

National Research University Higher School of Economics

Dmitry Grigoryev

**Socio-Economic Adaptation of Immigrants in a Perspective of Mutual Acculturation
of Immigrants and Majority Group Members**

PhD Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining
Philosophy Doctor in Psychology HSE

Academic supervisor:
Nadezhda Lebedeva
Prof., Doctor of Science

Moscow – 2018

PUBLICATIONS AND APPROBATION OF RESEARCH

First-tier publications¹

1. Grigoryev, D., & Berry, J. W. (2017). Acculturation preferences, ethnic and religious identification and the socio-economic adaptation of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 46(6), 537–557. [doi:10.1080/17475759.2017.1386122](https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2017.1386122)
2. Grigoryev, D., & van de Vijver, F. (2017). Acculturation profiles of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium and their socio-economic adaptation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(9), 797–814. [doi:10.1080/01434632.2016.1268145](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1268145)
3. Grigoryev, D., & van de Vijver, F. (2018). Acculturation expectation profiles of Russian majority group members and their intergroup attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 64(3), 90–99. [doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.03.001)

Second-tier publications²

4. Grigoryev, D. (2015). Vzaimosvyaz' vyrazhennosti etnicheskoy identichnosti i akkul'turatsionnykh ustanovok migrantov s urovnem ikh sotsioekonomicheskoy adaptatsii [The relationship of ethnic identification and acculturation attitudes of immigrants with their socio-economic adaptation]. *Kul'turno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya [Cultural-Historical Psychology]*, 11(1), 71–85. [doi:10.17759/chp.2015110109](https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2015110109) (In Russian)
5. Grigoryev, D. (2016). Tsennosti, sotsial'naya distantsiya i ustanovki po otnosheniyu k migratsii: kross-kul'turnoe issledovanie v Bel'gii, Germanii, Frantsii i Niderlandakh [Values, willingness to engage in intergroup contact, and attitudes towards

1 First-tier publications include papers indexed in the Web of Science (Q1 or Q2) or Scopus (Q1 or Q2) databases, as well as peer-reviewed collections of conferences that appear in CORE rankings (ranks A and A*).

2 Second-tier publications are papers published in journals included on HSE's list of high quality journals or indexed in the Web of Science (Q3 or Q4) or Scopus (Q3 or Q4) databases, as well as peer-reviewed collections of conferences appearing in CORE rankings (rank B).

- immigration: A cross-cultural study of Belgium, Germany, France, and the Netherlands]. *Psikhologiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki* [*Psychology. Journal of Higher School of Economics*], 13(2), 273–298. (In Russian)
6. Grigoryev, D. (2017). Diskriminatsiya migrantov v sotsioekonomicheskoy sfere: rol' mezhgruppovykh ustanovok prinimayushchego naseleniya [The discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain: the role of intergroup attitudes of the mainstream population]. *Sotsial'naya psikhologiya i obshchestvo* [*Social Psychology and Society*], 8(3), 63–84. [doi:10.17759/sps.2017080306](https://doi.org/10.17759/sps.2017080306) (In Russian)

Other publications

7. Grigoryev, D. (2015). Ethnic and religious identification, acculturation attitudes and the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [doi:10.2139/ssrn.2600845](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2600845)
8. Grigoryev, D. (2015). Vliyanie vyrazhennosti etnicheskoy identichnosti na vybor migrantami ikh akkul'turatsionnoy ustanovki [The effect of strong ethnic identification on preferences of acculturation attitudes by immigrants]. *Izvestiya Saratovskogo universiteta. Novaya seriya. Seriya: Akmeologiya obrazovaniya. Psikhologiya razvitiya* [*Izvestiya of Saratov University. New Series. Series: Educational Acmeology. Developmental Psychology*], 4(1), 63–66. (In Russian)
9. Grigoryev, D. (2015). Akkul'turatsionnye profili migrantov i uroven' ikh sotsioekonomicheskoy adaptatsii [Acculturation profiles of immigrants and their socio-economic adaptation]. *Mir obrazovaniya – obrazovanie v mire* [*The world of education – the education in the world*], 59(3), 75–85. (In Russian)
10. Grigoryev, D. (2016). Acculturation profiles of immigrants and their level of socio-economic adaptation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [doi:10.2139/ssrn.2739727](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2739727)
11. Grigoryev, D. (2017). Razrabotka korotkoy versii shkal iz metodiki Dzh. Dakkita: avtoritarizm pravogo tolka, orientatsiya na sotsial'noe dominirovanie, vera v opasnyy i konkurentnyy mir [Development of a short version of the dual process

- model scales: right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, dangerous and competitive worldviews]. *Natsional'nyy psikhologicheskiy zhurnal* [*National Psychological Journal*], 28(4), 30–44. [doi:10.11621/npj.2017.0403](https://doi.org/10.11621/npj.2017.0403) (In Russian)
12. Grigoryev, D. (2017). Mezhhgruppovye ustanovki prinimayushchego naseleniya i diskriminatsiya migrantov v Rossii [Intergroup attitudes of the host population and discrimination of immigrants in Russia], in book: *Mezhkul'turnye otnosheniya na postsovetskom prostranstve* [*Intercultural relations in post-Soviet space*]. Monografiya pod red. N.M. Lebedevoy [the monograph by N.M. Lebedeva (Ed.)]. — M.: Izd-vo «Menedzher», pp. 82–121. (In Russian)

Reports at conferences

1. V All-Russian conference with international participation "Prakticheskaya etnopsikhologiya: aktual'nye problemy i perspektivy razvitiya" [Practical ethnopsychology: actual problems and development prospects], 20-21 Nov 2015, (Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, Moscow, Russia). Report: *Teoreticheskaya model' sotsioekonomicheskoy adaptatsii migrantov: na primere russkoyazychnykh migrantov v Bel'gii* [*A theoretical model of the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants: The case of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium*]. (In Russian)
2. V International scientific conference "Psikhologiya individual'nosti" [Psychology of individuality], 09-11 Dec 2015, (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia). Report: *A theoretical model of the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants: The case of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium*.
3. III International scientific conference "Culture in society, between groups and across generations", 30 May–01 Jun 2016, (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia). Report: *Acculturation profiles of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium and their level of socio-economic adaptation*.
4. IV International scientific conference "Culture in society, between groups and across generations", 18-20 Apr 2017, (National Research University Higher School of

Economics, Moscow, Russia). Report: *Discordance of acculturation attitudes of natives and their support of discrimination of immigrants in Russia.*

RESEARCH TOPIC

Rapidly increasing modern migration rates accompanied by a massive increase in labor immigration. Since one of the leading reasons for immigration is the achievement of a higher standard of living. Despite immigrants seek to improve their quality of life, actually, immigration more often relates to various problems, discrimination, and economic difficulties (Wong, Chou, & Chow, 2012). In this regard, the problem of the socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants in a host society is always pressing. Regrettably, as Hayfron (2006) noted, economic studies on labor market outcomes for immigrants have not examined how the psychological problems immigrants face can impact their acculturation process. This absence is probably because most economists and sociologists consider this problem the domain of psychology; however, socioeconomic adaptation has hardly been studied by psychologists (see also Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008) and most extant literature has focused only on assimilation as mode of acculturation (Hayfron, 2006).

In my PhD research, I considered and investigated the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants in a perspective of mutual acculturation of immigrants and majority group members. The focus of the part of research about immigrants was on the integration hypothesis (e.g., Berry, 1997) versus ecological acculturation framework (e.g., Salo & Birman, 2015) involving multiple indicators for the assessment of socio-economic adaptation, and also its psychological antecedent variables (see Grigoryev & Berry, 2017; Grigoryev & van de Vijver, 2017). The part of research about majority group members was devoted psychological antecedents of endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domains. The relationships between endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domains and acculturation expectations and other intergroup attitudes by majority group members were considered (see Grigoryev, 2017;

Grigoryev & van de Vijver, 2018). Such analysis of the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants on both sides (immigrants and majority group members) provides extending our knowledge about socio-economic adjustment of immigrants and possibly interventions to contribute.

Thus, the contribution of this research to the theoretical field lies in the fact that these findings allow expanding our understanding of the role of psychological antecedents in the socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants. In practical implications, that means the obtained findings can be used by government services and NGOs in organizing a set of activities for dealing with immigrants aimed at helping them to integrate and adapt to the host society.

CONTENTS

Introduction

The first to use the word "acculturation" was J. W. Powell in 1880, who understood it as the psychological changes caused by the "cross-cultural imitation", and was used in the context of describing changes in Indian languages (Sabatier & Boutry, 2006). Although the phenomenon itself, which stands for the concept of "acculturation" was discussed by Plato, in fact, for the first time the problem of understanding the consequences of acculturation was posed by him, in the collection *Laws*, Book XII (Rudmin, 2003). Initially, the study of acculturation was consolidated in social anthropology (e.g., F. U. Boas, W. H. Holmes, R. H. Lowie, etc.), and was associated with the study of the processes of cultural change in the tribes of North American Indians, later acculturation was actively studied in sociology and social psychology (Sabatier & Boutry, 2006). In 1904, G. S. Hall, the first president of the American Psychological Association and Clark University (USA), was probably the first psychologist who began to write about acculturation; he argued that the acquisition of the first and second cultures for humans like an educational process—a person learns culture (Rudmin, 2003). In 1918, W. I. Thomas and F. W. Znaniecki proposed

the first psychological theory of acculturation with the help of which they studied Polish immigrants in Chicago. Finally, the anthropologists Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936) gave the most well-known definition of acculturation: “Acculturation comprehends 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” (p. 149).

The modern concept of acculturation refers to changes that occur when people who have socialized in one cultural context change it to another context, e.g., as a result of immigration; the concept of the psychology of acculturation and adaptation is used to refer to the psychological changes that occur in people involved in the acculturation process and their possible consequences (Berry, 2017). At the group level, acculturation changes encompass demographic, cultural, political and economic changes that can range from relatively minor changes in the way of life of both groups to significant ones; changes at the population level provide the basis for individual changes (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, & Sam, 2011). At the individual level, acculturation is a dynamic and complex process that covers changes in behavior, language, identity, values, and social relationships and includes a set of preferences about how to behave in the process of acculturation, so-called acculturation strategies / orientations / preferences / attitudes that have often a significant relationship with behaviors (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006). According to the famous taxonomy by Berry (1997), acculturation strategies require immigrants to answer both issues: maintaining their own culture and adopting a dominant culture. Maintenance one's own culture but refusing to accept a dominant culture is separation strategy. In opposite, adoption of a dominant culture but refusing to maintain one's own culture is assimilation strategy. Simultaneously orientation to both cultures: the maintenance of one's own culture and adoption of a dominant culture is integration strategy. Also, the answer to these issues are about two spheres of acculturation: private and public (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003) or peripheral and central (Navas et al., 2005). For instance, the public sphere may include such domains, e.g., as work, social relations and

friendship, and language; private sphere may include such domains, e.g., as consumer habits, family relationships, religious beliefs and customs, and values and principles. In other words, acculturation is also a domain-specific process; acculturation is situated in an ecological context, and should therefore be considered as a context-specific process (Ward & Geeraert, 2016), as proposed in the Ecological Acculturation Framework (e.g., Birman, Simon, Chan, & Tran, 2014; Salo & Birman, 2015) and the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM) (Navas et al., 2005). It has been suggested that context specificity can take the form of domain dependence of acculturation orientations and behaviors.

Individual differences in the psychological characteristics that persons bring to the process of acculturation lead towards adaptation, which is consequences that occur with individuals or groups in response to the demands of the external environment (Berry, 1997). Adaptation may both lead to a mutual fit between the individual and the environment or not. Searle and Ward (1990) were the first to distinguish between psychological and sociocultural adaptation. Later, Aycan and Berry (1996) also began to consider economic adaptation, which they defined as full participation in economic life in Canada by achieving a certain level of income and matching planned and achieved financial goals. Marital adaptation can also be one of the basic aspects of adaptation, married couples are studied in the process of acculturation as a whole (Ataca & Berry, 2002). In modern studies of adaptation, socio-economic adaptation is also increasingly identified, which is seen as a more extended variant of the economic adaptation of the previously proposed by Aycan and Berry (1996) (see, e.g., Besevegis & Pavlopoulos, 2008; Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk, & Kinunen, 2011). Socio-economic adaptation can be defined as the outcome that allows immigrants to participate well in the social and economic life of the host society (Grigoryev & Berry, 2017). This aspect of adaptation is also associated with psychological and sociocultural adaptation (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008).

Contemporary research shows that the majority of immigrants leave for another country primarily for economic reasons. For example, Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2001)

have noted that, in spite of the sustained ambition of immigrants to gain financial security, they face serious obstacles; achieving economic success is more complicated for them than for natives. During the process of immigration to another country, a process which is often accompanied by considerable costs and risks, immigrants frequently become unemployed or have to work part-time. Particular difficulties are related to unacceptable housing conditions, unemployment, low income, discrimination, social exclusion, lower socioeconomic status (SES), and a low quality of life (Wong, Chou, & Chow, 2012). Even when immigrants manage to find a job, they are usually in an unequal position compared to natives (Winter-Ebmer, 1994). The first employment, even for highly educated immigrants, often belongs to non-prestigious employment in the so-called “secondary labor market” (e.g. cleaning services, construction work, etc.). Such employment is characterized by low language proficiency requirements and thus low incomes, fixed-term contracts and limited opportunities for career growth (Haberfeld, Semyonov, & Cohen, 2000; Forsander, Salmenhaara, Melegh, & Kondrateva, 2007). An increasing number of studies aim to help facilitate the adaptation of immigrants and to improve their quality of life (van der Zee & Sandal, 2016; Wong, Chou, & Chow, 2012). Nevertheless, the subject of socio-economic adaptation in general has been little studied (Hayfron, 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008). Moreover, previous studies often focused on employment as the only socioeconomic adjustment outcome, which is a poor rendering of all possibly relevant socioeconomic indicators and limits our understanding of the process. Socioeconomic adaptation enables immigrants to completely participate in the social and economic life of the host society, involving multiple indicators (see Grigoryev 2015; Grigoryev & Berry, 2017; Grigoryev & van de Vijver, 2017).

In general, summarizing existing research it is possible to identify and classify several of the main factors that may associate with the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants (Grigoryev, 2015) based on an empirically tested (Potocky-Tripodi, 2003) theoretical model of the economic adaptation of refugees (see Kuhlman, 1991): (1) socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants (e.g., gender, age, education, ethnicity, family

composition, etc.); (2) characteristics of stay in a country (e.g, length of stay, initial conditions of immigrants, travel and movement within a host country, etc.); (3) non-economic and psychological aspects of immigrants (e.g., level of language proficiency, acculturation strategies, attitudes towards social mobility and change of residence, etc.); (4) characteristics of a host society and country (e.g., economic conditions, ethnic composition, social and cultural distance, attitudes towards immigration and immigrants, etc.); and (5) state policy on immigrants (e.g., availability of quotas and benefits, legal rights, work of institutions, level of corruption, etc.). If the first three groups refer to internal factors that are associated with immigrants themselves, then the last two groups constitute external conditions for adaptation that do not directly depend on immigrants. At the individual level, issues of acculturation are covered by the first four groups of factors.

A few models address intergroup attitudes and their ramifications for acculturation preferences of both groups (e.g., Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Navas et al., 2005; Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, 2002), since acculturation takes place on two sides, that is, majority group members are also involved in this process when immigrants in large numbers come in a country. Majority group members also have preferences as to how immigrants should behave, so-called acculturation expectations. These preferences may also be varied depending on the private or public domains. Majority group members may expect for assimilation in some domains (e.g., workplace) and integration into others (e.g., values). They have some representations (subjective assessment) about how immigrants behave in their life in a host country concerning these issues for each domain, and these ones can be far from the real state of affairs. The mismatch between these views of majority group members and their expectations about the behavior of immigrants may provoke a perceived threat from immigrants, a lack of willingness to contact, and then discrimination against immigrants, and conflicts (Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, 2002). Discrimination makes difficult for immigrants to adapt and, as a consequence, to integrate into a host society. The difficulty in adapting immigrants may lead to various negative consequences for both immigrants themselves, and for a society and economy of a

host country; discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domains (e.g., workplace, labor market, rental of housing, etc.) is the most serious in its consequences (OECD, 2013).

Overview

In the following after this overview of the field of my research project, I briefly provide the studies descriptions. In the first part of my research project (study 1 and study 2), a sample of first-generation of Russian-speaking immigrants ($N = 132$), aged 19 to 65 years ($M = 35.9$; $SD = 9.3$), with various lengths of stay in Belgium (from 2 months to 18 years ($M = 7.1$; $SD = 5.0$) and all of them arrived from Russia to Belgium) was considered. On the whole, I referred a question what consequences for the socioeconomic adaptation of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium have their different acculturation orientations? I examined their orientation toward the host society (integration and assimilation), orientation toward their own ethnic group (separation) in basic life domains, the duration of their stay in the host country, and interaction between these factors, by using a combination of person-oriented and variable-oriented approaches (see Bergman & Magnusson, 1997; Bergman & Trost, 2006) and an extended measure of socioeconomic adaptation. From this point of view, the use of grouping methods, such as a cluster analysis or latent class analysis, can be regarded as an appropriate approach to acculturation if the group of individuals would comprise subgroups who deal with acculturation issues in a different manner; grouping procedures allow the identification of such subgroups. According to the OECD (2008; 2015), Belgium has one of the larger immigrant communities in Europe, with more than 12% foreign-born in the population. Belgium has a high living standard and a stable economy that attracts large numbers of immigrants each year, and few immigrants return to Russia from Belgium (Corluy, Pina, & Verbist 2015; OECD, 2008; 2015). Still, labor market outcomes for immigrants in Belgium tend to be poor. Employment rates are low in international comparison, particularly for immigrants from non-EU countries. Unemployment is also high, and immigrants' unemployment is almost two and a half times higher than that of the native population. Still, Belgium remains one of the most popular destination countries for Russian-speaking immigrants

despite considerable difficulties to obtain visas and work permits and high levels of unemployment among immigrants relative to other EU countries (Bisin, Patacchini, Verdier, & Zenou, 2011; Corluy, Pina, & Verbist, 2015; OECD, 2008; 2015). I used the following measures: ethnic identification and religious identification (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007), acculturation preferences (Berry, 2011; Tatarko & Lebedeva, 2011), index of socio-economic adaptation by the World Bank survey (Besevegis & Pavlopoulos, 2008), and sociodemographic variables inclining the time of stay in Belgium and language skills.

In the second part of my research project (study 3 and study 4), using a person-oriented approach, I addressed acculturation expectation profiles of Russian majority group members ($N = 576$), aged from 15 to 79 years ($M = 35.1$, $SD = 13.4$), and relationships between these profiles and relevant intergroup attitudes. On the whole, I referred a question what consequences for endorsement of discrimination of immigrants the socioeconomic domain by Russian majority group members have their different acculturation expectation and intergroup attitudes? I turned to the Russian population to study this question, given that this population is highly diverse and has been understudied (e.g., Jurcik, Chentsova-Dutton, Solopieieva-Jurcikova, & Ryder, 2013); the Russian Federation is historically a plural society, comprising more than 190 ethnic groups, the territory of the Russian Federation includes 21 national republics. The United Nations estimated the Russian Federation to be the world's second-leading country in hosting most immigrants in 2013 after the United States. After the European refugee crisis in 2015, Russia came on the third place with a small margin (Lebedeva, Tatarko, & Berry, 2016). Researchers, who investigate intergroup relations in Russia in the framework of Mutual Intercultural Relations In Plural Societies (MIRIPS) project (see e.g., Lebedeva, Galyapina, Lepshokova, & Ryabichenko, 2017), noted that in spite of the variety in contexts (e.g., Central Federal District of Russia or North Caucasus), a responsibility and leading role for improving intercultural relations in Russia belong to the majority group; migrants and ethnic minorities prefer an integration strategy. However, the attitudes of Russians towards migration and migrants are rather negative in spite of some mainly obvious economic need

for labor migrants and the term 'migrants' is connected mostly with im/migrants from Central Asia and the Caucasus, who are often considered as a source of economic burden and cultural threat (Lebedeva et al., 2017). Also, there is still a lack of clear immigration policies in Russia and any special programs for the mutual intercultural relation of majority and minority groups, which should first of all focus on increasing of cultural, economic, and physical security of Russian majority group members, since all of this positively related to their acceptance of immigrants and adaptation to new polycultural realities of Russian cities (Lebedeva & Tatarko, 2013). I used the following measures: dangerous worldview and competitive worldview (Duckitt, 2001), RWA (Altemeyer, 1996), SDO (Ho et al., 2012), multicultural ideology (Berry & Kalin, 1995), willingness to engage in intergroup contact (Halperin, Canetti-Nisim, & Pedahzur, 2007), endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain: the questionnaire contained items asking for endorsement of behaviors that reflect discrimination of immigrants in the workplace, labor market, rental housing sectors, and other domains focusing on the socioeconomic domains deemed relevant in the literature (see Dancygier & Laitin, 2014; Mallender et al., 2014; OECD, 2013), acculturation expectations by the RAEM (Navas et al., 2005).

In addition, the contribution of this study to the field is due to theoretical, methodological and empirical novelty:

theoretical novelty

- the conceptualization of the concept of "socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants" was carried out, what is socioeconomic adaptation of immigrants was defined, the factors influencing it were classified, key indicators were identified and discussed, and the necessity of considering socioeconomic adaptation in studies of acculturation of immigrants was grounded;

- the rationale for the need to consider the mutual acculturation of immigrants and a host population was vastly expanded taking into account the domain-specificity of acculturation, e.g., the division into public and private acculturation domains.

- to explain the endorsement of discrimination in the socioeconomic domain, models from the field of acculturation and intergroup relations were considered together, which is extremely rare for studies of this kind (see Ward, Szabo, & Stuart, 2017). In particular, the dual-process model (Duckitt, 2001, Duckitt & Sibley, 2017) and the model of attitude of majority to cultural diversity (Berry, 2006, Berry & Kalin, 1995, Schalk-Soekar & van de Vijver, 2008) were considered to establish how many predicted variance the models share, and to what extent each model adds a unique component to the prediction. The prospects for the integration of such models for explaining discrimination were discussed;

methodological novelty

- the combination of a variable-oriented approach and a person-oriented approach to acculturation was used. The advantages and disadvantages of each of them were showed, the consequences of the application were discussed and practical recommendations were given;

- for the first time in acculturation literature, a person-oriented approach was used in conjunction with the measure taking into account the specificity in public and private acculturation domains;

- this research also has a significant contribution to the development of measures. Based on the literature on the topic (see Dancygier & Laitin, 2014, Mallender et al., 2014, OECD, 2013), the measure of endorsement of discrimination in the socioeconomic domain was developed and tested, and a number of measures that are well-proven in acculturation and intergroup relations studies were translated (e.g., measures from the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (Navas et al., 2005), SDO₇ (Ho et al., 2012), willingness to engage in intergroup contact Halperin, Canetti-Nisim, & Pedahzur, 2007));

empirical novelty

- the empirical comparison of the integration hypothesis (e.g., Berry, 1997) and an ecological acculturation framework (e.g., Salo & Birman, 2015) using a person-oriented approach to socio-economic adaptation of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium was conducted;

- the model of socioeconomic adaptation of first-generation immigrants was tested combining sociodemographic variables, acculturation preferences, and components of social identity (ethnic and religious identification) on the Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium was tested;

- for the first time, a person-oriented approach was used to identify the profiles of acculturation expectations of the host population in Russia.

I describe each of my studies in more detail below.

Part 1. Study 1. Acculturation profiles of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium and their socio-economic adaptation

The study by Grigoryev and van de Vijver (2017) investigated how various modes of acculturation of first-generation Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium, an infrequently studied group, were associated with their socioeconomic adaptation; more specifically, the study addressed their orientation toward the host society (integration and assimilation), orientation toward their own ethnic group (separation) in the basic life domains, the duration of their stay in the host country, and interaction between these factors.

It was hypothesized that the group of immigrants with a stronger orientation toward the host society (assimilation and the integration) have a higher level of socioeconomic adaptation than the group of immigrants with the orientation toward the ethnic group (Integration, Assimilation > Separation). Length of stay also matters; the group of immigrants with a longer stay have a higher level of socioeconomic adaptation (Long stay > Medium length of stay > Short stay). Taking into account possible time-specific of acculturation (the interaction between acculturation and length of stay), the group of immigrants with both the orientation toward the host and ethnic group (integration) with a low length of stay have the highest level of socioeconomic adaptation among other groups with a shorter length of stay because they can use both the resources of their own ethnic group and the resources of the host society (Integration + Short stay > Assimilation + Short

stay, Separation + Short stay). Finally, immigrants with a stronger orientation toward the ethnic group (separation) are expected to gain least from staying longer in the host country (Integration + Medium or long stay, Assimilation + Medium or long stay > Separation + Long stay).

The novelty of the study is a person-oriented approach was used by applying latent profile analysis, an advanced exploratory statistical analysis that allows the identification of groups of immigrants with similar acculturative characteristics. Also, whereas many acculturation studies focus on sociocultural adjustment, this study focused more on the economic aspects of the adjustment process; more specifically, the index of socioeconomic adaptation that was compiled by the World Bank was used and provided rich information about the socioeconomic adjustment of immigrants.

The significance of this study that at all desire of immigrants fully to adjust their social and economic life in the host society, they do it is not always possible for several reasons, sometimes, depending on the specific context, one of these reasons is the reliance to their own ethnic group, or because of neglect or the lack of opportunity for an orientation toward the host society.

Part 1. Study 2. Acculturation preferences, ethnic and religious identification and the socio-economic adaptation of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium

The study by Grigoryev and Berry (2017) examined a sample of first-generation, highly educated, Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium. The novelty of the study is an extended individual level model of the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants in which their acculturation preferences are used as a key psychological antecedent of socio-economic adaptation was used. Ethnic and religious identification were also considered as predictors of acculturation preferences. If the previous study used a person-oriented approach that is holistic, then this study used a variable-oriented approach that is more analytical, which allowed to evaluate the relationships of the variables included earlier in the acculturation profiles. A proposed model in which immigrant socio-economic

adaptation can be predicted at the individual level by their acculturation preferences, the level of host country language skills and the length of stay in the host country. The model was tested using path analysis.

It was used a model of the socio-economic adaptation of Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium, advancing the following hypotheses. H1: Acculturation preferences involving orientations toward the host group (integration and assimilation) are positively associated with high levels of the socio-economic adaptation. H2: An acculturation preference involving separation from the host group is negatively associated with the socio-economic adaptation. H3: Immigrants with higher levels of host country language skills and a longer time spent in the host country have higher levels of the socio-economic adaptation. H4: Strong ethnic and religious identification prevents the assimilation of immigrants and promotes the choice of the separation preference. H5: Better language skills contribute to preferences that are oriented to the host society (integration preference and assimilation preference). H6: The longer immigrants reside in the host country, the more they are inclined to focus on integration and less on their ethnic group.

The significance of this study that a number of psychological factors impacted socio-economic adaptation. Most important was the finding that acculturation preferences of immigrants, regardless of their length of stay in the host country, were associated with the level of their socio-economic adaptation: integration and assimilation strategies were associated with higher socio-economic adaptation, while separation was associated with lower socio-economic adaptation.

Part 2. Study 3. The discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain: the role of intergroup attitudes of the mainstream population

The study by Grigoryev (2017), was tested a conceptual model of relationships of the discordance between acculturation attitudes of Russian majority group members (i.e., discrepancies between perceived and desired acculturation attitudes), right-wing

authoritarianism, multicultural ideology, and dealing with immigrants that cover both positive and negative intergroup attitudes: willingness to engage in intergroup contact and endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain.

The following hypotheses were tested. H1: Dangerous worldview is positively associated with RWA and competitive worldview is positively associated with SDO. H2: Dangerous and competitive worldviews are negatively associated with the support of multicultural ideology and willingness to engage in intergroup contact. H3: RWA and SDO are positively associated with the endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain and negatively associated with the support of multicultural ideology and willingness to engage in intergroup contact. H4: Multicultural ideology and willingness to engage in intergroup contact are negatively associated with the endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain.

The novelty of the study is that I referred to the dual process model (Duckitt, 2001; Duckitt & Sibley, 2017) and models of attitudes of natives towards cultural diversity (Berry, 2006; Berry & Kalin, 1995; Schalk-Soekar & van de Vijver, 2008) to clarify how much variation the models share and to what extent each model adds a unique component to the prediction. The convergence of such models is urgently needed both for the field of acculturation and intergroup relations (see Ward, Szabo, & Stuart, 2017). The model was tested by structural equation modeling (SEM) including demonstrated measurement and structural invariance. The conceptual model was supported that right-wing authoritarianism and multicultural ideology have well-established negative and positive effects on intergroup relations, respectively.

Also, the significance of this study that representations of individuals about the social world as a dangerous and competitive place, which is formed by individual differences originating from the personal experience of socialization and impact of the existing social environment, may also be negatively associated with the support of multicultural ideology and willingness to engage in intergroup contact that in turn to some extent elicit the endorsement of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain.

Part 2. Study 4. Acculturation expectation profiles of Russian majority group members and their intergroup attitudes

The study by Grigoryev and van de Vijver (2018) employing a person-oriented approach to acculturation expectations held by Russian majority group members, was investigated the presence of groups of profiles and relationships between acculturation expectation profiles and intergroup attitudes. It was expected that more prejudiced individuals, who have authoritarian attitudes, reject diversity, perceive the social environment as competitive and threatening to security will also have more assimilation-type profiles; furthermore, the profiles themselves will show domain-specificity, which amounts to a difference in heritage and mainstream expectations across life domains.

The novelty of the study is that applying latent profile analysis jointly with the domain-specific perspective allowed to find three easy-to-interpret acculturation expectation profiles: biculturalism expectations, alternate-biculturalism expectations (with public—private domain differences in preference), and assimilation expectations. The subsequent comparative analysis showed that these profiles mainly differed in the extent of the desirability of maintenance of heritage culture, and adoption of the mainstream culture by immigrants only in private domains of life. The biculturalism expectation profile (23%) contained individuals who support the idea of a multicultural society. The alternate-biculturalism expectation profile (48%) contained individuals with slightly less emphasis on adoption of mainstream acculturation for immigrants, a distinction between preferences in the public and private domains of life, more focus on public domains, and less right-wing authoritarianism. The assimilation expectation profile (29%) contained individuals with a higher dangerous worldview and endorsement of discrimination, and lower support of a multicultural ideology, willingness to engage in intergroup contact, and desire of maintenance of heritage acculturation for immigrants.

The significance of this study that for immigrants for the current conditions, adjustment is very important, notably in the public domain, and that manifestations of the

ethnic culture will least likely lead to conflicts when applied in the home sphere. A more ambitious and time-consuming solution would be to try to revise expectations by majority group members to more integration-type, since a dominant group has a major influence on the acculturation process.

KEY RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Key aspects to be defended:

1. In general, the group of immigrants with a stronger orientation toward the host society (assimilation and integration) have a higher level of socioeconomic adaptation than the group of immigrants with the orientation toward the ethnic group.

2. Better language skills contribute to preferences that are oriented to the host society (integration preference and assimilation preference). The longer immigrants reside in the host country, the more they are inclined to focus on integration and less on their ethnic group. Also, immigrants with higher levels of host country language skills and a longer time spent in the host country have higher levels of socioeconomic adaptation.

3. The ethnic and religious identification have consequences to acculturation preference (e.g., for Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium it may be the source of maintenance of heritage culture). Strong ethnic and religious identification can prevent the assimilation of immigrants and promotes the choice of the separation preference.

4. More prejudiced individuals from the host population, who have authoritarian attitudes, reject diversity, perceive the social environment as competitive and threatening to security also have more assimilation-type profiles; furthermore, the profiles themselves show domain-specificity, which amounts to a difference in heritage and mainstream expectations across life domains (e.g., work, family relations, values, etc.). Such a state of affairs makes difficulties for the socioeconomic adjustment of immigrants in a host country.

Conclusions

The findings of my PhD research allow drawing the following conclusions. Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium, in contrast to immigrants from other regions, do not have the penalties associated with having a dark complexion and non-European phenotype (Grigoryev & van de Vijver, 2017). Therefore, in the case of an orientation toward the host society, there is less a risk of discrimination in the labor market. Also, they do not have a developed ethnic enclave economy to use a support of cultural ties in case of separation preference. Furthermore, most of the studies of acculturation of Russian-speaking immigrants in EU-countries and USA have shown that the orientations toward the host society (integration and assimilation), better host language proficiency, and longer length of stay in the host country are associated with more socio-economic adaptation (see, e.g., Besevegis & Pavlopoulos, 2008; Drydakis, 2013; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk, & Kinunen, 2011; Vinokurov, Birman, & Trickett, 2000). This evidence is consistent with the immigrant assimilation hypothesis, human capital theory (Drydakis 2013; Gorodzeisky & Semyonov, 2011) and the theory of ethnic enclaves (Portes & Bach, 1985). Also, in an aspect of acculturation, the ethnic and religious identification may have consequences to acculturation preference (Gattino, Miglietta, Rizzo, & Testa, 2016; Samnani, Boekhorst, & Harrison, 2012), for Russian-speaking immigrants in Belgium it may be the source of maintenance of heritage culture. The pattern of relationships between demographic and psychological variables and the socio-economic adaptation of immigrants from Russia living in Belgium corresponds to much of the research findings from other societies with other immigrant groups (e.g., Berry, 2017 for review). Hence, I may claim some degree of convergent validity for my findings. I may also suggest that similar patterns will be able to find for other white immigrants in the Western countries and who are not living in their ethnically dense areas or / and without a developed ethnic enclave economy.

For Russian majority members, a general psychological mechanism for the endorsement by the host population of discrimination of immigrants in the socioeconomic domain was showed. In some ways, it is similar to what was established by Western colleagues in their countries (e.g., Berry, 2006; Cohrs & Stelzl, 2010; Haugen & Kunst,

2017; Kauff et al., 2015; van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998), and in some ways, it reflects the purely Russian-specific phenomenon. Representations about the social world as a dangerous and competitive place where the way of life of decent people is under constant threat, and "dog-eat-dog", motivates people to abandon the idea of a multicultural society and contacts with immigrants, and also to support authoritarian ideological attitudes. Individuals with a conservative orientation tend to regain their sense of security and social control through negative views on diversity, as well as the establishment of strict boundaries and hierarchies between social groups and the endorsement of discrimination. This is a typical conservative response to social change (see, e.g., Crawford, 2017; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Napier, Huang, Vonasch, & Bargh, 2018), which is perceived as a threat to physical, economic, and cultural security. As the results cultural-specific to Russia, one can note the structure of the relationship between ideological attitudes. For instance, the lack of a significant correlation between RWA and SDO is somewhat at odds with the value of about .30, found in a meta-analysis (see Perry, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2013). In general, the practical conclusions of this part of my PhD research echo the recommendations for improving intergroup relations by Berry (2016), which include: (1) supporting multiculturalism and integration policies; (2) increasing the level of cultural, economic, and personal security; and (3) providing opportunities for intergroup contact. In turn, this will be able to reduce discrimination of immigrants in the socio-economic domains, which can ensure much better socio-economic adaptation for newcomers in a host country.