

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra sociologie

Diplomová práce

Bc. Věra Gavrilova

Russian „Second Generation“ in Europe: Comparative Analysis of Integration Patterns, National Identity and Transnational Ties of the Children of Russian Migrants in Prague and Paris.

“Druhá generace” Rusů v Evropě: komparativní analýza etnické identity, mezinárodních vazeb a integračních vzorců u dětí ruských imigrantů v Praze a Paříži.

Praha 2015

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Yana Leontiyeva, Ph.D.

Na tomto místě bych ráda poděkovala vedoucí mé diplomové práce, Mgr. Yaně Leontiyevé, Ph.D. za hodnotnou pomoc při jejím zpracování. Mé vřelé díky patří též respondentům za ochotu a poskytnutý čas, stejně jako mé rodině a mému partnerovi za podporu a trpělivost.

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracoval(a) samostatně a výhradně s použitím citovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů.

V Praze, dne 27. července 2015

Věra Gavrilova

Klíčová slova (česky)

Migrace, Děti immigrantů, Integrace, Česká republika, Francie.

Klíčová slova (anglicky):

Migration, Children of Immigrants, Integration, Czech Republic, France.

Abstrakt (česky):

Diplomová práce se zabývá komparací druhé generace ruských migrantů ve dvou evropských metropolích: Praze a Paříži. Autorka se v rámci práce pokusila zanalyzovat etnickou identitu dětí ruských přistěhovalců, existenci mezinárodních vazeb s vlastní rodičů a integrační vzorce. Studie je založena na hloubkových rozhovorech s mladými ruskými migranty z druhé generace a jejich rodiči. Analytické části předchází přehled teoretických konceptů používaných v diplomové práci s důrazem na existující teorie integrace migrantů a zejména integrace druhé generace migrantů. Přestože výsledky této studie nemohou aspirovat na generalizaci ani v kontextu Evropy, ani celé České republiky a Francie, autorka se pokusila nastínit hlavní podobnosti a odlišnosti mezi populacemi ruských imigrantů druhé generace ve dvou evropských metropolích, stejně jako mezi první a druhou generací ruských migrantů a přinese informace o ruské "nové druhé generace", které mohou být použity pro další výzkumy či tvorbu politik.

Abstract (in English):

A master dissertation is devoted to the comparison of Russian second-generation migrants in two European capitals: Prague and Paris. It analyses ethnical identity of the children of Russian immigrants, existence of transnational ties with the homeland of their parents as well as their integration patterns. The study is based on in-depth interviews with the Russian second generation adolescents and their parents. The analytical part is preceded by a review of the main theoretical concepts used in the study with the focus on the existing theories of migrants' integration in general and second-generation integration in particular. Despite the fact that the results of the study can be generalised neither to the entire Europe, nor to the whole Czech Republic or France, the author tries to outline the main similarities and dissimilarities between the populations of The Russian second-generation immigrants in two European capitals as well as between two generations of Russian migrants and brings information about the Russian „new second generation“ in general that can be used for further researches or policy-making.

OBSAH

1. Introduction	7
1.1. Subject of the Study	7
1.2. Research Questions	10
1.3. Thesis Outline	11
2. Theoretical basis	14
2.1. Definition of the Terms Used	15
2.2. National Identity	17
2.3. Transnational Ties	20
2.4. Integration Theories	22
2.4.1. Dimensions of Integration	22
2.4.2. Integration Policy Types	25
2.4.3. Acculturation Strategies	28
3. Research context	30
3.1. Prague	30
3.1.1. History of Russian Immigration to the Czech republic	30
3.1.2. Russian Community in the Czech republic: statistical data and characteristics	31
3.1.3. Immigration policies	32
3.2. Paris	34
3.2.1. History of Russian Immigration to France	34
3.2.2. Russian Community in France: statistical data and characteristics	35
3.2.3. Immigration policies	35
4. Methodology	38
5. Comparative analysis of Russian second-generation immigrants in Prague and Paris	40
5.1. National Identity	40
5.2. Integration Patterns	45
5.2.1. Legal Status	45
5.2.2. Participation In An Educational System	46
5.2.3. Cultural Integration	51
5.2.4. Interactive Integration	55
5.2.5. Discrimination	57
5.3. Transnational Ties	60
6. Conclusion	64
References	
Appendixes	

1. Introduction

1.1. Subject of the Study

This master thesis is devoted to the second generation of Russian migrants living in Europe. More precisely, it deals with the integration issues and transnational ties of young Russians, whose parents left Russia and consequently settled in one of selected European countries: the Czech Republic or France. Both of these states have received a significant number of Russian immigrants during the last two decades after the fall of the socialist regime, when newly established Russian Federation has opened its borders for outward migration. The latest available statistical data for the Czech Republic shows that Russians are considered to be the fourth most frequent citizenship of immigrants in the country with 33 138 residents, which is 8% of the whole number of migrants (Czech Statistical Bureau 2013). In France position of the Russians in the list of largest ethnic groups of migrants is “weaker”. The latest official statistics available dated 2011 shows that this group is placed on the 29th place according to its size, however the absolute number of Russians living in metropolitan France (53 112 persons) is even higher than in the Czech Republic. (Insée 2011)

These impressive statistics have been cited above in order to emphasise the importance of the Russian community as a significant part of multinational mosaic of immigrants settling in both of the studied countries and, therefore, the importance of exploring Russian-origin children and adolescents, who to some extent will define the future of The Russian community abroad, as a part of this group. With the growing tempo of migration, population of migrants’ children becomes more and more numerous and, if we want to understand its possible behaviour and impact on society, this population is definitely worth studying. However, the first problem arises with the need to define the “second generation”. Should only “native-born” descendants of migrants be included or “foreign-born” children can be also considered as the second generation? There is no consensus about that in the academic world yet. King et al. (2006) speaks of a second generation as both native-born immigrants’ children and foreign-born ones arrived before starting primary education, some authors (Rumbaut 1997) prefer to distinguish between these categories and construct difficult system of 1.25, 1.5, 1.75, etc. generations. Marques et al. (2007) takes the concept more broadly and refers to all migrants’ children in general. In my research I will use the term “second

generation” (as well as the equal terms “descendants”, “young Russians”, etc. in order to avoid repetition) namely in this broader sense, however, in order to avoid including children who arrived recently and just haven’t had enough time to start an integration process, I have defined the target group of my research as the migrants’ children at the age of 14-18 who have been living in the host country with their parents for more than 6 years.

There are several questions connected with this group of migrants that create the core of the thesis. Are these young Russians integrated into the host society enough to perform within professional and social space as successful as their peers from the native population? To what degree do they tend to preserve the culture of their parents’ country of origin as well as the one of the European state where they live now? Do they feel themselves to be Russians and to what extent are their lives linked with Russia?

When speaking about peculiarities of second-generation integration, several points that can be relevant in the context of the following study, are worth mentioning. First of them refers to the formation of national identity of migrants’ children. According to Waters (1990), national identity of the second generation depends on the time spent in the host country. On the examples of our respondents, we will be interested in knowing, if longer residence in the country is connected with self-identification with a dominant ethnical group.

Secondly, we cannot but mention the impact of eventual discrimination on the relationship between the second generation and majority population. Gans (1992) maintains that the level of integration of the young descendants of immigrants is also connected with the level of discrimination in the society. From his point of view, the more frequent are manifestations of discrimination, the higher is the probability that second-generation migrants will be oriented at their own ethnic community by participating in ethnical economic structures and creating cultural contradistinction with the majority. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the link between discrimination level and distancing of an ethnic community from the majority should not be taken as a one-way causal relation: an opposite situation, when a particular ethnic group is discriminated due to its reluctance to participate in a common economic, social and cultural life, cannot be excluded.

Thirdly, we should not forget about the key role of a family in socialisation and identity formation processes. In case of migrants’ families it is especially

relevant to mention that not all cultural contents are transmitted from parents to their children, transmission of concrete values and cultural patterns is determined by so-called “transmission belts”, i.e. “conditions favorable for transmission in a particular socioeconomic and cultural context, such as personal characteristics of the transmitter and the receiver (resources of education and age), and family interaction variables (parenting styles and parents’ marital relationship)” (Schonpflug 2001). In this study, by interviewing both the first and the second generations of migrants I would also like to understand, whether viewpoints and attitudes of the young generation concerning the host society and their own ethnic origin are similar to those of their parents.

The last concept that should be introduced in connection with the peculiarities of the second-generation integration is multiple ethnic identity referred to as “cultural hybridity” (Reynolds 2006). According to this concept, children of migrants being faced to different cultural environments and social systems, have “constant negotiations of their identity by referring to multiple frames of belongingness - “homeland”, “host country” or even cosmopolitan references” (Vathi 2011: 109). Therefore, it is not always right to seek for one ethnic identity in case of each young respondent by considering indicators of which side (self-identification with motherland of their parents or with the country where they actually live) outweigh the others. We assume that national identity is a complex phenomenon formed as a consequence of interaction of influencing factors, that is why in this research I have used several indicators of ethnic identity (e.g. attitude towards the Russian community, self-identification when being asked about “your” country, particularities of language use, etc.).

Using a field method of in-depth interviews, the thesis compares living patterns, ways and extent of integration, as well as the liaisons with Russia of the migrant’s children living in two capitals: Prague and Paris. The capitals were selected as places of data collection due to the author’s opportunity to conduct the field work there, however this choice also respects the fact that the largest share of migrants (including those of Russian ethnic origin) live namely in the capitals. (Czech Statistical Bureau 2012; Insée 2011) The comparison itself is based on two sets of empirical data. First sample consists of the interviews with adolescents not younger than fourteen years old and not older than eighteen, who have been living with their parents in the Czech Republic or France for the period longer

than 5 years. The other sample includes the interviews with one of the parents of the interviewed teenagers and serves to provide more complete picture of integration patterns and cultural environment of each family as well as some details on the matter. In other words, I have decided to conduct semi-structured interviews with both teenagers and their parents in order to complement their point of view with the one of the adults.

After the data collection, the information has been analysed and structured in terms of four integration dimensions distinguished by Bosswick and Heckmann (2009): structural, cultural, interactive and identificational (i.e. national identity). In the second part of the thesis I try to find similar trends and peculiarities within two populations of Russian-origin teenagers, complementing the information got from them by opinions and attitudes of their parents. Moreover, a separate chapter is dedicated to the analyses of liaisons of the Russian second generation with the motherland of their parents.

Therefore, the study tries to provide a complex overview of integration specifics of adolescent children of Russian migrants, however it does not aspire to be the full description of The Russian second generation in France, neither in the Czech Republic due to impossibility of generalisation as a result of limited number of respondents.

1.2. Research Questions

Before launching the qualitative study, principal research questions supposed to define the direction of the project were outlined. First of them is connected with the extent to which the identity of the young Russians is connected with their ethnicity. The research project has to reveal the nature of the children's identity and its relationship with the fact of their ethnical origin. In other words, I would like to know if they rather feel to be Russians or associate themselves with the ethnic majority of the country they live in. Taking into account that the concept of ethnic identity is not always simple and can include several elements (e.g. ethnic identity depending on a specific situation experienced by an individual), I would also define conditions evoking the feeling of belonging to a particular ethnic group for the young Russians.

Secondly, the thesis aspires to answer the question considering the strength of transnational ties with Russian Federation. Do the young Russian descendants communicate with their parents' country of origin? If yes, what means

of communication do they use: direct social contacts with relatives and friends, following Russian media, etc.? Understanding the character of transnational ties will help us to specify their role in forming of a personal identity as well as their impact on the integration patterns practised (or not practised) by a concrete individual of the target group.

Thirdly, the thesis project tries to explain the role of the Russian ethnic community within the integration of the second generation of migrants into the host society. Does the Russian diaspora provide the young members with the integration support? Does it play an important role in terms of their life choices or the second generation is independent enough from their proper ethnic network and integrates to the host society by other means? In addition, the thesis poses the supplementary question: do the integration patterns of parents and children within one family differ? If yes, what is the role of ethnic component in explaining this difference?

Moreover, the research project also aspires to reveal the presence of interconnectedness of the level of integration into the host society, ethnic identity of a concrete young respondent and the intensity of transnational ties in the particular case. What is the relationship between these three concepts? Is there any evidence that one of them influences the others in a more significant way? Finally, all the research questions mentioned above will be considered in a comparative context between the French and Czech environment. An intergenerational dimension will also have place in the research: some aspects of the children's integration will be studied in terms of relationship with the parents' integration specifics.

1.3. Thesis Outline

The thesis can be methodologically divided into two parts: the first part includes the chapters one to three and provides the theoretical basis for the following qualitative research, while the second part including the chapters four and five presents the analysis of the data collected within the in-depth interviews.

The first chapter is aimed at presenting the principal issue of the study, explaining the author's interest in the particular sociological problem of Russian second generation and structuring the subject of the study by formulating concrete research questions. This chapter also gives a basic idea about the research methods used within the project and introduces the outline of the thesis.

The second chapter focuses on theoretical approach and basic concepts concerning the problems of national identity and transnational ties of migrants with the country of origin. In this section the author also tries to prevent all possible problems of theoretical ambiguity by defining the main terms used in the following text. Last but not least, the second chapter introduces the current integration theories. In this context, the author focuses on four dimensions of integrations presented by Bosswick and Heckmann (2006) that are later used in terms of structuring the analysis of the second generation integration, types of integration policies existing in host societies, types of integration strategies undertaken by migrants. In connection with the specifics of the research target group (young Russian descendants), the author also presents the existing scientific concepts of the second generation integration.

The third and the last chapter of the thesis theoretical part describes the “environment” of the phenomenon studied: it provides a reader with the retrospective view of the history of Russian immigration into France and the Czech Republic, not omitting the actual state by giving the statistical data about the Russian community living in both countries as well as information about the immigration policies of the host countries.

The following chapter (4) serves as an introduction to the comparative analysis of the second generation of Russian migrants in two countries as it acquaints the reader with the methodology of the research conducted. The author tries to describe the procedures executed and characterise the respondents sample in order to show up the limitations of the research results and the possible level of their following generalisation.

The fifth chapter of the thesis presents the results of the comparative analysis. This chapter has two semantical parts: the focus of the first section is on the results concerning the integration patterns of Russian second generation in terms of four dimensions of integration explained in the chapter two (it is essential to notice that one of these dimension, the identity dimension, reflects the studied concept of national identity of the children of Russian migrants), the second section of the chapter is devoted to the problem of transnational ties of the research target group with their parents’ country of origin, the Russian Federation.

The last sixth chapter serves as a conclusion that summarises the results of the analysis conducted within the thesis and evaluates the value of the research as a whole pointing to its strengths and weaknesses.

2. Theoretical basis

An interest in the phenomenon of migration first appeared in North American environment in 1910-1930, when social scientists within the traditions of Chicago sociological school raised the questions of racial segregation and inter-ethnic conflicts. (Bordes-Benayoun, Schnapper 2008: 71) European scientific community ignored the issues of migration or associated them with general problematic of social classes till the second half of the 20th century. The same tendency can be seen in particular case of immigrants' children that started to be an object of research in Europe later than in the United States, where one of the first publication on the topic "The New Second Generation" by Portes emerged in 1996. The studies focusing on the descendants of immigrants have "strongly North American focus" (Lee 2008: ix), while European perspective is only represented by several authors' works (e.g., Crul & Vermeulen's work on Turkish-origin youth in Europe (2003) or Zana Vathi's study of Albanian second generation (2011) that were created within TIES research project on the second generation of migrants from Turkey, Ex-Yugoslavia and Morocco in eight European countries). Another problem of conducting a research of migrants' children in European environment arises in connection with a great cultural diversity: in other words, numerous combinations of host states and migrant's countries of origin are possible, that makes it much more difficult to find common patterns and, therefore, to construct the needed theoretical basis for the research of the European immigrants' second generation in general.

The topic of Russian-origin youth in Europe is even less explored, the cause of it probably lies in the fact of relatively late start of Russian immigration inflow into European countries that began to have a mass character only in the first decade of the 21st century. Consequently, there are few studies focusing on the integration issues of Russian immigrants' descendants living in Europe, even though now many representatives of this generation reach the full age and, thus, become participants of labour market and social life of the host societies. The aim of this thesis is to start filling this gap.

Integration of migrants was always considered to be a complex phenomenon that includes interaction of several factors such as integration politics of the receiving state, cultural peculiarities of concrete ethnic group of migrants and personal traits of a newcomer. We can also describe the problems of integration as an

opposition between a migrant (sometimes with his ethnic group as a background) and a host society. The children of immigrants are supposed to be an interesting subject of study as they seem to undergo even more sources of influence as this opposition in their case is mediated by a family and, first of all, parents, whose attitudes and level of integration can not but influence the result of child's integration process. Moreover, the representatives of the second generation who spent their childhood and/or adolescence in a host country are faced to compulsory structural integration linked with school attendance that excludes the possibility of complete isolation from the major society and, therefore, interferes into the process of integration in other dimensions as well as ethnic identity formation. Furthermore, studying the integration pathways of the second generation offers a possibility of its consequent comparison with the parents' and current newcomers' ones, opening a perspective of longitudinal study of migration and integration. As this aspiring intention can not be incorporated into my Master thesis, I would like to focus on the Russian second generation itself and compare the integration patterns and liaisons with the home country of young Russian descendants across two host societies: the Czech and the French one.

These two countries can be especially interesting from the research point of view due to the differences in conditions that they provide for migrants including the immigrants of Russian origin and that can significantly influence their integration process. First of all, the difference can be seen in the closeness of the official language of two countries with the Russian language: the Czech language as well as Russian belongs to the slavic group of languages, while the French one being the roman language has far less similarities with the native language of Russian immigrants. Secondly, taking into account the common socialist past of the Czech republic and Russia, we can presume that the Czech culture can be considered as closer to the Russian one in comparison with the French one. We can not but mention the cultural difference between two host states as well as the difference in their immigration history and migration policies. All these factors make the comparative study of The Russian secondgeneration within Czech and French environment interesting.

2.1. Definition of the Terms Used

This chapter aims at defining principal terms that will be used repeatedly in the following text in order to avoid ambiguity within their usage.

The term “**migration**” that will appear on almost every page of the thesis refers to “*permanent movement of individuals or groups across symbolic or political boundaries into new residential areas and communities*” (Scott, Marshall 2009: 470). In the case of Russian migrants studied within this thesis, migration will be associated primarily with the movements between states. It should be said that migration being a bilateral phenomenon includes two processes: leaving one country (in our case, Russian Federation) and coming to another one (the Czech Republic or France). In this connection a migration process is usually seen as a sum of emigration (the act of leaving one state) and immigration (settling in a new one).

Diaspora is a “*religious or national group living outside an (imagined) homeland*” (Bauböck, Faist 2009: 9). Gabriel Sheffer (1993) suggests three criteria to define diaspora: common ethnic identity, presence of internal organisation and significant level of contact with the homeland.

The term “**integration**” can have different meanings depending on the context, however in case of this thesis it can be defined as inclusion of a new individual into a group and his acceptance by other members of this group (Jandourek 2007: 109). It should be noted that the concept of integration is generally divided into two parts: social integration referring to the interaction of a new-comer with a host society and system integration as “*the result of the anonymous functioning of institutions, organisations and mechanisms - the state, the legal system, markets, corporate actors and finance*” (Lockwood 1964 in Mouzelis 2008: 97). We also can speak about several dimensions of integration reflecting different spheres of life, where an individual can notice the changes emerged within the process of integration into a host society.

Another term that is repeatedly used in the text of the thesis is “**identity**”, which in its broader meaning refers to “*a definition, an interpretation of the self that establishes what and where the person is in both social and psychological terms*” (Guibernau i Berdun 2007: 10). More specifically, I speak about national identity, i.e. the concept of self-identification with a particular ethnical group that can become a complex and problematic issue in case of the immigrants’ children facing the influence of both culture of their parents’ country of origin and cultural environment of a host society.

When speaking of **transnational ties** of a migrant, I mean all kinds of communication between him and his country of origin (or his parents' country of origin in case of the descendants who were born abroad). This can include social contacts with relatives or friends living there, visits of the country, following mass media produced there, attempts to stay abreast of the news or various manifestations of participation in social or political life of the national community.

2.2. National Identity

A human has always sought to understand his own nature and inquired who is he. As a social being, very often he tended to answer this question by finding common features with other members of society and, by this means, identifying himself with a particular social group. H.-P. Frey and K. Hausser (1987) call this type of identification "collective identity", when *"the object of identification is not individual people, but rather groups, organisations, classes, cultures. The subject is people who reveal the social system through descriptions."* (Frey and Hausser 1987: 4) It should be added that an individual can identify himself with several groups and consequently have several collective identities. The example is a man claiming to be Italian, sociologist, catholic and green peace activist at the same time.

As mentioned above, one of the social groups with which an individual can identify himself is an ethnical community determined by common ethnicity of the group members. Farley (1982: 6) defines ethnicity as *"a group of people who are generally recognised by themselves and/or by others as a distinct group, with such recognition based on social or cultural characteristics"*. This definition admits that the characteristics of ethnicity can be both objective (i.e. recognised by the outgroup) and subjective (i.e. recognised by the members of the ingroup). However, the problem in this regard is that there is no consensus about the roots of ethnicity and, thus, no common idea of the nature of ethnical (or national) identity in the scientific world. Here we can distinguish two main paradigms explaining the origin of national identity of an individual: primordialist and instrumentalist approach.

Primordialism ("primordial", "primary") is a concept understanding ethnicity as an inseparable characteristic of every person, i.e. as a trait that has its roots in biological origin of an individual. Clifford Geertz (1963: 107) explains the core of primordialistic understanding of identity as following: *"One is bound*

to one's kinsman, one's neighbor, one's fellow believer, ipso facto; as the result not merely of personal affection, practical necessity, common interest, or incurred obligation, but at least in great part by virtue of some unaccountable absolute import attributed to the very tie itself."

It should be noted here that there are different forms of primordialism, their difference is connected with a variety of factors that are used to explain the roots of group's cohesion. Sandra Joireman (2003) speaks of biological (or natural), cultural, linguistic and "soft" primordialism. The first case tends to emphasise the role of blood ties, the second and the third, as it is clear from their names, pay attention to culture as a whole or native language as a critical factor, while "soft" primordialism *"views the primordial attachments as evolving from history and a myth of a common homeland rather than blood ties or cultural heritage"* (Joireman 2003: 28).

On this basis we can conclude that within primordialism an ethnic group is understood as an old natural formation and national identity is attributed to a human at the moment of his birth and can not be changed as the time passes. The latter is the most essential point of primordialistic concept in terms of studying the Russian second generation because it implies that a child (including the children of migrants living abroad) is born with a particular national identity remaining stable during all his life. In other words, primordialism denies flexibility as a trait of national identity. Therefore, from this point of view, a person born in a Russian family (either in Russia or elsewhere), where the Russian language was spoken and the native culture was treated as the main one, will have unchangeable Russian national identity.

However, the problem here is that this concept ignores any factors that can influence national identity during the life of a person. What about international migration and a change of linguistic environment (these factors can be even more influential at the early age of a person), or a child born to parents with different ethnical identity? Primordialism seems not able to explain these and other cases and, therefore, was objected to critics.

One of the alternative concepts defining the parameters of ethnicity and national identity is instrumentalism. In contrast to primordialism, instrumentalist approach sees national identity as a flexible phenomenon. This identity *"may be important at some times and in some circumstances and completely absent in oth-*

er times". (Joireman 2003: 35) It means that ethnicity, being dormant, can be mobilised and influence social dynamics, primarily in case of ethnic conflicts. In this connection instrumentalists also speak of the cases, when "ethnicity is manipulated and used by elites to achieve political goals or some form of political mobilisation". (Joireman 2003: 36)

Secondly, the core of the ethnicity concept is not connected with the "content" of the ethnical group, but is defined by the boundaries of the group. F. Barth (1969: 15) states that "*the critical focus of investigation from this point of view becomes the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses*".

The third difference is that, according to instrumentalists, a membership in an ethnic community is acquired by ascription or self-ascription and, therefore, can change over time. Moreover, instrumentalism mentions "individual advantage" (social or any other good) as the main factor influencing the choice of ethnical reference group and defines it as "*self-interest that motivates ethnic identification*" (Joireman 2003: 39). In other words, a person chooses his own national identity with regard of benefits and advantages that one can bring to him. For the case of our study it means that a child born in a Russian family should not necessarily have a Russian national identity, but can literally "choose" the one that "suits" him the best.

Nevertheless, the instrumentalist approach also has its weak points. For example, Jenkins (2008: 15) criticises the idea of dormant national identity and speaks of "ongoing process of ethnic identification", results of which are reflected in individuals' everyday life.

When speaking of the process of shaping the national identity of a group and an individual, we can state that, similar to the concept of national identity, there are many opinions on the matter in the academic world. One of them, represented primarily by Barth, sees the identity formation process from a relational perspective and understands it as a construction of boundaries between two groups (in which both groups take part), when the relations between two ethnic groups are built on the basis of "us" and "them" dichotomy. Individual ethnic identity, from Barth's point of view, "*rooted in early socialization and produced and reproduced in the ongoing concerns of the here-and-now*" (Jenkins 2008: 80). Within the following research project, I would like to examine the national

identity of the young Russian descendants and try to find the reasons of self-identification with a particular ethnic community.

2.3. Transnational Ties

An interest for transnationalism as a phenomenon of maintaining transnational ties with a country of origin by an immigrant started to increase in the early 1990s. (Levitt et al. 2003) Probably the most explicit definition of transnationalism was given by Basch et al. (1994: 7) and understood this phenomenon as *“the process by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement.”* These group of authors also maintained that this process is called namely transnationalism in order *“to emphasize that many immigrants today build social fields that cross geographic, cultural, and political borders”* (Basch et al. 1994: 7).

Joppke and Morawska (2002) noticed that immigrants and their descendants can follow both strategies (assimilation in the host society and “transnational linkages” with the home country) at the same time, and one of them does not exclude the other. Schiller et al. (1995: 48) calls migrants with transnational bonds “transmigrants” and characterises them as individuals *“firmly rooted in their new country but maintaining multiple linkages to their homeland”*.

Transnational bonds can have various forms including visits of the country, communication with relatives and friends living there, sending parcels or money, taking part in elections, etc. The increase in transnational activities among others can be understandably connected with the development of communication technologies allowing immigrants to maintain more effective intercourse with their native country. The intensity of the ties reached such a level that it *“lead transnationalists to argue that immigrants' lives and their identities may be developed in relation to more than one nation”* (Tamaki 2012: 148). This assumption gives us the right to use the concept of transnational ties in close connection with the identity concept and to presume that there is a reciprocal relationship between strength of transnational ties of the individual and his national identity.

However, the question is why people who have made a decision to leave their motherland still maintain linkages with it, i.e. what factors influences existence of transnational ties between a migrant and his homeland? Schiller et al. (1995) mentions three factors that have an impact on creating and maintaining “transnational” linkages. The first of them refers to intensity and nature of migra-

tion: the vaster is the migration flow (number of migrants going from the home country to the host country), the more probable is emergence of transnationalism within migrants' behaviour. When speaking of this factor, Schiller et al. also mentions political reasons of migration as a circumstance enhancing transnational connection.

The second factor is connected to the diversity of migrants' cultural resources determining existence of concrete forms of transnationalism within a concrete ethnic minority. In other words, specific cultural traits shape the behaviour of migrants and, therefore, have an impact on the intensity and manifestation of transnationalism among these people. On the basis of the mentioned theory we can assume, for instance, that migrants who came alone (without family) from the countries, where the extended family type is considered to prevail, will probably maintain more intensive linkages with their home country as they are used to staying in contact with their relatives. On the contrary, migrants from the countries with the core family or single-household as a prevailing social element, will be less likely to hold close connection with their homeland.

The third factor is associated with the level of discrimination emerging in the host society towards incoming migrants. Understandably the historically pre-conceived way of treating migrants (or a group with a particular ethnical origin) characteristic for a concrete host society can influence migrants' desire to keep tough intercourse with their home country. In case of high discrimination rate, these relations can perform the function of escaping the reality and compensating the lack of social interactions with the majority of the population.

Three factors proposed by Schiller et al. two decades ago have been revised and elaborated by several authors. Dahinden (2009) added a factor of time presuming that the longer an individual stays in a particular country, the smaller is the strength of his transnational ties with his homeland. Consequently, it means that representatives of the second generation of migrants, who have spent the majority of their life in a host country, are less likely to be transnationally oriented. Vertovec (2009) also speaks about certain individual characteristics that can condition transnational activities of a migrant. These characteristics mainly refer to demographical (gender, age), socio-economic (social class, level of income) and other (actual legal status, migration history) factors. Vertovec also notices that all

these factors of the individual dimension are interrelated with other circumstances on community and state levels.

What does this discussion mean for our research project? After naming possible manifestations of transnationalism and factors that can influence its emergence, I will try to search for relations between the living circumstances of migrants' children and their eventual tendency to maintain transnational linkages with the homeland of their parents. An interesting point can be also found in comparing intensity and manifestations of transnational ties between parents and their children.

2.4. Integration theories

2.4.1. Dimensions of Integration

Social integration being a complex phenomenon takes place in several dimensions. That's why in order to evaluate the degree of integration of the individual or a group of migrants, it's necessary to measure the level of integration in each of its dimensions. In this connection I consider it essential to define four basic integration dimensions that will be used later within evaluating integration degree of the second-generation migrants.

Before we examine the dimensions of integration, we must first briefly explain the concept of basic forms of integration, just as it is based. The classification of integration dimensions by Bosswick and Heckmann (2006) that has been chosen by me for the research project is based on the Esser's concept of basic integration forms (Esser 2000). Esser (2000) distinguishes four forms of integration:

- **Acculturation (sometimes called socialization)**

Acculturation is the process of tertiary socialization of a foreigner in the host society, coupled with the knowledge and skills adoption, as well as the acceptance of cultural standards and norms necessary for successful interaction in the society.

- **Placement**

Placement is characterized by attaining a certain position in the economic and educational system of the society, in the professional sphere of life and in civil society. This process uses acculturation as the basis and also assumes the acquisition of rights associated with a specific position, and, hence, obtaining possibilities for accumulation of cultural, social and economic capital.

- **Interaction**

Interaction, according to Esser, is the process of creating social ties, involvement in certain networks, e.g. finding friends, getting married or, on a generalized level, taking part in activities of any social group within the host society.

- **Identification**

The last form of integration, identification, lies in the subjective sense of belonging of a migrant himself and the social system on cognitive or emotional level.

The forms of integration mentioned above correspond to the concept of integration dimensions by Bosswick and Heckmann (2006). The authors identify four dimensions of integration: structural (possibility of access to institutions of the host country), cultural (language acquisition and adoption of social standards of the majority), interactive (social relationships with individuals within the host society) and identification (sense of belonging or self-identification with the majority) aspects. (Bosswick and Heckmann 2006)

- **Structural Integration**

At this level of integration we take into account immigrant's possibility to access the key institutions of the host society (education and health systems, labour market, etc.), participation in which determines social and economic status of newly arrived migrants. Each individual who is economically and socially active at least to the smallest extent (which corresponds to the objectives of changing the country of living of most migrants - improving their economic and social status), is required to pass through this dimension of integration. The only option to avoid structural integration is living within the enclosed "ethnic colonies", which in fact can not replace all institutions existing in the host society. All these facts suggest the inevitability of going through structural integration within the integration process as a whole.

- **Cultural Integration**

Explanation of the concept of cultural integration is based on the assumption that migrants can aspire to any position in the host society only after acquiring its basic social skills and cultural norms. The process of adoption of these standards by individual, coupled with a change in his cognitive, attitudinal and behavioural characteristics, is called cultural integration. However, it should be noted that these changes do not always lead to the rejection of his native cultural

system. In this context it is possible to speak about the phenomenon of **biculturalism**.

- **Interactive integration**

A certain level of adoption of the elements of cultural integration becomes a condition for interactive integration, since this dimension of integration lies in the entrance of the individual into the primary social ties with the majority population. Bosswick and Heckmann mention several indicators of progress in this dimension: incorporation into networks of social relations, friendship and love relationships with the host society members, marriage and membership in voluntary organizations.

Very often, in the first phase of integration, the compatriots of a migrant, who have settled at this country before, become a kind of connecting element between the newly incoming individual and the host society. They help him to start the process of integration as soon and effectively as possible by sharing useful information and experiences of interaction with individuals and social institutions.

- **Identification integration**

Identification integration includes subjective self-identification of an individual with the host society, its institutions and objectives, a sense of belonging to this community. Such self-identification emerges as a result of understanding, accepting and participating in the life of the society. Bosswick and Heckmann also maintain that realisation of integration in this dimension is not a prerequisite for participation in social life (unlike the cultural dimension of integration) but rather can be taken as an outcome and an index of personality changes occurred in the overall integration process. Change in value orientation and attitudes during adaptation to a new society leads to construction of a new identity of the individual. And the fact if a migrant identifies himself with the host society within this new identity, shows the extent of changes that have taken place within his personality.

Bosswick and Heckmann's classification of integration dimensions have been used in the actual research project in order to evaluate integration degree of the second-generation migrants as it has been already used by several authors in the field (e.g. Rákoczyová, Trbola 2010). Moreover, it allows to better structure the in-depth interview (where the identification integration dimension refers also to the respondent's national identity) as well as the further analysis of the integration level of Russian migrants' descendants.

2.4.2. Integration Policy Types

Nowadays, when studying the immigrants' integration, the social scientists are more likely to consider it as a reciprocal process determined not only by the efforts of migrants, but also by "reaction" of the host society and its institutions. In this connection a term of **integration policy** seems relevant. Newly arriving immigrants make up more or less numerous ethnic and cultural groups that in their attempt to integrate into majority society face a monocultural nature of the nation-state. Historically determined reaction of the majority population to an attempt of interaction in this case can be explained by a model of integration policy.

Several authors (Schnapper 1992, Todd 1994, Barša 1999) distinguishes three types of policies in the context of their place on an imaginary continuum with assimilation of immigrants within the host society on the one side and coexistence of several cultural elements, which however have different weight and importance. The latter model is often referred to as cultural pluralism. Based on the position of a specific country on this axis, Barša (1999), as well as most contemporary writers, speaks of three possible categories of integration policy: assimilation, pluralistic (multiculturalist) and ethno-exclusive model. It is also necessary to mention that these models should be taken only as ideal types, i.e. as theoretical categories that are not represented in reality. Nevertheless, with regard to clarity, each type of integration policies is associated with a specific European country that best reflects the essence of the ideal type in its integration policy.

- **Assimilation model (France)**

French (or assimilation) model is based on the division of public and private spheres of life, while cultural particularities of ethnic minorities can be manifested only in migrants' private sphere of life. It does not imply that migrants in a state with a similar integration policy type are obliged to abandon their cultural grounding. On the contrary, migrants have the right to keep their specific ethno-cultural elements (e.g. national or religious symbols), however they are not tolerated to manifest them in a public sphere of a majority society. Such a condition guarantees equality of new society members and the majority within the public and political spheres. The French model of integration also influences the educational system of the country that is focused on building "*a single and indivisible nation (nation une et indivisible)*" (Barša 1999: 11), with a focus on its history, culture and language. The fact that a person belongs to a particular ethnic, cultural

or religious group, have to be a “*purely private matter of citizens without any public political relevance*” (Barša 1999: 10).

- **Pluralistic/ multiculturalist model (Great Britain)**

Unlike the assimilation integration policy, the British model does not require ignoring the ethnicity of the individual or relocation of its signs to the private sphere of life. On the contrary, it presupposes the coexistence of several cultures within one country, and takes political considerations on the presence of these cultures within the society. British model seems to be the most compromise towards the newly arrived individuals: the educational system is ready to take into account ethnic, cultural and religious differences of students, a state offers support to the functioning of various cultural and other social institutions aimed at protection of minority cultures. Some authors also distinguish between *de facto* and *official multiculturalism* (Joppke, Morawska 2003), when *de facto* multiculturalist approach presumes recognition and protection of broad migrants’ rights, official multiculturalism goes further and tends to separate citizenship and ethnical identification, abandoning the principle of blood as the basis for naturalisation process.

However, some degree of majority culture acceptance by newly arriving members of society and its superior position in comparison with other cultures to some extent compensate the heterogeneous nature of society. Nevertheless, even with a certain superiority, the major culture remains relatively weak and pluralistic integration model has been repeatedly blamed for being “*guilty of having enabled and facilitated <...> extremist violence*” (Ben Rafael, Sternberg 2009).

- **Ethno-exclusive model (Germany)**

German model was determined historically by migration of Turkish workers in Germany in the middle of the 20th century. This category of migrants was expected to return to their native country after finishing their work that, consequently, influenced the integration policy concerning the Turkish people in Germany as the possibility that migrants would be integrated into mainstream society, was almost excluded. In this connection the ethnic minority was involved in the economic life of society, but remained excluded from public and political spheres, i.e. the integration took part only within one of its dimensions.

In the case of ethno-exclusive model, the majority population is understood as an “ethnic nation” (*das deutsche Volk*) (Kastoryano 2002: 43), while migrants are taken as foreign and “nonintegrable” into it as the main principle of in-

dividual's identification as a German is *Jus sanguinis* (right of blood) and not *Jus soli* (right of the soil). It is needed to say that, despite the majority's lack of interest in the public and political integration of foreigners, the cultural traditions of ethnic minorities are being preserved *"not in order to stimulate emergence of a multicultural society, but to facilitate the future return of immigrants [to their homeland] and protect [German] cultural homogeneity"*. (Martinello 1997: 55)

It has been already noted that the integration models mentioned above are nothing but ideal types, i.e. theoretical categories and in reality the states named as the examples of integration policies with time start to take over features of other integration policies: Germany ceases to preclude the possibility of naturalization of immigrants, France eases requirements for ethnic minorities regarding the transfer of all cultural symbols to a private sphere, Great Britain starts putting emphasis on the integration of individuals, unlike the previous policies focused merely on groups.

The same tendency of several interlocking integration policies seems to exist **in the Czech Republic**. In the current Czech society some features of both the British, French and German models are present. Naturalization process in Czech republic, as well as in France, is based on right of the soil and is characterised as "one of the strictest across the EU" (Acquisition 2010). As for educational system, we can observe a kind of generalist approach, when the state does not distinguish special needs of students belonging to different ethnic groups: the Education Act 29/1984 Sb. states that all categories of foreigners can be admitted at a state school or university, but an educational institution does not have a responsibility to provide additional classes of Czech language for the foreigners. Study of Czech is mandatory in all schools. Moreover, there is a requirement of its acquisition for obtaining permanent residence permit and citizenship.

However, there are some signs showing the tendency to multiculturalism in the Czech society: absence of resistance against the presence of symbolic signs of particular ethnic groups and religions in public and coexistence of national cultural, public and religious organizations in the context of ethnic minorities, e.g. existence of ethnical organisations are among them. For example, there are several educational institutions allowing to study in languages other than Czech (but with compulsory class of Czech), e.g. Slavic Gymnasium or English College in Prague. Furthermore, since 2004 immigrant women applying for the Czech citi-

zenship, can preserve their last name without adding a typical Czech terminal “-ová”, which can be also considered as a manifestation of a multiculturalism tendency.

The closeness of the Czech integration policy with the German type is connected with a certain extent of “circulation” approach (Kušniráková, Čížinský 2011: 509), i.e. treatment of integration issues regarding temporariness as a dominant characteristic of immigration in the country. Kušniráková and Čížinský however mention that this tendency is now partially replaced by integration efforts.

2.4.3. Acculturation Strategies

Moving to another social environment always evokes behavioural and cultural changes of an individual as a result of interaction of a newcomer’s culture and the one of majority. There have been several attempts to classify these changes, one of which were presented by J. W. Berry within his four-fold model of acculturation strategies. The term “acculturation” is defined as *“those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups.”* (Redfield et al. 1936: 149)

According to Berry, each strategy of intercultural interaction consists of two components: socio-cultural attitudes and actual behaviour of the individual in specific situations, which, as noted by the author of the theory, rarely coincide. This discrepancy is explained by undertaking of formal models of behaviour, often diverging from the motivation of the individual in making certain behavioural decisions and social constraints of behaviour (norms, opportunities, etc.). The theory of J. Berry (1980) suggests four strategies of acculturation: integration, assimilation, segregation and marginalisation. Berry makes a distinction between policies of assimilation and integration, as well as between the strategies of separation and marginalisation as various ways of acculturation process (concerning both groups and individuals). The core of the typology is based on two criteria of individual (or group) orientation: own ethnic group (desire to preserve their own cultural heritage and national identity) and majority ethnic group (orientation on contacts with a wider society, taking part in its activities, accepting its values).

Taking into account these criteria, we can distinguish four types of acculturation strategies chosen by ethnocultural groups and implemented by ethnic majority in society. In case of dominance of ethnic identification and weak motiva-

tion to implement intercultural contacts, individual chooses the strategy of segregation, i.e. a possible variant of acculturation in which ethnic minorities deny the majority culture and maintain their ethnic features. In contrast, when an ethnic group attaches importance to the preservation of its own culture, but at the same time does not limit the interaction with other cultures, we can speak of a strategy of integration. Integration is the result of identification with both old and new cultures. Integration strategy can be freely selected and successfully performed by an ethnic minority, when the dominant society is open and includes a focus on internal cultural diversity. Moreover, this strategy requires mutual adaptability, including the adoption by non-dominant and dominant groups the rights for all groups to live within a society as culturally different peoples.

If an ethnic group has little opportunity or interest in the preservation of its own culture in the presence of desire to interact with other cultural groups, the assimilation strategy is most likely to take place. Assimilation means that an immigrant completely identifies himself with a new culture and denies the culture of ethnic minorities, to which he belongs. Marginalization strategy includes little interest in interaction with the other ethnic groups (e.g. because of exclusion or discrimination). This acculturation strategy is characterised by the fact that migrants do not identify themselves with the culture of the ethnic majority, nor the culture of an ethnic minority.

It should be noted that, when determining the strategy type, minority ethnic group as well as its individual members have a choice. However, each strategy requires certain conditions and is more probable to be chosen in a certain situation. Integration strategy, for instance, can be fully implemented by an ethno-cultural group or an individual only in a multicultural society that presumes universal acceptance of cultural diversity as a value of society, relatively low level of prejudice (minimal ethnocentrism, racism, discrimination), positive mutual relations between ethnic and cultural groups, a sense of belonging to society and identification with it of all individuals and group, but also the desire to preserve cultural heritage.

3. Research context

3.1. Prague

3.1.1. History of Russian Immigration to the Czech republic

Russian immigrants have been settling over the territory of the Czech Republic since the beginning of the 20th century. According to Sládek (2010), we can distinguish three periods of Russian immigration to the Czech Lands, i.e. three large groups of migrants, who did not only move to the country at the same time, but very often had common motives for migration and similar social status: these groups are the inter-war migration (1918 - 1948), immigration between 1948 and 1989, and post-revolutionary migration since 1989 until present.

The first wave of emigration, which took place in the interwar period, comprised mainly Russian intellectuals coming as a result of the political regime in the country of origin, but also Austro-Hungarian Russian military prisoners, who could not return to their homeland for the same reason, as well as refugees from the time of the First World war and civil war in Russia (Sládek 2010: 27). However, some of the immigrants of this period were forcibly repatriated after World War II and subsequently arrested in the Soviet Union. Sládek (2010: 28) also speaks of a certain extent of voluntary "innovative" immigration of Russians with the aim of improving living conditions.

The second wave of emigration of Russians to the Czech lands is mostly considered as formally voluntary, since in many cases it was a migration as a result of a marriage of an immigrant with a Czechoslovak citizen. Nevertheless, it is important to note that sometimes such a marriage was only a fictitious way to leave the Soviet Union, where migration was almost impossible even within the Eastern Bloc (Sládek 2010: 29).

The third, "post-revolutionary" wave of Russian emigration, which takes place until the present time, can be explained by both push-factors (the situation in the country of origin) and pull-factors (luring conditions in the target country of migration, i.e. the Czech Republic). The respondents of the Sládek's research (2010), who immigrated to the Czech Republic in this period, mentioned the political and security situation in Russia and ethnic discrimination among the reasons that made them leave their country. Pull factors include, for example, the economic conditions of life in the Czech republic. Migration in order to get an education is also one of the largest forms of contemporary migration of Russians along with

psychological reasons connected with finding a new identity by changing the environment, as well as creating an alternative place for living and conducting business associated with the economical uncertainty in Russia. The number of immigrants from the third wave is the largest in the history of Russian immigration to the Czech Republic and, consequently, has the largest share in contemporary Russian community in the country.

3.1.2. Russian Community in the Czech republic: statistical data and characteristics

Before characterising The Russian community in the Czech republic numerically, it is needed to distinguish between Czech citizens of Russian nationality (17 872 people according to census 2011)¹ and Russian citizens with long-term or permanent residence in the Czech republic (33 138 people in 2013 according to Czech Statistical Bureau). It is interesting to mention that the fourth position of people with Russian citizenship in the citizenship rating among the population of immigrants is stronger than the sixth position of Czech citizens with Russian origin among citizens with non-Czech nationality. It can be a sign of both absence of desire to obtain Czech citizenship among Russian migrants and specific state migration policy precluding naturalisation of them, but also the fact that many of them came to the Czech republic relatively recently (in the last wave of migration) and haven't spent enough time for being able to apply for the Czech citizenship².

The Czech city with the biggest number of Russian migrants is the capital, Prague (ČSÚ 2013), where there are several major Russian expat organisations, e.g. Russian Centre of Science and Culture, Russian Institute, etc. Socio-demographic characteristic of The Russian community in the Czech republic includes relatively high education and income level of its members (Drbohlav et al. 1999: 20, 25), which significantly differ them, for example, from Ukrainian immigrants with mostly lower education and income level.

The other characteristic trait of The Russian community in the Czech republic as a social group is its inward orientation or relative autonomy, i.e. preference of internal social interaction in terms of different spheres of life. (Sládek

¹ <http://vdb.czso.cz/sldbvo/#!stranka=podle-tematu&tu=30629&th=&vseuzemi=null&v=&vo=null&void=>

² In most cases, an individual needs 5 years spent in the Czech republic to be able to apply for a permanent residence permit and 5 years more to be able to apply for the Czech citizenship. (MVCR 2014)

2010) This autonomy includes creation of ethnic economic structure (“russian” cafés, shops, etc.) as well as intra-communal marriages and other kinds of social relationships.

3.1.3. Immigration policies

In the last decade, the approach of the Czech Republic to legal migration is changing especially in the assessment of its impact. Passive prevention of unwanted immigration that used to exist in the 90ies concedes and a new point of view, which takes into account the economic and social aspects of migration and resettlement, appears. In other words, immigration gradually becomes one of the effective tools for solving the economic and social issues of the country. Therefore, in 2003, the government adopted "Principles of government policy in the field of migration of foreigners" (decree №55 January 13, 2003), which became the foundation of the formation of the "Concept of the immigration policy of the Czech Republic." Taking into account that in the Czech Republic, as well as in other developed countries of Europe, the demographic situation worsens, state migration policy does no longer impede legal migration, which is considered as beneficial in the long run of the country and the Czech society.

Conditions of foreigners residence in the Czech Republic are regulated by the State law n. 326/1999 with the following amendments, as well as several decrees of the Government of the country. One of the most important aspects of the immigration policy of the Czech Republic is the absence of any material aid to foreign immigrants, i.e. we can conclude that the country does not provide additional motivation to immigrants. Moreover, in order to obtain a Czech visa or residence permit, a foreigner must provide a certificate of his financial state that guarantees him a decent living in the country during the period of his stay. This measure is supposed to prevent the inflow of immigrants with an insufficient income level and consequent criminality, but in practice is often circumvented with the help of dummy certificates, etc. Obtainment of permanent residence permit by citizens off non-EU countries requires a certificate proving acquisition of certain level of the Czech language. In addition, an entry to the territory of the Czech Republic is denied to persons who have a conviction on criminal charges and related crimes, as well as persons suffering from serious infectious diseases or severe chronic illnesses that require lengthy and costly treatment.

Despite the lack of government social assistance programs for foreigners, the Czech Republic is an attractive country for immigration not only due to its favourable economic and geographical location, but also the lack of any restrictions on starting the business for foreigners, as the requirements for establishing a company are softer in comparison with other European countries. In particular, the foreign participation in the share capital of a company may be equal to 100%. In addition, the first two years the company has the right to have zero annual balance and at a later time is not required to be active with a high turnover (unlike France).

The phenomenon of migration forced the Czech government to develop the concept of foreigners' integration. Legislative and practical measures at the ministerial level, with the aim of supporting the integration of foreigners, have been taken during the last decade, e.g. Ministry of the Interior, has developed a "Concept of integration of foreigners in connection with the entry of the Czech Republic to the European Union". Besides this authority, other ministries such as Ministry of Labour and Social Issues, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Industry and Trade, Ministry of Regional Development and Ministry of Health, contribute to the implementation of this policy. The budgets of these ministries include special mandatory indicator of financial support for projects of integration of foreigners that provide financial support for civil society organizations dealing with issues of foreigners.

The key role in the implementation of integration policy belongs to the Commission of the Minister of Labour and Social Security on the integration of foreigners monitoring activities of individual branches. However, the area of migration policy is within the competence of the Interior Ministry, which also provides a bilateral cooperation with EU member countries, as well as states outside the EU. This cooperation is primarily aimed at coordinating the implementation of immigration and asylum policy, and in particular at preventing illegal migration.

Despite certain integration efforts, some authors doubt the maturity of the Czech integration policies and ask whether *"departure of foreigners (or enforcement of rules enshrining migration "temporariness" not always in an obvious way) is not considered by a state power as a more important goal than the integration of foreigners into society"* (Kušniráková, Čížinský 2011: 506).

3.2. Paris

3.2.1. History of Russian Immigration to France

In France, the process of Russian immigration began before the twentieth century, but reached its maximum after the Russian communist revolution 1917 with the arrival of large numbers of “white” (i.e. pro-tsar and counterrevolution) emigrants to France. This period is usually associated with the first wave of Russian immigration to the country and, in the case of the Czech lands, mostly included intellectuals and representatives of the higher social layers. Many of them spoke French as a legacy of Russian high society of the 19th-century, who had used French as a second language in every day life. (Krauss and Victoroff 2012)

The second wave included those Russian citizens who had ended up on the occupied territories or who had been interned in the war camps during the Second World War and were afraid to be enjailed in the Stalinist forced labour camps after returning to their native country. (Livak 2010) Therefore, they preferred to stay in one of the European countries including France.

The third wave took place during the years 1970-1980 and was made up of dissidents and opponents of the Soviet regime. (Krauss and Victoroff 2012) As well as in the case of two previous waves, these people had not left the Soviet Union voluntarily, however, they had been objected to political pressure that can be characterized as a softer one in comparison with the first two waves of immigration.

The last, fourth wave of Russian immigration to France started the collapse of the Soviet Union, continues till now and is often labelled as an economic migration. Nevertheless, immigrants of the fourth wave left Russia hoping to find an environment that would be more stable not even economically, but also politically and socially. Even nowadays, when the situation in Russia has changed significantly, there is still a number of Russians who come to work in French enterprises. Among this group of migrants, there are many computer scientists, scientists working for the CNRS and research institutes. There are also many students (mostly at the institutions of higher education) with a predominance of girls, who in most cases return to Russia at the end of their studies. (Krauss and Victoroff 2012)

The specifics of Russian immigration to France in comparison with the Czech Republic are connected with the political situation of both host countries: during the Soviet period, the Czech Republic belonged to the Eastern Bloc and,

therefore, could not serve as a shelter for those Russians, who wanted or were obliged to escape the Soviet reality. On the contrary, it was much more difficult for Soviet citizens to migrate to France situated in the Western Europe as the borders of the Soviet Union were closed and emigration from the country (or at least from the Eastern Bloc as a whole) was almost impossible.

3.2.2. Russian Community in France: statistical data and characteristics

In France, the most up-to-date statistics concerning the number of Russian citizens living in the country refers to 2011 and includes 53 112 persons. As for the number of people of Russian nationality (i.e. both French and foreign citizens), this data seems vague and varies from 200,000 to 500,000. (Russieinfo.com, 2014) As well as in the case of the Czech Republic, most of the Russian immigrants have settled in the capital of the country, Paris that is considered to be “the Russian capital out of Russia” (Grouix 2007).

The Russian community in France differs from the one in the Czech Republic in terms of its extreme heterogeneity: moreover, there is an opinion that The Russian community no longer exists as an aggregate within the French environment due to the big number of disparities within the diaspora. According to Iakounina, “*wealthy Russians who live in the south [of France] and have <...> villas have nothing to do with students, dissidents, researchers or with the descendants of first generation migrants <...>*”. (Russieinfo.com, 2014) As Russians in France do not form a real community with close ties between its members, we can predict the lower level of inwards orientation among them than in the Czech Republic. In other words, in France we expect lesser willingness to limit one's social interactions by own ethnic group members.

The group of immigrants that seem to be relatively more interested in performing common activities consists of Russian women married with French men: some of them organize Russian associations and schools, the main aim of which is to teach children of Russian and partly Russian origin the language, as well as traditions and culture of their ancestors (Grouix 2007).

3.2.3. Immigration policies

France is one of the oldest immigration countries in Europe and in the world. It started receiving immigrants since the Great French Revolution and in the middle

of the 19th century the country provided a shelter for more than a million immigrants.

Migration legislation in France treats different groups of ethnics unequally: migration policy is maximally tolerant towards residents of the EU countries because French law treats them as European citizens, who have a right of freedom of movement, residence and work within the European Union, as well as people from overseas departments and territories of France because they are French citizens and, therefore, have the right to move freely throughout the whole territory of the State, including its metropolitan area.

As for the other immigrants, the main goal of individual French migration policy is integration of an immigrant into French society through education system and other social institutions. French law uses the "right of soil": any child born in a foreign family that have lived in France for at least 5 years (from 11 years to adulthood) has the right to acquire a nationality. It is also possible to get French citizenship by naturalization and marriage. (Vosdroits.service-public.fr 2015) Naturalization is carried out among foreigners who have lived in France for at least five years. Residence permits can be provided for one year and ten years period with the possibility of extension. The residence permit for ten years can be obtained by an immigrant only after at least 5 years stay in France.

The legislation basis for French immigration policy is the law "On Immigration and Integration" adopted in 2006. While in previous years the focus was on administrative methods aimed at reducing the number of immigrants staying in the country, the migrants' riots in Paris in 2005 showed that the main task of that immigration policy should be the integration of foreigners already living in France in order to reduce the risk of outbreak of social unrest in the country. Successful process of immigrants' integration belongs to the tasks of the French Office for Immigration and Integration (L'Office Français de l'Immigration et de l'Intégration).

The key point is reflected in Article 5 of the law dated 2006: "*A foreigner who intends to obtain a permanent residence permit, must conclude a contract with the state concerning the reception and integration, translated into a language understood by this foreigner. <...> A foreigner is obliged to follow the way of life inherent for the country's citizens.*" (Legifrance.gouv.fr 2006) As well as in the Czech Republic, obtainment of a permanent residence permit requires a spe-

cial document that certifies a certain level of French language, recognized by the state. In addition, an applicant should prove the availability of financial basis for the period of his stay in France, the amount of which is smaller in comparison with the Czech Republic due to the difference in living minimums. Furthermore, labour migration to France is very limited now: a potential employer must prove that none of French citizens was interested in the position occupied by the immigrant.

The Law "On regulation of immigration, integration and asylum" dated 2007 among others considers the issue of family reunification, asylum, immigration and labour. The law requires "the provision of DNA testing for immigrants - applicants for family reunification in order to prove the presence of kinship". (Legifrance.gouv.fr 2007) It should be added that these DNA tests are conducted by the state and are optional (in case of demand of the state authorities). A foreigner who has applied for family reunification is also required to have a certain level of French.

The latest document defining immigration policy in France is the Law "On immigration, integration and citizenship" (2011), which includes a number of provisions concerning the strengthening of the fight against illegal immigration flows, including issues of employment of foreigners without a work permit. The Law contains measures aimed at strengthening the integration policy and reforming the system of deportation of foreigners staying in the country illegally. (Legifrance.gouv.fr 2011)

Therefore, in most aspects French immigration policy resembles the Czech one, which is understandable due to the fact that both countries are members of the European Union that obliges them to follow common European directives concerning the questions of immigration. However, as the result of its colonial past, along with European Union citizens, France also has special (and generally less strict) requirements for immigrants coming from its former colonies (e.g. Algeria). Nevertheless, these exceptions do not concern Russian citizens, for whom the conditions for obtaining residence permit or naturalization are almost the same in both countries, if we neglect the necessity of proficiency of the French language, which is subjectively more difficult to learn for a Russian speaker than Czech that belongs to the Slavic language group.

4. Methodology

As the study aims at understanding specific traits of national identity and integration process of young Russian descendants, the qualitative method of **semi-structured in-depth interview** has been used to achieve its purpose. The ad hoc prepared questions allowed to guide the conversation in the right direction and simplified consequent comparison of respondents' answers. At the same time, this method helps an interviewer to react to spontaneous yet important discourse of a respondent.

The respondents of the study included pairs of first generation Russian migrants and their children. Target group of young respondents was defined as adolescents not younger than fourteen years old and not older than eighteen, who have been living with their parents in the Czech Republic or France for the period longer than 5 years. The other sample includes the interviews with one of the parents of an interviewed teenagers and serves to provide the more complete picture of integration patterns and cultural environment of each family as well as some details. All in all, ten pairs "a parent - a child" were interviewed within both sides of the study: five in Prague and the same number in Paris. Parents and children were interviewed separately in order to minimise reciprocal influence and distortion of the information provided. Regarding the minor age of the second-generation migrants, the permission of their parents to interview them was always asked.

The respondents in Paris were recruited through placing the advertisement on several online forums for the expats living in France and contacting potential narrators in social networks, in Prague the access to the respondents were executed thanks to the sport coach of the school of artistic gymnastics Sokol Žižkov I., where several young Russian girls practice this kind of sport, as well as through the author's social contacts. Within both sides the snowball technique were additionally used to access more respondents. Being fully aware of the fact that such respondent recruiting procedure can not provide representative results that can be generalised, I have chosen it regarding the time and funds limitations of the study.

The young respondents sample includes 6 girls and 4 boys from 14 to 18 years old, seven of which were born in Russia and three in their actual country of residence, the adults sample consists of 6 mothers and 4 fathers from 37 to 52 years old. The respondents' profiles are presented in the Tables 1 and 2 in the Ap-

pendix. In order to respect the anonymity of the respondents, their names were changed. The exception concerns the respondents who authorised the author to mention their real names.

The interviews were held in the period of September-October 2014 in Paris and January-February 2015 in Prague. The interviews were arranged in advance by phone, email or social networks and took place in quiet public places such as parks, cafés, etc. The respondents were proposed several language options of an interview, however, all of them decided to be interviewed in Russian. Nevertheless, especially in case of the second generation immigrants, the conversation required the interviewer's language proficiency in the language of the residence country of the respondents as sometimes they had problems with expressing themselves in Russian tended to use Czech or French words and expressions and mix them with Russian ones.

Duration of the interviews varied between 25 and 70 minutes. The interviews were recorded with the help of the dictaphone of the mobile device, transcribed in Russian manually. Consequently, the chosen passages used in the text of the thesis were translated into English. Within the translation I tried to preserve the initial meaning as well as respect the English language structure. The interviews were analysed on the basis of four dimensions of integration presented above (Bosswick & Heckmann 2006). However, when structuring the analytical part I tried to prioritise the findings of the study in order to facilitate reading of the text.

5. Comparative analysis of Russian second-generation immigrants in Prague and Paris

5.1. National Identity

When characterising the national identity of Russian migrants, there are several tendencies distinguishing the first and the second generations, descents of Russian migrants and their parents. The first feature that should be mentioned is **rejection of a migrant label** by the children that took place in case of many adolescent respondents. The young Russians both in Prague and Paris, unlike their parents, do not see themselves as aliens in the country where they live but rather as elements of the multicultural puzzle representing the host society. One of the respondents, while speaking about her friends' nationality, *a priori* defines migrants' children as French. According to her, migrants children no longer belong to the category of migrants:

“My friends are French but their parents didn't live here [in France]. They came to France like my parents did.”

(Sveta, 14 years old, Paris)

There is also a difference between siblings of different ages in this regard: younger children, who came to the host country at earlier age than their elder siblings or were born in the host country, see themselves and are perceived by elder brothers and sisters as “being less Russian” or “being closer to the Czech/French culture”. Consequently, we can distinguish two different types of relationships between second generation siblings. In some cases we can see a kind of alienation connected with different life experience and cultural background:

“We are not really close with my [elder] brother... I do not know why... Probably because me and my younger brother and sister, we were born here, in the Czech Republic, and he was born in Russia. <...> Actually I think I'm closer to the Czech culture than my parents and my elder brother.”

(Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

Sergey, a father of two sons of seventeen and six years old, describes their relationship in the following way:

“Nikita [the elder of the brothers] does not take Mark [the little brother] serious, he notices every mistake Mark makes when he speaks Russian, he gets angry and he says to me and his mother: “He makes mistakes in his native language! Have you heard it? Aren't you ashamed?!”

(Sergey, Nikita's father, 45 years old, Paris)

However, sometimes such a difference between two siblings leads to the situation, when the elder of them tries to teach and transmit national cultural values (including Russian language) to the younger one. For example, 17-year-old Yana, the elder sister of 3-year-old Marianna, reads her books in Russian and teaches her native language because she knows *“many people who forgot Russian as they had not spoken it”* and she does not want her little sister to be one of them.

Another manifestation of rejection of a migrant status is connected with distinguishing between respondent's (and his ethnical group) position and other “migrants”. In this case his own ethnical group is used in positive or at least neutral connotations without emphasising their “external” origin, while other “migrants” are seen as aliens having negative impact on the host society:

“I like France as a country, it has a lot of cultural values but <...> I do not like actual French policies. There are a lot of immigration flows from Africa... If only they [immigrants] did something good here... But they mostly do nothing. Or Rumanians, for example... They sit on the ground at every bus stop and nobody ever wants to do anything with them. Or some Parisian districts, the ones in the North, look like an African town.”

(Sasha, 15 years old, Paris)

As it can be concluded from the statements mentions before, the representatives of the Russian second generation do not feel themselves to be migrants in the “alienating” sense of the term. Young Russians in Paris and Prague reject the immigrant identity but it does not mean that they also reject Russian national identity. To be precise, the level of national identity (national consciousness), i.e. the extent of sense of belonging to Russian ethnic group, varies among different respondents. The first differentiating factor is connected with the **child's country of birth**, which does not mean that children of Russian parents born in the host country do not feel themselves to be Russians. However, namely for this category of respondents it was most difficult to answer the questions about national identity and motherland unambiguously. For instance, 17-year-old Erika born in Prague rejects any attempts of reflection on the matter of her national identity:

“I do not know which ethnic group I associate myself with... It's hard... My parents are from Russia, I was born in the Czech Republic. That's what I always say and I do not want to go beyond this.”

(Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

Sasha (15 years old, Paris), who was born in Paris but spent several years of his childhood in Russia, asserts that he has two mother countries and does not want to favour one of them. Nevertheless, sometimes the fact of being born in a host country interacts with another important factor that can be described as familial values. 14-year-old Masha born in Prague mentions the **impact of parents** on her national identity:

“Why do I feel myself to be Russian and consider Russia to be my motherland? I think cause I was just brought up like this.”

(Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

She also mentions that in her family Russian traditions and language are preserved on parents' initiative, e.g. her mother prohibits using any other language except Russian for communication at home. Her father explains such efforts by an attempt to connect the two generations, parents and their children on the basis of the common roots:

“Russia is a part of us [parents] and I think we should transmit this part to the children, to tell them how we used to live... cause it's part of us and, therefore, part of them as well. They should know where their roots are from.”

(Sergey, Masha's father, 49 years old, Prague)

As for those young Russians who were born in Russia and came to the host country with their parents or joined them later, the question of identity is clearer: all of them associate themselves with Russian ethnic group. However, even among them there is a tendency to have a so-called “double” identity resulted from different factors. When being asked on holidays abroad where do they come from, many of them would mention both countries (Russia and the actual country of living) but in different order and this order would be chosen by the respondents for different reasons. One of the respondents would first of all say that she is from France *“in order to look cool... like “Oh my! You are from France! It's such a great country!”* (Yana, 17 years old, Paris) but then she would add that her parents *“have moved there from Russia when she was six”*. Unlike her, 18-year-old Alina would mention Russia on the first place but later she would say that actually she lives in France because this country *“has a great influence on her personality”*.

On the contrary, 14-year-old Artem would mention only the Czech Republic and justifies his choice by the fact that *“it’s too long to tell the whole story”*. It turns out that the answer to the question can also depend on an interlocutor and, more precisely, on his nationality:

“It depends on who I am talking to... If I’m with the Czech people, I would say that I’m Czech. That’s good that I do not have a [Russian] accent. With the Russians I would probably say that I’m from Russia.”

(Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

It is interesting to mention that an attitude to one’s origin varies between the generations. Parents perceive their foreign origin as a difficulty or an obstacle for their actual life in a European country, that should be overcome in order to improve the quality of life. Such perception is closely connected with their forced de-skilling and “starting life from zero” after migration.

“I used to work as an accountant. When we moved to Prague, we had left everything there [in Russia]. We had no friends, no job... We didn’t speak Czech... Even though my husband was planning to start a business here, everything was so unstable. <...> It was the hardest time of my life, I think.” (Inna, 44 years old, Artem’s mother, Prague)

“My wife has a university degree in psychology but after moving to Paris she did different jobs... You know, a kind of traditional migrant jobs... Like babysitting, housekeeping, things like that...” (Sergey, Nikita’s father, 45 years old, Paris)

He adds then that *“it was hard for her to change a job for a less-skilled one but at the time we had no choice.”*

Unlike their parents, the second-generation migrants take the fact that they were born in the family of foreigners and its consequences (especially advanced language skills) as a not-to-lose opportunity or a strength that could provide them with a **competitive advantage on the labour market** in the future. Therefore, they often tend to choose or envisage a career pathway connected with intercultural sphere (translation, International relations, diplomacy, etc.) 17-year-old Yana from Paris hopes that her bilingualism (she speaks perfect French without any accent and considers Russian as a mother tongue) will help her to become a translator, the high scores in Russian helped her to enter prestigious university. She also mentions her proficiency in Russian as an object of jealousy of her friends from the majority ethnical group:

“For example, I’m chatting with my Russian friend in the café. Our French friends arrive, they hear us speaking the language they can not understand and they are amazed: wow, you speak Russian! It’s so cool!” (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

Some respondents from Paris used their proficiency in Russian as a means to ameliorate their school grades by choosing Russian as a foreign language and, therefore, increasing their total average score.

Not only the Russian second generation migrants perceive their origin and cultural background as a plus, they also want their younger siblings and children to continue profiting by the same advantage. One of the respondents presents the following utilitarian explanation of her wish:

“I want my children to speak two languages: Russian and English. And maybe the third other language, it depends on who will be my husband. <...> It’s useful to speak many languages, you have more chances to enter a good university or find a good job.” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

When speaking about the identity transition from the first generation of Russian migrants to their children, we can distinguish two strategies followed by parents. The first of them is presented by the parents who transmit their national identity and encourage their children to maintain it. In such families special practices like reading Russian books, cooking traditional meals, celebrating national holidays or religious practices are performed in order to unite the family and maintain Russian identity of its members. Sometimes some measures (e.g. prohibition of speaking any language except Russian at home mentioned above) are applied.

“We have a tradition: each Sunday morning we cook and eat pancakes. Real Russian pancakes. My mother used to cook them when I was a child and now I cook them for my daughter.” (Olga, 40 years old, Lena’s mother, Prague)

“In our family we celebrate orthodox Christmas on the seventh of January, the New Year, the Old New Year [the Orthodox New Year] together.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

“We go to the [orthodox] church to light a candle and pray once a week.” (Sasha, 15 years old, Paris)

“My mother read me some Russian poetry when I was little. I absolutely love it and every time I feel myself melancholic now I take Yesenin’s book.” (Lena, 18 years old, Prague)

The second strategy concerns the situation, when parents do not transmit national identity to their children. In the case of Erika’s family, where Christmas is celebrated on the 25th December (*“cause of the holidays at school”* (Erika, 17 years old, Prague)) and two sisters speak English between them, we can observe the distancing from the Russian identity within both generations.

“My grandmother always watches Russian TV channels and my mother hates her for this cause there is always politics and all this Russian stuff...” (Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

The choice of such strategy can be sometimes explained by parents’ dissatisfaction with a migrant’s status and consequent desire to protect their children from these inconveniences in the future or a parent’s new marriage with a representative of majority.

“I see how she [daughter] becomes French. I can see it in the way she speaks, thinks, chooses clothes, etc. but I do not think it's bad. We are in France and being French is rather an advantage.” (Irina, 41 years old, Sveta’s mother, Paris, married to a Frenchman)

5.2. Integration Patterns

Integration as a process of inclusion of a migrant into a host society is connected with significant changes in his life. Manifestations of such changes can take place in its different spheres. Attaining a certain legal status and a position in an educational system of a host state seem to be the key factors, on the basis of which we can assess so-called “structural integration” (Bosswick and Heckmann 2006) in case of young second generation Russian migrants. As it turned out, structural integration of Russian second-generation migrants is carried out mostly through their parents, i.e. first-generation migrants.

5.2.1. Legal Status

As for a legal status, the main role in its acquisition is played by children’s parents, i.e. first generation migrants: a decision to make or not to make an effort to obtain a certain kind of residence permit or a citizenship is mostly taken for the whole family and often reflects the future plans of its members concerning their

place of living. The families that want to stay in a host country tend to have aspirations for a citizenship of this country.

“Thanks God, finally after 5 years of waiting we got it [French citizenship] three years ago! We were obliged not to leave France during this period... We couldn’t visit my mother, who is still in Russia. It was very hard but I’m happy now.” (Galina, 37 years old, Yana’s mother, Paris)

The reason for this can be seen rather in utilitarian advantages of being a citizen of a certain country:

“With the citizenship it’s easier. <...> Everywhere. Whatever you do, they treat you differently if you have a Czech ID: at a doctor, in the city hall, in all municipal institutions you have it easier, you do not have to give them tons of different papers, confirmations... you do not have to go to the police foreigners’ department... My life has changed since I got Czech citizenship. (laughs)” (Svetlana, 38 years old, Eldar’s mother, Prague)

“My parents will apply for a citizenship. And me... As I have been told <...>, without a [French] citizenship one can have problems with education... with entering the university, for example.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

“I do not have [Czech] citizenship but I would like to obtain it. It can help me in the future, especially when I will be searching for work. <...> you know, if you are not Czech, your employer must prove you are better than any Czech... So I want to obtain citizenship to have this advantage.” (Lena, 18 years old, Prague)

Despite aspiring for Czech citizenship, Lena cited above, as well as other respondents, claims to feel herself to be Russian. Moreover, almost all of them have kept or plan to keep Russian citizenship for the same (utilitarian) reasons. Therefore, obtaining a citizenship does not have “symbolic” undertone of being excluded from one society and included into another but is rather perceived as a step needed to facilitate one’s life in the host country.

5.2.2. Participation in the Educational System

Another very important manifestation of young migrant’s integration is his/hers **participation in an educational system** of a host society. In this case we can distinguish two integration strategies: either going to “ordinary” school preferred by a major population, or choosing a “special” educational institution aimed at particular ethnical group, focused on studying a certain language or generally created for migrants. The decision concerning this choice is taken by par-

ents, however, in several cases child's opinion on the matter is also taken into account.

Surprisingly, a choice of school to attend seems not to be connected with the actual language skills of a child. In many cases, the young migrants soon after their arrival in a host country were placed in an ordinary class, where the subjects were taught in the official state language that was not acquired by him at a sufficient level. It led to the emergence of difficulties faced by a child during the educational process and, consequently, resulted in a very stressful situation for both parents and a child:

"I moved to France when I was five. <...> I had to go to school without language skills, without anything... I was speaking Russian to a teacher, so nobody understood me... And I was good only at maths because <...> they [children in French schools] learn to read and count at school. But I had already learned to count, read and write in Russian when I was at kindergarten. That's why I was able to do maths exercises brilliantly. But reading... It was a catastrophe!" (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

"For my daughter, there were some difficulties at school during the first years. When she was in primary school, we used to call my friend, who were living here [in France] since a long time. She translated tasks for us, I tried to explain it to my daughter, she tried to understand what they wanted from her..." (Galina, 37 years old, Yana's mother, Paris)

"At the age of eight I started attending Czech school. My level of Czech was...zero. (laughs) I was the only Russian in the class. The teacher was shouting at me cause I didn't understand what she was saying. Then I mixed Czech and Russian, confused the words... The teacher of Czech hated me. I didn't understand what was wrong, why I was treated like this... I got really bad marks at the beginning, now it's way better." (Eldar, 16 years old, Prague)

It is needed to say that possibilities of institutionally assisted integration into a school system differ between two studied countries: while in the Czech Republic possibility to place a migrants' child in a preparatory class (with additional lessons of the Czech language) exists only for migrants from the EU states (Clanky.rvp.cz 2015) and is not available for children with Russian origin, in France since 2002 there is a possibility for them to be enrolled into special classes that are aimed at intensive language preparation and integration of foreign pupils

(*CLIN (Classe d'initiation pour non-francophones)*) for foreign children recently arrived in France and *CLA (Classe d'accueil)* for foreign pupils aimed at intensive language preparation (Education.gouv.fr 2015). This difference to some extent explains why some interviewed children had no language and cultural preparation and were placed into an ordinary class from the very beginning of their education in a host country: these are either the Russian children living in the Czech Republic, whose parents have chosen an ordinary Czech school for them, or children living in France, who started their education in 2002 or several following years and didn't have the opportunity to be enrolled to the preparatory class due to limited number of places in such classes.

Those respondents from France, who were placed in such preparatory classes consisted of immigrants' children, tend to have an experience of "smoother" integration into school environment. However, obviously it didn't prevent them from all possible difficulties at school: they still claim that at the beginning they used to have certain troubles with comprehension and, consequently, worse marks.

"When I was placed in Classe d'accueil, they started to speak French to us from the first minute... We didn't understand a word. But the time passed and I learned to understand and speak." (Alina, 18 years old, Paris)

"I was in Classe CLIN during three months approximately, then I switched for Classe d'accueil, where I stayed three months and then I went to a normal class. Well, I wasn't really ready for this but anyway I'm happy I did this preparatory classes... <...> At first I had some problems with... Comment dire "comprehension"?³ <...> But now I have no problems at school." (Sveta, 14 years old, Paris)

However, with the time passing the young Russians seem to overcome difficulties connected with language acquiring by "*studying harder than the others*" (Artem, 14 years old, Prague). Many respondents, who arrived to the host country at a relatively higher age and started their education here from the secondary level, mentioned hard working, good discipline and respectful attitude towards their teachers as the key factors that had helped them to ameliorate their notes at school:

³ "How can I say "comprehension"?" fr.

“I wasn't good at SVT⁴. Neither in Russia, nor in France... But the teacher really liked that I was more disciplined than the others. At the first lessons he really appreciated that I stood up every time when answering his questions by force of the habit, as I was taught to do so in Russia. Everyone around was laughing, but he liked it.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

“When they [the teachers] give us our grades for each trimester, the teacher also writes his characteristics of a student... And mostly I was characterised as “serious student, who likes to work hard”. Even though there were some problems with language... the language barrier, I tried... I did my best to study well.” (Alina, 18 years old, Paris)

After overcoming the difficulties, young migrants in many cases start to compare Russian and local education system and appreciate the teaching style in Czech and French schools that seems to differ from the Russian one in terms of interactivity, effective dialogue between a teacher and a student and a requirements of independent thinking:

“When you go to ordinary school in Russia, they do not teach you to think by yourself, to cogitate... You simply learn what they ask you to learn by heart, after that you recite everything you learnt by heart like a robot... and that's all! And you can not use it in practice. Here [in France] they give you time and documents you have to study yourself, to think about... You tell your ideas on the matter, after that the professor either tells you're right, or... assesses your speculation, your point of view and tells you where you were wrong.” (Alina, 18 years old, Paris)

“Here [in Prague] the teachers' behaviour is... freer. They are interested in your opinion on a fact or an event... In Russia it is really strict, they want precise dates or definitions.” (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

Another pathway of young Russian migrant's structural integration is connected with a choice of so-called “special” type of school that includes schools at Russian embassies, schools for Russian-speakers or focused on Russian language but, surprisingly, also a school oriented on English language. Several motives for this strategy are observed among the respondents. Some of the parents decided to take their children to a “Russian” school in order to facilitate their educational process at the time, when they didn't acquire official language of the country well

⁴ Sciences de la vie et de la terre, fr., the name of natural sciences subject at school

enough. However, it is interesting that all young respondents from Paris, who attended such schools, stayed there only for a relatively short period of time and then switched for an ordinary French school, while in Prague one of the respondents studied in the Russian Embassy school switched it for the English College and the other girl, who started her education in the country in the 1st Slavic Gymnasium focusing on Russian language, continues to attend this school despite assessing her level of Czech as good enough “*not to be recognised as Russian*” (Lena, 18 years old, Prague). Therefore, for Parisian respondents attending the Russian embassy school played the role of indispensable preparation of newly arrived children for their future education mostly because they improved their level of French. In case of Lena living in Prague, the choice of school made mostly by her mother reflects a certain segregation undertone once again proving the inner orientation of the Russian first generation migrants in the Czech Republic that, furthermore, affects the integration of their children. However, the mother herself explains the choice by convenience reason:

“O: We took her to the Slavic Gymnasium because... Well, not we but I. My husband showed noninvolvement on the matter. ... because I thought it would have been easier for her to study there than in a Czech school. The environment is more familiar, the language requirements are more... suitable I should say. And then she got used to this school, she made some friends with other Russian-speaking children. All her best friends are from this school now.

VG⁵: Have you ever thought of changing a school?

O: If she’s good in this school, why should we change it?” (Olga, 40 years old, Lena’s mother, Prague)

Another phenomenon that has been observed within the Czech site is the choice of school focused on English language (the English College in Prague) and educating multinational students population. The respondents explain such choice of school by its hard education standards, as well as promising higher education and career opportunities after graduation. It is needed to specialise that in the case of two respondents attending this school, English does not play the role of an international language facilitating communication between migrants and host society members because both girls were born in the Czech Republic and speak Czech

⁵ Vera Gavrilova

perfectly. For one of them, 17-year old Erika, the choice of such school can be seen as a sign of following segregation strategy as she, despite living all her life in the Czech Republic, has never attended ordinary Czech school: after studying at Russian Embassy school, she has entered the English college. However, this choice can be also explained by the fact that both young respondents are planning to leave the Czech Republic for an English speaking country in the future.

5.2.3. Cultural Integration

While pathways of structural integration of The Russian secondgeneration in Prague and Paris seem not to vary between the two sites, forms of cultural integration differ significantly in two cities. The tendencies include general positive attitude (however, with a certain extent of distancing) towards the French culture of the respondents living in Paris and a significant distancing and even tolerating objection to the Czech one of those living in Prague. It should be also added that children of Russian origin and their families in both cities tend to preserve their national culture by means of speaking their mother tongue (with a small exception of a family, where two sisters speak English between them), Russian holidays celebrations, reading books in Russian, etc.

Within Parisian site, there are several aspects of French culture that play important role for its assessment by the young respondents. First of all, it is its **multiculturalist nature** that resulted from intensive immigration experienced by the country. This feature is taken by the young Russians as a possibility to meet and discover different cultures. Yana explains her attitude to the matter as following:

“What I adore in France is that there are many different national cultures here. You discover them, you have different friends... You can taste Moroccan cous-cous, or go to the 13th district⁶ and grab Chinese noodles, I do not know... You see how different people dress, what they like, how do they behave or speak... It’s like you have been to different corners of the world! That’s amazing!” (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

“French culture. What is it actually? I would rather say there is a mix of different traditions, cultures now...” (Alina, 18 years old, Paris)

⁶ The biggest China-town in Paris is situated in the 13th district.

Another interesting point is connected with **distinguishing “old” and “new” French culture** by the respondents that associate the “new” one with contemporary liberalistic values. In this case “old France” and its culture is mentioned by some respondents in positive and new one - in negative connotations. In case of Nikita, who inclines to orthodox religion, values of “old France” seem to be closer to those of his native country and probably in this connection he defends them and objects the “new” values:

“N: The French culture itself <...> that used to be 30 years ago, or 40... I like it very much. The older generation, what they tell me about France, how it used to be... Now many people from older generations are shocked by what is happening now in France. And I like it neither... what France has turned to. <...> All their... homophile... All this culture, with all those parades of homosexuals... And also that they deny Christian values. Older people, most of them, at least those, whom I know, do not like it. And what they tell me about France... I really like it. What we have now, I do not like.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

Personal distancing of the Russian second generation migrants from the French culture is manifested in many details: perceiving it as an integral and, therefore, faceless part of European culture that can be opposed to the Russian one, perceiving French national holidays as *“just a day off at school, an opportunity to spend it with your friends and... a beautiful firework”* (Yana, 17 years old, Paris) or a hope to marry a Russian because *“common culture, traditions... I will never find it there.”* (Alina, 18 years old, Paris) In this case, an essential role seems to be played by parents, who “remind” the young Russians of their difference from the major population in indirect way in connection with national traditions:

“When I was a child, I noticed at Christmas time that Santa gave presents to all other children on the 25th of December and on the 31st of December to me. I asked the parents <...>. They explained to me that this is another Santa, a French one, and that it was a Russian one, who gave presents to me.” (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

In Prague, general attitude of the Russian second generation towards the Czech culture presents the signs of objection, externally expressed distancing but, at the same time, its toleration as a major culture of a country of living:

“Czech culture is not really close to me, nothing of it impresses me. (laughs) But I do not say I hate it. I was born here, I live here all my life... I got used to it.”
(Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

“Some things [within the Czech culture] like... some holidays, for example, are cool... But in general I do not like Czech culture.” (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

“Frankly speaking, I like other cultures more. For example... Russian culture is also interesting, French, Italian ones and so on...” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

Within Prague site, the distancing is manifested in the way of dressing, rejecting Czech books, cuisine and music and attending “national” cultural events such as concerts and performances of Russian artists. Russian cultural elements are often presented as preferable to those of major culture. 14-year-old Masha likes neither Czech music and books, nor Czech cuisine:

“Of course I read Czech books, but I do it only for school. They are so... Some of them are rather interesting, but most are so... I do not know how to express it. For example, “Kytice”⁷. It is so brutal. <...>

VG: And Czech traditions, holidays?

M: Hum... They are funny, but we do not celebrate them.

VG: When you say “we”, whom do you mean?

M: My family. We celebrate Russian holidays instead. For example, we celebrate Christmas on the 7th of January and not on the 25th of December.” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

“I would rather go to a concert of a Russian band <...> than to a Czech one. Even though my Czech friends invite me sometimes. I do not like the [Czech] music, I find it really weird how Czech language goes together with music.” (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

“I know that at school others sometimes gossip about how I look and what I have. Like, you know, Czech guys do not really pay attention to this. And when they see my new AirMaxes... or a new mobile phone, they tell me: “It can be easily noticed that you are Russian.” But it does not bother me. I am who I am and if they do not like it... I do not care.” (Eldar, 16 years old, Prague)

Interesting findings are also connected with a **language as a cultural element**. If we consider acquiring the language of the host country as a part of cul-

⁷ Collection of poems by Karel Jaromír Erben.

tural integration, we will noticed that **the second generation** migrants succeeded in this sphere more than their parents, even when both generations have been living in the country for a significant period of time. All young respondents claim that at the moment they do not have problems with expressing themselves in the official language of the country, where they live, while their parents show different levels of language skills, from having a Russian accent to not speaking it at all. This diversity is connected with their level of social integration, as well as with peculiarities of their professional life: obviously, those first generation migrants, who either for professional reasons or due to personal preferences communicate with majority population, have better language skills than those staying within Russian ethnic community.

“My parents are self employed, that's why they do not communicate with others much. <...> They speak Czech bad: Mom has an accent and Dad does not even make an effort.” (Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

“My father speaks better than my mother because he communicates with the Czech people at work. And mother, she has an accent and she makes some mistakes like... for example, she does not put a particle “se” with verbs.” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

Moreover, in many migrant families children, being more proficient in the official language of the country, help their parents to learn it or to resolve issues, when special language skills are required.

“Mom has learned to speak French when she was working in the café, now she speaks rather well but sometimes she still asks me for an appropriate word or an expression.” (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

“Sometimes she [mother] asks me to go to the City Hall with her. She is afraid she wouldn't be able to explain them something. Even though I'm convinced that she should go there by herself cause it's the only way to learn Czech for her, I still go with her.” (Lena, 18 years old, Prague)

Along with good level of the language of the host country among the second generation migrants, the phenomenon of forgetting Russian, is also observed. It is especially noticeable within Parisian site, where the young respondents sometimes had difficulties with finding Russian words and showed tendency to mix French and Russian during a conversation. The adolescents are conscious of losing Russian skills, which they seem to regret.

Religion as a part of cultural system can be also considered as an indicator of cultural integration. In case of Russian second-generation migrants, all of which has claimed themselves to be religious Orthodox Christians, **religiosity** (even though its concept is taken differently by different respondents) plays a role of distinguishing characteristics from the major population. It also turned out that on general level the children perceive religiosity differently in comparison with their parents: they tend to define religiosity simply as a sense of belonging to a certain confession. This sense is seen as a given-by-birth characteristics and is closely connected with a concept of ethnical origin. On the other hand, first-generation migrants understand religiosity as concrete practices (going to masses, observing the fasts and feasts of the church) and, as these practices are not followed in some families, such adults do not consider themselves to be religious.

It is interesting that the nature of religious identity of a second generation migrant does not always reflect that of his family. In case of 17-year-old Nikita, Orthodox Christianity seems to play a very important role in constructing his identity. The young respondent himself admit his “fanatic” attitude to religion in the past and contrasts it with religious views of his parents:

“My family is not religious: my father does not believe in God, my mother... she has her own world outlook, she believes in God but she has her own... view on it. And me, especially during the period when I was 13 till 15 years old... i was into Orthodox Christianity almost fanatically. Now I’m still Orthodox, but there is no more fanaticism.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

5.2.4. Interactive Integration

In terms of interactive integration, the second generation of Russian migrants in Prague and Paris shows completely different patterns in comparison with their parents. While first-generation migrants are mostly integrated through members of their own ethnical group, their children seem to overcome this barrier and, with minor exceptions, have tight social contacts with majority population. When we speak about interactive integration, school becomes a key platform for socialization of migrants’ children. Namely here most young respondents made acquaintances with representatives of local population and, therefore, for those children, who study in a “special” ethnically oriented educational institutions, establishing contact with native children is less probable. Particular category is made up by the Russian children, who have migrated at a relatively higher age. These

respondents used to have difficulties with socialising at school caused by weak language skills. In those cases their primary integration were conducted, besides their own intention, with the help of young compatriots studying at the same school. Sasha, born in Paris but spent his childhood in Russia, describes his first days at French school as following:

“When I came here, the French were mostly friends between them, they have known each other for ages... And when I came, I didn’t speak the [French] language. And being very secretive, I was sitting on my own, I didn’t understand some things... and there was a Russian girl in the class, it was her I was mostly communicating with at the time. Sometimes she translated something for me, she already spoke French very well. Then I made some more friends. <...> And now when I adapted to the school, all students in the class are my friends.” (Sasha, 14 years old, Paris)

As for the differences of interactive integration within two sides of the study, Parisian respondents got known most of Russian peers through parents, as they were children of their parents’ friends. In Prague the situation seems to be reversed: second-generation migrants meet their compatriot peers at school or interest clubs that sometimes leads to the acquaintance of the parents. This difference can be seen as a result of lower share of Russian students in French schools, i.e. lower probability to come across a Russian peer at school. In the Czech Republic, schools and especially clubs of interest (like sport clubs) serve as an integration media for Russian first generation including communication both with majority and representatives of own ethnic group. 14-year-old Masha living in Prague is engaged in rhythmic gymnastics and goes to a gymnastic club, where she has made new friends, as well as her mother has done:

“She [mother] gets on well with other girls’ mothers from the gymnastics club. At first, they just needed to discuss something together... Like our competition costumes or presents for our trainers... But now they are friends. She calls them often just to chat or to ask something.” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

Moreover, young respondents from Prague show more interest in meeting and getting known compatriot peers, while second-generation Russians living in Paris tend to be interested in developing contacts with representatives of other nations. For Prague second generation, making friends with compatriots seems obvious and natural:

“At school I communicate with Russians, even if they are... very strange.” (Masha, 14 years old, Prague)

“You come to school and see: Oh, a Russian! It means you can chat with him.” (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

Such unconditional desire for communication with peers of the same ethnical origin is explained by common cultural background and language, which facilitate reciprocal understanding:

“There is still some [Russian] culture within me, I grew up there... 12 years [spent in Russia] is a long period anyway... And our culture and traditions remain the same and we can talk about it... For example, when we speak Czech, we can not insert Russian words in order to tell a joke. If we say this, it will... not be funny. And when you speak Russian with someone, you tell him a joke, he understands it and you feel yourself... in the right place, at ease.” (Lena, 18 years old, Prague)

In Paris, the young Russians are more oriented on international communication, taking advantage of multicultural social environment. However, there is an exception, 17-year-old Nikita, who shows strong desire to stay in touch with compatriots and even takes part in a Russian national organization “Compatriots abroad”, where he helps in organising meetings and pickets. His activity in the sphere is, to a great extent, connected with his plans to return to Russia in the future and a large social network left in Russia.

“When I was younger, <...> in the street somebody was speaking Russian and I was like: “Oh, are you Russians too?” (laughs) Now I do not do it of course, but I still seek to communicate with Russians, if they have this desire as well.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

5.2.5. Discrimination

The level of migrants’ discrimination is closely interconnected with the extent of their integration into a host society. As it has been said above, the second generation of Russian migrants has different integration patterns than their parents, therefore, the difference in perception of the discrimination phenomenon between two generations can be seen as logical continuation of this variance. The first thing that should be said is that the young Russians both in Prague and Paris understand the term “discrimination” including discrimination on the basis of ethnicity in legal terms, i.e. as a behaviour prohibited by the law and, consequently,

do not associate eventual inappropriate treatment as a manifestation of discrimination. In this connection, there is only one respondent among the second-generation migrants, who admitted being discriminated because of her ethnical origin. On the contrary, most young respondents in Prague claimed neutral, tolerant or indifferent attitude of majority towards Russian minority, in Paris the attitude of the French people towards Russians was characterised by their perception as exotic, mysterious foreigners from the little known far-away country. At the same time both sides denied having a personal experience with discrimination on the basis of ethnicity by applying to its forbidden character:

“According to the rules, it is written in the Constitution that... the school shouldn't... it does not have the right to... discriminate anyone.” (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

“I have never experienced anything like this. Never. At school we are taught that it's prohibited to discriminate anyone, but I have seen myself in metro that, for example, somebody is speaking Russian loudly and the old people look at them and say to each other: “Oh, they are so ignorant!”” (Erika, 17 years old, Prague)

The last passage by Erika reveals another interesting finding: discrimination or its absence is, to a great extent, connected with the level of language acquisition. This tendency is presented in a clearer way in Prague. In this case language plays the role of manifestation of foreign ethnicity: the heavier is the accent and the more mistakes one makes while speaking official language of the host country, the greater is the probability that he will be discriminated. It is proved directly by the Russian children living in Prague, who speak well enough not to be recognised as foreigners (*“That's good that I do not have a [Russian] accent.”* (Erika, 17 years old, Prague)) and, indirectly, by their parents, first-generation migrants, with poorer language skills, whose personal experience with discrimination is significantly richer and includes cases of direct and indirect discrimination in different spheres of life, while within Parisian site discrimination mostly had indirect character and included bureaucracy-loaded procedures compulsory for migrants and unnecessary for citizens:

“We were looking for an apartment rent and I was calling owners of flats. One of them was a woman, she listened to me and then asked: “Aren't you Russian?”. I said yes. She said: “I will not rent my flat to Russians cause they always move out in three months after moving in. <...>” I said that I'm looking for a long-term

rent and I'm not going to move out in three months. Than she asked me spitefully: "But then how would you explain that all Russians moved out so quickly?!" I had no intention to explain her anything and I hung up. She called me back two hours later but I didn't answer." (Inna, 44 years old, Artem's mother, Prague)

"We tried to start running a business, a small Russian traditional bakery. But it was unsupportable in terms of all these documents we needed to provide as we are not [French] citizens. Sometimes we needed two papers to prove one thing! <...> I'm not surprised that French entrepreneurs do better, they just do not need to care about all these papers." (Sergey, Nikita's father, 45 years old, Paris)

Despite denying the fact of experiencing ethnical discrimination, some of Russian second-generation migrants, however, mentioned some cases, when their nationality and stereotypes connected with it influenced their treatment by others:

"When I started going to [Czech] school, the classmates didn't talk to me. Later, when we became friends I asked them why they had not been talking to me and they said that they had thought that as I'm Russian I should have been a son of mafia. (laughs)" (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

"Other girls... I think they envy me, they look enviously because everyone says Russian girls are... beautiful." (Sveta, 14 years old, Paris)

"A friend of mine invited me to sleep at her place. And there were her relatives coming.<...> We started having a dinner, everything was good, we were eating asparagus. And Valerine, her mother in a conversation somehow mentioned that I'm Russian. Just mentioned. And one of the relatives asked me again: "Are you Russian?" and started talking to me... like I was mentally retarded, even though 10 minutes ago he talked to me normally. I said to myself: "Okay, I won't tell him anything." And then he continued: "Do you have asparagus in Russia?" I said yes. Then it was the time of a desert. <...> It was a cake and when they were cutting it, he said: "No, give her the biggest piece or we'll be chased by mafia." <...> It was very funny, I came out of the room and started laughing." (Yana, 17 years old, Paris)

Such cases of mistreat do not mortify the young Russians but rather seem ridiculous to them as absurd stereotypes that have nothing to do with reality. Moreover, actions of local residents are sometimes justified and defended by respondents as a result of great flow of tourists coming to a city and migrant criminal actions, which are disambiguously condemned.

5.3. Transnational Ties

Transnationalism of a migrant can have several manifestations, from visiting the country of origin to following its national media. When speaking of the intensity of transnational ties among first and second generations of Russian migrants in general, it should be said that parents' transnationalism is stronger within both sides of the study: their return visits are more frequent than those of their children, they communicate with relatives and friends and follow mass media of their native country more often.

Surprisingly, most children visit Russia without their parents (alone, with elder siblings, another adult like sport coach, etc.). At the same time reasons for return visits of the first generation are similar to those of the second one and include visiting relatives and friends. The only exceptions are those parents, who visit Russia for business or professional reasons. Frequency of return visits among the first generation seems to depend on the income level of a family, number of relatives and friends left in the country of origin and professional life of an individual: those with higher incomes, wider social network in Russia and more flexible working schedule pay visits to Russia more often. Surprisingly, the frequency of return visits does not depend on the individual level of social integration to the host society. We could presume that less integrated migrants visit Russia more frequently. However, there are Russian migrants with minimum level of social integration (communicating mostly with the member of their own ethnical group, etc.), who visit Russia very seldom. In this case migrants' families prefer their relatives to visit them in Europe, explaining it by more possibilities for recreation and sightseeing. Personal frequency of return visits remains stable and does not decrease with time passing from leaving Russia.

As for the second generation, it is obvious that frequency of their return visits, besides other factors, depend on family income level. However, this factor is not determinant in case of children born in the Czech Republic or France, who, despite sufficient income of the parents, do not visit Russia very often or do not visit it at all: both girls from Prague have been to Russia only a couple of times at sports competitions, a boy born in Paris has returned to Russia with his parents when he was three, spent five years there, returned to Paris and since then he has never been to Russia. This fact is explained by his father Anatoliy due to the son's lack of social contacts there. His example also demonstrates that, until the chil-

dren grow up, decisions on paying or not paying visits to the country of origin belong to parents and children have less to do with their own initiative of visiting Russia:

“Why should he go there? Or rather, for whom? His friends are here [in Paris], relatives... Grandmother comes to see us. So there is no reason for him to go there. Moreover, now he is too young to go there [to Russia] alone, I would never let him go alone and I do not really want to go there. If, when he grows up, he wants to go, I will not discourage him.” (Anatoliy, Sasha’s father, 56 years old, Paris)

There is no relation between frequency of return visits and national identity of a young migrant: in some cases respondents showed strongly pronounced Russian national identity, even though they have never visited Russia since their migration. On the contrary, perception of the country of origin and feelings during the visit are connected with the “intensity” of identity. We can distinguish two categories of respondents: those feeling “at home” in Russia and those feeling “at home” in a host country. Second-generation migrants with strong Russian national identity seem to have a feeling of being at home in Russia, even if they have never lived there:

“I absolutely liked it. I felt like I know everything around very well. I felt like... I’m at home.” (Masha, born in the Czech Republic, 14 years old, Prague)

The same feeling fortified by wide social network left in Russia was described by Nikita:

“When I’m in Russia, I feel myself at the right place. Nobody has never greeted me as warmly as in Russia. <...> Sometimes I wake up, my eyes are still closed and I feel that I’m at my grandmother’s [in Russia], she is doing something in the kitchen... I open my eyes and understand I’m in my room in Paris and... it’s a disappointment. <...> I have all my friends there. If you ask anyone in my neighbourhood [in Russia], if they know Француз⁸, everyone would tell you... It is my nickname. Most of them do not know my name, but everyone has heard about me. And I know everyone. I stay in touch even with those people, who went to the kindergarten with me.” (Nikita, 17 years old, Paris)

⁸ Frenchman, rus.

The other group of respondents enjoys visiting Russia, but feel more nostalgic about the “former, old” Russia, where they used to live and which they do not see now. These second generation migrants, while in Russia, miss their actual city of living and do not perceive their country of origin as “home”.

“Everything is different there... I got used to everything here [in France], my friends are here... There [in Russia] it’s just pleasant to walk the streets where I used to walk, to recall something. <...> When I was there for the last time, I met my former classmates. It was interesting to meet them, everyone has changed a lot. Anyway we were... playing together, they used to be my best friends, but... frankly speaking, now my life is here, in Paris. It wasn’t sad for me to leave Russia.” (Sveta, 14 years old, Paris)

“Now, when I’m in Russia, I miss Prague a bit and when I come back I rejoice: finally i’m back to my favourite city!” (Artem, 14 years old, Prague)

“ [When in Russia] Sometimes I got sad because... Firstly, the cities and the people are changing. Mentality and culture that I had before leaving [Russia] stayed with me, but those of the people have changed. And when I come, I stay the same person, but all of them are “new” for me. And there is kind of conflict situation. Then I start to miss Paris and ask Parisian friends about what is going on here.” (Alina, 18 years old, Paris)

Except paying return visits, Russian migrants of both generations in Prague and Paris communicate with their relatives and friends by telephone or the Internet. The choice of communication means depends on the communication partner: obviously, older relatives are often reached by telephone, younger relatives and friends - through social media, especially special “Russian” social networks such as odnoklassniki.ru for the first generation and vk.com in case of second generation. However, there is a means that is used massively by both generations and that seem to be more popular in terms of transnational communication than other ways of communication. It is Skype application allowing to make free video calls. Most of respondents claim to use it on a regular basis for communication with relatives and friends in Russia. These seances of communication become a kind of a family ritual, when everyone gathers around a computer and talks to a relative or friend living in Russia.

As for such manifestation of transnationalism as following Russian media, second-generation migrants mostly do it only passively, i.e. when their parents

watch Russian television or tell everyone Russian news that they have read on the Internet. Russian TV channels available at almost all respondent's homes, are watched mostly by first-generation migrants. Tatiana, Alina's mother working in the Russian Consulate Office in Paris, claims that while she follows Russian news on TV on a daily basis for professional purposes, her daughter generally is not interested in it and only "*occasionally looks some interesting facts up on the Internet*" (Tatiana, Alina's mother, 44 years old, Paris). The only exception is 17-year-old Nikita, taking part in Russian national organisation and being in charge of posting some news on its local website. He is the only young respondent, who claimed purposeful searching of Russian news and being well informed on the current events in his country of origin.

6. Conclusion

The study showed that the second generation of Russian migrants in Prague and Paris significantly differs from the first generation in terms of level of integration and maintaining transnational ties, while national identity in case of the most families is, on the contrary, transmitted from parents to children through the upbringing process and, therefore, remains relatively stable within two generations. In other words, longer residence in the country does not imply self-identification with a dominant ethnical group and the young respondents feel themselves to be Russians as their parents do despite their advanced level of integration into the host society. The only “problematic” category of respondents includes children born abroad (in the Czech Republic or France): for some of them, the identification of motherland, i.e. the choice between the country of birth and Russia, is difficult or even impossible.

As for the differences between parents and children, the young Russians are better integrated into the host society, which is manifested especially within interactive and identification dimensions of integration: they are more proficient in the official language of the country, they have wider social network within a major society, they reject migrant label and take their foreign origin as an advantage that can help them to succeed in their future career. The key difference is also connected with the overcoming by the second generation of segregation tendency performed by their parents. While the first generation of Russian immigrants is known for its closeness, the second generation seem to have tighter contacts with people of other ethnical origin including major population. The Russian diaspora does not affect their life choices: the second generation is independent enough from their proper ethnic network and integrates to the host society by other means such as official education system of the country, interest clubs and multicultural social network. Even the young respondent involved into the Russian national organisation started to take part in it *a posteriori*, being already integrated through French educational system and having numerous social contacts outside the diaspora.

As for comparison of two sides of the study, a significant difference concerns the relationships of the first and second generation migrants with their own diaspora members. In Paris the acquaintances with other Russians are mostly mediated through the first generation: the young Russians there got known most of

Russian peers through their parents, as they were children of their parents' friends. In Prague the situation seems to be reversed: second-generation migrants serve as mediums of community integration as they meet their compatriot peers at school or interest clubs that often leads to the acquaintance of the parents. This difference can be also connected with the more developed national infrastructure in Prague in comparison with Paris ("Russian" sport and music clubs, children art studios, etc.) and, therefore, higher probability of getting across compatriots there.

Another difference between the Russian second generation in Prague and Paris lies in the domain of cultural integration. While the young respondents from both sides showed significant level of distancing from the culture of the host country, its perception as something that simply cannot be internalised by a migrant due to his origin and preference of Russian or international culture instead. In Paris this distancing was accompanied by admiration of the French culture as an external element. In Prague the young respondents enjoyed the Czech culture less, which however does not mean they do not have a respect for it as a majority culture of their country of residence.

Finally, retrospectively the difference between Prague and Paris is also connected with the existence of state educational integration support in France (Classe CLIN and Classe d'accueil), which helps the young migrants to start the integration process smoothly. Probably, namely this fact explains the emergence of segregative strategy in education observed in Prague (the children studying in a Russian Embassy school, Slavic Gymnasium and English College).

As for transnational practices of the second generation, they can be characterised as passive because they are usually mediated by parents of a child, who decide on the frequency of the return visits, communicate main Russian news and very often encourage a young Russian to call or send a message to relatives and friends in Russia. It is interesting that the intensity of transnational ties is not connected with the national identity of a respondent: some respondents that have been in Russia only twice have strong national identity. On the contrary, the feelings during the visit of Russia seem to depend on national identity: the respondents with a strong sense of belonging to the Russian community felt there "at home".

We can make a conclusion that there is no direct interconnectedness of the level of integration into the host society, ethnic identity of a concrete young respondent and the intensity of transnational ties in the particular case. The second-

generation Russians feel to be Russians, are well-integrated and have different intensity of transnationalism depending on many factors including the family income level, number of family members and friends in Russia, etc. A very important role is played by their parents, who determinate the intensity of national identity and the frequency of return visits to Russia. Nevertheless, the integration profile of the second generation significantly differs from the one of the first generation.

References:

- Acquisition of citizenship in the EU (2010). EU27 Member States granted citizenship to 696 000 persons in 2008. Retrieved 30 May 2015. Eurostat news release, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-06072010-AP/EN/3-06072010-AP-EN.PDF, 4 s.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1997). *Nations unbound*. Amsterdam [u.a.]: Gordon and Breach.
- Barša, P. (1999). *Politická teorie multikulturalismu*. Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Bauböck, R., & Faist, T. (2010). *Diaspora and transnationalism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Ben Rafael, E., & Sternberg, Y. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Boston: Brill.
- Berry, J. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla, *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (1st ed., pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Bordes-Benayoun, C., & Schnapper, D. (2008). *Les mots des diasporas*. Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail.
- Bosswick, W., & Heckmann, F. (2006). *Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities* | Eurofound. [Eurofound.europa.eu](http://eurofound.europa.eu). Retrieved 11 April 2015, from <https://eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2006/other/integration-of-migrants-contribution-of-local-and-regional-authorities>
- Clanky.rvp.cz,. (2015). *Metodická doporučení k začleňování žáků-cizinců do výuky v českých základních školách*. Retrieved 30 May 2015, from <http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/k/z/14329/METODICKA-DOPORUCENI-K-ZACLENOVANI-ZAKU-CIZINCUCU-DO-VYUKY-V-CESKYCH-ZAKLADNICH-SKOLACH.html/>
- Dahinden, J. (2009). Are we all transnationals now? Network transnationalism and transnational subjectivity: the differing impacts of globalization on the inhabitants of a small Swiss city. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 32(8), 1365-1386.
- Drbohlav, D. et al. (1999). *Ruská komunita v České republice*. Prague.

- Education.gouv.fr, (2015). *Bulletin officiel de l'éducation nationale spécial n°10 du 25 avril 2002*. Retrieved 30 May 2015, from <http://www.education.gouv.fr/bo/2002/special10/texte.htm>
- Esser, H. (2004). Does the “New” Immigration Require a “New” Theory of Intergenerational Integration?1. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1126-1159.
- Farley, J. (1982). *Majority-minority relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gabriel, S. (2009). In Conference on the Diaspora Networks. Cyprus.
- Gans, H. (1992). Second-generation decline: Scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of the post-1965 American immigrants. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 15(2), 173-192.
- Geertz, C. (1963). *Old societies and new States*. [New York]: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Grouix, P. (2007). *Russes de France*. Monaco: Rocher.
- Guibernau i Berdún, M. (2007). *The identity of nations*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jandourek, J. (2007). *Sociologický slovník*. Praha: Portál.
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Rethinking ethnicity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Joireman, S. (2003). *Nationalism and political identity*. London: Continuum.
- Joppke, C., & Morawska, E. (2003). *Toward assimilation and citizenship*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kastoryano, R. (2002). *Negotiating identities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- King, R. et al. (2006) ‘Time, Generations and Gender in Migration and Settlement’, in R. Penninx et al., *The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement in Europe* (1st ed., pp. 233-267). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Legifrance.gouv.fr, (2011). *LOI n° 2011-672 du 16 juin 2011 relative à l'immigration, à l'intégration et à la nationalité* | Legifrance. [online] Available at: <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000024191380&categorieLien=id> [Accessed 3 May 2015].
- Legifrance.gouv.fr, (2006). *Loi n° 2006-911 du 24 juillet 2006 relative à l'immigration et à l'intégration* | Legifrance. [online] Available at:

<http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000266495> [Accessed 3 May 2015].

- Legifrance.gouv.fr, (2007). *LOI n° 2007-1631 du 20 novembre 2007 relative à la maîtrise de l'immigration, à l'intégration et à l'asile* | Legifrance. [online] Available at: <http://legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000524004&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id> [Accessed 3 May 2015].
- Levitt, P., DeWind, J., & Vertovec, S. (2003). International Perspectives on Transnational Migration: An Introduction. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 565-575.
- Livak, L. (2010). Russian émigrés in the intellectual and literary life of interwar France. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Marques, M., Rosa, M., & Martins, J. (2007). School and Diversity in a Weak State: The Portuguese Case. *Journal Of Ethnic And Migration Studies*, 33(7), 1145-1168.
- Marshall, G., & Scott, J. (2009). *A dictionary of sociology*. [Oxford]: Oxford University Press.
- Martiniello, M. (1997). *Sortir des ghettos culturels*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Mouzelis, N. (2008). *Modern and postmodern social theorizing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38(1), 149-152.
- Reynolds, T. (2006). Caribbean families, social capital and young people's diasporic identities. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 29(6), 1087-1103.
- Rumbaut, R. (1997). *Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families*. *Papers.ssrn.com*. Retrieved 11 April 2015, from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1888727
- Russieinfo.com, (2014). *La communauté russe en France est "éclectique"* | *Russie Information*. [online] Available at: <http://www.russieinfo.com/la-communaute-russe-en-france-est-eclectique-2014-10-30> [Accessed 1 May 2015].
- Schnapper, D. (1992). *L'Europe des immigrés*. Paris: F. Bourin.

- Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Blanc, C. (1995). From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48.
- Schonpflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational Transmission of Values: The Role of Transmission Belts. *Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(2), 174-185.
- Sládek, K. (2010). *Ruská diaspora v České republice*. Praha: Pavel Mervart.
- Sous la direction de Charlotte Krauss et Tatiana Victoroff., (2012). *Figures de l'émigré russe en France au XIXe et XXe siècle*. Editions Rodopi.
- Tamaki, E. (2011). Transnational Home Engagement among Latino and Asian Americans: Resources and Motivation1. *International Migration Review*, 45(1), 148-173.
- Todd, E. (1994). *Le destin des immigrants*. Paris: Seuil.
- Vathi, Z. (2011). The children of Albanian migrants in Europe: ethnic identity, transnational ties and pathways of integration : Sussex Research Online. Sro.sussex.ac.uk. Retrieved 11 April 2015, from <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/7421/>
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Vosdroits.service-public.fr, (2015). *Titres, documents de séjour et de circulation des étrangers non européens - Service-public.fr*. [online] Available at: <http://vosdroits.service-public.fr/particuliers/N110.xhtml> [Accessed 3 May 2015].
- Waters, M. (1990). *Ethnic options*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Insee.fr., (2011). *Insee - France métropolitaine - IMG1B - Les immigrants par sexe, âge et pays de naissance - 2011*. Retrieved 11 April 2015, from http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/tableau_local.asp?ref_id=IMG1B&millesime=2011&niveau=2&nivgeo=METRODOM&codgeo=1#infos-connexes
- Mvcr.cz., (2015). *Informace k novému zákonu o státním občanství ČR - Ministerstvo vnitra České republiky*. Retrieved 13 April 2015, from <http://www.mvcr.cz/clanek/informace-k-novemu-zakonu-o-statnim-obcanstvi-cr.aspx>
- Vdb.czso.cz., (2013). *Veřejná databáze ČSÚ*. Retrieved 13 April 2015, from http://vdb.czso.cz/vdbvo/tabparam.jsp?voa=tabulka&cislatab=OBY5092PU_OK&&kapitola_id=743

Appendixes:

Appendix 1. List of Respondents.

Table 1 List of Second-generation Informators

	Sex	Age	Country of Birth	Years Spent in the Host Country
Paris				
Yana	F	17	Russia	12
Sveta	F	14	Russia	6
Alina	F	18	Russia	6
Nikita	M	17	Russia	8
Sasha	M	15	France	7
Prague				
Masha	F	14	Czech Republic	14
Erika	F	17	Czech Republic	17
Lena	F	18	Russia	6
Artem	M	14	Russia	5
Eldar	M	16	Russia	8

Table 2 List of First-generation Informators (Parents)

	Sex	Age
Paris		
Galina	F	37
Irina	F	41
Tatiana	F	44
Sergey	M	45
Anatoliy	M	56
Prague		
Sergey	M	49
Andrey	M	52
Olga	F	40
Inna	F	44
Svetlana	F	38

Appendix 2. Interview Questions:

With teenagers

1) General Information

- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- How many years have you been living in Prague/Paris?
- Do you speak Czech/French? At what level?

2) Integration Patterns

a) Structural Dimension

- Do you go to school? Which one?
- What ethnical origin do the other students at your school have? What ethnical origin prevails?
- Have you ever changed school? Why?
- Do you enjoy going to school? Why?
- What was (or still is) the biggest difficulty for you at school?
- How good are your school grades? What influences your school performance?
- How do you get along with the teachers? Do your teachers treat you in the same way as other pupils?
- Do you go to any interest club or sport section? What ethnical origin do the other participants have? What ethnical origin prevails?
- What are you going to do after finishing school? Are you going to enter university? Why? Are you going to find a job? What kind of job?
- Do you have Czech/French citizenship? Would you like to apply for it? Why?

b) Cultural Dimension

- What is your attitude towards Czech/French culture in general? Do you like Czech/French books? Music? Traditions? Cuisine?
- Do you or your family celebrate traditional Czech/French holidays?
- Is your family religious? What religion do you practice?

c) Interactive Dimension

- What ethnic origin are your friends?
- Do you have a boyfriend/girlfriend? What ethnic origin is he/she?
- Do your peers of different ethnic origin make friendship with each other?
- Do you know many Russians living in your city?
- How do you perceive the relationship of Czech people/ Frenchmen towards Russians?
- Have you ever been treated unfairly in connection with your ethnic origin?

d) Identity Dimension - National Identity

- Imagine that you are on holidays abroad and you have been asked where are you from, what would you answer? Why?
- Which ethnic group do you identify yourself with?
- Do you speak Russian? At what level? What language do you consider to be your mother tongue?
- In what situations do you use Russian and Czech/French? Why?
- What language do you use at home? Why?
- What country do you consider to be your motherland?
- What is your attitude towards the Russian community in the Czech republic/France?
- Do you take part in any Russian organizations? Why?

- Do you want your future children to speak Russian? To know Russian culture? Why?

3) **Transnational Ties**

- Do you have any relatives/friends in Russia? If yes, do you communicate with them? By what means?
- Can you say that you are in touch with Russia? Why? If yes, by what means?
- Do you visit Russia? How often? For what purpose? Do you go with your parents or alone?
- Do you like these visits? What do you feel during it?
- How does the frequency of these visits change with the time? What's the reason for it?
- Do you follow Russian media? If yes, how often? Which one?

4) **What else would you like to add?**

With parents

1) **General Information**

- How many years have you been living in Prague/Paris?
- Do you speak Czech/French? At what level?
- What is your marital status?
- How many members are there in your family?
- How old are you?

2) **Integration Patterns**

a) **Structural Dimension**

- What is your current legal status? What is the one of your child? Would you like to change it?
- What do you want your children to be in the future?

- What level and specialization of education do you want your children to get? Why?
- Where do you see your future? The future of your children?
- What was your occupation in Russia? What do you do now?
- Was it hard for you to find a job/ to start a business in the Czech republic/France? Who has helped you?
- What is the ethnic origin of your co-workers/employers?
- What level of income in comparison with the major population do you earn?

b) Cultural Dimension

- What is your attitude towards Czech/French culture in general? Do you like Czech/French books? Music? Traditions? Cuisine?
- Do you or your family celebrate traditional Czech/French holidays?
- Is your family religious? What religion do you practice?

c) Interactive Dimension

- What ethnic origin are your friends?
- Do you know many Russians living in your city?
- What kind of relationships of your children with the major society would you
- How do you perceive the relationship of Czech people/ Frenchmen towards Russians?
- Do you feel discriminated? If yes, in what spheres and to what extent?

d) Identity Dimension - National Identity

- Imagine that you are on holidays abroad and you have been asked where are you from, what would you answer? Why?
- Which ethnic group do you identify yourself with?
- In what situations do you use Russian and Czech/French? Why?

- What language do you use at home? Why?
- Have your or your children's level of Russian changed with the time? If yes, how do you feel about it?
- What is your attitude towards the Russian community in the Czech republic/France?
- Do you take part in any Russian organizations? Why?
- Do you want your future descendants to speak Russian? To know Russian culture? Why?

3) Transnational Ties

- Do you have any relatives/friends in Russia? If yes, do you communicate with them? By what means?
- Can you say that you are in touch with Russia? Why? If yes, by what means?
- Do you want your children to keep in touch with Russia even after they grow up?
- Do you visit Russia? How often? For what purpose? Do you go with your children or alone?
- Do you like these visits? What do you feel during it?
- How does the frequency of these visits change with the time? What's the reason for it?
- Do you follow Russian media? If yes, how often? Which one?

4) What else would you like to add?