

Leaving (for) Home Understanding Return Migration From the Diaspora

Alaina Brenick¹ and Rainer K. Silbereisen²

¹Human Development and Family Studies, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA,

²Department of Developmental Psychology, Friedrich Schiller University, Jena, Germany

With the upsurge of globalization, economic uncertainty, and political turmoil in many countries comes increased migration, including growing streams of migrants returning from the diaspora. These are groups of people who have lived away from their ancestral territories for generations or even centuries and, due to pressing political, social, economic, or cultural reasons, return to what they deem their traditional home (e.g., Bradatan, Popan, & Melton, 2010; Jasinskaja-Lahti & Yijälä, 2011; Silbereisen, 2008; Tsuda, 2009). These immigrants are typically well acculturated and established in their countries of birth, and yet millions of them have returned to their ethnic homelands (see Tsuda, 2009). Moreover, along with the typical strains associated with immigration, these groups must navigate the competing interests of self, home country, and host country in an ethnic homeland that in all actuality may be quite foreign to them. There are major issues that complicate this particular immigration context – the rights afforded to ethnic return migrants may be different from rights afforded to citizens born in the country or other immigrant groups, and the host country may have strong desires and expectations of these migrants to easily and quickly acculturate to their new setting. These expectations may be shared by the migrants but may also conflict with their desires to maintain their foreign ethnic identity. As a result, research focusing on the unique, and as of yet understudied (see Jasinskaja-Lahti & Yijälä, 2011; Stefansson, 2004), experiences of immigrants from diaspora populations warrants increased attention, and is thus the focus of this special issue of *European Psychologist*.

Conceptualizing Diasporas and Ethnic Return Migration

To fully understand the ethnic return migration experience and how it differs from other migration experiences, we must start with some fundamental questions: First, how are diasporas conceptualized? From where and to where

do these migrants return? Historically, the term diaspora prototypically refers to people of Jewish descent who, for centuries and numerous generations, have lived outside their ancestral homeland in the Eastern Mediterranean region in various regions of the world (e.g., North and South America, Eastern and Western Europe, Africa, and the Middle East). This represents a “victim diaspora” (Tsuda, 2009), as these individuals fled into the diaspora in order to escape ethnopolitical persecution. Today, the concept of diaspora is applied in a much broader sense in the field of migration studies. Diasporas also emerged as a result of migratory movements of ethnic groups for economic or colonization opportunities in nearby countries and further abroad, or due to nonmigratory changes in historic country borders (such as is often the case in Eastern Europe). In addition to Israel, European countries, such as Germany, Spain, Greece, Poland, Finland, England, and Ireland (e.g., Corcoran, 2002; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003; Jasinskaja-Lahti & Yijälä, 2011; Levy & Weiss, 2002; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos, Obradovic, & Masten, 2008; Silbereisen, 2008; Solé & Parella, 2003; Titzmann, Silbereisen, Mesch, & Schmitt-Rodermund, 2011; Tsuda, 2009), serve as ethnic home countries with diasporas throughout Europe as well as in North and South America.

Second, we must ask what draws these individuals to return from the diaspora to their ethnic homelands? Wherever there is a dislocated diaspora established over a considerable period of time that maintains, invents, or revives a connection with a country of ancestral origin, immigration to the territory of origin is a possibility. *Push factors* emerge once the situation in the country of residence turns bleak in political, cultural, or economic terms. These are complemented by *pull factors* from the country of destiny, such as a need for population growth or the wish to gain from the human and social capital of these immigrants, creating an environment in which waves of ethnic return migration can be expected (Silbereisen, 2008).

Once having fled the region of today’s Israel for reasons of ethnopolitical persecution, Jews in the diaspora found themselves returning to Israel for the very same reasons after

centuries away. Their return migration to Israel during the decades after World War II and the breakdown of the Soviet Union was unparalleled and yet shows commonalities with other diaspora migration waves. Obviously, escape from ethnic discrimination and similar hardships formed push factors that significantly facilitated this return migration (e.g., Remennick, 2007). At the same time, pull factors, such as the Israeli policy to provide a safe haven and to increase the population of the Jewish state, were also significant in facilitating this return migration. In addition, there were the real or imagined ties to the ancestral home, construed and sometimes romanticized through actual contact or ongoing community dialog in the diaspora about the dream of returning home, as well as images relayed via the media (e.g., Al-Ali & Koser, 2002; Schein, 1998; Tsuda, 2009).

Following the end of the Cold War, similar patterns emerged with the wave of ethnic return migration from Eastern Europe to Germany and from Russia and Estonia to Finland. However, beyond these extraordinary circumstances, ethnic return migration, like most other types of migration, typically stems from economic uncertainties in the country of residence (push factor) and dreams of a better life in a new host country – the ethnic home country (pull factor). Where ethnic return migration differs from other types of migration is in the selection of the new host country. Individuals with an ancestral tie to a more economically developed country may then be more likely to return to their ancestral homeland because they believe integration and acculturation will be easier than in entirely foreign surroundings (Silbereisen, 2008; Tsuda, 2009). As an example, many diaspora migrants return to the territories or country of their ancestors due to the gross inequalities between the weak economy of the country of birth and the more prosperous situation in the country of immigration. Special ethnically-based preferential immigration policies are important pull factors often put in place either to provide those with ethnic affiliations protection from ethnic persecution in the diaspora or to honor and strengthen the common cultural heritage. As mentioned above, this is the case for Israel as well as Germany, Finland, and Greece with their many “*Aussiedler*,” “*paluumuuttajat*,” and Pontians of ethnic German, Finnish, and Greek origin from Eastern Europe, Russia, and the former Soviet Union, respectively. Such policies rest on the presumption that despite these groups having been born and raised abroad, sometimes over many generations, they nevertheless are culturally similar to the native population of their ancestral home due to their common descent. The resulting policies, including instant citizenship or dual nationality, are typical in Europe and Israel. Countries in Asia, however, tend to promote return migration from regions such as South America primarily for economic reasons, and consequently civic integration is much less preferential, and often does not include citizenship (Joppke, 2005).

As a result, there are tremendous policy demands to address diaspora migrants, yet there is still little psychological research on their adaptation and development, particularly on a comparative level across and within countries with natives and other immigrants, to inform the planning and implementation of such policies. Therefore, the present

special issue presents articles in this line of research that address the overarching question, “What are the commonalities and specificities of acculturation and development in contexts of ethnic return migration from the diaspora?” Given the differences in immigration policies, we decided to focus on diaspora migrants from European countries and Israel (“the largest and most important case of ethnic return migrations,” Tsuda, 2009, p. 13) in this special issue. Additionally, while ethnic return migrants all share a “homecoming” attitude, ethnic orientations often hold less influence over immigrants residing in economically prosperous diaspora countries, such as Asian-Americans who return to their origins for strictly economic purposes (see Tsuda, 2009). This additional difference provides further support for our decision to focus solely on ethnic return migration within Europe and Israel. More specifically, we have included studies on ethnic German immigrants from Eastern Europe to Germany, Pontic Greek immigrants from the former Soviet Union to Greece, Ingrian-Finnish immigrants from Russia to Finland, and Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union and from Ethiopia to Israel. Information on the particular history and background of these groups is provided in the respective papers, but a common thread is that their acculturation is much more complicated than the migration policies and their rationale assume.

Current Research on Ethnic Return Migration

The diaspora groups studied in this special issue are often of mixed ethnic origin. For instance, when considering groups from the former Soviet Union, Jewish immigrants in Israel come as families, with one partner often of non-Jewish origin, and the same applies to the ethnic German and Ingrian-Finnish immigrants. Thus, immigrants’ cultural affinity to the ethnic country may differ between family members, and beyond that, in spite of preferential treatment, the families are confronted with the usual obstacles of immigration, such as a downgrading of their qualifications in the local labor market (Dietz, 1999), or a shift in the power balance between parents and offspring (Titzmann, 2011). Without the particular combination of the push from hopes to improve their economic situation and the pull of easy citizenship and (assumed) integration in the destination country, some of the groups addressed in this special issue might very well have chosen more economically attractive countries (e.g., Silbereisen, 2008; Tsuda, 2009).

Before we introduce the particular substantive topic of the collection of papers, a qualification is indicated concerning the homeland-diaspora distinction as such. According to Weingrod and Levy (2006), the situation is actually more complex than often assumed because many diaspora immigrants develop identifications with other destinations once they arrive in their ancestral home, be it the country of origin or still other places. An example is Ethiopian Jews who, due to discrimination, begin to identify with and attach to a virtual black diaspora (e.g., through a connection to reggae

music and an African-American identity). In other words, there is some variation in identification among people of purportedly the same ancestry in a given country, and “returning home” is not the end of the story.

Beyond deciding to address samples of diaspora immigrants in Finland, Greece, Israel, and Germany, we had to select a substantive focus for the special section. Immigration and especially diaspora immigration is not a new topic but the emphasis has traditionally been on the psychological and social consequences of immigrants’ acculturation to the new context. The intermediary processes that lead to adjustment, however, have garnered less attention. Given the fact that diaspora migrants are often characterized by multiple identities that may or may not converge into one new national identity, we decided to look at ascribed and accepted identifications, for example, the German (national and ethnic) identity and the Russian (national) identity that ethnic German immigrants share. Against this backdrop, the solicited papers either reported research on rather proximal consequences for behaviors and social encounters in the host country, or again studied rather proximal antecedents, which in part date back to the country of origin. More specifically, on the one hand, some papers address the participation in activities aimed at the native population of the host country. On the other hand, some papers deal with perceived discrimination as an antecedent to identification among migrants and the ways in which migrants may be identified in the host culture.

It is obviously not possible to comprehensively cover such topics with only six papers, but we wanted to face the challenge of putting together research that illustrates how the desiderata of acculturation research that are rarely met may be dealt with. Consequently, one of the papers includes pre-migration data, gathered during the extended time of preparation in the country of origin that is required before remigration due to the difficulties of potential migrants to find housing in the future host country. As immigration, except for forced expatriation, is an individual decision, such research designs are difficult to accomplish because of the long time period required in order to assess all individuals at pre-migration stage and after immigrants’ arrival in the new home country.

Another often neglected issue is the comparison across different immigration groups and with natives. The decision to select research on diaspora immigrants from and to Europe and Israel for this special issue also allows for a comparison of the fates of immigrants that used to be citizens of the same country of origin, namely, the former Soviet Union. Although a full cross-comparison was not possible (such as Russian-Jews immigrating to Israel or to Germany), we nevertheless have papers that compare identification and related processes across countries.

Diaspora immigrants typically arrive as entire families, and given the fact that most groups were well integrated in the country of origin, this means that the ethnic composition within the family is often not homogeneous. This and the related differences in the identification can be a source of additional friction during the acculturation process and result in divorce or separation, which in all likelihood will have consequences for adjustment. A paper addressing such

issues highlights a within-family context effect, but there are other contexts of even larger importance for the young people studied in most of the papers – school.

In school, processes of both identification and discrimination take place. Furthermore, schools themselves are not homogeneous but differ in the ethnicity profile of the student body or the climate concerning discrimination. Whatever happens to individuals’ acculturation, it certainly is also shaped by the interpersonal and ecological context where they live, study, or work, and especially the quality of the intergroup relations they experience and act out themselves (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Stokols, 1996).

Taken together, the topics covered in the six papers present a story spanning from pre-migration hopes and fears to what is actually perceived as discrimination from different sources after immigration. Further, the papers show how expectations and experiences of discrimination result in identification with more or less emphasis on the new national identity or a “rebound” of old ethnic or national orientation. Finally, the authors discuss the potential behavioral consequences of these experiences among immigrant youth, such as alcohol misuse and suicidal ideation. Although some studies have longitudinal data, the data are collected from actual groups in real-world settings and are not based on experimental designs, and thus causal interpretations are suggestive at best. Nevertheless, each paper is explicit about potential applications in the social policy framework. While the specific paper topics may be somewhat eclectic, all are based on approaches from social psychology and developmental psychology, with theories of intergroup relations playing a particularly dominant role.

Before we turn to a short summary of the papers in this special issue, which range from an emphasis on identification-driven experiences of discrimination to consequences for social and personal behaviors, a last common theme should be mentioned. These papers address mostly first-generation immigrants, ranging in age from early adolescence to middle adulthood; we also have to bear in mind that the levels of discrimination experienced in most cases are rather low. However, there are also exceptions of people living in niches characterized by low social capital and high levels of discrimination. We begin with the paper on perceived discrimination among immigrants in Greece.

The paper by Motti-Stefanidi and Asendorpf (2012) compares two immigrant groups in Greece. First is the group of ethnically Greek descendants of the Pontic Greeks who used to live on the Black Sea coast in ancient times (i.e., beginning in the 8th century BC), but were persecuted during the communist rule in the former Soviet Union and forced to relocate to other regions of the country. This group benefits from preferential immigration policies as compared to nonethnic Greek immigrants. The second group is comprised of labor immigrants from Albania who emigrated following the political changes during the 1990s. These migrants are deemed foreigners without any privilege, although some of them are actually of Greek ethnicity as well. Both immigrant populations are targets of discrimination, with the Albanians proper representing the less esteemed group.

The crucial aim of this paper is to better understand how perceived ethnic discrimination at the group level and

individual characteristics are translated into perceived ethnic discrimination at the personal level. Based on past research, the hypothesis was that for the sample of early adolescents studied, those who had more positive individual characteristics (e.g., higher self-esteem, self-efficacy beliefs, grade point average, and peer popularity) would perceive less personal discrimination. This set of conditions indicates a better ability to successfully navigate age-typical developmental tasks. The reason behind this expectation is that those better off in terms of the positive individual characteristics listed above would be less inclined to interpret ambiguous situations as evidence of discrimination against themselves, and would elicit more positive reactions from their social environment.

Concerning the translation of group discrimination to personal discrimination (both correlated .55), the result was that the interindividual difference variables were relevant above and beyond group discrimination. This effect was similar for Pontic Greeks and Albanians. In addition, the analysis (statistical interactions with group discrimination) of protective effects of the individual difference variables overall showed that these variables were irrelevant when faced with low group discrimination. Under high group discrimination conditions, however, the individual difference variables reduced the effect of group discrimination on personal discrimination (fewer stressors in their lives had a similar effect).

An advantage of the study is that it addresses a rarely investigated issue and offers a long list (including personality measures) of personal attributes that may exert a protective effect against the negative impact of group discrimination many immigrants experience. The study could not differentiate whether this protective effect of positive personal attributes is behavioral, due more to immigrants' modeling culturally defined positive habits of proximal individuals and therefore eliciting less discrimination, or cognitive, due more to a change in their conceptualizations of the immigrant experience including conceptualizations of discrimination. Although longitudinal data are required to clarify the direction of effects, one could argue that improving self-esteem, self-efficacy, academic achievement, and peer popularity would help an individual feel less discriminated individually than the larger ethnic group to which he or she belongs. Whether perceiving reduced discrimination could have the unintended negative side effect that such young people would refrain from working against discrimination remains an open issue.

The paper by Brenick, Titzmann, Michel, and Silbereisen (2012) also looks at perceived discrimination as an outcome, and applies a complex design that enables the researchers to investigate how context affects the relation between individuals' conceptualization of intra- and intergroup dynamics and perceived discrimination. In this case, the context for the adolescent ethnic German immigrants (first generation) is the school, assessed as native classmates' negative attitudes and the proportion of ethnic Germans in the student body (up to about 30%). The core condition for discrimination is the salience of immigrants as a group of lower status, and this salience can be influenced by students' own behavior. Consequently, the expectation was that adolescents with a higher ingroup orientation and those who perceive a higher

expectation by natives to segregate would report higher discrimination. This group difference would theoretically be explained because both strong ingroup affiliation and perceived expectation to segregate would increase the salience of their lower group status.

Interestingly, these main effects were not statistically significant, perhaps because among adolescents, as compared to adults, a high ingroup orientation is almost normative (see Brenick & Killen, 2011; Shrum, Cheek, & Hunter, 1988). Rather, utilizing multilevel modeling, the authors found cross-level interactions between the school context and the individual variables. More specifically, in schools with a high proportion of immigrants there was no relationship between ingroup orientation and perceived native segregation orientation with discrimination. In schools with a low proportion of immigrants, however, the relationship was significantly positive as expected. It is likely that in schools with a high proportion of immigrants, the salience of that minority group is already quite high and in such a context individual behaviors of immigrants do little to heighten the minority group salience.

The paper discusses several cross-level interactions as well as results indicating that there is also a main effect of school on average perceived discrimination (which is low anyway, probably due to the relative closeness in cultural orientation to the native Germans, particularly in comparison to foreign immigrants). In summary, the analyses demonstrate that the effect of intergroup relations on discrimination is primarily context dependent. Certainly the current assessments of the discrimination-relevant attributes of schools are rather narrow and need to be expanded in future research.

The data are not longitudinal (although the direction of effects between intergroup encounters and discrimination found is plausible and supported by other research). Furthermore, the proportion of ethnic German immigrants in the schools studied was such that they always represented a minority, whereas other immigrant groups such as Turkish adolescents represent a majority in classrooms in some regions of Germany. Whether the proportion of immigrants makes a difference concerning the consequences should be addressed in future research.

Concerning practical implications, it is clear that successful social policies against discrimination require the consideration of both immigrants and natives, and, in particular, looking at conditions that influence the salience of being a minority with a low status. Ethnic German adolescents seem to be better protected against perceived discrimination in schools with a higher proportion of ethnic German immigrants. In all likelihood, this is so because only then the adolescence-typical befriending and grouping up with other similar individuals (i.e., other ethnic Germans) does not give an extra push to being perceived as deviant from the norm.

The third paper in the current special issue by Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2012) addresses a major problem in many studies on acculturation – the lack of pre-migration data. They investigated adult Ingrian-Finnish remigrants from Russia to Finland, with a specific focus on identification (Ingrian-Finnish and Russian) and anticipated discrimination, assessed up to 2 years before immigration. Follow-up

data were gathered soon after actual immigration, up to 15 months later. The main aim was to investigate how pre-migration anticipation of discrimination translated into post-migration experiences of discrimination, and how this discrimination may have affected a change in identification after migration. The results indicated that while the anticipated discrimination in this group was rather low, many immigrants were later confronted with higher than expected actual discrimination, rooted in their predominant use of the Russian language and other behavioral attributes that native Finns perceive as foreign. This discrepancy has two potential consequences: First, it may create a cyclical interaction in which immigrants' intergroup attributes may become more negative (as defined by the larger native community). Second, immigrants may not develop a national identity as members of the Finnish society. In addition, the diaspora immigrants may increase their ingroup identification as Ingrian-Finns. The authors further assume that the associations between anticipated discrimination and identification in the year after immigration are not only linked via the post-migration discrimination, but also as a function of individual differences in the perceived legitimacy of immigrants' lower status compared to native Finns, and the impermeability of group boundaries.

These considerations yielded a complex structural equation model with two periods of assessment to test these effects. The main result was that anticipated discrimination had the expected negative effect on national Finnish identification, but not on Ingrian-Finnish and Russian identification. This was linked via two of the intergroup attributes studied: perceived discrimination in the receiving country and perceived group boundary permeability. In other words, higher anticipated and real discrimination predicted higher national Finnish identification. Such effects did not apply to Ingrian-Finnish and Russian identification, which instead showed a moderate stability over time. Russian identification additionally seems to be affected by post-migration encounters such as discrimination, whereas Ingrian-Finnish identification seems to be unaffected by any of the variables studied. In sum, it looks like ethnic discrimination in this group of biculturally identified immigrants promotes a new Russian minority identity within Finland.

A possible interpretation for the lack of an effect of discrimination on the Ingrian-Finnish identity may be the distinction between group discrimination and personal discrimination as discussed by Motti-Stefanidi and Asendorpf (2012). The discrimination as assessed in this study is not very clear in this regard, and increasing one's Ingrian-Finnish identity (re-ethnization) may require the experience of both group and personal discrimination. The authors discuss specific strategies that may be employed to avoid conflicts between the new national and the Russian (minority) identity, such as developing a common superordinate category, one that encompasses both the majority and minority – above and beyond attempts to reduce discrimination. Other research illuminating the pre-migration situation stressed the change in identification concerning country of origin and country of destiny. According to a study by Tartakovsky (2001) on future Jewish immigrants to Israel from Russia and the Ukraine, there is a strong tendency to

detach from identifying with the countries they were brought up in, in favor of a more unilaterally positive identification with the country of destiny and the Jewish ethnic identity. Although this pattern is known to change after immigration, the strong and immediate push toward identifying with the host country – Israel, in this study – may provide the necessary strength to overcome the stress of the first periods of acculturation.

The Ingrian-Finnish immigration to Finland shows parallels to the Russian-Jewish and the ethnic German diaspora migrants, including the extensive pre-migration preparations required by the country of destination (language classes and providing cultural scripts) and the preferential treatment concerning civic integration. Nevertheless, Finland is unique because the total proportion of immigrants (foreigners) in the population is just 3%, which is much less than the immigrant population in countries like Germany or Israel.

The paper by Walsh, Edelstein, and Vota (2012) investigates the relations of ethnic identity and parental support with suicidal ideation and alcohol use among adolescent Ethiopian Jews in Israel. This group of immigrants is particularly interesting because they acculturate to lower-status segments of the Israeli population and experience many strains such as weak economic power and low educational prospects, as well as further discrimination by the majority based on their dark skin color. Additionally, as adolescents, they are confronted with the task of developing a well-founded identity, a task that is challenging at best when confounded with the multitude of maturation- and acculturation-related stresses. Their parents are often unable to provide support in adjusting to the new culture as they, too, face the difficulties of navigating a new and drastically different culture and often differ in opinion from their children regarding the maintenance of the heritage ethnic identity. The hypothesis was that lower levels of ethnic identity as Ethiopians and as Israelis, and lower levels of parental support would correspond to higher risks of suicidal ideation and alcohol consumption. This relation was found, especially for Ethiopian identity and low parental support for both target variables. Further, the effect on suicidal ideation was maintained when controlling for depressive symptoms. The authors interpret the link between ethnic identity and the problem behaviors as a consequence of difficulties in forming a positive identity due to prevalent experiences of alienation and discrimination. This is a plausible link but it is important to note that experiences of alienation and discrimination were not assessed in the study. Earlier research on other migrant groups in Israel has shown that suicide rates among recent immigrants were higher than those reported for the country of origin (see Negash et al., 2005) and thus the high rates should not be attributed to Ethiopian cultural factors.

Interestingly, there were no differences between first- and second-generation adolescents in variable mean levels and relationships among variables, which suggest that it is probably not the acculturation as such but the marginalized status as a minority that drives the problem behaviors. Feelings of disconnectedness from one's heritage culture seem to be a critical component in maladaptive development and problem behaviors. This finding suggests an avenue for

intervention measures that target strengthening bonds to the heritage culture, and supporting parents in playing a stronger role to ease distress for their adolescent offspring.

Diaspora immigrants, especially those of the first generation, almost by definition have to develop a dual identity – that of the host culture and that of the culture of origin. Earlier research has shown that these identifications do not represent two poles of one dimension, but rather are relatively independent and vary in the size and direction of their correlation across migration groups and countries (Phinney, Berry, Vedder, & Liebkind, 2006). Diaspora immigrants in Germany and Israel are under rather strong assimilation pressures compared to other groups and countries (Silbereisen, 2008), and thus one would expect the new and old national identity to correlate negatively.

Indeed, this was the first result of the study reported by Stoessel, Titzmann, and Silbereisen (2012). They assessed longitudinal samples of ethnic German and Russian-Jewish immigrants in the respective countries, entailing several waves separated by 1 year each, and the correlations between German/Israeli and Russian identification (a self-labeling approach was used) were substantial and negative at all assessments. Moreover, the association was somewhat less negative in Israel, probably indicating a weaker ethnic ideology in Israel concerning immigrants from Russia, who also represent a much larger share of the population than the ethnic German migrants do in Germany. As the main objective of the research, the authors wanted to find out whether the two cultural identifications relate to corresponding attitudes and behaviors toward the host culture, positively in the case of German/Israeli identification and negatively for Russian identification. The theoretical rationale was that the migrants' salient self-categorization resulted from the legal status as citizens of the respective country and was due to their perception by the natives as Russians. In turn, migrants' self-categorization guides further attitudes and actions in intergroup situations with natives. This thinking is common fare in psychological research on immigration, but longitudinal studies are very rare; this paper fills that design gap in the literature. The authors utilized growth curve analyses to study the relationship between initial level and slope of both cultural identifications, and level and slope concerning attitudes toward encounters with natives, host culture language use, and proportion of natives in the peer network. In other words, the research question concerned the degree to which change in identification corresponds to change in attitudes and behaviors.

The results on the German sample, young people aged 11–21 years, at the first assessment were clear-cut: Increasing identification in the host culture was associated with increasing pro-host culture attitudes and behaviors. However, the reverse association was found concerning increasing identification with the culture of origin. Although the data were longitudinal, the model of growth curve analyses used did not identify the direction of effects. However, previous experimental studies have demonstrated that intergroup behavior follows identification in time (see Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

The authors performed basically the same analyses with an equivalent Israeli sample of Russian-Jewish immigrants, though identifications were only assessed once. When the

German analyses were rerun such that they matched the Israeli analytic procedure, the similarities were obvious. In both Germany and Israel, cultural identification plays the same significant role in explaining interindividual differences in diaspora migrants' host culture participation. On a practical note, one may wonder whether reducing migrants' identification with the culture of origin would be advisable to increase encounters with the host culture that in all likelihood are helpful for adapting to the new country. However, this reduction would possibly be detrimental because identification with the culture of origin is known to promote higher self-esteem and successful adaptation in many domains, including school achievement. In this regard the study was somewhat narrow in the assessment of outcomes.

Immigration based on ethnic affinity to the country of destination often occurs in the form of an entire family, and given the fact that diaspora immigrants in most cases were well established in their country of residence, not all members of a family that migrates share the ethnic attribute that makes the entire family eligible for privileged immigration. For instance, one third of the Russian immigrants to Israel are not considered Jewish according to religious law, in spite of the fact that they immigrate into a state based on their families' Jewish affiliations. Moreover, due to discrimination against Jews in their country of origin, the non-Jewish partner in a marriage then had an advantage in terms of reputation among authorities, whereas this relation is often reversed after immigration to Israel and thus may represent another source of strain on the marriage. Lavee and Krivososh (2012) compared married couples and divorced/separated couples (who came to Israel as a couple) who emigrated from the former Soviet Union, and also distinguished between Jewish and mixed ethnic origin of the couples. The assumption is that the strains of immigration entail risks for marital stability. Further, the authors presume these risks to be higher among couples of mixed heritage because the different cultural backgrounds make acculturation in Israel even more difficult. Both sources of instability taken together should help explain the high divorce/separation rate among immigrants. Based on various theoretical approaches, the authors assessed measures of current strains concerning personal adjustment to Israel (e.g., whether an individual feels at home), social adjustment (e.g., whether an individual feels accepted by society), and the disparity of a couple concerning these two attributes.

The results of the discriminant analyses were quite straightforward. Divorced/separated immigrant couples displayed lower personal adjustment of the male partner than intact marriages, whereas there were no group differences in social adjustment. Further, discrepancies between the partners in these attributes were relevant, with higher discrepancies increasing the likelihood of divorce/separation. Unexpectedly, there was no large difference in adjustment between Jewish and mixed couples, except that the effects seem to be a bit more pronounced for mixed couples, which corresponds with earlier research on the higher instability of interracial marriages (Zhang & Van Hook, 2009). Moreover, in Israel public identification of an individual's religious identity is a nonissue when it comes to immigrants from

Russia given that most of them are secular in orientation. Thus, in public, mixed and non-mixed couples are likely to be viewed similarly at first glance. This caveat is probably also why there was no difference in social adjustment between Jewish and non-Jewish immigrants. A gender difference concerning personal adjustment revealed a higher flexibility among immigrant women, which is reminiscent of other research on marital stability under economic strains that showed similar results (Ptacek, Smith, & Zanas, 1992).

As mentioned previously, the study used a convenience sample and is further constrained in its explanatory power by concurrent rather than prospective data. Thus, we cannot rule out that the low personal adjustment and the higher couple discrepancies among divorced/separated couples might partly represent a consequence of rather than an antecedent to marital instability. However, given that this topic among ethnically mixed immigrant couples has rarely been studied, the research reported represents a worthwhile first step.

Taken together these six papers emphasize the influence of ascribed and self-ascribed identity throughout the immigration experience of diaspora migrants. Both in the diaspora and in the ethnic home country, these individuals face significant intrapersonal, interpersonal, and intergroup challenges in navigating and achieving the development of a secure identity. The importance of home versus host culture varies by context such as home or school, by individual role such as parent, child, or partner, and by group such as immigrant or native. Diaspora migrants must not only define for themselves their preferred balance of home and host culture identity, but also do so under the pressure of expectations from, as well as discrimination by, the native host society and the immigrant's own family and friends. These papers suggest that promoting the successful adaptation of diaspora immigrants into their ethnic home countries requires a sophisticated understanding of the multiple competing and contextualized pressures on defining oneself in a foreign home country.

References

- Al-Ali, N., Koser, K. (Eds.). (2002). *New approaches to migration? Transnational communities and the transformation of home*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bradatan, C., Popan, A., & Melton, R. (2010). Trans-nationality as a fluid social identity. *Social Identities*, 16, 169–178.
- Brenick, A., & Killen, M. (2011, April). *The influence of adolescent cultural group identity and intergroup contact on evaluations of Jewish and Arab intergroup friendships*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal, Canada.
- Brenick, A., Titzmann, P. F., Michel, A., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2012). Perceptions of discrimination by young diaspora migrants: Individual and school-level associations among adolescent ethnic German immigrants. *European Psychologist*, 17.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Corcoran, M. (2002). The process of migration and the reinvention of self: The experiences of returning Irish emigrants. *Journal of Irish Studies*, 37, 175–191.
- Dietz, B. (1999). *Ethnic German immigration from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union to Germany: The effects of migrant networks* (Discussion Paper, 68). Bonn, Germany: IZA.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., Horenczyk, G., & Schmitz, P. (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, 79–97.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Yijälä, A. (2011). The model of pre-acculturative stress. A pre-migration study of potential migrants from Russia to Finland. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 499–510.
- Joppke, C. (2005). *Selecting by origin: Ethnic migrations in the liberal state*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lavee, Y., & Krivosh, L. (2012). Marital stability among Jewish and mixed couples following immigration to Israel from the former Soviet Union. *European Psychologist*, 17, 158–167.
- Levy, D., & Weiss, Y. (Eds.). (2002). *Challenging ethnic citizenship: German and Israeli perspectives on immigration*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Mähönen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2012). Anticipated and perceived intergroup relations as predictors of immigrants' identification patterns: A follow-up study. *European Psychologist*, 17, 120–130.
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2012). Perceived discrimination of immigrant adolescents in Greece: How does group discrimination translate into personal discrimination? *European Psychologist*, 17, 93–104.
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., Pavlopoulos, V., Obradovic, J., & Masten, A. S. (2008). Acculturation and adaptation of Pontian adolescents in Greek urban schools. *International Journal of Psychology*, 43, 45–58.
- Negash, A., Alem, A., Kebede, D., Deyessa, N., Shibre, T., & Kullgren, G. (2005). Prevalence and clinical characteristics of bipolar I disorder in Butajira, Ethiopia: A community-based study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 87, 193–201.
- Phinney, J. S., Berry, J. W., Vedder, P., & Liebkind, K. (2006). The acculturation experience: Attitudes, identities, and behaviors of immigrant youth. In J. W. Berry, J. S. Phinney, D. L. Sam, & P. Vedder (Eds.), *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition* (pp. 71–116). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ptacek, J. T., Smith, R. E., & Zanas, J. (1992). Gender, appraisal, and coping: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 747–770.
- Remennick, L. (2007). *Russian Jews on three continents: Identity, integration, and conflict*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Schein, L. (1998). Forged transnationality and oppositional cosmopolitanism. *Comparative Urban and Community Research*, 6, 291–313.
- Shrum, W., Cheek, N. H., & Hunter, S. M. (1988). Friendship in school: Gender and racial homophily. *Sociology of Education*, 61, 227–239.
- Silbereisen, R. K. (2008). New research on acculturation among diaspora migrants. *International Journal of Psychology*, 43, 2–5.
- Solé, C., & Parella, S. (2003). The labour market and racial discrimination in Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29, 121–140.
- Stefansson, A. H. (2004). Homecomings to the future from diasporic mythographies to social projects of return. In F. Markowitz & A. H. Stefansson (Eds.), *Homecomings: Unsettling paths of return* (pp. 2–20). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

- Stoessel, K., Titzmann, P. F., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2012). Young diaspora immigrants' attitude and behavior towards the host culture: The role of cultural identification. *European Psychologist*, 17, 143–157.
- Stokols, D. (1996). Bridging the theoretical and applied facets of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist*, 51, 1188–1189.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2001). Premigration ethnic and national identities: Jewish adolescents planning emigration from Russia and Ukraine to Israel. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46, 386–399.
- Titzmann, P. F. (2011). Growing up too soon? Parentification among immigrant and native adolescents in Germany. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1007/s10964-011-9711-1
- Titzmann, P. F., Silbereisen, R. K., Mesch, G., & Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2011). Migration specific hassles among adolescent immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Germany and Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 779–796.
- Tsuda T. (Ed). (2009). *Diasporic homecomings: Ethnic return migration in comparative perspective*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Walsh, S. D., Edelstein, A., & Vota, D. (2012). Suicidal ideation and alcohol use among Ethiopian adolescents in Israel: Its relation to ethnic identity and parental support. *European Psychologist*, 17, 131–142.
- Weingrod, A., & Levy, A. (2006). Paradoxes of homecoming: The Jews and their Diaspora. *Anthropology Quarterly*, 79, 691–716.
- Zhang, Y., & Van Hook, J. (2009). Marital dissolution among interracial couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 95–107.

Alaina Brenick

Human Development and Family Studies
University of Connecticut
348 Mansfield Rd., Unit 2058
Storrs, CT 06269-2058
USA
E-mail alaina.brenick@uconn.edu