 3) two out of three best friends are Estonian; and 4) all three best friends are Estonian.

Identificational integration

The sense of belonging to Estonia is measured by a block of seven statements about emotional attachment to Estonia, feelings of membership in Estonian society and feelings of closeness and connection with the majority group. An index was created based on agreement with the following statements: 1) 'I love Estonia'; 2) 'I feel unwelcome in this country'; 3) 'I consider Estonia my homeland'; 4) 'I would gladly leave Estonia and settle elsewhere'; 5) 'I feel that I am part of Estonian society'; 6) 'I am proud of the achievements of Estonians'; 7) 'I have nothing in common with Estonians'. The respondents expressed their agreement with the statements on five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'[12].

---

10 The answers given to the open-ended question were recoded according to the International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (ISEI) based on the ISCO-88 scale.

11 Due to the small size of the group with citizenship of countries other than Russia or Estonia (2,6 per cent), they are excluded from analysis.

12 For composing the index, all the statements were recoded so that the smallest value indicates the weakest identification and the scales for three items (b, d, and g) were reversed (Cronbach's Alpha = .830).

The second aspect of identificational integration, the sense of belonging to and identification with the country of origin and co-ethnics living there, is measured using different items. As these items do not have similar measurement scales, it is not possible to compose an aggregate variable. Connection with Russians in Russia is measured by the statement, 'I have nothing in common with the Russians living in Russia'. Identification with Russians living in Russia was also measured by nominal self-categorisation on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 'very strongly' to 'not at all'.

Attachment to Russia is measured through three questions: 'I consider Russia my homeland'; 'How strongly connected with Russia do you feel?' and 'Do you intend to live in Russia in the future for a period of one year or longer?' The first indicator is measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. The second indicator is measured by a six-point Likert scale ranging from 'very strongly' to 'not at all', and the final item by four categories : 1) certainly not, 2) possibly, 3) likely, 4) certainly yes.

The sense of belonging to and identification with one's ethno-cultural group or ethnic identity is measured through five statements about ethnic pride, attachment to the group, and the importance of cultural practices. The five statements measuring the strength of ethnic identity are: 1) 'Being a Russian is an important part of myself'; 2) 'I see myself as a real Russian'; 3) 'When somebody says something bad about Russians I feel personally offended'; 4) 'I often wish to conceal the fact that I am a Russian'; 5) 'It is important to me to know Russian history, culture, customs and traditions'. These statements use a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Based on these statements, a summation index was composed.

Results of the analysis

The hierarchical cluster analysis produced three groups of respondents according to their level of structural integration. These groups are presented in Table 1. The first group, the 'least structurally integrated' has the highest percentage of respondents with basic education and vocational secondary education and the lowest percentage with higher education. None of the respondents are managers or professionals and this group has the highest share of unskilled workers and unemployed persons. Finally, this group has the highest percentage of people without citizenship and the lowest share of those with Estonian citizenship. This group is rather large, consisting of nearly one third of the sample. The third group, the 'most structurally integrated', has the highest percentage of persons with higher education, the highest percentage of managers and professionals, and also the highest percentage of Estonian citizens. Among Estonian citizens, this group has the highest percentage of persons who obtained Estonian citizenship by naturalisation, indicating a certain level of cultural integration or proficiency in Estonian. This is the smallest group. The final group, the 'somewhat structurally integrated' is the largest group and is characterised by a medium level of education and occupational position. In addition, the percentage of Estonian citizens in this category falls between the other two groups.

The analysis of the differences in the means of integration dimensions across the clusters reveals that cultural integration is significantly related to the structural dimension of integration. Self-evaluated proficiency in the Estonian language is highest in the 'most structurally integrated' group and the lowest in the 'least structurally integrated' group (Table 2). Social integration is not significantly related to the level of structural integration based on the difference in the means for friendships. The only aspect of identificational integration that is significantly related to structural integration is diasporic identity. Two of the statements included as the indicators of connection to the country of origin and to co-ethnics living there show significant differences in the levels of agreement across the three clusters. In the 'least structurally integrated' group, there was stronger agreement with the statement 'I consider Russia my homeland' than in the other groups. Similarly, the sense of belonging to category 'Russians in Russia' is stronger among the respondents belonging to the 'least

Table 1: Structural integration cluster profiles (column %)

Variables included in the cluster analysis	Clusters based on structural integration indicators		
	Least Integrated	Somewhat Integrated	Most Integrated
Highest completed level of education			
Basic education or less	29	6	0
Vocational secondary education	47	36	8
General secondary education	17	23	7
Vocational education based on secondary education	6	23	20
Higher education	1	13	64
Employment status and occupational group			
Professionals	0	2	66
Service workers	8	37	32
Skilled workers	17	34	2
Unskilled workers	17	11	0
On parental leave	36	17	0
Unemployed	23	0	0
Citizenship status			
Without citizenship	62	30	17
Russian citizenship	10	8	8
Estonian citizenship by naturalisation	12	32	53
Estonian citizenship by birth	16	30	22
N	114	132	59

Source: authors' calculations, TIES

Table 2: Mean values of cultural, social and identificational integration indicators across structural integration groups

	Clusters based on structural integration indicators		
	Least integrated	Somewhat integrated	Most integrated
Cultural integration			
Proficiency in Estonian*	14,90	13,14	10,59
Social integration			
Best friends' ethnicity	0,36	0,43	0,42
Estonians among current friends	1,89	1,98	2,04
Identificational integration			
Sense of belonging to Estonia	25,43	26,08	27,03
I have nothing in common with the Russians living in Russia	2,39	2,72	2,59
I consider Russia my homeland*	3,48	3,83	3,88
To what extent do you feel yourself: Russians in Russia*	4,06	4,67	4,62
How strongly connected with Russia do you feel?	3,42	3,29	3,66
Do you intend to live in Russia in the future for a period of one year or longer?	1,28	1,15	1,23
Ethnic identity	20,33	19,56	19,79

* significant at $p<0.05$

Source: authors' calculations, TIES

Table 3: Correlations between indicators of cultural, social and identificational integration (Pearson Correlation coefficients)

		Cultural integration	**Social integration**	
		Proficiency in Estonian	Best friends' ethnicity	Estonians among current friends
Cultural integration	Proficiency in Estonian	1,00	-0,11*	-0,23*
Identificational integration	- Sense of belonging to Estonia	-0,24*	0,15*	0,26*
	- I have nothing in common with the Russians living in Russia	-0,08	0,14*	0,16*
	- I consider Russia my homeland	-0,19*	0,03	0,06
	- To what extent do you feel belonging to Russians in Russia	-0,16*	-0,09	0,06
	- How strongly connected with Russia do you feel?	0,08	-0,11*	-0,09
	- Do you intend to live in Russia in the future for a period of one year or longer?	0,13*	-0,07	0,04
	- Ethnic identity	0,13*	-0,13*	-0,05

* significant at p<0.05
Source: authors' calculations, TIES

structurally integrated' group (Table 2). It is noteworthy that the differences in these two indicators between the 'most structurally integrated' and 'somewhat structurally integrated' groups are small, but the difference between the 'least structurally integrated' and the other two groups is quite large.

Table 3 presents the results of the bivariate correlation analysis between cultural, social and identificational integration dimensions. Proficiency in Estonian is positively correlated with the number of Estonian friends. All of the aspects of identificational integration are significantly correlated with at least some of the indicators of social and cultural integration. While the indicators of diasporic identity are either significantly correlated with either proficiency in Estonian or with indicators of social integration, both ethnic identity and the sense of belonging to Estonia are significantly correlated to both cultural and social integration indicators. Respondents who feel that they have nothing in common with 'Russians in Russia' are likely to have better Estonian language skills and a relatively higher number of Estonian best friends. Positive responses to the statement, 'I consider Russia my homeland', are negatively correlated with a positive assessment of Estonian language proficiency. Surprisingly, proficiency in the Estonian language is not related to respondents' intentions to live in Russia in the future. Respondents with a strong sense of belonging to Estonia also have a good command of the Estonian language and a relatively high number of ethnic Estonians friends among both their best friends and current friends. Respondents who have a weak Russian ethnic identity evaluate their Estonian language proficiency positively and also have more Estonian friends.

Conclusions

The results of this analysis cast doubt on the applicability of the linear assimilation model to the patterns of integration among second generation Russians in Estonia. While there is a connection between cultural and structural integration, which is predicted by linear assimilation theory, there is

no significant relationship between structural integration and social or identificational integration. While being structurally integrated does seem to require a certain degree of cultural integration, particularly Estonian language proficiency, this has not lead to a higher degree of social integration, as measured by friendships with the ethnic majority members, or to a greater sense of belonging to Estonian society among the more integrated groups of respondents. Ethnic identity also does not vary significantly across the three structural integration groups.

The relationship between structural and cultural integration might be explained by the fact that knowledge of Estonian is a prerequisite for social mobility in Estonian society. The 'most structurally integrated' group has the highest percentage of persons with higher education degrees. As a result of Estonian education and language laws, higher education is available publicly only in the Estonian language. In addition, this group had the highest percentage of Estonian citizens who obtained citizenship through naturalisation, which includes citizenship and language examinations. Finally, the 1999 Estonian language law allows for the regulation of language not only in the public realm, but also in private enterprises that are determined to be in the 'justified public interest'. Consequently, the link between structural and cultural integration is explained by the emphasis placed on language proficiency in both the public and private sphere, as well as by the fact that language serves as a gatekeeper for citizenship.

Diasporic identification is also significantly related to structural integration. There are several possible explanations for this relationship. The first of these concerns the cultural requirements for citizenship. The 'least structurally integrated' group has the lowest level of Estonian language proficiency and the highest percentage of respondents with an undetermined citizenship status. Naturalisation requires knowledge of the Estonian language, the Constitution, and a loyalty oath. While there have been efforts to ease naturalisation requirements, language proficiency continues to be one of the main barriers to naturalisation. The relationship between diasporic identity and structural integration can, therefore, be explained through the cultural dimension of integration. Connections to Russia and to Russians in Russia were significantly stronger among respondents with poor Estonian language proficiency and among noncitizens, and therefore, diasporic identity might be an alternative to what is viewed as a difficult naturalisation process. Previous studies have argued that Russians view the exclusive nature of citizenship policies as offensive and feel that the process of naturalisation is humiliating (Nimmerfeldt 2008b, Vetik 2010). Disinterest in naturalising might also be explained by feeling rejected by the resident country and the majority group (Kurthen 1995:932). Finally, the retention of undetermined citizenship status could be due to practical reasons, such as the fact that it is easier for persons without Estonian citizenship to travel to Russia.

The bivariate analysis reveals that language proficiency is also related to both social and identificational integration. Russians with better Estonian language skills have more Estonian friends and feel a stronger sense of belonging to Estonia, a weaker connection to Russia and Russians living in Russia, and a weaker ethnic identity. Social and identificational integration are also related in a predicted way. Among those who have Estonian friends, the sense of belonging to Estonia is stronger and connections to Russia and to Russians in Russia are weaker. The ethnic identity for those with Estonian friends also tends to be slightly weaker than for those without Estonian friends.

These results ultimately call linear assimilation theory into question in the Estonian case because structural integration does not necessarily lead to integration along social and identificational dimensions. One possible explanation is the unique citizenship situation in Estonia. The large number of Russians with undetermined citizenship may not be the result of a weak sense of belonging to the political community, but rather the result of either naturalisation policies or practical choices. The latter concerns such things as the ease of travelling to Russia or the fact that the lack of Estonian citizenship poses no problems for living in Estonia, especially for those residing in Tallinn or Ida-Virumaa (see Nimmerfeldt 2008b, Vetik 2010, Schulze & Nimmerfeldt 2011).

Another possible explanation for why integration in Estonia does not follow this model is the ethnic segmentation of Estonian society inherited from the Soviet period. During the Soviet era, there were parallel education systems based on the Estonian and Russian languages. Public and private schools at all levels, from pre-school to higher education, continue to provide education in the Russian language. However, in 2007 a new law was passed requiring minority language schools to transition to teaching 60 percent of subjects in the Estonian language. While the language of instruction in public higher education institutions is Estonian, it is also possible to continue studies in the Russian language in private higher education institutions (Lindemann & Saar 2011: 59-62). In addition, the economic and regional spheres are ethnically segmented. The majority of Russians are concentrated in Ida-Virumaa County, where the ethnic Estonian population is low, and in Tallinn (Sokolova 2011). Although there are significant numbers of both ethnic Estonians and ethnic Russians in Tallinn, neighbourhoods remain ethnically segregated (Ojamäe & Paadam 2011). As a result, Estonians and Russians are separated from one another both in the school system and later in the labour market. While Russians may achieve a higher occupational position within this segregated economy, they do not necessarily come into contact with ethnic Estonians in either their professional or private life.

Future research on second generation Russians in Estonia should test these variables in order to provide a definitive answer to why the linear assimilation model is not applicable to second generation Russians in Estonia. In addition, a more elaborated operationalisation of the cultural and social integration dimensions would shed greater light on the relationships between different dimensions. The strongest correlations exist between cultural integration and the other three dimensions; however, cultural integration is operationalised in this study and in the TIES data only by titular language proficiency. Other aspects of acculturation, such as traditions, customs, literature, and music might reveal different results. Social integration is operationalised through friendships. Intermarriage, which is often treated as the litmus test for social integration, could not be operationalised in the TIES data set as the ethnicity of the partner was not asked. Interethnic contacts could be measured in a more nuanced way, taking into account both frequency of contacts and the quality of these contacts, as relationships with partners, spouses, and friends imply a deeper relationship than those with schoolmates, colleagues and other acquaintances.

References

Alba, R. (1990). *Ethnic identity: The transformation of white America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Alba, R. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Integration*. Harvard University Press.

Alba, R. & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration, *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 826-874.

Alba, R. & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American Mainstream. Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barkan, E. R. (1995). Race, Religion, and Nationality in American Society: A Model of Ethnicity From Contact to Assimilation, *Journal of American Ethnic History* 14 (2): 38-101.

Bean, F. D., Stevens, G. & Wierzbick, K. (2003). The New Immigrants and Theories in Incorporation, in F. D. Bean & G. Stevens (eds), *America's Newcomers: Immigrant Incorporation and the Dynamics of Diversity* (94-113). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation, *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46(1): 5-68.

Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29(6): 697-712.

Bosswick,W. & Heckmann, F. (2006). *Integration of migrants: Contribution on local and regional authorities. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working. Conditions*. Available at http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/22/en/1/ef0622en.pdf, accessed at 10.09.2010

Brown, S. K. & Bean, F. D. (2006). New Immigrants, New Models of Assimilation, *Special issue on 'The Second Generation', Migration Information Source*, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, DC.

Buijs, F. J. & Rath, J (2006). *Muslims in Europe: The State of Research*. IMISCOE Working Paper.

Castles, S. & Miller. M. (1993). *The Age of Migration. International Population. Movements in the Modern World*, New York.

Cornelius, W. A., Martin, P. L. & Hollifield, J. F. (eds) (1994). *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Crul, M. & Schneider, J. (2010). Comparative Integration Context Theory: Participation and Belonging in New Diverse European Cities, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 33, (7): 1249-1268.

Crul, M. & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The Second Generation in Europe. Introduction, *International Migration Review* 7(4): 965-986.

Esser, H. (2000). *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen*. Band 2: Die Konstruktion der Gesellschaft. Frankfurt-New York: Campus.

Faist, T. (2000). *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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.

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

Gans, H. A. (1992). Second generation decline: scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of the post-1965 American immigrants, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2): 173-192.

Gibson, M. A. (2001). Immigrant adaptation and patterns of acculturation, *Human Development* 44: 19-23.

Glazer, N. (1993). Is Assimilation Dead?, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 122-136.

Glick-Schiller, Basch, Blanc-Szanton (1995). From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration, *Anthropology Quarterly* 68(1): 48-63.

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

Hallik, K. (2010). *Koos pole lihtne aga eraldi ei saa* [It's not easy to live together, but it's not possible to live separately]. Tallinn: Tallinn University.

Heckmann (2006). Integration and Integration Policies. IMISCOE network feasibility study. Final paper of INTPOL team. EFMS. available at: http://www.efms.uni-bamberg.de/pdf/INTPOL%20Final%20Paper.pdf, accessed at 20.02.2011.

Heckmann, F. & Schnapper, D. (eds) (2003a). *The integration of immigrants in European societies: National differences and trends of convergence*. Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius.

Heckmann, F. & Schnapper, D. (2003b). Introduction, in F. Heckmann, D. Schnapper (eds), *The integration of immigrants in European societies: National differences and trends of convergence* (9-14). Stuttgart: Lucius and Lucius.

Heckmann, F., Lederer, H. W. & Worbs, S. (2001). *Effectiveness of National Integration Strategies towards Second Generation Migrant Youth in a Comparative European Perspective*. Final Report to the European Commision. Bamberg: EFMS.

Heitmeyer, W., Schröder, J. & Müller, H. (1997). *Verlockender Funda-mentalismus. Türkische Jugendlichen in Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Jandt, F. E. (1998). *Intercultural Communication: An Introduction*, Thousand Oaks, California; London: Sage.

Kalter, F., Granato, N. & Kristen, C (2007). Disentangling trends of the second generation's structural assimilation in Germany, in S. Scherer, R. Pollack, G. Otte & M. Gangl (eds), *From Origin to Destination: Trends and Mechanisms in Social Stratification Research* (214-245). Frankfurt and New York: Campus.

Kurthen, H. (1995). Germany at the Crossroads: National Identity and the Challenges of Immigration, *International Migration Review* 29(4): 914-938.

Lahav, G. (2004). *Immigration and Politics in the new Europe. Reinventing Borders*. Cambridge University Press.

Lindemann, K. & Saar, E. (2011). Ethnic inequalities in education, in R. Vetik, J. Helemäe (eds), *The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve: The TIES Study in Estonia* (57-89). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lindemann, K. (2011). Explaining different returns from human capital in labour market, in R. Vetik, J. Helemäe (eds), *The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve: The TIES Study in Estonia* (91-116). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Morowska, E. (1994). In Defence of the Assimilation Model, *Journal of American Ethnic History* 13(2): 76-87.

Nimmerfeldt, G. (2008a). Introduction, in *Integration of Second Generation Russians in Estonia. Country report on TIES survey in Estonia* (3-8). Tallinn: IISS. www.tiesproject.eu.

Nimmerfeldt, G. (2008b). Kodakondsus [Citizenship], in *Integratsiooni Monitooring 2008*. Aruanne [Integration of Estonian Society, Monitoring 2008. Report]. Tallinn: Riigikantselei/RASI [the State Chancellery/IISS]. Available at: www.rahvastikuminister.ee/?id=12051, accessed at 18.02.2009.

Nimmerfeldt, G. (2011). Sense of Belonging to Estonia, in R. Vetik and J. Helemäe (eds), *The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve* (201-224). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Ojamäe, L. & Paadam, K. (2011). Housing Conditions and Neighbourhood Satisfaction, in R. Vetik and J. Helemäe (eds), *The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve* (163-180). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Penninx, R. (2004). *Integration of Migrants: Economic, Social, Cultural and Political Dimensions*. Background Paper for the UNECE-Conference, January 12-14, 2004, Geneva. Available at: http://www.unece.org/pau/_docs/pau/2004/PAU_2004_EPF_BgDocPenninx.pdf, accessed at 03.12.2010

Penninx, R. & Martinelli, M. (2004). Integration processes and policies: State of the art and lessons, in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martinelli, M. & S. Vertovec (eds), *Citizenship in European cities: Immigrants, local politics and integration policies* (139-163). Aldershot: Ashgate.

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

Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K. & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-Being: An Interactional Perspective, *Journal of Social Issues* 57(3): 493-510.

Portes, A. & Bach, R. L. (1985). *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. University of California Press.

Portes, A. & Manning, R. (1986). The Immigrant Enclave: Theory and Empirical Examples, in J. Nagel & S. Olzak (eds), *Competitive Ethnic Relations* (47-68). Orlando: Academic Press.

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. (1999). Conclusion: towards a new world – the origin and effects of transnational activities, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 463-477.

Remennick, L. (2002). Transnational community in the making: Russian Jewish immigrants of the 1990s in Israel, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(3): 515-530.

Schulze, J. & Nimmerfeldt, G. (2011). The Language of Belonging. Second Generation Russians in Estonia. Paper presented at Association for the Studies of Nationalities Annual Conference, Columbia University, April 14-16 2011.

Sokolova, A. (2011). Migration Patterns, in R. Vetik and J. Helemäe (eds), *The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve* (25-36). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

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.

Vermeulen, H. & Penninx, R. (eds) (2000). *Immigrant Integration: The Dutch case*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Vetik, R. (2010). Kodakondsus ja kodakondsusetus [Citizenship and Denizenship], in *Integratsiooni Monitooring 2010. Aruanne* [Integration of Estonian Society, Monitoring 2010. Report]. Tallinn: Kultuuriministeerium/ RASI [Tallinn: Estonian Ministry of Culture/IISS].

Vihalemm, T. & Lauristin, M. (1997). Cultural Adjustment to the Changing Societal Environment: The Case of Russians in Estonia, in M. Lauristin, P. Vihalemm, K.-E. Rosengren & L. Weibull (eds), *Return to the Western World: Cultural and Political Perspectives on Estonian Post-Communist Transition* (279-298). Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Waldinger, R. (1996). From Ellis Island to LAX: Immigrant Prospects in the American City, *International Migration Review* 30(4): 1078 -1086.

Warner, W. L. & Srole, L. (1945). *The Social System of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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

Wiley, N. F. (1970). The Ethnic Mobility Trap and Stratification Theory, in P. I. Rose (ed.), *The Study of Society* (551-563). New York: The Free Press

Williams, J. A. & Ortega, S. T. (1990). Dimensions of Ethnic Assimilation: An Empirical Appraisal of Gordon's Typology, *Social Science Quarterly* 71(4): 697-710.

Wilson, K. L. & Portes, A. (1980). Immigrant Enclaves: A Comparison of the Cuban and Black Economies in Miami, *American Journal of Sociology* 8: 295-319.

Gerli Nimmerfeldt is a researcher at Tallinn University, currently working at the Institute of International and Social Studies and at the Institute of Political Science and Governance. Her main research interests are related to the socio-cultural integration of minority youth and the identity building processes. Recent publications include: Nimmerfeldt, G. (2011). Identificational Integration: Conceptualisation and Operationalisation on the Example of Second Generation Russians in Estonia. Tallinn: Tallinn University Dissertations on Social Sciences; Nimmerfeldt, G. (2011). Sense of belonging to Estonia, in R. Vetik and J. Helemäe (eds) The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve (201-224). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Jennie Schulze is an Assistant Professor of Comparative Politics at Duquesne University. Her research concerns the influence of European institutions and Russia's activism on the process of minority policy formation in the Baltic States, as well as the theoretical importance of minority rights norms and minority integration for democratic consolidation in Eastern Europe. Schulze, J. (2011). Interethnic Relations: Contact and Crisis, in R. Vetik & J. Helemäe (eds) The Russian Second Generation in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve (165-182). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press; Schulze, J.L. (2010). Estonia Caught between East and West: EU Conditionality, Russia's Activism, and Minority Integration, Nationalities Papers 38(3): 361-392.

In terms of education, **Marti Taru** has a background in sociology and political science. He has been employed at Tallinn University since 2002. In recent years, Marti Taru has conducted research on intercultural integration, themes related to youth, youth work and youth policy.

Acknowledgements:
The authors would like to thank Kristina Lindemann from the Institute of International and Social Studies at Tallinn University for her help with coding the variables measuring occupational position and highest educational level completed.