Identities and integration in the context of ethnic migration

A longitudinal, multi-pronged approach to studying Ingrian-Finnish migrants

I. Jasinskaja-Lahti*, T. A. Mähönen, S. Varjonen, L. Arnold, A. Yijälä & K. Jurva

This paper presents some of the key results of the INPRES ("Intervening at the pre-migration stage: Providing tools for promoting integration and adaptation") research project concerning identity and integration of Ingrian Finns migrating from Russia to Finland. Conducted at the University of Helsinki between 2008 and 2011, the aim of the research project was to investigate the factors involved in these migrants' integration processes over the course of the migration process, starting before they move to Finland. The project also aimed to provide research-based tools to promote integration and positive intergroup relations. In this paper, we discuss our findings that concern the complexity of identities and how they are constructed and change based on context. The role of identities in the formation of acculturation orientations, and anticipated and actual intergroup relations are also discussed. The results presented are derived from our most recent INPRES publications and ongoing work.

Key words: ethnic (re)migration, identity, acculturation, intergroup relations

Avainsanat: paluumuutto, identiteetti, akkulturaatio, ryhmienväliset suhteet

Background

Finland has one of the smallest proportions of people of immigrant background in Europe, with foreign citizens constituting only 3.2 per cent of the total population in 2010. The biggest and the most rapidly growing immigrant group in the Finnish context is that of Russian-speaking immigrants from Russia and other parts of the former Soviet Union (FSU), which make up about one third (i.e., approximately 55,000) of the total immigrant population in Finland (Statistics Finland 2010.)

An influx of voluntary migrants is important for Finland because of the country's great need for labour; like most European countries, Finland faces an aging population. Until recently, the policy has been to meet labour needs domestically or through the return migration of former nationals and their descendants – which makes the Finnish context different from that of the other Nordic countries (Valtonen 2001). The biggest group of ethnic migrants are Ingrian Finns, who are mainly the descendants of Finns who emigrated from Finland between the 17th and the beginning of the 20th century to rural Ingria (located between St. Petersburg and the Gulf of Finland). The main reason for this wave of emigration was Sweden's interest in replacing the Orthodox population with Lutherans in the Ingrian area, which was transferred from Russia to Sweden in the Stolbova Peace Agreement in 1617. In addition to this main wave, two smaller groups of Finnish remigrants consist of the descendants of Finns emigrating from Finland to the FSU territory during the 1920s and 1930s and after the World War II (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti 2000).

During and after World War II, many Ingrian Finns were relocated around the FSU, which led to ethnic persecution and dispersion, nationally mixed marriages, and often also monolingualism in the Russian language. For decades, people with Finnish roots in Russia were isolated from contemporary Finnish society. The political opening of the Soviet Union at the end of the 1980s, and finally its collapse in the early 1990s, allowed people with Finnish roots living in Russia to (re)discover their Finnishness (see e.g., Davydova & Heikkinen 2004).

*Corresponding author: Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti (PhD) is a Professor of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

Ethnic migration from the FSU to Finland officially began in 1990, when people of Finnish descent, as well as their relatives, were given the right to apply for Finnish repatriate status in order to migrate to Finland. In order to get repatriate status, applicants must satisfy certain selection criteria including proof of their Finnish ethnic background. In addition, they must demonstrate sufficient Finnish language competence in an official language test. They can prepare for this test by attending an immigration training program in Russia that includes courses on Finnish language and culture. Due to the long waiting list and problems with finding housing in Finland, potential migrants have typically had to wait years (up to 15 years) in Russia before migration. Consequently, potential Ingrian-Finnish ethnic migrants start preparing themselves for future migration and rediscovering their Finnish identity long before they actually cross the Finnish border. It should be noted that while the remigration of Ingrian Finns has represented a large source of migrants to Finland since the 1990s, in 2011, Finnish authorities decided to close the queue for ethnic remigration and apply the same immigration criteria for ethnic migrants as those used for labour migrants. Approximately 30,000 Ingrian-Finnish ethnic migrants have moved to Finland since 1990 and the approximately 10,000 registered potential ethnic migrants (including their family members) that are still residing in Russia have five years left to apply for repatriate status (Finnish Immigration Service 2011).

Previous studies on Ingrian Finns have demonstrated that the integration of these migrants into Finnish society has been challenging. As in the case of migrants from the FSU to other countries of remigration, such as Germany and Israel (Heleniak 2006), the problems encountered by Ingrian-Finnish migrants often involve a lack of human or material resources. Despite their partly Finnish background (and in the case of the older migrants, Lutheran religion) which make them culturally similar to national Finns, they are often monolingual in Russian, do not have corresponding professional qualifications to the Finnish system and typically have linguistically closed social networks, which prevents them from functioning as full members of the society and predisposes them to constant experiences of ethnic discrimination (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Perhoniemi, 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim 2009). As such, the Finnishness of Ingrian Finns is largely questioned by the national majority group (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz 2003; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Jaakkola, & Reuter 2006).

These migrants are also targets of relatively negative attitudes and, as Russian speakers and moving from FSU/Russia, they are almost unanimously considered to be ethnically Russian by the Finnish majority population, which places them among the least welcome immigrants together with the Somalis and the Arabs (Jaakkola 2005). Such experiences have been shown to be unexpected by these ethnic migrants who view themselves as being at least partly "Finnish" either because they consider themselves to be so or because they have been defined as such by others prior to their move to Finland (Jasinskaja-Lahti 2000). So, despite the assumption of similarities between Ingrian-Finnish migrants and the Finnish majority population – which clearly underlies the Finnish remigration policy and, as we argue, is visible in the expectations and identity constructions of Ingrian Finns, the reality is much more complex. This highlights the contextual nature of identities and urges us to take a close look at not just what happens after migration, but also the pre-migration context (see also Davydova & Heikkinen 2004).

The INPRES project

To study the migration and integration processes of Ingrian-Finnish ethnic migrants moving to Finland, the four-year INPRES project was designed and carried out at the Unit of Social Psychology of the University of Helsinki between 2008 and 2011. The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (Grant No 1123297). One of the main focuses of the project was on the identity formation and construction as well as identity change undergone by ethnic migrants over the course of their migration process from Russia to Finland. Both the pre-migration and post-migration stages have been taken into account and two distinct lines of psychological research on identity were used: cognitive and developmental psychological approaches to identity formation and change (e.g., social identity theory and acculturation psychology), and a social constructionist approach to identity as a social action (e.g., discursive social psychology). Such a research design has rarely has been employed in previous research on voluntary/ethnic migrants.

Participants

Participants of the INPRES research project were recruited, at the pre-migration stage in Russia during spring 2008, through Finnish language courses organized by the Finnish authorities for potential migrants as part of their immigration training. Survey respondents were asked to take additional questionnaires home to be filled in by their spouses or other relatives who were also planning to move to Finland. In addition to the people taking part in the language training, the questionnaire was sent to those potential migrants who had already passed the language test and were in the last phase of the pre-migration process that is, waiting to be officially granted a place of residence in Finland.

Two follow-up survey data were collected between 2009 and 2011 from those participants of the pre-migration stage who had migrated to Finland. These participants were tracked using the Finnish population register. While several measures were used in both stages, the pre-migration survey mainly concerned migrants' expectations and the post-migration survey focused on migrants' experiences of living in Finland.

Along with the quantitative survey study, four semi-structured focus groups were conducted at the pre-migration stage in Russia in 2008, with one session in Petrozavodsk and three sessions in St. Petersburg. Focus group participants were recruited from those who answered the survey during the pre-migration training programme. In total, there were 26 interviewees with six to seven in each group at the pre-migration stage. In 2010, three follow-up sessions were conducted in Helsinki with 11 of the original participants in all (three to five participants in each focus group). The focus group sessions were conducted in Russian, by the first author, who is a native Russian speaker.

Results

In the INPRES study, we placed emphasis on context, time and reciprocity in terms of how identities are formed and produced during the migration process. Specifically, we have argued for the need to study the migration and integration process in general – and identities in particular – starting from the pre-migra-

tion stage, which has been generally neglected in research on voluntary migrants. The multiple (Russian, Ingrian-Finnish and national Finnish) identities of migrants were approached through a focus on self- versus other-ascribed identities and identity changes. In the next section, we present our results in terms of three theoretical traditions used in the INPRES project to study identity and integration. Each of these – namely the acculturation, social identity, and discursive approaches – is characterized by different theoretical and methodological tools to address the complex phenomenon of migrant identity. In the INPRES project, these approaches have been used separately as well as concurrently to formulate the specific research questions of the study and explain findings. This was done to further develop the separate lines of research on identity in the context of migration, as well as to gain a dynamic and complex understanding of the migration and integration processes as experienced and constructed by ethnic migrants.

Identities over the course of the migration process: Applying social identity, discursive and acculturation approaches

In social psychological research on immigrant integration, the social identity approach has been the basis of much of the quantitative research on ethnic and national identities (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2009; Verkuyten 2007). In this field of research, migrant's ethnic and national identities are seen as parts of their social identity and defined as a person's self-concept as a member of an ethnic/national group. For multiethnic or multiply identified people such as ethnic migrants in this study, there is not an obvious single ingroup or outgroup. In fact, multiply identified individuals can claim membership in two or more groups, but are sometimes not accepted by others as a member of either. The challenge faced by these individuals is not only to balance the importance of two or more distinct identities, but rather to integrate or otherwise manage multiple potentially conflicting, but often also enriching, identities (Phinney & Alipuria 2006). From the perspective of acculturation research, which has also investigated matters of identity among immigrants, cultural contact between two or more groups leads to changes within cultures and individuals. In

particular, the notion of psychological acculturation refers to changes an individual experiences as a result of being in contact with other cultures, and as a result of the group-level acculturation that one's cultural or ethnic group is undergoing (Graves 1967). From this approach ethnic identity is particularly meaningful when people from different ethnic groups are in contact with each other, and it has been shown to be especially important for ethnic minorities (Phinney 2001). In the acculturation research tradition, ethnic identity has typically referred to a person's ethnic identification, feelings of belonging and commitment to one's own ethnic group, attitudes towards own ethnic group, and a feeling about shared values (Phinney 1990; 1996). Thus, what separates ethnic identity from other social identities is the shared thought of imagined or real common origin and ancestry (Verkuyten 2005).

According to our quantitative findings presented in four articles (i.e., Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2011; Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahti, in press; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Mähönen, & Ketokivi, submitted; Yijälä & Jasinkaja-Lahti, 2010), participants highly identified with both cultural groups, Russians and (Ingrian) Finns, in the pre-migration stage, with the Ingrian-Finnish identification being slightly more pronounced than Russian identification. These results refer to bicultural or alternatively more complex identity structures among the ethnic migrants studied and support our previous study (Jasinskaja-Lahti & Liebkind 1999) showing that among newly immigrated adolescents from Russia to Finland, particularly Finnish identity was accentuated at the expense of their Russian identity.

Also based on the discursive analysis of focus group data (Varjonen, Arnold, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2009, submitted), participants constructed a predominantly Finnish identity for themselves at the pre-migration stage. In the discursive approach, the assumptions regarding cognitive processes are put aside and the research object is approached on the level of language use, which again is treated as social action. This means that the use of language is seen, consciously or unconsciously, as action-oriented and serving different kind of social functions (e.g., Burr 2003). In other words, the focus is on what people "do" in their talk and how they do it. As such, discursive psychology is not interested in whether language use reflects some underlying attitude or feeling (see e.g., Wiggins & Potter 2007, Potter & Wetherell 1987; Potter 2003).

Discursive psychology, although often presented and used as an alternative approach to the study of psychological matters, is not oppositional to more traditional cognitive approaches used to study acculturation and ethnic identity in social psychology. These two approaches can be seen as focusing on different analytical levels, thus complimenting each other to better address questions of ethnic identity as a social phenomenon (Verkuyten 2005).

In our pre-migration focus group data, the category of Ingrian Finns was rarely used by the participants; rather, the key categories used in identity negotiations were Finns and Russians. Finnish identity was built by, for example, referring to Finnish mental characteristics, such as honesty. Similarly to the results of the Davydova and Heikkila's (2004) pre-migration study among the same population, in this study, these kind of identity constructions were often built using a fairly deterministic biological discourse, in which Finnish characteristics where explained as a result of Finnish blood and genes. Thus, as a biological fact Finnishness was constructed as something that cannot be taken away, an inner resource that does not disappear even after living many generations in Russia. Reducing Finnishness to couple of key characteristics, such as honesty, that all Finns are supposed to share, makes it possible for an individual to claim a Finnish identity on the basis of that key defining feature. In our study, Finnishness was also described in opposition to Russian characteristics, thus creating strong borders between Russians and Finnish. These identity constructions can be seen to serve to explain and justify the decision to migrate to Finland, as well as underline the internal homogenity of all Finns, regardless of where they might live. In this way, as a carrier of Finnish character the future integration to Finland was oriented to as an easy and positive experience. However, our analysis also showed how some participants discursively oriented towards being treated as Russians in Finland portraying this future prospect as an inevitable, shared destiny of all ethnic migrants.

One interest in the INPRES project was the process of pre-acculturation and the pre-migration acculturation orientations of Ingrian-Finnish migrants and their families, as well as the role of migrants' perceptions of future hosts' acculturation preferences in influencing the formation of these orientations. As described in Yijälä & Jasinskaja-Lahti (2010), pre-acculturation

can be considered as the first stage of the acculturation process, consisting of a variety of social, psychological and cultural characteristics as well as changes that follow the migrant's pre-migration contact experiences and preparation for the migration process. Following Berry and associates' model of acculturation orientations (e.g., Berry 1990; Berry, Phinney, Sam & Vedder 2006; Berry 1997), immigrants must confront two basic issues: the desire to maintain their original culture in the new country and the desire to be in contact with members of the host society. Based on these dimensions, four distinct acculturation orientations (also called as acculturation options, attitudes or strategies) can be formed: integration (i.e., orientation towards both heritage and new culture), assimilation (i.e., orientation towards new culture), separation (i.e., orientation towards heritage culture) and marginalization (i.e., detachment from both cultures) (e.g., Berry et al. 2006). Even though the integration orientation is less evident when measured through identification rather than through culture adoption or attitudes (Snauwaert et al. 2003), empirical studies in several countries have clearly shown that integration is the most commonly preferred acculturation orientation by migrants and often also leads to best adaptation outcomes (e.g., Berry et al. 2006; Sam & Berry 2006).

In our data, similar to Tartakovsky's (2002) findings, integration was found to be the predominant acculturation orientation for the clear majority (66.9%) of the potential migrants surveyed. Thus, they showed a strong preference for both contact with the members of the national majority and cultural maintenance (i.e., the desire to maintain the original culture and identity). One fifth of the participants preferred assimilation (i.e., mostly emphasized the importance of contact with the national majority group members), while separation and marginalization orientations were the least commonly preferred orientations. Moreover, participants also perceived the acculturation expectations of their future host nationals to be rather pro-integrationist (i.e., believed that Finns support intergroup interaction and also to encourage – at least to some extent – immigrants from Russia to Finland to maintain their culture while in Finland). With regard to identification, participants identified more strongly with (Ingrian) Finns than with Russians, although the difference between the two different foci of identifications was not very large, which could refer to bicul-

tural or alternatively more complex identity structures of the migrants.

The quantitative results of the INPRES study clearly showed that the pre-migration acculturation orientations of potential migrants are predicted by their perceptions of the acculturation preferences prevailing in the receiving society. The results were in line with those previously obtained in studies on the post-migration stage (e.g., Horenczyk & Sankevich 2006), but showed that the impact of host acculturation preferences on the formation of acculturation strategies is already present in the pre-migration stage. In particular, the assimilation orientation was related to ethnic migrants' perception of Finns as discouraging immigrants to maintain their own cultures, whereas the preference of separation orientation was based solely on the perception that Finns do not encourage immigrants enough to have contacts with members of the majority. Along with our assumptions, those who highly endorsed the integration orientation also strongly perceived that Finns encourage immigrants to maintain their culture and also have contacts with the members of the national majority group. While these findings are in line with those previously attained in studies on the post-migration stage, they indicate that migrants' anticipations of what is preferred by the host society in terms of their acculturation are already influencing how they choose their acculturation orientation before migration.

While the results from the pre-migration stage suggest that the period before migrants move to the new society is a distinct period in the migration process, it also has implications for migrant experiences, attitudes and contact with the majority after migration. According to the most recent studies testing the classic contact hypothesis (Allport 1954), while positive experiences of intergroup interaction are typically found to improve the outgroup attitudes of majority group members (Pettigrew & Tropp 2006), the effects of intergroup interaction on outgroup attitudes are typically small or even non-existent among minority group members (e.g., Binder et al. 2009; Tropp & Pettigrew 2005; but for an exception, see Jasinskaja-Lahti, Mähönen, & Liebkind 2010). One possible explanation for this difference may be that despite some positive experiences, minority group members may distrust the majority, as intergroup interaction often includes also discrimination (see, e.g., Tropp 2008;

Tropp & Pettigrew 2005). These negative experiences may also negatively affect identity patterns by preventing, or at least discouraging, migrants from identifying with the national majority group (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2009; Verkuyten 2007). Recent research among immigrants (Verkuyten 2007) and ethnic remigrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2009) has attested that this indeed is the case. Perceived discrimination may lead to national dis-identification, which, in turn, may foster a vicious circle by invoking even more discrimination among the national majority group (see Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2009).

In our INPRES quantitative results, migrants' expectations before migration about their future intergroup relations were related to their perceptions of intergroup relations after migration: the more ethnic discrimination they anticipated in the pre-migration stage and the more negative were their pre-migration experiences of contacts with Finnish nationals, the more negative were their perceptions of actual intergroup relations after migration. These perceptions, in turn, were negatively reflected in their national identification and attitudes towards the Finnish majority group. The INPRES findings also clearly showed the pre-migration factors that affect migrants' willingness to interact with members of the new society after migration. Specifically, a good quality of pre-migration intergroup interaction, positive attitudes towards the future host nationals and positive future expectations of intergroup interactions encouraged potential migrants to actively engage in intergroup interactions after migration. This is a significant finding that has implications for how we can encourage (ethnic) migrants to develop relationships with members of the new society after arrival and promote positive interactional outcomes.

However, when post-migration intergroup interaction is negative, our quantitative results show a (Finnish) national dis-identification as well as increased Russian identification, due to these negative experiences. Of particular interest, also the participants of our qualitative post-migration focus groups frequently referred to being Russians in Finland. From a discursive approach, however, this pattern of moving from the category of Finns in Russia to the category of Russians in Finland, as shown in our data, is not interpreted as sign of underlying identity change. Rather, we can look at these constructions from the point of view of those social functions they serve, as well the resources available for constructing ethnic identities in two different cultural as well as temporal contexts, in Russia and in Finland, in pre- and post-migration stages.

It is interesting, that although Finnishness is the prerequisite for Ingrian Finns to receive official repatriate status to Finland, being Finnish was discursively constructed as being possible mainly in Russia and not in Finland. This can be perhaps interpreted through contextually variable discursive meaning systems: moving to Finland meant new challenges for maintaining the previously functional identity constructions of Finnishness. In the context of Russia, a reference to Finnish character and blood was enough to construct the identity of a Finn, whereas in the Finnish context the biological discourse was not a strong enough discursive tool to prevent the Finnish identity from being threatened. Thus, contrary to the situation in Russia, in the public sense being Finnish was described to be impossible in the Finnish context and Finnish identity appeared to become a more as a private and internal thing, instead a public "fact". Overall, the results of the INPRES project challenge the traditional perspective on ethnic migration as an optimal or easy way to secure the formation of a positive national identity; for example, the religion-based legitimacy of immigration of Jews to Israel has been seen to open the doors for the development of national identity (Horenczyk & Ben-Shalom 2001). The results of our study clearly show that the process and prerequisites of the formation of national identity depend on the inclusiveness of the immigration context in general – and national identity in particular – rather than on shared cultural characteristics between an immigrant and majority group members.

Future research

We welcome future research in other socio-historical contexts with other migrant groups to evaluate the empirical generalizability and theoretical applicability of our findings. Also research among multicultural youth is called for, as their identity formation probably follows a path more complex than the one presented here among adult ethnic migrants (see, e.g.,

Oppedal 2006). Methodologically speaking, to fully acknowledge the fact that migration affects not only individuals but also their (extended) families and broader ethnic communities, a multilevel approach to identities and integration is needed. Furthermore, the development of a full-scale multi-method approach to immigrant integration is needed to incorporate the statistical analysis of change both in the levels of the group and the individual with a social constructionist approach to identities, intergroup relations and, generally speaking, integration.

Moreover, more diverse identities, reference groups and sites of belonging should be addressed in future studies to better acknowledge the complexity of cultural identities (see, e.g., Benish-Weisman & Horenczyk 2010; Birman et al. 2010; Tartakovsky 2002). For example in Tartakovsky's (2002) study, the integration acculturation orientation of the potential Jewish emigrants from Russia to Israel migrants was related to neither their identification with Israelis nor with Russians, but with Jews living both in Russia and in Israel. By taking into consideration additional layers of identities in different cultural contexts, future studies may produce valuable information on how ethnic identification affect the choice of a specific acculturation strategy in the pre- and post-migration contexts.

From a discursive point of view, it would be interesting to investigate how other groups of ethnic migrants construct identities in Finland and elsewhere, as well as the ways in which Finnish majority group members talk about Ingrian Finns. It would also be of interest, for comparison purposes, to do a third wave set of focus groups later to look for any differences and similarities in the identity constructions at different points in time. Finally, studying how Finnish identity is employed and contested by various migrant groups in Finland, for example, in new media and other every day contexts, would add to our understanding on identity as a socially constructed phenomenon and a resource.

Further research may also choose to include the notion of migrant transnationalism (Vertovec 2009), especially in the context of border regions – such as in the case of Ingrian Finns – where movement and connections between people and societies are possible as part of everyday life. Moreover, attention must be paid to the receiving society. Acculturation is not only about the migrants but concerns also the members of the receiving society, in this case Finns living in Finland.

In conclusion, there is a need for social psychology to broaden its scope and to acknowledge the limits of simple, dualist majority-minority distinctions. As Verkuyten (2005) points out, the field tends to ignore the diversity of social comparisons, the flexible definitions of in-groups and out-groups, important within-group differences, and the central role of the members one's own ethnic group or co-ethnics. Future research must take this into account, not only in theory but also in practice, when building our understanding of different kinds of migration.

Practical implications

Importantly, the INPRES study points out that we must prevent the development of a conflictual relationship between ethnic migrants' new national (Finnish) and minority (Russian) identifications. This goal can be best achieved in an inclusive intergroup context where the distinctiveness and value of different subgroups is secured under a common superordinate category (see, e.g., Hornsey & Hogg 2000). In other words, policy makers should focus not only on reducing discrimination and promoting positive intergroup interaction, but also on creating conditions in which it is possible for all ethnic groups to have a secure status and a sense of belonging to the larger society. Further, they can look at how pre-migration contact with representatives of the new society can help migrants in their integration process. Even in the case of ethnic migrants with exceptionally positive expectations and high levels of initial identification with the future hosts, positive outgroup attitudes and a sense of belonging to the society cannot be expected, if their enthusiasm is met with rejection.

Our study also underlines the unequal power-relations between ethnic migrants and the Finnish hosts in defining who can be Finnish and on what basis. A timely question that follows from our findings is: is it possible for ethnic migrants and other minority group members to reach an equal position in Finnish society? The closed horizon and lack of opportunities evident in the statement from our focus group data that "I'll never be Finnish here, I'll always be Russian here", which indicates that the social category

of Finnish is quite limited. Therefore, broadening or challenging the limits of Finnishness and respecting migrants' self-categorisation as Finns is essential in creating a more inclusive and welcoming society.

Although the ethnic migrants struggled with identifying as Finns after migration in Finnish society, the INPRES study showed that these individuals begin the migration process from a positive stance. Specifically, integration was found to be the predominant acculturation orientation for the clear majority (two thirds) of the potential migrants surveyed. Similarly, the participants generally perceived the acculturation expectations of the Finnish majority group to be rather pro-integrationist. That is, the ethnic migrants believed that Finns support intergroup interaction and also encourage – at least to some extent – immigrants from Russia to Finland to maintain their culture while in Finland. This is an important finding since numerous previous studies have related the integration orientation to the best adaptation outcomes across different countries and cultures (e.g., see Berry & Sam 1997, for a summary). As such, the INPRES study highlights the optimistic outlook held by ethnic migrants already before they move to the new society, that is, they are positively geared towards integrating into Finnish society upon arrival. This eagerness towards integration should be further encouraged in policies and programs that facilitate participate in broader (Finnish) society, while also allowing opportunities for migrants to maintain other cultural ties.

References

Allport, Gordon (1954): The nature of prejudice. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Benish-Weisman, Maya & Horenczyk, Gabriel (2010): Cultural identity and perceived success among Israeli immigrants: An emic approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*, pp. 516–526.

Berry, John W. (1990): Psychology of acculturation. In: J. Berman (ed.): *Cross-cultural perspectives* (Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 37). University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE, pp. 201–234.

Berry, John W. (1997): Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied psychology, 46*, pp. 5–68.

Berry, John W., Phinney, Jean S., Sam, David L. & Vedder, Paul (2006): Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 55*, pp. 303–332.

Berry, John W. & Sam, D. L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In: Berry, John W., Segall, Marshall H. & Kagitcibasi, Cigdem (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 3: Social behavior and applications* (2nd ed.). Allyn and Bacon, Boston, pp. 291–326.

Binder, Jens, Zagefka, Hanna, Brown, Rupert, Funke, Friedrich, Kessler, Thomas, Mummendey, Amelie, Maquil, Annemie, Demoulin, Stephanie, & Leyens, Jacques-Philippe (2009): Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, pp. 843–856.

Birman, Dina, Persky, Irina, & Chan, Wing Yi (2010): Multiple identities of Jewish immigrant adolescents from the former Soviet Union: An exploration of salience and impact of ethnic identity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34,* pp. 193–205.

Burr, Vivien (2003): Social Constructionism (2nd ed.). Routledge, New York.

Davydova, Olga & Heikkinen, Kaija (2004): Produced Finnishness in the Context of Remigration. In: Puuronen, Vesa, Häkkinen, Antti, Pylkkänen, Anu, Sandlund, Tom & Toivanen, Reetta (eds.), *New Challenges for the Welfare Society.* Publications of Karelian Institute, University of Joensuu, pp. 176–192.

Finnish Immigration Service (2011): Inkerinsuomalaisten paluumuuttojono 1.7.2011–1.7.2016 [Remigration queue for Ingrian Finns from 1 July 2011 to 1 July 2016]. Available at: http://www.immigrationservice.fi/netcomm/content.asp?path=8,2475,2525,2821. Accessed on June 3, 2011.

Graves, Theodore D. (1967): Acculturation, access, and alcohol in a tri-ethnic community. *American Anthropologist, 69*(3/4), pp. 306–321.

Heleniak, Timothy (2006): The end of an empire: Migration and the changing nationality composition of the Soviet successor states. In: Munz, Rainer & Ohliger, Rainer (eds.), *Diasporas and ethnic migrants. Germany, Israel and Post-Soviet successor states in comparative perspective.* Frank Cass & Co., London, pp. 115–140.

Horenczyk, Gabriel & Ben-Shalom, Uzi (2001): Multicultural identities and adaptation of young immigrants in Israel. In Shimahara, N. Kim, Holowinsky, Ivan Z. & Tomlinson-Clarke, Saundra (eds.),

Ethnicity, race, and nationality in education: A global perspective. Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwa, NJ, pp. 57–80.

Horenczyk, Gabriel, & Sankevich, V. I. (2006): Acculturation attitudes, perceived ingroup and outgroup expectations, and adaptation among immigrant adolescents. Paper presented at the 18th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece.

Hornsey, Matthew J. & Hogg, Michael A. (2000): Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 4*, pp. 143–156.

Jaakkola, Magdalena (2005): *Suomalaisten suhtautuminen maahanmuuttajiin vuosina 1987–2003. Työpoliittinen tutkimus 286* [The attitudes of Finns towards foreigners. Labour Political Research 286]. Ministry of Labour, Helsinki, Finland.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga (2000): *Psychological acculturation and adaptation among Russian-speaking immigrant adolescents in Finland*. Department of Social Psychology, University of Helsinki.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga & Liebkind, Karmela (1999): Exploration of the ethnic identity among Russian-speaking immigrant adolescents in Finland. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*, pp. 527–539.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Liebkind, Karmela, & Perhoniemi, Riku (2006): Perceived discrimination and well-being: a victim study of different immigrant groups. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 16*, pp. 267–284.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Liebkind, Karmela, & Solheim, Erling (2009): To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination. *Applied Psychology, 58*, pp. 105–128.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Liebkind, Karmela, Horenczyk, Gabriel, & Schmitz, Paul (2003): The interactive nature of acculturation: Perceived discrimination, acculturation attitudes and stress among young ethnic repatriates in Finland, Israel and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, pp. 79–90.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Liebkind, Karmela, Jaakkola, Magdalena, & Reuter, Anni (2006): Perceived discrimination, social support networks, and psychological well-being among three immigrant groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, pp. 293–311.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Mähönen, Tuuli Anna, & Liebkind, Karmela (2010): Ingroup norms, intergroup contact and intergroup anxiety as predictors of the outgroup attitudes of majority and minority youth. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, pp. 346–355.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Mähönen, Tuuli Anna & Liebkind, Karmela (in press): Identity and attitudinal reactions to perceptions of intergroup contact among ethnic migrants: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Psychology*.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Mähönen, Tuuli Anna & Ketokivi, Mikko (submitted): The dynamics of ethnic discrimination, identities and outgroup attitudes: A pre- and post-migration longitudinal study of ethnic migrants.

Mähönen, Tuuli Anna & Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga (in press): Anticipated and perceived intergroup relations as predictors of immigrants' identification patterns: A follow-up study. *European Psychologist*.

Oppedal, Brit (2006): Development and acculturation. In: Sam, David L. & Berry, John W. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 97–112.

Persky, Irena & Birman, Dina (2005): Ethnic Identity in Acculturation Research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*(5), pp. 557–572.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., & Tropp, Linda R. (2006): A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, pp. 751–783.

Phinney, Jean S. (1990): Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), pp. 499–514.

Phinney, Jean S. (1996): Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(2), pp. 143–152.

Phinney, Jean S. & Alipuria, Linda L. (2006): Multiple social categorization and identity among multiracial, multiethnic, and multicultural individuals: Processes and implications. In: Crisp, Richard J. & Hewstone, Miles (eds.), Multiple social categorization: Processes, Models and Applications. Psychology Press, Hove, pp. 210–238.

Phinney, Jean S., Horenczyk, Gabriel, Liebkind, Karmela, & Vedder, Paul (2001): Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-Being: An Interactional Perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), pp. 493–510.

Potter, Jonathan & Wetherell, Margeret (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage Publications, London.

Potter, Jonathan (2003). Discursive Psychology: Between Method and Paradigm. *Discourse & Society, 14*(6), pp. 783–794.

Sam, David L., & Berry, John W. (eds.) (2006): *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Snauwaert, Boris, Soenens, Bart, Vanbeselaere, Norbert, & Boen, Filip (2003): When Integration Does Not Necessarily Imply Integration Different Conceptualizations of Acculturation Orientations Lead to Different Classifications. *Journal of Cross-Cultural psychology, 34,* pp. 231–239.

Statistics Finland (2010). Population structure of Finland. Available at: http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/index.html. Accessed on March 15, 2011.

Tartakovsky, Evgeny (2002): Acculturation attitudes of potential emigrants: Jewish youths in Russia. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, pp. 1845–1862.

Tropp, Linda R. (2008): The role of trust in intergroup contact: Its significance and implications for improving relations between groups. In: Wagner, Ulrich, Tropp, Linda R., Finchilescu, Gillain & Tredoux, Colin (eds.), *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew*. Blackwell Publishers, Malden, MA, pp. 91–106.

Tropp, Linda R., & Pettigrew, Thomas R. (2005): Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*, pp. 951–957.

Valtonen, Kathleen (2001): Cracking monopoly: immigrants and employment in Finland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 27*, pp. 421–38.

Varjonen, Sirkku, Arnold, Linda & Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga (2009): "There is a difference" – A Discourse Analytic Study on the Social Construction of Finnishness and Finnish Identity. In Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. & Mähönen, T.A. (Eds.): *Identities, Intergroup Relations and Acculturation: The Cornerstones of Intercultural Encounters* (pp.52-66). Helsinki, Finland: Gaudeamus.

Varjonen, Sirkku, Arnold, Linda & Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga (submitted): "We're Finns here, and Russians there" - Identity construction of ethnic Finnish migrants before and after migration from Russia to Finland.

Verkuyten, Maykel (1997): Discourses of Ethnic Minority Identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*(4), pp. 565–586.

Verkuyten, Maykel (2005): *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Psychology Press, London.

Verkuyten, Maykel (2007): Religious group identification and inter-religious relations: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10,* pp. 341–357.

Vertovec, Stephen (2009): *Transnationalism*. Routledge, Milton Park.

Wiggins, Sally & Potter, Jonathan (2007): Discursive Psychology. In: Willig, Carla & Stainton Rogers, Wendy (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, pp. 73–90.

Yijälä, Anu & Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga (2010): Pre-migration acculturation attitudes among potential ethnic migrants from Russia to Finland. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*(4), pp. 326–339.

Writers from left:

Linda Arnold is a graduate student of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Katrina Jurva (MA) is a doctoral student of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Tuuli Anna Mähönen (PhD) works as a postdoctoral researcher of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Sirkku Varjonen is a doctoral student of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland.

Anu Yijälä is a doctoral student of Social Psychology at the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland.