

Motivational goals, group identifications, and psychosocial adjustment of returning migrants: The case of Jews returning to Russia

Eugene Tartakovsky¹, Eduard Patrakov², and Marina Nikulina³

¹The School of Social Work, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel

²Department of Social Security, Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

³Institute of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

The present study investigated the motivational goals, group identifications, and psychosocial adjustment of Jews who returned to Russia after emigrating from the republics of the Former Soviet Union to different countries ($n = 151$). To gain a deeper understanding of these returning migrants, their traits were compared with those of Jews living in Russia who did not emigrate ($n = 935$). Compared to locals, returnees reported a higher preference for the openness to change and self-enhancement values and a lower preference for the conservation values; there was no difference in the self-transcendence values. Returning migrants had a relatively weak affiliation with the home country: they had a weaker identification with the home country than with the country of emigration, their identification with Russians was weaker than that among Jews who did not emigrate from Russia, and their intention to emigrate (again) from Russia was greater than that among locals. However, the Jewish identification of returning migrants was similar to that of locals. The adjustment of returning migrants varied across different dimensions: their economic adjustment was better than that of locals; however, the interpersonal adjustment of returnees was less successful than among locals.

Keywords: Returning migrants; Value preferences; Group identifications; Psychosocial adjustment; Jews; Russia; Israel.

So, here you are.
Too foreign for home.
Too foreign for here.
Never enough for both.
Ijeoma Umebinyuo. Diaspora blues.

According to the OECD (2001) definition, “returning migrants are persons returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants (whether short-term or long-term) in another country and who are intending to stay in their own country for at least a year.” There are several reasons why research on this population is important. First, contrary to popular opinion, return migration is a mass phenomenon (Hoerder, 2002; Kunuroglu, van de Vijver, & Yagmur, 2016). Second, return migration may be challenging, because the process of adjusting to the home country may be just as

demanding as the process of adjustment in a foreign country (Cassarino, 2004; Kunuroglu et al., 2016). Finally, returning migrants may have a significant impact on the economy (Liao & Sohmen, 2001) as well as on the cultural and political life in their home country (Constant & Massey, 2002; Dustmann & Weiss, 2007; Harvey & Moeller, 2009).

Despite the importance of understanding return migration, very little research has addressed this phenomenon. Moreover, almost all of these studies have focused on the economic aspects of return migration, while only a few studies have examined its psychological aspects (Cassarino, 2004; Kunuroglu et al., 2016; Sussman, 2001, 2010). The present study focused on Jews and their relatives who returned to Russia after emigrating from the republics of the Former Soviet Union to different countries. Their traits were compared with those of Jews living

Correspondence should be addressed to Eugene Tartakovsky, The Bob Shapell School of Social Work, Tel-Aviv University, P.O.B. 39040, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel. (E-mail: etartakov@hotmail.com).

The study was partly supported by a grant from Leonid Nevzlin Research Center for Russian and East European Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The authors are grateful to all research assistants who helped to distribute the questionnaires.

in Russia who did not emigrate (“the locals”). The main goals of the study were as follows:

1. To understand the motivational goals of the returnees as expressed in their value preferences (Schwartz et al., 2012; Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001).
2. To investigate the returnees’ group identifications, including identification with the home country, the country of emigration, and their ethnic group.
3. To examine different aspects of the returnees’ adjustment in the home country.

Motivational goals of returning migrants

Economic, sociological, and psychological theories emphasise different aspects of the migrants’ motivation. Economic theories consider the differences between the economic conditions in the country of immigration and in the home country as the main reason for migrants’ return (Cohen & Habersfeld, 2001). These theories predict that return migration increases when the investment climate and employment opportunities decline in the country of immigration and/or improve in the migrants’ home country (Constant & Massey, 2002; King & Christou, 2008). Sociological theories consider problems in social adjustment in the country of emigration as the main reason for return (Cassarino, 2004). These theories assume that most migrants return to their home country due to a sense of alienation from the country of emigration (often due to prejudice and discrimination) and difficulty in accepting foreign values and social norms (Kunuroglu et al., 2016).

No psychological theory of return migration exists; therefore, the present study applies the general theory of motivation for emigration (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001) to investigate the motivation of returning migrants. This theory assumes that people emigrate in order to facilitate the attainment of their general motivational goals as expressed in their personal value preferences. The theory classifies motivations for emigration into three categories: preservation (seeking physical, social, and psychological security), self-development (personal growth when acquiring new abilities, knowledge, and skills), and materialistic (promoting wealth and financial well-being). Each motivation relates to a preference for specific values in Schwartz’s value theory (Schwartz et al., 2012). Preservation is associated with the conservation values, self-development is associated with the openness to change values, and materialism is associated with the self-enhancement values (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001).

The present research assumes that Jews returning to Russia are driven mostly by self-development and materialistic motivations. This assumption is based on two main considerations. The first is based on the assumption that returning migration, like other types of migration,

entails a dramatic alteration in one’s social environment. The self-inflicted social changes associated with returning migration may be compatible with the self-development motivation and a high preference for the openness to change values, as they promote the motivational goals of striving for excitement, novelty, and change in life and exercising freedom to determine one’s own actions (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001). The second consideration relates to the fact that during the last 15 years Russia enjoyed rapid economic growth (The World Bank, 2015). Migration to a rapidly growing country may promote the attainment of the materialistic motivational goals expressed in the self-enhancement values (achieving high social status and control over people and resources) (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001). Thus, the first hypothesis of the present study stated that returning Jewish migrants, compared to the locals (i.e., those Jews who have not emigrated from Russia), would have a higher preference for the openness to change and self-enhancement values (**H1**).

Group identifications of returning migrants

Researchers assume that ethnic minorities and immigrants have multiple group identifications (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Empirical studies conducted in Israel and the USA have demonstrated that Jewish immigrants from the Former Soviet Union identify with their country of immigration, their home country, and their ethnic group (Persky & Birman, 2005; Tartakovsky, 2009, 2011). Following this model, the present study assumed that Jewish returning migrants to Russia identify with three groups: their ethnic minority group (Jews), their home country (Russia), and their country of emigration. It was further assumed that those belonging to the Jewish minority in Russia who did not emigrate identify with two groups: their ethnic group and the home country.

Studies on various immigrant groups have demonstrated that immigrants’ identification with the country of immigration is usually weaker than their identification with the country of origin (Phinney et al., 2001; Staerklé, Sidanius, Green, & Molina, 2010; Tartakovsky, 2009). This pattern of group identifications may be expected among returning migrants as well, because after returning to the home country, many migrants feel different from the locals, which may in turn strengthen their identification with the country of emigration and weaken their identification with the home country (Kunuroglu et al., 2016; Sussman, 2001). Therefore, the present study hypothesised that returning migrants would have a stronger identification with the country of emigration than with the home country (**H2**). In addition, compared to locals, returning migrants would report a weaker identification with the home country (**H3**).

TABLE 1
Socio-demographic characteristics of returnees and locals

<i>Socio-demographic characteristics</i>	<i>Returnees</i>	<i>Locals</i>	<i>Test for difference</i>
Age	42.3 (12.5)	39.6 (11.7)	$t(1053) = 2.48; p = .013$
Gender, % (males)	58%	44%	$\chi^2 = 10.7; p = .005$
Family status, % (married or living with a partner)	80%	74%	$\chi^2 = 8.34; p = .040$
Education, % (secondary; vocational; tertiary)	3%; 10%; 87%	2%; 11%; 87%	$\chi^2 = 1.18; p = .757$
Occupation, % (unemployed; blue-collar workers; white-collar workers; professionals; managers or businesspersons)	15%; 9%; 7%; 43%; 25%	12%; 7%; 18%; 50%; 13%	$\chi^2 = 26.5; p = .000$
Religious affiliation, % (none; Judaism; Christianity; other)	48%; 35%; 12%; 4%	41%; 43%; 12%; 4%	$\chi^2 = 4.97; p = .664$

Adjustment to the home country

Economic theories assume that returning migrants with greater financial assets and valuable professional skills will experience positive economic adjustment upon return to the home country (Constant & Massey, 2002; Kunuroglu et al., 2016). In the present study, it was assumed that Jews returning to Russia acquired new skills abroad, which gave them an advantage in the Russian job market. Therefore, it was hypothesised that the economic adjustment of returning migrants would be more positive than that of the local population (**H4**).

However, the situation might be different regarding the psychological adjustment of returnees. Jewish returning migrants in the present study left their home country with the intention of permanently settling in a foreign country and spent a relatively long time abroad. In this aspect the present study differs from most previous studies that focused on sojourners (e.g., students, English language teachers, and relocated managers) (Sussman, 2001). People who leave their country to permanently settle abroad may be more estranged from the population of their home country (Tartakovsky, 2009, 2011). Therefore, it was assumed that Jews returning to Russia might have more problems affiliating with Russian society than Jews who did not emigrate from Russia. Specifically, it was hypothesised that compared to locals, returnees would experience a greater sense of discrimination (**H5**), feel less satisfied with their relationships with other people in Russia (**H6**), and have a stronger intention to emigrate again from Russia (**H7**).

METHOD

Target population

About 2 million Jews lived in the Former Soviet Union before its breakdown in 1990 (Tolts, 2003). Since then, about 1.5 million Jews have emigrated: 990,000 arrived to Israel, about 320,000—to the USA, and about 230,000—to Germany (Tolts, 2011). According to the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics (2015), from 1990 to

2013, about 110,000 immigrants from the Former Soviet Union left Israel. The number of Jewish immigrants from the FSU who left other countries of immigration is unknown. The number of Jewish migrants who returned to Russia is also unknown; however, most sources estimate the number of Jewish migrants who returned from Israel to Russia at about 70,000 (Murphy, 2005). Together with returning migrants from other countries, the total number of Jewish returning migrants to Russia may be about 100,000 (Ferris-Rotman & Sweeney, 2008).

Sample

In the present study, the returning migrants' sample consisted of 151 participants, and the comparison sample of locals, that is, Jews living in Russia who did not emigrate, included 935 participants. Among returning migrants, 64% had Israeli citizenship, 15% had German citizenship, 10% had US citizenship, 2% had Canadian citizenship, and 9% had citizenship of another country. On average, migrants spent almost 6 years in a foreign country before returning to Russia, $M(SD) = 5.85(5.67)$; *Range* 1–25. On average, migrants lived in Russia for 7 years after their return from a foreign country, $M(SD) = 7.06(6.41)$; *Range* 1–23.

Table 1 presents the socio-demographic characteristics of the returning migrants compared to the locals. The results obtained demonstrated that returnees were older (42.3 vs. 39.6), there was a higher proportion of males among them (58% vs. 44%), and a higher proportion of returnees were married or living with a partner (80% vs. 74%). A significant difference was found in the occupations of the two groups: compared to locals, a lower proportion of returnees worked in white-collar (7% vs. 18%) and professional jobs (43% vs. 50%), and more returnees occupied managerial and business positions (25% vs. 13%). No significant difference was found in education and religious affiliation between the two groups. The average religiosity level, on a 5-point scale from 1 (*atheist*) to 5 (*orthodox*), among returnees was similar to that among locals, $M(SD)_{\text{returnees}} = 2.03(.99)$; $M(SD)_{\text{locals}} = 2.09(.89)$; $t(1055) = 0.67$; $p = .506$.

Procedure

The study was conducted in five metropolitan areas: Moscow, St. Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, Rostov, and Kazan. These cities are among the ten largest cities in Russia, spanning both the European and Asian parts of Russia. About one third of the participants lived in Moscow, while the rest were quite evenly distributed across the four remaining cities. The study questionnaires were distributed by 12 research assistants living in the five metropolitan areas. The questionnaires were distributed through social networks, in Jewish community centres, religious organisations, and through the assistants' acquaintances in face-to-face interviews, by e-mail, and using electronic questionnaires. Adults eligible for immigration to Israel under the Law of Return completed the questionnaires anonymously. Participants holding a foreign citizenship or a permanent residence permit (excluding those of the republics of the FSU) who lived more than one year in a foreign country and more than one year in Russia after their return were registered as returning migrants.

Instruments

Personal value preferences

Personal value preferences were measured using the latest version of the Portrait Values Questionnaire, PVQ-R (Schwartz et al., 2012). This questionnaire consists of 57 items. Each item portrays a person's goals, aspirations, or wishes that indicate the importance of a specific value. For each item, respondents indicate how similar the described person is to them on a 6-point scale, from 1 (*not like me at all*) to 6 (*very much like me*). Item example: "It is important to him to obey all the laws" (conservation). Scores for each value are calculated as means of the relevant items. As recommended by Schwartz et al. (2012), to correct for individual differences in use of the response scales, each participant's responses were centred on his or her own mean, that is, from each value score the average of all 57 values was subtracted. Internal consistency of the scales was similar to that reported in previous studies (Cronbach's $\alpha = .69$ to $.85$).

Group identifications

Group identifications were measured using the National Identification Scale (Roccas, 2003). The scale was used three times, each time denominating a different group: Jews, Russians, and the citizens of the country of emigration (locals did not complete the last scale). The scale is comprised of four items (an example is provided for Jewish identification): "Being Jewish is an important part of my self-definition"; "When I talk about Jews,

I say 'we' and not 'they'"; "When Jews are criticised, I take it personally"; "It is important for me to think about myself as a Jew." The participants evaluated each item on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 5 (*fully agree*). The three scales demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90; .89; .90$).

Psychosocial adjustment

Perceived economic conditions. Two aspects of the perceived economic conditions were measured in the present study using single-item scales. First, participants were asked to evaluate their current financial situation compared to other people in Russia on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*much worse*) to 5 (*much better*). Second, they were asked to evaluate changes in their financial situation during the last year on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*much worse*) to 5 (*much better*).

Satisfaction with life. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a 5-item measure of satisfaction with life in the sense of a global cognitive judgment of one's own life. Answers are given on a 7-point Likert-scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). An example item: "The conditions of my life are excellent." In the present study, SWLS demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha = .89$).

Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. Satisfaction with interpersonal relations was measured using a single-item scale, whereby participants were asked to evaluate their degree of satisfaction with their number of friends and acquaintances and with the quality of their relationships with them. The responses were measured on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*not satisfied at all*) to 5 (*very much satisfied*).

Perceived discrimination. Perceived discrimination was measured by the Discrimination Questionnaire (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). The questionnaire consists of 12 items measuring the ethnic minority members' sense of suffering due to negative attitudes of the majority population. Item example: "I feel that I am not wanted in Russian society because I am Jewish." The participants evaluated each item on a 5-point scale, from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 5 (*fully agree*). The scale had high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$).

Emigration intentions. Emigration intentions were measured using a single-item scale. Participants were asked, "Do you plan to leave Russia?" and were provided with four possible answers: 1—*No, I do not plan to leave Russia*; 2—*I am not sure, maybe I will emigrate sometime in the future*; 3—*Yes, I plan to emigrate in 2–3 years*; 4—*Yes, I plan to emigrate in about a year*.

TABLE 2

Personal value preferences, group identifications, and adjustment of returnees and locals: means, standard deviations, and tests for difference (controlling for age and gender)

Variables	Returnees	Locals	F; <i>p</i> ; partial η^2
Openness to change	0.41 (0.57)	0.19 (0.50)	20.6; .000; .019
Conservation	-0.04 (0.50)	0.14 (0.46)	18.0; .000; .017
Self-enhancement	-0.75 (0.86)	-0.91 (0.74)	4.47; .035; .004
Self-transcendence	0.28 (0.48)	0.31 (0.42)	0.29; .588; .000
Russian identification	2.74 (1.16)	3.28 (1.03)	33.3; .000; .031
Jewish identification	4.00 (1.11)	4.02 (0.99)	0.26; .872; .000
Perceived economic conditions	3.45 (0.75)	3.18 (0.70)	17.7; .000; .017
Perceived change in economic conditions	3.06 (0.89)	2.75 (0.86)	18.3; .000; .017
Perceived discrimination	1.89 (0.79)	1.69 (0.70)	5.90; .015; .006
Satisfaction with life	3.75 (1.25)	3.76 (1.05)	0.90; .764; .000
Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships	4.01 (.95)	4.21 (.78)	4.33; .038; .004
Intention to emigrate from Russia	2.46 (1.06)	2.05 (.86)	19.7; .000; .021

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the personal value preferences among returnees and locals. Multivariate tests using a general linear model and controlling for age and gender demonstrated that value preferences of returnees significantly differed from those of the locals, *Wilks' λ* = 0.977; $F(4, 1034) = 6.16$; $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .023$. When comparing the four higher-order value types, it was found that returnees had a higher preference for the openness to change, $F(1, 1041) = 20.6$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .019$, and self-enhancement values, $F(1, 1041) = 4.47$; $p < .05$; $\eta^2 = .004$, and a lower preference for the conservation values, $F(1, 1041) = 18.0$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .017$; no difference in the self-transcendence values was found, $F(1, 1041) = .29$; *ns*.

To further investigate the motivational goals of returnees and locals, the value hierarchies were examined separately in the two groups using paired-samples *t*-tests. Among returnees, the openness to change values had the highest rank followed by the self-transcendence values; however, the difference between them was not significant, $t(150) = 1.72$; *ns*. The conservation values were less important than the self-transcendence values, $t(150) = 5.21$; $p < .001$, and the self-enhancement values were less important than the conservation values, $t(150) = 7.90$; $p < .001$. Among locals, the self-transcendence values were more important than the openness to change values, $t(934) = 5.65$; $p < .001$, which in turn were more important than the conservation values, $t(934) = 2.45$; $p < .05$. Finally, the self-enhancement values were less important than the conservation values, $t(934) = 30.4$; $p < .001$.

When comparing the group identifications of returnees and locals (Table 2), it was found that the strength of their Jewish identification was similar in the two groups, $F(1, 1041) = .26$; *ns*, while Russian identification was greater among locals, $F(1, 1041) = 33.3$;

$p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .031$. The relative strengths of the group identifications in each of the two groups were compared using paired *t*-tests. Among returnees, the strongest identification was with Jews followed by identification with the country of emigration, $M(SD)_{\text{Jews}} = 4.00(1.11)$ vs. $M(SD)_{\text{Emigration}} = 3.48(1.19)$; $t(135) = 4.35$; $p < .001$. In addition, identification with the country of emigration was stronger than Russian identification, $M(SD)_{\text{Emigration}} = 3.48(1.19)$ vs. $M(SD)_{\text{Russians}} = 2.74(1.16)$; $t(135) = 4.32$; $p < .001$. Among locals, Jewish identification was stronger than Russian identification, $M(SD)_{\text{Jews}} = 4.02(.99)$ vs. $M(SD)_{\text{Russians}} = 3.28(1.03)$; $t(927) = 17.0$; $p < .001$.

Returnees perceived their economic conditions in a more positive light compared to locals, $F(1, 1031) = 17.7$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .017$. In addition, they perceived changes in their economic conditions during the last year in a more positive light than locals, $F(1, 1029) = 18.3$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .017$. At the same time, returnees reported that they suffered from ethnic discrimination more than the locals, $F(1, 1017) = 5.90$; $p < .05$; $\eta^2 = .006$. In addition, returnees were less satisfied with their interpersonal relationships than locals, $F(1, 1026) = 4.33$; $p < .05$; $\eta^2 = .004$. Finally, returnees expressed a stronger intention to emigrate from Russia than locals, $F(1, 1024) = 19.7$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .021$. However, no difference was found in satisfaction with life when comparing returnees and locals, $F(1, 1031) = 0.90$; *ns*.

DISCUSSION

The results obtained indicate that the motivational goals of returnees, as expressed in their value preferences, set them apart from the local population. When comparing the value preferences in the two groups, it was found that returnees reported a higher preference for the openness to change and self-enhancement values and a lower preference for the conservation values; no difference in

the self-transcendence values was found. Schwartz's values theory claims that differences in value preferences between two groups indicate differences in their basic motivational goals (Schwartz et al., 2012). Therefore, the results obtained indicate that the system of basic motivational goals of returnees differs from that among Jews who did not emigrate from Russia. Specifically, seeking novelty and excitement in life, independence, and freedom to implement one's own ideas and to determine one's own actions is more important for returnees than for locals. In addition, elevating one's social status through control over people and resources is more important for returnees than for locals. At the same time, security, stability, and certainty in life and subordinating oneself to socially imposed expectations are less important for returnees than for locals. Thus, according to the motivation for emigration theory (Tartakovsky & Schwartz, 2001), Jewish returning migrants in Russia have strong self-development and materialistic motivations, and a weak preservation motivation for migration. Most return from abroad to Russia to develop their abilities, acquire new ideas and knowledge, and master new skills. In addition, some returning migrants perhaps experience the rapid social and economic changes in Russia as exciting and providing them with a sense of novelty. Finally, the returnees aim to increase their wealth and social status. The lower preference for the conservation values found among returnees indicates that they may be willing to sacrifice stability and security in their life in order to achieve their self-development and materialistic goals.

Since most Jewish migrants in Russia are returnees from Israel, it is interesting to compare their motivational goals with the motivations of native-born Israelis emigrating from Israel. Previous studies have indicated that native-born individuals emigrate from Israel mostly for economic and self-development reasons (e.g., to obtain a higher education) (Cohen, 2009). Security reasons play only a minor role in emigration from Israel, and their effect is mediated by economic conditions (Cohen, 2009; Lustick, 2004). In addition, a study conducted among Israeli high-school adolescents has demonstrated that those interested in emigration reported a low level of religiosity, low involvement in social institutions, and low support for the government (Hartman & Hartman, 1995). These psychological characteristics are compatible with a low preference for the conservation values (Schwartz et al., 2012), indicating that for native-born Israelis who want to emigrate from Israel the goal of preserving tradition and belonging to a larger collective is relatively less important. Comparing the results of previous studies with those obtained in the present research, it may be concluded that the motivational goals of Jewish returning migrants in Russia are similar to those of native-born Israelis emigrating from Israel. In both groups, the self-development and materialistic

motivations for emigration predominate, while the preservation motivation is less important.

The results of the present study confirmed that returning migrants have a multifaceted system of group identifications that includes identification with the country of emigration, with the home country, and with the ethnic minority group. Among returning migrants, identification with Jews was the most salient, and identification with the country of emigration was stronger than identification with Russians. In addition, the returnees' identification with Russians was weaker than that among locals.

The results obtained partly corroborate Sussman's (2010) Cultural Identity Model that claims that most returning migrants affiliate simultaneously with the country of emigration and the home country. However, the results of the present study demonstrate that among returning migrants who belong to an ethnic minority in their home country, the strongest affiliation is with their ethnic group. This phenomenon is not specific for returning migrants; it has been found among Jewish immigrants in Israel and in the USA (Persky & Birman, 2005; Tartakovsky, 2009), as well as among Jews who did not emigrate from Russia in the present study. Moreover, a large cross-cultural study has found that in a vast number of countries, people belonging to ethnic minorities identify more with their ethnic group than with the nation (Staerklé et al., 2010). The present study corroborates this phenomenon among returning migrants.

The present study demonstrates that returning migrants have a relatively weak affiliation with the home country: they identify less with the home country than with the country of emigration, their identification with Russians is weaker than that among Jews who did not emigrate from Russia, and their intention to emigrate from Russia is greater than that among locals. This finding is especially interesting, because, on average, returning migrants lived only about 6 years in the foreign country, which is less than the time since their return to Russia (7 years). The weak affiliation with the home country found among the Jewish returning migrants to Russia may be related to their belonging to a Diaspora group. Unlike returning migrants who belong to the majority population in their home country and who may experience a sense of homecoming when returning from abroad (Rebhun & Ari, 2010; Sussman, 2010), Jews returning to Russia go to the Diaspora, and when they return, they are once more an ethnic minority in their home country, which may explain why their affiliation with the home country remains relatively weak even many years after their return.

The results obtained indicated that the adjustment of returning migrants varied across different dimensions. Economic adjustment among returnees was better than that among locals: a higher proportion of returnees occupied managerial and business positions; returnees evaluated their economic conditions more positively than locals; and returnees evaluated changes in their economic

conditions during the last year more positively than locals. At the same time, the interpersonal adjustment of returnees was less successful than that of locals: returnees suffered more from discrimination, and they were less satisfied with their interpersonal relationships. In sum, however, it seems that for returnees, positive and negative aspects of life in Russia balanced each other, because their general satisfaction with life was similar to that reported by locals.

Two factors may explain the returnees' pattern of adjustment to the home country. The first is related to the returnees' motivational goals as reflected in their value preferences. As mentioned above, returnees have a higher preference for the self-enhancement and openness to change values, which, according to Schwartz's value theory (Schwartz et al., 2012), means they are more motivated than locals to achieve control over people and resources, to raise their social status, to make their own decisions, and to experience novelty and excitement in life. At the same time, returnees have a lower preference for the conservation values, which means they are less motivated than locals to submit to group norms, devote oneself to the group, and sacrifice their own interests in order to maintain smooth interactions with others. This system of value preferences fits well with the demands of the professional and business world (Sagiv, Roccas, & Hazan, 2004), and it enables returning migrants to achieve economic success in their home country. However, the returnees' value preferences may contradict the requirements of developing satisfying interpersonal contacts, which are associated with a high preference for the conservation and self-transcendence values (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Another factor that may be responsible for the obtained pattern of adjustment is related to the circumstances of return migration and society's reaction towards returning migrants. Many returning migrants leave some of their family and friends in the country of emigration, which may decrease their network of social contacts in the home country. In this way, returning migrants may be quite similar to other types of migrants. In addition, Russian society may perceive returning Jewish migrants as more alien than local Jews and, therefore, discriminate against them more. However, it should be noted that both returnees and locals reported relatively low levels of perceived discrimination.

Limitations of the present study and suggestions for further research

The first limitation of the present study relates to the sample of migrants, which was small and not random. However, it is important to note that the sample used for the present study had some important advantages. Participants were recruited in different geographic areas

and from different communities and organisations. Unlike most of the previous studies that focused on one professional or social group of returning migrants (e.g., managers, teachers, or students), the present study sample included people belonging to different professional groups. Therefore, despite being small and not random, the present sample may be fairly representative of the studied population. The second limitation of the study relates to its cross-sectional design, which does not enable conclusions regarding causality. Further studies should use a longitudinal design, measuring migrants' characteristics before and after migration. A third limitation of the study relates to the fact that a comparison was not made with Jewish immigrants from the FSU who remained in their countries of emigration. Such a comparison might provide important information regarding the self-selection of returning migrants and the effect of socialisation in the country of emigration on their psychological characteristics.

Conclusion

Despite its limitations, the present study advances scientific understanding of return migration in several ways. First, the results obtained demonstrate that returning migrants remain different from the local population in their value preferences, group identifications, and socio-psychological adjustment many years after their return. Thus, expectations to reunite with the home country expressed by some returning migrants before they leave the country of emigration (cf. Sussman, 2010) may prove to be illusionary.

Second, the results of the present study indicate that among Jews returning to Russia, materialistic and self-development motivations predominate. These motivations may also be important for migrants returning to other countries experiencing rapid economic growth, such as China, India, and Brazil. However, other migrant groups may have a greater preservation motivation for returning to their home country; for example, returning refugees, people who return home to marry or retire, and those who want to bring their children back to their traditional environment.

Third, the present study revealed a complex pattern of adjustment among returning migrants. Their economic adjustment was successful, yet their interpersonal relationships in the home country were more problematic. These findings have some important practical implications. Many developing countries try to attract their citizens living abroad to return by emphasising the business and employment opportunities now existing in the home country. This policy may be initially successful given the predominantly materialistic and self-development motivations of returning migrants. However, in order to retain migrants in the home country, they should provide more

protection from discrimination. In addition, both the receiving society and migrants' organisations should help returning migrants expand their social networks to help enhance their interpersonal relationships in the home country.

As a final comment, it should be noted that although the results obtained indicate differences between returnees and locals, these differences should not be overstressed. All the detected differences were relatively small in size, and no difference between the two groups was found in the self-transcendence values and in Jewish identification. Moreover, the value hierarchies in the two groups were similar: the self-transcendence and openness to change values were more important for both groups than the conservation and self-enhancement values. Taken together, these findings suggest that the population of Jewish returnees to Russia and local Russian Jews constitute two subgroups of the same ethno-cultural group. The similarities between the two subgroups may provide a sound basis for collaboration and mutual support among their members.

Manuscript received March 2016
Revised manuscript accepted May 2016
First published online July 2016

REFERENCES

- Cassarino, J. P. (2004). Theorizing return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6, 253–279.
- CBS (Central Bureau of Statistics). (2015). *Israelis who stayed abroad more than one year during 1990–2013: Selected data*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbs.gov.il/www/publications/alia/t3.pdf>
- Cohen, Y. (2009). Migration patterns to and from Israel. *Contemporary Jewry*, 29(2), 115–125.
- Cohen, Y., & Haberfeld, Y. (2001). Self-selection and return migration: Israeli-born Jews returning home from the United States during the 1980s. *Population Studies*, 55(1), 79–91.
- Constant, A., & Massey, D. S. (2002). Return migration by German guest workers: Neoclassical versus new economic theories. *International Migration*, 40(4), 5–38. doi:10.1111/1468-2435.00204.
- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- Dustmann, C., & Weiss, Y. (2007). Return migration: Theory and empirical evidence from the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45(2), 236–256.
- Ferris-Rotman, A., & Sweeney, C. (2008, May 5). *Despite anti-Semitism, Russia lures back Jews*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-israel-palestinians-1948-russia-idUSL118299720080506>
- Hartman, H., & Hartman, M. (1995). Israeli students' attitudes toward emigration. *Youth & Society*, 26(4), 403–437.
- Harvey, M., & Moeller, M. (2009). Expatriate managers: A historical review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(3), 275–296. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00261.x.
- Hoerder, D. (2002). *Cultures in contact: World migrations in the second millennium*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- King, R., & Christou, A. (2008). Cultural geographies of counter-diasporic migration: The second generation returns 'home'. *University of Sussex, Brighton, Sussex Migration Working Paper*, 45.
- Kunuroglu, F., van de Vijver, F., & Yagmur, K. (2016). Return Migration. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 8(2). doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1143.
- Liao, D., & Sohmen, P. (2001). The development of modern entrepreneurship in China. *Stanford Journal of East Asian Affairs*, 1(1), 27–33.
- Lustick, I. (2004, June). Recent trends in emigration from Israel: The impact of Palestinian violence. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Israel Studies, Jerusalem, Israel* (pp. 14–16). Retrieved from http://img2.timg.co.il/forums/1_157881297.pdf
- Murphy, K. (2005, March 2). Jews find new life in Russia. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2005/mar/02/world/fg-jews2>
- OECD. (2001). Glossary of statistical terms. Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1, Statistical Papers, Series M, No. 58, United Nations, New York, 1998, Glossary. Retrieved from <https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=2349>
- Persky, I., & Birman, D. (2005). Ethnic identity in acculturation research: A study of multiple identities of Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(5), 557–572.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 493–510.
- Phinney, J. S., Madden, T., & Santos, L. J. (1998). Psychological variables as predictors of perceived ethnic discrimination among minority and immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(11), 937–953.
- Rebhun, U., & Ari, L. L. (2010). *American Israelis: Migration, transnationalism, and diasporic identity* (Vol. 13). Brill.
- Roccas, S. (2003). The effects of status on identification with multiple groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(3), 351–366.
- Sagiv, L., Roccas, S., & Hazan, O. (2004). Value pathways to well-being: Healthy values, valued goal attainment, and environmental congruence. In A. Linley & J. Stephen (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice* (pp. 68–85). New York: John Wiley.
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., et al. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688.
- Staerklé, C., Sidanius, J., Green, E. G. T., & Molina, L. E. (2010). Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry in national attitudes around the world: A multilevel analysis. *Political Psychology*, 31(4), 491–519.
- Sussman, N. M. (2001). Repatriation transitions: Psychological preparedness, cultural identity, and attributions among

- American managers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 109–123.
- Sussman, N. M. (2010). *Return migration and identity: A global phenomenon, a Hong Kong case*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2009). Cultural identities of adolescent immigrants: A three-year longitudinal study including the pre-migration period. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(5), 654–671.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2011). Pre-migration ethnic and national identities: Jewish adolescents planning emigration from Russia and Ukraine to Israel. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(5), 386–399.
- Tartakovsky, E., & Schwartz, S. H. (2001). Motivation for emigration, value priorities, psychological well-being, and cultural identifications among young Russian Jews. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 88–99.
- The World Bank. (2015). GDP growth. Retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG>
- Tolts, M. (2003). Mass Aliyah and Jewish emigration from Russia: Dynamics and factors. *East European Jewish Affairs*, 33(2), 71–96.
- Tolts, M. (2011, November). *Demography of the contemporary Russian-Speaking Jewish Diaspora*. A paper presented at the conference on the contemporary Russian speaking Jewish Diaspora, Harvard University.