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Abstract
Since 1990 about 30 000 people of Finnish origin have moved to Finland from the territory of the former Soviet Union - mostly from Russia and Estonia. The Return Migration Program established after public announcement of the president of Finland Mauno Koivisto considered people of Ingrian Finnish origin to be “returnees”. The integration of ethnic migrants into the country of ethnic origin seemed to be problematic, especially among the representatives of the younger generations of Ingrian Finns due to Russian monolingualism. In July 2011 the return queue was closed and ethnic migrants who have registered in the return queue before this deadline could apply for a Finnish residence permit before July 2016.

While the reasons why people with Ingrian Finnish origin migrate to Finland have been discussed in scientific literature, the reasons of immobility of this group have not received much attention in the thematic literature. When looking at the reasons of immobility I try to find out whether the choice to stay is an independent decision or affected by particular circumstances. Furthermore, I am interested in family influence on the migration decision-making process of my respondents.

The fieldwork was conducted in March 2016 in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region. The research data is collected during qualitative interviews with the ten respondents of Finnish descent who are eligible for participation in the Finnish Return Migration Program. The reasons to stay reported by the respondents include those that are common for the migration decision-making irrespectively of the destination country, for instance, fear of the unknown, concerns about successful integration into the new society and influence of family members. However, understanding of these reasons requires looking at the differences between Russia and Finland, ethnic migrants’ expectations to be recognized as co-ethnics by the representatives of the majority population in Finland and historical circumstances which have influenced desire of some ethnic Finns to stay in their homeland – former Ingria.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is focused on Ingrian Finns – the descendants of Finns who have migrated to the territory of former Ingria (presently in the Leningrad region, Russia) in the seventeenth century when the respective area was under Swedish rule. Since the conclusion of the peace agreement among the participants of The Great Northern War in 1721, Ingria has remained as part of Russia’s territory. For a long time, Ingrian Finns were able to preserve Finnish culture and language but drastic changes in the national policy of the Soviet Union and dispersion across the country led to a large-scale assimilation of the younger generations of Ingrian Finns into Russian culture. Under Stalin’s regime, Ingrian Finns suffered from massive repression and deportations. During the Second World War, Ingrian Finns who were trapped in the territory occupied by German troops were evacuated to Finland. After the conclusion of an interim peace treaty between Finland and the Soviet Union in September 1944, most of Ingrian Finns were transferred back to the Soviet Union but they were not allowed to return to their home villages in the Leningrad region. Returning to their homeland – former Ingria became possible for Ingrian Finns only after Stalin’s death.

After the president of Finland Mauno Koivisto made a public announcement in 1990 that Ingrian Finns meet remigration criteria and the Return Migration Program was launched, about 30 000 ethnic Finns including their spouses and children have moved to Finland mainly from Russia and Estonia. The integration of Ingrian Finns into the host society appeared to be more difficult than expected by the Finnish officials; the representatives of the younger generation and people of middle age frequently did not have sufficient Finnish language skills. The lack of proficiency in Finnish and the emergence of the economic recession in Finland at the beginning of the return migration program made finding a job in Finland challenging for some of these ethnic migrants. Moreover, the hostile attitude of some of the representatives of the receiving society towards newcomers and perception of Russian-speaking ethnic Finns as part of the Russian minority in Finland made many of the ethnic migrants reconsider views on their ethnic identity that they used to have before the migration. The conditions for obtaining return migrant status, in turn, were amended several times by the Finnish authorities. Finally in 2011 the Return Migration Program was declared closed; those who joined the return migration queue before July 2011 could apply for a...
Finnish residence permit before July 2016. However, theoretically, the possibility to migrate to Finland is not restricted by any time limitations for some particular groups of ethnic Finns.

Today only an insignificant number of Ingrian Finns is living in the territory of former Ingria; many of them have relatives and friends in Finland. This study is concentrated on the reasons of immobility of Ingrian Finns who have a right to participate in the Return Migration Program but choose to stay in the country of current residence. Migration research is frequently concentrated on migrants who physically cross the borders of nation states instead of studying people who stay and possibly maintain relationships across the national borders, for example, with their relatives who have already migrated. Thus, the topic of this study has not received attention in the scientific literature on Ingrian Finns. Furthermore, during the previous years, the number of publications about Ingrian Finns has decreased significantly. This could be associated with the declining migration rate of Ingrian Finns; from 2011 until 2015 the Finnish Immigration Service granted approximately 1500 Finnish residence permits to ethnic Finns.

The nature of my interest towards Ingrian Finns is connected with particular life circumstances. I became acquainted with the people of Ingrian Finnish origin and members of their families in 2013 when I was taking Finnish language courses for migrants in Lappeenranta (Finland). At that point, I was lacking any profound knowledge about Russian Finns and ethnic migration to Finland as I was born and had been living for the most of my life in Kaliningrad (Russia), a place that is far away from the Leningrad region and the Republic of Karelia, areas where their inhabitants would possibly have more contact with Russian Finns and knowledge about this ethnic group.

Looking at the specific historic circumstances helps to improve understanding of the complex Ingrian Finnish identity. During the Soviet rule, Ingrian Finns were regarded with suspicion by the government and majority of the population because they have a connection to capitalist Finland. Thus, Ingrian Finns frequently had to conceal their nationality in order to avoid negative consequences of stigmatized Finnish identity. The establishment of the Return Migration Program not only gave the possibility to people with a salient Finnish identity to move to the country of their ethnic origin but also allowed people of Ingrian Finnish origin who have assimilated to Russian culture to rediscover their Finnish identities.
As a representative of the Tatar minority from Russia myself, and having a special interest in the questions of belonging and multiple ethnic identities are the reasons for my decision to study Ingrian Finns and related issues of Ingrian Finnish identity.

The data for the empirical part of this work was collected during fieldwork in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region in March 2016. With a few exceptions, the data was collected by conducting individual face-to-face interviews. All the interviews were recorded. The majority of the interviews was conducted with assistance from the St. Petersburg Society of Ingrian Finns (Pietarin Inkerin Liitto) and several interviews were arranged via personal contacts.

The main research question of this study is as follows: what are the main reasons for Ingrian Finns who are eligible to participate in the Return Migration Program to remain in Russia? The aim of the research is also to understand to what extent the decision to stay was an independent choice of the respondents and what circumstances or individuals/groups have affected this decision and how? It has to be acknowledged that my research is based on a sample consisting of ten respondents and one expert interview. Despite the limited number of the respondents, rich qualitative data that was collected during fieldwork enables this study to shed light on the current situation of ethnic Finns living in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region.

The respondents reported various reasons to stay in Russia. Among them are fear of the unknown, advanced age as a possible hindrance for integration into new society, fear to become unemployed in Finland, influence of family members who do not want to immigrate to Finland, influence of community, and appreciation of living in the homeland. Moreover, although fear of discrimination in the country of ethnic origin was not mentioned as a separate reason to stay in Russia, this topic was frequently discussed in interviews. Besides the examination of the respondents’ reasons to stay put in Russia, this Master’s Thesis includes discussions of other themes that were touched upon in interviews and that can be helpful for understanding of the reasons for staying put.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 A brief history of Ingrian Finns

Ingrian Finns could be denoted as inhabitants of former Ingria – it was located in the northwest of Russia and limited by south coast of Gulf of Finland, in the north it is bounded by Lake Ladoga and in the west by River Narva. This area is called as “Inkeri” or “Inkerinmaa” by Finns, “Ingermanland” by Swedes, “Ingria” by Russians and “Ingerimaa” by Estonians. There are several theories explaining the origin of the name Ingria. Finnish onomastics scholar Nissilä (1961: 134-135) refers to Russian historian Vasily Tatishchev who suggested the connection between the name of this territory and prince Igor – grand prince of Kiev and son of Rurik – the prince of Novgorod and the founder of the Rurik dynasty. Nissilä states that the Scandinavian equivalent for the name Igor is the name Ingor (Inger, Ingvar). Musaev (2004:15) refers to another version, which associates the origin of the name Ingria with the name of Swedish princess Ingegerd, who was the wife of Prince Yaroslav of Kiev. Musaev admits that Finnish equivalent for the name Ingegerd is Inkeri. According to another version, the origin of the name of the territory is connected with the hydronym Inkere – Finnish name of the river Izhora and ethnonym Inkeroiset or Inkerikot – Finnish denomination for the people Izhorians (Musaev 2004:15). However, according to Nissilä (1961: 138-139), name of the river Izhora is older than the name of people Izhorians. This scholar supposes that the name of indigenous population originates from the name of the river.

Votes (Vods) and Izhorians (Izhors) – the speakers of Finno-Ugric languages¹ represent the indigenous population of Ingria region. According to Nenola (2002:56), Ingria inhabited by Votes, Izhorians and Russians was under the domination of the Russian Orthodox Church starting from the Middle Ages. The Finns from the former Finnish municipality Äyräpää (which is located on Karelian Isthmus, in Vyborgsky District of Leningrad area and nowadays is called Baryshevo) and the Savonia (Savo) province, which is situated in the Eastern part of Finland, came to Ingria in the seventeenth century when Ingria became a part of the Swedish Empire (Matley 1979:2) after the conclusion of the Treaty of Stolbovo

¹The Izhorian language is the Baltic-Finnic (the Finnic) language (a branch of Finno-Ugric languages), which is closely related to Karelian language. The Votic (Votian) language is also the Baltic-Finnic language, it is closely related to the Estonian language (Shaskolsky 1979: 45, 46).
between Sweden and Russia in 1617. The endeavours of the Swedes to convert the Orthodox population of Ingria to Lutheranism led to a large outmigration from the area, which in turn affected the decision of the Swedes to encourage the Lutheran Finns to migrate to Ingria (Matley 1979:2). However, even though the indigenous population of Ingria had the freedom to practice Orthodox religion, Sweden following the policy: “One land – one church” did not show respect for this right; moreover, Orthodox believers were left without own pastoral care as it was forbidden to invite priests from Russia (Saloheimo 1991: 71). Additionally, a tax concession (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 8) and an exemption from the compulsory military service are considered to be important factors that stimulated the migration of Finnish peasants to Ingria (Shlygina 2004: 166; Shaskolsky 1992:110 cit. Novozhilov 1999: 125).

King of Sweden Gustav II Adolph originally wanted the German population to move to the Ingria area and donated land to German farmers, hoping that this would serve as a good motivation for Germans to move to the respective area. This course of action did not lead to the desired result because only a small number of German farmers moved to Western Ingria, and even this group did not succeed in settling in the area and had to return to their motherland (Hämeen-Anttila 1941: 44).
After the conclusion of the Treaty of Nystad (Uusikaupunki) among the participants of the Great Northern War in 1721, Ingria again became a part of the Russian Empire (Nenola 2002: 56). Since then Ingria has remained within the territory of Russia - respectively as a part of the Russian Empire, the Russian Soviet Socialistic Republic, and the Russian Federation. Meanwhile, the foundation of St. Petersburg and the cession of Ingria to the Russian Empire could be seen as critical stages in the history of the Finnish population of Ingria (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 9). On the one hand, the transfer of Ingria from Sweden to the Russian Empire was followed by the establishment of serfdom for Ingrian peasants (Haltsonen 1965: 43). For the Ingrian peasants serfdom meant a life under harsh conditions; for instance, rune singer Jaakko Räikkonen’s parents had to save up money for fourteen years in order to ransom themselves (Flink 2000: 427). On the other hand, for the local Finns, the proximity of St. Petersburg meant new social-economic opportunities (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 9). In the beginning of the 20th century, Ingrian Finns were
predominantly involved in agricultural activities and delivered dairy products and vegetables to the capital (Zadneprovskaya 1999: 87).

Finns that came to Ingria from the areas of Äyräpää and Savonia formed two distinctive groups: the Äyrämöiset and the Savakot. According to Flink (1995: 17), the knowledge about the Savakot and the Äyrämöiset appeared within the scientific circles after 1833 thanks to Sjögren. Russian scientist Dmitri Uspenski presented the research conducted by Sjögren about the two respective groups to a wider audience within his article, which was published in the journal the Finnish Herald (Finskiy Vestnik) in 1845 (Flink 1995:17). The aforementioned groups maintained a separate group identity and also preserved distinguished details of language, women’s costume and decoration (Zadneprovskaya 1999:90). However, gradually the cultural differences between the two groups vanished (Haltsonen 1965: 99) and it is noteworthy that already in 1897 the Russian Census gave notion of the Finnish population without mentioning distinctive subgroups of the Äyrämöiset and the Savakot.

Despite the growth of the Russian population in the respective region, Ingrian Finns were able to preserve their own culture, traditions and language (Pohl 1999: 22). Even though Russian population in Ingria was almost of the same size as the Balto-Finnic population at the end of the eighteenth century, in the nineteenth century Votes, Izhors and Ingrian Finns were mostly living in mono- or multi-ethnic villages separately from Russian residents (Nenola 2002: 57). According to Nenola, this circumstance facilitated the preservation of their culture and traditions despite the fact that the younger population of Votes and Izhors actually could speak Russian. Meanwhile, according to Novozhilov, in the big villages Russians, Ingrian Finns and Ingrians² frequently lived together and rarely followed the segregation based on ethnicity (Novozhilov 1999:126). Thus, the segregation within the villages was frequently based on a social division and the level of prosperity. At the same time, Novozhilov does not rule out the possibility of existence of monoethnic Russian and Finnish villages in Ingria. Furthermore, Matley (1979: 4) emphasizes the significance of the Lutheran Church for the preservation of the Ingrian Finnish culture, because it precluded Ingrian Finns from assimilating into the Russian culture at the same degree as Orthodox Izhors and Votes.

² In this particular statement Novozhilov uses the term Ingrians without referring to specific ethnic groups of Votes (Vods) or Izhorians (Izhors).
The first school for the children of the Finnish Lutherans in Ingria was established in 1782 in the village of Malye Kolpany near Gatchina with the support of Pavel Petrovich (future Emperor Paul I) and the financial assistance of a peasant Abram Kuvainen, who also became the first teacher in this school (Flink 2000: 430).

The events of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Russian Civil War made Ingrian Finns to support opposite sides. On the one hand, under the influence of Red Finns who came to Soviet Russia in order to escape persecution, some Ingrian Finns took the side of Bolsheviks\(^3\) (Konkova & Kokko 2009:13). However, by spring 1918, the population in many of the Ingrian parishes turned against bolshevism (Tynni 1990: 257). The expropriation of livestock and food products in 1918 by the Bolsheviks led to peasant revolts in Ingria. The revolts, in turn, resulted in Ingrian refugee movement to Finland. Ingrian corps of volunteers joined the White Armies under the command of Generals Iudenich and Rodzianko who planned to take Petrograd (St. Petersburg). However, the military operations of White Armies did not succeed and many of Ingrian Finns who actively participated in the struggle against the Bolsheviks fled to Finland or Estonia (Matley 1979: 5).

The Tartu Peace Treaty was concluded between Estonia and Soviet Russia on February 2, 1920. According to this agreement part of Western Ingria became the territory of Estonia. After the transfer was made the territory that included about 2 000 inhabitants became known as Estonian Ingria (Mutanen 1995:197). The peace agreement between Finland and Soviet Russia signed in Tartu on October 14, 1920. According to this agreement, Ingrian Finns were granted the amnesty and the scope of rights, including the right to education in their national language:

“The Russian Delegation proclaims, on behalf of the Socialist Federal Republic of the Russian Soviets, that the Finnish population of the Government of Petrograd is granted full

\(^3\)“Bolshevik, (Russian: “One of the Majority”), plural Bolsheviks, or Bolsheviki, member of a wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ Party, which, led by Lenin, seized control of the government in Russia (October 1917) and became the dominant political power. The group originated at the party’s second congress (1903) when Lenin’s followers, insisting that party membership be restricted to professional revolutionaries, won a temporary majority on the party’s central committee and on the editorial board of its newspaper Iskra. They assumed the name Bolsheviks and dubbed their opponents the Mensheviks (“Those of the Minority”).” (Encyclopædia Britannica https://global.britannica.com/topic/Bolshevik)
enjoyment of all the same rights and advantages that Russian law gives to national minorities. This particularly refers to the following points:

The above-mentioned Finnish population has the right:

Freely to regulate, within the limits of general laws and regulations, its public education and teaching, its communal and inter-communal administration and its local judicial organisation.

To take all necessary measures with a view to developing its economic position;

To attain the above-mentioned ends by means of the necessary organisations of its representatives and of its executive authorities, which organisations shall be subsidised out of the public funds in an adequate manner in accordance with the laws in force;

To make free use of the language of the local population for public education and teaching and for other internal affairs.”

At the end of the 1920s, the Soviet Government decided to apply the collectivization policy. According to Musaev (2004: 221), although the number of poor peasants among the Ingrians was not big, the massive repressions at the beginning of the 1930s concerned a large number of the peasant population outside the category of affluent peasants (kulaks). The collectivization policy in Ingria and the entire Soviet Union was followed by the arrests of kulaks and the forfeiture of their property (Musaev 2004: 222). During 1929-1931 about 4320 Finnish families (approximately 18 000 people) were expelled from the Leningrad region (Nevalainen 1990: 77). In 1930-1931 the “affluent” peasants and their families were deported from the Leningrad region to the Kola Peninsula, the Ural region, Western and Eastern Siberia and Yakutia (Musaev 2004: 229).

In 1933 there were two Finnish national areas (raions) where Finnish was regarded as an official language; 284 Finnish elementary schools, 434 Finnish kolchozy, and radio broadcasts in the Finnish language in the Leningrad area (Pohl 1999: 22). Besides that, until the end of the 1930s, there were about 20 newspapers and magazines published in the Finnish language in the Soviet Union (Nevalainen 2005: 309). In the first half of the 1930s,
the national policy applied in the Soviet Union was considered by Kremlin as a mistake. This policy did not lead the national minorities to become a part of Soviet community; instead it resulted in a strengthening of national self-consciousness. During 1933-1934 the national policy experienced a drastic change, which resulted in the strengthening of the position of central government and Russian language (Nevalainen 2005: 312).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group/year</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1942*</th>
<th>1959*</th>
<th>1970*</th>
<th>1979*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>140 370</td>
<td>121 577</td>
<td>66 946</td>
<td>92 717</td>
<td>84 750</td>
<td>77 079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izhorians</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>15 298</td>
<td>8 729</td>
<td>1 062</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall number</td>
<td>160 870</td>
<td>137 569</td>
<td>76 342</td>
<td>93 804</td>
<td>85 531</td>
<td>77 827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Area occupied by German troops
2. Entire area of the Soviet Union.

Besides the abolition of the previous national policy of korenizatsiya (indigenization) in the 1930s, attitude towards Finns of the Leningrad region changed drastically, because Stalin’s regime considered Ingrian Finns to be an anti-Soviet element due to their ethnic background – ethnic connections to capitalist Finland. Under Stalin’s regime, Ingrian Finns suffered from repressions, ethnic cleansing, deportations, and imprisonment. Although it is possible to say that a policy of ethnic cleansing was applied towards Red Finns, Canadian Finns and Finns from the USA, Nevalainen argues that quantitatively the biggest losses were among Ingrian Finns, because about 55 000-60 000 Ingrian Finns were executed and deported in the 1930s (Nevalainen 2005: 361-362).

At the beginning of Germany’s invasion of the Soviet Union, on August 26, 1941, The Military Council of the Leningrad Front adopted the decree “On the mandatory evacuation of German and Finnish population of the suburban districts of the Leningrad region” (Musaev 2004: 285-286). It was planned to evacuate all Finnish population (88 700) (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 19). However, this decision was only partly implemented. The Siege of Leningrad and other military operations that took place on the territory of the former Ingria divided the respective territory into the Soviet and German-controlled areas: most of Central and Western Ingria was occupied by German troops and Northern Ingria
was still under Soviet control. During 23-28 of March 1942, approximately 30 000 Finns were deported from the Soviet-controlled territory to Siberia (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 19).

Germany reached an agreement with the Finnish authorities that the Finnish population from the territory of Ingria, which was occupied by Germans, would be evacuated to Finland. The labour shortage in Finland was one of the most important reasons behind the decision to evacuate Ingrian Finns to Finland. During 1943-1944 approximately 60 thousands of Finns including Izhorians and Votes were evacuated from Ingria to Finland via Estonia.

**Table 2.** Evacuation of Ingrian Finns to Finland during 1943-1944 (Nevalainen 1989: 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Shipping</th>
<th>Ingrians</th>
<th>Estonian</th>
<th>Number of people (overall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>29.3.1943-17.10.1943</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22 050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>18.10.1943-14.4.1944</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37 950</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>38 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>15.5.1944-17.6.1944</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Germany</td>
<td>17.7.1943-12.5.1944</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>62 848</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>63 205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the Ingrian Finns were working in farms, road construction or in similar jobs, while those who were able to find their relatives in Finland had better housing conditions and employment opportunities (Shlygina 2004:8). For the majority of Ingrian Finns who were transferred to Finland, residence in Finland lasted from seven months to approximately two years (Nevalainen 1991: 282).

The interim peace treaty between Finland and the Soviet Union was signed on September 19, 1944. This treaty obliged Finland to return to homeland the Soviet citizens who were interned and forcibly brought to Finland (Nevalainen 1991: 283). The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland stated that also civilian Ingrians could return to the Soviet Union, in case they had this kind of intention (Kaivola-Bregenhøj 1999:53). According to Flink (1995:164), Finnish authorities made it clear to the Ingrian Finns that it is better to return to the Soviet Union. Moreover, there were rumors that if the Ingrian Finns will not leave from
Finland immediately, they will be taken later against their will. Generally, Ingrian Finns were promised that they could go back to their home villages in Ingria (Flink 1995: 164). About 8 000 Ingrian Finns stayed in Finland, and around half of them afterwards moved to Sweden (Matley 1979: 12; Flink 1995: 165).

Nevalainen states that from 1944 until 1947, 56 869 Soviet civilians returned from Finland to the Soviet Union; there were about 54 700 Ingrian civilians among those who returned (Nevalainen 1991:287; Flink 1995:165). Only when Ingrian Finns were on their way back to Ingria, it became apparent to them, that officials did not have plans to bring them back to their home villages (Kaivola-Bregenhøj 1999:54). Instead, Ingrian Finns were transported to and resettled in five regions: Yaroslavl, Novgorod, Pskov, Kalinin7 and Velikiye Luki8 (Flink 1995: 165, 176).

After the end of the war Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians moved to the area, which has previously been inhabited by Ingrian Finns (Flink 1995: 181-182). Thus, Ingrian Finns were not allowed to return to their home places. On May 7, 1947 the USSR Council of Ministers issued the decree “To prohibit the Finns from settling in their former places of residence in Leningrad and in the Leningrad District.” Furthermore, The decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet “Concerning the Criminal Responsibility for Escape from the Place of Mandatory and Permanent Settlement of Persons Evacuated to the Remote Regions of the USSR at the time of the Patriotic War” was signed on November 26, 1948. In this decree, people who try to escape from places of forced settlement will be assigned a punishment of twenty years of hard labor (Zadneprovskaya 1999: 87).

In the 1950s, a significant number of Ingrian Finns moved to Soviet Karelia with the permission of the Soviet government, as there was a labor shortage in the area devastated by war, especially in the forest industry (Shlygina 2004: 9). After Stalin’s death, the Soviet government significantly changed the policy towards Ingrian Finns. However, even though in the post-Stalin era the politics towards Ingrian Finnish minority changed drastically, Finnish language institutions were not reconstructed after the abolition that had taken place in 1938. Due to the limited number of Finnish language institutions and schools, the Ingrian Finns have experienced a substantial assimilation into the Russian population.

7 Currently Tver region.
8 Nowadays the territory of this region is divided among the Tver, Pskov and Novgorod areas.
Fig. 3 The return of Igrians from Finland to the Soviet Union 5.12.1944 - 15.1.1945
(Flink 2010: 214)

Assembly centers (kokoamiskeskukset) in Finland: 1. Helsinki 2. Lohja 3. Hyvinkää

Settlement areas in the Soviet Union: Pskov (Pihkova), Novgorod, Kalinin
(present day, Tver), Jaroslav, Velikiye Luki (spelled as Velikije Luki in Finnish).
The Ingrian Finnish culture has for a long time been “a hidden memory culture” (Teinonen 1999:100) and only in the late 1980s the public discussion of the Ingrian issue became possible due to the drastic political changes in the Soviet Union and the introduction of perestroika (restructuring)\(^9\) and glasnost (openness)\(^10\) policies (Teinonen 1999:100). Thus, in August 1987, a special issue of the journal Punalippu (The Red Flag, nowadays Carelia) focusing on Ingrian theme was published. It is noteworthy that in this issue (8/1987) the tragedies encountered by the Ingrian Finns during the Soviet period were described openly for the first time (Konkova & Kokko 2009:26). The publication of this special issue led to the unexpected consequences. The Ingrian Associations that were founded in Leningrad, Estonia and Karelia received acceptance from the authorities and were officially registered in 1988 and 1989 (Flink 1991: 316; Konkova & Kokko 2009: 27-28).

The first half of the 1990s could also be regarded as a period of revival for the national movement of the Ingrian Finns. The aspiration for the political rehabilitation of Ingrian Finns became one of the most important targets of the national movement. It turned out that legal acts which constituted the legislative basis for repressions, including the Decree of the USSR Council of Ministers № 5211/rs, dated May 7, 1947, prohibiting Ingrian Finns to reside in Leningrad and Leningrad area, were still in force (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 30). Moreover, Finns were not mentioned among the nationalities that had been exposed to massive repression during the period of Stalin’s rule in the USSR’s “Declaration on Recognizing the Illegal and Criminal Acts against Peoples Subjected to Forcible Resettlement and Ensuring their Rights,” which was issued by the Supreme Soviet on November 14, 1989 (Pohl 1999: 25). However, a decree “On the Rehabilitation of the Russian Finns” (June 29, 1993) stated that Ingrian Finns have the right to return to the places of traditional residence and that the local authority should provide assistance to those who wanted to return (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 30).

---

\(^9\) Perestroika – “program instituted in the Soviet Union by Mikhail Gorbachev in the mid-1980s to restructure Soviet economic and political policy. Seeking to bring the Soviet Union up to economic par with capitalist countries such as Germany, Japan, and the United States, Gorbachev decentralized economic controls and encouraged enterprises to become self-financing.” (Encyclopædia Britannica [http://global.britannica.com/topic/perestroika-Soviet-government-policy])

\(^10\) Glasnost – “Soviet policy of open discussion of political and social issues. It was instituted by Mikhail Gorbachev in the late 1980s and began the democratization of the Soviet Union. Ultimately, fundamental changes to the political structure of the Soviet Union occurred: the power of the Communist Party was reduced, and multicandidate elections took place. Glasnost also permitted criticism of government officials and allowed the media freer dissemination of news and information.” (Encyclopædia Britannica [http://global.britannica.com/topic/glasnost])
In 1990 the president of Finland, Mauno Koivisto (in office 1982 to 1994) said in the television interview that Ingrian Finns correspond to the criteria of return migration. After that, Ingrian Finns were granted the right to immigrate to Finland on the basis of ethnic origin. The ethnic migration to Finland gave to the Ingrian Finns the opportunity to live in the native language environment (Flink 1991: 318). After the establishment of the Return Migration Program approximately 30 000 ethnic Finns have immigrated to Finland from the territory of the former Soviet Union, mainly from Russia and Estonia. According to the Russian Census, in 2010 the Finnish population of the Leningrad region among those who have mentioned their nationality was 4366 people (0,3 per cent of the entire population of the region). The Finnish population of St. Petersburg was 2559 people in 2010 (0,1 per cent of the entire population of St. Petersburg).\(^1\)

In July 2011 the return migration queue for people of Ingrian Finnish origin was closed. People who have registered in the return migration queue before the aforementioned date could apply for the Finnish residence permit before July 2016 (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2016).\(^2\) From 2011 until 2015 the Finnish Immigration Service granted approximately 1500 residence permits to ethnic migrants. According to the estimation of the Finnish Immigration Service (2016),\(^3\) around 300-400 individuals will apply for a residence permit on a basis of ethnic migration “at the last minute”. The estimation is grounded on “the number of people considering remigration that have taken part in language examinations”.

When we discuss the current situation of Ingrian Finnish minority living in the territory of the former Ingria it is important to mention an emergence of a separatist movement that supports the independence of St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region from Russia. Thus, members of this movement have used the symbol of Ingrian Finns, specifically, the flag of Ingria during their protests. This phenomenon has not received attention in the academic literature on Ingrian Finns; information about this separatism movement is mostly available on the Internet in the Russian language.\(^4\) According to the article written by Andrei

\(^1\) Natsionalnyiy sostav naseleniya po sub'ektam Rossiyskoy Federatsii (Population by ethnic group in the subjects of the Russian Federation).
\(^3\) http://www.migri.fi/services/customer_bulletins/1/0/remigration_of_ingrian_finnish_returnees_approximately_30_000_well_over_300_applications_still_expected_to_arrive_67538
\(^4\) https://vk.com/free_ingria, http://www.ingria.info/about
Pyykkönen, which was published in the newspaper “Inkeri,” the first case of using the Ingrian flag in public together with the radical political statements was noticed in 2007. Even though the respective separatist movement assumed to include only about twenty active members, their actions still complicate the position of ethnic Finns who live in the Leningrad region and St. Petersburg. The claims of free Ingria pronouncing by the political activists may jeopardize the Ingrian flag and image of Ingrian Finns among the authorities of the region in question. Thus, during the meetings with officials, members of the Society of Ingrian Finns already have been criticized for using the “separatist” flag and were recommended to create a new variant of the flag.

1.2 About the terminology

In order to avoid confusion, it will be pertinent to provide some clarification about the terms used for describing the migration of people with Ingrian Finnish origin to Finland. Various terms are used to refer to ethnic migrants from the former Soviet Union to Finland, among them: remigrant, returnee, Finnish expatriate and immigrants (Toivonen et al. 1995: 183,189) Ingrian remigrant (Kyntäjä 1997: 102-103), return migrants (Koivukangas 2002:2).

Tsuda distinguishes two types of return migration: return migrants of the first generation who move to the country of birth and ethnic return migration, which implies “later generation descendants of diasporic peoples who “return” to their countries of ancestral origin after living outside their ethnic homelands for generations.” (Tsuda 2010: 617)

According to Jasinskaja-Lahti (2000:2), previously the term remigrant or returnee was applied in Finland regarding Finns who had emigrated to foreign countries (for instance, to Sweden), and later returned to Finland, but after 1990 this term was used to refer to immigrants of Finnish or Ingrian Finnish origin who come to Finland from the territory of the former Soviet Union. The terms paluumuutto (return migration) and paluumuuttaja (returnee) in regard to migrants with Ingrian Finnish origin are widely applied in both Finnish media and official documents issued by the Finnish government. In Russian media term repatriation (repatriacija) is widely used in regard to ethnic migration of people with

Ingrian Finnish origin. Despite the wide use of the terms return migration and remigration in both scientific articles and public debate on Ingrian Finns, the term ethnic migration is used in this Master’s thesis. The use of the term ethnic migration will help to avoid an ambiguity of the word return when it is applied to Ingrian Finnish migrants. However, the program established for ethnic migrants is called in this Master’s thesis the Return Migration Program. The choice of this name is justified by the conformity to original Finnish name used for the migration of people with Finnish and Ingrian Finnish origin to Finland: paluumutto (the return migration).

1.3 The problem of the ethnonym

Kaivola-Bregenhøj (1997: 208) points out that before the Second World War the minority, that inhabited former Ingria used to call itself Finns, and the Russians also used the same name when they referred to them. Likewise, Shlygina (2004:12) emphasizes that although in the middle of the nineteenth century Peter von Köppen referred to the Äyrämöiset and the Savakot already in the Census of the Russian Empire of 1897, the Russian Finns were calling themselves Finns. Shlygina (2004:12) admits that many of the Ingrian Finns whom she interviewed told her that they had heard word Inkeriläinen (Ingrian) for the first time in their life in Finland. However, according to Konkova and Kokko (2009: 42), the term Inkerinsuomalaiset (Ingrian Finns) is known from the end of the nineteenth century. These authors assume that the appearance of the term is connected with the rise of the national consciousness among the Finns of Ingria. The Finns from the parishes of the Karelian isthmus say that the use of this ethnonym in regard to them is wrong as they believe that Inkeri is a name of the area that extends southward from the river Neva and their region, in turn, is called Karjala, that is the Karelian isthmus.

The results of the two recent Russian Censuses (2002, 2010) demonstrate how seldom the Russian Finns use this ethnonym to refer to themselves: according to the data of the Russian Census of 2002 among 34 364 people who called themselves Finns, 314 people

\[17\] For instance, in the information page about the conditions of ethnic migration to Finland published on the Internet in the Russian language by the Finnish Immigration Service ethnic migration is called repatriation - repatriacija (http://www.migri.fi/download/16763_paluumuttojono_ru.pdf?0fefa1ed145ad388). Personally I also applied the word “repatriation” during the interviews and conversations with the respondents because it is widely used in Russia in regard to ethnic migration of the Inkeri Finns.
acknowledged that they are Ingrian Finns; in the following Russian Census of 2010, 441 people of 20,708 Finns called themselves Ingrian Finns.

Although the Finnish media applies the terms Ingrian-Finns, Ingrians or Finns for the Finnish-speaking population of Ingria in Northwest Russia with the same frequency without providing an explanation how meanings of these terms differ from each other, term Ingrian-Finns is quite commonly applied in Finland to denominate the ethnic group under consideration (Teinonen 1999:110). Furthermore, Shlygina (2004:12) states that in an official decree issued by Mauno Koivisto the ethnonym Inkerinsuomalaiset (Ingrian-Finns) was applied instead of Inkeriläiset. The term Ingrian-Finns implies that “there is one group of Finns living in Ingria, outside the borders of Finland, and another group of Finns living in Finland” (Teinonen 1999:10).

Teinonen (1999: 111) admits that the use of the term Ingrian is not recommended, as it completely omits the reference to the Finnish descent, but it is sometimes permissible in Finland when the point at issue is “the inhabitant of Ingria”. Similarly, Shlygina remarks that Pekka Nevalainen and Pirjo Takalo had a negative attitude towards the use of the term Inkeriläinen (Ingrian). The aforementioned authors believe that this term indicates the geographical location instead of ethnicity because it could be applied to any inhabitant of Ingria. According to Teinonen (1999: 111), the use of the term Ingrian Finn or Ingrian-Finn for the Finns born or living in former Ingria is often preferable, as, for instance, the term American Finn or American-Finn is applied for the Finns living in America.

Moreover, Rimpiläinen (2001:107) believes that today the use of the term “people of Ingrian Finnish origin” would be more correct than the term Ingrian Finns, because construction of Ingrian Finnishness was complicated and strongly affected by historico-political circumstances: the Russification of younger generations in some cases is not a hindrance to rediscover one’s Finnishness, while others might see themselves as solely Russians or Estonians. According to the respective author (2001:107), the alternative term could be perceived as more flexible as it implies holding of multiple ethnic identities.

In this Master’s thesis, the terms Ingrian Finns and people of Ingrian Finnish origin are used the most. However, when these terms are used in this Master’s Thesis they do not specify the degree of Finnishness or implicate any additional meanings.
1.4 The Return Migration Program

As was mentioned above the basis for granting to people of Ingrian Finnish origin the right to immigrate to the country of ethnic descent was the statement that Mauno Koivisto, the president of Finland made on the 10th of April 1990 during the interview on the television program Ajankohtainen kakkonen. Mauno Koivisto claimed that:

“In any case, a situation is that these are Finnish people who have been relocated to that area by Swedish authorities. For example, by religion, they are very strongly Lutherans, not Orthodox. So the criteria of remigration apply to them even though these families have been living there for a quite long time.”

(Koivisto 1990)

Although Kyntäjä (2004: 194) argues that the real reasons and political motives behind granting to people with Ingrian Finnish origin the right to move to Finland and the eligibility for receiving welfare benefits as Finnish citizens are not known, besides influential words said by Mauno Koivisto, the labour shortage in Finland is seen among the most important reasons why in the 1990s the Return Migration Program for Ingrian Finns was launched (Jasinskaja-Lahti 2000:2). However, Prindiville (2015: 118, 144-145, 155) stresses the humanitarian perspective informed by the appreciation of tradition of humanitarianism in the Nordic countries and an aspiration of historical atonement for the post-war transfer of Ingrian Finns back to the Soviet Union, likewise the motivation to provide the compensation for the military service in Finnish army during the Second World War as the motives that affected the decision to grant to people of Ingrian Finnish origin right to immigrate to Finland. Simultaneously there was an increasing interest towards the theme of Ingrian Finns in Finland, which used to be “silenced” for a long time due to the political concerns about diplomatic relationships with the neighboring Soviet Union, and gradually the discourse promoting “the debt of honor” to the Ingrian Finns emerged (Davydova 2002: 82).

The Aliens Act (Ulkomaalaislaki) of 1991 was the main legal instrument regulating the ethnic migration to Finland. It was stated in the paragraph 1 (momentti), subparagraph 1

---


19 It has to be acknowledged that in Finnish legal tradition paragraphs (momentit) are not numbered in the texts of laws but they have to be numbered by using Arabic numbers when they are referred to in other texts.
(kohta) of the article 18 of the Aliens Act 378/1991 that “a temporary residence permit could be granted if:

1) a close relative of the alien resides in Finland or if the alien has other ties to Finland;
2) the alien comes to study at the educational institution in Finland and her/his livelihood is secure;
3) the alien may be granted a work permit or his livelihood in Finland is otherwise secured; or
4) there is a cogent humanitarian or other special reason for granting a permit.20

Prindiville emphasizes that there was no specific reference to the Ingrian Finns in the text of the aforementioned article of the Aliens Act (378/1991) but subparagraphs 1 and 4 “appear sufficiently broad to encompass returnee status for the Ingrian Finns” when considered together with the statement of Mauno Koivisto on Ingrian Finns made in April 1990 (Prindiville 2015: 136) However, in the Law amending the Aliens Act (Laki ulkomaalaislain muuttamisesta 639/1993) that passed in 1993 subparagraph 1 of paragraph 1 of article 18 included the reference to ethnic origin: “a temporary residence permit may granted 1) if a close relative of the alien resides in Finland or if the alien has Finnish descent or other ties to Finland.”21

At the beginning of the establishment of the Return Migration Program, an individual could get the return migrant status if she/he could prove that at least one of her/his grandparents were Finnish by nationality. Other criteria like sufficient level of Finnish language skills, job contract, studying place or proof of secure livelihood were not required from the individual who was planning to immigrate to Finland on the basis of Finnish origin (Markkanen 1997: 21).

After the beginning of ethnic migration, it became apparent for the Finnish authorities that almost all Ingrian Finnish migrants required training that will help them to prepare for ethnic migration (Kyntäjä 1997:107). It appeared that Ingrian Finns of middle age were predominantly monolingual in Russian as their spouses and children. Critical views on

---


integration potential of Ingrian Finnish migrants were expressed already in the initial stage of return migration, specifically, already in September 1990, some of the parliamentarians of the National Coalition Party (Kansallinen Kokoomus or Kokoomus) negatively evaluated integration capability of Ingrian Finns (Prindiville 2015: 140).

The integration of Ingrian Finns appeared to be problematic because in 1991 - when the number of the ethnic migrants begun to increase, the growth of Finnish economy already turned into one of the biggest economic crisis in the Finnish history (Pitkänen & Jaakkola 1997: 10). The economic crisis, in turn, brought the extensive unemployment and correspondingly worsening of employment opportunities for Ingrian Finnish migrants. These circumstances lead the authorities to reassess requirements for ethnic migration (Kyntäjä 1997: 108). In 1995 The Parliamentary Committee on Migration and Refugee Policy (Maahanmuutto- ja pakolaispoliittinen toimikunta) was created. One of the first assignments of this committee was to prepare the proposal with the new criteria of return migrant status. The respective Committee prepared the report on Ingrian return migration in January 1996 (Kyntäjä 1997: 108).

Soon after the report of the Parliamentary Committee was published, the new conditions for migration on the basis of the Finnish origin were imposed: according to the article 18 a, paragraph 1, subparagraph 1 of the Law amending the Aliens Act (Laki ulkomaalaislain muuttamisesta) 511/1996, a temporary residence permit could be granted to a person originating from the former Soviet Union, who have Finnish descent if: “The applicant is itself, or one of her/his parents or at least two of his four grandparents are or have been registered in documents as Finnish by nationality.”22  Additionally, the respective law imposed on the potential migrants a requirement to participate in the preparatory training: “A precondition for a residence permit to be granted is that an applicant participates in the immigration preparatory training held in the departure country unless there is good reason

---

22 Original text: “1) jos hakija on itse, toinen hänen vanhemmistaan tai ainakin kaksi hänen neljästä isovanhemmastaan on tai on ollut merkittävä asiakirjaan kansallisuudellaan suomalaiseksi;”
http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1996/19960511. However, this amendment does not concern the descendants of Finnish citizens. See article 47, paragraph 1, subparagraph 1 of Aliens Act (301/2004).
http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2004/20040301#L4P47a
to deviate from this.”

According to the Government Bill on Amending Article 18a of the Aliens Act (Hallituksen esitys Eduskunnalle laiksi ulkomaalaislain 18 a §:n muuttamisesta, HE 160/2002 vp) the list of documents that are regarded as proof of Finnish origin includes:

a) A birth certificate in which both or one of the applicant’s parents are registered as Finnish by nationality

b) In the case of absence of the respective certificate, Finnish origin may be proved on the basis of one of the following documents:
   - an internal Soviet passport in which the applicant is registered as Finn by nationality;
   - a birth certificate of a close relative of the applicant identifying that both or one of the parents of that close relative have Finnish nationality;
   - a marriage, divorce or adoption certificate of the applicant or her/his parents;
   - a certificate issued by the National Archives of Finland;
   - an official certificate issued by a Finnish parish or some other reliable document.

The proficiency in Finnish or Swedish as the prerequisite for granting a residence permit to a participant of the Return Migration Program was stated in the Law amending the Aliens Act (Laki ulkomaalaislain muuttamisesta 2003/218). According to the amended article 18 a, besides the participation in the preparatory training organized in the country of departure, applicant “demonstrates the certificate with results of language test organized by Finnish authorities, which proves that she/he has the level of Finnish or Swedish language proficiency corresponding to the level A2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages designed by the Council of Europe unless participation in the return migration preparatory training or language test considered to be unreasonable taking into account the applicant’s circumstances.”

---


24 https://www.edilex.fi/he/fi20020160.pdf, p.4

Service (2013): “participation in the language test is not compulsory if this requirement is considered to be excessive, specifically in the case of advanced age or poor health of the applicant. The decision regarding this issue is made by the Immigration Service”.

Another important condition for granting a residence permit is the submission of a rental agreement or other document confirming that the ethnic migrant has accommodation in Finland. In case if an applicant does not submit this kind of document during six months after applying for Finnish residence permit, he would not receive a positive decision (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2014).

The return migration queue was closed in 2011. According to the Law amending the Article 48 of the Aliens Act (Laki ulkomaalaislain 48§:n muuttamisesta 57/2011), people of Finnish descent who originate from the territory of the former Soviet Union and correspond to the return migration criteria may be granted a residence permit if: “the applicant has registered in diplomatic mission of Finland as the return migrant before 1 July 2011 at the latest and has applied for the residence permit before 1 July 2016 at the latest.” However, theoretically, Ingrian Finns that were evacuated to Finland in 1943-1944 and those Ingrian Finns who served in the Finnish army during the Second World War have the right to apply for the Finnish residence permit on the basis of ethnic migration “without any time limit being imposed” (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2016). Likewise, the option of ethnic migration to Finland is still available for the descendants of Finnish citizens because so far there are no time limits imposed on them that would restrict the possibility to apply for a Finnish residence permit.

According to Government Bill on Amending Article 48 of the Aliens Act (Hallituksen esitys Eduskunnalle laiksi ulkomaalaislain 48 §:n muuttamisesta, HE 252/2010 vp) it is possible to estimate on the basis of data obtained from the different statistical sources that from 1990 to 2010 about 30 000 return migrants moved to Finland (mainly from Russia and Estonia). Ethnic migrants from the former Soviet Union are presented not only by Ingrian

---

27 http://www.migri.fi/download/16763_paluumuuttojono_ru.pdf?0da7a4929a75d388
30 Besides that Ingrin Finns also moved to Finland from Siberia, other Baltic countries and Central Asia (Kyntäjä 1998: 32).
Finns but also by the descendants of Finns who immigrated to Russia mostly in the 1920s and 1930s from Finland or via the United States or Canada (Kyntäjä 1997: 107).

It is difficult to define precisely the numbers of Ingrian Finnish immigrants. Although the data about migration between the former Soviet Union and Finland is available, it is more complicated to obtain specific data regarding ethnic migration to Finland (Kulu 1998: 62). The exact number of Ingrian Finns who have moved to and live in Finland on a permanent basis is not available because official statistics does not collect information about ethnicity of individuals (Hallituksen esitys Eduskunnalle laiksi ulkomaalaislain 48 §:n muuttamisesta, HE 252/2010 vp). Besides that, the right to immigrate was also given to ethnic migrants’ spouse and children who are under eighteenth years of age, regardless of their ethnic origin.

1.5 Previous research on Ingrian Finns’ reasons for migration and immobility

“The Soviet empire was falling apart when the remigration to Finland began.”

(Räsänen 1999: 16)

Tsuda (2010: 617) states that even though return migration could be regarded to be more ethnically motivated compared to other types of migration, the majority of ethnic return migrants in the first place is driven to migrate to the country of ethnic origin, not because of reasons strongly associated with ethnic roots and ancestry, but rather ethnic return migration concerns the relocation from less economically advanced countries to more affluent countries of origin in order to receive higher wages and have better standard of living. Thus, among the most important reasons for migration of Ingrian Finns to Finland are mentioned economic motives enforced by the general feeling of insecurity, low wages, and pensions in the home country, poor living conditions and worries about children’s future (Kyntäjä 1997: 108). According to Malinen (1999:202), the financial situation of almost all Ingrian immigrants improves after moving to Finland, despite the fact that the majority is living with the financial assistance of social services.

32 The statement of Malinen could be relevant for the early 2000s, but presumably does not fully reflect actual situation regarding the following years, as the economy of Russia has seen considerable growth before 2008, which also meant the significant increase of wages, especially in metropolitan areas of the country. However, since that time two economic crises happened in Russia: one of them happened in 2008 and another one, which is actually ongoing started in 2014.
Precarious economic and political situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the economic crisis of 1998 also could be seen as external factors facilitating interest of Ingrian Finns in ethnic migration program. Finland is seen by potential ethnic migrants as the country of possibilities and following the rule of law, and the ethnic migrants, in turn, wish to create the best conditions for their children to settle in Finland (Davydova 2002: 164). Meanwhile, Miettinen (2006:113) mentions another reason that could have an impact on the decision of Ingrian Finns to immigrate – fear that their children could be called up for a military service and sent to Chechnya.

However, according to Tsuda (2010:617), potential ethnic migrants while having difficult socio-economic conditions choose to move to countries of their ethnic origin instead of choosing other countries because they might feel ethnocultural similarity and “nostalgic attachment” towards their ethnic homelands. Consequently motives of interest in own origin and country of ethnic origin could be challenged to some extent while thinking about Ingrian Finns’ reasons of ethnic migration, but definitely, could not be completely disaffirmed.

In my research, I decided to concentrate on the reasons why some Ingrian Finns currently living in Russia decide not to move to Finland or in other words: what are or could be the reasons to stay. In my opinion, this question has not been widely discussed in academic literature nor been the topic of separate research. However, it was possible to find at least some information about previous research concerning this topic. Thus, Anepaio (1999: 178) while discussing remigration of Ingrian Finns from Estonia mentions reasons that affect the decision to stay in Estonia instead of migrating to Finland. According to Anepaio, these reasons include: a fear of those with high social standard that it would be complicated to achieve the same in Finland, an influence of a spouse or children who do not want to leave Estonia, some of the representatives of the older generation feel more attachment to Estonia because of the proximity between Estonia and places where they have born, the older generation also is afraid to change life because of their age, and moreover, some of them had encountered negative attitudes during their stay in Finland in 1943-1944. According to Kyntäjä (1998: 41), the two important reasons that affect the decision of Ingrian Finns from Estonia to stay are fear of becoming unemployed in Finland and fear of negative perception by the receiving society.
2. INTEGRATION OF INGRIAN FINNS INTO FINLAND

2.1 Integration definition and models

In a broad sense, integration could be understood as a process describing “How do newcomers to a country become part of society” (Castles et al. 2002:112). It is difficult to give a precise definition of integration due to the complex character of this process, which takes place at different societal levels and in various sectors including the participation of variety of social actors: authorities, politicians, co-workers, employers, neighbours (Castles et al. 2002:113).

Jørgensen (2011:94) states that integration could be seen as “end-goal of society”, which implies principles determining if individual could be accepted by the receiving society; according to him, power is one of the most important characteristics of the concept of integration: people who are holding a dominant economic and social position also have ideological and symbolic power.

Licata et al. (2011: 903) state that although national models of integration in Europe differ depending on a particular state, three types of integration could be distinguished: a multicultural, an assimilationist and a segregationist type. A British multicultural model implies the perception of immigrants as ethnic groups while a French assimilationist type is associated with expectations that immigrants will adopt the culture of the majority population. A German model is frequently perceived as segregationist, because of immigrant’s exclusion from the receiving society. The respective model, which is also called differentialist in the typology proposed by Castels, restricts access to political participation or complicates naturalization process for migrants (Borevi 2010:21).

Meantime Berry (1997: 6) while discussing culturally plural societies, which appear as a result of migration, refers to the concept of acculturation applied for describing cultural changes that are experienced by people. A classical definition of acculturation can be found below:

“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 cultural patterns of either or both groups.” (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits 1936: 149)
Berry (1997:9) applies the concepts of assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization in order to describe the acculturation process experienced by individuals in plural societies. **Assimilation** strategy is described as a case when members of non-dominant groups are not willing to maintain own cultural identity and have the intention to interact with representatives of other cultures on a daily basis. **Separation** strategy, in turn, implies that individuals of the non-dominant group want to maintain their own culture and do not want to interact with individuals who represent other cultures. Meantime, the concept of **integration** in the context of acculturation is understood by Berry as a combination of intention to maintain own culture and an aspiration to be involved in society as an integral part. Regarding the **marginalization** concept, it denotes a weak intention or possibility of maintaining one’s original culture (frequently because of loss of connections with original culture) and an absence of enthusiasm in interacting with others (frequently as a result of exclusion and discrimination).

Acculturation strategies (Berry 1997:10)
Individuals are not completely independent in their choice of particular acculturation strategy because the selection of a certain strategy leading to one of the four potential outcomes of acculturation could be restricted by limited resources of the immigrant and by prescript roles and pressures derived from the receiving society (Steinbach 2001:507).

2.2 Problems of integration among ethnic migrants

Cultural similarity and self-perception of Ingrians as Finns (despite the possible mixed origin), could be regarded as beneficial for the process of integration into receiving society (Lönnqvist et al. 2015: 499), because other groups of migrants coming to Finland could face difficulties in interactions with local population and integration due to processes of “othering” which implies perception of individual as representative of particular group and regarding this group as distinctive from majority of population. A perception of migrants as representatives of different and “other” cultures might complicate interactions between migrants and representatives of the majority population by creating distance between the two respective groups. Furthermore, according to Tsuda (2010: 617), ethnic return migration could be seen by nation-states as a way to solve the dilemma that is posed for immigration policy: how to reconcile the lack of unskilled labour force and concerns about possibilities that migrants would become a threat to country’s “ethnic stability” and a homogeneous ethnic composition. In a case of ethnic return migration, the dilemma seemed to be solved because return migrants are considered to be “co-ethnic descendants” (Tsuda 2010: 617).

However, ethnic migrants appear to encounter same problems as migrants, in general, do in the immigration countries. This, in turn, may complicate their integration into the host society. Hess (2008) has conducted research on the post-1987 migration of ethnic Greeks and Germans from the former Soviet Union to the countries of ethnic origin and applies terms of “parallel livelihood” and “parallel citizens/lives” in order to characterize problems in integration that return migrants face in the host societies. A parallel livelihood comprises “almost self-sufficient functioning” and could be seen as the consequence of social exclusion, which in turn, implies inequality in access to resources: housing, employment, and education (Hess 2008: 1528). Even though, similarly to the case of Ingrian Finns, Greek and German ethnic migrants are considered to be the most privileged immigrant groups in countries of ethnic origin because of equal legal status with local citizens, funded
language and professional training and eligibility to receive social welfare benefits, both groups still experience social and economic exclusion (Hess 2008: 1528). Thus, Lönnqvist et al. (2015: 499) while discussing Ingrian Finnish migrants stress that even such migrants who could be seen as “privileged” will encounter problems and difficulties that are commonly encountered within the process of migration: separation from friends, family, and adaptation to a new environment and coping with drastic changes in life.

Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2012:121) state that Ingrian Finns during the stage preceding migration have very positive expectations about “quality of intergroup relations” and the probability of their successful adaptation in the country of ethnic origin. Meanwhile, hesitations about the ethnic identity of Ingrian Finns expressed by the majority of Finnish population and encounters with ethnicity-based discrimination and preconceptions within receiving society have a detrimental impact on the adaptation of Ingrian Finns in Finland (Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahti 2012: 121).

Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2012:121) associate the difficulties faced by Ingrian Finnish migrants also with a deficiency of human and material resources, which imply a lack of knowledge of Finnish language, a disparity between professional qualifications in the home country and country of emigration, and linguistically closed social surroundings. These factors complicate a full integration of Ingrian Finns into Finnish society and moreover could be seen as resulting in ethnic discrimination encountered within contacts with representatives of the majority population (Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahti 2012:121).

Malinen (1999: 206) also discusses the absence of Finnish language skills and intertwined with this factor unemployment as the main obstacles for integration. According to Malinen (1999: 206), even representatives of the older generation, who have command of Finnish language, might encounter problems of linguistic character while communicating with officials, because Finnish they have learnt in former Ingria is different in particular aspect from the modern variation of official Finnish applied by authorities in everyday practice. In turn, factors that may facilitate successful integration include knowledge of Finnish language, ethnic migrants’ motivation to integrate and financial security (Malinen 1999: 202).
According to the data of the two research projects conducted at the unit of social psychology at the University of Helsinki, Ingrian Finnish migrants have integrated well into Finland in regard to their well-being and social integration. The ethnic migrants revealed to have a strong connection to Finnish society and Russian culture and think positively about their future in Finland. However, integration of the research participants in respect of employment and learning the Finnish language appeared to be more problematic. Furthermore, some respondents feel that they are not regarded to be full members of Finnish society (Mähönen & Yijälä 2016: 15,16). Thus, the results of the research project revealed that among Ingrian Finns who were living in Finland approximately three years at the moment of conducting the research 45 per cent were unemployed, 21 per cent had full-time job, 11 per cent had part-time job, 14 per cent were retired, 5 per cent were staying at home to take care of the children or other family members and 4 per cent were studying (Mähönen & Yijälä 2016: 32).

2.3 Generational groups

Kyntäjä (1997: 108) distinguishes three generational groups among Ingrian Finnish migrants. The older generation is described by Kyntäjä as “the real Ingrian remigrants” and includes Ingrian Finns who identify themselves as Ingrian Finns (or Finns) and don’t have serious difficulties in defining their own ethnic identity. Meantime, middle-aged Ingrian Finnish migrants are characterized by Kyntäjä as having problems with acculturation due to disparities between home country and receiving country, negative stereotypes prevalent among the majority population in the receiving society, a lack of Finnish language proficiency, lacking social networks and a high level of unemployment in Finland.

In regard to the youngest generation, Jasinskaja-Lahti and Liebkind (2000:505) suppose that representatives of this generational group seem to encounter the biggest problems in acculturation. One of the main differences of this group from the immigrants of advanced age is a frequent occurrence of monolingualism in Russian, which is a result of assimilation policy applied in the Soviet Union during the Stalin’s rule and after the Second World War.

---

33 The INPRESS/LADA research project lasted from 2008 until 2014 and examined the group of Ingrian Finnish migrants during the various migration stages including the pre-migration period. During the pre-migration stage, 225 potential migrants of Finnish descent participated in the research. The next stage of the research included 155 respondents who at that moment were living in Finland from six months to one year. The following stage of the research included 133 respondents, for whom duration of living in Finland lasted for about two years. Finally, 85 respondents participated in the last stage of the research, duration of living in Finland lasted about three years for these respondents (Mähönen & Yijälä 2016: 24).
Kyntäjä (1997: 112) believes that acculturation is the most problematic for those immigrant adolescents among Ingrian Finns who do not have a profession or whose studies are interrupted. The lack of Finnish language proficiency complicates their chances to find a job. Moreover, the representatives of this generational group might feel alienated themselves; in terms of acculturation theory this generational group “can be characterized by the mode of separation\textsuperscript{34} with some elements of marginalization.” (Kyntäjä 1997: 112).

Nevertheless, Jasinskaja-Lahti and Liebkind (Aronowitz 1984, 1992; Vega & Rumbaut 1991 cit. Jasinskaja-Lahti & Liebkind 2001: 175) stress that there is a tradition of evaluation and explanation of problems in adaptation encountered by immigrant adolescents as a result of the separation and loss experienced during acculturation process, or as a discordance in cultural values, rather than as a result of perceived discrimination and negative attitudes expressed by the representatives of the receiving society. Furthermore, it is important to note that in general different researches have demonstrated contradictory findings on the adaptation\textsuperscript{35} of immigrant youth. For instance, results of some researches have demonstrated that adolescent immigrants adapt as well or even better than young people among nationals despite supposedly lower socioeconomic status (Berry et al. 2006: 325). This phenomenon is generally known as the immigrant paradox.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, the results of the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY) that was conducted in 13 countries and included 7,997 research participants aged from 13 to 18 demonstrated that generally immigrant adolescents adapt as well as their national peers (Berry et al. 2006: 319). Other researchers, in turn, referred to the difference in academic achievement between immigrant adolescents and their national peers (Cooper et al. 2002:73; Motti-Stefanidi 2015: 265-266).

\textsuperscript{34} Description of separation and marginalization concepts proposed by J.W. Berry could be found on p. 28.
\textsuperscript{35} Successful adaptation of immigrant youth is considered to depend on how well immigrant adolescents cope with developmental and acculturative tasks and on their psychological well-being. Developmental tasks imply the expectations of parents, teachers, and society for behavior and achievement of adolescents (Motti-Stefanidi 2015: 264).
\textsuperscript{36} “In its simplest sense the immigrant paradox refers to a rather positive adaptation outcome among immigrants, particularly first- generation immigrants, compared with their national peers (Hayes-Bautista, 2004). Following classical assimilation theory, it would be expected that second-generation immigrants would show better adaptation compared with the first generation. But, if paradoxically, the opposite is found, namely a decline in adaptation, an immigrant paradox may be implied.”(Sam et al. 2008:152) However, immigrant paradox has been reported more frequently in the United States and Canada than in Europe (Sam et al. 2008:142).
Another important point that has to be acknowledged is that immigrant youth is not a homogeneous group consisting of members that adapt in the same way. Some immigrant adolescents adapt better than the others (Motti-Stefanidi 2015: 267). Furthermore, gender and socioeconomic position of a family are considered to be “sources of variation” for acculturation (Berry et al. 2006: 307). The results of research conducted by Motti-Stefanidi (2015: 268) demonstrated that positive family relations and high personal agency facilitate the adaptation of immigrant adolescents. Likewise, Jasinskaja-Lahti and Liebkind (2001: 175) consider family to be one of the most important resources that might help to facilitate the adjustment of immigrant adolescents and provide support in coping with potential difficulties which young immigrants could encounter, especially at the initial stages of acculturation. Concerning the agency factor, Motti-Stefanidi (2015: 268) states that even though the contexts play an essential role in the adaptation of young immigrants they are not decisive because immigrant adolescents are agents in their acculturation.

2.4 Discrimination in the country of ethnic origin

According to Jaakkola (2005: 69), soon after the Return Migration Program was established attitude among the majority population towards Ingrian Finnish migration was positive, despite the economic recession and the high unemployment rate in Finland. From 1993 until 2003 three-quarters of Finns who participated in research had a positive attitude towards migration of Ingrian Finns. Jaakkola explains positive attitudes by the common ethnic background, which can be perceived as a basis for belonging to the same culture and group.

Nevertheless, Russian-speaking immigrants are frequently considered to be Russians by the representatives of the majority population. Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2003:84) state that after ethnic migrants are perceived as “Russians”, they could be subjected to all prejudices that are generally predominant for Russians. While discussing young ethnic migrants from the former Soviet Union in Finland, Germany, and Israel, the respective authors claim that attitudes towards immigrants from Russia in the aforementioned countries are mainly negative, especially among groups of the population that are characterized by low economic and social status (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003:84).

Even though the attitudes survey have demonstrated that during the years 1987-2003 Finns were more positive towards Ingrian Finns, Anglo-Saxons and migrants from the Nordic countries than to migrants from other European countries, Asia and Africa (Jaakkola 2009:
in practice, Russian-speaking ethnic migrants face discrimination as much as Russians do (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003:84). According to the results of attitude surveys conducted by Jaakkola (2009:88) regarding Estonian, Polish, Chinese, Russian and Somali immigrants, in 2007 Finns were least favorable towards Somalis and Russians immigrants.37

Negative attitudes to immigrants from Russia in Finland have historical roots. Puuronen (2011: 70) describes how the attitudes of Finns to Russia and Russians were changing during the course of history. According to Puuronen, before Finland became independent, attitudes to Russia varied from Russophobia that implies fear of Russia and antipathy towards Russians to Russophilia that implies admiration and positive attitude towards Russians and Russia. After the Finnish Civil War, negative attitudes to Russia spread among nationalists and the right-wing activist organizations. After the Second World War, public expression of Anti-Russian sentiment was rare but it did not disappear from people’s minds and conversations. During the years 1948-1991 the official Finnish publicity that was following the regulations of The Paris Peace Treaties of 1947 and The Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance (Sopimus ystävyydestä, yhteistoiminnasta ja keskinäisestä avunannosta, YYA-sopimus) demonstrated a positive attitude to the Soviet Union.

The situation has changed again in the beginning of 1990s after the Soviet Union was dissolved and a larger migration of Russians and Russian-speaking immigrants to Finland began. According to Puuronen (2011:71), Russian-speaking immigrants have a specific position in Finland because their homeland is a neighboring country that has had problematic relationships with Finland.

Nonetheless, Laihiala-Kankainen (2006: 73) claims that when we discuss the attitudes of Finns towards Russians, it should be taken into consideration that Finns like Russian-speaking immigrants who are living in Finland form a heterogeneous group. According to Laihiala-Kankainen (2006: 85), the attitudes of particular groups of Finnish population to Russia and Russians depend on their ideological views and demographic characteristics like

37 Jaakkola (2009:87) notes that attitudes towards immigrants varied depending on the location, gender, education and socio-economic status of respondents. People with the highest level of education and the highest socio-economic status were more favorable toward foreign job applicants and to all nationalities that were referred to in the survey: Chinese, Poles, Somali, Estonians and Russians. Likewise, young women had more positive attitudes than young men towards Polish, Chinese, Russian and Somali immigrants.
gender, place of residence and level of education. Thus, Russian culture, especially literature, music, and art were appreciated in Finland at all times - at least among the representatives of the Finnish intelligentsia (Laihiala-Kankainen 2006: 85). Moreover, it is highly important to note that attitude of Finns to Russia as a state and to Russian people do not necessarily correspond with each other. Some people among Finnish population might feel antipathy towards Russian state and at the same time have a friendly attitude to Russians.

Meanwhile, the findings of the recent longitudinal study\(^\text{38}\) of Ingrian Finnish immigrants revealed that during the all examined stages of migration, discrimination\(^\text{39}\) was not reported frequently. However, over the years the average number of discrimination cases increased (Mähönen & Yijälä 2016: 35). Despite the experiences of discrimination, trust in the majority population on average was quite strong among the respondents.

\(^{38}\) The INPRESS/LADA research project, see footnote 33.

\(^{39}\) The focus of the INPRESS/LADA research project was on how ethnic migrants view their experiences but not on the objective criteria like evaluation of language proficiency or cases of discrimination that had been handled in court (Mähönen & Yijälä 2016: 22). For instance, in the study of dynamics of ethnic discrimination that was conducted as part of INPRESS research project, measures that were previously applied by Schmitt, Spears, and Branscombe (2003) and Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2009) have been adjusted to measure anticipated and perceived discrimination. The questions for measuring perceived discrimination of ethnic migrants included: “Finns have a positive attitude towards my ethnic background”, “I have been treated fairly in Finland”, “I have experienced discrimination in Finland” and “My ethnic background has been appreciated in Finland”. Respondents had to evaluate each statement and choose from option 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2012: 908).
3. INGRIAN FINNS' IDENTITY AND CRITERIA OF FINNISHNESS

3.1 Identity as a theoretical concept

Even though “identity” has become both a technical term for social scientists and a “widespread social label” by the 1980s (Weigert et al. 1990:5) and “one of the unifying frameworks of intellectual debate in the 1990s” (Jenkins 1996:7), identity as an approach towards understanding intergroup and ethnic relationships is perceived as one of the most difficult problems within social sciences, as there is a huge number of contradictory theories applying various concepts and descriptions which attempt to give profound explanation for this complex phenomenon (Liebkind 1989: 25). Moreover, immensely applied by various social science disciplines, the meaning of the term identity is often left without specific explanation while scholars refer to this concept (Weinreich 1989: 46). Despite widespread application of the concept, there is no conformity regarding the meaning and understanding of identity (Gleason 1983 cit. Weigert et al. 1990: 29).

Weigert et al. (1990: 6, 28) associate the emergence of identity within “sociological” psychology with psychological climate dominating within American society during the Second World War period and emphasize the influence of questions: “What it means to be an American, German, French?” which aroused due to immigration processes, on emergence and shaping of identity theory.

It is difficult to overestimate the impact of Ericson on the emergence and development of identity concept and theory, as he is considered to be one of the first scholars who began to apply this concept in social sciences (Burke & Stets 2009:38). According to Grotevant and Von Korff (2011: 593-594), development of several orientations of identity research is associated with Erikson’s theory. Social scientists have mostly applied Erikson’s psychodynamic approach, sociological and anthropological perspectives and theoretical framework of developmental life span. Erikson examines processes of identity development within societal and cultural context, thus in Erikson’s view identity formation depends on the implementation of tasks meaningful for a particular culture (Weinreich 1989: 47).
3.2 Ethnicity and Identity

According to Premdas (2002:177), ethnicity could be understood as a shared group consciousness that produces a sense of belonging on the basis of being a member of the community, which presupposes to have common descent and culture. Eriksen (2010: 5) refers to an association of ethnicity with minority questions and race relationships within a non-academic circle and states that in social anthropology it is understood as aspects of relationships between groups that are regarded by members, and also by non-members as culturally different.

The understanding of ethnicity has been influenced by the ideas of Norwegian social anthropologist Fredric Barth expressed in the prominent collection of essays “Ethnic groups and Boundaries” (1969). This scholar claimed that ethnic groups are mainly defined by ethnic boundaries of social character existing between these ethnic groups and to a lesser extent by the differences or commonalities existing between their cultures:

“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 boundaries to which we must give our attention are of course social boundaries, though they may have territorial counterparts. If a group maintains its identity when members interact with others, this entails criteria for determining membership and ways of signalling membership and exclusion.” (Barth 1969: 15)

However, according to Eriksen (2010: 67), there is an ongoing debate on the relationship between ethnicity and culture in ethnicity studies. Despite the differences in understanding the role of culture, many social anthropologists accept the there is a complicated relationship between ethnicity and culture. Thus, it is hardly possible to equate cultural differences with ethnic differences.

Liebkind (1989: 28) mentions two perspectives aiming to give an explanation to the phenomenon of ethnicity: situationism and primordialism. Within situationism paradigm, instrumentality, pragmatism, and changeability are viewed as the main elements of ethnicity; ethnic identity, in turn, is seen as strongly influenced by pressures derived from society. Whereas in the paradigm of primordialism ethnicity is based not on rational and pragmatic considerations, but rather implies attachments to “a primordial tie which connotes unity and solidarity above and beyond internal divisions.” (Liebkind 1989: 29)
Eriksen (2010: 70) states that approaches concentrating on the identity aspect of ethnicity were for a long time met with criticism in social anthropology. Personal identity was not studied for a long time by anthropologists because anthropology is concentrated on processes that happen between people, whereas identity is seen as existing inside a person. However, in recent time study of identity in social anthropology has seen significant progress. According to Eriksen (2010: 71), identity that is studied in social anthropology is a social identity but “not the depths of the individual mind”.

Tajfel (1978: 63) describes social identity as the part of individual’s self-perception, which is associated with his awareness about his membership of a social group and also the meaning and significance that being a member of a group has for the individual. Tajfel (1978: 67) argues that the social identity of a person seen as his/her “knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of his membership” can be determined only “through the effects of social categorizations segmenting an individual’s social environment into his own group and others.”

According to Burke and Stets (2009: 118), having a certain social identity implies being like other members of the group and having similar views. Moreover, members of the groups identify themselves and other members of the group positively, while those who are not members of the same group are perceived negatively. This process of evaluating, in turn, leads to developing a sense of “us” and “them” between members of different social groups (Burke & Stets 2009: 119).

Umana-Taylor (2011: 793) refers to ethnic identity affirmation and relates the emergence of this concept with a domain of social identity theory. According to Umana-Taylor (2011: 793), ethnic identity affirmation implies positive or negative connotations that individual feels towards his or her membership in a particular ethnic group.

Jenkins (1996) believes that all identities to some extent could be understood as social identities:

---

40 Eriksen (2010:71) claims that “identification” will be more accurate term than “identity” because the latter term seems to imply “a fixed thing.”
“All human identities are in some sense – and usually a stronger rather than a weaker sense – social identities. It cannot be otherwise, if only because identity is about meaning, and meaning is not an essential property of words and things. Meanings are always the outcome of agreement or disagreement, always a matter of convention and innovation, always to some extent shared, always to some extent negotiable.” (Jenkins 1996: 4)

Eriksen (2010: 73) states that there is a close connection between identities and external circumstances that imply the influence of powerful groups holding dominant status. Thus, identities may reflect changes that are happening in society and they are not as private and constant as it can be assumed.

Meanwhile, in some cases, it might be difficult to attribute a particular ethnic identity to a person. Eriksen (2010: 74) calls the people for whom ethnic identification appears to be problematic ethnic anomalies. The second and the third generations of immigrants in Europe and children of “mixed” couples could be seen as ethnic anomalies. According to Eriksen (2010: 76-77), in modern societies, it may be highly important to create unequivocal ethnic categories. This is especially relevant in cases when particular ethnic groups could receive special rights on a basis of their ethnicity. However, ethnic classifications are more complex in practice than those that are defined at an institutional level.

3.3 Identity change in pre-migration stage and after migration

Migration to Finland on the basis of Ingrian Finnish origin is a rather long process, which includes the following steps: applying for ethnic migration queue, providing documents that could serve as evidence of Finnish origin and participation in pre-migration training in the country of emigration. Since participation in the Return Migration Program usually implied a necessity to wait a long time in the queue, potential ethnic migrants begin to prepare themselves for expected migration and rediscover their Finnish identity before they actually move to Finland (Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahtı 2012: 120-121). Meantime, it could be argued that an individual who is planning to move to other country constructs his or her ethnic identity on different grounds while being in the country of emigration and after moving to the new country (Davydova 2002: 159).

It is important to stress that identities change within a process of transforming relations regarding groups and individuals; this process, in turn, might affect to migrant’s self-ascription as being part of different entities like nation-state or ethnic group: “The relational
nature of identity is the crucial aspect, with differences in relation to other ethnic groups and nation-states being important constituents.” (Hedberg & Kepsu 2008: 95)

Thus, according to Varjonen et al. (2013:111), ethnic migrants have two majority groups: one of these groups is represented by the country from where they emigrated and where they spent most of their childhood and life before emigration and the second majority group is represented by the population of the country of immigration and ethnic origin. Due to their ethnic background respective migrants are considered to be part of the ethnic minority group in the country of emigration, and at the same time, they are also not regarded as representatives of the majority population in the country of ethnic origin (Varjonen et al. 2013:111).

As many Ingrian Finns moving from Russia to Finland speak the Russian language better than Finnish or are monolingual in Russian, they are not regarded to be a part of the Finnish-speaking majority in Finland, while in Russia they consider themselves to be at least partly Finnish; although it is questionable whether this Finnish identity is also affected by contacts with the majority population in Russia (Varjonen et al. 2013:114). As a result, in cases when ethnic migrants feel that their expectations about membership in the ethnic majority group could not be met, these migrants’ feeling of affinity towards the country of emigration might increase, while feeling of belonging to the country of ethnic origin might lessen (Varjonen et al. 2013:111). Thus, according to the research of Japanese-Brazilians migration to Japan conducted by Tsuda (2000: 56), due to the ethnic refusal towards Japanese migrants from Brazil expressed by the majority population in Japan and the existing cultural differences between migrants and the host society, Japanese-Brazilians had to reconsider their ethnic self-consciousness after arrival to the country of ethnic origin. They frequently reinforced their Brazilian national identity in response to an experienced ethnic rejection.

Mähönen et al. (2015: 126) discuss the conflict between self-understanding of ethnic migrants who view themselves as belonging to the national majority group and actual situation when “desired” identity is rejected or questioned by the receiving society. These authors conclude that the membership in the national or ethnic group is strongly connected to power relations: the question of suitability for the membership is dependent on people who are asked and situational context.
3.4 From stigma identity to a “desired” Finnishness

In order to reach more profound understanding of Ingrian Finnish identity it is important to mention that it could be characterized as a stigmatized identity: many of Ingrians had to conceal and under communicate their Ingrian Finnish identity because of fear to be discriminated or be attributed negative characteristics by representatives of the majority population during Soviet rule (Teinonen 1999: 107).

The emergence of the concept of stigma in sociology is associated with Erwin Goffman (1963:3-5), who determined stigma as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” (1963:3) or in other words, individual with stigma has “an undesired differentness from what we had anticipated” (1963:5). While naming different types and cases of stigmas, Goffman (1963:4) mentions race, nation, and religion and states that these instances of stigma “can be transmitted through lineages and equally contaminate all members of a family”. According to Goffman (1963: 13,14), a stigmatized person might feel unsure before the contact with those who are thought to be “normals”, because he/she does not know how he/she would be perceived by them and whether he/she would be identified within the category of his stigma. Thus, the question of acceptance is essential in the life of the individual with stigma. In Goffman’s view (1963: 9), a stigmatized individual could have different types of respond to his stigma. In some cases, an individual may try to correct what is seen to be his/her drawback.

In the case of Ingrian Finnish identity - ethnic stigma was maintained through “switching” between Russian and Finnish identities depending on the situational context: the former was communicated within the public space while the latter was left for the more secure private space, which mostly included family members (Teinonen 1999: 107). For instance, many Ingrian Finns were speaking their mother tongue Finnish only within a limited family circle (Kaivola-Bregenhøj 1997: 210). Thus, Finnishness has been seen by Ingrians as “a hidden social identity” (Miettinen 2006: 154). Concealing of Finnish identity also expressed in changing Finnish version of names and even patronymic names to Russian in order to avoid possible negative connotations and labels, because during Soviet times Finns were considered to be “unreliable” minority collaborating with fascists and consequently enemies of Soviet citizens (Tiaynen 2013: 233).
In this respect it is important to mention influential work about stigma identity written by Eidheim in “When Ethnic Identity is a Social Stigma” (see also Eriksen 2010: 35-36), where the respective scholar examines relationships between the Norwegian population and the Sami living in the Norwegian Arctic coast (“Lappish population”) observed during fieldwork. Eidheim describes illustrations of how stigmatized identity is maintained and concealed in everyday life within differentiated private and public spaces. Similar to the case of Ingrian Finns, Eidheim gives a notion of secret Lappish language, which is used only in secure situations as an element of “Lappish secret life” because of Sami being illegitimate ethnic status at the time when Eidheim conducted his fieldwork. According to the observation made by Eidheim (1969: 52): “…we must realize that an inherent quality of the public sphere is that it gives no scope for Lapps to show behavior which springs from their Lappish identity without great social costs.” In the case of Ingrian Finns, the social costs for demonstrating and revealing of Finnish identity in public space meant discrimination, expressed in the applying of the derogative name tšuhna, limited access to resources, for instance, difficulties with admission to institutions of higher education or diminishing potential within labour market (Teinonen 1999: 107).

According to observations and interviews conducted by Eidheim (1969: 46, 55), representatives of the Sami population found it appropriate not to speak their native language to their children and did not want their children to study the Sami language, because they considered the native language as being a nuisance for them and thought that more proficient Norwegian language skills would reduce the likelihood of situations where their children had to bear social costs for being recognized as having a “Lappish identity”. Meantime, Eriksen (2010: 36) while commenting Eidheim’s findings admits that a derogative self-attribution is typical for powerless groups in polyethnic societies. Liebkind (1989: 33) in turn refers to Rosenberg who states that social scientists frequently assume that individuals holding low statuses in society hierarchies will correspondingly have lower self-esteem compared to those with a higher status. Liebkind (1989: 34) concludes that alterations of social identities depend on changes in the social structure.

Meanwhile, Kyntäjä (2004) has conducted research where the aim was to examine the meaning of stigma for the identity of immigrants from Estonia and Russia in Finland, among whom were also participants with Ingrian Finnish origin. According to Kyntäjä (2004: 204), stigma could be seen as a contextual experience, because representatives of a
stigmatized group might have negative views about themselves in particular relationships or circumstances: “…effects of stigmatization on ethnic identification are mostly perceived by immigrants on a behavioral level and in certain contexts, for example, in restaurants and dancing places and also when trying to obtain job.” At the same time, it seems that that meaning of stigmatized identity for Ingrian Finnish immigrants in contemporary Finland significantly differs from the meaning and implications that the ethnic stigma had for them while they were living in the Soviet Union.41

Teinonen (1999: 107) and Kaivola-Bregenhøj (1997: 208) stress that if in former years in the Soviet Union period few Ingrian Finns tend to register as Finns (for instance, in case of mixed origin) due to political situation and potential negative consequences, nowadays situation is drastically different, because in recent years Finnish ancestry has meant a possibility to obtain the right to immigrate to Finland. Thus, Miettinen (2006: 158) states that the rise of the Finnishness value makes many representatives of the younger generation with an Ingrian Finnish origin to be interested in own roots due to pragmatic reasons – chance to move to Finland.

Meanwhile, Davydova and Heikkinen (2004: 181) argue that although the construction of ethnicity by potential ethnic migrants in pre-migration stage is frequently implemented through applying appropriate family lines as resources making ethnic migration possible and is corresponding to the context of ethnic migration program, it does not imply that remigrants could not present themselves as members of other than Finnish ethnic group in different context or would have uniform view regarding their Finnishness.

3.5 Markers of Ingrian Finnish Identity

3.5.1 Language

According to May (2001: 134-135), language is not regarded to be determining aspect of ethnic and national identity and there is no necessary conformity between language and ethnicity. Several ethnic groups could have the same language and still regard themselves as having distinct ethnic identities, and vice versa. For instance, the representatives of Swedish-speaking minority in Finland regard themselves and are regarded as Finns by the

41 The subchapter about discrimination of Russian-speaking ethnic migrants in Finland could be found on p. 33.
majority population. However, language could still be seen as an essential component of ethnic identity:

“Thus, I will argue, language may not be intrinsically valuable in itself – it is clearly not primordial – but it does still have strong and felt associations with ethnic and national identity. As such, language cannot simply be relegated to a mere secondary or surface characteristic of ethnicity.” (May 2001: 135)

The influence of dominating culture and education in the Russian language at schools resulted in Russian becoming the first language and Finnish becoming only the second language for Ingrian Finns (Kyntäjä 1999: 6).

Iskanius (2002: 4-13) has conducted research on language and ethnic identity of young Russian-speaking immigrants in Finland, who were aged between 16 and 30 and many of those mentioned being of Finnish or Ingrian Finnish origin. Results of the research revealed that the majority of respondents identified themselves as having a strong Russian language identity and that the relation between language identity and ethnicity was also rather strong in the selected sample. According to Iskanius (2002: 5,11), Finnish is more a tool that helps to obtain education and find an occupation for the Russian-speaking immigrants, who encounter the dilemma of finding a balance between their mother tongue and Finnish language as an integration instrument in the new society and an element of their ancestral culture.

Mähönen et al. (2015: 128-130) analyze language as an identity marker in the construction of Finnishness of Ingrian Finns on institutional, community and interpersonal levels. They demonstrate that on institutional level Ingrian Finns’ Finnishness and integration were challenged within the political debate through emphasizing the cultural distance between Ingrian Finns and the majority population and referring to the absence of proficiency in the Finnish language as an obstacle for integration. On a community level, the Finnish language was seen as a crucial denominator of Finnishness and of maintaining a generational continuity. Similarly on an interpersonal level the Finnish language was defined as an important marker of Finnishness and creating obstacles for the construction of a Finnish Identity in the case of Russian monolingualism.

3.5.2 Lutheran Religion

The Lutheran religion and Church are frequently mentioned among the most important elements or markers of Ingrian Finnish identity. According to Miettinen (2006: 114), the
Lutheran Church has played a crucial role in the preservation of Finnish language among the Ingrian Finnish minority, because it was the only Finnish-language organization that united Finns living in Russia and thus Lutheran faith and Finnish language were inextricably bound together. Moreover, Lutheran religion like the Finnish language was essential for Ingrian Finns as it increased understanding of the shared historical roots with their ethnic homeland Finland (Flink 2002: 59). Sihvo (2002:196) while describing the meaning of Lutheran religion for Ingrian Finnish identity refers to 1930s when the majority of Ingrian Finns were members of the Lutheran Church: “To be Finnish meant to be Lutheran, hence Lutheranism represented Finnish minority nationalism. At that time, the church was the most visible organization, which clearly represented the Ingrian’s Finnish nationality in Russia.”

Although Davydova and Heikkinen (2004:186-187) agree that Lutheranism for a long time has been seen as one of the most important elements of ethnic identity for the Finnish minority in Russia as opposed to Orthodox religion of majority population, respective scholars discuss research results which indicated that religion was not a significant element of self-identifications made by interviewed potential ethnic migrants. At the same time, these results are understandable because of an official atheist discourse and propaganda applied in the educational system and politics in the former Soviet Union (Davydova & Heikkinen 2004:186-187). Due to the antireligious policy in the former Soviet Union, the importance of the Lutheran Church as a fundamental element in the construction of Finnishness for Ingrian Finns diminished (Miettinen 2006: 116).

Teinonen (1999: 115) also emphasizes that historically religion has been more significant for older generations of Ingrian Finns than to representatives of the younger generation. At the same time, Lutheran church ceremonies and registration of new Lutheran congregations in former Ingria after the drastic changes in the position of religion in the beginning 1990s in Russia could be seen as an essential component of a revival of Ingrian Finnish Identity, as examples could serve the cases when people among the younger generation want to be baptized under the influence of their grandparents who see this as a possibility for generational continuity (Teinonen 1999: 115).
Sihvo (2002: 196) also accentuates the role of the Lutheran Church of Ingria\(^\text{42}\) in the national revival of Ingrian Finns in the beginning of 1990s and admits that the ideas about the participation of Russian people and use of Russian language in the Lutheran Church were met with hostility among the church members and some leaders; for instance, a critical view about the possibility for Russians to join the congregation could be found in an interview given in 1993 by Ilmari Ronkonen of the Koltushi congregation. Meantime, Teinonen (1999:116) refers to opinions of those who were not against Russians participating in activities of the church as they thought that such national discrimination was wrong and would only lead to conflicts among Ingrian Finns.

Both Sihvo (2002:196) and Teinonen (1999: 116) agree that nowadays the significance of the Lutheran Church for Ingrian Finns could be described not only in terms of religion, because for many of them the Lutheran Church is a place for practicing Finnish language, meeting other Ingrian Finns and a possibility to contact with Finns from Finland.

### 3.5.3 Traumatic memories

Miettinen (2006: 117) states that stories about the tragic fate of the people as in the case of Jews and Armenians constitute one of the most important elements of Ingrian Finnish identity. The recollections of the forced evictions, tragedies encountered during the Second World War, the experiences of being in prisons, labor camps and survival in that tragic time constitute the essential part of life and the collective memory of Ingrian Finns (Miettinen 2006: 117).

According to Miettinen (2006: 151), the emphasis on the descriptions of the tragic periods of life in the stories told by Ingrian Finns creates for the listeners the impression that the life of the Ingrian Finns consisted only of suffering. As a matter of fact, most of the life has been “normal”, but speaking of more stable parts of life is not a part of Ingrian Finns’ story telling. For example, regarding the older generation of Ingrian Finns, more stable era including 30 years from Stalin’s death in 1953 until the middle of the 1980s has not received much attention in their life stories (Miettinen 2005: 151).

\(^\text{42}\) The official name is The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Ingria.
Konkova and Kokko (2009: 37) in turn claim that impact of the repressions of the Stalin era is so strong that even Ingrian Finns who were born after the death of Stalin and personally have not suffered from the repressions admit that they feel themselves affected by them. Nevertheless, today this feeling of being affected by the repressions is one of the factors, which unites Ingrian Finns who are scattered in different countries (Konkova & Kokko 2009: 37).

In order to understand what influence traumatic memories could have on Ingrian Finns who did not personally suffered from the repressions it is important to look at how these memories are transmitted from one generation to another. Here, the concepts of collective and post-memory have to be explained. Thus, Pine, Kaneff and Haukanes explain that for Halbwachs, “collective memory” had mostly social nature:

“Through their membership in social groups such as those based on family and kinship, religion or political allegiance, individuals received and formed their memories. Any social group had a collective memory, which was transmitted, and reproduced in its members, over generations. The individual was simultaneously a member of various different social groups or collectivities, each of which evoked and reproduced its unique set of memories.”

(Pine, Kaneff & Haukanes 2004: 10)

While discussing the memory of Holocaust Hirsch explains what role photographic images play in producing memories for subsequent generations of those who have gone through traumatic experiences. Hirsch applies a concept of postmemory that could be seen as:

“…the relationship of children of survivors of cultural or collective trauma to the experiences of their parents, experiences that they ‘remember’ only as the stories and images with which they grew up, but are so powerful, so monumental as to constitute memories in their own right.”

(Hirsch 1999: 8)

Hirsch (1999: 8) states that postmemory is different from survivor memory that has more direct connection to the past. In turn, a connection of post-memory to its source maintained not through remembrance but through projection and creation made by those who were not born at the time when dramatic events had taken place. According to Hirsch, postmemory could not be limited only to personal recollections as it implies cultural and public acts of remembrance:

“It is a question of adopting the traumatic experiences – and thus also the memories – of others as one’s own, or, more precisely, as experiences one might oneself have had, and of inscribing them into one’s own life story. It is a question of conceiving oneself as multiply interconnected with others of the same, of previous, and of subsequent generations, of the same and of other – proximate or distant – cultures and subcultures. It is a question, more specifically, of an ethical relation to the oppressed or persecuted other for which postmemory can serve as a model: as I can “remember” my parent’s memories, I can also
“remember” the suffering of others, of the boy who lived in the same town in the ghetto while I was vacationing, of the children who were my age and who were deported. […] Postmemory in my terms is a form of heteropathic memory in which the self and the other are more closely connected through familial or group relation, for example, through what it means to be Jewish, or Polish.”

(Hirsch 1999: 9)

Therefore the concept of postmemory is helpful not only in understanding how Ingrian Finns who have not experienced repressions and deportations could feel themselves affected by the repressions but also in understanding how a feeling of being affected by these traumatic experiences and memories can be the factor that unites the Ingrian Finns. Since postmemory is a group type of identification, it helps to Ingrian Finns to establish a connection not only with the previous generations but also to identify with other Ingrian Finns whom they possibly do not know but who have also gone through experiences of repressions.
4. METHODOLOGY

The fieldwork took place in March 2016 in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region. During the research I have conducted interviews with 10 respondents and one expert interview with Wladimir Kokko. The majority of respondents were found with the significant assistance of the St. Petersburg Society of Ingrian Finns (Pietarin Inkerin Liitto), several respondents were found via personal contacts I have in Finland and one respondent was found via snowballing sampling.

Meetings with the respondents were mostly organized in the office of the Society of Ingrian Finns in St. Petersburg; some respondents were interviewed in cafés, some at their home or workplace. The choice of location and time for conducting the interviews mostly depended on the respondents’ schedules.

Plenty of valuable observations were made and interesting dialogues took place in the interval between the recorded interviews – when I was drinking coffee in the kitchen of the Society of Ingrian Finns’ office, while I was participating in International Women’s Day celebration or was having spontaneous discussions with already familiar Ingrian Finns in the corridor of the premises of the Society of Ingrian Finns. Besides conducting interviews and having spontaneous, but frequently insightful discussions with respondents and people working in the Society of Ingrian Finns, I also had a possibility to become acquainted with activities of this organisation as I participated in the dancing class and attended a conference where organizational and other important questions concerning the work of the respective organization were discussed.

4.1 Ethical considerations

Protecting Confidentiality
All names in the research part of Master’s thesis are pseudonyms and most of names of the geographical places and other details reported here have been changed in order to protect the anonymity of the informants. At the same time many interviews were conducted in the

---

43 According to Flick (2009: 165), expert interviews are different from biographical interviews because expert interviews are more concentrated on respondent’s expertise in a particular field rather than respondent as a person.
44 Wladimir Kokko is a former chairman of the St. Petersburg Society of Ingrian Finns, a deputy speaker of the Finnish Expatriate Parliament (FEP) and one of the authors of the book “Ingermanlandskie Finny: očerki istorii i kul'tury” (The main outlines of Ingrian Finnish history and culture).
office of the Society of Ingrian Finns, and consequently, some of the respondents were aware who was interviewed besides them (for example, they could see how I agreed about interviews with someone else) and probably could identify some of the other respondents after reading extracts of the interviews, even if these extracts do not include real names and places. Presumably, those of the informants, who were members of the Society of Ingrian Finns and who already knew each other also knew life stories and some details of the Finnish origin of the other participants. As these details were shared intentionally and voluntary by some of the respondents with other research participants, a hypothetical recognition of informants by their familiars should not threat respondents’ anonymity.

**Informed consent**
The respondents were asked an informed consent for the participation in the research. Informed consent included standard information about the objective of the research, voluntary nature of participation and correspondingly the possibility to withdraw from the participation at any stage of the research, likewise, the protection of anonymity in handling respondents’ data was guaranteed in the text of the informed consent.  

At the same time, respondents were not informed about the use of the observation method. While planning and designing the research, I did not assume that I would have a possibility of adopting the observation method and that I would like to make use of the observations made during fieldwork as the supplement to data collected within interviews. Gray et al. (2007: 87) refer to a disguised observation, implying that people who are observed are not aware of the observation that has been made. Thus, some social scientists claim that disguised observation is unethical because it intrudes into the privacy of people who have not given consent for being observed (Gray et al. 2007: 88). Similarly, Jones and Somekh (2011:134) state that observation is more menacing than interviewing and implies various ethical issues, consequently it is important to obtain informed consent before conducting observations.

However, observations that were made during fieldwork could not be called disguised because people who were observed knew that I collected data for the research and also were aware of the main question of the research. Some spontaneous conversations that I found valuable were not recorded but respondents did not mention that this information could not

---

45 See appendix 3 for English version of informed consent.
be used in the research or has confidential character. Moreover, some people who did not participate in formal recorded interviews were sharing their opinions regarding the topic of my research and also were aware that I was doing research.

**Topic sensitivity**
The majority of people that I met in the Society of Ingrian Finns did not reject participation in the research. On the contrary, it seemed that they were interested in participating in it. Thus, they were reflexive when they were explaining their choice to stay in the country of current residence; likewise, they had been thinking before about the possibility of ethnic migration and probably had discussed their ideas and hesitations about moving with other people. However, discussion of this topic and related themes with an outsider may be a new experience for the respondents.

When I was trying to search respondents via personal contacts, two potential interviewees whom my familiars asked about the participation in research refused to participate and they also did not want to give any detailed explanation of their negative response. One potential respondent answered shortly: “I have nothing to tell her.” While another person wrote: “I just don’t want to go to Finland”. My familiars contacted with these two persons via social networks and were surprised to receive negative answers, likewise, the short categorical style and form of the answers did not correspond to the image of these two specific persons my familiars had before. Although a variety of reasons might be behind these negative responses (e.g. absence of interest, free time), I assume that topic sensitivity may be among these reasons.

**Researcher positionality: reflections on own ethnicity**
As my research closely deals with the questions of ethnicity and ethnic identity, it would be pertinent to describe possible interrelations between my ethnicity, country of permanent residence and positionality as a researcher. Several crucial ethnic and national characteristics influencing my positionality towards research participants could be identified: someone connected to Finland and Finnish institution of higher education or somehow belonging to Finland, the representative of a minority living in Russia, Tatar.

---

46 Respondents sometimes referred to Finland with words: “In your country…” During one telephone conversation, one of the potential respondents asked: “And what is about Finland? Do guys give flowers to girls on Women’s Day? Or do they give flowers at all?”
Oriental, a recent immigrant to Finland or new in Finland. It is notable that some of the respective characteristics are in conflict with each other, but most of them could be defined in terms: closeness – distance, similarity – difference/otherness. Furthermore, the ambiguity of my ethnicity and complexity in affiliation to a particular national state and belonging to distinct cultures could be seen as reducing the distance as the majority of research participants may know about ambiguous ethnicity from their personal experience.

Was my ethnicity an advantageous positionality? Did it help me to interact with the research participants and build trust? Or could it be, on the contrary, a hindrance for interactions with informants and in understanding them? Certainly, it is difficult to give any precise answer, but I tend to believe that my ethnicity and state of being different brought more advantages for interactions with interviewees than disadvantages. Being different (in relation to the majority population of Russia) and being a representative of a minority meant being somewhat similar, especially having relation to a minority that is known for the experience of deportations and repressions. This condition supposed that I might have some kind of pre-understanding of people I want to research and at the same time could serve as an explanation of my sincere interest towards these people because from a position of common sense it seems natural that a minority person could be interested in studying other minority groups.

Once one of the interviewees referred to me as “also a person of two cultures, but in a bit different way”. Being a minority person in a country with an assimilation policy for nationalities presupposed having a complex or ambivalent ethnic identity, and this ambivalence, in turn, could be considered by respondents as a similarity. Meantime, my ethnicity taken irrespectively of historical similarities (history of repressions and deportations) and minority status has a strong oriental dimension imposing tangible cultural and religious differences between me, a Tatar, and Ingrian Finns. However, as my observation has shown, this visible difference also could be negotiated.

Some of the people I was introduced to in the Society of Ingrian Finns were wondering about the nature of my interest towards Ingrian Finns. For some people, my presence during the conference held in the Society of Ingrian Finns was also obscure. I did not understand

47 It is notable that usually when I told about my Tatar origin to people I met during the fieldwork, they often thought that I am a Tatar from Tatarstan, besides that, several times I was asked if both of my parents were Tatars.
the necessity of self-presentation for unfamiliar members of this organization before the event started and the fact that there were almost no any other outsiders present in the conference.

Once I was invited to join the celebration of the Women’s day in the Society of Ingrian Finns. Some members of the society whom I did not know asked me to introduce myself to them and tell where I was coming from. Once again I explained that my parents are Tatars, but currently, I am living in Finland. One of the representatives of the society started to say that there are similarities between Tatar and Finnish languages. I was asked to say the phrase “I love you” in Tatar - “Мин сине яратам,”¹⁴⁸ which actually sounds similarly to the Finnish version: “Minä rakastan sinua,” where “min” has the same meaning as “мин”, likewise “sine” has the same meaning as “sinua”. Thus, I also mentioned that in colloquial Tatar language father is called “әәти,”¹⁴⁹ which is pronounced in the almost similar way to Finnish word “әити” (mother). One of the members of the society hypothesized that the existence of these kinds of language similarities might have some kind of historical explanation and may indicate some kind of connection in the past, for instance, intensive interactions due to the neighborhood.¹⁵⁰ Although, aforementioned similarities are not enough for making conclusions about language influence and connections, referral to these similarities allow to suppose or think about a probability of some kind of connection between two languages from different language groups (Turkic and Finnic) that are perceived as distinct. Thus, such quest for similarities was telling for me as it demonstrated how at the first sight very tangible differences or ethnic boundaries between ethnic groups could be negotiated and reconsidered depending on the will of the actors involved in the interaction.

It is notable that nobody of those who were following the discussion opposed the ideas about the possibility of similarities and close interactions because of an assumption that being Tatar and to have a connection to Islam is different from being Finnish and have a connection to Lutheranism, i.e. Christianity. While talking about boundaries between

¹⁴⁸ Spelled as “Мин сине яратам” in Tatar language.
¹⁴⁹ Spelled as “әәти” in Tatar.
¹⁵⁰ Making sense from these few examples of perceived language similarity or intriguing coincidences in two languages that are not considered to be related requires an appeal to linguistic analysis and research. However, an apparent fact of the neighborhood of Tatarstan and Udmurtia where Udmurt (Uralic language, the Permic subgroup) is spoken by the significant part of the population, gives a basis for negotiating and hypothesizing the distance between the languages by those who do not have an expertise in the field of comparative linguistics.
ethnic groups, Assmuth (2012: 111-112) refers to Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of distinction. According to Assmuth, representatives of different ethnic groups who aim higher position in status hierarchies will try to mark the distinction from those who hold the lower position. In this regard, when I return to this discussion, I wonder how did it feel for the people whose identity for a long time was stigmatized, to imagine having any connection with the believers of Islam, if we take into consideration the degree of Islamophobia in the Western world? However, I felt that not only obvious similar features of my ethnicity were noted (for instance, minority status), but also, visible difference via negotiation was transformed into a relative similarity.

4.2 Methods description

Although, it seems that the topic chosen for this thesis does not require a particular type of research and both quantitative and qualitative research would be suitable, initially I decided to choose and conduct qualitative research. According to Gray (2007:42), in qualitative data words are especially important as “they can capture subtleties of meaning and interpretation that numbers do not convey”.

Gray describes participant observation as:

“…qualitative research in which social phenomena are observed firsthand in their natural setting. The researcher, or fieldworker, establishes continuing social relations with the individuals being studied.” (Gray 2007:43)

Meantime, a person who conducts observation always has some kind of influence on those who are observed, and who may become stressful and act differently because of observation (Somekh & Lewin 2011: 133).

The list of both open-ended and close-ended questions - interview guide51 was prepared in advance. I assumed and targeted relative flexibility in actual interviewing process regarding the order and way to ask questions and I also was ready that the initial list of questions would be modified to some extent. Ideas about additional questions that could be asked from the respondents or how already formulated questions could be modified appeared gradually within fieldwork. The manner of asking questions also varied and developed from interview to interview.

51 See appendices 4 and 5.
Almost all the interviews took the form of an individual face-to-face interview and were recorded, with few exceptions: for instance, in one interview two respondents were participating at the same time. Besides that, an additional interview via Skype was conducted with one of the respondents in May 2016. The interview with two respondents presenting simultaneously and answering the questions in rotation was not designed beforehand and took this kind of form due to particular circumstances. This form of interviewing was absolutely new for me and at first, I perceived the presence of two participants during the same interview as a bit problematic, as I worried that the presence of another person might be a hindrance for one or both of the interviewees if sensitive topics will be discussed. However, it seemed that the interviewees knew each other for many years and were not confused that they had to answer the questions of the interview in rotation and could listen what the other respondent will say. Conversely, the presence of two interviewees seemed to be an advantage, because the respective respondent used to reflect on what was told by the other and give valuable comments or arguments supporting or opposing ideas and opinions expressed by one of them. Although the interview with two respondents could not be called a focus group interview, it could be supposed that the processes that occurred during this interview might be similar to those that take place in an interview with a focus group. Thus, Barbour and Schostak (2011: 63) emphasize the dialogic and reflective character of the focus group, which leads to an emergence of multiple views and possibility to debate about the proposed topics.

4.3 Sampling

I could assume the fact that the majority of my respondents were found via the assistance of the Society of Ingrian Finns and were the members of this organization might affect the qualitative data I collected during fieldwork. Hypothetically, the member of such organization may have salient Ingrian Finnish or Finnish identity or be interested in their ethnic roots and the preservation of culture. Of course, it could be supposed that not all the members would have salient Ingrian Finnish or Finnish identity as some people with Ingrian Finnish origin might have some practical or other reasons for membership than an interest in Ingrian Finnish culture. However, in my personal view, most of the respondents that I contacted via the Society of Ingrian Finns have salient Ingrian Finnish or Finnish identity. It is possible to suppose that if the research participants were found individually and had not been members of the aforementioned organization or had not taken active part in the activities of the organization targeting the preservation of Ingrian Finnish culture, I
would receive different qualitative data and form a different point of view about the inhabitants of St. Petersburg with Ingrian Finnish origin who choose to stay in Russia instead of moving to Finland.

Although it is hardly possible to make any generalizations based on such a small sample, at the same time, it could be assumed that the informants’ membership in the aforementioned organization still affects the obtained data. In this sense, it is difficult to understand if this influence is an advantage or drawback for the research, in case the influence is strong enough to affect the collected data. The choice to access people with Ingrian Finnish origin via a cultural institution was primarily defined by difficulties to get an access to the potential respondents by any other means. Personally, I tend to believe that this characteristic of informants is an advantage for my research. Moreover, I consider the possibility to observe informants in a setting more natural for them than a formal research interview, including having conversations or listening to dialogues happening between other people, as essential for shaping my understanding and view regarding the collected data, as I could present not only the data obtained during the interviews but also the data of participant observation.

4.4 Research question

The actual target of this research was to understand what are the most important reasons affecting the choice of people with Ingrian Finnish origin who are eligible for a participation in the Return Migration Program to stay in Russia. This general question included several more narrow questions. Thus, my aim was to find out the answers to the following sub-questions:

1. Is the choice to stay deliberate and independent or forced by particular circumstances? Does it depend on the opinion of other people?

In this question, an individual’s willingness and interest in ethnic migration to Finland are contrasted to the influence of other people/concatenation of circumstances. In other words, this question can be interpreted in this way: if a person actually chooses to stay or he/she actually does not have a choice because of some external factors? For instance, an individual was interested in participating in the Return Migration Program but did not

---

52 Lewin (2011: 224) calls an approach that is concentrated on a specific group or not implying generalization of findings to the whole population as a non-probability sampling. According to Lewin (2011: 224), it is significant to admit the “undoubted bias” of this approach.
submit an application for immigration queue before the deadline. In another case, individual might want to move to Finland but her/his relatives are against it.

2. How certain the respondents are about their choice to stay? Do they still consider probability to move to Finland?

Here I try to understand if my respondents made a final decision regarding the question of participation in Return Migration Program. Also, I am interested how those who made the final decision and do not consider moving to Finland evaluate or have been evaluating their choice. What kind of hesitations they might have and why?

3. What is the role of the family members in the decision-making process? Who affects the choice to stay and how?

In the first sub question, the role of the family in the decision-making is only touched on, whereas the respective sub question is solely concentrated on this issue. The assumption about the influence of family emerged already on the initial stage of the research because when families consider a migration to another country choice is frequently made collectively and faces the necessity to compromise conflicting opinions and desires.

4. What ideas and views about life in Finland affect the choice to stay?

Reasons to stay can be particular circumstances like being late for registering in immigration queue but they also can be ideas that potential ethnic migrants have about migration to Finland.

4.5 Interviewing

Only few respondents perceived the theme of research and the main question of interview with some wonderment, while majority of respondents did not try to challenge the question of my research even if some of them could express that they are slightly surprised as they asked to repeat the theme of research when I had presented it at the first time. For instance, once I phoned to one of the respondents in order to ask about participation in research and after I presented myself and briefly told about the theme of research, the respondent asked: “Do you say repatriation? But is it compulsory?” Then I had to explain that I used this term as nominal and another term - ethnic migration would be more pertinent, but term repatriation might be more familiar for potential informants as it is more frequently used in media and public debate. However, it could be assumed that the respective informant challenged not only the incorrect use of the term, which is also highly important, but probably also the meaning and the appropriateness of the question: “Was it compulsory to go, if you wonder why I or others did not go?”
Presumably, the question that I presented to respondents as the main question of my research: “Why people with Ingrian Finnish origin entitled to the right to participate in the Return Migration Program decide not to participate in the respective program and not to move to Finland/stay in country where they are living currently?” already implied some kind of view, position or judgment towards the theme and issue. Therefore, the question was not completely neutral. The question “Why” could contain some kind of judgment towards the choice of staying put made by the particular respondent because it is made from the position of migration and choice of option “migrate to Finland” as natural: “Why you as a person with Ingrian Finnish origin decided not to move to Finland?” The idea that the main question may sound as it contains evaluations or judgments appeared only within fieldwork. Thus, I felt that it would be appropriate to explain to the informants that the respective question is a bit inverted and it does not include any call to action or evaluation of their choice. It was important for me to explain that I do not make any judgments regarding respondents’ choice, but anyway, I would like to know why they stayed in Russia and did not move to Finland?

Another respondent challenged the use of word *decide* in the question “why people with Ingrian Finnish origin decide not to move to Finland/ stay in Russia?” This respondent corrected me several times when I was using the word decide in regard to those potential ethnic migrants who refused to leave the country:

It [the question] is weird because in my opinion those [people] who leave – make a decision but not those [people] who refuse to leave. For instance, I was born here and I am living here. It could be said that I decided not to leave, but I made a decision only after I found out that I could leave. For instance, Sergey [brother] told me: “You may leave”. I said: “Ok”. But I was just drinking tea at home when we were discussing this. It could be said that I made a decision: I decided that I would not stop drinking tea and I would not leave. I decided to continue to drink tea. Then Sergey said again: “By the way, it is cool there. You may leave”. But at that moment we might seat with him in a café near the metro station…I also did not jump out and left. It is possible to say that I made a decision. But it is more reasonable to say that I just *have not made a decision* to leave.\(^{53}\)

(Vitaly, 46 years)\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{53}\) Translations of original extracts from the interviews were edited in order to make them more understandable for the reader. However, editing was made with the intention to preserve the original meanings of translated texts.

\(^{54}\) All names of research participants are pseudonyms. Likewise, the names of geographical places (for instance, names of home villages) mentioned by the respondents and some other details were changed in order to protect respondents’ confidentiality. The pseudonyms were chosen so that they would reflect if a real name has Finnish or Russian connotation. However, some of the interviewees with Finnish first names have Russian surnames, while others had Finnish first and last names and the same situation was with respondents with Russian first names. Pseudonyms include only first names of the interviewees.
It is interesting to note that the respondent has emphasized the passive position of those who refused to leave, as they do not actually make a decision. In the respondent’s opinion, making a decision implies some kind of action; while those who continue to live as they used to live and do the ordinary things, do not take any kind of action. I believe that the respondent was talking about the agency of people who move and the absence of agency in regard to people who stay. However, personally I feel that agency could be applied to both categories moving/staying, but a particular life story is important: various cases could be found among people who did not move, as some of them were taking plenty of actions required for ethnic migration (e.g. participation in courses, submitting application, approval of Finnish descent) and anyway decided not to move, while others were not taking almost any actions in order to move to Finland. At the same time, I found the critical opinion of the respondent also relevant, because I was asking the question about people with Ingrian Finnish origin who are eligible for ethnic migration as a general group without making any reference to the level of their activity or interest regarding the possibility of ethnic migration. In this sense, use of collocation “make a decision” or verb “decide” could be questioned, and verb “choose” could be proposed. However, the relevance of verb “choose” would also depend on a particular case as choice implies understanding and awareness about the existence of alternatives, likewise, it implies some degree of agency.
5. REASONS AND IDEAS BEHIND IMMOBILITY CHOICES

5.1 The complex reasons to stay and hesitations

For most of the respondents, the question of participation in the Return Migration Program was relevant: almost all of them considered at least at some point in their life the possibility to move to Finland on the basis of ethnic origin. Each respondent has an individual story of non-participation in the Return Migration Program. Specifically, some of the respondents were more active: they registered in the return migration queue and participated in the Finnish language courses, but they refused to leave when waiting time in the return migration queue ended. The representatives of the younger generation among the respondents (29-31 years) with one exception did not have to apply for the immigration queue because their parents did it when the respondents were under aged. When they turned eighteen years they could make a personal choice and use their right to migrate to Finland but they decided to postpone the participation in the migration.

Four out of ten respondents I have interviewed still have right to move to Finland: three of them belong to the category “descendants of Finnish citizens” (Suomen kansalaisten jälkeläisiä) and one respondent was evacuated to Finland during the Second World War and then returned back to the Soviet Union. So far no any time limitations imposed for the representatives of these categories if they would like to migrate to Finland. Two respondents belonging to the group “descendants of Finnish citizens” were still considering the opportunity to move to Finland. Nevertheless, one of these four respondents had a personal time limit because his daughter will turn eighteen after few years and consequently could not apply for a Finnish residence permit on a basis of family reunification policy as an underage child of an adult.

It is significant to admit that the majority of my respondents had several reasons, and very seldom respondents could define the most important and crucial reason that affected their decision to stay:

I cannot tell straight that I stayed because of the specific reason. It is not like this with me. I do not deny that I would like to live in Finland. I mean that it would be a pleasure for me to live there in order to study the language…because so far Finland is still not an alien country to me.

(Jyrki, 31 years)

55 Discussion about the problem of two categories of migrants of Finnish origin who migrate to Finland from the territory of former Soviet Union is discussed in subchapter 7.2 “Contradiction between ethnic Finns’ self-understandings and official classification”, p. 97.
Usually, the respondents had a complex of reasons and ideas explaining why they have not participated in the program launched for the ethnic migrants and have not moved to Finland. For instance, one of the interviewees - Lumina told that she decided not to migrate to Finland because her old mother was against the migration to Finland. At the same time, this respondent admits that she was already aged when the Return Migration Program was launched and if she would be younger she might move to the country of ethnic origin even against her mother’s will. Moreover, she supposed that her mother also would be younger in the aforementioned case and would not need a caretaker so the informant could leave without feeling guilty. However, when Lumina was discussing the possibility to migrate to Finland in the younger age, she supposed that even if she will move to Finland, she would still return to the Leningrad region.

For some of the respondents two kinds of reasons to stay in home country are relevant: on the one hand, they appreciate the opinion of their relatives who do not want to migrate and criticize those who moved to Finland, on the other hand, they try to estimate their chances for successful integration into the host society in the country of ethnic origin. When the informants try to imagine what will be the outcome of the ethnic migration for them, they are especially concerned about the possibility to enter the Finnish labor market and the attitudes of the representatives of the receiving society. The interviewees form the opinion about the life of ethnic migrants in Finland mostly on a basis of the information obtained from their relatives and familiars/friends.

Only one respondent said that already at the beginning of the establishment of the Return Migration Program she decided that she would not go to Finland and did not mention that she ever had any doubts about her choice. Other respondents to a bigger or lesser extent had doubts if their choice to stay in the country of the current residence is the right one. For instance, Maarit who did not have the intention to migrate to Finland, anyway assumed that she might change her mind in the future and might regret that she did not migrate to Finland when this option was available for her:

I think that maybe I should have gone. Sometimes I think…we always look at the things in retrospect. Sometimes you think – it is bad. For instance, I knew one granny. […] She was a lonely and old person. When it was time to leave she was saying: “No, I don’t want. This is my motherland”. Later, after she became sick, she told me: “Oh, I should have gone, there it
Maarit refers to the acquaintance who did not migrate to Finland because of the significance of living in her motherland but changed her mind later because she assumed that she could receive better elder care in Finland. The intention to stay in homeland might encounter the harsh reality of the material world, specifically, the tangible disparity in social security and care provision for the elderly between the home country and the country of ethnic origin.

The ethnic migration to Finland usually implied the long waiting time for the applicants with the Ingrian Finnish background. Likewise, people whose waiting time in the return migration queue ended but who did not decide to move to Finland immediately kept in mind another deadline – the 1st July 2016. The potential migrants could reconsider their choice of migration or immobility several times while they were waiting for their turn in the return migration queue.

So I had both: the aspiration and unwillingness to go there… So when I turned eighteen years old and I got the individual number in the queue, I wanted to go there to study. Later I did not want to go there. [...] I had the hesitations. There are always doubts. Sometimes I have them even now. Well… first of all, of course, an individual is driven by the search for something better. So an individual always wants something better and has some kinds of hopes. Also, it happened so, that nothing holds me here. I mean nothing. I do not have family… And I could easily move.

Rezeda: After you decided that you would stay in Russia, did you have any doubts regarding your choice?

Dmitry: It is a rather difficult question. These kinds of thoughts: “Should I try or not?” always appear. But I did not have such a strong desire that I had to leave. I did not have.

This respondent admitted that although he still has doubts about his choice, he did not have a strong motivation to move to the country of ethnic origin. The absence of high motivation to migrate to Finland was also mentioned by another respondent Henna:

Because for once in a while I really had the desire to go there. So I decided then: “Maybe it was not meant to be. Probably, there is a reason why I should still be here - in Russia.” Well, since that time I live here. I cannot say that I had a strong desire. So if I really wanted [to migrate], I would do this all. I just got an idea that actually it [migration to Finland] would not be bad.

At some point, Henna was interested in participating in the Return Migration Program but she did not follow the deadline for registration in the return migration queue. The interviewee admitted that the fact that she did not follow the deadline imposed by the
immigration service demonstrates that she did not have a high motivation to migrate to Finland.

5.2 Fear of the Unknown

Generally, the choice to migrate to any country is not the easiest one for the people who consider migration decision because it requires agency, financial resources and the readiness to encounter significant changes. Although in the case of ethnic migration to Finland, the Finnish government provides an essential financial support and assistance in the integration of ethnic migrants into the new society, some of the ethnic migrants still consider the migration to be a certain risk:

Well, in any case moving to another place raises a plenty of questions and there is an uncertainty about how everything will go there. It was known at the beginning that everything is somehow organized there, that you will receive assistance in finding the accommodation and also with studies. Well, it was known that at the beginning that you will be all right. But anyway, it will be the new place, so that is why I had hesitations. [...] To live in the different country means that there are new rules. You have to get used to a new place. (Dmitry, 29 years)

Another respondent admits that moving to Finland will bring significant changes to his life and at this point he does not feel ready to face these changes:

I was thinking about the moving but it is the step that I probably not ready to take now. Well, actually so far it feels good to be here. Well, it is not about where it is good or bad, the thing is that I do not know what I will do there. So here I have friends, here I can socialize. [...] And here everything seems to be stable at this point: I have the job and the social network that is why I am satisfied to be here. So far I decided to stay. [...] I just understood that at this point it is better for me to be here. Maybe there is also the factor of uncertainty: what will happen there, if the things will work out or not…Well, it is likely that things will work out, but at this moment I feel comfortable [to be] here. Yes, it is probably just a question of leaving the comfort zone. (Evgeny, 30 years)

As most of the potential migrants, Evgeny tries to make some predictions about his life after migration and has concerns about the uncertainty that moving to another country implies. Evgeny has emphasized several times the absence of the dissatisfaction about his current situation and the life in St. Petersburg. It seems that this respondent appreciates the stability of his career and social life. Probably, for the respondents of the senior age, the worries about the necessity to face changes and uncertainties play even bigger role in their migration decision-making. Two
respondents Maarit and Lumina admitted that they considered their age as problematic for migrating.

Well, it was difficult for me. Additionally, it was meaningless in this kind of age. My nephew moved with his family and they tried to persuade me to move: “Come to live here – you know the language better and etc.” But I did not dare change everything. I was thinking: Why? I am the resident of the blockaded Leningrad and my pension is a bit higher. So I did not come to a decision. I thought it is better to stay here. Here is my motherland, and my ancestors lived here. Maybe young people have a need for it, but I decided that I do not have to do it. (Maarit, 76 years)

Although Lumina did not want to participate in the Return Migration Program because she was appreciating her mother’s desire to stay, this respondent admitted that she did not consider migration also because of her age – she was almost sixty years old when the Return Migration Program was launched in Finland. In Lumina’s view, it was meaningless to start new life in a senior age:

How old was I at that point? I was at least sixty years old. To start to live somewhere from the scratch…and to start something…[...] It is impossible to start a new life in this age.

At the same time, for other people with Ingrian Finnish origin the senior age sometimes could be considered as the reason why they would like to move to Finland. There is a significant difference in pensions and care possibilities that elderly people could get in Russia and Finland. For instance, Jyrki admitted that children and elderly people constitute the groups who could enjoy living in Finland because of the good social security programs that are designed for them. Thus, Jyrki’s father was seriously considering ethnic migration to Finland at some point because of the higher pension.

Therefore, the same characteristic of those who consider the migration to Finland – the senior age might have different implications and an impact on the choice to stay or to migrate. In some cases, old age becomes the hindrance for migration because the potential migrants among elderly people are not ready to face changes and “start the life from the scratch” at this age. Nevertheless, even the representatives of the younger generation among the interviewees admitted that they are not willing to face the changes that the moving to another country may bring. However, in the other cases, elderly people among the potential ethnic migrants may consider migration to Finland more seriously because they worry about their financial situation, specifically, they might be dissatisfied with the pension they receive in the country of the current residence. Moreover, elderly people might be concerned about the health problems, an absence of caretakers or the unsatisfactory housing
conditions. In these cases, the ethnic migration to Finland can be considered by the potential migrants as the way to solve the problems that are relevant for elderly people in their home country.

5.3 Family and community influence

5.3. 1. The role of family and community in migration decision-making

It became apparent in interviews that family has played a significant role in the migration decision making of the interviewees. The respondents have relatives who opposed the migration decision and relatives living in Finland who persuade them to come and share information about life in Finland. In my view, this information might have an impact on the migration decision-making of some of my respondents.

It has to be acknowledged that almost all the interviewees who participated in this research have relatives or both relatives and friends who moved to Finland as ethnic migrants and currently live there. One of the respondents has a sister who came to Finland at a job invitation and currently is working in Finland. All informants were in contact with their relatives: they usually contacted via phone or Skype. Many respondents said that they visit their relatives and friends in Finland. One informant admitted that nowadays she visits her relatives and familiar not as often as she used to do before the onset of the recent economic crisis in Russia. One of the informants, who has a brother in Finland, admitted that he has never been to Finland, but already obtained a visa and has plans to go there in the nearest time. Visits to Finland and discussions with relatives and friends via the Internet seem to be important sources of information for the respondents who want to know about Finland and life of ethnic migrants in Finland.

Of course, as it was already mentioned above, most of my respondents visit Finland but anyway, I believe that their ideas about the life of ethnic migrants in Finland are informed not only by information that they obtained during their visits to Finland or when their relatives visit St. Petersburg. In the case of the representatives of younger generation a big scope of information is obtained distantly. However, it could be assumed that ideas about Finland among potential ethnic migrants are mostly based not on their individual experience but on the experience refracted through the subjectivity of their relatives and friends.
The strict position against the migration is an example of another kind of family influence on the migration decision. Thus, parents of the some of the respondents were strongly opposed to the migration to Finland and interviewees did not want to go against their parents’ will. Here I find appropriate to repeat some details of Lumina’s case: her mother was already old when the Return Migration Program was established and she was strongly against immigration because of negative experience she had when she was evacuated to Finland during the Second World War. Lumina did not want to go against her mother’s will, but also, it was unacceptable for her to leave her old mother alone without any caretaker in Russia. Parents and relatives of the respondents convinced them that it is significant to stay in their homeland – in the Leningrad region.56 Some of those who stayed in the Leningrad region had an adamant negative attitude to ethnic migration to Finland and the ethnic migrants were considered to be the traitors:

To be honest, when our relatives were moving [to Finland], my parents criticized everybody. Although, they, of course, experienced it all: Siberia and all but they believed that our land is here, and these others…well, it was so. (Anastasia, 61 years)

[…] after an individual moves to Finland, he (she) denies an access to him (her). This kind of attitude is mostly because of regarding those who moved as the traitors.

(Henna, 30 years)

One of the respondents Henna first could not leave because her father was categorically against the migration to Finland. Moreover, she felt a profound influence of community on her choices and behavior, which would not be willing to understand how a person which has a strong Finnish identity, speaks Finnish as a mother tongue (that is considered to be very rare for young Ingrian Finns) and has a family strongly connected to the Ingrian Lutheran Church could leave Ingria which is experiencing a large out-migration of Ingrian Finns. Henna admitted that she always felt some kind of social control of community because she understood that her behavior and actions might affect the reputation of her relatives who are connected to the Ingrian Lutheran Church. In this sense, for Henna the influence of community on her migration decision was intertwined with the worries about the reputation of her family: when Henna worried how her behavior and, specifically, migration to Finland will be perceived by the community she was worried how this will affect her family. However, even though the respective respondent admitted that family

---

56 See subchapter 5.5 “We have to be only here”: staying put in the Motherland, p.73 for a more detailed description of significance of homeland reported by the respondents as the reason to stay in Russia.
(specifically, father’s opinion)\textsuperscript{57} and community affected her migration decision-making, this influence was strong during the specific period of her life. Thus, as it was acknowledged above, at some point Henna admitted the possibility to migrate to Finland. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that Henna’s relationships with her father, specifically aspiration to obey his will, likewise attitude towards Ingrian Lutheran Church were not the same during different periods of her life. That is why the influence of family and community on Henna’s decision-making was relevant for a specific period of life.

Returning to the discussion of how those Ingrian Finns who already migrated to Finland affect the migration decision of their relatives in the home country, it is important to mention that some of them try to encourage migration choice. However, in some cases, these attempts might have an opposite effect:

Well, they actually had moved and that is why I had information about their life. They, actually, were satisfied with everything but according to some of their stories not everything is so bad here [in Russia].

\textsuperscript{(Dmitry, 29 years)}

For instance, although relatives of Dmitry asked him to move to Finland, their emotion-charged stories about the way of life in Finland, about Finnish people and attitudes to Russians have had an influence on Dmitry’s ideas about migrating to Finland. However, if Dmitry’s closest relatives only try to persuade him to move to Finland, other respondents experience the controversial influence of relatives on decision-making: some relatives call them to migrate to Finland while other relatives are not willing to go or strongly oppose the decision to move.

In this respect it is interesting to think what role the power relations and closeness between family members play in the decision-making: it could be assumed that the opinion of spouse will be more important than, for example, the opinion of the brother. For instance, one respondent who acknowledged that her mother affected her decision to stay put in Russia also has a nephew who immigrated to Finland and tried to persuade her to participate in the Return Migration Program. However, it is difficult to make any generalizations in this respect because it could be assumed that each family might have an individual pattern of power relations between family members that, in turn, also might undergo changes during the life course. In the next subchapter, I look at the example of one family more precisely

\textsuperscript{57} It should be acknowledged that according to Henna her father has changed his initial categorical point of view on the ethnic migration to Finland.
and try to analyze how family members of my respondent affected his migration decision-making.

5.3.2 The active role of a child in migration decision

Another respondent - Maksim also mentioned the influence of the family in the migration decision-making. In the case of this respondent, the influence of the relatives was twofold. On the one hand, Maksim’s brother who took actions to find and provide evidence of his Finnish origin and eventually migrated to Finland made Maksim seriously consider the ethnic migration. Thus, earlier Maksim was not sure if he is eligible for the ethnic migration to Finland and did not know if this option is open to him and his siblings. Moreover, after Maksim’s brother moved to Finland, he was trying to persuade him to migrate to the country of their ethnic origin. Meanwhile, the influence of Maksim’s spouse and child who at that point categorically opposed the migration and refused to leave was more significant for the decision-making:

Maksim: I even tried to discuss it with my family but my family right away said: “The child is 12 years old, she is at school, she is in the sixth grade, the Finnish language – we do not want to go anywhere, we feel good to be here”. It was very strict.
Rezeda: So could you say then that your family affected your decision to stay?
Maksim: I am convinced that only the family had influence because when in 2012 my brother left [to Finland] and we started to discuss with the family the opportunity to move to Finland, they right away told me in a categorical manner: “No, we would not go anywhere! We do not want even to think about it”. All these discussions were immediately terminated. Well, at that point I did not want even to think about moving without my family. Since they had very strict and rigid position towards staying put – there was no any sense to try to overpersuade them.

Although in the respective dialogue the impact of the spouse is marked, specifically, her worries about the migration to become a difficult process for their daughter were mentioned, the respondent also uses: “they” and “my family” (spouse and daughter). In this respect, it is noteworthy that for this interviewee the impact of his under-aged child in the decision-making process is not minor or insignificant. It might be assumed that adults who consider moving to another country will come to a decision on a basis of their own ideas, evaluations and estimations and will appreciate more the opinion of the significant other – the spouse, who is also an adult and can critically evaluate the reasons for or against the migration.

Nevertheless, the case of the respective respondent demonstrates that the will and the opinion of the minor are taken seriously and may have a crucial impact on migration
decision of whole nuclear family. According to Lulle and Assmuth (2013:7), migration decisions made by parents are frequently influenced by the considerations about the future of their children, who, in turn, take an active part in the decision-making process. This is how Maksim who so far has not migrated to Finland because his spouse and child were categorically against the moving to another country and who is actually seriously considering ethnic migration in the nearest years explains the influence of his daughter:

Maksim: So again a lot will depend on the situation with the school because I do not want to migrate alone. Although probably it would be possible to go alone but I do not want to go alone. For instance, if the child would not pass the school entrance exams or will decide to stay here, maybe we will have to reconsider our plans. Although at the present moment she says that she is ready to go there no matter if she will be admitted to school or not.

Rezeda: So the decision to move is more likely to depend on daughter’s attitude.

Maksim: Yes! Yes. Well, before the beginning of this year she was certain that under no circumstances she would go there [to Finland] because here she has everything: school, apartment, mother, and father and all familiars and friends. And after the beginning of this year, she is certain [about the moving], probably because the school comes to an end and all her friends leave to different places…Furthermore, it also could be the impact of age. She seriously started to think what she would do in the future. Now she is absolutely ready for a new trip.

It could be supposed that Maksim expresses particular concerns about his daughter’s certainty regarding the moving to Finland. The beginning of the year is considered to be the border that divides two opposite positions of his daughter. It seems that the transition from one categorically expressed position to another might create some confusion for the interviewee. Anyway, child of this research participant is not just submissively follows her father’s will but in a certain way has the power to determine the plans of her parents regarding moving to Finland.

At the same time, although Maksim’s daughter supposedly appears to be an independent actor, which has the power to determine her parent’s migration decision, practical considerations of daughter’s schooling seem to be very important for Maksim and his wife. This respondent has mentioned education several times when he was talking about the impact of his family on the migration decision. Thus, Lulle and Assmuth (2013:7) state that for Latvian migrants in Britain the children’s education seems to play a significant role in a family’s choices of location(s), and length of stay abroad. Likewise, the study of the Polish migrants in London conducted by Ryan et al. (2009: 69,74) proposed that children’s education could be seen as a factor affecting migration decision-making. In the case of Maksim, the education of his daughter certainly plays an important role: in 2012 when
Maksim was at the first time seriously thinking about migration the fact that his daughter only began to study in the secondary school was referred by Maksim’s wife as an obstacle for migration. The question of migration is again relevant for Maksim in this year as his daughter expressed the interest in migration. Furthermore, Maksim emphasized during and after the interview the highly important role of the education in shaping migration decision, specifically, the success of the school entrance exams that his daughter was planning to take in the nearest time.

However, the case of this respondent is a bit different from the findings of Ryan and Sales (2013: 93) who consider children’s age to be crucial for the choice of migration. Thus, for the respondents of research conducted by Ryan and Sales (2013: 96) the age of a child and the stage of the education determined the decision to leave children in Poland or to take them to Britain. Children of older age were considered to have more problems with education because of migration while younger children were supposed to be able to cope with the migration and adapt to a new education system. Whereas, for Maksim’s family, the age of child also affected migration decision but was perceived in a different way: the younger age of the child was not regarded by the parents as the condition promoting the choice of migration like it was in the research conducted by Ryan and Sales. However, such a comparison might be a bit problematic because in the aforementioned research children who were studying in primary school were considered by parents to have fewer problems with education after migration than teenagers, whereas Maksim’s daughter was already studying in the secondary school when the migration choice was considered seriously at the first time.

5.4 The “Meaningless” migration

The choice between migration and staying put is problematic because the respondents had to define for themselves the reasons why they should leave and try to estimate in advance if their expectations and hopes would come true and how many chances they have to succeed in the new social environment and society. Meantime, it seemed that some of the respondents consider moving to Finland meaningless because in their view various aspirations of a potential ethnic migrant to Finland actually could not be satisfied in the country of his/her ethnic origin. For instance, those who wanted to improve their economic situation feared of living with the support of social services and did not consider this kind of life as an improvement of their economic status.
[...] and I do not see any special prospects for myself in Finland. So there is some kind of dream about better life... Well, it is just a dream, because unfortunately many of those who move there live with a support of social benefits. (Jyrki, 31 years)

Furthermore, the aspiration to live in Finland because of ethnic affiliation is also challenged. Thus, in some respondents’ views, first of all, people with the Finnish origin are not considered to be Finns in Finland and second Finnishness is contested due to the globalization processes. It could be assumed that some of Ingrian Finns who appreciate their Finnish descent consider Finland as the place where it is “easier” to be Finn or preserve own Finnishness. The fact that some of the Ingrian Finns reconsider their ethnic identity after they encounter the hostile attitude of the receiving society has been described in the previous research and scientific literature on Ingrian Finns. However, to my knowledge, the worries of the potential migrants that Ingrian element of identity will be lost after the migration has received less attention. Usually, the loss of the Ingrian culture because of the Return Migration Program is discussed without specific reference to identity.

Jyrki: [...] And most importantly - that specific identity is lost. So after the individual comes to Finland he (she) becomes suomalainen [Finn] or venäläinen [Russian]. So that special inkeriläinen is lost. So he (she) assimilates in order to enter the society... assimilates and completely forgets his history. The other option - he is resisting the assimilation and everything Russian that he has learned during all these years, probably from parents or probably just because of life, this becomes tangible. He says: “I am Russian. We are... ”.
Rezeda: So do you think that there could not be some kind of in-between alternative?
Jyrki: It could be but very seldom. So I really have friends who were inkerinsuomalaiset [Ingrian Finns] when they left and who remained inkerinsuomalaiset. But it is a minimum percentage.

According to this respondent, in most cases, only two options of acculturation are available for the ethnic migrants in Finland: assimilation and separation. The problems of integration of Ingrian Finnish migrants in Finland are frequently discussed from the perspective of “too much” Russified ethnic Finns who fail to become the members of the receiving society because they differ from the expectations of the majority society: they are lacking Finnishness and resist adopting a Finnish culture. Thus, it seems that the success of integration of Ingrian Finns is frequently associated with their ability to assimilate – to master the proper Finnish language without accent, and to be as much Finnish as possible so that the Finnishness would not be contested: having connection to Russia puts under the suspicion Finnishness – being from Russia often means forgetting the native Finnish language and/or culture. In this regard Russianness and Finnishness seem to be mutually
exclusive and opposing categories. Therefore, this kind of understanding of integration seems to be equal to the assimilation.

During a long period the Ingrian Finns were able to preserve their Finnish descent: Finnish language and the Lutheran faith; however, gradually they absorbed some features of the Russian culture and language and later many of Ingrian Finns could not resist the forcible assimilation policy in the Soviet Union. At the same time, the core of the Ingrian Finnishness may be supposed to be in its unique historical fate and “in-between” position. Thus, moving to Finland might mean for some of the ethnic migrants the necessity to choose between the two options: Finnishness or Russianness and consequently sacrifice the Ingrian Finnishness.

Furthermore, the respective respondent challenges the aspirations of those Ingrian Finnish migrants who see moving to Finland as the opportunity to maintain own Finnishness and preserve the viability of Finnish culture in their family:

Jyrki: Regarding my personal perception of Finland – it feels good to be there. When I go there – I find peace of mind, it feels good…it is something akin but anyway I do not feel myself, as I would be at home.
Rezeda: Do you mean the feeling that you have when you are in St. Petersburg or Ingria?
Jyrki: No, I do feel myself like at home but I do not feel myself, as I would be native (rodnym). Probably this is the correct way to say.
Rezeda: So do you feel alien yourself there?
Jyrki: Well, I feel that some things are alien to me. So it feels good to be there but…Maybe it is not that Finland where I would like to live due to some political issues. I do not know. I do not have an aspiration.

Jyrki: Besides that…Finland somehow…gradually ceases to be Finnish.
Rezeda: What do you mean?
Jyrki: Well, globalization. Probably, these are my own political views.

The potential ethnic migrants may dream about their own “pure” and ideal Finland. Probably living during a long time away from the country of ethnic origin makes the image of ethnic homeland become static and carefully protected.\(^{58}\) Thus, possible contradictions with the imaginary of ideal Finland and ideal true Finns may be painful for those who imagine. Similarly, Mandel refers to the disappointment that ethnic Germans from the

\(^{58}\) Some other factors might shape the way Ingrian Finns living in Russia imagine their ethnic homeland. Nowadays Ingrian Finns may apply for a visa and freely travel to Finland, while during the Soviet rule they did not have this kind of possibility. Even though Finland was geographically proximate country - at the same time it was distant. Also, the fact that Finland for a long time had a highly restrictive immigration policy could affect the image of this country constructed by the Ingrian Finns who live in Russia.
former Soviet Union feel after they migrated to Germany because their image of Germanness is contested:

“Their expectation, after having suffered discrimination for their Germanness at the hands of the Soviets, was to enter what they imagined to be a purely German environment. Instead, they confront what they see as distinctly non-German social, cultural, and commercial milieu. Rubbing up against pervasive American and global influence in popular culture, and ubiquity of pornography and of seemingly non-German residents living, working, driving cars, and owning businesses, proves off-putting and offensive to many Aussiedler (resettlers).”

(Mandel 2008:315)

The ethnic migrants with Ingrian Finnish origin may perceive Finland as the connection with their descendants, history and past. Therefore, changing Finland perceived to be a hindrance for keeping this connection because changing Finland is more about the future than about the past.

5.5 “We have to be only here”: staying put in the Motherland

I need to say, my aunt told me: “I will eat bread and salt but I will not go anywhere.” When we were in Siberia – during the war, I remember how my mother used to say all the time: “We have to return to our homeland. We have to return to our homeland”. We were exiled. For some reason, I was wondering: “And this is not our homeland?” My mother answered: “No, Leningrad – is our homeland and we have to return there”. (Maarit, 76 years)

The significance of homeland was not only mentioned by several respondents as an essential factor which has affected their decision to stay in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region but also was discussed by the other respondents when they referred to their relatives or familiars. It was important for me to find out how the relatives of respondents had influenced the significance of homeland and feeling of place attachment of the interviewees. It could be supposed that the importance of the homeland was transmitted to respondents via stories and memories of their close relatives. Another assumption I made after conducting interviews with informants who emphasized the significance of the home place is that the value of homeland increased after the tragic experience of deportations, temporal transfer to Finland and impossibility to return to home places during a long time period. Although home place became distant and was physically absent for the relatives of the respondents for a particular time, it was present in their imagination and memories.

…I understand that I would feel homesick. This is the homeland. This is my homeland. This is my homeland, what else can I say? Of course, people miss their homeland.

(Lumina, 82 years)
After acquaintance with previous research on Ingrian Finns, I decided to include the question about the place attachment in my interview guide, because the theme of returning home was frequently mentioned in narrative research conducted with Ingrian Finnish participants. At the same time, I did not expect that the question about place attachment would be so relevant and significant specifically for my research participants:

Regarding the attachment towards the particular place or territory – this is absolutely relevant, because when after 1942 my mother and all relatives – half of them was executed and another half was exiled to Siberia...So in Siberia we all the time heard how our mother was keeping saying: Soikkola, Soikkola, Soikkola...And, of course, we had so strong desire to go there! And after I arrived, I was not just walking in the city, I was flying - my feet did not touch the ground. And even now...I still always enjoy that I am...Well, these are the roots of our parents, we learned it at mother’s knee, that is why...Also, maybe after the arrival to Finland this feeling of motherland – St. Petersburg...although I was not born here, I was born in the far North – in Siberia... (Larisa, 54 years)

Homeland can be regarded as the place where a person was born and grown up while for the respective respondent none of these two conditions were relevant. She was born in Siberia and only after she turned eight years, her family moved first to Crimea and later to St. Petersburg. If for respondents’ parents and relatives the Leningrad region was both homeland and motherland, for the respective respondent the Leningrad region might to a bigger extent hold the meaning of motherland/mother country or mother’s place – place where her mother is coming from. Affiliation towards homeland as a particular place or area appeared without a physical presence in this place, but, instead, the belonging to “confiscated” homeland was “inherited” by the respondent from her mother. However, although the respondent said that she learned about belonging to the region “at her mother’s knee,” belonging was transmitted via her mother’s repetitive references to the place.

The importance of homeland was transmitted to the respondents not only by the closest relatives like the mother or the father but also by more distant relatives, for instance, uncles in the following example had affected the informant’s view about the significance of motherland:

59 In the interview guide the question was formulated as: “Do you feel an attachment or feeling of belonging to a particular area or territory?”

60 The respondents used the Russian word rodina when they referred to homeland. According to Ozhegov’s Dictionary of the Russian Language (2004:671), rodina means: 1. fatherland, native country. 2. one’s place of birth, origin. According to the Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language (1989: 358) word rodina comes from the noun “rod”, which includes the following meanings: “what belongs to the kin, is connected with birth; the place of birth; fatherland. In the Oxford English Dictionary (1989:1126, Vol.9) motherland has meanings: a. a country as the mother or producer of anything. b. the country of one’s origin; one’s native country.
Finns had a very strong attachment towards these places. My mother had two brothers: one was living in the Ural; [...] another one was living in Tver. They used to come every year and both of them cried. They cried and told: “We will return here!” They spent their young years here before the War. “We will return!” Each time, I remember, that they always cried, and we formed an opinion that here – we have to be only here. (Maari, 76 years)

Homeland was remembered by the respondents’ parents and relatives, and these remembrances had a decisive meaning for informants as they affected their life choices. Furthermore, memories narrated by relatives become the property and heritage of representatives of the younger generation. It is notable that some of the respondents haven’t participated in the tragic events, as they were not born at that time, and others were so small so that they hardly could remember anything from that time. Therefore, here the concept of post-memory\(^{61}\) that was introduced by Hirsch could be applicable. Thus, the respondents have post-memories of tragic times that are “remembered” as the stories told by their parents or other relatives. The absence of a real experience behind the remembrances or weak images left in memory did not diminish the meaning and strength of remembrances collected as post-memory. Here the significance of memories for the respondents is probably defined by the meaning that the remembered events had for their families, rather than actual participation or cognitive ability to consciously perceive events at the time when they were happening so they could be recalled as an individual authentic experience.

One of the respondents emphasized how specific and detailed were the homeland recollections of her father:

[...] but, of course, they always remembered their own place...And my father passed away last year – he was already ninety-five years old and until his last days he all the time was recalling to the minutest detail of his place...the place where he was born.

(Anastasia, 61 years)

However, homeland and home are not seen by the respondents only as particular geographical places and material objects surrounding these places (for instance, houses and trees). For instance, for Lumina, imaginary and ideas about home include both: the social environment of relatives and friends and associations between places and important periods of life. In this sense, home also means native and familiar:

Because it is homeland, everything is here, I got the education here, the job is here, here I retired, friends are here, and relatives are here. Everything.

(Lumina, 82 years)

\(^{61}\) See subchapter 3.5.3 “Traumatic memories”, p.46 for definition of the term post-memory.
Two respondents while they were discussing how important it is for them to stay in the homeland explained that the graves of their relatives also belong to their home places:

She [the mother] always was saying: “All the graves are here, everybody is buried here”, and it is true, she was right – everything is here. She also told: “We strived so long time for the possibility to return to our beloved Leningrad”.    (Lumina, 82 years)

I did not want [to migrate]. I did not want. I have relatives here. I was born here and grown up here…Here are the graves of my mother and my folks.    (Maarit, 76 years)

The possible question arising here is why it is so important for the respondents to be near the graves of their relatives? On the one hand, the significance of being near the graves of relatives might represent the importance of generational continuity as respondents could maintain their connection with extended family and kin. By thinking about having the connection with relatives that they even haven’t seen, people might imagine themselves as a part of the bigger community than just the nuclear family or community of the closest relatives. Thus, kin could be the sort of imagined community like the nation in the prominent Benedict Anderson’s theory (2006). At the same time, living near the graves implies a possibility to visit the cemetery, which holds an explicit commemorative connotation, as the commemorative practices might help to imagine the connection with the kin through remembering.

If potential ethnic migrants may consider Finland as a place opposite to the home place – distant, unfamiliar and incomprehensible (place that is opposite to “here”), despite the ethnic connection, it is anyway interesting to think how does the fact that the relatives of respondents are living in Finland affect the perception of this country? Although all respondents have relatives and some also have friends and familiares in Finland, two interviewees told me about this influence in a rather explicit way within the discussion:

Anastasia: Well, of course, I like Finland - I like to be there, I like to make visits. But I feel that, of course, I had a feeling that I have relatives there…Well, actually, I do have relatives there and this…
Maarit: Yes, I have a feeling of affinity (rodstvennoe) there.
Anastasia: Yes, it is kindred (rodnaya).
Maarit: I go there with a big pleasure.

Although relations between my ethnicity and positionality as a researcher were discussed at length in the previous chapter, I think it is pertinent to reflect on the role of my background in the data analysis process. Thus, it should be acknowledged that everything connected with the homeland and the motherland was not apparent for me and not taken for granted.
My own situation and life story allowed me to somewhat question affiliation towards homeland and place attachment that the respondents view as natural and inherent to them. I was born and living whole my life away from the motherland – the place where other relatives are living or were living, and after that away from the home place, where I was born and had been living most of my life. The mother country was visited just a few times during my lifetime. So I learned to live without the motherland - or far away from it, without appreciating and expressing interest towards my own roots and kin. Separation from the places, alienation from the native and familiar culture and “belonging to somewhere else also” is a normal situation for my life, thus I seldom felt that I would want to return, as my belonging to places never was apparent to me.
6. IMAGINING MIGRATION

6.1 Fear of being unemployed in Finland

The high rate of unemployment and difficulties with finding a job in Finland were frequently reported by the respondents as important reasons to stay in the country of current residence. According to data published by Statistics Finland (2016), the unemployment rate in Finland was 10.1 per cent in March 2016 (273 000 people).\(^{62}\) According to the report published by Statistics Finland, 14.4 per cent of foreign\(^{63}\) men and 17.0 per cent of foreign women aged 20-64 were unemployed in 2014 (Niemin 2015:122). Whereas the unemployment rate was 8.4 per cent among Finnish men and 6.3 per cent among Finnish women in 2014 (Niemin 2015: 123).

It became apparent during the interviews with those respondents who considered difficulties with finding a job in Finland to be an important reason for staying put that the potential ethnic migrants to Finland have certain expectations about the job and it is crucial for some of them to work according to an obtained degree. It seems that respondents had negative expectations about their chances to find a job in Finland.

Yes, I was thinking about moving, it was in the nineties – when the situation in the country was insane. […] I have passed the compulsory Finnish language exams; I was studying Finnish at the courses organized by the Inkerin Liitto (the Society of Ingrian Finns). But… later all worked out, and the main reason why we did not leave, of course, it is employment. The fact that it is impossible to find employment according to the degree in Finland. […] Of course, he [the husband] would not be able to find the same occupation in Finland without language skills. It is quite difficult to learn the language. The main reason why we did not move is that it is impossible to find employment there [in Finland]. Well, I think so, because I do not know what difficulties we would face there if we would move, some other reason could also appear.

(Larisa, 54 years)

It is noteworthy that the respective respondent – Larisa, who did not work after she became a mother, named difficulties in finding employment in Finland as one of the main reason to stay in Russia. The worries about the threat of unemployment were concerning mostly her husband’s chances to find an occupation which would be similar to his current highly skilled position in Russia. However, when I asked Larisa another time about the reasons to

---


\(^{63}\) In this research “a foreigner” was defined as a person whose both parents have been born outside Finland (or the only parent, which is known by the respondent). Thus, among the research participants were the people who were born in Finland, who have been living in Finland short or long time and also those who already received Finnish citizenship (Niemin et al. 2015: 8).
stay in Russia, she told me that both of them – her husband and she would not be able to find a job in Finland.

Immigrants’ qualifications are frequently not fully recognized in the labour market of the host country because of disparity in education and training systems, lack of knowledge and discrimination (Jasinskaja-Lahtı et al. 2002: 24, 86; Mannila & Reuter 2009: 946). Thus, difficulties in finding a job due to the high unemployment rate in Finland are also accompanied by a necessity to undergone procedures that are required if a holder of degree obtained abroad would like his or her qualification to be recognized in Finland. One of the respondents - Dmitry expressed concerns not only about unemployment but also about the necessity of retraining, which in the respondent’s view still does not increase the chances of the job applicant to find an employment:

Oh, unemployment! It would be compulsory to get retraining, to get your diploma recognized, to study for a few years. Of course, it is more interesting to study in your country [Finland]. First, you study, and after that you face unemployment. Although my profession is in demand – fixing refrigerating appliances should be in demand. But in your country it is stricter regarding the work – if you do not have the degree, nobody will let you to work. And here [in Russia] if you have an experience and skills it is possible to find a rather decent work. On the one hand, it is bad that you could find a job without a degree, but on the other hand, if you have skills and aspiration, you would not be left without a job. Anyway, you have to get your degree recognized: educational systems are different, new facilities – it would be compulsory to get re-training. And then after you have already spent your time on studying - you face unemployment. (Dmitry, 29 years)

Another respondent Henna was also emphasizing that the process of searching a job in Finland is complicated, demanding and different from the process of finding a job in Russia.

[…] I do not even try to conceal any information during the job interview. If I quit my last job after two months, I honestly say: “Well, I did not like that job”. Could you imagine if I would say in the same way in Finland, where, as you know, people appreciate their jobs so much? It is a disaster to be unemployed. I do not ever think in the same way while I am here [in Russia], because although salaries are lower, there are plenty of jobs. So you know that in any case you would not be left without a job, especially if you have skills. These kinds of factors confuse me. I know how my sister was searching for employment [in Finland] and, to be honest, it was like hell. In my view. (Henna, 30 years)

Both of the above-mentioned respondents marked the differences in the employment process in Russia and Finland. In their view, in Russia, it is enough for a job applicant to have actual skills to do a particular work in order to get a job. Dmitry emphasized that a job applicant should have a corresponding qualification/degree in order to get a job in Finland, whereas Henna referred to a lack of job opportunities in Finland.
It is notable that Henna’s opinion about the process of finding a job in Finland is based not only on information that is available on the Internet or obtained in conversations with relatives and familiars who already live in Finland or are closely connected to this country. She was a witness of how her sister was applying for a job in Finland while she was still living in Russia and what specific steps the recruitment process included.

6.2 Anticipating negative attitudes

The theme of negative attitude and perception in the country of ethnic origin was frequently referred to and discussed during the interviews with respondents, although my interview guide did not include a question connected with the attitude of the majority population of Finland towards immigrants of Ingrian Finnish origin. Consequently, the discussion of the respective theme was initiated by the respondents who referred to stories told by their relatives or acquaintances living in Finland. Although, it is possible to think about the negative perception that Ingrian Finns encounter in Finland as a sort of discrimination as I first understood it, later I made the conclusion that the respondents were mostly emphasizing the perception of Ingrian Finns as Russians and a negative attitude to Russians in Finland but not discrimination that implies distinct treatment in labour market, workplace or the housing sector.

One of the respondents expressed in a quite explicit way his worries about the possibility of encountering negative attitudes from the representatives of the host society:

Besides that, according to what I have heard from the others, Finns are not kind to…they treat Russians with disdain. And I do not want to feel it – that others will not take me seriously in the new place. This is what I found out about Finns. When it comes to us, we are, on the contrary, well disposed towards them. Of course, we make sometimes jokes about them, but we also make jokes about ourselves. And in regard to them, I do not know, but maybe they are scared of us or maybe not. Do you know? Why do they have such an antipathy towards us?  

(Dmitry, 29 years)

If other respondents while talking about the negative perception in Finland were underlining that Ingrian Finns are not treated as Finns in Finland, but as Russians, Dmitry was mostly talking and wondering about the negative attitude towards Russians in Finland. It is relevant to mention here that when asked about his own ethnicity, Dmitry said that he is half Russian and half Finn, though today he feels that he has more Russian mentality. Thus, for this informant, it was not so important that he would not be considered to be a Finn in the
immigration country because he did not consider himself to be a Finn. Instead, he did not want to be “treated with disdain” as a Russian.

Well…I do not have anymore an idealized image of Finland, now I also know other aspects of Finnish life. Back in the day we mostly have met Finnish Christians who came to visit us and actually brought presents. These kinds of Finns, these kinds of Christians - not all people in Finland are like those to whom you could come in the summer to stay with their family for two weeks and they would care about you like about a small child. As it became apparent later, there are different kinds of people in Finland: there are people who cannot stand people from Russia at all - it does not matter for them if these people are Finns or not. (Henna, 30 years)

The image of a country is hugely affected by the interactions and contacts with the country’s nationals. The idealized image of Finland and Finnish people the respondent told me about was based on her contacts with a specific group of the Finnish population – religious people who presumably were interested in the Ingrian Church and in having contacts with Ingrian Finns. This respondent stressed that Russian background – the fact of coming from Russia is decisive for those Finns who have a hostile attitude towards Russians. According to this logic of stereotyping, coming from Russia means being Russian despite Finnish origin.

Other interviewees who raised the issue of negative attitudes and perception of Russian-speaking migrants as Russians by the representatives of the host society were highlighting the disappointment and frustration Ingrian Finnish immigrants feel after having experienced pejorative treatment in the country of ethnic origin:

And then she was telling that Finns anyway had this kind of attitude, although they considered them to be the Finns, but ryssät.64 She cried. I asked: “Why do you cry?” [She asked] “Why do they do so?” However, she was saying that nobody even knew, she was aged and spoke the language perfectly; nobody would even guess where was she from based on her speech. The last name was Finnish - Rantanen. And for some reason, she worried very much when the others found out where she was actually from.

(Maarit, 76 years)

Maarit said that her relative had excellent Finnish language skills. The insufficient knowledge of Finnish is not only considered as one of the main obstacles for integration of Ingrian Finns into Finland but also has been applied in public debate to challenge their Finnishness. Thus, my respondent’s relative met the important conditions for passing as a Finn, but it seems that in cases when her connection to Russia was revealed, the opportunity for being accepted as a Finn was canceled for her. Worries that others would know the truth

64 Derogative term applied for Russians in Finland.
about the Ingrian Finnish origin reminds of the insecure position that a stigmatized Finnish identity meant for Ingrian Finns living in the Soviet Union.

However, they are not Finns there. You know very well that they are ryssät there. For instance, my cousin… I laughed so much at this! So once she took a walk, and behind her, some kind of Arabs were walking. And it happened that she got lost and asked them to show her the way. They explained to her how to get to the place, and just after a while she heard like they said about her: “Well, tuossa menee ryssä”. […] She said to me: “Could you imagine this? And who are they? And they dare to call me ryssä.” I asked her: “And who are you?” She replied: “Well, if this would be said by someone else, but not by them”. I told her: “Well, these kinds of people we are in this world, these kinds of people.”

(Lumina, 82 years)

It is notable that the relative of this respondent was frustrated because those who considered her to be a representative of the Russian minority were apparently immigrants in Finland. For the respondent’s relative, the representatives of the majority population of Finland have the power to define if she could be considered as belonging to the majority Finnish population or minority Russian population.

### 6.3 Socializing in Finland: “Finns are different”

The contradictions between the ethnic migrants from the former Soviet Union and the majority population of Finland is not only expressed in that some of the representatives of the receiving society are not willing to consider Russian-speaking migrants as Finns but also the ethnic migrants feel themselves different from the majority population. The difficulties in communication between the representatives of the host society and immigrants might emerge not only because of the language barrier. Also, cultural differences might complicate interaction and communication between the ethnic migrants and representatives of the majority. Even those people with Finnish origin that tried to maintain Finnish culture in Russia and speak the Finnish language fluently could find aspects of communication and the way people communicate in the country of ethnic origin as alien and incomprehensible.

Yes, Finland is a different country, and Finns are some kind of different people, and it is not very easy to understand them. If we will talk about those things that Gumilyov referred to: mentality and behavioral patterns, Ingrian Finns are different from Finns from Finland in regard to their behavioral patterns. For instance, one of the traits of their national character is community spirit, which is absolutely extrinsic for Finns from Finland. I know a lot of examples that confirm this. There were the cases when we assisted the migration

---

65 “there goes”  
of grannies that after moving to Finland were living in retirement homes. After a while, I visited them and asked: “So how is your life going? How do you like the meals: are they good or not? Is it warm enough? Is it comfortable place?” They answered: “Oh, it is warm and comfortable here”. “Do you receive good care?” “Yes, we receive good care”. “Do you like to be here?” “No.” “Why?” “Because every granny is in its own room, the door is locked. There are no friends, no grandchildren, no neighbors - nobody”. So if we talk about mentality and behavioral patterns of Ingrian Finns, in this sense, they differ from Finns from Finland.

(Wladimir Kokko67)

Interesting research about the differences in communicative behavior between the Finns and the Russians was conducted by the Voronezh State University and Voronezh State Technical University (Russia) in cooperation with the University of Jyväskylä. For instance, it was emphasized that the Russians and the Finns have a different attitude towards using pauses in speech and appearance of silence during the discussion (Turunen 2000: 33, Melikyan 2000: 47-52). According to the respective research, the differences in communicative behavior between Finns and Russians also concern the use of smile as a demonstration of politeness towards a stranger, choice of themes for discussion and questions that would be considered as impolite to ask from the conversation partner and even physical distance kept during the conversation with a stranger. At the same time, it was also remarked that not all people act in the same way both in Finland and Russia and stereotyping might create additional barriers for intercultural communication.

They were living in Lappeenranta in some kind of a retirement house. We were going there and visited all of them. And one aunt - her name was Galina, and she was bored so much. Her son has died suddenly. She left the country. And she was telling me: “Every night I cry”. We were visiting them, and she was very bored. Of course, they have a bit different mentality there, here people are used to… the Finns here became Russified to some extent. And they have familiars and friends. She said: “I knew all the neighbors living in the same house, I could discuss with them”, and there [in Finland] she could not socialize as much as she used to.

(Maarit, 76 years)

It might be assumed, that the differences in the communicative behavior might not only complicate the communication of some of the Ingrian Finns with the representatives of the host society but also to make it difficult for them to socialize, find friends and maintain the relationships with acquaintances. For those Ingrian Finns who used to have an extensive social network consisting of close and distant relatives, friends and neighbors in Russia, the absence of such a network or difficulties in socializing in a new environment might lead to an appearance of some sort of alienation. For elderly people among Ingrian Finns socializing in the new society might be complicated not only because of cultural differences

67 See p. 49.
and differences in communicative behavior but also because of limited possibilities to contact and make connections with other people. For instance, representatives of younger generations might have more possibilities to socialize at school, the institution of higher education, work, and language courses.

6.4 Life after ethnic migration

And when I am with my relatives I get an idea what kind of life it is: Look out of the window...Go to the shop and come back from the shop. It is not interesting.

(Lumina, 82 years)

During the interviews, I have heard several times how the respondents were expressing explicit critique of the way ethnic migrants who moved to Finland live their lives after immigration. Some respondents believe that the differences in the systems of social security in emigration and immigration countries make immigrants from Russia passive because in the immigration country they could receive money without putting in much effort:

The fact that there are quite many Russians there [in Finland] is an advantage and a disadvantage at the same time, technically you could know the language [Finnish], but there are possibilities to communicate in Russian. On the other hand, I do not like how Russian people act there. Here [in Russia] they act normally. They are more relaxed there [in Finland], they act in a more bold way, because they have to work less if they want comfort, and that is why people become more relaxed. Well, I think that here the situation is normal, but there the easier conditions do not always mean good. So they make a person be more relaxed, and it is not sure that this has a good impact on a person.

(Evgeny, 30 years)

Another interviewee who has been working even after she retired, recalled the case when she met several young immigrant women from the Leningrad area in Helsinki and find out that they were making window-shopping because they did not have enough money to buy things:

Lumina: So you see, they just waste their time. I believe that it is possible to find some kind of occupation (zanyatie) in any place. I do not understand this, but a person easily gets used to being lazy. He (she) begins to think: “Why should I go to work if I could sleep in the morning?” And this is a human lifestyle.

Rezeda: It makes people become more relaxed.

Lumina: It makes them become more relaxed! It is terrible! They say: “Well, we get enough, well, enough...we are not starving.” I answer them: “How it would be possible if you would also starve? If they let you come, nobody will allow you to die from hunger.” But regarding everything else...I can’t say anything. They live. They have an accommodation. The accommodation is good. They are well off. I mean that they are on a welfare – well, it is ok...But they would like to have more. Of course, they would like to have more. Well, you can’t do anything about it, because you live in a different state and you have...the government gives support to you. Well, you have to be grateful for it. And I understand it very well.
First, Lumina criticizes the young women whom she occasionally met and after that refers to her relatives. It seems that Lumina talks about ethnic migrants from Russia in Finland as a homogeneous group: people whom she barely knew and relatives were discussed as belonging to the same group – not only because of similarities in the factual migrant and language background but also due to similarities in the so-called lifestyle and economic situation. Lumina emphasizes the passiveness of people she is referring to as she believes that they do not have an occupation not because it might be complicated for the migrants to find an occupation in a foreign country: “it is possible to find some kind of occupation in any place”. At the same time, Lumina uses the general word “occupation” instead of job or employment. It seems that the respondent describes the ethnic migrants who already live in Finland as lacking agency or as “hostages to circumstances” because the respondent feels that her relatives would like to improve their financial situation but on practice are satisfied with the minimum financial support they get from the government.

Meanwhile, the image of passive and lazy migrants contradicts with the fact that ethnic migration to Finland, in any case, requires active agency from the migrants: the documents required for the confirmation of origin must be found, the Finnish language should be learnt, language exams should be passed, likewise other practicalities need consideration and resources. Furthermore, Lumina’s criticism towards the life of her relatives implied that she uses these examples to show that maybe this kind of life is different from the life the person may have dreamt about. It felt that Lumina enjoys her eventful and saturated life in Russia and would not like to live as her relatives in Finland do: without work or occupation. However, even though Lumina refers to the ethnic migrants in Finland, as if they formed a homogeneous group, she also remembered few examples of successful migrants among her relatives who were able to undergo all the procedures required for qualification recognition and find employment.

6.5 “Almost nobody returns”

Although I did not ask the respondents any questions about those people who first moved to Finland as ethnic migrants and later returned back to Russia, several68 of my informants were keen to discuss this theme. Some of the respondents were convinced that a very small and insignificant number of people with Ingrian Finnish origin who has moved to Finland

---

68 Three of the ten respondents referred to the examples of their acquaintances/relatives of Finnish origin who have moved to Finland but later have returned back to Russia. The other three respondents did not refer to the specific examples but told me that only a small number of ethnic migrants return from Finland to Russia.
return back to Russia while others knew particular examples of those who had returned. Of course, the discussion of a possibility to return to Russia was relevant to the theme of my Master’s Thesis and the main research question and probably should have been included in my interviews. Additionally, in my view, the respondent’s referral and interest in this topic should not be left without attention.

On the one hand, the fact that people return or on the contrary return in small numbers could be an important characteristic of ethnic migration to Finland for the potential ethnic migrants as they could suppose some sort of correlation between the number of those who return to the emigration country and the “successfulness” of the immigration. If only a small number of Ingrian Finns return to Russia, could it mean that ethnic migrants appreciate their life in Finland and do not have reasons to return back? In other words: what does it tell about ethnic migrants’ satisfaction with their life in Finland? Even if ethnic migrants might be dissatisfied with the absence of work or intensive contacts with the native population and tell about it to their relatives and friends living Russia, they do not return to Russia and this might create additional questions for the potential migrants. If living in Finland would be unbearable for ethnic migrants, why would they not return as it is not restricted or forbidden, especially taking into consideration the relative geographical proximity? Of course, these ideas and speculations could not give objective descriptions of what respondents really might think about the fact that very few people among ethnic migrants to Finland return to Russia. However, one respondent expressed explicitly her conviction in that ethnic migrants to Finland do not return because they are satisfied with their life in the country of ethnic origin:

Well, of those who have moved almost nobody returns, maybe very few [people]. The most, of course…The majority is satisfied and stays there. (Maarit, 76 years)

Even though Maarit said in a final manner “almost nobody returns” about ethnic migrants from the former Soviet Union who move to Finland, she also told me during the same interview about her aunt who after moving to Finland was living in retirement house and felt herself upset and alienated. Probably, moving back to the country of emigration in the case of the elderly who are dissatisfied with their life in Finland would not be a very feasible option, as already immigration to Finland could be demanding for elderly people. At the same time, this option of returning back might be more feasible for young and middle-aged people; however, the majority of them does not use this option and does not
return. Probably this fact might be telling for those of the potential ethnic migrants who so far do not have time limitations for moving to Finland and still may consider the immigration.

Meanwhile, it was important for me to hear examples given by some respondents who did not express a strong conviction in that “almost nobody returns”:

Anastasia: Of course, there are cases. For instance, my sister, who already has been living there [Finland] for twenty-three years, she received there another degree, she was working in healthcare when she left from here...She knew the language from childhood and she also graduated from the University there and worked there. [...] Soon she will turn sixty-five years and she is deep in thought that maybe she would return here...

Maarit: But very few leave [from Finland].

Another respondent – Jyrki said that the opportunity to return back to Russia always exists for ethnic migrants, who are moving to Finland, and in his opinion, many ethnic migrants had the idea that they could return. This respondent gave his own example of person who returned back to Russia:

I know people who returned. I have an acquaintance who left – she was living half the year in Imatra. But she left with the words: “That’s not mine”. It is notable that when she moved she already had a job, she was working, she had everything – she had a good life, but she said: “That’s just not mine. I cannot.” It is noteworthy that her Finnish is excellent; I mean she does not have an accent. So when Finns find out that she is Ingrian, they [are surprised]...well, because these languages are a bit different. (Jyrki, 31 years)

What has drawn my attention in the respondents’ narratives about people who returned from the country of ethnic origin to their home country, is that both of the above-mentioned respondents were emphasizing that those who returned had jobs and had exceptional Finnish language skills. A deficient knowledge of Finnish and an absence of employment are frequently considered to be the most important obstacles that complicate the integration of migrants into the host society, and respondents stressed that even the ethnic migrants who have significant preconditions for successful integration into Finnish society might want to return or actually return to the country of emigration. In this sense, ethnic migration is not only about receiving recognition from the representatives of the majority population and becoming a member of the host society in the affluent country of ethnic origin but also about individual preferences and belonging. Place attachment and belonging to motherland were indicated by several of my respondents as significant motives that affected their choice to stay put; likewise the power of belonging could be decisive in
helping to define which return is the right one. “That’s not mine” - this is how the acquaintance of my informant explained her another return.

6.6 “It was never discussed”: memories of repressions

The attempts to hide one’s Finnish nationality and origin among the Ingrian Finns during the Soviet rule were discussed in spontaneous unrecorded conversations. It is notable that one of my interviewees introduced himself by his Finnish name, but immediately acknowledged that in his passport he has a Russian name because his relatives had security concerns when they registered his name. Also, stories about people presenting themselves with their Russian names instead of the real Finnish names (which were actually written in their official documents) were remembered and told by another participant in a spontaneous conversation.

The respective interviewee told that he did not know his Finnish grandfather well because he was living far away and had visited them only several times. Moreover, these visits had a “semi” secret character: usually parents had discussions with the grandfather in the kitchen; besides that, the respondent told me that his grandfather very seldom stayed for a night. According to the interviewee, his father had a Russian nationality in all official documents including his birth certificate, and supposedly the grandparents of the interviewee were also designated as Russians in this certificate.69

It is noteworthy that several interviewees during a long time were not aware of the events that had happened to their parents or had very limited information about these events. For instance, one of the research participants - Larisa found out about the Finnish nationality of her mother only when she applied for a passport and noticed that it was written on her birth certificate that her mother is a Finn. The mother of Larisa refused to talk with her about these themes because of the traumatic experience of deportations and executions, and Larisa tried not to ask about it, as she did not want her mother to break into tears and become upset.

The parents of Anastasia and the mother of Maarit also during a long time refused to tell them about the dramatic events they have lived through:

69 The respondent does not have any information about his grandmother’s ethnic origin.
Anastasia: After all, we did not know about the repressions, we did not…
Maarit: Yes, nobody has told us. I think that they were afraid, Anastasia.
Anastasia: Probably they tried not to involve us…For instance, I was about fourteen or fifteen years old when I found out what exactly my parents experienced during the blockade [The Siege of Leningrad] and after it. So if others were saying: “And what we have lived through….”, they [the parents] always kept silent. I remember that once, probably I was in the eighth or ninth grade and my parents were watching a movie about the war. […] They were watching the movie and discussed it with each other: “Yes, this was so, and this was this way”. At that point, it was so overwhelming for me because I did not… I knew that they had to leave, that they were evacuated, something else, but… They had never said to us, they had never told us. And, for example, they have not told us why my father did not serve at the front. Of course, later I learned about it… I would not say that they were afraid; after all, they were speaking Finnish at home. They did not want to… So there was some kind of freedom, of course… They probably did not want that we will take to heart something.

In the respective dialogue, Anastasia and Maarit view the silence kept by their parents in a bit different way. Maarit believes that fear was the main reason why their relatives had been unwilling to tell about the events that had happened to them: refusal to discuss the past was influenced by considerations about the present and the future. It might have felt more secure for some of the Ingrian Finns who suffered from the repressions to keep silent, undercommunicate the details of their past because probably the threat of new executions or exiles did not seem to be unrealistic, and consequences of these kinds of discussions were hardly predictable. In Anastasia’s view, her parents did not want to share their traumatic experience as they wanted to protect their daughter from feeling sadness.

Maarit: My mother and aunt also were discussing in Finnish at home. But I did not know almost anything before I turned twenty years. And only this aunt Ekaterina, Alexey’s widow, she started to tell about it in the presence of my mother, but she did not even want to listen: “There is no need to discuss it.” I did not know anything – that we have been in Siberia, that we were exiled, nothing at all.
Anastasia: Actually, there was no rehabilitation, they were still public enemies.
Maarit: And there was no rehabilitation. In my opinion, they also had a fear.
Anastasia: That is why they were silent.

I joined [the Society of Ingrian Finns], I came and told to aunt Merja: “Well, we…”. She told: “That is it, now the lists with names and a deportation date would be drafted”. Because there is hand written list, the date when we were exiled is written in this list. Once I requested verification letter – there was just last name, year of birth, month – this was all. And these archive lists could be obtained, as they were required in order to receive a pension. And when I said about it [the membership in the Society of Ingrian Finns], she said: “That is it. The lists are ready, and now if something will happen – you would be deported right away”. I think there was fear. They never discussed. My mother did not even want to listen. And that aunt from Moloskovitsy, who has left, she also was exiled with us, she also was with a child and she actually was telling everything. […] Well, my mother passed away a long time ago – in 1973 and there was no any rehabilitation at that point – nothing. It was never discussed. No. If someone started to discuss, she was saying: “We
don’t have to talk about it”. And it seemed to me that she was afraid. She experienced so much.

(Maarit, 76 years)

As it was discussed above, memories of repressions constitute an important part of Ingrian Finnish identity. Meanwhile, not all Ingrian Finns are ready to share and discuss their traumatic experiences even with their family members. The two interviewed brothers told me that their grandmother did not share with them any details of her experience of deportation and explained that she did not have any specific remembrances of that time because she was a small child. However, it is not known if their grandmother did not remember or did not want to remember that dramatic events.
7. REFLECTIONS ON IDENTITY

7.1 Variations of ethnic identity among the respondents

Identity is one of the central concepts of my Master's thesis. I felt it is important to write how the respondents described their ethnic identity. For this purpose, a separate question about identity was prepared in advance in the interview guide. However, the respondents frequently raised the topic of identity during the interviews without my special request. While some of the respondents did not have hesitations about their Finnish or Ingrian Finnish identity others were not so confident about their identity.

Sometimes identities were presented as opposed to other identities. Thus, some respondents claimed that they are Finns, not Ingrians. In this particular case “Ingrian” is presented as a conventional name that is not chosen by the respondents:

Anastasia: By the way, that generation – they did not call themselves Ingrians. They all were telling: “We are Leningrad Finns”. So this is somehow…
Rezeda: Do you mean a prewar generation?
Anastasia: Well, yes, prewar…Yes, our parents, those who were [born] before the war.
Maarit: Of course, prewar [generation], my mother was born in 1908.
Anastasia: And in general, later they started...
Maarit: Well, all are Finns, Finns, Finns, Finns.
Anastasia: Well, how to say about it…“Ingrians” is a conventional name. Isn’t it?
Maarit: It was written “Finns” in a passport and all the other documents.
Rezeda: And you personally - who do you think you are? How could you define your…
Maarit: Do you mean nationality or what?
Rezeda: Yes.
Maarit: Well, I mostly considered myself a Finn.
Anastasia: I also consider myself a Finn.
Maarit: For my entire life, Finnish nationality was designated in my passport.

It is notable that both of these respondents indicated the significance of living in former Ingria as the most important reason to stay in the Leningrad area and Russia. Having strong place attachment to the former Ingria region even though hugely affected by the parents’ influence does not deny the possibility to preserve a strong connection to the country of ethnic origin. Even though it is highly important for these people to live in Ingria they do not think that this fact anyhow eliminates or questions their Finnishness. Although they do not live in Finland, they still view themselves as Finns. Moreover, one of the respondents emphasized that in her official documents her nationality is indicated as Finn. This formal condition was presented as an important argument that confirms the conventionality of the name “Ingrian” when applied to Finns who live in the Leningrad region.
Another respondent Henna reported about having a strong Finnish identity. She learned Finnish in her childhood, as it was the main language that was used by her family members at home. Moreover, Lutheran faith has played an important role in her life because her family is closely connected with the Lutheran Church of Ingria.

[...] generally speaking, we were true Finns who speak Finnish and have somehow Finnish way of life. There was never a question what our nationality is. But there were, for example, Finnish grannies, which could be considered as one hundred percent Finns. But she [a granny] could have a Russian husband and her children did not speak Finnish. Even regarding our family - in my childhood, my aunts seemed to us to be the bearers of Russian culture. Of course, we were happy to visit them and spend different celebrations with them but it was like a trip to Russia. Thus, it was a celebration in traditional Russian style – in the apartment with a carpet,70 a table, and Olivier salad.71 [...] And it [the celebration] was always organized according to a standard – this kind of strict Soviet standard: there were Olivier salad, a sprat; well, everything was according to the standard. [...] Our house was the newest in the village but it was absolutely not Russian type of house, everything was different in it. My father furnished everything according to his taste: so we did not have carpets – nothing like this. So in the 90s even our relatives did not seem to be Finns for me. So when someone left [migrated], it was said about him (her): “Well, he (she) is not even a Finn”. Another person left and it was also said that: “He (she) is not a Finn at all”. And eventually it appeared that “all not Finns” left [migrated to Finland] and there is nobody left at all [in the village]. (Henna, 30 years)

In this example, Finnishness is also presented by the respondent as the way of life, the food that is served during the celebrations and the interior that could be typically Soviet and therefore not Finnish. Although Soviet citizen is perceived by some of the respondents as having no nationality or for whom nationality does not play an important role, as it will be seen in the examples below, it seems that for Henna Soviet way of life means closeness to Russianness. Henna’s understanding of Finnish way of life of her nuclear family, in turn, is constructed in opposition to Soviet/Russian way of life of some of her other relatives.

It is important to mention that two of my respondents who have absolutely same Ingrian Finnish origin because they were brothers described their ethnic identity in a bit different way. Thus, one of them considered himself to be half Russian and half Finn and admitted that today he feels as more Russian by mentality. His brother told me that he is an Ingrian Finn. It could be assumed that the two brothers may use different language when they talk about the same categories. Thus, the name “Ingrian Finn” could be considered to be less descriptive regarding the proportions of Finnishness and Russianness (despite the stereotypes that are vital among some of the representatives of the majority population in

70 A carpet was a functional and prestigious item in a typical Soviet apartment. They were produced in the southern Soviet republics and usually were hanging on the walls as means of thermal and noise insulation.
71 Traditional salad in Russian cuisine, it is especially popular during the celebration of New Year’s Eve.
Finland). However, it could not be expected that two people who formally have the same ethnic origin will have an equal self-understanding of their ethnic origin.

Rezeda: Who do you think you are? How can you describe your ethnicity?
Evgeny: I consider myself to be an Ingrian Finn...So far nothing has changed.
Rezeda: And can you say how it is expressed?
Evgeny: How it is expressed? Unfortunately, I do not know what to tell about it.
Rezeda: Maybe it finds some kinds of expression? Or do you feel that you are somehow different?
Evgeny: So, what kind of expression finds the fact that I am Ingrian? I do not know. I do not exactly feel this but...I do not know. It is like Mexican, but at the same time not American. Maybe it is something in the blood. I do not know.
Rezeda: But do you feel that...
Evgeny: Blood ties and simply the fact that I stay here. Well, I do not know but what is about Ingrian Finns who moved back to Finland: are they considered to be Finns or Ingrians?
Rezeda: Yes, it is very complicated.
Evgeny: I do not know.
Rezeda: I see. But do you feel that you may differ from the others?
Evgeny: There are no differences. The only thing is the last name. I am not different from the peers in any sense because we were raised up in the same conditions, so there is nothing special...

It seemed that the respective respondent was not very keen on discussing his Ingrian Finnish identity. For this respondent, Ingrian Finnishness was exclusively linked to blood ties and ancestry but it was not felt or expressed in any other way. At the same time, the respondent questioned the clarity I wanted to receive from him about his ethnic identity: Ingrian Finnish identity as other dual identities is complex and cannot be approached easily.

Another respondent who also described his identity as Ingrian Finnish explained what kind of role his grandmother had in the formation of this identity. For him, Ingrian Finnishness is a result of a gradual process as it cannot be inherited at once but develops gradually via upbringing, contacts with the representatives of the older generation, studying Finnish language, and going to Lutheran Church:

Jyrki: Even my preserved understanding that I am an Ingrian, it remained because of my grandmother who raised me. Although I had a mixed family, Finnish, Ingrian Finnish influence was the only national influence that I felt.
Rezeda: But you consider yourself to be an Ingrian Finn?
Jyrki: Yes. Because...I have two alternatives: to consider myself a Soviet person – some kind of mixed culture or *inkerinsuomalainen* (Ingrian Finn). Well, actually there is more *inkerinsuomalainen* in me.
Rezeda: How could it be expressed?
Jyrki: Well, first of all, it is about how you feel yourself. Well, firstly, [it is expressed] in upbringing. The most important thing is what kind of environment I have grown up in. So there is the family. I was coming to the village to visit my grandmother. I was doing it until 1993 – until I turned eight years. My grandfather and grandmother were living there. Each time I was brought there I had to say goodbye to the Russian language. […] We were singing songs. It was a gradual process. It is so - it could be transmitted. It is not like you come into a room and say: “Here is an Ingrian Finn”. It is this kind of…roughly speaking it is something that you ingest from parents, grandfathers and grandmothers – well, from your ancestors. Already starting from childhood I was under the influence of the Church. My grandmother [was holding me] by the hand. I still have these pleasant memories from my childhood. Actually, I did not understand anything specifically at that point but I have remembrances how at the time of the parish revival we were walking with grandmother about three kilometers on Sundays: there were my grandmother and many other grannies and a group of children. We [children] were running along this road, we were going to the meetings that were held in the Church. Also, we had a lot of guests from Finland – grandmother’s familiars from the Church circle so I had a Finnish social environment. Additionally, half of the village population was Finnish and it was always possible to hear Finnish spoken there.

For this respondent, Ingrian Finnishness is strongly connected to the pleasant memories of his childhood. Although the respondent explains that the formation of Ingrian Finnish identity was a gradual process, it is important to note that his first memories about the Ingrian Church are associated with the times when he was so small that he “did not understand anything specifically”. The process of the formation of Ingrian Finnish identity has taken place in the early childhood – the period when children are very sensitive to the influence of their parents and relatives.

Lumina as other respondents of advanced age did not use the word “Ingrian” for describing her ethnic identity. She explained that she is a Russian Finn and gave explanation why she defines her ethnic identity in this particular way:

Rezeda: But you told me that you consider yourself to be a Finn.
Lumina: Yes, because actually I grew up in a Finnish family. Yes-yes-yes. I mean a Russian (russkiy) Finn. I mean Russian (rossiskiy) Finn. Yes. It was, I do not say that I am a Finnish Finn. Not on any account. I am a Russian Finn. And it is not a problem at all.
Rezeda: Because I have a question about ethnicity, how an individual defines himself. That is why I am asking.
Lumina: Individual defines himself…You see, a person may say that he (she) is a Jew. But he (she) does not have any relation to…Actually, it is impossible for Jewish people. It was not a good example. Suppose an individual who says: “I am a German” but he (she) does not know the language, German traditions, nothing. But he (she) still is a German and he (she) tries to believe it. Isn’t it so? Anyway, I grew up among…All the relatives are also Finns. Mostly. For the most part, all the relatives are Finns because after the war when my father died all paternal relatives also….
Rezeda: You stopped communicating.
Lumina: I was among Finnish-speaking people, that is why…And regarding Russian – it goes without saying. I was studying in Russian school and at a Russian University and I
was working among Russians. So some people even did not know that I am a Finn. When we had more frank conversations, people were surprised: “Really? And can you speak [Finnish]?” I answered: “Yes, I can!” They did not hear [how Lumina was speaking Finnish] because nobody was speaking. If someone would speak I also would speak but if nobody was speaking why would I? It was of no use.

Rezeda: So do you think that for the individual’s self-definition biological ancestry is not as important as knowledge of the language?
Lumina: The knowledge of language and traditions. This is very important. And biological ancestry goes without saying. It is doubtless. It is always considered, it does not matter if we agree with this or not. But if you have only biological ancestry and you do not know anything besides that…It is worthless. Well, when filling a form they will put “Finn” under your nationality and this is all.

Even though this interviewee admitted that the biological ancestry plays a significant role for individual’s self-identification, she acknowledged that ethnic identity grounded solely in biological ancestry could be questioned. Having a Finnish family and living and working among Russian people was emphasized by Lumina as factors that influenced her self-understanding. This respondent also emphasized the significant role of language - in her view knowledge of language has an essential role in the formation of one’s self-understanding. Thus, interviewee marked that she was studying in Russian language and living among Finnish-speaking people.

When I asked the respondents to talk more specifically about their ethnic identity, they referred to different conditions, circumstances and even factors that were crucial for their ethnicity. Among them are aforementioned blood ties, living in a Finnish family and among Finnish or Russian-speaking people, generational continuity and the influence of the Lutheran Church. In the meantime, one of the respondents described himself as Russian with a North European touch and associated his ethnic identity with an interest towards Scandinavia and Scandinavian literature:

Vitaly: […]…Probably…Probably Russian. Basically, I like Scandinavian countries. Basically, I like Scandinavia. I like Northern Europe. If we talk in general. At school, I liked, for example, “Edda,” “The Cattle Raid of Cooley” and “The Sagas of Icelanders.” All of this is wonderful. Actually, I thought that I am Russian. But it is also impossible to say that I am completely Russian. This kind of Russian with a North European touch. Because I was in Tver region and, of course, everything is absolutely different there. For example, I was not as much interested in different Russian folk tales or in Russian traditional culture. So probably I have some kind of strange touch. Supposedly I am Russian but a strange one.
Rezeda: How is this strangeness expressed?

72 Ancient Icelandic literature
73 Old Irish tale
74 Medieval Icelandic literature
Vitaly: The strangeness is exactly in that…Probably I had never considered myself completely Russian. It could be said like this. Never.
Rezeda: Never?
Vitaly: Well, initially everybody was Soviet and it [nationality] was not important at all. And later it was so - yes, I always liked Scandinavia.

It is important to mention that there is a debate among the general public whether Finland is belonging to the category of Scandinavia or not. However, the respondent also refers to the category of Northern Europe, which is generally considered to include Finland. It is notable that for this respondent ethnic affiliation is connected with the notion of culture: Russian culture did not provoke as much interest of the respondent as Scandinavian culture, specifically literature, did.

Meanwhile, notion of Soviet identity as excluding reference to any specific nationality or ethnic identity was mentioned by several interviewees including Maksim who has rediscovered his Finnish origin when he was already an adult:

Well, actually before the particular moment, before we become acquainted with Finnish culture, I and my brother who actually made us be interested in it, we, I personally felt myself the Soviet citizen. All of us were Soviet people, all people were brothers, all were Russians, and in general there were no any ethnicities besides the fact that we all, I personally belong to the Soviet Union. I am certain about it, although nobody has asked about it before. After we became acquainted with the representatives of the Society of Ingrian Finns, visited several feasts, started to be interested in these themes (I visited several lectures and heard the discussions about our origin, history), I started to understand better some features of my character that raised the questions before. They seemed to correspond more to Ingrian fellow (tovarisch) and less to the Soviet citizen.

(Maksim, 40 years)

Although Maksim always knew that his grandfather was a Finn, this condition had more formal meaning for him and did not affect his self-understanding because of the strong belief in Soviet identity. Whereas in the case of the aforementioned respondent Jyrki formation of ethnic identity has taken place in early childhood, Maksim’s Ingrian Finnish identity actualized when he was already an adult. For Jyrki, his grandmother’s influence was crucial for the formation of his Ingrian Finnish identity. By contrast, Maksim hardly remembers his Finnish grandfather because he has seen him only few times many years ago when he was still alive. However, for Maksim actualization of Finnish identity could be compared to some sort of recognition. Thus, Maksim recognized his Finnishness because features of character like rigidity (upertost) and deliberateness (nespeshnost) even though generalized but anyway attributed to Finns and Ingrian Finns in his view corresponded to his character and character of his brother.
7.2 Contradiction between ethnic Finns’ self-understandings and official classification

Another important question about the Ingrian Finnish identity became apparent for me during fieldwork. For some of my respondents, the conditions for ethnic migration are different from those that are defined for the rest of the respondents. There is no necessity to wait long time in a queue before moving to Finland, no deadline for applying for the program and residence permit and also no requirement of having at least two grandparents of Finnish origin. The contradiction between self-understandings of respondents who see themselves as Ingrians and Ingrian Finns and classification that defines them as belonging to the category “the descendants of Finnish citizens” instead of Ingrian Finns was rather confusing for me. It is important to mark that the difference in policies applied for two categories of ethnic migrants to Finland has not received an attention in Finnish discourse on ethnic migration from Russia (Davydova & Heikkinen 2004: 180).

Three of my respondents belong to the category “the descendants of Finnish citizens.” This category includes the descendants of the Finns that had lived in St. Petersburg before 1917, Red Finns, who came to Russia because of the threat of persecution for taking part in political events of 1918 in Finland, those, who illegally crossed the Soviet border from 1930, and American Finns who moved to the Soviet Union in the 1930s in order to assist the development of communism (Davydova & Heikkinen 2004: 179). However, two of the three respondents who belong to the aforementioned category view themselves as Ingrian and Ingrian Finns.

The several questions arise in regard to the segregation between two groups. May people who in Finnish authorities’ view belong to category “descendants of the Finnish citizens” be at the same time Ingrian Finns? Who has right to define to what category individual suits the best and what these definitions and categories mean for self-understanding of people of Finnish descent? At first, I was confused and hesitated if the respondents who are defined by Finnish authorities as “descendants of Finnish citizens” could be at the same time Ingrian Finns and thus are suitable for my research. The distinct administrative division between the two groups seemed to be unquestionable and the differences in historic background of the representatives of two groups served as the reaffirmation of the distinction.
Larisa: Regarding the origin: mother is Finn, my father is Russian. Correspondingly, all of the maternal grandfathers and grandmothers are Finns. They are even not Ingrians, but true (nastoyashie) Finns.
Rezeda: Oh, so not Ingrians?
Larisa: Well, Ingrians...And Ingria [Ingrians] - are those people who live within this territory. Is it correct? So they were living here in Soikkola, it means that they are Ingrian Finns. We are not Ingrians: the Izhorians, the Votes, and the Vepsians. There are the Ingrian Finns. These are all Ingrians, they all considered to be Ingrians.

It is notable, that at first the respondent makes a distinction between the Ingrian Finns and the true Finns but when I asked about it, she immediately corrected herself. In Larisa’s view, territory belonging is decisive for defining who can be considered as Ingrian and Ingrian Finn. In the case of Larisa, territorial belonging of her relatives is not just a random circumstance but factor playing an important role in her life: as it was acknowledged before she was born far away from the homeland of her mother but considered it to be her homeland and had a strong aspiration to move to the Leningrad region.
DISCUSSION

Initially, the main research question of this work was defined as follows: What are the most important reasons affecting the choice of people of Ingrian Finnish descent who are eligible for the Return Migration Program to stay put in Russia? One of my aims was to find out is the choice to stay put is deliberate and independent or determined by particular circumstances/ does it depend on the opinions of other people in the case of my respondents?

It appeared to be very difficult to give a precise answer to this question. When this question is explained and simplified as the question about the possibility or absence of choice, the answer will be that most respondents had the possibility to choose to participate in the Return Migration Program. As it was mentioned above, all respondents were chosen according to suitability for participation in the Return Migration Program. The aim was to find out what other reasons could limit the possibility of choice for those people who formally had the opportunity to immigrate to Finland on the basis of their Finnish origin.

It could be assumed that even in cases where other people have significantly affected the decision to stay, it was the respondents’ choice to act on opinions of others. Even in the case of the respondent who had an old mother, who required care and did not want to immigrate or another respondent whose closest family – his wife and daughter opposed the migration, it was these respondents’ personal choice to stay put in Russia and stay with their closest relatives. It cannot be said that these respondents were left without any choice simply because of the negative opinion some other people have had towards the choice of migration.

However, the case of one respondent can be considered as an example of how the particular circumstances do actually affect the possibility to choose the migration or stay put. This research participant was late to register in the migration waiting list and after the deadline had passed, participation in the Return Migration Program simply became impossible for her. Being late for registering in the return migration queue can be seen as a concatenation of circumstances but at the same time it can characterize motivation to participate in the Return Migration Program and supposedly can be seen as a choice of non-participation.

Overall, the initial view of opposing the independent character of choice and influence of circumstances/other people can be challenged. Although the influence of other people
appeared to be significant, it cannot deny an independent character of choice or characterize specifically how independent the choice to stay put was. Even though for many of the research participants the choice to stay in Russia was influenced by their relatives, in the end, it was the respondents’ decision to stay.

It should be acknowledged that this study does not take into account Ingrian Finns who cannot migrate to Finland on the basis of ethnic origin. However, Ingrian Finns who are not eligible for ethnic migration to Finland can immigrate to Finland on the other grounds (e.g. employment, studies, marriage to Finnish citizen or person holding a Finnish residence permit, becoming an entrepreneur in Finland).\(^75\)

At the first glance, immigration to Finland seems to be more difficult for those who cannot participate in the Return Migration Program because some of the aforementioned options require particular skills, extensive funding, effort and some can hardly be planned or assumed in advance. Furthermore, immigration to Finland that is not based on ethnic origin,\(^76\) family ties (e.g. marriage, family reunification) or humanitarian reasons is more disadvantageous with regards to social support offered by the Finnish government and waiting time for granting permanent residence permit and citizenship. At the same time, the necessity to wait several years in the immigration queue that existed for a particular group of ethnic Finns and in some cases difficulties in finding the documented evidence of Finnish origin do not make the Return Migration Program an easier option either. Meanwhile, Ingrian Finns who are not eligible for this program might have relatives and friends in Finland and thus helpful knowledge about Finland. This might create a relative advantage for them in comparison with other people who are considering migration to Finland but do not have any established connections in Finland.

My choice of the respondents among Ingrian Finns who are eligible for the Return Migration Program was based on the assumption that the eligibility for the return migrant status is the factor that facilitates the choice of migration. When it is considered together with the fact that many ethnic Finns have used their right to immigrate and many ethnic Finns who have not immigrated yet to Finland have relatives and friends in Finland who might try to persuade them to immigrate or assist them with the immigration process,

\(^75\) It could be expected that most of these options could exclude Ingrian Finns of advanced age, but, on the other hand, most of Ingrian Finns of advanced age are supposed to have at least one parent of Finnish nationality and thus be eligible for criteria of the Return Migration Program.

\(^76\) It is necessary to repeat that the criteria for granting a right to immigrate to Finland on the basis of ethnic origin are different for Ingrian Finns and descendants of Finnish citizens. See p. 22.
questioning the reasons for staying put seem to be more justified. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the reasons for Ingrian Finns who do not correspond to the return migration criteria and have chosen to stay, cannot be questioned or studied. There are factors that might facilitate their immigration to Finland: the geographical proximity for those who live close to the Finnish border, affinity to the country of ethnic origin, difference in wages between Russia and Finland, possibility of assistance or support of relatives or friends who already live in Finland in finding information and/or arranging practical matters. The point is that the institutionalized migration of Ingrian Finns within the Return Migration Program to Finland is a more noticeable phenomenon that has been studied and discussed more in a thematic literature. Likewise, this work observes the immobility of potential ethnic migrants to Finland exclusively in the context of Finnish Return Migration Program and policy.

It should be acknowledged that the limitation of this study could be associated not only with a small size of the sample and the fact that most respondents were the members of the Society of Ingrian Finns. The research section comprises of an overview of the reasons that have affected the choice of the interviewed Ingrian Finns to stay in Russia. The reasons to stay that were mentioned in this study could be examined more specifically and with a larger sample size in order to get more accurate and transferable findings.

In my view, future research can be concentrated on how ideas about ethnic migration and life in Finland are propagated by the relatives of potential immigrants who permanently live in Finland, how these ideas are adopted and what role do they play in migration decisions. Furthermore, the role of the media in the formation of a discourse on modern Finland among ethnic Finns who are living in Russia could also be an alternative topic or the part of a separate research. It is important to stress that even though the migration of ethnic Finns from Russia to Finland has decreased significantly in the recent years, it is nevertheless continuing. Some of the ethnic Finns who are currently living in Russia still have right to immigrate to Finland on the basis of their ethnic origin even after the Return Migration Program ends in July 2016. Moreover, as was mentioned above, ethnic Finns who cannot immigrate to Finland on the basis of ethnic origin can apply for Finnish residence permit and immigrate to Finland on the other grounds including employment, studies, marriage or other reasons.

Additionally, the phenomenon of the separatist movement in St. Petersburg that uses the Ingrian Finnish symbol during the protests could be studied, because nowadays it is difficult
to find any reliable information about it in scientific literature. This phenomenon is special because the symbol of a minority group – the Ingrian flag has been appropriated for political purposes by the people who are not related to this minority.

It is certain that I do not have power or competence to propose recommendations on how the national policy applied towards Ingrian Finnish minority living in Russia should be modified and what new measures should be introduced. However, I hope that this work will help readers to improve their basic understanding and knowledge of this minority and the current situation of those ethnic Finns who have decided to stay put in Russia.
CONCLUSION

It was difficult for the respondents to name the most important reason that has affected their choice to stay put in Russia. Most of the respondents had several reasons explaining why they did not immigrated to Finland. For some respondents, the decision to stay put was influenced by the opinion of their close relatives and at the same time by a critical evaluation of migration outcomes. The respondents like other people who consider migration, were trying to predict how successful life in Finland would be for them after the migration. They expressed special concerns about their chances of finding a job in Finland and attitudes of the receiving society.

The research participants acknowledged that they had or still have doubts about their choice to stay in Russia. Only one respondent said that she had already decided to stay in Russia at the time when the Return Migration Program had just been established. This respondent did not express any doubts about her decision to stay put. Meanwhile, for four respondents, the possibility to immigrate to Finland on the basis of Finnish origin is not restricted by any time limitations. Two of them are still considering the immigration to Finland.

Ethnic migration like other types of migration implies that migrants will have to face changes and adapt to new conditions and rules, especially if the immigration and emigration country differ significantly from each other. Thus, some respondents were concerned about the risk and uncertainty that migration to Finland would bring despite the fact that the Finnish government would provide sufficient financial support for the integration of ethnic migrants.

The unwillingness to encounter significant changes as one of the reasons to stay put was also mentioned by the respondents of an advanced age. These respondents considered their age as a hindrance for migration. On the other hand, some ethnic Finns may consider precisely their senior age as a reason for migrating to Finland because of the significant differences in pensions and the elderly care between Finland and Russia. Thus, some respondents referred to their relatives or familiars who were considering participating in the Return Migration Program because of higher pensions and better elderly care services available for ethnic migrants in Finland.

Family members appeared to be highly influential where the respondents’ migration decisions were concerned. The influence of family on the decision to migrate was expressed
in various forms which included refusal to immigrate to Finland, negative attitudes towards immigration to Finland and providing information about Finland and life of ethnic migrants in Finland.

Some research participants had or have close relatives who are against the migration to Finland. Nonetheless, going against the will of family members in one case would possibly mean leaving an elderly mother without a primary caretaker and separation from spouse and daughter in another case. Therefore, the choices of immobility were affected by obligations, unwillingness to separate from the family and considerations about the family’s reputation. Family and community influence appeared to be closely interlinked for one respondent who was concerned how her decision to migrate will affect the reputation of her family in the eyes of the community. Furthermore, the analysis of the example of one particular family revealed the significant role of the child and child’s education in her parents’ migration-decision making process.

In general, communication with relatives and familiars who already live in Finland appeared to be a significant source of information for the respondents. It can be assumed that information that was obtained during the personal visits, via telephone or Skype conversations affected the respondents’ opinions about the life of ethnic migrants in Finland and their chances to successfully integrate into the Finnish society.

The significance of living in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad region appeared to be an important reason for staying put. Some respondents also referred to their relatives and familiars who did not immigrate to Finland because they appreciated living in their homeland very much. It can be supposed that this sense of attachment that the respondents have towards the Leningrad region was influenced by their close relatives.

The threat of being unemployed in Finland was considered by some respondents as an important reason to stay put in Russia. These respondents negatively evaluated their chances to find a job in Finland. The respondents had particular expectations about employment, specifically, it was important for them to find a job that will correspond to their obtained degrees. The lack of proficiency in Finnish, the differences in the educational systems of Russia and Finland, and the necessity to get retraining and official recognition of degrees were mentioned by the respondents as factors that could make the process of finding a job in Finland problematic.
The outcomes of immigration to Finland were challenged by some research participants because life after the migration did not seem to meet their expectations. Those who wanted to immigrate in order to improve their socio-economic position or for whom their career plays an important role were fearful of being unemployed in Finland. The idea of being “more easily Finn/or more Finn” in Finland was questioned because of the existing negative attitudes and perception of ethnic Finns from Russia as Russians by some representatives of the host population. Moreover, one respondent expressed concerns that this specific Ingrian Finnish identity is frequently lost after migration to Finland because ethnic migrants wish to assimilate into the Finnish society or on the contrary develop a salient Russian identity as a form of resistance against assimilation. In the view of this respondent, the processes of globalization that take place in Finland might have a negative influence on the preservation of Finnish culture.

The reasons for staying put in Russia as reported by the respondents are common for the migration decision-making regardless of the destination country. Across the globe, the fear of changes, worries about the chances to successfully integrate into the new society, influence of family members, anticipating negative attitudes and desire to stay in the homeland may encourage those who are considering migration to stay instead. On the other hand, the migration decision-making process of ethnic Finns who live in the Leningrad region is specific because potential migrants have various sources of information for evaluating the migration decision. These include extensive social networks in the emigration country and a possibility to visit it thanks to the geographical proximity. However, in this sense, ethnic Finns can be compared to other people who consider migration to the neighboring country or other foreign country where they happen to have extensive social networks.

Nevertheless, the understanding of the respondents’ reasons for immobility requires analyzing them within a specific context. This implies looking at the economic, cultural and institutional differences between Russia and Finland, ethnic migrants’ expectations to be recognized as co-ethnics in the country of their ethnic origin and historical events. For instance, the fear of unemployment in Finland is informed not only by the knowledge about the high unemployment rate but also by awareness of a necessity to hold qualifications recognized by the Finnish authorities in order to get a job in Finland. With regards to the anticipation of negative attitudes, ethnic Finns are similar to other ethnic migrants in that they too expect to be perceived as members of the majority population in the country of
ethnic origin and thus experience disappointment in the case of ethnic rejection. A desire to stay in the homeland is special in the case of ethnic Finns because they were deported from the Leningrad region and for a long time they were not allowed to return to their home villages. After the Leningrad region became a forbidden place for Ingrian Finns, its significance has increased and it became a highly desired destination that was frequently remembered and referred to in exile.
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I hereby testify that Rezeda Lyykorpi, born 6.10.1987, is since autumn 2014 enrolled in the Master’s Program *Border Crossings: Global and Local Societies in Transition*, majoring in Sociology, at the Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies, University of Eastern Finland (Joensuu campus). I am Ms. Lyykorpi’s appointed thesis supervisor.

The topic of Ms. Lyykorpi’s research is the so-called repatriation programme of Finland regarding Ingrian Finns who are citizens of other countries, mainly Russia and Estonia. The main aim of her research is to study the reasons why some representatives of different generations among the Ingrian Finns, who are eligible for the repatriation, decide not to participate in the repatriation programme. This topic has not received extensive attention in the scientific literature, and consequently it corresponds to the criterion of scientific novelty. Despite the fact that migration research is frequently concentrated on immigration and emigration, several researchers are paying attention to those groups of people who could not be determined in terms of the mentioned categories and actually decide not to move to other countries. The relevance of the topic derives from the fact that the repatriation programme will be closed down at the end of 2016.

Ms. Lyykorpi will be conducting empirical research (data gathering) for her Master’s thesis in Russia in spring 2016. The research takes the form of individual face-to-face interviews to be recorded. The informed consent to take part in the research will be asked from all respondents/study participants. All collected research data will be applied only for scientific purposes and will be handled in strictest confidentiality. Confidentiality is also maintained by using full anonymity in the resulting Master’s thesis.
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Informed consent (the Russian version)

Резеда Лююкорпи
Noljakankaari 12 B 14
80140 Joensuu
rezedal@student.uef.fi

Информированное согласие на участие в исследовании

Спасибо за то, что Вы согласились принять участие в моем исследовании

Цель исследования

Основная цель эмпирического исследования состоит в изучении причин, по которым представители различных поколений среди ингерманландских финнов принимают решение не участвовать в программе репатриации при соответствующих условиях, необходимым для участия в ней.

Добровольность участия
• Ваше участие в исследовании является исключительно добровольным.
• Вы можете принять решение не участвовать в исследовании сейчас или отказаться продолжать участвовать на любом этапе без каких-либо негативных последствий.

Конфиденциальность
Исследование проводится в форме индивидуального интервью, предполагающего личную встречу. Во время интервью будет вестись запись. Важным условием проведения исследования является выражение респондентами информированного согласия. Все полученные данные будут использоваться только для научных целей и обрабатываться в условиях строжайшей конфиденциальности. Конфиденциальность будет также обеспечена за счет соблюдения полной анонимности в итоговой дипломной работе.

ПОДТВЕРЖДЕНИЕ ИНФОРМИРОВАННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ НА УЧАСТИЕ В ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ

Подписывая данную форму информированного согласия, я подтверждаю, что прочитал(а) и понял(а) цель участия в исследовании. Я даю свое согласие на участие в исследовании и осуществление аудиозаписи во время интервью.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Подпись участника исследования</th>
<th>Дата: «_____»___________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Informed consent
for participation in research

Rezeda Lyykorpi
Noljakankaari 12 B 14
80140 Joensuu
tedal@student.uef.fi

Participant code: __________

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research

The research objective

The main aim of this research is to study the reasons why some of the representatives of different generations among Ingrian Finns who are eligible for the participation in return migration program decide not to participate in the respective program.

The voluntary nature of the participation

• Your participation in a research is completely voluntary
• You can refuse to participate in the research now or refuse to continue to participate at any stage without any negative consequences.

Confidentiality

The research takes a form of individual face-to-face interview. The interview will be recorded. Obtaining informed consent from participants is essential for this research. The collected data will be used only for research purposes and handled according to confidentiality principle. Confidentiality will be also ensured by the compliance with the anonymity principle in the final Master’s Thesis.

CONFIRMATION OF AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

By signing this consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the purpose of participation in the study. I give my consent to be a participant in this research and permission for this interview to be recorded.

| participant's signature | Date: «_____» 2016 |
APPENDIX 4
Interview guide (the Russian version)

Список вопросов

1. Не могли бы Вы рассказать о себе?  
   (Возраст, профессия, образование, семейное положение)

2. Не могли бы Вы рассказать о своем происхождении: кто из Ваших родственников  
   является ингерманландским финном/финкой? Вы часто общаетесь с ним/с ней?

3. Вы когда-нибудь думали о возможности переезда в Финляндию и участии в  
   программе репатриации?  
   • В случае положительного или отрицательного ответа, не могли бы Вы  
     пояснить Ваш ответ?  
   • Насколько серьезным было Ваше решение о переезде? Посещали ли Вы  
     курсы, предназначенные для подготовки к репатриации, или занимались  
     сбором документов, необходимых для участия в программе репатриации?

4. Какие идеи/представления у Вас были о возможности переехать ижить на  
   постоянной основе в Финляндию? Не могли бы Вы рассказать о том, как Вы  
   представляете себе Финляндию?

5. Кем Вы себя считаете? Как Вы можете описать свою национальную/этническую  
   принадлежность? (Ответ по желанию)

6. Вы знаете финский язык?  
   • Приходилось ли Вам изучать финский язык? В течение какого времени?  
     Приходилось ли Вам использовать финский язык в повседневной жизни? В  
     каких ситуациях?

7. Являетесь ли Вы членом Общества ингерманландских финнов «Инкерин  
   Лийтто»?  
   • Принимаете ли Вы участие в мероприятиях или праздниках, организованных  
     для ингерманландских финнов? Как часто Вы принимаете участие в  
     подобных мероприятиях?

8. Посещаете ли Вы Лютеранскую церковь?

9. Какое значение Вы вкладываете в понятие «Дом»? По Вашему мнению, у человека  
   может быть два «Дома»? Испытываете ли Вы привязанность или чувство  
   принадлежности к определенному месту или территории?

10. Вас когда-нибудь посещали мысли о возможности переезда в другой город или  
    страну (помимо Финляндии)?  
    • В случае положительного ответа, не могли бы Вы объяснить почему?  
    • Вам когда-нибудь приходилось жить в другом городе или стране? Не могли  
      бы Вы указать временные рамки?
В случае, если респондент рассматривал возможность переезда в Финляндию:

1. На Ваш взгляд, какие факторы, внешние события или представления повлияли на Ваше решение оставаться в России?

2. Оказали ли Ваши родственники или друзья какое-либо влияние на Ваше решение оставаться в России?

3. Есть ли у Вас родственники или друзья, проживающие в Финляндии? Поддерживаете ли Вы с ними связь?

4. Считаете ли Вы, что Ваш выбор оставаться в России является осознанным и полностью основывается на Вашем решении или в какой-то степени продиктован внешними и независящими от Вас обстоятельствами? Не могли бы Вы пояснить свой ответ?

5. После того, как Вы приняли решение оставаться в России, посещали ли Вас когда-нибудь сомнения относительно сделанного выбора? Не могли бы Вы пояснить свой ответ?
APPENDIX 5
Interview guide

1. Could you tell about yourself?
   (Age, occupation, education, marital status)

2. Could you tell about your Ingrian Finnish origin (which member/members of your family is Ingrian-Finn? Do you contact often with her/him? How well do you know her/him)?

3. Have you ever thought about moving to Finland and participation in the Return Migration Program?
   • Could you please explain your answer?
   • How serious was your decision to move to Finland? Have you participated in the preparatory courses or collected the documents required for participation in the Return Migration Program?

4. What kind of ideas/thoughts did you have about the possibility to move and live permanently in Finland? Could you tell me how do you imagine Finland?

5. How do you see yourself? Could you describe your nationality/ethnic identity?

6. Do you know the Finnish language?
   • Have you studied the Finnish language before? For how long time? Did you have to speak the Finnish language in everyday life? In what kind of situations?

7. Are you a member of the Society of Ingrian Finns (Inkerin Liitto)? Do you participate in any events or feasts organized for Ingrian Finns? How often do you participate in these events?

8. Do you visit the Lutheran Church?

9. How do you understand the term “home”? In your view, may a person have two homes? Do you feel an attachment to a particular place or territory?

10. Have you ever thought about moving to some other town/country (besides Finland)?
   • In the case of positive response, could you explain why?
   • Have you ever lived in another town or country? (When? For how long time?)
In the case a person was considering the participation in the Return Migration Program:

1. In your opinion, what affected your decision to stay in Russia (factors/ events/ ideas)?

2. Did your relatives/ friends affect your decision to stay in Russia? How? Do you have any family members or friends living in Finland? Do you visit them? (How often?)

3. Do you have relatives/friends living in Finland? Are you in touch with them?

4. Do you think that your choice to stay in Russia – is deliberate and completely based on your decision or somehow forced by the circumstances? Could you explain your answer?

5. After you decided to stay in Russia, did you ever have any hesitations about your choice? Could you explain your answer?
RESIDENCE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR REMIGRATION

This application form is for you if you are applying for a residence permit as an 'Ingrian-Finnish' returnee.

1) You are yourself, or at least one of your parents or at least two of your four grandparents are or have been entered in a document as Finnish nationals and you have registered as a returnee at a Finnish diplomatic mission in Russia before 1 July 2011 or 2) you belong to the people evacuated from Ingria to Finland in 1943 or 1944 and returned to the Soviet Union after the war; or 3) you served in the Finnish army during the period 1939-1945.

If you are applying for a residence permit on the grounds that you have been a Finnish citizen, or that at least one of your parents or grandparents is or has been a Finnish citizen by birth, you need to use the form Residence Permit Application for Former Finnish Citizens (OLE_EN).

Carefully fill in and sign the application. Incomplete information will delay the processing of the application and may lead to its rejection.

An application may be submitted to a Finnish diplomatic mission abroad or to the local police in Finland. A processing fee will be collected when the application is submitted, according to the Decree on charges. Read the instructions for filling in the form at www.migri.fi → English → Application forms. Clarifications that you need to append to your application are listed in Section E of this form.

☐ I am applying for my first residence permit ☐ an extended permit (for the first time on this basis)

Population registration and the personal identity code

If you wish, you may request a Finnish personal identity code to be issued with your residence permit. In that case, the personal information in your passport, as well as your address, mother tongue and occupation, will be recorded in the Population Information System, which is Finland’s national population register. If no residence permit is granted, no information will be recorded in the Population Information System, and you will not be issued with a personal identity code.

The 11-character personal identity code is based on your sex and date of birth (e.g. 300171-931H). You will need it when contacting the Finnish authorities. It will also make things easier for you when, for example, you contact a bank or your employer.

☐ I request that my personal information be recorded in the Population Information System

SECTION A

1 Information on applicant

1.1 Personal data

Family name

First names

Former names (please give all combinations of first names and family names that you have used previously)

Gender ☐ Male ☐ Female

Date of birth (dd.mm.yyyy) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Latter part of Finnish personal identity code (if applicable)

Do you have, or have you previously had, a Finnish personal identity code?