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Abstract

This thesis examines identity-adaptations and adaptation processes of migrants from the former-Yugoslavia. It concerns threats to identity experienced by migrants who have encountered radical socio-political upheaval, as well as the way they cope with these threats. In this thesis, an explicit model of identity adaptation and adaptation processes is proposed: identity-adaptation is understood as restructuring of identity and its elements; adaptation process represents coping with threats to continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy, as a means of achieving a meaningful identity, comprised of various identity-aspects forming an identity-structure. This model is largely derived from identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986).

This thesis investigates the following issues: a) the role of the overall identity-structure and its content in adaptation-processes of migrants; b) the role of social context; c) the type of identity-threats experienced by migrants, and what their sources are; d) the way people cope with these threats. The findings reported in this thesis come from two studies — a qualitative analysis of migrants’ constructions of identity-adaptations and perceptions of threat based on interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith, 1996a) and the quantitative investigations of threat and coping processes.

The key findings in this thesis are: a) identity-adaptation evolves as a meaning-making process whereby different identity-aspects and the identity-structure are negotiated amid a complex system of group categorisations, taking into account the socio-cultural, historical and biographical context; b) the four identity-threats to continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem are distinguished on the basis of the sources of these threats and their interrelationships; c) the need to distinguish between identity-state (as an evaluative basis of identity) and the identity-threat is emphasised; d) coping responses for this group of migrants include distinct patterns of dealing with threat, and they operate at the intra-psychic level, inter-personal/collective level, or both; e) testing the relationships between the type of identity-motivation, threat and coping strategy, it is demonstrated that different threats are evaluated on the basis of the
identity-motivations (identity-states) that are salient for the particular coping orientation.

It is concluded from these results that migrant identity-adaptations and adaptation processes can not be studied outside of a model of identity that takes into account the complex relationship between intra-psychic and socio-historical factors. Given the inconsistency of findings and the poor applicability of some of the established theories in this domain, it is argued that a more refined conceptualisation of identity-adaptation and adaptation processes should be constructed that takes into account the individual, cultural and contextual variations in people's conceptualisations of what constitutes threat to their identity, and their response to it. It is argued that it is wrong to assume that any one identity-aspect is inherently problematic in a particular social context. Instead, the information about threats to identity should be derived from the awareness of how people construct their identity as well as the socio-historical context in which it is expressed, in order to achieve the desired levels of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem.
© Lada Timotijevic, 2000
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Snakes and Angels

And even when snakes adore you
   it is the God's gift to you,
and when the satyr addresses you,
   he too means something to you,
just your own heart
   is left unknown to you,
and why, oh why — you ask yourself —
   its inconceivable might
like the plague emanates
   and, like the snake and the satyr together,
your whole life turns
   into an irrevocable vigil.

And even when angels caress
   your emerald soul and the lustre of your mind,
and when into their illusive blueness
   the skies clothe your woeful soul,
you again, and again do not know
   what such graces mean to you,
and whether a tree is your friend,
   and if its woods love you,
and whether you've come up to the bird,
   or allied yourself with the worm,
or you've once and for all
   run away from your mind.

But stop weeping
   and at your bones gnawing,
east from this world
   you will yet again start building
all roofs and eaves
   you've longed for, but never accomplished,
though you'll make yet again a house of regret
   you'll be breaking free from like a scent from its flower,
into the desert of pain, sorrow and numbness,
   the desert of your blind and forgetful eye.

Bozidar Timotijevic
(translated by Lada Timotijevic)
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION AND THE THESIS OUTLINE

1.1 Overview

Migration represents one of the most relevant issues in social science for its broad and varied social, economic and psychological consequences. Globalisation and rapid, radical changes that characterise contemporary world induce movements of huge populations paralleling those of some earlier eras (e.g. 19th century movements). The twentieth century in particular has been considered the age of migration. Europe, whose history has been characterised by frequent population-movements, shifting borders and changing national sentiments, has been forced to grapple with this issue with the renewed urgency towards the end of the 20th century. The massive shifts in Europe in the late eighties and the early nineties (the fall of the Berlin Wall, dismantling of some of the Eastern-European federal states which in some instances have led to massive civil conflicts), initiated rapid growth in the numbers of refugees arriving to Europe, a large proportion of them escaping the bloody conflict in the former-Yugoslavia. As a result of the sudden increase in asylum applications and the nationalist ideologies gaining a renewed momentum in some of the European countries, immigration issues re-entered public awareness as one of the burning issues of contemporary Europe. Immigration has become topical in most media-coverage, and been used to differing purposes.

Such large and sudden immigration movements have often been perceived by local populations with growing discomfort, foreigners and migrants frequently being represented as welfare-scroungers, job-snatchers and threats to national identity and stability (see The Economist, 1998; 2000a,b,c; Hall, 2000). Simultaneously, however, much of the European popular consciousness and governmental policies are increasingly aware that Europe may indeed benefit, if not be in need of the fresh influx of migrants, and that an effort should be made to allow their better integration into a new society.
Social science has undertaken to answer this question of migrant-adaptation in a variety of ways. Examining adaptation of individual migrants, much research has attempted to understand when integration would be most successful (e.g. Knight et al., 1993; Massey and Denton, 1992; Boekestijn, 1988; Argyle, 1982; Scott et al., 1989; Neto, 1995; Padilla, Watsuma and Lindholm, 1985), however it has invariably failed insofar as there has been a notable lack of more comprehensive models from which these complex processes are to be systematically investigated. When a framework has been proposed for a more systematic study, the focus has mainly been upon the processes and consequences of inter-group contact (e.g. Stephen et al. 1998; Greenland and Brown, 1999; Lalonde and Cameron, 1993; Moghaddam and Perreault, 1991). Understandably, much of social psychological research has gone into examining inter-group relations, and ensuing processes of prejudice, stereotyping or racism. However, this vast literature has often failed to explain migrants' adaptation from a more integral perspective, instead choosing to limit its focus upon just some aspects of this process, such as categorical identification of the members of groups in contact.

This thesis is set to investigate the processes of adaptation and identity-adaptation of the former-Yugoslav migrants who have arrived to Britain due to the conflict in their country in the early nineties. In order to surpass some of the shortcomings of the earlier work, this research is formulated with the aim to establish a more comprehensive model of adaptation based on the concept of identity, as a unifying construct binding intra-psychic, and socio-contextual processes in their complex reciprocity. A working model of adaptation process and identity-adaptation is proposed based on identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986), aimed to integrate various perspectives in the study of adaptation processes and identity-adaptation. The advantage of this theory over some influential identity/group-relations theories such as social identity theory (SIT, Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and self-categorisation theory (SCT, Turner et al., 1987, 1994) rests in its more comprehensive treatment of both identity-structure and identity processes shaping this structure. SIT primarily focuses upon the consequences of inter-group relations, so when it has been used
to explain processes of adaptation and identity-adaptations, inconsistencies and contradictions in findings have occurred. IPT focuses more upon the dynamics of identity itself, which includes both the processes of identity and the identity-structure and content. This theory accepts the motivational basis of identity argued by SIT, but extends the number of motivational principles guiding identity-processes: apart from self-esteem, the theory argues that the need to achieve continuity, distinctiveness and self-efficacy should assume equal status as motivators of human actions. This theory is more suited to the study of migrant-adaptation as it provides a detailed model of identity (its processes and structures) from which the actual adaptation processes and identity-adaptations could be studied.

First, defining identity-structure in relational terms, as complex system of the elements constituting identity, IPT explicitly recognises that any change in an identity-aspect will require the simultaneous changes in the overall identity-structure as well as other elements within it. Thus, it rejects the notion that identity-adaptation should be viewed as a person's efforts to establish favourable representations of an identity-aspect based on their minority-group membership (a single category of identification), frequently endorsed by SIT-protagonists. The model of identity-adaptation proposed here views identity structure in terms of complex relationships between its elements. The changes in one element will therefore impact upon the changes in the overall structure, but also the meanings of other identity-aspects within it. Thus, identity-adaptations involve a whole system of relationships (identity-structure) between identity-elements.

Another issue addressed in this thesis is the identity-motivation underlying its processes. Whereas SIT focuses upon self-esteem as a motivational factor, in the current model of adaptation Breakwell's (1986, 1993) classification of identity-motivations is accepted, which includes continuity, distinctiveness and self-efficacy. In this sense, adaptation process is defined here as a process of coping with the threat emerging when identity is not
operating according to any or all of the four identity-motivations of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy.

From the above, it is evident that in this thesis, a conceptual distinction will be made between identity-adaptation and adaptation process. The former represents identity-restructuring and changes in the meanings of identity and its elements. The latter is defined as coping with the perceived threat, and is seen as a process that evolves at the level of an individual (intra-psychic), between individuals and groups, or both. Identity-adaptation (i.e. identity-restructuring) and adaptation process (i.e. perceptions of threat and responses to them) are conceptually interrelated: identity-structure (and its content) gives the process of adaptation the form (i.e. provides the context in which these evolve); the process of adaptation underlies the revisions of identity-structure (leading to identity-adaptations).

Before embarking upon the short overview of this thesis, a few more conceptual clarifications and definitions should be made here. First, identity is defined in this thesis as a complex representation of identity-structure and its various aspects, motivated by the need to achieve a sense of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. It is important to emphasise that identity and the self-concept are here treated interchangeably. Breakwell’s (1987) and Deaux’s (1992) assertion that the distinction between these two constructs mirrors the different emphases characterising distinct (specifically European and US) theoretical traditions, rather than the differences in the actual phenomenon (i.e. its processes and structures) under investigation, will be accepted in this thesis.

Secondly, the motivational aspects of identity are derived from IPT definition of the “guiding principles of identity”. As these are treated within IPT as pressures to achieve continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem, it is evident that as such, they represent difficult constructs to operationalise. In this thesis, therefore, it is thought that the operation of identity-principle is seen in a particular identity-state of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem. Identity-state is distinguished from the threat
to this state conceptually and methodologically, so as to avoid the confounding between the position and the experience of threat.

The goal of this thesis is to illustrate that a restricted view of migrants' identity-adaptation, based on the fragmented notion of their identity (the perspective many a politician has implicitly adopted in their rhetoric on migrants), and the limited ways in which adaptation-processes have been conceptualised, misrepresents the actual dynamics of migrant adaptation. Some of the issues raised in this thesis are: a) the role of the overall identity-structure and its content in adaptation-processes of migrants; b) the role of social context; c) the type of identity-threats experienced by migrants, and what their sources are; d) the way people cope with these threats. These issues will be investigated and some suggestions made as to the way identity-adaptation and adaptation processes should be investigated in the future.

1.2 Summary of chapters

Chapter two gives a review of the vast literature regarding migrant adaptation. Its focus is limited to the outcomes of migration, rather than its antecedents, i.e. the predictors of the decision to migrate. The goal of this chapter is to systematise the findings and literature in this area. Although not exhaustive, this review is written with an aim of gaining some insight into the kind of factors investigated within migration literature, and the ways in which these have been linked and operationlised. It is argued that much of the work done in this area has been inconsistent and often contradictory, mostly due to the lack of appropriate theoretical conceptualisations of migrant-adaptations. When some of these studies have been conducted from within a theoretical framework (e.g. within “minority group” paradigm, or “acculturation strategies” framework), some conceptual as well as methodological problems have arisen. For instance, inability to account for the inter-individual variation in response to migration, a problem affecting “ethnic minority” studies, is due to their implicit assumption that all members of a cultural group are similar in
particular ways that are characteristic of the culture that they are a part of, thus exaggerating the universality of these patterns. It is therefore suggested that migrant adaptation should be examined within the framework of identity, bringing together both the intra-individual and the socio-cultural and contextual factors.

Chapter three reviews in detail the most influential socio-psychological theories of identity-adaptation and adaptation process. Five prominent ways of conceptualising this process as a complex dynamics between the self and society are reviewed, these including the acculturation strategies framework, social identity theory, self-categorisation theory, identity-conflict or marginal man theory and identity process theory; implications of these for the current study are outlined wherever necessary. In general it is argued that the weakness of some of these theories rests in their restrictive conceptualisation of both the concept of identity and that of society, as well as their interaction, which is reflected in the theories' poor applicability to migration context. Accounting for these omissions, the final part of this chapter proposes a working model of identity-adaptation and adaptation processes, outlining the system of relationships between variables spanning both inter-individual and socio-cultural levels of analysis. This model proposes that identity-adaptations represent restructuring of identity-elements. This restructuring is brought about by people's perceptions of threat to their identity and the coping process resulting from these perceptions, defined as adaptation process.

As the current investigation of identity-adaptations and adaptation processes is grounded within the "naturalistic" setting of a real migrant group, chapter four is written with the aim of describing the historical context and socio-political and economic conditions of a specific migrant group under investigation: the former-Yugoslavs who have arrived to Britain due to the war in their country which commenced in the early nineties. Many issues investigated in this thesis are explicable only with reference to the specific socio-ideological constellation of the society these migrants have emigrated from. The aim of this chapter is
therefore to tackle some issues that help explain the complex processes of former-Yugoslav adaptation and their identity-adaptations.

Chapter five outlines the methodological issues in this thesis. The choice of the method and its epistemological basis, the design of studies, and the type of data have been outlined in this chapter. Here, also, a detailed account of the methodological tools used in conducting the studies, sampling and procedure have been delineated. The way some conceptual clarification of previous theories of adaptation processes and identity-adaptation has been operationalised in this research is here described. For instance, an important conceptual (operational) distinction between identity-states as more enduring motivation to achieve continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy, and threats to these states is here elucidated.

The empirical part of this research is described in chapters six, seven, eight and nine. Chapter six is based on an interview-study (N=24) conducted in order to examine how people talk about and conceptualise real threats to their identity: whether migration is threatening and what threats are perceived for this population of migrants is looked at. Investigating the way in which people construct their identity in the face of threat, some assumptions embedded in earlier work, specifically, the SIT (Tajfel, 1981) and SCT (Turner et al., 1987, 1994) are examined. It is found that there are inter- as well as intra-individual variations in the ways people define their salient categories from which self-evaluations are made, and these relate to their efforts to achieve distinctiveness, continuity, self-efficacy and self-esteem. Evidence that people are constructive in achieving meaningful identity is shown in the way different aspects of identity interrelate, in people's selective choice of comparative context, and sometimes in their discursive practises (e.g. inconsistencies in their accounts).

Chapter seven more systematically investigates some of the complex inter-relationships between different factors, as found in the prior chapter. This study is based on
questionnaire-survey (N=110), incorporating a series of questions pertaining to identity structure, socio-contextual factors, and demographic variables. How these relate to identity-states and threats is examined. The focus of this chapter is a test of a series of hypotheses in order to establish the possible ways of pursuing further the more complex models. The hypotheses posited here are developed bearing in mind specific socio-cultural and historical background of the migrant population investigated, although the aim of this chapter is to also test some of the most prominent theories and their assumptions as applied in the migration literature. It is found that perceiving oneself in terms of the minority group category does not relate to threat in the way predicted by social identity or self-categorisation theory. It is concluded that most support is established for those predictions that incorporate a more complex understanding of identity-adaptation, in terms of interaction between identity structure/content and socio-historical context.

As the previous empirical chapters in this thesis have outlined that the experience of threat is, seemingly, based on a more complex set of processes than previously thought, in chapter eight, nested regression analyses are conducted in order to test what sources constitute different types of threats to identity. This chapter emphasises the distinct psychological mechanisms underlying four identity-threats of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. It is confirmed here that the way a threat is perceived will depend upon the level of identity state as the main identity-motivator, but also, upon other affective-cognitive as well as socio-contextual sources of threat. Explanations offered are discussed in relation to some general theories of threat, and the importance of not inferring the experience of threat from the person’s occupying a position of threat is emphasised.

Some findings in previous chapters, where expected relationships between identity-threat and other variables have not been found, have indicated the role of coping for this migrant group. Chapter nine, therefore, focuses upon the processes of coping. In the first part of the chapter, evidence is presented that there are indeed wide individual variations within this group of migrants in terms of their coping orientation. The range of coping strategies used
spans both intra-psychic as well as inter-individual/collective orientation. These different coping patterns are characterised by distinct affective and cognitive processes. Some of these findings are discussed with reference to the prominent theories of coping. In the second part of this chapter, simple interactions between identity states and coping are examined in order to establish the capacity of a particular coping to curtail threat. This finding contributes to the recent literature which illustrates that different threat-related coping responses will be expected for different types of threats. These findings support the model of adaptation-processes adopted here, emphasising the need for more careful and refined conceptualisations of complex constructs such as identity-threat, identity-state and coping.

Finally, chapter ten gives a summary of the findings placing them within the framework of the available literature. In this chapter, some suggestions are made as to the way to-date approach to the study of adaptations is conducted, and it is argued that the future research of migrant populations should base the study of migrant-adaptations on an explicit model of identity. In conclusion, it is argued that this model should conceptualise identity-adaptations and adaptation processes as people’s constructive ways of perceiving as well as responding to the potential threats in the environment.
Chapter Two

MIGRATION – THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH MIGRANTS’ ADAPTATION

The literature on immigration from the social psychological perspective is vast, quite incoherent, with a notable lack of more comprehensive models that may encompass a large number of variables that interplay in the process of group/individual movements and cross-cultural interaction. The aim of this review is to attempt to systematise the findings and theoretical concepts that have been operationalised in the immigration research. The chapter is divided into several sections: first, a short historical overview of the major theoretical models in migration literature will be presented. The types of migratory groups commonly studied will be described. And finally, the predictors of migration-adaptation constituting the models and various perspectives on the issue will be examined. This part of the literature review will be divided into two sections according to the conceptual paradigm adopted among the theorists: the collective and individual perspective on migration. The aim of this chapter is to establish the way literature in this area understood and attempted to explain migrants’ adaptation, draw attention to some of its weaknesses and omissions and suggest a new framework in which the issues of adaptation should be studied.

2.1 Historical overview of the literature of culture-contact

Social scientific research on mobility probably started with the work of Ravenstein in 1885 (cited in Hormouth, 1990) who tried to explain the flow of migration by formulating its laws and trends. He was mainly interested in social and economic parameters associated with migration, and the individual motives and psychological consequences of migration were not discussed. The subsequent development of the psychological research on migration has primarily been interested in the a) antecedents leading to migration (reasons, motives, decision processes as well as other demographic, social and environmental factors influencing and leading to migration); b) psychological
consequences of a move; c) stages of changes involving the complex of environment-person interaction.

Within the 1930’s psychodynamics’ tradition the outcome of migration and cross-cultural contact (i.e. the relationship between culturally disparate individuals as determined by the groups these individuals belong to, [Bochner, 1982]) was explained with reference to the personality characteristics of the members of the groups that come into contact: psychoanalytic study of the ‘authoritarian personality’ (Adorno et. al, 1950) assumes, for instance, that the culture-contact situation interacts with the person's general trait of the level of prejudiced thinking which in turn leads to the differential outcomes of the contact - stereotyping that may result into conflict. Ethnocentric tendencies would therefore inhibit people's adaptation to new environment.

The models with the pseudo-medical undertones, have been developed first in sociological theory, and then within psychological literature, where the bulk of work emerged from within the clinical studies of the outcomes of the adaptation process. The assumption behind this rationale predicts a stressful nature of culture-contact experience that requires clinical approach. One of the most influential, early models developed within this tradition has been the marginal man concept introduced by Stonequist (1964) and Park (1928, 1950). Here, the consequences of culture-contact were explained in terms of psychological responses of a mostly negative nature for an individual whose inability to adhere to any of the sets of cultural norms that are in conflict may result in a state of anxiety, increased race-awareness, stress, a complex of inferiority, etc.

Stonequist analysed the psychological outcomes of each of the phases that an immigrant faces upon immigration into a new country: they first become "depayse" (involving the feelings of homesickness), then "déclassé" (implying the fall in status) and finally "deracine” (final stage, which includes a fundamental uprooting of sentiments and values). Of course, to what extent all immigrants follow the same pattern of psychosocial response to migration has been questioned intensely (e.g. Goldberg, 1941; Kerckhoff and McCormick, 1955; Golovensky, 1952). Although this approach will be
reviewed in more detail in the section 3.4, it is important to point out that the process of adaptation and identity-restructuring (e.g. “uprooting of sentiments and values”) will largely depend upon the way an individual habitually and actively constructs different categories of identification within their social environment. Golovensky (1952) argued that such approach failed to understand how a person copes with changes in the environment- how they resolve the contradictions and ambivalence as a potential outcome of migration.

Since the 1960's a number of cognitive theories of culture-contact have been developed, ranging from cognitive balance and reinforcement theories (Heider, 1958), Rockeach's belief-similarity hypothesis (Rockeach, 1960, 1961), theory of "subjective culture" (Triandis et. al. 1972), acculturation model (Berry et. al, 1988, 1989), to the most recent developments within SIT (Tajfel, 1978) and SCT (Turner, et al., 1987, 1994) paradigm. Common to all these theories is an implicit or an explicit assumption that the inter-group contact situation accentuates perceptions of the social environment in terms of its categories/groups. Perceived similarity or dissimilarity between groups has been frequently thought to represent a main determinant of the psychological and social outcomes of culture contact.

One variant of cognitive-clinical perspective, which is also linked to the clinical study of migration outcomes, is the concept of culture shock, introduced into literature by Oberg (1960) who primarily used it to explain the difficulties of sojourn (temporary migration) experience. The theory states that entering a new culture is characterised by lack of clues and information in the environment that could fit people's learned patterns of social behaviour thus impairing social interaction. This may result in confusing and disorienting experience for the newcomers. Culture-shock is most commonly viewed as a normal process of adaptation to cultural stress that may result in such symptoms as anxiety, helplessness, irritability and a longing for a more predictable and gratifying environment (for review, see Church, 1982).
A large proportion of culture-shock literature has looked at the stages of psychological adjustment of the individuals involved in cross-cultural experiences (Oberg, 1960, Adler, 1975, Lysgaard, 1955, Deutsch and Won, 1963, for review see Church, 1982). The studies investigated intra-psychic processes determining the culture-contact experience. For instance, the notion of the U-curve adjustment (Lysgaard, 1955) describing a sojourner's level of adjustment typically detects three stages of the process: initial state of elation and optimism, followed by the state of frustration and anxiety, with finally gradual recovery of better adapted psychological responses to a new culture. In his review of the stage-descriptions of culture-contact experience, Church (1982) concludes that the support for the U-curve hypothesis is weak, inconclusive and too generalised. The main critique specifies that although these studies refer to a within-individual longitudinal adjustment process, almost all of the data on which these descriptions are based are cross-sectional.

The monotone sequence of changes with migration approach postulates monotonically increasing adaptation. This position is supported by the mounting evidence that the length of residence is positively related to higher levels of identification with the host-country and the use of the host-culture language (slang, fluency), and negatively correlated with reported alienation, mental problems and neuroticism, the problems with the family, self-reported unhappiness, anxiety, etc. (for review, see Scott et al., 1989). Scott et al. concluded that the problem with most stage-approach studies is related to confounding effects of differential attrition of successful and unsuccessful migrants – the unsuccessful ones may have already repatriated, and the measure of adaptation success then tells us little about the real time effects of acculturation.

In 1980's, the problem of culture-contact was broadened to the issues of inter-individual and inter-group relations, their predictors and outcomes for both groups and individuals. The emphasis on inter-individual relations and communication has drawn attention to the processes of culture learning that occur in cross-cultural interaction. The degrees of adaptation will depend on similarity between the home and the host culture,
erationalised in terms of culture distance. The new approach proposed a programme at was needed in order for the prospective sojourner or migrant to adjust. The programme suggested that the nature and success of people's coping with the new environment to a large extent depended on the person's experience in her/his own country and the degree of preparation for the new experiences. The procedures for reducing maladjustment were suggested, such as transfer of home culture reinforcers, the development of new reinforcers that are compatible with the new culture, modelling of successful migrants/sojourners and vicarious reinforcement (Bochner, 1982).

Although the merit of this approach rests in its recognition of the relevance of interpersonal determinants of the sojourners' and immigrants' adaptation, thus emphasising the social dimension of the experience, the main deficiency rests in the highly descriptive nature of the studies, and the emphasis on psychological outcomes rather than the processes of the culture-contact experiences. Furthermore, the theoretical premise whereby the culture-contact experience is explained and understood in terms of social learning puts too much emphasis on cognitive processes that encompass culture-contact situation, failing to account for the interactive processes involved between individual cognition and contact situation.

What characterises most of these approaches is either lack of sophisticated theoretical models as they are mainly descriptive in character, or the simplistic and restricted methods used, adding little ecological validity to the investigation.
2.2 Varieties of migration

Scott et al. (1989) identified four types of migration that may have different psycho-social effects on an individual. This list is illustrative, though not exhaustive:

1.) International vs. domestic migration (e.g. from rural to urban areas as the most common domestic migration).

2.) Voluntary vs. forced migration; the former being initiated by a migrant (often-termed economic migration) and the latter by some compelling social circumstances such as governmental/institutional change or civil war in the migrants' home country (political migration). Refugees represent the most common forced migratory population, but the distinction between voluntary and involuntary migration is not that clear-cut: first, the boundary between the economic and political migration is not easy to define (the two very often overlap, see the Economist, 2000a). Such classification requires modelling of the relationship between the state's and the immigrants' definitions of what constitutes forced relocation: legal definition of the refugee status changes depending on the local laws and the global socio-economic circumstances, and immigrants' construction of their immigrant status as forced or voluntary will to some extent interact with these definitional terms, but not entirely. It is also possible that the self-definition as a voluntary or an involuntary migrant will undergo a change as a function of various factors (e.g. the level of adaptation, socio-economic status, congruence between the personal values, opportunities and the social structure that provides the framework for their realisation). Despite these definitional difficulties it has largely been assumed that involuntary (forced) migration is associated with higher susceptibility to illness and other emotional, physiological and behavioural reactions such as higher mortality rate, incidence of terminal illnesses, etc. (for review, see Hormouth, 1990 and Berry, 1998).

3.) Further distinction exists between permanent and temporary migration in terms of the intended length of stay in the host-country. Again, the distinction represents just a
"pure form", since many sojourners remain in their host countries for the rest of their lives, whereas many long-term migrants return to their base sooner or later after their migration. The Economist (2000a) has discerned yet another type of migrants, on the increase since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, known in the jargon as a "cross-border commuter", "labour-tourist" or "incomplete migrant". These are the individuals whose life is divided between an immigrant country where they work, and home where they would spend most of their free time. These people have been seen to commute mostly from Eastern Europe to Western European states such as Germany, Austria, etc.

4.) Finally, the authors distinguished between the elite and inferior migration, defined in terms of the status that immigrants assume in the host country and the mobility chances that are possible for groups of immigrants. What this distinction actually says in terms of adaptation processes is, however, unclear. The position considered "advantageous" for an immigrant for his or her adaptation efforts is culturally relative, as different host-cultures provide different broader social framework for adaptation, and different home-cultures prescribe diverse ways of possible adaptation patterns. Such distinction to an extent overlaps with the distinction between the voluntary and forced migration in terms of both the material and psycho-social resources available to an individual to cope with migration, at least at its early stages. It is therefore not clear what factors should define the "elite" and the "inferior" migration: as will be reviewed later in this chapter (see section 2.3.3), a number of demographic, situational and personality variables interact, their impact being difficult to ascertain. Finally, such distinction has evaluative undertones: how the actual "status" of an immigrant is measured, and people's subjective perceptions and objective chances for mobility ought to be specified before this distinction is used to explain adaptation outcomes.
2.3 Perspectives on migration: the processes, predictors and outcomes

A distinction can be made between two dominant approaches to migration in the literature: the collective (or inter-group) perspective and individual perspective of culture-contact.

2.3.1 Group analysis

From the collective perspective, a group of immigrants is seen as a relatively homogeneous ethnic group, and culture contact defined as a situation of confrontation and often conflict between two distinct and self-contained culture systems (Scott et al., 1989). Such a collective perspective focuses almost exclusively on ethnic identity (or language) as a basis of inter-group relations, assuming that relative group status and the level of identification are the main determinants of adaptation (e.g. Lalonde, Taylor and Moghaddam 1988; 1992; Moghaddam, Taylor and Lalonde, 1987; Leclezio, Louw-Potgieter and Souchon, 1985; Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker and Obdarzalek, 2000; Share-Pour, 1999; Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996). The methods of study involve attitude-analysis as indicators of the degree of change that has occurred as a consequence of inter-group contact, and ethnic identity scales operationalised either as self-reported ethnic beliefs, affects and behaviours, or as a level of language-proficiency. Mainly based upon social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; 1981), self-categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987; 1994) and acculturation strategies framework (Berry, 1997; Berry et al., 1987; 1989), the tenets of these theories will be explored in detail in the following chapter. However, the empirical tests of these theories – the way certain constructs they have developed have been conceptualised and measured in migration literature – will be examined in the sections that follow.
2.3.1.1 Ethnic identity as a measure of adaptation

The issue of immigrant adaptation has often been conceptualised in terms of the degree and pattern of endorsement of different identity-aspects: ethnic identity and host-culture identity. The operationalisation of shifts in ethnic identity have varied from the treatment of different categories of identification as mutually exclusive, to the recognition of the multifaceted nature of identity and the possibility of endorsing multiple group memberships. A number of studies have operationalised adaptation in terms of a complete acceptance of the values, norms and patterns of behaviour dominant in the host-country, treating assimilation (that is a complete acceptance of the new culture to the detriment of the culture of origin) as an index of adjustment (e.g. Padilla, 1980). Other writers have contended that some degree of overlap between the two cultural and ethnic categories (the ethnic and the host-culture) endorsed by an immigrant is an optimal measure of adaptation – Berry (1980), for instance, defined the desired adaptation strategy as that of integration.

The methodological paradigms used in ethnic-identity research in the field studies have often been modelled on the basis of similar operationalisations in the laboratory setting. Mummendey and Schrieber’s (1983) systematisation of the ways in which in-group bias has been studied in experimental settings can be extended to the studies of ethnic identity in real-groups situations. The immigration studies have a) either assessed ethnic identity on a complementary dimension (the degree of identification with one group is endorsed to the exclusion of the other, as the two are measured on a single bipolar scale - e.g. Sagiv and Schwartz, 1998); b) ethnic identity has often been measured on separate scales (whereby the same dimensions of ethnic identity are assessed for both the home and the host-culture separately, e.g. Ward and Kennedy, 1994); c) and finally, different foci of group-evaluation and behaviour have been assessed independently depending on their prevalence in different category-memberships (e.g. Cortes, Rogler and Malgady, 1994). The majority of studies have operationalised ethnic identity in terms of ethnic awareness (knowledge of cultural
symbols, norms, and behavioural expectations), and affective aspect of identity – ethnic loyalty. The implications of this conceptualisation and the ways of measuring ethnic identity will be discussed further below.

Scott et al. (1989) recognise four most common study-designs in this domain of research: 1) inter-group comparisons carried out between different immigrant groups; 2) group comparisons between a specific immigrant group in different host-cultures and the control group in the country of origin; 3) the minority group is often compared to the majority group on a number of identity-related dimensions, such as inter-group perceptions, stereotyping, willingness for inter-group contact; 4) finally, temporal comparisons that include cross-sectional studies (e.g. looking at the effects of the length of stay in the host-country upon identity outcomes of the first and the second generation immigrants), and to a lesser extent the longitudinal design. In relation to the latter, it is generally accepted that the length of residence in the host-country represents the main determinant of ethnic identity change (Richman et al., 1987; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1992; Boski, 1991). Not surprisingly, it has been found that the prolonged residence in the host-country is related to the more changes in the pattern of identification with the host and original culture. Some problems with these methodological paradigms and designs, however, are evident, and will be reviewed further in this chapter.

Padilla (1980) created what he termed the “acculturative typology”, from his measures of ethnic- and host-culture involvement. He discerned between two aspects of this involvement: ethnic loyalty (i.e. preference of one cultural orientation over the other) and cultural awareness (i.e. knowledge of one’s cultural symbols). His typology assumed replacement of one adopted culture (e.g. the culture of origin) by new cultural norms and values (i.e. that of the host culture), treating them as incompatible. The scales devised to measure the amount of acculturation, measure immigrants’ involvement with one culture to the exclusion of the other. Such a measure has been criticised for not tapping the independent impact of each of these cultures upon an
individual’s identity (Cortes et al., 1994). It has been argued that the assumptions of the zero-sum choices facing immigrants in terms of their prospective identification do not sensitively capture the complex cultural interactions stemming from the increasing diversity of the migrant contexts: the multiculturality of the dominant societies, and the reciprocity of cultural influences. With this, the multifaceted nature of identity is neglected, and the self viewed as one-dimensional and unified.

The independent measures of the degree of involvement with different cultures and the patterns of identity-change have been used in order to tap the process of multiple group identification. Cortes et al. (1991) conducted a cross-generational study of biculturality among Puerto Rican adults in the US. Their findings showed that although first generation migrants scored higher on Puerto Rican cultural involvement than on American cultural involvement, second generation shows about equal involvement in both cultures. The weak relationship they found between the endorsement of the two cultures (the American and the Puerto Rican) supported their proposal that each culture should be assessed separately for their impact upon individual identity. Still, even here the process of adaptation was limited to just one kind of group identity – ethnic/national. It is argued in this thesis, however, that restricting the observed processes of identity change and adaptation to just one category of identification is a weak conceptualisation of this process. Instead, a careful examination of the changes in the overall identity-structure is essential. This issue is examined in more detail in the following chapter (see, for instance, section 3.6)

Boski (1991) operationalised Tajfel’s theory by testing the patterns of multiple group memberships: looking at the cross-generational changes of the Canadian and Polish identity among Polish immigrants to Canada, he utilised Tajfel’s theoretical distinction between different aspects/foci of ethnic identity: the criterial (the knowledge about the group identity), the correlated elements (one’s perceived position in relation to the category prototype on the comparison dimension) – both
measured on separate scales, and affect for country - measured in terms of rating scales and reaction times. It was assumed that this conceptual distinction would allow resolution of the theoretical problem of mutual exclusivity of different group memberships. The study revealed that criterial identity showed less stability over time than correlated identity. Furthermore, response latency measures indicated that, while salience of immigrants' ethnic identity decreased over time, cognitive and emotional ambiguity increased due to difficulty in establishing the extent to which personal identity corresponded with the ethnic identity prototype.

This notion that different distinctive cognitive-affective components of a social (ethnic/national) identity should be analysed in order to understand a true nature of identity change has been frequently emphasised (e.g. Rosenthal and Hrynevich, 1985; Lalonde, Taylor and Moghaddam, 1992; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1992; Massey and Denton, 1992). Rosenthal and Feldman (1992) carried out a study in order to explore ethnic identity of the first and second-generation Chinese adolescents (conducted in two major immigrant countries – America and Australia). Ethnic identity here was assessed by ethnic identification, ethnic behaviour, knowledge of the culture, and importance and evaluative components of ethnic identity. Similar to Boski’s findings, there was an erosion in time of ethnic identification and behaviours/knowledge, but not of the importance and evaluative components of ethnic identity. The authors concluded that ethnic identity should be conceptualised in terms of hierarchical organisation of its different “components”: deeper levels (which comprise not only cognitive, but also affective processes) show much greater resilience to change. It is the aim of this thesis to examine the role of evaluative aspects of people’s identity in people’s perceptions of threat, and how its effects compare to the cognitive factors (such as identity-structure) involved in the process of threat-perception, in order to establish its function in the process of adaptation.

However, reducing the cognitive processes of adaptation to just those of self-categorisation with an ethnic group (e.g. criterial and correlated measures of
identification, see Boski, 1991) will not be adopted in this thesis for a number of reasons. First, the categorisation of the self with a particular social category may be just one aspect of the cognitive processes involved in identification. Categories themselves are often controversial, their meanings constructed out of processes of communication. Billig (1987) recognised the opposing cognitive process of "particularisation", which involves seeing a stimulus as different from all the other instances within a category. It is argued here that the problem with the "categorical" measure of identity is that it fails to view identity as it operates habitually, in everyday communication and within a web of interpersonal relationships, that is, the variability of meanings attached to different categories of identification across individuals.

It would be important to recognise that the meaning of any single category of identification is also derived from the position of the category of identification within a system of other identity-aspects constitutive of an overall identity of an individual. The above reviewed studies have failed to recognise this partly due to the conceptual distinction between the social and personal identity adopted within these studies, which is explicitly rejected in this thesis (see section 3.3.3). It is argued here that all social identities are simultaneously personal, as they assume a particular position within a web of the meanings derived from all other identity-aspects constitutive of our overall identity-structure (see Breakwell, 1986; Deaux, 1992). However, the emphasis in the studies such as those reviewed above, has been mainly upon one kind of social identity – that assumed by the researchers to be the most salient in the culture-contact situation (ethnic/national identity). Recent research (e.g. Pittinsky et al, 1999; Hedge, 1998), however, has shown that adaptive processes prompt an implicit reorientation of an individual affect across his or her many different kinds of social identity (e.g. ethnic, gender, professional or others). In this thesis, the study of identity-adaptation will incorporate the measure of the overall identity-structure, as a system of identity-aspects hierarchically arranged within the structure in terms of their relative importance for an individual, and not just the ethnic identity.
Two problems, therefore, arise from the studies like the ones reviewed so far: one pertaining to the conceptualisation of the self as "unidimensional", whose changes in the process of adaptation evolve along a single dimension of identification. The other relates to the methodological, and as such, conceptual issue of "temporal" dimension of identity: although aiming to tap the changes in identity structure and the related processes, very few studies have employed a true temporal perspective and as such, their conclusions could only be tentative. For instance, it is dangerous to infer about temporal changes from the cross-sectional designs. If anything, the studies reported here managed to tap the contextual salience of certain identity-aspects at the time of their measurement. They say very little about the chronic importance (centrality) of these aspects of identity over time. Recently it has been emphasised that the centrality of aspects of identity in its organising structure plays an important role in the likelihood of change of that aspect of identity (Deaux, 1992; Breakwell, 1986; Rosenberg, 1979). Ethier and Deaux (1994) emphasised the need to study changes in identity as they evolve in real time. In their longitudinal study of identity maintenance efforts of Hispanic students, they have come to an important conclusion that certain aspects of identity – such as ethnic identity – show a large amount of stability over time. In the study, those with strong initial ethnic identity found the way to deal with threats to that identity (e.g. the process of remooring the elements of identity to the new environmental cues) and thus maintain or even reinforce the endorsed identity. Those with low initial importance of the ethnic identity, however, reported further decrease in its importance as a response to the perceived threats to this identity and attrition of the ethnic identity-related behaviour.

2.3.1.2 Determinants and outcomes of ethnic identity

Given the recognition of the important role that ethnic identity plays in the process of adaptation, many studies have tried to isolate the determinants of ethnic identification among minority groups: the socio-structural, demographic, cultural and other factors have been investigated in an attempt to determine the predictors of
ethnic-identification. SIT postulates that under certain conditions such as inter-group comparison, group members start favouring their own group over the out-group, indicating the strengthening of in-group identification. Given that the inter-group context is endemic to the immigrant status, the predictions of the strengthening of ethnic identity and group favouritism have frequently been tested under the SIT theoretical framework. However, there have been some contradictions in the emerging findings from within this theoretical framework. As reviewed by Van Knippeberg (1989), many studies (both experimental and field studies) have failed to replicate the findings from the earlier minimal group experimental paradigm, and often even found out-group favouritism effect (preference for the dominant group identity).

Lalonde, Taylor and Moghaddam (1992) examined the interactions between multiple group memberships (ethnic, immigrant, and host-national/Canadian) among the population of the Haitian and Indian immigrant women in Canada. The awareness of the relative position of their group in the majority-structure (perceptions of the Canadian majorities of their ethnic groups), perceived discrimination and motivation for culture retention were examined as predictors of different categories of identification (their ethnic group, immigrant and Canadian category). For both groups of women, their attachment to their heritage group was the strongest. However, women from both samples acknowledged that membership in their ethnic group was not positively valued by majority members of Canadian society. This finding seems somehow at odds with SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and SCT (Turner et al, 1987, 1994) which predict that ethnic in-group identification serves the function of providing a sense of positive identity in the social milieu. The authors concluded that ethnic identity provides a sense of rootedness or attachment for these immigrants, which prevails even under the conditions of negative outcomes of the inter-group comparisons for the members of the in-group. This finding echoes the more recent developments within SIT paradigm (e.g. Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996; Deschamp and Brown, 1983; Abrams and Hogg, 1988; Branscombe et al., 1999; Brewer, 1991) which have shown that positive identity (self-esteem) may not be the only motivation
for inter-group behaviour and identity-processes. In this thesis we examine the role of other identity-motivations for adaptation processes, and these are continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy (after Breakwell, 1986, 1993). These issues will be reviewed in more detail in the following chapter.

Thompson (1995) further examined the relative impact of two sources of socio-cultural influence upon racial identification: the relative influence of within group vs. inter-group interaction, and of demographic variables was assessed. It emerged that the best predictor of positive racial identity was the amount and nature of within-group contact (ties to and interactions with other in-group members) – and this was especially related to, what the author termed “psychological” racial identity (group commitment, pride and acceptance, that is, in terms of SIT – the motivational and self-enhancing aspect of identity). Inter-group conditions (perceived discrimination, for instance) determined only the socio-political racial identity (the likelihood of political activism). SIT theorists in their developments of Tajfel’s ideas neglected intra-group contact and affiliation as a source of strong in-group identification, instead focusing upon purely cognitive processes and their broader socio-structural antecedents (e.g. permeability, group size, stability, relative status). Such conceptualisation, however, seems to be too simplistic: Thompson illustrated that the predictors of in-group identity and its maintenance formed a complex interaction between inter-group, intra-group and demographic variables.

In short, both the local interactive context and people’s sense of continual allegiance to a particular group (sense of attachment, chronic importance of identity) seem to inform the extent to which a migrant’s ethnic identity would be implicated in his/her adaptive strategies. There is a danger in oversimplifying the context of migration and the process of adaptation in the effort to maintain the parsimony of the theory. The model of adaptation adopted here will incorporate the issues frequently neglected in the study of inter-group relations: individual and group biography/history, as well as
the overall identity structure and the emotions that reside in it, as given in people’s biography (through time), will be given a due attention.

So far we have examined some ways in which ethnic identity and its predictors have been discussed in migration literature. However, a large number of studies have treated ethnic identity as an antecedent of adaptation. Adaptation, often studied in terms of objective and subjective well-being is then regressed upon ethnic identity, religious or any other group-based distinguishing characteristic of an individual, and the changes in these aspects of one’s self-concept are then examined in relation to adjustment. Massey and Denton (1992), for instance, showed a strong correlation between the preference for white racial self-identification (the host-national racial identity) among Mexican mestizos, and the increase in socio-economic status, more contact with Anglos, and greater English language ability. Waters and Eschbach (1995) illustrated how different immigrant-ethnic populations proceeded differently in amalgamation with the dominant society (in terms of their social and economic status in the new country), concluding that different ethnic identifications may form an important component of the explanation of groups’ integration and their status in the dominant society. This study implicitly pointed to the need to understand cultural parameters when examining inter-group contact and the conditions for adaptation. Also, Ward and Kennedy (1994) concluded that strong host-national identification led to less socio-cultural adjustment difficulties (defined in terms of the ability to negotiate interactive aspects of the host culture), and that strong ethnic (national) identification evinced less psychological adjustment problems (defined as the ability to cope in order to achieve subjective well-being). Berry (1998), similarly, argued that acculturative strategy of integration (simultaneous endorsement of both ethnic and host-national identity) was most likely to lead to the positive acculturative outcomes.

It is not clear from the research to-date to what extent ethnic identity acts as a buffer against stress, facilitating psychosocial adaptation, or at what point (if at all) it becomes an impediment to a smooth culture-transition. Kozulin and Vegner (1995)
conducted a study of Russian immigrants to Israel, and their findings raised a number of interesting questions: they provided evidence that adaptation is often different in different spheres of life; positive perception of life in the new environment does not necessarily mean that the immigrant is ready to adapt to the new norms. This is especially evident in the frequently reported discrepancy between strong endorsement of cultural traditions and ethnic identity on one hand, and the everyday life-style on the other. They concluded that immigrants often resort to embracing more than one culture in different spheres of their life in emigration. Although these and similar findings are telling, they fail to propose a theoretical model aimed at explaining the observed variations in responses across contexts and identity-aspects. This thesis will aim to provide such overall model from which these variations could be systematically studied.

2.3.1.3 Inter-group perceptions

Inter-group perceptions represent an important topic in migration literature, since it has been assumed that specific inter-group relationships that an individual enters as a member of a group condition the objective status of groups and their members, having a profound impact upon their identity. The socio-structural variables (e.g. dominance relationships between the groups, the size of the minority group, permeability of group-boundaries) have been investigated in relation to both the in-group (majority group) and the out-group (minority group) perceptions and expressions of prejudice against the minority groups. It has been maintained that understanding the cognition behind certain inter-group contexts will predict the likelihood of inter-group contact, an important parameter in multicultural society. The dominant group's perceptions of inter-group contact will constitute the socio-structural and representational factors of migrants' context of adaptation; the minority groups' perceptions will to a large extent affect their choice of the strategies of coping with the new environment.
SIT (Tajfel, 1978, 1981; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) predicted that under the conditions of lower status, groups will be motivated to protect their positive sense of self using individual or collective coping strategies. The motivation that will impel people to cope occurs under the conditions of perceived negative evaluation of the in-group (often stemming from the objective unequal dominance/power relationships), and this is frequently, but not exclusively related to the conflict over either realistic or symbolic resources. Inter-group perception is determined by contextual (socio-structural) determinants of inter-group contact.

Objective conditions – such as competition for scarce resources and the perceived threat to economic well being have been examined for their impact upon the incidence of inter-group discrimination. Quillian (1995), for instance, examined the attitudes of host-culture members towards immigrants and racial minorities using Eurobarometer Survey 30 and showed that perceived threat is a function of economic conditions and the size of the subordinate group relative to the dominant group. Individual variables did not play a significant part in predicting prejudice. Similarly, Esses et al. (1998) found in their example of the dominant group's attitudes towards immigrants, that perceived competition for resources represented an important aspect of inter-group relations. Gran and Hein (1997), on the other hand, illustrated that the dominant group's perceptions of immigrants depended largely on ethnicity of the group (including the social representation of that group as similar or dissimilar to the dominant group) and on the immigrant group size. Realistic threat (economic competition) was not predictive of perceived threat.

Other socio-structural conditions such as permeability of group boundaries and the status of the immigrant group have also been tested for their predictions of discrimination. Echabe and Castro (1996), showed that the status of the out-group (e.g. lower-status out-group - the Third World immigrants vs. higher status out-group – the European immigrants) interacted with the perceived permeability of group boundaries (anticipated closed or open state-frontiers), predicting perceived threat to
the in-group (host-nationals). Lower status out-group generated threat when frontiers were permeable (leading to the negative perceptions of low-status immigrants by the dominant group), whereas higher status out-groups were perceived more negatively and as threatening when the state-frontiers were sealed off. This argument emphasised the need to take into account both structural conditions and group representations when discussing inter-group relations. The authors pointed to the need to take into account representational processes inherent to structural conditions - e.g. the policy of closed frontier is often based on exclusionary, discriminatory rhetoric.

The purely contextual considerations of inter-group context, together with the structural determinants of inter-group perceptions have, as we have seen, an insufficient explanatory power. The representation of the groups (anchored often in the history of inter-group relationships) is a powerful moderator (and mediator) of these relationships. But the cognitive aspects of inter-group context are far from sufficient predictors of perceptions, as will be seen below.

Stephen et al.'s (1998) study of prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel examined the relevance of four different types of threat to formation of prejudice: symbolic threats (based on value differences between groups); realistic threats to the power, resources and well-being of the in-group; anxiety concerning social interaction with out-group members and feelings of threat arising from negative stereotypes of the out-group. They have found that inter-group anxiety and negative stereotype of the out-group were more powerful and consistent predictors of prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants than were realistic threats or symbolic threats. The study showed that mere inter-group comparison was not sufficient determinant of prejudice: emotional context of this comparison (anxiety), as well as long-standing representations of groups in question (which often determine the context of inter-group relations) played a role over and above immediate contextual demands.
The support for this conclusion comes from Greenland and Brown's (1999) study of inter-group perceptions of the British and the Japanese sojourner sample. Testing the relationship between group categorisation and the quality of inter-group contact with inter-group bias and positive out-group affect, they found that inter-group anxiety and the quality of contact were associated with the in-group bias and categorisation, and that in fact it was the inter-group affect (anxiety) which influenced categorisation (not the other way round). The existence of emotions as important antecedents of categorisation and inter-group perceptions accentuate the importance of understanding the "habitual behaviour" and memory, that is the history of mutual perceptions and influence between the specific groups in question, rejecting the universalism implicit in the group-based studies of immigrant adaptation. It is not any group context, but the specific group situation that may or may not produce the varying degree of inter-group differentiation. These studies are an important reminder that emotions need to be taken into account as a necessary parameter under the conditions of a potential threat to identity, and this forms the focus of this thesis.

However, what most of these studies fail to recognise is the need to distinguish between the threat of being an immigrant and a threat of immigration. Whereas the former is directly connected with a specific category of identification (ascribed or adopted), the threat of immigration may not be limited to just one aspect of identity, but encompass its whole structure. This distinction is important, as it determines not only the focus of research, but also the phenomenological domain of threat as well as the coping responses to it. Thus, for instance, whereas being an immigrant may not be threatening in itself (partly depending on the extent to which that label/category has been incorporated into one's self-definition), the act of immigration may pose threat to a range of identity-aspects. This thesis focuses upon the threats of immigration as it is explicitly recognised here that migration involves palpable challenges to many behaviours, cognitions and motivations of an individual across a variety of domains.
Even more relevant for migration literature is the implications of inter-group perceptions (and specifically of discrimination against minority groups) for minority-members’ identity: specifically, its consequences for self-esteem and enhancement strategies employed in order to ward off threat to identity. SIT should, on theoretical grounds, lead to the conclusion that minority group members have lower self-esteem because they compare unfavourably with the majority group. Lower in-group status in the societal hierarchy, perceived discrimination and negative stereotyping should be detrimental to the ethnic minorities’ sense of self. Such a position would then influence coping responses in order to alleviate these threats. Whether and under what conditions these postulates hold will be examined in more detail in the following chapter. How these replicate in the migration studies will be briefly presented below.

The first postulate that the minority status would be linked with lower self-esteem which would motivate coping, was thoroughly examined by Rosengberg (1979). He showed how the relationship between self-esteem and lower perceived status (perceived discrimination and negative stereotypes) was at least tentative: he provided a detailed review of literature that found no support for this assumption. No relationship was found between the objective rank of a group and the reported self-esteem of its members.

The SIT prediction that lower self-esteem would lead to employment of either individualistic strategy (when socio-structural variables permit exit from the devalued group) or collective enhancement and action strategies (when such conditions do not exist) have also been examined in the real-groups context. A number of studies have replicated these hypothesised relationships. Lalonde and Cameron (1993) looked at the relationship between status of the groups (relative disadvantage of the immigrant group in relation to the dominant culture) and a preference for the collective acculturation strategies. Their cross-generational study of four immigrant groups (Black Caribbean, Chinese, Italian and Greek) in the US concluded that the objective level of discrimination (the level of stigmatisation of each of the groups, measured as
independent of the perceptions of disadvantage) was predictive of perceived discrimination and retention of ethnic identity. Also, the immigrants from the more stigmatised groups were more likely to choose the behaviours representing a collective acculturation orientation than the immigrants from the relatively less disadvantaged groups. Moghaddam and Perreault (1991), in their study of the first generation visible immigrants (Chinese, West Indians and South Asians) in Canada further found that the perceived discrimination led to the preference for the collective mobility strategy.

However, it is not possible to confidently conclude that the low in-group status universally predicts either low self-esteem (as reviewed by Rosenberg, 1979), or the use of collective mobility strategies in the immigration context, not least due to the serious methodological drawbacks of many of the reported studies. First, they confounded the national and cultural specifics of the immigrant populations with their group status. The perceived discrimination reported above by the differentially disadvantaged groups of immigrants, might as well have been the consequence of a specific culturally-driven way of making sense of the environment and responding to it (e.g. the Chinese and the Black Caribbeans being more collective in orientation than the Greeks and the Italians in the sample). Sagiv and Schwartz (1998) showed that the minorities might develop different motivation to retain their ethnic uniqueness (segregation strategy or collective action), and to integrate in the wider society (assimilation or passing strategy). According to their socio-historical analysis, Muslim Arabs were more activated to maintain uniqueness and less motivated to integrate than were Christian Arabs in Israel. Thus, group differences exist in terms of readiness for inter-group contact on the basis of their motivation for ethnic-identity retention or assimilation. The fact that culture plays a role in shaping even some more general psychological processes such as need for distinctiveness or collective orientation has been examined with greater depth recently (e.g. Vignoles et al., 2000).

Furthermore, there is increasing evidence that it is the dominant, rather than the inferior group, which would exhibit inter-group discrimination and collective
orientation (Sachdev and Bourhis, 1985, 1987, 1991). In migration literature, the out-group favouritism has also been reported in many studies of immigrants' children ethnic identity preference. Testing the consequence of ethnic identification has been examined in relation to children, as it has been assumed that their cognitive and behavioural patterns would most directly reflect the structural conditions of the society. There have been a number of studies conducted on children of immigrants that looked at the process of development of ethnic awareness, evaluation of different ethnic identifications and ethnic self-identification. It has been assumed that the negative consequences of the low perceived in-group position in the dominant society will be most evidently reflected in the identity-patterns of the second-generation immigrant children. Typically, children would be asked to evaluate people of various races and ethnicity viewed as reflecting children's attitudes towards their own ethnicity – and related self-esteem and self-concept. Berry et al. (1992) concluded that much of this work showed that children who were of minority racial group tended to be “accurate” in distinguishing between different races, to show a low degree of self-identification and exhibit “white- or dominant group-bias”. The findings have traditionally been interpreted as evidence of an individual coping strategy (the out-group identification or “passing”), or self-rejection.

However, as Rosenberg (1979) maintained, it is possible that people (including children) simply adopt the dominant beliefs and representations about different groups (including those they belong to), but these not relating to their self-esteem and self-concept. Assuming that out-group bias is the evidence of an attempt at coping with negative group-identity is tentative as long as the actual importance of that group identity for an individual is not measured – that is, the extent to which an individual habitually bases his or her self-evaluation on that identity. He concluded that understanding where specific social identity - racial and other “minority group” categories - are positioned in the overall structure of a person's identity, is necessary in order to tap this relationship between the perceived position of the in-group in society and the self-concept. Such approach will be accepted in this thesis, whereby
the focus will be on the multifaceted nature of the self, studied in terms of the differential relative importance of different aspects constituting one's overall identity-structure.

The varied levels of importance of different aspects of identity is related to the issue of identity-processes being different depending on the nature of categorisation. It is to be expected that an ascribed category may have different consequences for people's identity to the self-ascribed self-categorisation. Rosenberg (1979) maintained this distinction clearly in his study where he compared the effects of the ascribed (e.g. racial identity) and the achieved identity (e.g. academic performance) for children's global self-esteem. The achieved identity was the only predictor of self-esteem. The more recent work has recognised that the mere fact of being categorised within a group one does not identify with may be perceived as threatening (Branscombe et al., 1999). It is therefore of crucial importance to tap the subjective importance of different identity-aspects in order to understand whether and what kind of threats will be perceived by an individual, rather than assuming that the threat is implicit to a particular social position of an individual.

2.3.1.4 Attitudes

One way of examining the causes and outcomes of culture-contact is by measuring people's attitudes. Most of the research in the inter-group literature assumed that changes in attitudes might be a good indicator of the dynamics of acculturation. Berry et al. (1992) classified three distinct approaches to attitudes in immigration literature into acculturation attitudes, modernisation attitudes and inter-group attitudes (between different ethnic groups).

Acculturative attitudes glean the information of how the immigrant group members wish to relate to the dominant group. Berry et al.'s (1988, 1989) analysis of acculturative attitudes is an empirical study of the dynamics of acculturation and its outcomes among
various categories of people coming into lasting contact with the dominant culture. They
distinguished between four possible types of evaluative responses to the host and home
culture: assimilation, separation, integration and marginalisation. Conceptually, they
represent a continuum of self-identifications ranging from ethnic-culture maintenance,
to a complete acceptance of and assimilation into the dominant-culture. Assimilation is a
strategy used by those individuals who value and have adopted the majority culture,
abandoning their culture of origins; separation consists of valuing cultural maintenance
but rejection of the host culture; integration implies coexistence and endorsement of the
two confronted cultures; marginalisation refers to the attitudes of those individuals who
neither value cultural maintenance, nor accept the dominant culture. This pseudo-
medical model also ascertains that it is the attitudes of integration that will have the
strongest relationship with psychological well being or low acculturative stress of
immigrants (Berry, Kim, Minde and Mok, 1987). This and similar models of
acculturation outcomes (e.g. Triandis et al, 1988; Pettigrew, 1988) represent, however,
logically "pure forms"; in reality, individuals may adopt different attitudes towards the
host-culture depending on the domain of behaviour or experience under the
investigation (Scott et al., 1989; Kozulin and Venger, 1995). Furthermore, the
conclusions that the level of adjustment and ethnic identity can be gleaned from their
attitudes towards own or host-culture has been questioned. The reliability of the
attitudinal scales in predicting the nature of inter-group relationships is questionable,
as prior socio-psychological studies show that quite conflicting social beliefs and
attitudes can co-exist, depending on the context in which they are expressed (e.g.
argued that the level of analysis of attitudes reveals a lot about their layered nature,
which, it seems to us, Berry's "acculturation orientation" paradigm fails to capture.
This framework will be given its due attention in the following chapter.

Attitudes towards modernity are often conceptualised as indicators of the level of
acculturation. This interest in changes in the value-orientations upon migration stems
from the theoretical assumption that values represent a vehicle of acculturation - if the
migrant's values were to change to fit those of the host-society, adjustment is thought to be imminent. Most usually, the modernity scale was used to measure cultural values of different groups. It was assumed that acculturative groups lay somewhere on the traditionalism-modernity continuum, indicating the degree of acculturation and often, psycho-social well-being (e.g. Inkles and Smith, 1974). However, Smither and Rodríguez-Giegling (1979) looked at the levels of modernity, marginality and anxiety in two groups of refugees in the US (Vietnamese and Laotians) and the mainstream (US) population as a control group. They found no relationship between modernity attitudes and any of the designated variables (marginality or anxiety) in the two immigrant groups. This finding questions the relevance of the concept of modernity when studying psychological states of refugees, as well as arguing against the simplistic understanding of the process of adaptation as determined by the value-differences between the home- and the host-culture. Indeed, it is possible that these findings have been affected by the era in which this study was conducted. The issue of values as the determinants of adaptation process must not be studied in a cultural and historical vacuum.

Although most of the studies on ethnic attitudes have looked at either immigrant groups' attitudes towards the dominant group, or the dominant group's attitudes towards the designated immigrant groups or the immigrant population as a whole, it has been noted that reciprocal attitudes should be gauged in order to understand culture-contact as an interactive process. This way, the studies would glean more insight into the nature of some psychosocial processes such as ethnocentrism (for instance, its universality). It is important to recognise that the choice and enactment of acculturation strategies will be constrained by the ideological and structural characteristics of the host-society. The host-society's attitudes towards immigrants importantly interact with acculturative strategies of immigrant population. Such mutually influencing acculturation attitudes of both immigrant and host-groups have received more attention recently (e.g. Piontkowski et al., 2000; Van Oudenhaven et al., 1998).
In order to study group-attitudes in interaction, Van Oudenhoven et al. (1998) examined how different groups (the two ethnic groups of Moroccan and Turkish immigrants and the Dutch native group) react to four different adaptation strategies (as defined by Berry, 1980) of the Turkish and Moroccan immigrants. Both their affective and normative reactions to these groups were measured. The findings showed striking differences in perceptions of the attitudes between the host- and immigrant samples. The Dutch respondents preferred assimilation and integration as the immigrants’ attitude to inter-group contact, although they believed that the real inter-group contact was that of separation. The two immigrant groups’ respondents perceived integration strategy as the preferred option. The authors explained these differences in social representation of inter-group contact situations in terms of the likelihood of social contact with the out-group members: the minority groups were more likely to have interacted with the dominant-group members than vice versa, partly due to the sheer difference in group-size (i.e. there are more members of the dominant group to interact with than those of the minority group), and partly as a result of their minority status and their interest to integrate at least on certain level (e.g. socio-economic) into the dominant society.

Pientkowski et al. (2000) on the other hand examined the group-specific nature of acculturation attitudes of both immigrant and host-groups. They showed that different immigrant and host-groups develop different acculturation attitudes, based on a variety of factors (e.g. perceived similarity, group permeability, perceived outcome of inter-group contact). Furthermore, they illustrated that the mismatch between the acculturative attitudes of the host and immigrant groups in contact was associated with the greater perceived inter-group conflict.

These and similar studies point at the unsustainability of the assumptions of the uniform perceptions of environment within a migrant group. They also show that socio-structural determinants and the local realities of immigrants (e.g. inter-personal relationships) interact in the migrants’ efforts to represent and make sense of their social context. This difference, then, has a profound effect upon people’s actions in such contexts. However, the studies reviewed above are also characterised by insufficient awareness of the socio-
historical specificity of each of the groups in question: the history of relationships between groups, the nature of group ideology as well as the normative culture prescribing the degree and nature of interaction with the out-group are omitted from the analysis. In this thesis, an effort will be made to understand migrants’ perceptions of the intra- and inter-group relationships as well as their adaptation endeavour in the light of the specific historical backdrop characteristic of their culture.

2.3.2 Summary

The inter-group perspective on migration has addressed a number of issues of relevance to the study of adaptation of immigrants.

- Ethnic identity change has been conceptualised as an important aspect of adaptation process.
  a) However, these changes have often been operationalised as endorsement of one cultural identity to the exclusion of another, or the zero-sum choice. Those studies that have assessed each culture-involvement separately have often used cross-sectional design whereby the contextual salience was measured to the exclusion of the enduring importance of certain categories. There is some evidence that certain identity-aspects have greater importance and chronic salience than others, and that the centrality of these identity-aspects could explain people’s efforts at identity-management when coming into lasting contact with a different culture.
  b) Determinants of ethnic identity received a great deal of attention. Based on SIT, the socio-structural variables and people’s motivation to achieve positive social identity have been tested. It has been argued that other predictors such as sense of attachment to ethnic identity and people’s emotions as well as other motivations are important as well.
  c) The degree of acculturation has been conceptualised in terms of the changes in ethnic identification. Although earlier studies have considered the retention of ethnic identity as an indicator of poor adjustment, it is nowadays believed that ethnic identity may also act as a buffer of stress, thus facilitating adaptation. It has been
argued that ethnic identity may be beneficial for certain domains of experience and behaviour, but not others.

- Inter-group perceptions form the context of inter-group contact, and influence the possible ways of migrants' dealing with the new social environment.
  a) Inter-group perceptions are not limited to socio-structural parameters such as group-size, status or permeability of group boundaries. The processes of representation in a society are an important factor in determining the likelihood of inter-group discrimination. Affective as well as cognitive factors are to be incorporated into the explanations of inter-group perceptions.
  b) The consequences of inter-group perceptions most often investigated are self-esteem and identity-management strategies. There is no unequivocal evidence that low objective group status leads to low self-esteem. Furthermore, the evidence of the consequences of in-group discrimination in terms of utilisation of either collective or individual coping strategies is contradictory or disputed.
  c) Between-minority groups' comparisons carried out in order to determine different levels of discrimination and its consequence for immigrants' adaptation confound cultural and socio-structural variables.
  d) In-group favouritism is not confined to the subordinate groups.

- Attitudes towards other groups, towards acculturation and towards modernity have been studied, and typologies of acculturation devised.
  a) These typologies represent "pure forms", and it ought to be recognised that individuals endorse different attitudes relative to the domain of experience.
  b) Furthermore, the direct relationship between attitudes and behaviour is questionable and should not to be directly inferred.
  c) Finally, attention is drawn to the problem of assuming uniformity in perceptions of the environment and the unproblematic nature of the social context. The local environment and the interactive patterns are important aspects of people's efforts of making sense of their social context.
There are two more general conceptual shortcomings in the inter-group approach to adaptation:

- Assuming that all members of the cultural group are similar in particular ways that are characteristic of the culture that they are a part of, this approach exaggerates the universality of these patterns.
- Although the collective perspective has been developed with the awareness of a necessity to take group processes and their psychological outcomes into account when studying individuals, the level of analysis has been reduced to intra-psychic processes (cognition, affect or behavioural intention), and the "social" in the process of adaptation (i.e. the shared meanings, the interactive patterns, the shared experience, etc.) has been neglected.

2.3.3 Individual perspective of migration

Some authors (e.g. Scott et al., 1989; Furnham and Bochner, 1986) have explicitly stated in their research that psycho-social processes of adaptation as an outcome of migration can not be properly understood without taking into account a huge diversity of responses that exists within one cultural group, and that this might be consequent upon a number of variables specific to personality traits and life histories of immigrants as well as to the cultural characteristics of their ethnic/national backgrounds. "Though individuals in contact with similar cultures are likely to move in similar directions, these pertain to only a small portion of the abstract 'culture' and to only a small portion of the individual's response repertory" (Scott et. al., 1989:15). Just as the degree of cultural homogeneity and direction of change may vary substantially over collectivities, it is also true that different individuals are exposed to, incorporate and enact different (novel) cultural elements to varying degrees.

Among the most prominent researchers who have adopted the individual perspective are Bochner (1982), Scott, Scott and Stumpf (1989) and Furnham and Bochner (1986). A
vast range of factors that have commonly been studied in relation to acculturative outcomes can be classified into three broad sets of variables: demographic/background variables, environmental stressors and facilitators, and personality variables. These variables have been interchangeably examined in terms of their causal effect upon decision to migrate ("push-factors"), as mediators or moderators of the acculturation process upon migration, and as the outcomes of acculturation. Adaptation has often been conceptualised in terms of subjective well being – that is migrants' mental and physical health, often measured as an index of reported stress and physical complaints. An objective measure of adaptation such as the number of admissions into psychiatric hospitals, have also been measured as an outcome variable of migration. In the following review we will focus upon the factors that influence the adaptation process itself, rather than those that affect people’s decision to emigrate.

2.3.3.1 Demographic/background variables

It has been assumed that variables such as age, sex, socio-economic status, language fluency, previous contact with the host-country, religious affiliation, and others, can have direct or indirect effects on migration outcomes.

2.3.3.1.1 Sex

Sex of respondents has been tested across a range of studies for its effect on adaptational outcomes, but the findings are mostly contradictory and inconclusive: whereas a number of studies have found no gender effect on the level of adaptation (e.g. Leclezio, Louw-Ptieter, Souchon, 1985; Massey and Denton, 1992; Neto, 1994), others have reported an excess of psychiatric symptoms such as neurosis, less successful adjustment and retention of ethnic identification among female respondents and yet others, reported less threat and loss experiences by females (see Scott et al, 1989, for a review). There have been a number of explanations, ranging from the assertion about women's biological disposition towards greater anxiety, to the interpretation that the gender difference is entirely due to women's greater willingness to report their emotions. Many other studies,
however, countered these findings, showing that it is women who exhibited greater ability to adjust, who were more likely to identify with the host-country, reported higher satisfaction with life in the host-country (Boski, 1991), and were less likely to report the experience of loss and threat to their identity (Jerusalem and Mittag, 1997). Among the attempts to explain such findings are those interpreting gender differences in adaptation in terms of different sex roles: whereas women are thought to show greater orientation towards family and inter-personal relationships, and more dependence upon social support network, men's interest rests in their orientation towards abstract ideas such as society at large. These conclusions have been contradicted by some findings, in which women have been found to be less successful in creating new friends with migration than men (Jerusalem, Hahn and Scharzer, 1996). Furthermore, such an interpretation of gender-related differences in adjustment can not account for some interaction effects found in other studies. Burvill, Armstrong and Carlson (1983) found that gender interacted with ethnic background in determining the likelihood of parasuicide (attempted but failed suicide): among males, rates were higher for immigrants from New Zealand and Scotland than among native-born, but lower for immigrants from Yugoslavia, Italy and Poland; among females, immigrants from New Zealand had higher rates of parasuicide than native-born, while females from Greece, India, Pakistan and Italy had lower rates. Most of the studies in migration literature neglect the ideological context in which gender differences occur: if the normative culture of the host- and home-country are sufficiently similar, migration will not result in gender differences being significant parameters in adaptation process.

2.3.3.1.2 Age

Age is probably the most researched background variable: it is widely accepted that younger immigrants show higher level of adaptation due to their greater flexibility and readiness to modify the customary life-style. The majority of studies have investigated the effect of age on the level of host and ethnic-identification, concluding that younger immigrants largely report higher degree of host-culture identification and show greater preference for individual mobility strategy in comparison to their elders (Lalonde,
Taylor and Moghaddam, 1992; Lalonde and Cameron, 1993; Mason and Denton, 1992; Cortes, Rogler and Malgany, 1994; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota and Ocampo, 1993; Richman, Gaviria, Flaherty, Birz and Wintrob, 1987; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1990, 1992). However, the results are not incontestable. Some studies show that with age there is an increase in host-national identification for women but not for men (Boski, 1991). Also, Scott et al.'s (1989) study shows that parents report lower levels of psychiatric symptoms than their children. On the other hand, they are less likely to associate with the native-born Australians than their children are. In line with this finding, Ward and Kennedy (1994) emphasised the need to distinguish between social and psychological adjustment, the former indicating the success and nature of interaction and the ability to fit in, whereas the latter - the level of satisfaction and subjective well-being. Age, therefore, often can interact with other demographic (sex, socio-economic status, language proficiency), environmental or contextual as well as cultural factors, leading to different conclusions about its impact upon adaptation.

2.3.3.1.3 Language proficiency

Age difference has often been linked to language proficiency variable: it is reasonable to accept that those more fluent in the original language of the host-culture will more easily fit into the new environment, since fluency in the host-national language enables their greater association with the host-nationals and frequent and more meaningful interactions. This allows them to understand and incorporate the norms and rules of the host-culture that are imbedded in the categories of language, and eventually show a greater degree of adaptation. Leclezio, Louw-Potgieter and Souchon (1985), for instance reported that the ethnic-language retention is the only predictor of ethnic identity. Suk-Ho Jun (1984) also concluded that language proficiency could account for the intention of an immigrant to stay in the host-country. Also, the study showed widening of the generation gap within a family (between the first and the second-generation immigrants) due to the increase in language proficiency among the younger generation respondents. One problem with all these studies stems from the ways of measuring language fluency: it has been measured either through self-reported measures or interview ratings of
unknown validity and reliability. Furthermore, most of the respondents have been asked retrospectively to assess their language proficiency upon their arrival. The relationship between language fluency and adjustment is not a straightforward one, but rather reciprocal and circular: greater fluency leads to greater interaction, which in turn improves language ability.

2.3.3.1.4 Previous cross-cultural experience

Previous cross-cultural experience with the host-culture might facilitate immigrants' better adaptation upon migration. The level of familiarity with the host-culture is often judged on the basis of the previous residence in the host country, previous contacts with the host-culture nationals, or the extent of culture distance between the home and the host country (e.g. previous residence in the country where the official language is the same as that in the country of immigration, such as the British immigrants to the US). Scott et al. (1989) reported in their longitudinal study with the Australian sample that immigrants who had had previous experiences with the Australian culture are likely to be better adapted to it: they reported fewer problems upon arrival into the country, higher inter-personal skills, their children had better academic performance; they also displayed higher self-esteem and satisfaction with life; finally, they did not rely on community services and welfare to a large extent. It is, however, difficult to draw firm conclusions about the independent effect of this variable since previous cross-cultural experience is often confounded with socio-economic status, language proficiency or even some personality variables.

2.3.3.1.5 Religious commitment

Religious commitment has been accepted as an important predictor of psychological well being and immigrants' better coping with stress upon arrival to the host-country. This is linked with the intra-psychic processes underlying religious affiliation (e.g. self-esteem), thus enabling better coping with adversities, and inter-personal gratification it provides (in the form of religious community and associations), as it is a frequent source of support – both emotional and instrumental. In the later stages of adaptation, it has
been argued, religious commitment may impair adaptation leading to psychiatric symptoms (Lin, Masuda and Tazuma, 1984). Some studies, however, showed no relationship between religious affiliation and psychiatric symptoms (Scott et. al., 1989). Others showed that even among the second-generation immigrants, religious affiliation played an important role in predicting life satisfaction (e.g. Neto, 1994). Overall, religious affiliation has often been confounded with, and studied as a component of ethnic identification, which makes it difficult to assess its independent effect on an individual. Furthermore, religion and age are often correlated, and hence careful measurement of these two variables independent of each other is needed.

2.3.3.1.6 Socio-economic status

Socio-economic status refers to the level of esteem and material well being enjoyed by a person or family in the society (Scott et. al., 1989). Occupation, wealth and education represent the most common indicators of the socio-economic status. Although socio-economic status has often been investigated as a direct or indirect predictor of adaptation, it is hard to assess what effects it will have on migration outcomes. It is generally accepted that pre-migratory socio-economic status will have a positive effect on later adaptation to the new culture through the decrease in the level of ethnic enclosure (e.g. Knight et al., 1993; Massey and Denton, 1992), increase in the number of occupational opportunities, and other means. The problem with the studies of socio-economic status rests in frequent confounding of personality factors and socio-economic variables: it may well be that the personality variables such as high self-esteem, self-efficacy or locus of control are more likely to be found among the individuals with the higher socio-economic status, which has an effect on behavioural outcomes in any social context. A methodological drawback of many studies assessing its effect lies in the common practise to gauge only the father's socio-economic status within a family.
2.3.3.2 Environmental stressors and facilitators

Immigration has traditionally been understood in terms of culture-shock, defined as an experience of a sudden shift in contingencies that customarily reinforce social behaviour, and are related to lack of knowledge or uncertainty about mutual expectations, value-differences, status loss, and other factors with specific psychological consequences such as anxiety, depression, learned helplessness, etc. (Furnham and Bochner, 1986). However, this notion has been too broad and descriptive to provide a useful analytical tool for the study of the processes emergent in culture-contact situations such as migration. The widespread acceptance of the concept of culture-shock has its roots in the taken-for-granted assumption that a new social context represents a source of stress and anxiety for a migrant. A wide range of studies have attempted to qualify the parameters in the environment that would lead to stress. Only recently some authors have recognised the possibility of beneficial effects of migration (i.e. change of the environment) for the newcomers. This, of course, depends on the nature of their movement (see section 2.3.3.4.1).

Here, a number of variables will be presented as potential environmental stressors and facilitators.

2.3.3.2.1 Social support and inter-personal relationships

The number, variety and depth of social interactions of immigrants with host nationals are important variables related to adaptation. The impact of social support has been investigated in relation to two major outcomes: acculturative stress and identity-change. The two, of course, have often been seen to co-exist, as illustrated in the studies of identity-conflict and conflicted loyalties, often thought to relate to the higher levels of distress and mental/physical disorder.

It is a widely accepted belief that a positive relationship with the host-nationals leads to successful adaptation. It has been recognised that the pattern of interaction (with both
the host and the ethnic community members) determines the level of stress experienced by a member of an immigrant minority. Kim (1977) contended that "the extent to which members of an ethnic group are acculturated will depend on the extent to which they participate in the communication channels of the host society" (p.73), and identified major determinants of the immigrant's communication patterns: language, motivation and channels of accessibility. Such a conclusion, of course, relies upon the conceptualisation of adaptation as a measure of assimilation into the host-culture (its complete acceptance). A number of studies, however, have shown that the social support and specifically the old social ties represents an important aspect of the migrants' smooth transition into the new environment. Hormouth (1990) reviewed the studies that showed how maintenance or continuity in the old social network contributed positively to coping with the new environment. He cited Jones (1980) who conducted interviews with newcomer families in an Australian city. She described how people gradually replaced old social ties by the new social ties that served the same function as those from the old social network.

Recognising different functions that the social support might serve Furnham and Bochner (1986) showed that immigrants developed two rather separate social networks - one composed of host-nationals, and the other of the co-culturals. The different functions of these networks were reflected, they argued, in the dilemma of the degree of ethnic and host-culture identification. They claimed that the ethnic co-nationals' network provided the emotional and intimate support, whereas the host-members' ties had an instrumental function in that they provided the necessary information on how to go about the new culture.

Their conclusions are problematic not least due to the growing evidence that the co-culturals may not always provide emotional support and that the host-nationals' support is not always exclusively instrumental. Scott et al. (1989) reported their longitudinal study in which they encountered no significant correlation between the prior presence of friends and relatives in Australia and various measures of adaptation. In another study of
Hmong refugees in Minnesota (Westermeyer, Vanga and Neider, 1983), it was shown that the lowest levels of pathology were found among the immigrants with little access to cultural informants and greater distance from other Hmong. Such a surprising finding was explained in the light of the impediments that ethnic communities might create for an individual’s social mobility within the host culture.

Furthermore, segmentation of social support into emotional and instrumental by source of support may often prove highly threatening and counter-productive for immigrants. Investigating the social support among Polish immigrants from three waves of migration to US, Aroian (1992) concluded that segmentation of emotional and instrumental support by source contributed to conflict among people from different waves of migration, reducing the opportunity for newly arrived immigrants to experience a greatly needed social support. That is, the benefits of social support might be the greatest if the same source provided a range of functions, at least initially. She also reported on the prevalence of competition and jealousy among ethnic community members, concluding that co-nationals could not be assumed to be automatic sources of support. Similar finding is reported by Boekstijn (1988) who argued that a crucial condition for the feeling of acceptance – the most important aspect of positive adaptation - is the forming of informal, intimate personal relations; it is of secondary importance with whom (co-culturals or hosts) such closer relationships are formed.

Other studies attempted to model the relationship between the availability and nature of social networks and identity-change. The role of the family and the immediate social network in identity-maintenance and change has been recorded many times (e.g. Knight et al., 1993; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1990). Boekstijn (1988) reviewed some literature on the influence of family and peers on children’s ethnic identity; these studies confirmed the assumption that greater interaction with the host-nationals leads to the weakening of ethnic identification in children and greater assimilation. Knight et al. (1993) showed that the ethnic family background functions as a mediator of their children's ethnic identity. Novakovic (reported by Bochner, 1982) in a study of young
Yugoslavs in Australia reported that ethnic identity maintenance to a large extent depended on ethnic composition of the respondents' peer-group. The assumption that the reliance upon the old social networks results in identity-maintenance is, however, disputed: it could be argued that the old social ties act as a mediator of identity-change in that they provide an individual with the sense of continuity, while the structures of a new social network are being evolved in order to provide a support for the newly emerging identity-aspects (Jones, 1980).

The contradictory and inconclusive findings presented above point to the need for alternative conceptual and operational definitions of social support. As shown above, conceptualising social support in terms of the quantity and the nature of the social network such as the number of friends, the function (e.g. instrumental, material, emotional) of different sources of social support or availability of resources, is limited. The subjective dimension of support is of crucial importance: Turner (1983) argued that the experience of social support - i.e. the importance or centrality of specific social ties - might be a better predictor of stress. He provided at least two reasons why this should be so: the measures of the subjective dimensions of social support (the actual experience of support) constitute useful criteria for assessing the relative personal utility of various resource or network characteristics. Furthermore, such an approach would preclude the confounding of measures of social support and some personality variables (e.g. whether the decrease in the number of close friends causes neuroticism, or is caused by it), or attitudes toward self. This stems from the basic recognition that the amount of support received does not always relate to the perceptions of being supported.

Furthermore, how the social support network becomes supportive, why it does so, and its role in adaptation ought to be understood in relation to an individual's self-concept: why certain interactions are perceived as supportive and others are not will largely depend on the meanings system that this communication network establishes.
2.3.3.2.2 **Negative life events**

It has commonly been assumed that significant life events that often lead to the sudden change in people's environment contribute to the incidence of chronic illness, including mental illness (see the reviews by Scott et al., 1989 and Berry, 1998). Such effects are not only limited to negative life events, but also include significant positive changes, if they are substantial. Scott et al. reviewed the studies showing high correlation between the unit of life change (negative or positive) and illness, concluding that the frequency of stressful life-events is related to neurotic symptoms. However, Dohrenwend et al. (1984), warned against "source contamination": obtaining the data from a single source may confound the measures of the independent and the dependent variable. The neurotic people may be more likely to report stress symptoms, as well as negative life-events. Possibly, some other personality variables such as "openness to experience" may systematically bias those who report more stress when encountered with significant life-changes than those who do not, while the measure of the link between negative life-events and reported stress fails to capture this (mediating) effect. How personality variables interact with people's adaptation will be reviewed in the following section.

On more theoretical grounds, it has been argued that the predominant emphasis on life-events as causes of stress and strain is overrated as an antecedent of stress (Pearlin, 1983). The quality of life-event, rather than its occurrence, could be a better determinant of whether or not a life event will result in stress (Dohrenwend and Pearlin, 1982). They need to be perceived by an individual and ascribed a subjective (and social) meaning in order to become a part of an individual's reality: external events are subjectively interpreted and understood (Bar-Tal and Jacobson, 1998). Furthermore, life-events are constitutive of our socio-cultural and structural context, so that when life-events result in stress, they do so within specific socio-structural niche. Pearlin suggested that our understanding of the processes leading to stress would be more meaningful if socio-structural determinants such as social roles are examined alongside life-events. In this thesis, the major life-events for the group of immigrants studied will be examined, and
some evidence will be presented that indeed different life-events are responded to differently (in terms of the perceived threat).

2.3.3.2.3 Status inconsistency and confused roles

One of the possible causes of stress arises from the role conflict that can emerge in the process of co-existence of two distinct sets of cultural norms and systems. Both Park (1928, 1950) and Stonequist (1964) dedicated a large part of their analysis to the problem of conflicted roles. Both recognised a dialectic nature of the immigrants' situation: on one hand, it has an emancipating effect, giving a person a potential for freeing themselves from the traditional and customary expectations. On the other hand, the characteristics of the new social structure impose a status dilemma upon them, since the immigrant is placed between two not completely compatible social positions. These studies triggered similar conclusions promoted in the role conflict (Hughes, 1949) and status inconsistency theories (Benoit-Smullyan, 1944; Lenski, 1954, 1956).

Starr (1977) summarised the postulates of these theories. As primarily sociological theories, they have assumed a strong role of social structure and the expectations emerging from it, as people are seen as positioned within a web of social roles and statuses, each satisfying certain socially determined function. When expectations among individuals are highly ambiguous or in conflict, interaction among those involved becomes strained. This problematic interaction, if extensive and prolonged, will be incorporated into the self-image of the actors who experience it, resulting in the experience of stress and lowering of self-esteem. The discrepancies may be related to achieved statuses (e.g. economic, educational, occupational), ascribed statuses (e.g. ethnicity and race) or both (e.g. race and class). Thus, for instance, immigrants are especially prone to marginality as an outcome of conflicting allegiances to different cultural groups. The example of a role conflict is that of an immigrant parent: conflicting desire to bring up a child in a way that maintains old traditions and values (related to one's home-culture), and the awareness of the child's need to integrate into the dominant social environment could bring about insecurities and tensions. Status
inconsistency might occur when one's prior high educational attainment and occupation are at odds in relation to the current minority status upon migration. Marginality and conflicted allegiances will be described in the following chapter. Here, some literature on conflicting roles and status inconsistency will be presented.

One of the domains of the study of role conflict has been the relationship between immigrants and their families. Family pressures to retain traditional values cause continual conflict between the need to socially accommodate to the new culture and economically progress, and to retain close inter-personal ties (within the family). Suk-Ho Jun (1984) studied communication patterns and generation gap among the first and second-generation Korean immigrants. Her findings showed that, although there was no difference in communication patterns with the American people among the two generations, communication gaps between the adult immigrants and their children were significant over the years regardless of sex. This difference was explained as a consequence of the conflict in the process of acculturation between the English-speaking children and their Korean-speaking parents. Conflicting demands to bring up their children in line with the ethnic and religious traditions and to simultaneously foster their quick integration into the new society places strain upon parents resulting in increasing stress, emotional disturbances and feelings of isolation, as shown by Hattar-Pollara and Meleis (1995).

Some studies, however, have recognised that family ideology is subject to change as well. Rosenthal and Feldman (1990) reported that family structure of the Chinese respondents varied depending on the length of residence in the host country. However, although the study showed rapid change in acceptance of individualistic norms as a function of time, there was little evidence of family structure change. Thus, family ideology is not static, but subject to change, and it can evolve to achieve equilibrium with the expectations of the dominant society, while retaining its old structure in order to maintain its basic supportive function. In another study, Rosenthal (1984) reported that inter-generational conflict among Australian immigrant families was no greater than...
among Australian-born families, questioning the notion of the prevalence of the role conflict in immigrant families.

Among the most researched areas of status inconsistency is that of class-race discrepancy: that is, how the disadvantaged position on one dimension (e.g. race) is reconciled with the more privileged position on another (e.g. class). Such an interest is understandable, given an abundance of evidence that the minority group status affects one’s position on other social dimensions such as material well being (income), social status and others. For instance, in their comprehensive review of objective racial and ethnic inequality in US (as measured by socio-economic status), Waters and Eschbach (1995) showed that disadvantage was great even among the most educated and achievement-oriented racial/ethnic groups, such as that of Asians. They showed that the minority groups such as Indian men and women needed more education to receive the same income as whites, and usually had smaller income than the whites for the same occupation. It has been argued that such discrepancy could often result in self-rejection or self-hatred (Lewin, 1948, cited in Rosenberg, 1979). However, Rosenberg presented evidence that provided no support for such hypothesis in his study of school children in US. Comparing the achievement (school marks and election to club-office) and racial identity (pride in one’s race) for their effect upon self-esteem, he showed that the youngster’s social and academic achievements – which represent the major realms of achievement at this age – were certainly associated with global self-esteem, either as cause or as effect. On the other hand, racial and religious status had little effect upon their global feeling of worth. Given that the racial and religious statuses could in no sense be interpreted by an individual as products of their own efforts or expression of their essential characteristics, the lack of relationship here was to be expected.

The inconsistent empirical support of the role/status conflict theory comes from the embedded social determinism of this approach: this line of thinking rests on the highly static conceptualisation of society. These issues will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter (section 3.4). It is important to note that the current research-
programme has been undertaken with the aim of rectifying social determinism commonly found in much sociological work on migration.

2.3.3.3 Personality variables

Personality is defined as the relatively enduring, relatively distinct characteristics of an individual that have a rather pervasive effect on behaviour. There is a wide range of literature on personality influences on adaptive outcomes of migration: constructs such as anxiety, self-esteem, traditionalism, ethnocentrism, Type A personality, to name but a few are the dimensions on which individuals have been found to vary, and which have been tied to different psycho-social responses to migration. Most of these studies have linked personality variables to the level of stress in immigrants, life satisfaction, maintenance of ethnic identity and general psychosocial well being. Adorno et al. (1950) for instance, provided a substantive empirical support for the existence of an authoritarian personality, a product of an interplay between biological, genetic and social factors. The authors hypothesised that the ethnocentric tendencies would inhibit the migrants' coping with new social norms, values and language. Rokeach (1960), similarly, predicted that attitudes reflecting "closed mind" led to less successful adaptation. Some authors emphasised interactive abilities of individuals based on a number of personality characteristics. Argyle (1982) defined "cultural competence" as the ability of an individual to deal with the representatives from different cultures, and quotes Hammer, Gudykunst and Wiseman (1978) who recognised three dimensions of inter-cultural competence: ability to deal with psychological stress, ability to communicate effectively and ability to establish interpersonal relationships. In one of his classifications of individual outcomes of migration, Bochner (1982) defined a "mediating" person as an individual with a capacity to act as a link between different cultural systems. Such an individual is most likely to be well integrated into the cultural system of the host society: they manage to retain their respective ethnic characteristics, but simultaneously merging into the new culture. On the opposite pole of this dimension lies the concept of "marginal personality", first defined by Stonequist (1964) and Park
(1950), reflecting an individual's inability to resolve the conflict between the two cultures - that of origin and the host culture - consequently leading to various forms of psychological dysfunction.

Neto (1995) compared immigrant and native born Portuguese youth in Paris, testing background, personality and some other psychosocial variables as predictors of life satisfaction. Of the three personality variables in the model (loneliness, social anxiety and locus of control), only the former was a strong predictor of satisfaction with life. The authors explained the trait as one of the indicators of cultural competence or a degree of social skills. Padilla, Watsuma and Lindholm (1985) tested a relationship between self-esteem and stress among three generations of Japanese-Americans, and found significant correlations between the two. Some personality factors were related to the way some stressors and threats are perceived, indicating that personality dispositions interact with situational factors, with its reciprocal effects on adjustment. Furthermore, the relationship between personality variables and favourability of attitudes towards the new culture has been tested and there is a substantial evidence that personality variables do affect people's conceptual framework as well (for review see Church, 1982). Of course, if loneliness and other similar constructs defining personality are defined as a trait, rather than an aspect of identity state (for instance, an emotion pertaining to a particular self-evaluation), adaptation processes or coping lose their theoretical significance.

Although the research on the relationship between personality and migration outcomes has been substantial, the findings are rather scanty and disconnected. Scott et al. (1989) argued that a number of conceptual and methodological problems plague the studies of the effects of personality factors on migration outcomes. On the methodological ground, the interpretation of the results is often problematic, since most of the studies have confounded personality traits and the effects they tend to predict - the psychosocial adaptation. For instance, adjustment is often operationalised in terms of psychological well being which includes the measurement of self-esteem, depression, anxiety, etc.,
most often treated as personality constructs. Even when the theoretical distinction is made clear, the processes of measurement are likely to confuse the independent and the dependent variable because the measures typically come from the same source at the same time ("source contamination"). Another reason they quote with respect to the confounding effect is the fact that personality characteristics can only be inferred from behaviour or self-reports, the measurement similar to that of adjustment. Furthermore, the artificiality of the findings may also stem from the respondents' need for cognitive consistency (between the reports of personality and adjustment characteristics), thus contaminating the results even further. Most importantly, the relationships between the variables are mostly studied outside a theoretical framework. Any theoretical model that has been proposed had to be restricted to a few variables, leading to the possible confounding of personality variables with demographic, cultural, developmental and other characteristics.

It is therefore necessary, the authors continue, that the measure of the predictor (the personality variable) is obtained prior to the measure of the outcome (adaptation). Furthermore, the measures of the cause and effect of a relationship that is investigated should be obtained from different sources: for instance, the personality measure of anxiety should be tested on the basis of physiological reactions and adaptation from the self-reported measures. The measures should also incorporate the objective and subjective effects: for instance, a measurement of anxiety and depression should incorporate both subjective measure (perceived stress given in self-reports) and objective measure (based on the measurements of the respondents' unconscious or physiological responses, on the reports and evaluations of the "significant others", etc.).

In line with their critique, Scott et al. reported their findings from the longitudinal study of Australian immigrants, where they tested five personality dimensions: emotional well-being, self-esteem, optimism, interpersonal dependence and values pertaining to selected foci of adaptation. The most attention was given to the role performances (as assessed by objective observers as well as by subjective self-reports) and to the test of
personality characteristics before migration. The study confirmed that personality variables had an effect on migration outcomes independent of background variables: background variables have been mediated by emotional well-being, optimism and affiliate independence before migration.

Although studies like this one can be useful in determining the possible sources of stability in the self-concept and their relationship to behaviour, they provide little basis for understanding the processes of the self-concept change. They say little about the change in cognitive representation of the self and the emotional processes accompanying this change, which is important, as it provides an indicator of the amount of coping employed in the process of adapting to the new social environment. Studies like these actually give little insight into the processes constitutive of the self-environment interaction, and as such, add little in terms of possible predictions of this dynamic. In order to rectify this, it is important to conceive of the self as a dynamic process affecting relationships between different aspects within an overall identity-structure. It is also necessary to recognise that this dynamics is not happening in a socio-historical vacuum (see chapter three, in particular section 3.6).

2.3.3.4 Acculturation outcomes

2.3.3.4.1 Stress: subjective and objective measures
Most commonly, the assessment of the success of adaptation has focused on the incidence of stress, and mental and physical health. As already mentioned elsewhere in this review, the majority of migration literature emphasises the negative impact of migration upon one’s mental and physical well being. However, there is no conclusive evidence that migration necessarily results in stress with the negative consequences for the physical and mental states of migrants. Some of these studies will be examined briefly here: the objective and subjective measures of stress and health-outcomes of acculturation will be reviewed. For full review the reader is referred to Berry (1998) and Scott et al. (1989).
Objective measures of stress have been mostly provided in the form of demographic indicators of mental and physical health (such as admissions to psychiatric hospitals, the incidence and rate of alcohol/drug abuse, suicide, abortion, evidence of youth offence and adult criminal and drug abuse). Other measures such as socio-economic well being (e.g. employment rate, income, housing) also have been investigated in relation to adaptation. Lot of these studies present evidence for the changes in the physical and mental condition of migrants upon their arrival. Berry (1998) quoted Statistics Canada (1996) which showed that the Canadian-born individuals have 7% higher prevalence of a variety of chronic diseases than immigrants do, but that these differences are reduced the longer the immigrants have lived in Canada. There is some evidence that the changes in the health status of immigrants usually migrate in the direction of the norm in the dominant society (see Kliewer, 1992 for overview).

Odegaard (1932) studied the immigrants from Norway to the US, and found higher mental-hospital admission for schizophrenia among the Norwegian immigrants than among the native-born Americans. He concluded that people who were predisposed to mental health problems were those who migrated. A different school of thought were soon to come from the marginal man framework (Park, 1950, 1928; Stonequist, 1964), which argued that the higher levels of mental disorders, psychiatric treatment, and maladaptive behaviour among immigrants, ethnic minorities and biculturals is due to the taxing nature of adaptive process in terms of conflicted identification. However, Golovensky (1952) provided exhaustive statistics of the adult crime rate, juvenile crime, admissions to mental hospitals and longevity of the Jewish ethnic minority in the US in his test of the theory. He found no evidence for the embedded assumptions about the negative outcomes for this population of immigrants (both the first and the second generation) in comparison to the norm. He concluded that “the marginal man concept, in its broadest sense, is a sociological fiction based upon a stereotype, which, like most stereotypes is a caricature of a truth or an exaggeration and distortion of a fact” (p. 335).
Subjective measures of stress: similar inconsistency of findings plagues the measures of stress, depression, anxiety and other mental disorders among immigrants. A variety of samples (e.g. Chinese, Mexican, Indonesian, European) have been used, as well as different tools of assessment (e.g. Mental Disorders-III-Revisited, Langner Scale, HSCL Depression Scale).

A large number of clinically based studies have investigated the refugee-population in terms of the post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). These often occur as a consequence of exposure to a traumatic life-event that threatens one's life or puts them in the position of witnessing the death or threat of death of those around or close to him/her (see Berry, 1998). The posttraumatic stress is a syndrome that involves intrusive recollections of the stressor events, which evoke panic, terror, grief or despair. It is manifested in daytime fantasies, traumatic nightmares and psychotic re-enactments, and often is coped with by avoidance or denial. Despite the abundance of evidence that PTSD causes serious disruption to one's adaptation, it seems that such a conclusion should be restricted only to the short-term time-scale. There is a growing literature of refugee-adaptation which shows that they are capable of a successful long-term adjustment (e.g. Beiser, 1994, as quoted by Berry, 1998). Similarly, it is not clear whether those who have made a conscious choice of emigrating to a particular country ("pull factors" including voluntary migration) necessarily experience fewer psychological and socio-cultural problems. Kim (1988) for instance showed that those with both "push" motivation (involuntary migrants such as refugees) and with "pull" motivation (voluntary migrants) had almost as great a number of problems.

With respect to a broader population of migrants (both voluntary and involuntary), the findings are similarly disputable. Although a number of studies have linked some of the mental conditions with migration, it has become increasingly evident that individual factors as well as cultural background of the population under investigation play a major part in determining the occurrence of mental illness. Berry (1998) for instance cited the studies which showed that the acculturative orientation of integration is most predictive
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l in terms of a) stress – mental and physical well-being, or b) psycho-
social well being (e.g. satisfaction with life, satisfaction with one's environment, number and nature of social ties, etc.). However, we have seen that findings that pertain to explanation of the acculturative outcomes are often contradictory and rarely comprehensive. This is often due to the contestable methods of investigating the process under investigation:

- Frequent overgeneralization from a limited sample (in terms of age, size, socio-economic status, or a nation-group)
- Culturally sensitive measures often lacking: willingness and ability of self-disclosure may yield different results among different cultural groups. It is necessary to devise measures which are sensitive to the specific characteristics of the sample – of both its cultural and historical context in which they are being examined. This could be achieved by multitude of methodologies – combining both qualitative and quantitative forms of measurement, which glean both the subjective meanings and the quantifiable measures of relationships between concepts.
- Confounding measures: difficulty in establishing the independent effects of often overlapping variables. This often stems from weak conceptualisations of the phenomena under investigation.
- The emphasis is frequently on contextual changes in migration, as measured at one point in time. Longitudinal designs are the most suited approach to the study of real change, although there are problems imbedded in the longitudinal cross-cultural studies as well: the individual's increase in language fluency and familiarity with the new culture can lead to changes in meanings of the scores (prospective designs). Also, attrition of immigrants makes generalisations of findings limited as they are derived from the experiences of successful immigrants only (retrospective design)(see chapter five, section 5.2). It is suggested here that more emphasis should be placed upon people's experience of change in order to understand their ways of dealing with it.
- Also, the differences in extreme responses may vary as a function of situation as well - a study should test the phenomenon across a wide range of behavioural domains.
Some conceptual problems prevail as well:

- Most of the studies have emphasised migration outcomes: a few of them have tried to model the individual-environment interaction. Even when they have (e.g. the studies of social support), it has been shown that alternative conceptualisations are needed.
- Most of the studies from within this perspective analyse the individual-level factors associated with adaptation (such as adaptational predictors or its outcomes). The socio-structural framework within which adaptation enfolds is frequently ignored. For this reason, their predictions are scanty and the predictors often confounded.
- Even when social variables are taken into account (e.g. social support or confused roles), the meanings of these socio-contextual variables and how different meanings emerge are rarely investigated. For instance, the importance of social ties and the identity-aspects reinforced by these is rarely acknowledged.
- Whereas group-level analysis focused on identity-change and coping behaviour, the individual-level analysis removed the notion of identity, instead focusing upon adaptation predictors and outcomes. This way, indirectly, a static, non-agentic understanding of the self is assumed.
- As the problem of identity-adaptation is not explored, the actual threat and processes of coping with it that underline identity-maintenance and change have attracted little real interest in migration literature. The complex interaction between coping and threat is not investigated.
- As mentioned above, there is very little attempt to devise empirically testable models of adaptation and coping with change, and this has led to multiplication of variables that are being examined and a few firm predictions.

2.4 General summary of the chapter

The presented review of migration literature has pointed to a range of conceptual and methodological problems encountered in its efforts to understand adaptation processes of immigrants. Part of the problem stems from the lack of integrative theoretical framework (as at the individual-level analysis), and partly it is the product of
problematic and weak methodological and conceptual definitions of the variables. It will be argued here that the process of adaptation is best understood through the concept of identity, as the construct incorporates the dynamic relationship between the intra-psychic processes and socio-historical context. Most prior literature on migration has failed to clarify this complex relationship. It is further argued here that people’s own conceptualisations of adaptation and change – both within their self-conceptualisations and the environment in which these changes occur, will be a good model of identity-adaptation. In order to understand identity-change and processes of adaptation, the perception of threat and responses to it should be given more attention, as these processes might be conceptualised as transmitters of identity-changes. In the next section, a more detailed examination of the way in which the self-society interaction has been theorised in social psychology will be examined, and a working model of adaptation presented, whereby a distinction will be made between identity-adaptation (i.e. identity-change) and adaptation process (i.e. the coping process).
The following chapter focuses upon the theories of adaptation. Only the most prominent socio-psychological theories will be presented, as the most influential conceptual frameworks used to generalise to specific migratory situations and groups. Finally, a working model of adaptation will be proposed as the conceptual framework used in this research programme to examine processes of adaptation and identity-change (identity-adaptation). This model will rely upon identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986), whose basic tenets will be elaborated and systematically investigated further in this thesis.

3.1 Adaptation and acculturation strategies

In an attempt to bring together the disparate findings within migration literature under a single theoretical model (or "framework"), Berry (1997) devised one of the most influential models of adaptation. He defined adaptation as "relatively stable changes that take place in an individual or group in response to environmental demands" (p.20). The "process" of adaptation is characterised by five "features": experiences of life-events related to acculturation; appraisal of these life-events (evaluation of stressors); coping with these stressors (acculturation strategies); and long-term outcomes or adaptation. A number of other variables were also incorporated into the model as moderating and mediating factors. This section will deal with each of these aspects of the model in turn.

The relationship between life-events and stress (often treated as the measure of adjustment) has received lots of attention (see section 2.3.3.2.2). On methodological grounds, the measure of stress experienced with the occurrence of a negative or major life-event is often confounded with the person's psychological state or personality.
(when the measure of stress is taken post-hoc) (see Thoits, 1983a for a review). For instance, neurotic people may be more inclined to report negative life-events and stress. Also, biased recall of negative life-events emerges when people report more stressful events and the related experience of stress then is actually the case, especially when they are trying to explain the current psychological state with reference to the past – depressed people are more likely to report higher incidence of negative life events and stress than the normal population of people. Another subtle methodological problem encountered in subjective reporting of stress and negative life-events stems from the confounding of the stressful nature of the event and the actual occurrence of distress. Overall, a frequently mentioned problem of this kind of research is the difficulty in establishing the causal link between negative life events and stress.

On a more theoretical ground, it has been argued that focusing on psychological stress and the number of negative life-events as its predictor variable, is a limited and not very telling way of understanding the complexities of the process of adaptation to life transitions. Stress, as Lazarus (1997) contends is a unidimensional concept ranging from low to high, and thus its power as an explanatory concept of coping is weak and vague. Psychosomatic measures of stress are not evolved enough, and do not incorporate complex meanings that different encounters assume, with their complex and varied effects upon acculturation outcomes. Thoits (1983a, 1991) similarly argued that limited predictive power of occurrence of stressful life-event with respect to the incidence of distress stems from the way that stress-inducing events have been measured: emphasising the linear relationship between the number of stressful life-events and distress (i.e. the “accumulation of life-events” hypothesis that the increase in a number of life-events will lead to an increase in strain upon an individual and the greater resulting distress) can not explain the status and group differences in experiences of stress. It is expected that low-status groups will be more prone to the experiences of stress not only due to the nature of their position in the social structure which presume higher exposure to stressful events and greater vulnerability, but also
due to the lack of coping resources (such as material and social support). However, she argues that a high number of negative life-events prevalent among low-status groups is not directly correlated with the reported distress among these groups. Rather, the specific type of life event is more likely to be predictive of stress and different groups' susceptibility to it. Furthermore, she maintains that explaining the factors leading to coping and stress in order to explain adaptation outcomes through an *appraisal model* of coping does not tackle the question of why certain life events have a disturbing effect, and instead focuses upon the issue of when they do (e.g. when coping is mobilised, event appraised as threatening, etc.). The problem with this line of research rests in the fact that it does not explain how events come to matter psychologically, and why. In line with this, understanding the actual meaning of life events for an individual (e.g. its undesirability, controllability, predictability, time sequence), rather than relying on their numbers, taxonomy, or a single-dimensional description of life-events in terms of the degree of difficulty they pose, is necessary in order to tap the true relationship between stressful life-events and stress. The meaning of a particular life-event, however, must be understood with respect to identity-processes, which will be the basis of this thesis.

Acculturation strategies were defined in this model as the decision on behalf of both dominant and non-dominant groups as to how to relate to each other, that is, how to "acculturate". The four acculturation strategies of assimilation, integration, marginalisation and segregation were outlined, and their functioning defined on the basis of two issues: the extent of cultural maintenance people endorse, and the amount of contact and participation (involvement with the alter-culture). As already mentioned in the previous chapter (section 2.3.1.4), these strategies were mostly measured through attitudinal scales. Adaptation was seen as largely dependent upon the "fit" between the dominant and non-dominant-group's choice of ways of acculturation. Berry hoped that, by introducing the concept of "fit", he could account for the cultural and environmental constraints inherent in a specific inter-group
contact. However, a number of theoretical problems lurk from within this conceptualisation of coping in adaptation.

First, Berry’s concept of culture is limited: his model succeeds in reification of culture as a defined set of norms and behavioural expectations. He failed to recognise that culture is invariably “individuated”, that is, interpreted in a more-or-less idiosyncratic way by its participants, subject to their reconstructions, and thus, much more fluid, dynamic and processual phenomenon than Berry initially conceptualised. This “fluidity” of culture, then, emerges out of the process of socialisation: communication and interaction; Berry’s distinction between “culture maintenance” and “contact” – i.e. cultural and social dimension of acculturation strategies is therefore a very interesting theoretical artefact, which in reality may not be so easy to maintain (see Reicher et al, 1997).

Berry’s concept of “fit” is also problematic for another reason: when interacting with the members of the out-group, people may not consciously define the situation as inter-group. That is, they a) may not have made a conscious decision of adopting a particular attitude with respect to interaction (which is implicit in Berry’s model); b) may never interpret their interactive pattern in terms delineated by Berry – such as ‘integration’, for instance; c) simply may not categorise their behaviour in a new culture as based on what they consider their culture and alter-culture to be. That is, we must not assume that their “culture” is salient when we observe that they behave in a particular way. Since Berry did not take identity as his starting point, this ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ dimension of people’s behaviour could often be confused. That is, even if people act according to the standards of their culture, whether it will be perceived as such by those in question, and how it will impact upon their perception of their own level of adaptation, would be difficult to estimate.

Berry recognised that different acculturation strategies may be employed in different domains of behaviour. So for instance, when he said that people might seek more
cultural maintenance in more private spheres than in public domain (e.g. such as work place or in politics), he implicitly assumed that all these contexts were defined in terms of just one type of group/category or social identity – that of ethnic/cultural group. However, people may seek to define the context in a variety of ways, whereby "home-culture" (as understood by Berry) may not be the only defining criterion of its definition. Different people may have different preferred ways in which they define a broad range of contexts, depending on the relative importance and salience of the identity in terms of which people act. But most probably, people's evaluation of their context is not only based on one specific group or culture they adhere to, but their organised system, as these specific "elements" (i.e. ethnic, gender) interrelate in a person's overall identity.

The issue that may be raised here, of course, is that of what Berry had in mind when using the concept of "culture". He made no attempt to define the term that he so liberally used: should culture imply specific characteristics of a group in terms of its ethnicity or nationality, or be treated in terms of a broader system of norms and beliefs extant within a circumscribed geographical realm? Even if the concept employed is the latter, broader definition of the culture, one needs to be cautious in the extent to which any single culture is perceived as a unified, consensual phenomenon. Culture is a process, and not only a "structure" or "set" of clearly specified beliefs, norms, ways of being. It is often comprised of many groups, each with their norms and beliefs, which frequently stand in relation of conflict to each other. Cultures may differ in terms of their cohesiveness, but by and large, they are not a clearly defined, unified system. Especially in the current, modern society, where a few societies stand isolated from the process of globalisation, the consensual conceptualisation of culture seems unsustainable.

It is accepted here that it is possible that "individuals may well be constrained in their choice of strategy, even to the point where there is a very limited role for personal preference. Indeed, when personal preferences are in conflict with national policies,
stress may well be the result”, (p. 12). However, it remains an empirical question to explain as to what extent people indeed perceive these broad, ‘macro societal’ constraints. Rosenberg (1979) emphasised that individuals rarely get to experience society in its totality, and the immediate inter-personal, local environment of an individual might be the most important defining social context for their behaviour and self-perceptions. Reicher et al (1997) also argued that “the concept of society must not only include macro-social structures and ideologies but also the micro-social processes of debate and argumentation in which identities are defined”, (p.102). We are not arguing against the notion of socio-cultural and historical constraints imposed upon individuals, but we also emphasise people’s resourcefulness in their adaptation processes (choice of behaviour in the new culture), which will also largely depend upon the subjective experience of their immediate, local environment. Although Berry would argue that different acculturation strategies encompass exactly this variation in adaptation, he insists that certain acculturation strategies are more adaptive than others (e.g. integration), thus failing to properly understand the real society-individual dynamics.

Furthermore, Berry stated that people explore various strategies before they finally settle for one that is most adaptive for them. People are indeed agentic and constructive, and this is the stance adopted in this thesis. However, this purposefulness can be overestimated. Strategies are not the “thing to be used”. They mean different things to different individuals in different domains. “Settling for a strategy” implies a teleological, linear approach to adaptation, even though Berry argued that his model was not a ‘stage’ model. He may not have described the specific sequence of stages, but still, the effect of his statement that “they eventually settle on one [coping strategy] that is more useful and satisfying than the others”, (p 12) implies a static, non-process conception of adaptation – of both an individual and a culture. Cultures may change (e.g. from liberal to fascist), and an individual’s interpretation of their position as “settled” is only possible in a static society. But, as Giddens (1991) argued, “modernity’s reflexivity refers to the susceptibility of most
aspects of social activity, and material relations with nature, to chronic revision in the light of new information or knowledge. Such information or knowledge is not incidental to modern institutions, but constitutive of them – a complicated phenomenon, because many possibilities of reflection about reflexivity exist in modern social conditions (p20). [...] The reflexivity of modernity extends into the core of the self (p32). [...] In the settings of modernity, [...] the altered self has to be explored and constructed as part of a reflexive process of connecting personal and social change” (p.33). It is the dynamics between an individual and society that is missing from Berry’s framework, and which he seems to be overlooking by making statements about final settling for the most useful strategies of acculturation.

Berry adopted Searle and Ward’s (1990) distinction between psychological and socio-cultural adaptation. Although this may seem a useful distinction, it is an artefact of the implicit assumption that there exists a “private” self as different and opposed to the “public, social” self. He claimed that psychological adaptation could be predicted by personality variables, life change events and social support while good socio-cultural adaptation was predicted by cultural knowledge, degree of contact and inter-group attitudes. Such distinction resembles the issue of individual vs. collective identity, explored in detail in section 3.3.3 in this thesis. Here, it is useful to pose a few questions about the empirical applicability of these two constructs. For instance, feeling self-efficacious (as an aspect of psychological adjustment) is often precipitated on a success in social domains: inter-personal contacts, work-place, intimate relationships. Even Berry himself recognised that, although conceptually distinct, the psychological and socio-cultural aspects of adaptation were empirically related, with correlation between the constructs as high as +.5.

Berry listed a number of moderating and mediating variables which span an individual and social level factors. He hoped to explain the way in which self-society interaction evolved in the process of adaptation. However, he made no attempt to explain in his process-oriented framework the functions and links between social and
individual variables he listed as necessary moderators or mediators of the process of acculturation. Instead, he listed a number of empirical studies that supported the assumption that these factors/variables were important.

Furthermore, as Schonpflug (1997) argued, the emphasis on stress, life events and appraisal was modelled to predict short-term, situational coping, but whether it readily translates into long-term efforts of acculturation still remains to be empirically tested. Seeing life-events as the acculturation experience triggering stressors and coping and treating them as discrete occurrences, fails to see a person's change and adaptation in continuity, and projects a conceptualisation of life events as devoid of social and identity processes (Pearlin, 1989). As both stress and long-term adaptation were measured as one-dimensional constructs (e.g. successful vs. unsuccessful adaptation), they are vague and often value-laden constructs in social science. This model failed to explain the psychological processes and their social underpinning, functional in the experience of stress and adaptation. The emphasis upon appraisal is too undifferentiated to be accepted as a viable explanation. Although Berry accepts the notion of "change" in the process of adaptation, how this comes about, and how it is negotiated by an individual is left unexplored.

I would argue here that the concept of identity should be introduced, as it is theorised in a way that encompasses an active, dynamic relationship between an individual and the environment, and since it specifies the psychological and social mechanisms in the process of negotiating change. Threat should replace the highly ambiguous concept of stress. This is because traditionally, the literature of threat has more explicitly accepted the "social" in its definition: its nature has been seen to largely depend upon the social context (in its broader sense) in which it is encountered, as well as the content of an individual's identity (Branscombe et al, 1999). Defined in this way, understanding what constitutes threats to identity (the type of threat and its antecedents) as well as how they interact with people's way of coping with it (responses to threat) represents a viable model of adaptation process. This will be explored in more detail in the following sections.
3.1.1 Summary

- The "acculturation strategies" model of adaptation suffers from a number of methodological and theoretical problems: on methodological grounds, the problematic conceptualisation and measurement of life-events led to frequent confounding of the measures of stress and life events.
- Theoretically, stress and adaptation have been criticised as unidimensional constructs and "psychological appraisal" construct as vague and unspecified.
- The way certain constructs such as that of 'culture' or 'group' have been treated, has implicitly led to the conception of a society as consensual and unified; this conception fails to account for the dynamic character of the individual-society interaction.
- Acculturation strategies are seen to be "things", stored in people's behavioural and attitudinal repertoire; they, however, could be used to differing degrees in different domains, depending on the individual's definition of the context; furthermore, they are often subject to revisions, as people are constructive and agentic.
- Macro-social factors may easily be exaggerated in terms of their constraints upon an individual's choice of coping. Lots of people's evaluation of their environment and themselves is derived from their immediate social environment.
- Adaptation has implicitly been treated as a monotone-sequence process, whereby people achieve final settlement in terms of the preferred acculturation patterns. The way psychological and social processes interact is not explained.

This is where we turn to one of the most creative and resourceful theories of identity-society interaction, the theory that aims to provide specific recommendations of how the two should be linked.
3.2 Coping with minority status: Social Identity Theory

SIT (Tajfel, 1978, 1981) emphasised the universal psychological processes in interaction with social structure as an important determinant of identity processes. SIT is fundamentally an inter-group theory, predicting inter-group behaviour in various contexts (e.g. competitive). Where it more closely discusses processes of adaptation of identity is in relation to its treatment of the motivational basis of identity – self-esteem – and its role in coping with identity-threats. SIT postulates that people tend to see themselves in terms of groups or categories ("social identity"), as this is an aspect of the basic cognitive process of categorisation. People strive to achieve or maintain positive self-evaluation, derived from a social identity. In the context of inter-group relations positive identity is evaluated when group-members compare themselves to other relevant groups on a relevant comparison dimension. This comparison process will be linked to the position that the group holds in the social structure. Thus, if the in-group holds an inferior position (such as a minority group status of immigrants), group-members will be motivated to improve evaluation of their social identity. This will be done using different coping strategies to deal with the threat of inferior position, and Tajfel recognised three such strategies:

1) individual mobility, whereby each group member tries to improve his/her position individually, thus status of the groups remaining unchanged;
2) collective mobility consisting of a direct action that the group as a whole undertakes in order to change the properties of the social structure and inter-group relations and thus improving the in-group’s position;
3) collective creativity aimed at changing the evaluation of the dimension on which the two groups are compared, or re-interpretation of the inter-group situation (e.g. shifting comparisons to a different out-group or making different evaluative criterion salient).
SIT specifies structural conditions that determine the use of these three strategies: **Permeability** of in-group boundaries determines the likelihood of individual mobility from one group to another. The more permeable the boundaries – the more likely it is that individual mobility strategy will be used. **Stability** of the social structure refers to the perceived likelihood that the group’s relative status within the structure could be changed: perceived instability of social structure implies social change/collective strategy. **Legitimacy** delineates the degree to which the established inter-group relations are perceived as justified – the perceived illegitimacy of the social structure will facilitate collective coping orientation.

In comparison to acculturation model, this represents a much more clear and concrete way of specifying how individual and social factors should be related in the process of adaptation, as it postulates a number of testable predictions. However, as Mummendy et al. (1996) contended, there has been a limited number of studies attempting to systematically test the operation of the three structural variables in the context of real-life inter-group relations. The few studies that have examined interaction between the three structural conditions as determinants of choice of coping strategy, have done so in the laboratory setting (e.g. Ellemers, Wilke and Van Knippenberg, 1993; Ellemers, Van Knippenberg and Wilke, 1990; Ellemers, et al., 1988). Most of these studies operationalised strategies in terms of in-group identification, postulating that low in-group identification triggered individual mobility, whereas high identification led to the use of one of the collective strategies. The actual behaviour was only inferred. Such treatment of coping strategies also assumed that inferior in-group position indeed implied individual **awareness** of the low position and also perceived **threat** in relation to it, without directly measuring these different concepts. Some other theoretical advances (e.g. marginal man theory [Park, 1928, Stonequist, 1964]; identity process theory [Breakwell, 1986]) recognised the experiential aspect of threat as a motivator for action and as a prerequisite for identity-change.
The SIT hypotheses seem to be successfully supported in experimental settings. The main characteristic of this design, however, is its limitation of the comparison dimensions of the groups in question to just one such criterion, thus creating an impoverished social setting for inter-group comparison (Mummendy and Schreiber, 1983, 1984; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1995; Blanz, Mummendy and Otten 1995; Ellemers, Van Rijswijk, Roefs and Simons, 1997). Hence, when applied to the groups with long and dynamic histories of intra- and inter-group relations (e.g. immigrant populations and ethnic minorities), evidence is scant and contradictory. Ellemers et al. (1988) for instance showed in their experiments manipulating group-status, group permeability and individual ability, that in low status groups, in-group identification decreased for group members with higher individual ability, and thus, preference for individual mobility strategy for more able individuals was inferred. Moghaddam and Perreault (1991), however, conducted research on preference for individual or collective mobility strategy on 313 first-generation visible-minority immigrants from southern Asia, mainland China and the West Indies who lived in Canada. Their findings showed that low self-esteem (as a measure of perceived “ability” or talent of respondents) was predictive of individual-assimilation mobility strategy, whereas high self-esteem was related to respondents’ higher motivation to use collective coping strategies. A number of studies (e.g. Ellemers et al. 1988; Lalonde and Silverman, 1994; Wright, Taylor and Moghaddam, 1990) also supported the hypothesis that members of low status groups identified less with their group when group boundaries were flexible and permeable, than members of low status groups with impermeable boundaries. Lalonde et al. (1992) conducted a study on two distinct groups of visible first-generation immigrants in Canada, from Haiti and India. Unlike their expectations that immigrants with the Canadian citizenship (permeable boundaries) would show higher level of identification with the majority group (Canadian identity stronger), the evidence was not unequivocal: whereas the hypothesis was supported for the Indian sample, the Haitian immigrants showed no preference for the Canadian identity under the conditions of high permeability. Furthermore, it was to be expected that high in-group identification would be related to positive distinctiveness of a group in the
social milieu. However, although the immigrants from both Haitian and Indian ethnic
group acknowledged that membership in their ethnic group was not positively valued
by majority members of the Canadian society, they still expressed very high levels of
cultural heritage and in-group identification.

Other predictions concerning the relationship between socio-structural variables and
the choice of coping strategies have also been disputed in the real-life group
situations. The structural variable most frequently questioned was that of perceived
stability: SIT postulates that the perceived instability of the social structure would
lead to the employment of the collective action strategies. Moghaddam, Taylor and
Lalonde (1987) showed in their study of the Iranian immigrants to Canada that those
respondents who believed more in the justice and fairness of the system were more
likely to endorse heritage culture maintenance and collective strategy, whereas less
faith in the fairness and justice of the Canadian system prompted the assimilation
strategy and individualistic orientation. Similar findings emerged in the study
conducted by Mummendy, Klink, Milke, Wenzel and Blanz, (1999) in their
investigation of East German population in Germany: perceived stability fostered
collective (Voice) strategy, whereas instability encouraged individual (Exit) strategy.

Given a great deal of contradiction in findings, Mummendy et al. (1996) ventured to
more systematically test the SIT main assumptions about the predictability of coping
strategies under the threat of negative social identity by strength of social
identification and structural properties of the inter-group relation in the natural
context. The unequal group status of the East and West Germans was thought to be
one such context that Tajfel had in mind when postulating his hypotheses about inter-
group contact. Overall, the authors concluded that no predictor concept was in
accordance with the SIT hypotheses in every respect. Part of the problem, they
argued, lay in different meanings that certain properties of the social structure (e.g.
perceived stability) assumed for individuals, and concluded that it was important not
to overestimate the convergence of perceptions of inter-group structure among
members of specific groups. There are large individual variations in the way properties of social structure are perceived and these do not solely rest in the status-position of groups (as SIT postulated).

These and other studies (see Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1999 for review), indicated that limiting the explanation of identity-coping to structural considerations curtails our understanding of the way people with disadvantaged group status cope with threat to identity. An attempt was made therefore, to try and account for in-group variations in response to threat. It was soon to be recognised that the level of group-identification was likely to influence people's inclination to leave a group independent of the nature of the inter-group boundaries (e.g. Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1997). This way, the emphasis was shifted away from solely objective – contextual determinants of people's response to inter-group situation, emphasising the role of individual commitment to a group when choosing coping behaviour. Furthermore, increasingly, theorists emphasised the importance of taking into account group norms and its content (e.g. Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1999; Branscombe et al., 1999, Ellemers, Barreto and Spears, 1999), as well as, what they have called, "social reality restrictions" facing the group-members (Doosje and Ellemers, 1997; Ellemers and Van Knippenberg, 1997; Ellemers, Barreto and Spears, 1999), that is, the tendency of the group members to stay in touch with the reality and not to make claims that are unwarranted. However, although each of these new qualifications of the theory represents an important contribution to the current understanding of the identity-dynamics and adaptation processes, they are still characterised by significant theoretical as well as methodological shortcomings. What these are, will be explored in the sections that follow.

In the following sections, a more detailed account of some reasons for SIT's lack of external validity will be explained in relation to some intrinsic problems of the theory. The two constructs will be explored here: that of self-esteem, and inter-group
comparison and inter-group differentiation. The issue pertaining to personal-collective identity distinction will be discussed in more detail in the section 3.3.3.

3.2.1 Self-esteem hypothesis

There are a number of problems outlined in relation to the SIT-based predictions of self-esteem. First, there is very little support in literature for the assumption that low personal self-esteem is related to low in-group status and more inter-group differentiation. It has been shown that in the real world context, people belonging to disadvantaged groups rarely reject their group identity, and there is not much evidence to support the assumption that they suffer from chronically low self-esteem (Crocker and Major, 1989). Rosenberg (1979) cited a range of studies of minority groups occupying disadvantaged position on a number of different dimensions of comparison (e.g. ethnicity, race, class), and concluded that low status groups did not automatically express low self-esteem. He warned against assuming that being seen as a member of a low-status group automatically meant that its members adopted the dominant group's evaluations. Furthermore, even if the group members incorporated the dominant representations of their in-group as inferior, it would be wrong to conclude that the characteristics of the group applied to the person him/herself. It is possible that such negative social identity has not been treated as an important aspect of an individual in the first place, and therefore failed to impact upon their evaluation of the self.

This issue of the chronic importance of social identity is crucial, if we are to draw conclusions about people's behaviour: unless the prior checks of identity importance were conducted, responses such as disidentification or "exit" strategy could only be inferred. Furthermore, SIT overemphasises the importance of inter-group relations for an individual. Rosenberg stated that whether an identity would be treated as important would not always be a function of the inter-group context in its broader sense - as a person rarely gets to experience the society in its totality - but would be born out of
the immediate inter-personal environment of the individual. The identity-relevant self-esteem, then, would affect one’s coping orientation in as much as it serves a function in the person’s local environment and immediate interactions. The role of the perception of people’s immediate social interactive context — that is, the social supports for their identity and its consequence upon perceived threat will be investigated in this thesis.

More characteristically, the researchers seem unable to agree on the issue of the consequences of self-esteem: whether the low self-esteem subjects engage in intergroup discrimination and in-group bias (as a collective coping strategy) (Lemyre and Smith, 1985), or whether it is the high self-esteem that leads to it (Luthanen and Crocker, 1991). Hogg and Abrams (1990) recognised the problem of causal direction between group identification and self-esteem: it is not clear from the theory whether individuals select a group to identify with because of its positive value in the society, or whether positive self-esteem is a result of identification with the group and intergroup discrimination. As Brewer (1991) contended, selection of group-based comparison and in-group bias may be a way of extending one’s self-esteem at the group level, rather than achieving it. Such a limited support for the motivational basis (threatened self-esteem) of inter-group differentiation was explained by Hogg and Abrams (1990; Abrams and Hogg, 1988) with reference to the global self-esteem measure. The authors explained frequently inconsistent and contradictory findings on the basis of inappropriate measurement tools: although most studies measured specific social identity, the measures of self-esteem employed looked at its global levels.

In line with this, many authors (e.g. Long and Spears, 1997) argued that self-esteem measures should incorporate self-esteem derived from the social category in terms of which people are currently acting. However, it is questionable to what extent people indeed act only in terms of a single aspect of identity. As Pittinsky et al (1999) showed, stereotype-relevant social context prompts an implicit reorientation of an individual self-evaluation across his or her many identity-aspects within an identity-
structure. Any one social identity does not necessarily function in isolation from other identity-aspects within the overall identity-structure. It is argued in this thesis that self-esteem is a construct encompassing a range of identity-aspects within a single identity-structure. Of course, it is not to argue that every identity equally contributes towards a person's self-evaluations, however, it is unlikely that self-esteem will be entirely category-related and context-dependent, depending on comparative context in situ. In line with this, self-esteem (as well as some other motivational factors) measured in this thesis is thought to encompass identity as an overall structure of identity.

It is also quite possible that a person does not derive anything in terms of self-esteem from a group membership (low in-group identification), and yet, feels threatened and derives an affective response from it (e.g. feels guilty about their group's behaviour). As the studies by Ellemers and Haaker (1995) (cited in Branscombe et al, 1999) showed, it is not always the high identifiers who are most sensitive to threats to identity – sometimes, the self-esteem of low identifiers may be less immune to the effects of the inferior value-status of a group (be it in terms of competence or moral position of the group), thus experiencing more collective guilt and lower collective self-esteem. Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey (1999) illustrated how the threat of prejudice can be somewhat alleviated by identification with the minority group, implicating greater vulnerability and lower well-being of low identifiers, and a protective role of categorical identification for self-esteem. It seems, as seen from these studies, that affect plays an important role in mediating these processes. This thesis will explore the role of emotions in mediating between identity-structure and content and threat, in detail.

Finally, a very important theoretical point needs to be made here: distinguishing between the personal and group-based or collective self-esteem rests on the assumption of the fragmented nature of identity, as comprised of personal and collective identity, the premise strongly opposed in this thesis. Abrams and Hogg
(1988) argued that “each self-image is a discrete entity, and is only rarely likely to be dragged into conflict with others. Global self-esteem may be a reflection of the total positively of many self-images over time, but will provide at best an insensitive indicator of short-term variations in the positivity of specific self-images” (p.323). However, the notion of identity as comprised of a number of unrelated “self-images” or identity-aspects is rejected on theoretical grounds in this thesis. It is believed here that the meaning is not intrinsic to an aspect of identity, but that it is derived from its relationship with other identity-aspects (after Saussure, 1959). An aspect of identity is positioned within an overall identity structure, and it derives its meaning (and therefore its value) both from its position relative to other aspects of identity, and relative to the identity-structure as a whole. This means that self-esteem, as an evaluative component of an identity-aspect, will be a product of intricate interrelationships between aspects of identity within the identity-structure. In other words, it is hard to define the construct of a “specific, group self-esteem”, when the meaning of that aspect of identity is defined in terms of the whole, i.e. in terms of the system of relationships between all the aspects constitutive of identity.

Recently it has become increasingly evident that a need for positive identity or high self-esteem may not be the only motivation implicated when two groups are in contact (e.g. Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996; Deschamp and Brown, 1983; Abrams and Hogg, 1988). In their study of the Polish and Dutch psychology students as natural groups, Mlicki and Ellemers (1996) showed how the Polish, even when given an opportunity to establish a favourable national image in the face of negative stereotype, declined this opportunity, instead, accentuating their national distinctiveness as well as the negative valence of the ‘typical’ Polish traits relative to the perceptions held by Dutch students. Neither did Polish students exhibit the group-protective attribution patterns - the negative traits used for evaluation were considered by them as typical for the Polish group: these negative traits were not attributed to the external circumstances. Nevertheless, the Polish students reported much stronger national identity than the Dutch. Studies like this one show that some people may choose to accentuate the low
status position of their group in order to protect their common identity as a distinct
group. Thus, distinctiveness may be a preferred motivating factor for people’s
behaviour, leading to a whole new pattern of responses to threat.

However, what determines at what point one type of motivation would prevail over
another is not as yet clear. There is some evidence that high identifiers have a greater
need for distinctive, rather than positive identity (see Branscombe et al, 1999).
However, how perceiving oneself in terms of a group membership (stronger
identification) should be meaningfully distinguished from the need for distinctiveness
is as yet unclear, and the two concepts seem to be confounded. According to the SCT
(Turner, et al., 1987, 1994), self-categorisation presupposes perception of meta-
contrast, which itself subsumes seeing one’s group as clearly distinctive from another
one. Furthermore, it is not understood how different motivations – such as self-esteem
and distinctiveness - should be related, as, for instance, in the situation of negative
distinctiveness of the minority status. It is not clear whether minority group provides
positive distinctiveness because it is more distinctive, or negative distinctiveness
because it is either too distinctive or presumably less attractive. This is where the
content of groups comes into explanatory models. This issue of what determines the
salience of different types of threat, and the types of responses that may be implicated
in different types of threat will be explored in detail in this thesis (chapters 8 and 9).

More recent literature has recognised that there indeed exists a wider range of possible
motivation factors which, when threatened, lead to diverse responses (e.g. Hogg and
Abrams, 1990; Branscombe et al, 1999). Little interest has yet been shown for
classification of the types of threat, and when such taxonomies have been produced,
they either focused upon personal vs. social identity threats, or, as in the case of the
latter, upon short-term threats. With the exception of Breakwell (1986) no attempt has
been made to understand chronic threats – those emerging from the chronically
threatening contexts. It is important to understand implications of different types of
threat for responses to threatening contexts. What processes characterise different
types of chronic threat, and their specific role in the process of adaptation will be explored in this thesis in great detail. The threats investigated will include not only self-esteem, but, based on IPT (Breakwell, 1986), will incorporate self-efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness threat (see section 3.6).

3.2.2 Social comparison and responses to threat

Social comparison, together with self-categorisation, is thought to represent the main cognitive process underlying identity-based inter-group behaviour. Social comparison is closely related to self-esteem, since, it is assumed, the main purpose of social comparison is its management of self-related (or group-related) evaluations. Thus, SIT would argue, the salience of collective identity would automatically lead to a search for favourable social comparisons with other groups, with the resulting in-group bias and out-group derogation, especially if the group-status is inferior. Social categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987, 1994) similarly used social comparison and categorisation as its starting point, when it premised that people might actively seek to enhance the meta-contrast (the social comparison between the two groups in which the differences between them are larger than the differences within them), in order to delineate more clearly their position in the environment. Thus, self-esteem and distinctiveness were both taken to be the motivating factor behind people's responses to social comparison. The significance of these predictions for migrants' adaptation is both in the threatening effect of low group status of migrants for their self-esteem and distinctiveness, but also in the migrants' possible choice of coping strategies when unfavourable inter-group comparisons ensue.

However, as already reviewed in the previous sections, the SIT predictions failed to be replicated in the field-studies – in many naturally occurring groups the in-group bias was not occurring (e.g. Mummendy and Schreiber, 1984; Van Knippenberg, 1984; Spears and Manstead, 1989). Furthermore, even when it was evident, in-group bias was not the sole province of the inferior-status groups: Sachdev and Bourhis
(1985, 1987, 1991) showed that dominant-group members were sometimes more inclined to use in-group favouritism than the minority groups. There was even some evidence that, rather than responding to the threatening context in terms of inter-group differentiation, a general predisposition toward closeness functioned to preclude inter-group differentiation: Giles and Evans (1990) showed that subjects who felt warmer toward their own racial group also felt warmer toward the racial out-group.

Part of the problem rests in the method of research that offered support to the theory's assumptions – the minimal group paradigm stripped the subjects of all but one possible social comparison dimension, leaving them with no strategic alternatives but to engage in unfavourable comparisons. However, when given the option of choosing a comparison dimension, subjects reported no in-group favouritism. Mummendey and Schrieber (1983) showed that in-group bias only occurred if subjects were not given the opportunity to assess both groups on non-corresponding dimensions, and therefore were not given an option of rating the out-group as "equally good" but "different". Reviewing the literature on inter-group comparison, Hinkle and Brown (1990) contended that in the contexts where there were multiple dimensions of comparison, in-group favouritism consistently appeared more on some social comparison dimensions, rather than others. This left open the question of which social comparison dimension would actually be relevant for social identity, the issue unresolved by SIT. Thoits and Virshup (1997) similarly recognised that the concept of social comparison is vague, as it is not understood what factors and conditions lead to the choice of specific social comparison dimensions. Furthermore, synchronic comparisons between groups may not be the only strategy of self: Mummendey et al. (1999) found no evidence for creative collective strategies in their study of Eastern German coping efforts. They argued that this might have been partly because the alternative possible sources of creativity might have included such strategies as temporal comparisons (first defined by Albert, 1977). Finally, there is some speculation as to whether social comparison should feature as the inevitable strategy of self at all. In a study of thirty-two young women who were involved in government scheme to train otherwise
unemployed young people to become unskilled engineers, Breakwell (1986) found no evidence that these girls engaged in any form of social comparison. She proposed that, in the face of highly unfavourable experiences under the social conditions of unemployment, these women established moratorium upon direct social comparisons as a way of coping with mounting threat.

In order to explain these disparate findings, recent work within SIT theory has sought to refine the theory by introducing individual-difference variables, recognised the role of restrictive character of the social context, and proposed a strong case for the historical nature of inter-group relations. All these innovations were intended to answer the criticisms of the "universalistic" tendency of the theory.

Recently, it has been shown how the consequences of social comparison in terms of the perceptions of threat and coping with it (which include both direct strategies such as inter-group discrimination and in-group favouritism, and the more subtle ones, such as social originality, in-group heterogeneity, disidentification), differed depending on the level of identification (e.g. Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1997; Verkuyten and Nekee, 1999; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1995; Branscombe et al, 1993; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1999; Ellemers, Barreto and Spears, 1999; Mullen, Brown and Smith, 1992; Branscombe and Wann, 1994; Ellemers and Van Knippenberg, 1997). In general, it has been thought that high in-group identifiers express more out-group derogation and in-group bias, thus protecting their collective identity, than the low identifiers, who are more likely to protect their personal identity, and disidentify ("exit" strategy).

Although the introduction of the strength of identification variable has broadened the focus of the SIT by removing the universalising tendency of the theory to treat all groups as the same type of a single, undifferentiated entity, we would argue that this construct has been conceptualised in a rather restricted way. The strength of identification is thought to be "a momentary, and sometimes more long-standing
of past contextual influences and ongoing allegiances, which will itself
tion of identity and context” (Spears, Doosje and Ellemers, 1999:61).
ation of this variable fails to explain what determines the differential
entification, essentially giving social context this causal role in
We would argue that a chronic, more enduring characteristic of the
ll as the specific identity, as well as the social context, should be treated
y influencing determinants of differential strength of identification.
olological problems – that is the way in which both threat and strength of
have been measured – can be detected as well: first, threat has rarely
asured, but almost always operationalised in terms of differential
status, whereby the position of threat has actually been confounded with
e of it. For instance, for low identifiers the position of threat may not
ual threat. Instead, the observed reactions might be a part of their
ertoire of behaviour, rather than a coping strategy. In order to understand
poral changes of identity should be gauged, and the sources of
 threat explored.

tification or group commitment has sometimes been measured on the
formation given to the respondents about the future of the artificially-
 – that is, whether groups would be “changed over” or “remain the
(Turner, Hogg, Turner and Smith, 1984). Sometimes, the measures have
lised in terms of in-group relations or the level of involvement with the
Osje, Ellemers and Spears, 1995). We would argue that both
ations limit the conceptualisation of the strength of identification to the
short-term time-span: the latter especially does not take into account, for
sequences of the anticipatory in-group identification for action – a
acterisation of the immigrants’ context of identification processes. Such
identification, although often strong, could frequently be accompanied by
volvement with the group. Although some literature has recognised this
anticipatory identification phenomenon (see Branscombe et al, 1999, for a review of the literature that has recognised the existence of threat to the desire to be accepted into a group), there are some problems with the conceptualisation of patterns of identification here as well. It is thought here that the two same-type group-identities are almost always mutually exclusive. As argued earlier in this chapter, it is important to recognise the possibility of simultaneous endorsement of two, apparently conflicting identities (see Park, 1928, 1959 and Stonequist, 1964).

Another problem with this operationalisation rests in that, in as much as the lack of involvement may not indicate low in-group identification, high level of involvement may be based on a range of identities (or identity-aspects): for instance, one’s engagement in affirmation of ethnic-group may originate in one’s strong identity as an intellectual, and the related beliefs in the just world. Thus, one’s identity-allegiance should not be studied in isolation from any other identity-aspect implicated in an identity-structure, and this approach is adopted in this thesis.

A further move away from the universalistic view of inter-group perceptions is evident in the recent introduction of group content into the theory as a variable that contributes substantially to the prediction of responses to threat. Jetten, Spears and Manstead (1999) have argued that if a social categorisation already provides people with a distinct and meaningful identity, then differentiating between the groups and discriminating against them would not be necessary. Inter-group differentiation may be absent if the subjects’ collective identity is embellished with a meaningful content that provides the subjects with sufficient amount of distinctiveness. It is increasingly clear that inter-group differentiation and in-group bias may occur only when a particular identity may be insufficiently clear or distinct. In this sense, the minimal group paradigm may indeed provide a “maximal” context in which inter-group discrimination may occur.
Furthermore, there is a recognition that in-group bias may be inhibited by group norms which prohibit inter-group differentiation of such kind (e.g. Reicher, Spears and Postmes, 1995; Ellemers, Barreto and Spears, 1999; Spears, Doosje and Ellemers, 1999; Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1999). There is increasing evidence from the cross-cultural psychology that identities and group attitudes in inter-group contact will vary depending upon the content and meanings of the identity in question (Triandis et al., 1988; Hinkle and Brown, 1990; Rhee, Uleman, Lee and Roman, 1995). In the context of migration, some studies have shown that groups will differ in terms of their motivation guiding their inter-group behaviour. For instance, Sagiv and Schwartz (1998) showed that Muslim Arabs are more motivated to maintain uniqueness and less motivated to integrate than are Christian Arabs. Carr, Ehiohuche, Rugimbana and Munro (1996) argued that the relationship between perceived ethnic similarity to a host and acceptance by that host may often differ considerably in Western versus non-Western contexts.

Much of social identity theorising after Tajfel (1972) neglected the importance of the socio-cultural and historical specificity of any of the processes in question, focusing upon the universal, general processes, thought to be extractable from the experimental, “minimal” setting. Arguing against social psychological experiments “in a social vacuum”, Tajfel (1972) contended that “all experiments are cultural” (p.75), and emphasising the historical specificity of many observed psychological effects and behaviours, he sought to introduce the study of groups into social psychology. However, despite Tajfel’s awareness of the necessity to see groups as historical, “taking into account the social reality which gives meaning and definition to ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’” (p.72), the subsequent work within this paradigm sought to examine general psychological processes to the detriment of the “unique” characteristics of the groups in question (i.e. genotype v. phenotype issue). As Billig (1996) argued: “the general can never occur except in a particular instance” (p.347). So for instance, examining the nature of national identity, Billig contended: “The question is not whether ‘national identity’ is an instance of ‘group’ identity; it clearly
is. The question to ask about national identity is why, in our age, it has seemed so
‘natural’ to value this ‘identity’ above life itself, so that this ‘identity’ has lain behind
slaughter on a scale and intensity unknown to other ages and their identities.” (p. 348,
see also Billig, 1995). It is the aim of this thesis to explore the adaptation patterns of a
specific group of immigrants, within a particular social context. Although cultural
norms and beliefs will not be directly measured (i.e. in terms of a systematic study of
group-related representations), the attempt will be made, especially in chapter six, to
be receptive to the commonalities and variations in the meanings that immigrants
assign to different identities, and try and trace these to their historical context.

An important innovation in the recent SIT-based work is the recognition of “reality
constraints” providing the framework for people’s self-strategies. However, the
adherence to reality concept may itself be problematic due to the ways of studying the
issues surrounding it: the negative but stereotypic dimension of inter-group
comparison on which a group fairs worse (and which the group has accepted to be
self-defining, e.g. Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996) might not be the dimension that
constitutes the group’s most important evaluative dimension (group norm), and
therefore, people may not contest it as a self-describing stereotype. Furthermore, the
same norms may have different meaning and value connotation for different groups.
For instance, being temperamental, irrational and aggressive may have a positive
value-connotation for one group, but quite the opposite for another. It is sufficient to
see one film directed by Emil Kusturica (e.g. “The Underground”), in order to
understand how the most unlikely group characteristics and values may be celebrated
by certain groups. However, more importantly, people may not uncritically accept the
representation of the reality as seen from the majority perspective – this is where
individual efforts at reconstructing and restructuring the meanings of their group come
into play. People may contest reality, and this is, we would argue, where the process
of adaptation is most evident. This constructive process will be explored in more
detail in this thesis.
Overall, the issue of inter-group comparisons and responses to threats are not as straightforward as many SIT theorists have argued. It has been argued here that social comparisons are more complex than initially assumed. One problem facing the migration literature applying SIT paradigm to the migration context, is that the study-design used mainly focused upon the social comparisons of the members of ethnic minorities in relation to the host as a reference group, thus assuming a dichotomous representation of social structure. Furthermore, such studies rarely investigated the historical specificity of inter-group interactions. As argued before, social structures, as well as a broader socio-historical context, are complex, and people are selective in their choice of levels of comparison and comparison groups, in a way which is protective of their positive sense of self. The referent other, for instance, may not be the same as the majority culture – such reference groups/individuals could be located within migrants’ local community. In the context of immigrants, it has been suggested that they might adopt distinct orientations towards various subgroups with which they interact (Horenczyk, 1997). The above review leads to the conclusion that individuals are selective and constructive in their choice of social comparative dimensions in their efforts to deal with their threatened identities. How these comparisons are utilised will be dealt with in the qualitative chapter in this thesis.

3.2.3 Summary

- The success of SIT in experimental contexts stems from the fact that minimising the context or the number of options for identity limits the range of its responses. In these contexts social psychologists control all of what they survey, and thus, rarely fail to find what they are looking for. However, real contexts are much more complex, and therefore, more comprehensive models are needed to explain the full range of identity-responses to their changes.
- Some of its basic premises – such as that of in-group bias being inherent to the social comparison process as motivated by low self-esteem have not been replicated in the real-group context, due to both conceptual and methodological shortcomings.
• Positive self-esteem is probably not the only function identity serves. How it differs from other motivation factors, in terms of the implications it has for people's behaviour, as well as the cognitive-affective processes that underlie it, is left unexplored.

• Universalistic tendencies of the theory should incorporate a more clear understanding of the socio-historical specificity of inter-group context, but also people's ability to construct a meaningful way out of these environmental constraints for themselves (individual difference variable).

• Strength of identification, as the only individual difference variable, has been conceptualised as a momentary and context-dependent aspect of the identity-dynamics. However, it is necessary to acknowledge the long-term importance and changes in identity in order to understand the differences in perceptions of threat.

• Identity is enacted in the immediate social environment so that, apart from socio-structural variables (such as low in-group status), people's local interactive environment through which identity is expressed ought to be explored.

• Dealing with threat people often alter their comparative context.

3.3 Multiple categories and the flexible self: Self-Categorisation Theory

Whereas SIT has been developed with the primary aim of understanding inter-group behaviour, SCT (Turner et al, 1987, 1994) seeks to explain the cognitive processes that create a collective sense of self. Tajfel (1981) does not explicitly discuss identity-adaptation and change, and it is only referred to in relation to self-enhancing efforts in the process of coping. On the other hand, SCT is set to understand how people alter their self-categorisations. This is a part of the overall framework of the theory that recognises that individuals are frequently members of multiple categories, whose salience at any one time will depend on both the context and the individual characteristics in question. Like Tajfel, Turner et al. (1994) also make clear the distinction between social and personal identity, defining personal identity as "categories that define the individual as a unique person in terms of his or her
individual differences from other [in-group] persons.” (p.454). The definition of social identity is given in terms of “self-categories that define the individual in terms of his or her shared similarities with members of certain social categories in contrast to other social categories” (Turner et al. 1994:454). The theory’s main focus is on describing when different self-categorisations will become salient, and it proposes that the shift from the personal to the collective identity happens through the process of depersonalisation (when individuals see themselves more in terms of stereotypical characteristics of the group, rather than their unique characteristics).

It has been argued that group identity will become salient when there is an interaction between the readiness of a perceiver to use a particular category (its accessibility), comparative fit and normative fit. Accessibility is based on an individual’s “past experience, present expectations and current motives, values, goals and needs” (p.455). Comparative fit reflects the principle of meta-contrast, in terms of the extent to which an individual perceives within-group characteristics as less different than the between groups characteristics. Normative fit represents the degree to which the category content matches the dominant stereotype in the society of that category. Subjective salience of a category is not only governed by the comparative and normative fit, but also by the motivated availability of social categories (Hogg, 1996). This involves negotiating the frame of reference in order to achieve a comparatively more favourable self-definition in that context.

3.3.1 Selection of stimuli and the social context

Most of the theorising and research in this paradigm centred upon the two principles of comparative and normative fit. They represent important determinants of the category that will become salient in a particular context in terms of which different types of action will ensue. However, although probably crucial in determining the actual process of selection of stimuli from the external context, accessibility has not
been given adequate attention, and hence the nature of the comparison process has not been discussed in detail.

What determines which category will be accessible is not clearly specified. Turner et al. (1994) state that "self-categories are selective in reflecting perceiver readiness as well as matching stimulus characteristics, and they embody long-term knowledge, beliefs and theories about category meanings. They are veridical in the sense that they are selected and constructed to match reality" (p.458). However, one of the most frequently encountered problems in empirical applications of the theory is in specifying the means of knowing when a category is accessible. An answer to this question has revealed circularity in the theory's conceptualisation of the concepts of accessibility and identity-salience: categories have been considered to be accessible if made salient (e.g. Oakes, Turner and Haslam, 1991). Given the indeterminate and circular definition of the two constructs of category accessibility and salience, social context has assumed a role of the most prominent causal variable in defining category-salience. The theory has increasingly directed its attention upon the nature of social context as the only determinant of the process of selection. However, as Hopkins and Reicher (1996) argued, context is rarely undisputed. The context itself is constructed in discourse, serving the function of establishing one's identity. This critique emphasises that identity is both a reflection of the social reality, and an active project directed towards changing that reality; thus, it is both agentic and reflexive. As Reicher, Hopkins and Condor (1997) contended, "there is a danger for SCT if (as in some of the studies) social reality is taken as self-evident and hence categorisation is seen to follow from it in a one-way direction of causality" (p. 102).

Categories do not emerge from within our heads as "stored things", when primed by the social context. The two are inextricably intertwined, and as Gellner (1991) noted, concepts are not devoid of reality, but exist as a part of a habitual way of being. There may be nothing inherent in a specific social context in terms of the way it is categorised — as Borges (1964) wittily described in his story of "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis
Tertius". Context is contestable, and therefore, categories are not self-evident (Reicher et al., 1997, Reicher, 1996). The emergence of a particular description of a reality does not change haphazardly, but evolves in the process of living it out. As Billig (1996) said, how categorisations are made depend upon what cultural myths they perpetuate. They therefore emerge not only from the macro-social structures and ideologies, but also, in the micro-social processes of debate and argumentation in which identities are defined (Reicher et al., 1997).

Positioning oneself within a web of interpersonal relations represents an important determinant of the category that will be made salient (Doise, 1988). Although explicitly recognising the dynamic relationship between the self and the society and the contextual determinants of self-categorisation, empirically, SCT assumes the priority of cognitive processes in determining the changes in the self. In the final analysis, SCT is a theory that primarily specifies the cognitive computations and information-processing procedures through which categories are made salient. The role of others in determining identity-salience is attenuated, and self-reflexive appraisals as a determinant of emergence of self disputed. "Unlike symbolic interactionism, the present analysis does not see the self as emerging from reflected appraisals in social interaction [...] but from cognitive processes of social comparison and categorisation in which the perceiver appraises self in relation to others, not from the perspective of others" (Turner et al., 1994:460). To the extent that our identity does not exclusively reflect the opinions and evaluations of us by others, the authors are right: our self-representation and evaluation does not necessarily mirror the opinions others form about us. However, social interaction is important not only in as much as our subjectivity emerges through our differentiation from others, but also for two other reasons: first, it is the process through which "shared meanings" emerge; secondly, it positions us in a society through the web of social interactions. It is argued in this thesis that identity partly reflects this awareness of our position in the web of interpersonal relations. As much as identity is defined as a reflection of a particular social reality (or is determined by it), it is also a constructive process.
emergent from communication with others, aimed at projecting new versions of that reality and one's own position in relation to it (Reicher, 1996). As interactive network seems to have been somewhat marginalised in recent identity-theorising (with notable exceptions, e.g. McCall and Simmons, 1978; Stryker and Serpe, 1982, 1994; Hormuth, 1990, Reicher, 1996; Reicher et al., 1997), the aim of this thesis is to put it back on track: we examined the way in which interactive patterns and ties are changing in time, and the importance of interpersonal relations for identity, through their role in people's perceptions of threat.

It is indeed recognised by SCT that people will have a consensual self-categorisation (i.e. categories of identification will conform to the same norm or a prototype) if the group members are exposed to the same social comparative context (as in the situation of ethnic minorities, religions, cults), whereas individual differences in representing a category of identification will be notable under the conditions of conflictual inter-group reality (e.g. in the situation of laissez-faire societies, emergence of factions in social movements). Indeed, there is some evidence that certain groups of individuals converge in their ways they respond to context, explained on the basis of variations (and convergence) in identity-relevant experiences (Thoits, 1991). However, whereas Thoits argued that it is the similarity in subjective experiences of a particular position, that leads to the common representations (and responses) to reality (as well as longer-term identity structures), the likelihood of consensual self-representation is explained by SCT with reference to the social context causing these consensual representations. We do not deny the role of the social context, in fact, the aim of this thesis is to strongly support the self-society dynamics. However, it is also believed that, even in the most "consensual" social contexts, its representations are individualised (given subjective relevance) and contestation of these are imminent.

Another contradiction emerging from the above argument of the SCT rests in its acceptance that the convergence in representing the self and reality emerges from the more or less consensual and constant social context. However, as Simmel (1950)
argued, the reality that has been unchanged for a period of time, often gives rise to stable identity-structures, the factor explicitly rejected by self-categorisation theorists. We believe that long-term identity structures do exist. There are certain patterns in the way some situations will be perceived and acted upon, based not only upon the common social context, but also, on the enduring identity structures.

The issue of social context is especially pertinent in the situation when the actual properties of a social context are strongly disputed, and this study concerns precisely one such situation of the former-Yugoslavs’ identities under the circumstances of the break-up of their country, with the resultant inter-group conflict and competition of meanings, attributions and justifications of the event. It will be proposed in this thesis that people’s identity-management includes their constructive relation toward the immediate social context.

3.3.2 Flexibility of the self-concept

SCT postulates that the self-concept is inherently fluid, in constant flux: “If self-categorisation is comparative, inherently variable, fluid, and context dependent, then the self is not a relatively fixed mental structure but the expression of a dynamic process of social judgement” (Turner et al., 1994:458). This dynamic process represents the changing relationship of the self with the social context. Turner argues that categories do not have a fixed content, and that their meanings will vary to reflect diagnostic differences between groups in specific context: “The content of a self-category is not a fixed set of attributes applied in an all-or-none manner, but is shaped selectively by the context of its application” (p. 457). The authors further maintain that “there is no psychologically based stability, continuity, or unity in the self from situation to situation. The concepts of perceiver readiness and normative fit — reflecting an individual’s motives, desires, memories, knowledge, habits and so forth — provide definite internal psychological constraints on self-category variation” (p.459, 460). What this implies in fact is that identities and self-relevant categories are
defined anew in each new context when a different relevant stimulus is presented, although this is shaped by the components of the self-relevant information determining selection of categories. As Thoits and Virshup (1997) contended, it seems difficult to maintain that, while a certain type of cognitive content is available to an individual (e.g., values, motives, goals), this does not extend to other types of representations such as self-category. Furthermore, maintaining the position of a perpetual re-construction of categories of identification from situation to situation, the theory defies the need for parsimony. It seems highly uneconomical having to always resort to the renewed efforts of constructing a new identity for oneself.

Furthermore, as Billig (1995) argued, the “intermittent” nature of self-categories, as argued by SCT as well as SIT, undoubtedly dismisses the role and power of myths and wider representations in a society. These myths do not exist isolated in individuals’ heads, but reflect the process of interaction and communication. Billig contextualised this argument within his analysis of national identity: “The latency of nationalist consciousness does not depend on the vagaries of individual memory: if it did, then many more people would forget their national identity. Nor does national identity disappear into individuals’ heads in between salient situations. [...] The apparently latent identity is maintained within the daily life of inhabited nations. The ‘salient situation’ does not suddenly occur, as if out of nothing, for it is part of a wider rhythm of banal life in the world of nations. What this means is that national identity is more than an inner psychological state or an individual self-definition: it is a form of life, which is daily lived in the world of nation-states” (p. 69).

It follows from this that, the notion that the self is infinitely changeable precludes the need to discuss the concept of adaptation at any length, as this term implies some notion of transformation of a habitual way of identity and its enactment. The SCT assumptions about identity as a fleeting phenomenon seems difficult to defend in the light of migration literature: most of it is geared toward explanation of the reasons for the profound difficulties migrants have in the processes of adaptation to the new
social environment and their inability to match their learned behavioural repertoire with the current context. Old identities are not all that easy to discard and, despite the changing representations of some categories in a new social context, people tend to remain loyal to the established meanings of the categories they adhere to, as will be seen from the analysis of migrants’ interviews in this thesis. The SCT approach seems unfit to explain the widely reported phenomenon of identity conflict (Park, 1928, 1950; Stonequist, 1964), when in the variety of situations a person is unable to behave according to one established category due to their conflicting allegiances.

Identity seems to have a strong tendency for stability and continuity (Hormuth, 1990). It has already widely been established that particular identities can be more central for an individual’s self-concept than some others, thus being habitually expressed in a whole range of situations. Rosenberg (1979) showed that self-esteem would be affected only if a relevant/important identity-aspect is under threat. Thoits (1991) also reported that an individual would experience most stress when salient (central) identity aspect is affected. The role-theories (Stryker, 1987; McCall and Simmons, 1978) define the self-concept as a more or less enduring structure of different self-categories that are hierarchically organised. Overall, it seems plausible to argue that categories are all-encompassing, implicated in a wider range of behaviours, and that their meanings will not be exclusively dependent upon the context, but have a more stable structure. This will be a function of cultural meanings, the person’s past and present experiences derived from the interpersonal and communicative context, as well as the organisation of the identity structure itself (and the relative position of the specific identity within it). We do not have an infinite capacity for content-definition of categories and their meanings in each new context, because identity is not possible without a sense of continuity through time and situations (James, 1890/1950; Breakwell, 1986). It is important to emphasise that continuity does not imply the “sameness” of identity; however, the changes in identity evolve in the process of establishing a link between an individual’s past, present and the future (Breakwell, 1987).
3.3.3 Collective vs. personal identity

The way identity-structure is conceptualised is the basic building block of any theory of identity-adaptation. As reviewed in the previous chapter, the inter-group theorists of migrants' adaptation have investigated the changes in one specific collective identity thought to be the most implicated in the migration context - that of ethnic or national identity. Such an approach was premised on the conceptual distinction between the group and the personal identity. We believe that this may be yet another reason for the difficulty in applying the experimental results of people's identity-adaptations to social context, to real groups.

Social identity theory treats identity as a continuum ranging from the inter-personal to the inter-group extremes, with inter-personal behaviour based on an actor's unique characteristics on one end of the continuum, and the group behaviour at the other. Self-categorisation theory postulates that an individual categorises oneself at different levels: individual, group or "species" level of categorisation. Thus, both theories make a distinction between different "aspects" of identity, SIT conceptualising it as a continuum, and SCT as the "level of inclusiveness". Either way, both Tajfel (1981) and Turner (1999) accepted that the individual and collective identity might not be inversely related (mutually exclusive), instead being salient in an individual's self-definition in relative terms, with different degrees of individuated or depersonalised identity. Nevertheless, most of the work within these frameworks, treated the personal and collective identity as mutually excluding.

Turner (1999) argued: "when we perceive ourselves as 'we' or 'us' as opposed to 'I' or 'me', this is ordinary and normal self-experience in which the self is defined in terms of others who exist outside of the individual person doing the experiencing and therefore cannot be reduced to purely personal identity." (p.12). This paragraph is rather problematic, as it implies the polarisation between the individual and collective self in terms of the degree to which 'the others' are implicated in such perceived self:
as if it is only the collective self which is primarily ‘social’, that is, whose meaning and representation is derived from the broader social context. It is argued here that any representation — including the representation of the self as a unique individual, is social, not only in as much as it is formed within a particular socio-cultural and historical context, but also in a more fundamental sense — in terms of the social genesis of the self and the self-reflexive appraisal.

“At certain times the subjective self is defined and experienced as identical, equivalent, similar to or interchangeable with a social class of people in contrast to some other class.” (Turner, 1999:12). However, the issue of what this “shared” quality of that category is, and how it comes about is unexplored. Both SCT and SIT explicitly dismiss that interpersonal interaction contributes towards the formation of a “collective self”, and yet, we would argue, it is interpersonal communication and social influence that represent the basic aspects of this “sharing”. The inter-group context may not be the only source of collective identity — personal identity and identity ascribed to friends can be as important sources of commonality of social identity as inter-group comparison-induced categorisation (Doise and Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1987). The awareness of common experiences and inter-personal connectedness may also affect one’s sense of collective identity, and with respect to this, the personal and social identity could be treated as homologous. The two theories are explicit, however, in their rejection of interpersonal attraction and sharing as a basis for inter-group based behaviour. This distinction is tentative also because, in the process of creating this “shared” meaning of a category, another process of “individuation”, or assigning of personal meanings to the category in question emerges (Breakwell, 1986; Deaux, 1993). Each category is enacted and experienced in a different way for different individuals, and rarely is there an absolute convergence in what it actually means for different people in everyday life.

Furthermore, as Simon (1997) argued, the individual self and the collective self are not based on different types of self-aspects: “...each self-aspect can be experienced as
socially shared and thus serve as a basis for a collective self under the appropriate social conditions." (p. 322). Thoits and Virshup (1997) asserted that the same identity could serve as group or personal identity, depending on the context: for instance, being a migrant can assume personal attributes as when one is aware of one's personal experiences of changing cultures (e.g. in inter-personal interactions), or can be treated as a collective, as in the situation when migrants - as a group - are confronted with the changing immigration policies leading to their exclusion from the dominant social structures. Thus, even a very idiosyncratic characteristic of a person (e.g. wearing a beard), might become a group-level criterion for construction of a category (e.g. when the beard became the defining characteristic of the Chetniks, see chapter four), but it is hard to imagine such a shift without previous "communication" of this fact. It is difficult to imagine what real consequences the new category of membership would have for a person, without this membership being implicated in a person's everyday interactive context. For instance, being an asylum-seeker only gains in significance in contact with the police, with a lawyer, with other asylum seekers and governmental institutions, before it is established in one's self-definition. And even then it is questionable to what extent it would inform people's self-evaluation and actions. It is quite possible that such identity has to be chronically salient (i.e. a frequent referent, thus influencing many of our actions) and emotionally charged in order to affect people's self-evaluations. Furthermore, each identity is placed within a network of other identity-aspects, which contributes towards a very idiosyncratic meaning of any one identity-aspect/category.

The point to be made here is that the process of self-change and adaptation will not be fully understood without our awareness of how different aspects of identity interact and influence each other. One of the goals of this thesis is to see how the meanings of different self-categories are shaped and how they interact in the process of recategorisation and cross-categorisation (chapter six).
3.3.4 Cognition and emotions

Both SIT and SCT place a strong emphasis upon cognitive aspects of self. Although in his early writings Tajfel emphasised a strong role of emotions, he also explicitly argued against affective explanations of group-formation — that is, interpersonal attraction was rejected as an explanation of formation of group consciousness. SCT deliberately de-emphasised the role of emotions in its explanations of categorisation processes. However, omitting emotional determinants from identity-process in their predictions of coping and identity-adaptation represents a conceptual weakness, as emotions are powerful source of action and a prism through which evaluations are often achieved. The ability to evaluate the position of one’s group and the perception of its low position as threatening, must be rooted in an affective system (see Paulus and Levitt, 1987). A number of authors (e.g. Crawford et. al 1992, Averill, 1980) theorised about the mediating role of emotions between cognition and action when faced with the changes in the environment that may be conflicting, threatening or simply overwhelming.

More recently it has been recognised that affect is importantly related to the experiences of threats. For a long time the SIT theorists have subsumed the “affective processes within identity” under the notion of self-esteem. Recent work, however, has accepted the need to examine emotions as independent from self-esteem in threatening situations. Branscombe et al (1999) reviewed some literature that increasingly endorsed the fact that affective responses accompanied threats, but also, that different emotions might be attached in different ways to different kinds of threat. How different emotions and threats relate, however, has not been investigated systematically. In this thesis the role that emotions play in the experience of threat will be explored, in order to examine whether different threats are characterised by different combination of affective and cognitive processes.
3.3.5 Summary

- The issue of accessibility is not clearly defined as it is thought that context provides the stimulus determining the category that will be accessed. However, context is rarely undisputed – people selectively choose the properties of the context that allow people to position themselves in relation to others in their efforts to establish their identity.
- Purely cognitive basis of identity-processes is too restrictive – identity is realised in interaction with others.
- The constant flux of identity seems improbable, not least due to the mounting clinical and cross-cultural evidence of the problems encountered upon drastic changes in one's context. The self in “perpetual flux” precludes the need to discuss coping and adaptation under the conditions of threat which emerge when radical environmental changes occur.
- Furthermore, identity seems to have a tendency for continuity, and therefore identity-structure in its continuity needs to be assessed.
- The levels of identity/self-categorisation – i.e. the collective and personal identity - are conceptualised as mutually exclusive. Such position creates a dichotomization that fails to understand the complex process of self-environment interaction.
- The role of emotions in identity - the perception of threat and responses to it - has largely been unexplored from the inter-group perspective of identity-processes and coping.

3.4 Identity-conflict and marginality: Marginal Man Theory

Simmel (1950), in his famous essay on “the stranger”, recognised that the enduring aspects of identity might emerge from the specific constellation of society, from the position of an individual in terms of simultaneous closeness and remoteness in relation to a group. By employing the “relational” definition of a stranger, Simmel recognised the social constraints, i.e. the social basis of identity: a stranger is an element of a group, albeit on its periphery. The specific social structure, sets the basis
for the development of a specific set of attitudes of a stranger (e.g. cosmopolitanism, tolerance, sense of uniqueness, objectivity) that inform his or her action. Thus, rather than a constant flux in self definitions, the basic tenet of this position is the existence of a more enduring identity consequence of being positioned within a particular web of relationships in a social structure. This is a set of characteristics, then, that an individual carries with him or herself into every situation. However, there is little indication in Simmel’s writing that this identity of a stranger implies an awareness of a group of “strangers”; instead, it is derived from a particular position of a person within specific inter-group and inter-personal relations. The stranger does not represent the extent or the degree to which this category is salient in a particular context. Rather, the stranger is a habitual way of being, both belonging and not belonging to a group or a category.

The problem with Simmel’s definition is that he did not explain how a specific set of attitudes might achieve conscious recognition, thus becoming the template for self-identification. This might not have actually been his intention – the specific personality constellation is, according to Simmel, derivable from the position within the society on the margins of a group, and hence, if the awareness of group belonging exists at all, we could argue, it does so with respect to the group on whose periphery the stranger resided. The subjective awareness missing from this theory, nevertheless, Simmel was conscious of the broader group representation of the person in a particular social relation to the majority group members, thus emphasising that existence in such society must be constrained to an extent by broader social context. However, an important aspect of this theory is its recognition of the habitual expression of identity within a more or less stable social context, the expression derived from a certain interactive framework, thus recognising self continuity: the enduring properties of the self.

This basic premise was subsequently adopted and adapted by the early role theorists who provided a detailed analysis of immigrants’ situation. The sociological theory of
marginal man, postulated by Park (1928, 1950) and Stonequist (1964), was a conceptual framework aimed at explaining the identity-consequences of migration into a new culture, or one's position as a member of a minority group. Park's and Stonquist's model of marginal man postulates the ambiguous position of a migrant, biracial, or any member of a "minority" group who is "...a cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now sought to find a place. He was a man on the margin of two cultures and two societies which never completely interpenetrated and fused." (Park, 1928: 892). Marginal person, then, lives on the margins of two cultures, and is torn between a nostalgic love for the old and a growing attachment to the new. Such a duality of culture produces a duality of personality, with the resulting emotional strain (anxiety) and the more enduring personality characteristics such as insecurity, ambivalence, chronic nervous strain, but also a certain degree of tolerance, cosmopolitanism, and detachment.

Park's and Stonequist's definitions of marginal man theory have subsequently initiated heated debates among scholars, and it is in these qualifications of the theory offered by its critics where we find the relevance of the theory for this thesis - the issues of adaptation. The theory deals with the issues of competing (ascribed, rather than achieved) identity-aspects as they spring out of culture-clash or conflicting inter-group relationships, and the subjective relevance of this culture-conflict for an individual. Thus, like SIT and SCT, the theory recognises the social basis of identity, and sets to explain how the properties of social structure shape and define one's subjective experiences.

However, the marginal man theory diverges from the two in a number of ways: by theorising contested identity-aspects, the theory postulates the simultaneity of multiple categories. Unlike SIT, which predicts strong identification with one social
category to the exclusion of the other, and SCT whose focus is mainly upon the salience of a single category within a social context, the marginal man theory allows for the simultaneity of the two same-type categories that are often conflicted within an identity-structure and within a single context. This co-existence of categories is, for instance, reflected in the awareness of the conflicting expectations and behavioural prescriptions in the specific context emergent out of the contested cultures defining one's collective identities. However, these are not "fleeting" and changeable multiple categorisations (as postulated by SCT), but they represent the patterns of loyalties and attachments, as the theory implicitly recognises the enduring aspects of identity and the possibilities of their chronic salience and habitual enactment. The theory is restrictive, however, in its qualification of this simultaneity of categories: it assumes that the two collective identities are almost always in conflict, thus leading to emotional reactions such as anxiety and feelings of inadequacy.

The subsequent developments of the theory (e.g. Goldberg, 1941; Green, 1947; Golovensky, 1952, Hughes, 1949) extended the concept of marginal man from cultural dualism to every role-conflict or status-inconsistency situation. For instance, a man coming from a traditional society into the Western culture has to deal with the clash between the requirements to act as a bread-winner in order to maintain his traditional role of a parent on one hand, and his diminished status and economic prospects as a member of the disadvantaged group, on the other. With respect to this, the marginal man/status conflict theories and the SIT converge in that both emphasise the importance of perceived status differentials between groups, as an underlying cognitive requirement in order for the conflict to emerge. Furthermore, the extensions of the marginal man theory (such as status inconsistency theory, Hughes, 1949) also recognise that the interaction between the socio-structural conditions and individual variables in the face of conflict/threat would produce a number of possible coping mechanisms ranging from resigning from the status which interferes with one's status aims, to collective activities such as social creativity (Hughes, 1949).
SIT predicted that low group-status in a social structure would threaten self-esteem and trigger the need to improve one’s position. Marginal man theory, however, recognises the need to distinguish between “marginal position” and “marginal personality” (Kerckhoff and McCormick, 1955). That is, marginal (or “minority”) position is not necessarily related to the awareness of the threatening nature of this position and the ensuing experience of threat. Goldberg (1941) qualifies this point by defining the conditions under which the minority group status will not be experienced as threatening: 1) if the so-called “marginality” is conditioned by early socialisation; 2) if the member of the minority or marginal group shares this existence with a large number of individuals in his/her primary groups; 3) if the member of the minority group participates through his years of early socialisation (into adulthood) into institutions largely manned by other people in the similar situation; 4) if this position results in no major blockages or frustrations of his/her learned expectations and desires. Under these conditions, the threat to one’s positive identity is improbable, as the person’s “minority” or “marginal” culture is every bit as real and complete to its member as the mainstream culture is to the non-marginal. In this theoretical argument, we recognise some of the important qualifications of the SIT by its critics, who emphasise the immediate interactive context in which a person lives and acquires one’s understanding of the world as an important determinant of one’s self-esteem and evaluation of the in-group identity. Furthermore, the notion of blockages and frustrations, as emerging from without the social constellation that puts a pressure to bear for changes in identity, represent early conceptualisations of threat. Unlike most SIT and SCT-based work on threat, its possible existence was treated as a chronic state, with the long-term consequences for an individual.

However, this is also the most disputed construct of the theory, as “marginal personality” is treated as a psychological “embodiment” of inter-cultural conflict. The resolution by an individual of “threat” of conflicted identities is, therefore, not seen as an alternative outcome. The concept of marginal personality received a limited empirical support: it was poorly or not at all tested empirically; frequently uncritically used in literature and used too generally across a vast number of minority status groups.
When tested against a control group (e.g. compared to the members of the mainstream/non-marginal groups), no between-group difference in the symptoms of marginality have been detected. As Golovensky (1952) stated, the intra-cultural contradictions and ambivalence are no less acute than the inter-cultural antitheses. Furthermore, this theory rarely discusses what processes lead to marginality — how the person copes with variability in the environment — how he/she synthesises diversities and composes conflicts. Multiple loyalties may not be conflicting, disorganising or damaging for an individual. In fact, every individual belongs to many overlapping groups. As Golovensky argued, a person “can be loyal to all of them without being thrown into a constant state of conflict and uncertainty.” (p.336). How this is achieved, however, was left unexplored.

From this, very fundamental theoretical problems of the theory could be recognised: despite the recognition of the possibility of conflicted identities, society is defined in terms of the roles and identities as a definite set of “rights and duties”, whereby people are shaped by and recruited into its structure. Two issues emerge from this: first, the view of society proposed is that of consensual structure, which exists beyond the incumbency of any single person. The multiple groups are thought to exist as self-contained, static and unchangeable entities. The fluidity of culture — adaptability of its meanings, norms and communication patterns is not recognised. The position of an individual in so conceptualised social structure is limited: he or she is seen to be drawn into a role, uncritically adopting the set of definitions the role provides for an individual. Reflexivity, and therefore individual agency, is left outside of this theory’s framework. Even if the role-theorists recognise the possibility for an individual to change the environment and the social structure, typically, it is assumed, they do not. It is difficult to infer from this theory what conditions would provide the basis for social change, and under what conditions a person will not follow the expectations of a role (see Holland, 1977).

As Breakwell (1986) argued, there are contradictions and conflicts within the ideological milieu, generated by inter-group power struggles, which permit an
individual some freedom of choice in formulating the identity structure. As the matter of fact, these early role-theorists failed to understand that multi-group characteristic of a society, frequent conflicts, inconsistencies and contested meanings. "Just as social structure presents massive forces which influence the individual from without toward certain forms of adaptation, so does personality present massive forces from within which lead him to select, create, and synthesise certain forms of adaptation rather than others." (Levinson, 1969:305) This point is important, as it recognises the dialectics of self-society interaction in the process of adaptation, and, from the point of view of identity-adaptations, the agency of an individual.

Nevertheless, it may be informative to borrow a few interesting insights from this theory: its emphasis on coexistence of several aspirations for group membership — in the case of migrants the "old" culture of origin, and the "new" host culture, brings us back to the argument that understanding the meanings and contents of identity structure in its continuity is crucial. It indirectly brings attention to the necessity to understand the extent to which the "new" attachments impact upon the "old" conceptions of identity and vice versa. This interaction between the representation of the old and the new identity-structures as they co-exist in a person's current understanding of self, together with the emotional connotations these identities have for the person, will be explored in the first empirical chapter.

3.4.1 Summary

- The theory recognises the possibility of simultaneous endorsement of more than one social category within a particular social context, albeit restrictively: such co-existence of categories is seen as conflicting.
- The theory recognised the need to distinguish between the threatening position and the experience of threat. It was argued that the socialisation context and the local interactive environment importantly determine whether certain position will be experienced as threatening.
• Introducing the concept of old and new identities the theory emphasises the importance of identity continuity.
• The theory see the society as consensual, and the individual as non-reflexive, thus failing to specify the conditions for either the social change, or for the resolution of identity conflict. It does not postulate the mechanisms that function in the process of coping with conflicts.

3.5 Adaptation as coping with threats to identity: Identity Process Theory

Previous sections made an overview of the most dominant theories of adaptation that more or less successfully recognised that this process involved a very complex interaction between the self and the society. The following section will review the theory that tried to bring together disparate arguments. The basic premise of identity process theory (IPT, Breakwell, 1986) states that adaptation represents a process of responding to threats to identity. It is argued here that how one will perceive the threat will largely determine the person’s efforts in the attempt to remove it, that is, the coping that will be adopted.

IPT proposes that the structure of identity is a dynamic social product of the interaction of the capacities for memory, consciousness and organised construal (that are characteristic of the biological organism) with the physical and societal structures and influence processes which constitute the social context. Identity resides in psychological processes but is manifested through thought, action and affect. People are normally self-aware: actively monitoring the status of their identity. They are also self-constructors: renovating, replacing, revising and removing elements of identity as necessary. In this sense, it importantly differs from some other social psychological theories such as SCT (Turner et al., 1994), which fail to recognise the constructive and self-reflexive nature of self. The IPT model of identity is similar to Giddens' (1991) notion of self-identity: “the self as reflexively understood by the person in terms of her or his biography” (p.53). Giddens emphasises that identity presume continuity across
time and space, but that self-identity is such continuity as interpreted reflexively by the agent.

IPT proposes that the structure of identity should be described in terms of the content and the value/affect dimensions. The content dimension consists of the characteristics which define identity: the properties which, taken as a constellation, mark the individual as unique. It encompasses both those characteristics previously considered the domain of social identity (e.g. group memberships, roles, social category labels) and of personal identity (e.g. values, attitudes, cognitive style). The distinction between social and personal identity is abandoned in this model. Seen across the biography, social identity is seen to become personal identity: the dichotomy is purely a temporal artefact. Of course, the content dimension is organised. The organisation can be characterised in terms of (i) the degree of centrality, (ii) the hierarchical arrangements of elements and (iii) the relative salience of components. The organisation is not, however, static and is responsive to changes in inputs and demands from the social context besides purposive reconstruction initiated by the individual. Each element in the content dimension has a positive or negative value/affect appended to it; taken together these values constitute the value/affective dimension of identity. The value/affective dimension of identity is constantly subject to revision: the value of each element is open to reappraisal as a consequence of changes in social value systems and modifications in the individual's position in relation to such social value systems.

The structure of identity is postulated to be regulated by the dynamic processes of accommodation/assimilation and evaluation, which are deemed by IPT to be universal psychological processes. Assimilation and accommodation are components of the same process. Assimilation refers to the absorption of new components into the identity structure; accommodation refers to the adjustment which occurs in the existing structure in order to find a place for new elements. Accommodation-assimilation can be conceptualised as a memory system and subject to biases in
retention and recall. These biases are said to be predictable since identity change is guided by certain "identity principles". The process of evaluation entails the allocation of meaning and value/affect to identity contents, new and old. The two processes interact to determine the changing content and value of identity over time; with changing patterns of assimilation requiring changes in evaluation and vice versa.

The processes of identity are guided in their operation by principles which define desirable states for the structure of identity. The actual end states considered desirable, and consequently the guidance principles, may be temporally and culturally specific. In Western industrialised cultures the current prime guidance principles identified within IPT are: continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy, and self-esteem. These four principles vary in their relative and absolute salience over time and across situations. There is evidence that their salience also varies developmentally across the lifespan (Breakwell, 1993). Cultures and sub-cultures differ in the levels of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy they deem desirable for an individual identity. They also differ in the manner in which the four principles can be instantiated. For instance, some cultures de-emphasise the requirement for distinctiveness (Vignoles et al, 2000), others exaggerate it. Also, the forms that distinctiveness can legitimately take differ across cultures (de Silva, 1993; Orme-Johnson et al, 1997).

The theory does not limit social framework of identity to its structure. Identity is created within a particular social context within a specific historical period. Structurally, the social context is comprised of interpersonal networks, group and social-category memberships, and inter-group relationships. The content of identity is assimilated from these structures which generate roles to be adopted and beliefs or values to be accepted. The social context has a second dimension that consists of social influence processes, which interact to create the multifaceted ideological milieu for identity. Social influence processes (such as education, rhetoric, propaganda, polemic, persuasion) establish systems of value and beliefs, reified in social
representations, social norms, and social attributions, which specify an arena in which both the content and value of individual identities are constructed.

IPT does not suggest that identity is determined by its social context. There are contradictions and conflicts within the ideological milieu, generated by inter-group power struggles, which permit the individual some freedom of choice in formulating the identity structure. Changes in identity are therefore normally purposive. The person has agency in creating identity. Furthermore, the limitations of the cognitive information processing system (primarily those associated with information acquisition and memory) themselves impose some constraints upon identity development (Neisser, 1993). At the most basic level, for instance, the inability to retrieve self-relevant material from memory may restrict identity modification even if such change would apparently be inevitable given the individual’s social position and experiences (Neisser and Fivush, 1994).

Changes in the social context will initiate changes in identity according to: (i) their personal relevance; (ii) the immediacy of involvement in them; (iii) the amount of change demanded; and (iv) how negative the change is deemed to be. Movement of the individual from one position in the social matrix to another will bring pressure to bear for a change in identity since this is likely to introduce a changed pattern of social influences and restrictions. A threat to identity occurs when the processes of assimilation-accommodation are unable, for some reason, to comply with the principles of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy, and self-esteem. Threats are aversive and the individual will seek to re-institute the principled operation of the identity processes.

Both the type of threat and its magnitude have been considered important factors in people’s judgements of the type of adjustment needed in response to it. Breakwell (1986) argues that threats operate at both individual and group level, frequently resulting in changes to either the structure and content, or value dimensions of identity. Sometimes, the very existence of an aspect of identity may be brought into question (e.g. if the threat challenges legitimacy of group membership); at other times, it can
require re-evaluation of the identity in question, often resulting in redefinition of the meaning of an aspect of identity and the amount of esteem it provides. From the forthcoming chapters it will be seen that both aspects of the experience types of threat are imminent for the particular migration population under investigation in this thesis: restructuring of the political boundaries and the violent re-shaping of the meanings of the dominant social categories during the recent former-Yugoslavian civil war resulted in frequent re-negotiation or even loss of the previous category-memberships for the individuals involved.

When threat ensues a person will naturally resort to coping in the attempt to remove the threat. These efforts will be directed at removing the threat either by: removing aspects of the social context which generate threat; individual movement into a new social position which is less threatening; a revision of identity structures, or the content or value dimensions, enabling identity to operate again in accordance to the four principles of self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-continuity and distinctiveness.

Coping itself is defined as a cognitive process or action with the goal of eliminating or ameliorating threat, whether it is consciously recognised (intended) or not, and the strategies of coping are classified according to the level at which they operate: intra-psychic, inter-personal and collective coping strategies. What coping will ensue, will be determined by interaction between four factors: a type of threat (e.g. internal or external, long-term or short-term, etc.), the social context (determined by both social structure and social processes), one’s identity structure (its organisation and content – e.g. centrality and salience of a particular identity) and the cognitive and emotional constraints (pertaining to information-processing system). The failure of the previous theories to take into account the combination of all four of these factors may explain the lack of consistent support for the minority group-status as a determinant of threat. Not all people experience threat in the face of discrimination, and how different factors combine in order to lead to the perception of threat needs to be explored (Deaux and Ethier, 1998). Thus, coping with threat will also vary considerably, depending on the subjective perceptions of threat. For a threat to evoke action, it must
gain access to consciousness. It is therefore possible to distinguish between occupying a threatening position and experiencing threat. If coping strategies are effective, occupancy of a threatening position may lose its power to threaten.

The theory’s recognition of the subjective nature of threat and complex factors influencing coping presents an important step forward in qualifying adaptation. In the following section we will set up the theoretical framework from which a model of adaptation will be derived to be tested further in this thesis.

3.5.1 Summary

- Breakwell’s (1986) Identity Process Theory explains identity adaptation and adaptation process by looking at the nature of the threat, occurring when identity processes can no longer comply with four motivational principles self-continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem. When threat is aversive, coping will ensue.

- Coping and threat are seen as a part of one process – that of adaptation.

- The theory conceptualises the framework of adaptation in terms of complex interaction between four factors: the type of threat, social context, one’s identity structure and cognitive/emotional constraints. The social context is treated in terms of both structural and representational (cultural) determinants.

- Identity is not completely determined by its social context. Identity-change is conceptualised as one’ reflexive efforts to achieve continuity: it recognises people’s agency in identity-adaptation.

- The coping strategies are not treated as mutually exclusive, as they can be used in collusion, and often even be inconsistent with each other.
3.6 The working model of coping and adaptation

The focus of both chapter two and the current chapter has been upon the concept of adaptation: in the former it has been investigated in the light of the empirical context of migration, and in the current chapter, the way adaptation processes and identity-adaptation have been treated - both implicitly and explicitly - in the most prominent social psychological theoretical frameworks has been discussed. It has been argued that stress, or physical well being as well as subjective well being are poorly conceptualised, badly operationalised, and altogether, barely valid ways of studying adaptation, not least because no clear relationship or model could account for individual variations in these parameters. In order to understand adaptation in terms of self-society interaction, the concept of identity has been examined here, and adaptation as seen in the process of response to threats to identity reviewed. It has been generally concluded that it would be too simplistic an approach to study adaptation exclusively in terms of a degree of endorsement of just one aspect of identity - specifically the strength of ethnic identity and host-culture identity, when threatened. Throughout these chapters, the failure of many theoretical and empirical approaches to incorporate identity-structure and content, as well as the role of the historical and local interactive conditions in shaping people’s response to major environmental changes has been pointed out. For all these reasons, a working model of adaptation is required, and a strong argument has been posited earlier toward a model of adaptation based on identity processes. Here, we will describe a model of adaptation derived to a large degree from the identity processes paradigm (Breakwell, 1986).

Adaptation, rather than adjustment will be investigated here, as adjustment implies assimilation, that is compliance with and acceptance of the host-culture norms and beliefs, the approach explicitly rejected here. The distinction is made in this thesis between identity-adaptation and the act of adaptation. The former represents the restructuring and changes in the meaning of identity aspects and identity-structure. The act of adaptation is the process of coping with the threats emerging or experienced as a
consequence of migration, and these include any thought, emotion and action directed at removal or attenuation of this threat. Coping process is seen to evolve in interaction with individuals and groups, within an individual (on the intra-psychic level), or both. Not every act of adaptation results in identity-change (identity-adaptation), as some coping strategies involve renegotiations of the environment (social, interactive) as a way of maintaining the current identity structures. Similarly, not every change or evaluation of an aspect of identity and its structure is considered to be adaptation, but just that which is related to the threat following the massive and important environmental change. In the next section, the following topics will be discussed:

1) Identity-adaptations represent changes in one’s established identity-structure and content in the face of threat; the role of the structure and content of identity will be reviewed here, and their social origins emphasised.

2) Adaptation process is triggered when threat to identity occurs. Threat therefore represents a major tenet of this thesis, and one of its aims is to isolate the sources of different types of threat. The definition of threat adopted here will emphasise its phenomenological nature, and the meaning of threat will be considered here as an important aspect of adaptation efforts. The socially constructed nature of this meaning, however, is recognised. Threat to identity will be distinguished as a separate construct from the identity-states based on four identity-principles of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem.

3) Adaptation represents coping with threats; coping evolves on the level of individual/group interaction, intra-psychic level, or both, and each of these levels of coping will be characterised by different ways in which identity-states are conceptualised and threats are perceived.

4) The role of emotions will be delineated.
3.6.1 Identity content and structure, and social commitment

In the previous chapters, a lot of attention has been directed toward the ways in which identity is structured, and how these identity components respond to the environmental changes. As mentioned before, change can happen in the content of identity (when re-defining the meaning of the identity), in the structure of its components (for instance when identities are lost, gained, or when they merge) or in the value of identity (changing the evaluative importance of the identity) (Breakwell, 1986). In most social psychological theories identity has been functionally divided into personal and social identity. Here, Breakwell's (1983) critique of such differentiation of the content of identity into personal and social identity will be accepted, which states that "Current personal identity is the product of the interaction of all past personal identities with all past and present social identities. But the reverse is also true: current social identities are the product of the interactions of all past social identities with all past and current personal identities." (p. 12) In this research, identity content and structure are considered to comprise a totality of self-related representations (identity-aspects), together with evaluative and affective components that accompany them, as reflexively constructed through their biography. No one specific identity functions in isolation from any other identity-aspects or the whole hierarchically organised structure. Therefore, for the explanation of adaptation, the whole identity-structure, not just one of its aspects (e.g. ethnic identity) is important. In this thesis, "specific identity" and "aspect (element, component) of identity" are the terms used interchangeably.

Identity structure and content are closely interwoven with social structure and its processes. The social position of an individual (e.g. being born into an ethnic minority group, being a female or a middle class) will provide some broad prescriptions and constraints for an individual behaviour. However, this is not to accept the position of social determinism, as the social structure (e.g. groups, categories and social network) and its processes (e.g. representations, education, persuasion) are frequent hosts to
contradictions, and have to be rendered meaningful to a person positioned within (Breakwell, 1986). This process of interpretation that an individual engages during his or her interaction with the social environment, is what is of crucial importance to our understanding of identity-adaptations. This is an important idea because it accepts the subjective meaning of any position that a person occupies within the environment (especially the position rendered “disadvantaged” by the observers or those who provide the label for the occupants of the disadvantaged positions).

Part of this “meaning-making process” resides in social interactions that a person enters and that provide supports for his or her identity. As Hormuth (1990) and many before him postulated, identity will be embedded in the social relationships that reinforce a specific identity-structure and content. It is possible to postulate that interpreting the meaning of the specific set or network of social relationships is one way of assessing the way a person constructs the self-other relationship as a constitutive part of identity-adaptation. Therefore, the process of interpretation investigated here is directed both at the meaning of identity and the meaning of the social relationships that support identity.

Identity-adaptations are always contextually specific. For instance, I may be more aware of my “foreignness” at the party where local jokes are being exchanged, but whether the salience of this category of a foreigner will have implications for my self-evaluations will largely depend on the extent to which that category is important or implicated in my overall identity. Such an approach emphasises the importance of temporal dimension of identity and the enduring properties of the identity-structure.

It has been recognised that identity-adaptation is usually more taxing and threat-inducing when huge environmental changes occur, as these usually carry with them the changes on several levels – both in terms of immediate supports for identity (social relationships), and in terms of the changing position of a person in the broader social structure (e.g. social categories). Furthermore, this often implies a changing
nature of the dominant social influence processes and ideologies confronting an individual. This is why it is necessary to distinguish between the long-term and short-term contextual change, together with the ensuing long- or short-term shifts in identity-structure. In this thesis, long-term shifts in identity-structure will be considered, and people’s changing perceptions of identity and its social supports (the socio-historical context as well as interactive patterns) in the period spanning their migration will be examined.

3.6.2 Threats to identity

Earlier research on threats to identity, especially within social identity paradigm, has focused on those threats that are related to either just personal identity or a person’s group-membership. In the latter, strength of identification has been thought to be related to the experience of threat, and hence, the choice of coping strategies. Other research – for instance in migration literature – has largely focused on taxonomy of threats (e.g. threat to realistic resources, symbolic threats, etc., see chapter two). Neither of these approaches is satisfactory, as both limit our understanding of threat: the former by considering short-term threats to just one aspect of the overall identity-structure; the latter, by failing to understand the processes underlying threat (i.e. what their sources are) and their implications for adaptation.

Furthermore, in their attempts to understand processes of adaptation and identity-adaptations, the majority of studies (both in the more theoretical framework of SIT, and within the empirical domain of migration literature) have mainly considered threats to self-esteem, and some, threats to distinctiveness. However, it is increasingly evident that there are other motivations informing people’s self-evaluations and threats (Hogg and Abrams, 1990; Branscombe et al., 1999; Breakwell, 1986, 1993). In this thesis, Breakwell’s (1986, 1993) classification of threats into four threats to continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy, will be accepted. This is because there is a growing evidence of the operation of these four threats under the
conditions of various long-term and substantial contextual changes, such as beach pollution (Bonaiuto, Breakwell and Cano, 1996), enforced physical relocation, (Speller, Lyons and Twigger-Ross, 1996; Speller et al, 1999a; Speller et al, 1999b), migration (Timotijevic and Breakwell, 2000), the processes of “coming out” in the case of homosexual identities (Markowe, 1996), the issues pertaining to the European identification and the threats to national identities (Breakwell, 1996).

The distinction will here be made between identity-state as an enduring motivation for continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem, and threat to these states. People may differ in terms of the level of desirable identity end-state, as in the example of the need for distinctiveness. At what point threat to a state will occur will depend upon people’s definition of the level of identity end-state that is satisfactory, that is, people’s motivation to achieve continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. What identity-state level will be desirable will be both culturally and developmentally determined (Breakwell, 1987). For instance, continuity might be a more salient motivator for people’s actions among older immigrants than among younger generations. There is growing evidence that there are cultural differences in the ways certain basic motivational principles are conceptualised (distinctiveness, for instance, was thought to be perceived differently according to the relational or individualistic orientations, see Vignoles et al., 2000). However, it is also recognised here that there are within-group differences in the way different identity end-states are constructed and threats are perceived. This will largely be imbedded within the subjective meanings of specific identity and its relation to other identity-aspects within the overall identity-structure of an individual.

The existence of threat, as well as its relative salience will be also contextually specific. However, this will also depend upon the meaning that current identity assumes for an individual. For instance, to use the above example, being “foreign” may affect one’s sense of distinctiveness (if one’s ethnicity or nationality are important evaluative criterion), or it could affect one’s self-efficacy (if one’s self-
representation as a sharp, competent actor in a social situation is central for the definition of the context. Thus, both macro-societal (e.g. perceiving oneself as a minority group member) as well as the micro-social elements (e.g. defining oneself in terms of inter-personal relations and the immediate social network) may be used to derive self-evaluations, and this will affect the type and nature of the threat experienced.

Perceptions of threat are thus central to adaptation-processes as well as identity-adaptation. In this thesis, it will be demonstrated that perceptions of threat are subjective, but also given within a specific socio-cultural context, and their situational, interactive, cognitive and affective sources will be isolated.

3.6.3 Coping with threat

Unlike earlier migration literature, whereby coping has often been treated in terms of "resources" people draw upon in the face of threatening life-events, in this thesis a more socio-psychological perspective on coping will be employed: coping is seen to be a constitutive part of identity-process, in fact, coping is the process of adaptations. Coping represents an action (in thought, emotion or deed) people undertake in order to deal with the amounting or the existing threat. The coping people will use will depend upon the relative salience of a particular motivation for people's self-definition, based on four identity-principles of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem, and this will determine the perceptions of threat. It is also true, however, that one's coping strategy can modify the way this motivation is constructed, thus altering the perceptions of threat.

Given that the focus of this research is upon the population of migrants forming a particular wave of immigration to Britain (with the similar socio-historical and contextual background), it would be of interest to investigate if there is a convergence in the coping these migrants use, and the way these specific coping profiles interact
with identity states influencing their threats. Already, in prior literature (e.g. recent findings within SIT paradigm), it has been accepted that different coping patterns emerge not only due to different structural and cultural specifics of the groups in question, but are also subject to individual variations (e.g. Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1997; Verkuyten and Nekee, 1999; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1995; Branscombe et al, 1993; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1999), although these variations have been seen to relate to the level of identification with a single social category. Furthermore, the coping patterns have been thought to relate to the manipulation in terms of self-definition with respect to a single aspect of identity. It is argued here, however, that the coping one employs may require adaptation within the overall identity-structure, content or value, within one’s environment, or both. All these patterns of coping will be measured and examined for their interaction with identity-states and their success at removing the threat, further in this thesis.

In the light of this, some of the issues investigated will be: a) the differences in adaptive patterns within the sample: the way coping strategies have been combined for different individuals or groups of individuals within the sample; b) the role of coping in perception and deflection of threat to identity-state.

3.6.4 Adaptation and the role of emotions

Emotions have been rarely discussed in the previous literature of identity-adaptation and adaptation processes. Most of the theorising that goes into predicting people’s involvement in the physical or social world has been socio-cognitively based. And, as Markova (1987) maintains, even when emotions have been given investigative priority, they have mainly been relegated to the realm of disruptive behaviour. Thus, within migration literature, emotions have been mainly considered within clinical domain of investigation, whereby focus has been placed upon managing or controlling the aversive impact of emotional disorders caused by migration (such as anxiety, fear/trauma, suffering, etc.), through therapy. Their role in identity processes has rarely
been discussed, and emotions have rarely been incorporated into testable models. The most prominent socio-psychological theories such as SIT and SCT also explicitly or empirically neglect the role of emotions in the process of person-environment exchange. Under this framework, emotions are equated to self-esteem (SIT), or left out of explanations of identity altogether (SCT). On the level of individual-society interaction, emotions arising from affiliating behaviour are treated as inconsequential in terms of either identity or social context. Here, it seems appropriate to briefly describe the conceptual standing in relation to emotion as it is adopted here.

The cognitive aspect of emotional process is not disputed here. In fact, appraisal or evaluative component is a constituent part of emotion – cognition is its conceptual *sine qua non*. "...Appraisals are bound in our common-sense definitions of different emotional states, so that when people characterise their own or someone else’s experience in emotional terms, this makes it likely that they will also endorse characteristic appraisal judgements". (Parkinson, 1995:55). Some appraisal theorists (e.g. Lazarus and Smith, 1988) argue that emotion mediates between cognition (primary appraisal defined as evaluation of personal relevance of the situation) and coping (secondary appraisal, that is appraisal of the coping strategy to be used). However, the conditions that determine the personal relevance of specific situation carrying emotional content is mainly an uncharted territory for appraisal theorists and appraisals are mainly operationalised in terms of different specific interpretations of situations. How these interpretations are done, however, is a moot point.

The interest in emotion in this thesis is primarily in its evaluative aspect. As Markova (1987) argued "Most often, when we are involved with activities and acquire knowledge about ourselves, there is much emotional content both in the involvement and in the knowledge acquired. Thus, information is perceived as threatening or as promising something good; it is evaluative and has consequences for the individual and his or her social relationships" (p.75). The cognition that the emotions are thought to be a constitutive part of is that of our identity and its various aspects. Thus, each identity-aspect is imbued with emotional value or connotation which gives it meaning and
prescribes one's identity-motivated action with respect to the environment. Emotions are not limited only to the present, but the emotions from the past as they exist in our memory of our identity-structure are also an influential part of our adaptation processes in the present (see Crawford et al., 1991). This especially is important with respect to the recognition that sense of continuity is one of the desired end-states for our identity. Furthermore, emotions, as the evaluative and meaning-creating process of self, relate to our environments and social context: social ties are also invested with emotions, or "affective commitment", as Hormuth (1990) defines it.

Thus, within this thesis, a special interest is focused upon the role of emotions in identity-processes that constitute adaptation. Emotions will be investigated as a way for respondents to "make sense of their environment" (chapter six) and as evaluative dimension of identity and its social supports (chapter seven and chapter eight). Their role as mediators or a meaning-making process of identity in one’s perception of threat will be explored in the model presented here.
Chapter Four

THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT: THE RISE AND FALL OF YUGOSLAVIA
AND THE BALKAN "VORTEX"

As stated in the Introduction section in this thesis, the current research programme aimed to examine the identity-processes extant among the immigrants from the former-Yugoslavia who moved to Britain as a result of the war in their country. As mentioned before, this population of immigrants were expected to be likely to experience threats to identity: they were exiles, they were foreigners, they had no home to which to return, their country had disappeared, they faced new cultural experiences, they had often left family and friends behind, many of them had had direct experience of the war which was considered to be the most destructive conflict in recent European history, and as such had been in the centre of political, diplomatic and media attention. The specific characteristics of this population of immigrants should allow us to examine the psychological consequences of radical environmental change such as group disintegration and changing inter-group relations, and, specifically, the nature of the identity threats that arise. As these processes are inextricably intertwined with both the past and the present socio-historical context of these immigrants, it was felt here that a short overview of the past and present context conditioning the immigrants' psychological make-up deserves closer attention.

The following section aims to describe the historical context and socio-political and economic conditions that have led to the most recent war in the Balkans. In the heart of this war was the issue of national and ethnic identity, competing ideologies as well as the role of the international community, as will be presented here. The aim of this section is to tackle some issues that help explain the complex processes of the former-Yugoslav identity: their cultural background, their historical complexes, the myths and beliefs informing the former-Yugoslav consciousness. Given the abundance of literature covering these issues, it was necessary to be selective in the choice of the referent work in
this area. Four major sources of information were used here: Malcolm (1994), Kovacevic (1995), Zimmermann (1999) and Glenny’s (1999) analyses of the Balkan context and the rise and fall of Yugoslavia. These sources have been written in the period during or after the Bosnian war 1992-95, which of course, has the advantage of historical wisdom, but also, the disadvantage of the historical facts being interpreted in the light of the most recent socio-political events, thus painting the Balkan picture that fits its new realities. Of course, as “the national histories are continually being re-written and the re-writing reflects current balances of hegemony” (Billig, 1995:71), it will be accepted here that biases are a constitutive part of reconstructing historical events. The short review of Yugoslav history given here, therefore, is itself one such constructive process at work.

However, in order to allow the reader to infer the extent to which a level of objectivity could be achieved in this chapter, as well as in the rest of this thesis, I feel it is necessary to position myself in relation to both the concepts and the issues pertaining to Yugoslavia, and to explain the background from which the current issues under investigation in this thesis have been approached. It should hopefully reveal the systems of meanings from which the empirical findings in this thesis have been interpreted, and allow the reader to assess the effort put into representing the respondents’ meaning systems as truthfully as possible.

I was born in Belgrade, the former-Yugoslavia, and, as many of those born in the post-WW2 era in this country, I am of a mixed ethnic origin: my mother is Hungarian, and my father was Serbian. I was brought up in a strict environment of non-nationalism, and the only identity conferred upon me by my parents was the Yugoslav identity. Their firm belief that I should be allowed to decide for myself whether I wanted to endorse either of my parents’ ethnic identity meant that no ethnic and cultural system of values was given preference in my upbringing.
With the advent of the inter-ethnic tensions and political hostilities in the late 80's, my position of "non-belonging" became more apparent, thus increasing my desire to be free from the conflict through objectivity.

It is hard to remain emotionless and untouched by the war whose destruction is measured not only in terms of the magnitude of human and material losses, but also in the shattered visions, beliefs and futures of many of those who have found themselves trapped in the ever growing conflict. I regret the disappearance of the former-Yugoslavia, although I am not nostalgic about it. I do not identify with any ethnic category, and find it hard to describe myself in those terms.

Having described the position that I come from, it will suffice to say that the sources used to aid representation of the history of the former-Yugoslavia and some of its nations in this chapter were selected for their "moderate" position on the issues of both the role and purpose of the former-Yugoslavia, and the intricate relationships between its constitutive nations. There are, of course, more extreme interpretations of the historical events based on the exclusionary politics and the ideology viewing a single ethnic entity in the Balkans (e.g. the Serbs, Croats, Muslims) as the most important and indeed the only cultural, political, military or economic factor in the area. These positions are not represented in this chapter, and an interested reader is referred to the works of Tudjman, (1997), Izetbegovic (1996) or the "Memorandum" of the Serbian Academy of Sciences published in 1986.
4.1 The concept of Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia emerged and disappeared in the periods of the tectonic shifts in the European and global politics. As an unintegrated part of Europe positioned on its margins, all the big changes in Europe had a direct effect upon the Balkans.

Yugoslavia was founded on the idea of freedom won by the Yugoslav nations under their centuries-long subjugation in the hands of the two great empires—the Austro-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire; it was also a result of the emergence of the new European order, and the establishment of the new powers in the European politics after the Great War (Kovacevic, 1995). Many problems to later scourge the former-Yugoslav peoples were the legacy of these two powerful conquerors: “they left a complex demographic patchwork within which ‘ethnic’ violence became lethal”, often assuming a usual pattern of the powerful majorities afflicting force upon the unprotected minorities (Glenny, 1999:326). It subsequently fell twice in its short period of its existence: just before the World War Second, as a result of the new pretensions of the great world powers, as well as the internal frictions scourging the country; and upon the disintegration of the bipolar structure of the European and world order at the end of the 20th century, leading to the new restructuring of the Balkans.

Yugoslavia was one of the youngest and most complex states in the European history: six nations - Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, Macedonians, Slovenes and Muslims (or eight, including the Albanian and the Hungarian ethnic minority), three great confessions.

---

1 There are ideological and historical debates pertaining to the motivation and reasoning behind the formation of Yugoslavia (the nation of the “South Slavs”). Some authors have emphasised not so much the political will of the South Slav peoples to live together, as much as the political void left as a consequence of the collapse of the great empires (Malcolm, 1994). Others, although recognising the genuine desire of the South Slavs to live together, have considered the creation of Yugoslavia partly a political tool of the great international powers such as US and France to counter the Italian expansion and her ambitions along the Dalmatian coast (Zimmerman, 1999; Glenny, 1999).
(Catholicism, Orthodox/eastern Christianity and Islam), different historical influences, distinct heritage and traditions, many dialects of mainly one dominant language, many different state mechanisms – all formed a complex socio-political and historical landscape of this country. In the heart of its creation and existence was a Serbo-Croat relationship, characterised by the two opposing ideologies of Serbian hegemony and centralising tendencies on one hand, and Croatian separatism and federalism, on the other (Malkolm, 1994; Kovacevic, 1995).

Two broad socio-political and economic processes in the 20th century underlined Yugoslavia’s rise and fall: one was the process of globalisation and universalism (the “free world”, multinational corporations, equality and unifying tendencies, democracy, human rights, etc.), and the other - that of the idea of the nationhood (the state, its history, traditions, identity, independence, sovereignty, etc.). Yugoslavia could not have been created without the endorsement of the notion of universalism, but could not have survived without the principle of territorial and national sovereignty (Kovacevic, 1995). In its final days, the predominance of the processes of globalisation over localism and self-sufficiency was simultaneous to the revival of the obsolete ideology of nationalism, the two opposing processes inevitably leading to its collapse.

4.2 The Balkans and the South Slavs

Ever since the Ancient Greece, the Balkans was at the crossroads of different civilisation and cultural/civilising influences. The split of the Roman Empire into its Eastern (Byzantine Empire) and the Western (Catholic) part remained until today in the form of the two frequently confronted cultural and interest spheres. The South Slavs arrived to the Balkans in the 6th-7th century, and the different cultural/civilising spheres were the conditions under which they were developing their separate national identities and aspirations. The Serbs and the Bulgarians were converted into eastern (Orthodox)
Christianity under the influence of Byzantine Empire, and the Croats and later Slovenes came under the influence of the Vatican.

The Croats lost their state in 1102, becoming a part of the Hungarian State and political entity. The Serbian State fell under the Turkish invasion in 1459, who conquered Bosnia as well, soon after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. With the advent of the Turks, yet another civilisation and the political power entered the Balkan socio-political scene—Islam, the social force which was to remain a legitimate political and cultural power in certain parts of Yugoslavia (e.g. Bosnia, Kosovo) up until today. With the arrival of the Ottoman Empire, the Balkans became the 'tampon' zone from which the rest of Europe was defending itself from the growing Asian power. In the context of the continual conflict and competition for dominance between the Austro-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, the Balkan peoples were used by both the European and the Oriental powers as the defenders of their highly volatile borders. Their common identity was being torn both through the process of conversion into Islam, but also, through the Vatican’s continued effort at converting the Slav people into Catholicism, especially after the losses suffered by the rise of Protestantism. All these processes provoked further inner migrations and mixing of the south Slavs across the Balkans and other European areas (e.g. Hungary, Austria, etc.), all of which were accompanied by great human losses.  

Quite distinct national identities have evolved from this quagmire of influences. The Serbs, the largest Balkan people, tied their national identity to the 14th century Serbian Kingdom, and the Serbian Orthodox Church. The Ottoman political and state organisation never managed to fully infiltrate the Serbian consciousness due to its very

---

2 Of course, there are debates about the origin of some of the peoples constituting the former-Yugoslavia. For instance, a group of herdsmen cold “Vlachs”, had arrived to the eastern part of Bosnia (Herzegovina) in the middle ages, to be subsequently used by Austro-Hungary as the defenders of its boarders. Their descendants nowadays identify themselves as the Bosnian Serbs, although there is a great deal of speculation whether they are, indeed, of the Slav origin. Malcolm (1994) for instance argues that they represent a group of Albanian descendants, whose greater mobility enabled their rapid movement across different areas in the Balkans.
distinct cultural and social constellation. As a consequence, the Serbs have always been antagonistic to the foreign rule. They were among the first Slav nations to form an independent state.

The Croats also lost their state very early on, and lived in the symbiosis with the Hungarians for a long time, due to their common religious orientation - Catholicism. This factor contributed to their consciousness of belonging to the universal European system of values, something unique among the rest of the south Slav peoples (of mainly Orthodox Christian or Muslim orientation). They have traditionally felt to be the defenders of the European civilisation. Until the first decade of the 16th century, the Croats were indeed *bilocristianitatis ante murales*, although soon after, this role was largely inherited by the Serbs who were invited by the Austro-Hungarian Empire to act as defenders of the Empire’s borders against the Ottoman Turks. The idea of the common Yugoslav (in translation the “South Slav”) identity was first articulated among the Croats, which was one of the two alternative visions of the development of the Croatian state—the other viewing the Croats as the most important, and probably the only political entity on the Balkans. This latter idea gained its full expression in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH), during the WW2.

The origin of the present-day Muslims is much more difficult to ascertain. Understanding it requires grappling with the complex issue of the massive islamisation of Bosnia, where a much larger percentage of population converted to Islam than anywhere in the rest of the Balkans except Albania. This process was completed in the period of 150

---

1 In fact, the Serb Orthodox Church became active in certain parts of the former-Yugoslavia (e.g. Bosnia) only with the advent of the Turks. The attempts to explain this sudden upsurge of Orthodox Christianity during the Ottoman rule in Bosnia vary: some have argued that the Church was acting as a protector of the Serb national consciousness under the Turkish rule (e.g. Kovacevic, 1995; Glenny, 1999); others have asserted that the Serb Orthodox Church was in fact favoured by the Turks over its Catholic counterpart for the Ottomans’ perceived threat from their nearest neighbours – the surrounding Catholic Europe (Malkolm, 1994).
years, and the predominantly Slav Christian population of Bosnia was soon to become the majority Slav Muslim population by the 16th century. Malcolm (1994) lists a number of theories explaining the process of Islamicisation in Bosnia, many of which are now rejected. One of the contested theories was that this mass conversion may have been due to the Bogumils finally deciding to convert to Islam, having held for centuries against Catholicism and the Orthodox Church. Another theory, endorsed by both the Croats and the Serbs, treated the Muslims of Bosnia as renegades from either Catholicism or Orthodoxy. Yet another theory claimed that the Muslims were the foreign element introduced by the Turks with their advent onto the Balkans. However, most likely, Islamicisation was a result of a combination of these factors: Christianity was quite weakly supported by any church organisation in Bosnia, especially in the more remote areas. With the introduction of the divisive system by the Ottoman Empire, whereby it was necessary to be a Muslim in order to have a career in the Ottoman State itself, and with legalisation of the privileged legal status of the Muslims, many Slavs were motivated to convert into Islam. This way, the Christian Slavs were relegated to a lower status, and considered "raya". From this complex set of circumstances emerged some common perceptions/stereotypes and animosities that the Slav Muslims and the Slav Christians – in particular the Serbs - held against each other: the Muslims perceived the Serbs as the executioners of their orderly and prosperous world, whereas the Serbs saw the Muslims as traitors.

The status of the Muslims as an ethnic and political entity in its own right had for long been debated. The category of a "Muslim" had not been treated as a cultural-historical label of equal rank to other nationalities in the newly formed Yugoslavia until after WW2, despite the fact that, with the emergence of Yugoslavia, Muslims were already operating as a community on a par with other nations in the newly formed state. Much of

---

4 The members of the Bosnian Church. The Bosnian Church managed to establish independence from both the Catholic and the Orthodox Church in the early 13th century, although its teachings combined the elements of both.
their political activity went into defending their own identity, often denied them by their 
Croat and Serbian counter-parts.

4.3 The rise and fall of the first Yugoslavia

After the Great War, from which Serbia emerged as a winner, the Kingdom of the Serbs, 
Croats and Slovenes (SCS) was first established on 1 December in 1918. Each of the 
three peoples (and many other minorities) entered the state with their own plans and 
pretensions, and their distinct cultural characteristics. The new state had been 
undermined, however, from its very beginnings. Despite the Kingdom of Serbia emerging 
as a winner in the war against Autro-Hungary, the great international powers agreed to 
recognise the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes as a new entity only after it 
had made duly territorial concessions to another ambitious international power - Italy. 
The country's anomalous diplomatic position was bad enough, but the real problems 
emerged from the unsolved question of other national entities of the country, as well as 
the poor economic management of the state. For the next twenty years, the country's 
destiny was sealed by its inability to resolve the national question that evolved around the 
centralising tendencies of the Serbs and the federalist pressures of the Croats (Glenny, 
1999; Kovacevic, 1995; Malcolm, 1994). Actually, the Serbian reluctance to grant other 
constituent parties of the country (primarily the Croats and the Slovenes, but also the 
Macedonians, Muslims, etc.) equal political status, and the absence of any agreement 
between the political elites of the Kingdom of SCS's main constituents, the Serbs and the 
Croats with respect to the political order of the new state, led to the country's 
disintegration, the bloody events of the WW2, and were the bone of contempt in the most 
recent Yugoslav history, as a prelude to the atrocities of the Bosnian war 1992-5. These 
conflicts were fuelled by the main party in opposition - the Croat Republican Peasant 
Party boycotting the work of the country's newly established parliament, ensuring that for 
the first five years of its existence, the Croat's question was not given due attention in the
political centres of Belgrade. It furthered the Serbian-Croat rift by confirming the Serbian prejudice that the Croat grievances were nothing more than covert separatism.

Apart from the internal problems, a major threat to its further development was the crisis of the democratic regimes in Europe, rise of fascism (Italy) and nazism (Germany), with the aim of changing the current world order, and the pretensions of the Bolshevik Russia. After the economic crisis had hit the world, the dependent Yugoslav economy was in ruins, and despite its appeals for help, the only country to take a keen interest in the Balkans was Hitler's Germany which counted on the Balkan rich agricultural, oil and mineral resources to sustain it through the next war. Yugoslav disintegration was largely caused by the growing appetite of the European powers, best illustrated in the formation of the Independent State of Croatia (supported by Mussolini and Hitler) and the territorial pretensions over Yugoslavia of the Hungarians, Bulgarians and the Albanians (Glenny, 1999).

The WW2 started in Yugoslavia slightly later than in the rest of Europe, when Hitler ordered bombing of Belgrade, the centre of opposition to Yugoslav collaboration with Germany. The fate of Yugoslavia was a shocking reminder to the rest of the world of the ruthlessness of the new military power - that of Germany. During the WW2 Yugoslavia was chopped up into at least nine units. "In almost every part of the country, the establishment of a new authority was accompanied by the settling of old accounts and the opening of new ones. Governance was replaced by state terror on a horrifying scale. The Ustaše (the military force of the Independent State of Croatia) turned their territory into one great slaughterhouse. The Germans in Belgrade lost no time in drawing up their lists of Jews, Gypsies and subversives, while in northern Macedonia, Bulgarian soldiers and secret policemen were torturing suspected Serb sympathisers and hanging their mutilated bodies from street lamps. Those who found themselves in Italian occupied zones were the least unfortunate. Yet uniquely in occupied and fascist Europe, armed resistance
organisations mounted a challenge to the Nazi’s New Order from the very beginning.” (Glenny, 1999:485)

The WW2 in Yugoslavia was fought between factions and with many different aims (Malcolm, 1994; Glenny, 1999). First, the war was initially conducted by Germany and Italy, and later Bulgaria and Hungary against Yugoslavia. Then, the Axis and the Allies’ forces were continuing their war efforts against each other in Yugoslavia. Simultaneously, the Axis occupiers fought against the local resistance movements. Furthermore, there were at least two civil wars: the Croatian extremists waged a vicious war against the Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia; but also, there was a war between the two political factions in Yugoslavia: the Chetniks and the Communist Partisans, which decided the political future of the country (Malcolm, 1994).

Two political and military factions emerged in Serbia, both of them gathering different ethnic groups into their troops: the disintegrated Royal Army formed the Chetniks, majority Serbian soldiers; a new force also emerged with its headquarters in Belgrade – this was the Yugoslav Communist Party under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito. The two factions developed notably different strategies and war aims, and were founded upon different ideologies: the Chetniks’ primary aim was to defend the Serbian civilian population and secure the King’s return to power after the war. The Communists’ goal was to spread across the country, and gain power over the royalists. The two were soon to become hated enemies, and the emergence of the open conflict between the two factions showed the full scale of the murderous chaos that then filled the Yugoslav canvas (Glenny, 1999)

The Independent State of Croatia (NDH), whose aim was creation of the Greater Croatia incorporating the whole of what is now known as Bosnia and Herzegovina, could only succeed in its plan with the help of the Muslim population in Bosnia. Although regarding them with a slight contempt, the Croats invited the Muslims into their ranks, and their
usually rich landowners and traders supported the Ustaše (Glenny, 1999). Malcolm (1994) argued that the Muslims’ disillusionment with the centralising Serbian rule in the period between the wars, and the Muslim natural affinity towards Croats made them more willing to accept Croats as their allies, who, in turn, promised them equal rights. The main task of the new (Muslim-Croat) administration in Bosnian towns was the execution of the most important and influential Serbs in the area (Glenny, 1999). This further pushed the Serbs of Bosnia and Eastern Herzegovina to organise themselves into Chetnik formations, and the next stage of the bloody civil war commenced, with the Chetniks taking revenge against the Muslim and Croatian unprotected civilian population. The scale of the atrocities paralleled those seen elsewhere in the country, and just in one town, up to 2-3000 Muslims were killed by the Chetniks. “This pattern of slaughter and counter-slaughter could be found in most corners of Bosnia and Hercegovina, and several regions of Croatia, from the summer of 1941.” (Glenny, 1999: 495).

The Muslims, soon to become disillusioned by the failed promises of the Croats and their vile and ruthless pogrom of the Serbs, but also witnessing the Serbian aggression against their population in certain areas of Bosnia (especially Herzegovina), soon started turning to the Communist Partisans, who, by that time, had already begun recognising the Muslims as a “special whole” (see Malcolm, 1994: 181).

With the advent of the war, the revolutionary movement of the Communists was gaining a momentum, and its aim was to combine liberation with the establishment of the socialist order. After the rigged elections in November 1945, the Communists came into power, taking hold of power in Yugoslavia much earlier than anywhere in Eastern Europe.

5 One of the most important tasks of the NDH was to solve the “Serbian question” (over a quarter of the population of Croatia were Serbs). They commenced a genocide against the Serbs (as well as other ethnic groups such as the Jews and the Gypsies), so ruthless that even the Germans were complaining against the Ustaše treatment of their victims (Glenny, 1999; Malcolm, 1994). Historical document estimate that over one million Serbs had been killed by Ustaše in just one concentration camp in Croatia – Jasenovac (Malcolm, 1994).
However, after its break with the Cominform in 1946, Yugoslavia parted from the influence of the Soviets, which allowed its very special role in international politics: it created strong ties with both the West, and subsequently the Soviets throughout the whole period of the cold war.

4.4 The rise and fall of the second Yugoslavia

The communist era in Yugoslavia (under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito) created an ideological basis which was markedly different from that in the rest of the Eastern European countries, based on three principles: brotherhood and unity (based on the idea of the common Slav origin of most of its constituent nationalities), the principle of national equality (which gained its institutional expression in the formation of a federal state), and the adoption of socialism as the new socio-economic order. Of the three principles, the most defining ones were those of socialism and "Yugoslavism" which would often clash with the nationalist tendencies. These clashes were permanent, resulting in frequent changes in Yugoslav constitution, and finally in the total decentralisation of the state, which led to its total incapacitation (Kovacevic, 1995).

During the communist era in Yugoslavia, a very special - "softer" form of socialism was emerging, based on decentralisation and economic self-management. At the level of diplomacy, Yugoslavia formed the special relationship with the Third World countries, especially India and Egypt, thus contributing to the fine balance between the two world blocks (the Atlantic and the Warsaw pact). This created a very special place of Yugoslavia in the panorama of international politics of the cold war. However, its internal politics was characterised by three big problems: a) unresolved peasant issue; b) unresolved national issue; c) economic mismanagement. These three issues created great rifts that were to subsequently contribute to the chaos of the war in the former-Yugoslavia. First, through collectivisation and high taxes Yugoslav peasantry (still the dominant force of its economy and the dominant income for a large proportion of
Yugoslavs) was being destroyed. This led to the growing rift between the countryside and
the increasingly more open and cosmopolitan cities. The growing social gap between the
cities and the countryside created what would in the subsequent years of the war in
Bosnia and Croatia be the most tremendous revenge of the (predominantly Serb and
Croat) rural population against the cities of Yugoslavia (especially Sarajevo).

Furthermore, the destruction of peasant economy led to massive emigration (up to
800 000 Yugoslavs emigrated to Germany only, to form a large labour force there called
"Gastarbeiers"). This established a pattern of emigration, but also certain widespread
representation of emigrants, as the second class citizens (as will be reflected in some of
the respondents' interviews in this thesis).

Thirdly, the inter-ethnic problems of the past were not given due attention under Tito’s
rule. In addition to a series of disputes over territory and the minorities with its four
neighbours (Italy, Bulgaria, Greece and Albania) in the early years of Yugoslav existence,
relations between Croats and Serbs and the Albanian-Serb tensions in Kosovo lurked as a
latent threat in the background of the Yugoslav internal policy. As Tito’s main aim was
his own power, he subdued national question by that of the state, and hence never
succeeded in accommodating legitimate expressions of national identity. Instead, his
preferred solution to the problem was its suppression, or worse still, neutralising one
nationalism by pitting another against it (Glenny, 1999). The old question of centralism
vs. federalism that was resolved by greater decentralisation of the country, raised another
issue of the rights and powers of the six federated republics (Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia,
Bosnia and Hercegovina, Montenegro and Macedonia) in relation to the central
government. Tito was often an arbiter in the clashes between various currents in the
Yugoslav politics: his narrow vision of Yugoslavia’s future was more concerned with his
own power than the survival of the country long-term (Glenny, 1999, Malcolm, 1994,
Zimmermann, 1999). He crushed the reformist and liberal currents in the Yugoslav
political scene, and again shoved the national question under the carpet. In 1974, the
The longest ever written constitution was produced, which granted the largely Albanian and Hungarian-dominated provinces of Serbia (Kosovo and Vojvodina) full autonomy, the move to later enable the rise of Milošević's nationalist policy and Serbian nationalism, that like a boomerang led to the similar rise of nationalisms across the country. The Constitution's impenetrable prescriptions for the future of Yugoslavia created a great deal of confusion after Tito's death, as the politicians and representatives of the eight Yugoslav entities (including Kosovo and Vojvodina) were struggling to achieve a common policy (Glenny, 1999, Zimmermann, 1999, Malcolm, 1994).

4.5 The war in the former-Yugoslavia

The totalitarian style inherited from the communists, and nationalism as the hibernating, but powerful ideology, achieved their symbiosis with the rise of Milošević's dictatorial rule: his emergence on the political scene was a direct consequence of his exploitation of the Kosovo question, and the Serbian emotions wrapped around the Kosovo proper. He stripped Kosovo of its autonomy, and started the suppression of the Albanian population in Kosovo, simultaneously arousing the feelings of martyrdom among his fellow-Serbs. The success of his deadly campaign would have been impossible without the lethal role of the Belgrade TV, and other mass-media which trumpeted Milošević's nationalistic policies. The Croatian national spirit was soon to emerge as well, enticed by the arrival of Tudjman into power. The two newly elected presidents, although coming from apparently radically different ideological backgrounds (Milošević was a communist with the newly adopted sword of nationalism, and Tudjman emerged from the anti-communist nationalist opposition), did not differ much in their style, aims and the means of achieving these aims. They both wanted power, and the establishment of the greater Serbia/Croatia (Glenny, 1999; Zimmermann, 1999).

Almost overnight, the conflict erupted over the old issue of unitarism vs. federalism. But there were also decisive new elements in the political canvas of Yugoslavia: the maturity
and political confidence of Slovenes, Bosnian Muslims, Macedonians and Albanians; also, the cultural division between the rural and urban life was much greater in Yugoslavia than anywhere else in the communist Balkans. The conflict between the republics took various forms: trade-war; fiscal war; media war; exploitation of the federal centre and the hostility towards the federal prime minister, etc. Croatia began a process of rehabilitation of the Ustaše state. The fear of the return of the WW2 hostilities – of both the Ustaše and the Chetniks could not be underestimated. Miloševic rushed to fuel even further the fear of persecution of the Serbian population in Croatia and Bosnia. Miloševic's tactic was to use Yugoslavia as a vehicle of his total rule, supporting Yugoslav National Army's ever-keener considerations of mounting a coup. When in 1991 the plan was finally abandoned, Miloševic parted from the idea of Yugoslavia as the means of total rule, and, appearing on TV in March 1991, announced the death of Yugoslavia. Before killing the bird off, however, Miloševic and Tudjman needed to resolve yet another issue: that of Bosnia. While the war in Croatia was taking a momentum, they met up in Vojvodina, and agreed to split Bosnia between Serbia and Croatia, cutting it in half.

This was all happening at the time when Europe was celebrating the fall of communism, German unification, the strengthening of the EU (Maastricht), and was involved in the crisis of the Gulf War. European leaders were in no mood to contemplate the possible tragedy of Yugoslavia. The Croatian president, however, finally managed to persuade the Germans (themselves sensitive to the issue of sovereignty in the mid of their unification), to unilaterally (without consultation with the rest of Europe) recognise Slovenia and Croatia as independent states. This was a dangerous move (diametrically opposed to that sought by Britain and France who recognised the need for thorough negotiations), which completely neglected the issue of the two most dangerous parts of Yugoslavia – Bosnia and Macedonia. As Glenny asserted, the reason Yugoslavia survived for such a long time was because it provided a viable solution to the problem of Bosnia with its incredibly complex mix of ethnicities. Although Bosnian president Izetbegovic was not ready at the
time to seek independence of his country from Yugoslavia (fully aware of its tragic consequences), encouraged by the US, Bosnia finally declared independence from Yugoslavia. The consequence was that one third of its population — the Bosnian Serbs — refused to recognise the new state as their dominion, and felt entitled (with the ideological and military support from Serbia) to start the inter-ethnic conflict in Bosnia. By recognising the independent states, the international community completed the disintegration of Yugoslavia, sealed the fate of the Krajina (Croatian) Serbs, but it also failed to take into account the implications this would have for Kosovo and Macedonia. The war in Bosnia commenced in 1992, and did not finish until 1995, when the warring factions were finally forced to sign a peace-deal known as “Dayton agreement”, splitting Bosnia into half: 51% of its territory belonging to Muslim-Croat Federation, and 49% to the Bosnian Serbs’ Republika Srpska. The Dayton Peace-Deal is an incredibly complex and contradictory text which many experts fear is sustainable only with the International Community’s presence in Bosnia. It can only exist as long as the international troops ensure its implementation. It is certainly not a lasting solution to the Bosnian problem.

The Bosnian conflict at the end of the 20th century resulted in the formation (and further disintegration) of as many as nine new “independent entities” (the shortest living state lasted for just over a week). It was the most vicious inter-ethnic conflict in Europe since the Second World War, whereby around 200 000 people had been killed in Bosnia and Croatia, many thousands of them being defenceless civilians. Over 3 million people fled their homes during the war: one in every eight people who lived in the old Yugoslavia - the largest outpouring of refugees in the recent history of Europe. Just by the end of 1993, almost 800 000 people were displaced from Bosnia into other parts of the former-Yugoslavia: Croatia, Serbia and Slovenia; over 1.6 million were internally displaced people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia. More recent figures show that by 1998 over 2 million refugees existed on the territory of the Former Yugoslavia. Many distinct communities were destroyed in the process of re-shuffling and forced migration of millions of people: for instance the Muslim population was expelled from Eastern Bosnia
by the Bosnian Serb army, and almost 200,000 Serbs had been driven out of Krajina in Croatia, the largest single movement of refugees since the WW2. Europe alone received approximately one million refugees, of whom 21,000 have arrived to Britain. Many more people have left Yugoslavia outside of the asylum framework and thus would not be recorded as refugees. Most of the respondents interviewed in this study have at some point of their abode in the UK been subsumed under the ‘asylum seekers’ framework, and a very few of them have been granted a full refugee status. Nevertheless it should be noted that there has been an overwhelming degree of legal ambiguity in relation to the people emigrating from the former-Yugoslavia to Britain throughout the conflict, as many laws pertaining to their status in the UK have been defined and amended in the course of the rapid change of the situation on the ground - i.e. the nature of the on-going conflict in the former-Yugoslavia and the magnitude of the refugee-flow.

The conflict in Kosovo that continued subsequent to the peace deal, with the intensified “ethnic cleansing” of the Albanian population in Kosovo by the Yugoslav authorities led to the number of refugees arriving to neighbouring and some EU countries increasing dramatically during 1999. With it, the issues of adaptation of forced migrants became more pressing than ever.
### Table 1. Asylum applications from the former Yugoslavia, in Europe, 1989-1998 (totals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of asylum</th>
<th>Number of applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>21,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>506,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>51,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>21,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>135,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>94,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>21,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>924,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Recognition of asylum-seeker from the former Yugoslavia under the 1951 Convention and those granted humanitarian status in Europe, 1989-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of asylum</th>
<th>Number of refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>30,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>69,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>11,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR

---

*Grecic, 2000*
Chapter Five

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The current research programme was set to examine the adaptation-processes of people who arrived from the former-Yugoslavia to Britain, as a direct or indirect effect of the civil war in their country. The following section will present the issues pertaining to the choice of the method, its design and the process of data-collection.

5.1 Epistemology: Combining the qualitative and quantitative research

It was evident from the very start of the current enquiry into adaptation that a new, different approach to the complex phenomenon should be adopted, the approach which would simultaneously be open to the full richness and complexity of the issues at hand, but also be amenable to a more rigid and robust model-testing. It was decided to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative method, as it was believed that it would allow greater validity of the conclusions to be drawn.

The traditional way of looking at the two broad types of data-collection and management saw them as polarised and incommensurable methods. The distinction drawn between the two encompassed the type of data (e.g. rich, soft vs. generalising, hard), the type of inference (e.g. inductive, systematic vs. deductive, analytic), the function/role these approaches assumed in research (e.g. description, individuation vs. causal explanation, generalisation), even the form of knowledge or philosophical/epistemological basis of these different ways of enquiry (e.g. phenomenology, Verstehen vs. positivism).

It has been generally accepted that the quantitative method emerged from within positivistic paradigm which endorsed quantifying the phenomena in a way which would allow hypothesis-testing, replication, objectivity and abstraction. Experimental manipulation and statistical tools have been taken to be invaluable assets of this approach.
that ensured systematic uncovering of what has been considered to be truth. Qualitative method was associated with socio-constructivist paradigm (Berger and Luckmann, 1975), as it took on board the constructive nature of reality, the inescapable importance of meanings, recognising the role of interaction (even that within laboratory setting), and cultural as well as individual diversities. Reflexivity (e.g. the intricate relationship between theory and the choice of the method; the role of science and research enquiry in reproducing, reconstructing and transforming the phenomena under investigation) and relativity (cultural specificity of both the contents and the form of enquiry) emerged as the core tenets of this approach.

Recent developments in psychology, but also other social sciences, have recognised the artificiality of the distinction between different epistemologies, based not only on the reality of the increasing cross-disciplinary projects relying on more varied methods of scientific enquiry, but also on the growing recognition of the complex interaction and mutual influence between the agent and the environment. Suddenly, the strict boundaries between various forms of enquiry became unsustainable. It is now more readily accepted that the strict distinction is not tenable as it “does not accurately map the differences in practical method or in philosophical position that are actually to be found among researchers.” (Hammersley, 1996:173). The two ways of doing research as well as associated epistemologies are “inextricably intertwined”, not only at the level of data sets, but also at the level of data analyses and designs (Howe, 1985). Furthermore, even if the concept of distinct empirical “paradigms” is to be accepted, these should not be treated as mutually exclusive; rather, they are to be pitched at different “levels of analysis”, each contributing in its own domain towards the overall picture of reality. Thus, an increasing number of authors nowadays argue that the choice of the approach will depend less on the researcher's philosophical position, and more on the judgement of the situation, context and purpose of the study (Hammersley, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1992).
Hammersley (1996) presents the case for abandoning the strict boundaries between the two methods of enquiry. He argues, for instance, that words and numbers are not the exclusive tools of expression of each of the two respective methods of enquiry – the qualitative and the quantitative approach. Recent research showed that survey-investigation of issues that were pertinent and of a highly sensitive nature for the respondents was itself not immune from the identity-dynamics. Barnett (1998) showed that the patterns of response to questionnaire-survey would to some extent be a function of the range of sensitivity of the items, with the implications that certain patterns may be wrongly attributed to underlying processes being investigated, where they are attributable to the sensitivity of the items that are being used and the way in which this is interacting with these processes. The analysis of such data would be highly problematic if people's answers to these questions were to be taken at their face value. It is increasingly recognised that any context, including the highly controlled one such as laboratory or even survey-questionnaire, is a part of social world, which is invariably embedded in a system of meanings.

The two methods have also been differentiated on the basis of the settings used for enquiry, frequently depicted as natural (used in qualitative data collection) vs. artificial (quantitative) settings of data collection. Hammersley argues that it would be more fair to define this distinction in terms of a continuum from less obtrusive to more controlled settings. It has been widely documented that even the most unobtrusive methods of data-collection (such as ethnography), is not immune to reactivity (for which experiments have traditionally been criticised). By their very presence within the context of study, the researchers add something to the ongoing socio-psychological dynamics, thus changing it, if only just slightly. It is recognised, for instance, that longitudinal interview technique might affect the sample under investigation in a way which will transform them into a very atypical and unrepresentative sample within the population (Scott and Alwin, 1998). It may be necessary, therefore, to change the meaning of the term "ecological validity" – even the most naturalistic methods are often unrepresentative simply because the context
of investigation differs in important ways from other similar contexts. Current research, for instance, will look at the very specific and therefore very unique population of immigrants, whereby replication of the concrete findings in other migrant groups will not be the main aim of the study. Rather, we will hope to point to the limits of certain conceptual assumptions, and test the alternative framework for understanding of similar phenomena in the future.

In short, it has been argued above that the two approaches — qualitative and quantitative — should not be considered as mutually exclusive, but rather, that their specific characteristics are frequently complementary, seen as a continuum, and sometimes as overlapping. A number of ways in which the two approaches could be combined has been suggested (see Hammersley, 1996 and Miles and Huberman, 1992). Most often, their interrelationship has been described as a) triangulation, whereby the two approaches are used in order to "confirm or corroborate" each other (Miles and Huberman, 1992), accounting for each other's inconsistencies and threats to validity (Hammersley, 1996), this way contributing to the stronger argumentation and greater accuracy of findings (Smith, 1996b); b) facilitation, whereby one approach is used as a basis for the development of a series of research hypotheses; c) complementarity, as they might provide different sorts of information that complement each other (Hammersley, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1992). The approach adopted in this research is that of facilitation and complementarity: the qualitative work was used as a means of accessing the intricacies of the socio-psychological characteristics of the particular migrant population in question (the former-Yugoslavs who arrived to Britain since 1992), thus providing information for the development of the subsequent study-design and instruments of measurement. However, quantitative approach was only partly informed by the findings from the previous study, as its design was derived from a particular theoretical position — that of IPT (Breakwell, 1986). Furthermore, it is important to emphasise that the qualitative study was not intended solely as exploratory, since the analysis of its data was approached with the intention of seeing a particular conceptual framework (elaborated in
chapter three) at work: the cognitive and emotional components of threat to identity were looked for, and some indication of identity change (identity-adaptation) seen as coping to threat was suggested.

In short, the research reported in this thesis, just like much of contemporary research, does not fall neatly into one or another “paradigm” of study. As will be discussed in more detail in the following sections, the boundaries between the two are porous as at no point did the researcher stand as a distant outsider in relation to the respondent in either qualitative or quantitative data. The manner of data-collection, the type of questions asked and the retrospective design adopted (see below) redefined the commonly perceived “static” nature of the quantitative research. Finally, such eclecticism in collecting data was necessary given the nature of the adaptation model in which the research was being conducted.

5.2 Design: Retrospective approach to studying adaptation processes and identity-adaptation

To understand people's identity-adaptation and adaptation processes in the event of migration, it is necessary to rely on people's life histories. Gleaning valid and reliable report on these is not an easy task, as the two most common ways in which this has been done – prospective and retrospective method – both have their downfalls as well as advantages. The design employed in the current research programme was that of retrospective collection of data. In the next section some pros and cons of this type of design will be presented and certain conceptual clarifications offered.

Retrospective approach to data collection involves people's present recollections about the past (Schwarz and Sudman, 1994). Scott and Alwin (1998) distinguished between three types of information to be captured by retrospective designs: event histories; the cumulation of experiences; and the evaluation or interpretation of experiences. This
distinction is important, as it suggests the limits of validity of the retrospective design adopted. For instance, whereas recollection of life events and cumulative experiences that affect current states necessitate precise recall of life-transitions, their duration as well as sequencing, the recollection of the subjective states, involves interpretation or the account of meanings of the past occurrences as filtered through the current states. Past importantly constitutes our current self-evaluations and also, past is remembered or constructed in the light of the present subjective states.

It is the last category of information that has been the focus of the current research programme. It was believed here that in order to study current adaptation patterns, people's memories represent invaluable source of information. The focus in this study was not on gathering life-events in their strict sequence, numbers or duration. It was not even on depicting the cummulation of life-experiences that affected the current states (e.g. the life-stages such as marriage, job, experience of war, migration, etc.). Rather, subjective evaluation of the past and present was thought to be a good index of the current identity states and the current perceptions of threat, the two, as seen from chapter three, good indicators of people's adaptation. It would be right to say that the data collected in this research was retrospective data, as the accounts of the past states were looked at as filtered through the current mind-sets. Retrospection understood in this sense is a good source of information about the present.

The design of the research was not fully retrospective, however. Merton (1956) made a distinction between retrospective data and retrospective design. Whereas the former represents the interpretation of the past events from the current position, the latter relates to collection of the perceptions of changes that have led to the current identity-states. Of course, there is a very thin line between these two aspects of research – retrospective design invariably encompasses retrospective data, as the influences of present upon the recollection of the changes in the past is rarely eliminated. Nevertheless, it has been felt here that the distinction is useful, given the combination of different methodological
approaches adopted here. Whereas interviews were a clear example of retrospection as it occurred in the present—i.e., as Scott and Alwin (1998) argued—people’s current contemplation of their past, or the current “looking back”, the questionnaire-based data was clearly rooted in the retrospective design: one of the main goals of this questionnaire was to get people to give their accounts of the changes that had happened across the specified periods of time, and look at their relationship with current reports of people’s states. In other words, whereas the interview study was not necessarily longitudinal study, the design of the quantitative study was embedded in the longitudinal framework—the aim was to get some measure of the subjective perception of development or change through clearly specified time-frames, as seen from the current perspective.

Here, it seems to be useful to clarify a few common misunderstandings affecting researchers’ choice and treatment of different methods and designs of study. Longitudinal design has often been equated with prospective data—that is, collecting events as they occurred in real time. Here, the critique of such view by Scott and Alwin will be adopted in that the prospective data is not always the most valuable source of information about change. Apart from the problem of sample attrition (commonly of up to 70% of the initial sample in the first wave), Hewthorne effect (changing the subjects’ behaviour through their participation so that they in some sense become an atypical sample), and difficulty in translating the meanings of events or constructs across time (as captured by measures of investigation), other considerations make prospective designs not always the most suitable longitudinal design. For instance, due to the gap between different waves of data collection, many significant short-term changes are not captured by prospective measures (Lillard and Waite, 1989). Retrospective data is probably more likely to capture the changes that are significant and short-term, as it often gives people the option of selecting the kind of experience they perceive to significantly influence their present. Furthermore, although prospective longitudinal data holds constant maturational/developmental effects upon identity-change, it makes it difficult to isolate factors of the contextual (socio-historical characteristics extant at the time of measurement) as well as cohort/generational
determinants of this change (Breakwell and Fife-Schaw, 1994), with the resultant confounding of the two factors. It could be said that retrospective data more confidently controls for the cohort/contextual factors affecting causal relationships, although not so well for the effects emerging from the developmental factors.

There are some problems with retrospective data and design as well: large recall biases and hence low reliability of data, sample bias (only the selected group of people who have managed to migrate, stay in the country, etc. participated), and more importantly, circularity in causation all represent great disadvantages to doing retrospective work. It seems misleading to believe, however, that the prospective design would clean the data of such biases: first, any situation in the present is interpreted and made sense of by reference not only to the available individual and social system of meanings, but also with reference to those existing in the past. Few studies can escape this dialectics between the past and the present in people’s reports of their current states. Furthermore, in the current study, the recollections of the past were important not necessarily for their objective, factual value (e.g. whether and in what sequence particular events or experiences evolved), but for their subjective value, or the meaning that they had for people’s current states. Studying identity, the construct defined as a structure of self definitions and representations “as reflexively understood by a person in terms of his or her biography” (Giddens, 1991:53), presupposes a researcher’s sensitivity to people’s memory (without memory of their past there will be no sense of continuity, and therefore no identity), and their interpretative power, that is, their ability to make things personally relevant by ascribing meanings and evaluations to them. An attempt to completely account for lack of reliability, source bias or measurement “error” conceived in this sense (i.e. in terms of lack of consistency across measurements typical for retrospective data) will make the study of complex phenomena such as identity – redundant, as the very stuff of the object of study will be removed. It is often all these different sources of bias which give us the insight into the real nature of complex phenomena such as identity processes: “To purge research of all these ‘sources of bias’ is to purge research of human life. It
presumes 'real' truth may be obtained once all these biases have been removed.” (Plummer, 1983:103).

Furthermore, retrospective data has been criticised for people’s tendency to revise their recollections of the past in the light of subsequent outcomes and present experiences. Had the objective of this study been to account for the precise sequencing of the events and demographic patterns, such critique would hold. However, the aim of the study was people’s adaptation. People’s recollections of their past say important story of the success of the current coping with threats. Once again, the value of the method adopted ought to be evaluated in the light of the purpose and nature of the study, rather than its absolute value. The retrospective data and design reported in the current study has been chosen not only with the view of the object of study (identity-adaptation and processes of adaptation), but also with the sight of the limitations in resources, sample size and considerable time-constraints affecting the current research programme.

5.3 Interview-research

This study investigates the processes of adaptation and identity-adaptations through analysis of the life-narratives of the former-Yugoslavian migrants who arrived to Britain since the beginning of the war in Yugoslavia in 1991. It was an exploratory study designed to allow free disclosure of highly sensitive issues. This required open-ended interviewing: 24 in-depth interviews are reported here. This approach was adopted because we wanted to understand in considerable depth what people were feeling and doing about the changes in their identity brought about by very dramatic transformations in their life circumstances.
5.3.1 The interview-schedule

It covered the factors influencing the decision to move; ethnic/national identification; the perceptions of the host and home-culture; interactions with the ethnic-minority community in the host-country; and general life satisfaction (see Appendix 1). Aware that the issues to be discussed were sensitive, given the recency of the event that had triggered their migration, we conducted the interviews in the respondents' native language. We believed that the use of a non-native language would represent a barrier to valid disclosure, particularly since respondents had varying fluency in English. Using English would also have been likely to bias the sample since those with less fluency might have been significantly less willing to participate in the study.

5.3.2 Sampling and procedure

It was important to restrict the population of immigrants studied to the specific “wave” of migrants, whose decision to emigrate was partly if not completely triggered by the eruption of war in their homeland. Their life had to be, if not directly, at least indirectly threatened or affected by the war in the country, in order for them to be included in the study.

Lack of official listings of contact addresses for immigrants from the former Yugoslavia in Britain forced us to rely on “snowball” techniques. Attempts had been made to approach immigrants in the clubs and communities for social gatherings of the peoples from different parts of the former Yugoslavia. Little control over the demographic spread of the sample could be imposed as a consequence (in terms of social class, educational background or ethnicity of a particular respondent). In the course of the research, however, an effort was made to cover approximately equivalent numbers of people from the three states in conflict in the former Yugoslavia (Croatia, Bosnia and Serbia), and of the people of different ethnic backgrounds (Muslim, Croatian or Serbian) living in each of these states. Furthermore, approximately equal number of males and females was
approached and interviewed, and it was the objective of the study to cover respondents across the age-span. Most of the respondents were residents of London; some of them were residents in Birmingham.

*Anonymity and Confidentiality.* In approaching the prospective respondents for an interview, the researcher had to emphasise the scientific (that is - non-political) nature of the research, and in some instances reveal the rough content of the interview schedule; it was important to guarantee anonymity and protection of privacy in order to attract respondents into the study. The issues dealt with were of highly sensitive nature — the migrants were often subjects to political persecution, and most of them were in the process of seeking asylum in this country, which made them politically vulnerable even in the new system. A very special effort was therefore made in the process of reporting the data not to refer to the participants’ quotes by name, and to disclose minimum information about the respondents.

*Trust and Researcher Accountability.* The politically sensitive context of study required that the interviewer gained trust and held herself accountable to the respondents. An issue encountered at this stage of the study was the prospective participants inferring the researcher’s ethnicity from her place of origin and accent. The interviewer, a former-Yugoslavian herself, from Belgrade in Serbia (the country and people often depicted and perceived as an aggressor in the vicious inter-ethnic conflict), on occasion may have been refused interviews because of her perceived ethnicity. This may have acted as a systematic bias determining who agreed to be interviewed. In the light of this, it was necessary to gain the participants’ trust and de-emphasise the inter-group/ethnic comparison context at least at the beginning of an interview, which was achieved by emphasising the individual experiences (e.g. life-trajectory, migration), or occasionally by initially letting participants decide which course the interview would take. Very early on it became evident that, what was initially conceptualised as a research interview, frequently gained the characteristics of the counselling interview. It became clear that
many participants agreed to be interviewed as a strategy of coping: they sometimes even explicitly admitted that they were hoping to gain a friend, someone who would listen to their problems, and offer them emotional support and advice. Some of them perceived the interviewer as a counsellor, which put pressure on the researcher to carefully balance the expectations of the participants against the requirements of a good research practice. Although great effort was made to achieve or maintain an "unobtrusive" researcher relationship with the interviewee, it was difficult not to feel obliged and drawn into offering minimal support to the respondent. This was usually done in the debriefing session.

Furthermore, the very nature of the interview topic often forced respondents to access many painful memories (that many of them had tried hard to forget), which further accentuated a highly responsible role of the interviewer in this unique kind of interaction. It was important, in the course of an interview, to judge the extent to which the interviewer was justified to probe with questions the information that the respondents would otherwise not be able to volunteer. It became ever more important to appropriately debrief respondents, and on occasion, the researcher felt that she had to check on the participant later that day or during that week.

Interviews normally lasted about an hour. Of the 24 interviewed, 12 were females, aged 21-50, 12 were males aged 17-50; there were 11 people from Bosnia, 6 from Serbia and 7 from Croatia. Their ethnic identity was much more difficult to ascertain, partly due to the complexity of identity processes at work in this population of immigrants. A number of them were of a mixed ethnic origin. Also, almost half of the subjects used the category of Yugoslavs to describe themselves.
5.4 Questionnaire-survey

A questionnaire was chosen for the next phase of research, as being the most efficient and appropriate instrument for collecting data from a larger sample of migrants.

5.3.3 Questionnaire-design

The questionnaire included a number of self-reported measures of self-concept, based on the phenomenological conceptualisation of the self as a structure of self-related representations (Appendix 2). Many criticisms have been levelled at this approach of studying the self-concept, but as Allport (1955) argued, the individual has a right to be believed when they report on themselves. To date, this has been the most common way of measuring the self-concept.

Identity content, Q1

The measurement of the content of identity used the prestructured list of identity-aspects and roles deemed important for the respondents in the interview-study. In order to measure the centrality or importance of different identity-aspects for an individual, a seven-point Likert-type scale was used (including '9' as 'not applicable' response category) specifying the degree of importance of different identity-elements for an individual, ranging from "Not at all important" to "Extremely important". It was decided to opt for a prestructured measure in order to restrict the range of aspects constituting people’s identity to those most dominant in the population under investigation. These were: ethnic identity (e.g. Croatian, Serbian, Bosnian, etc.); the former-Yugoslav identity; occupational identity; family-identity; material status, social status, religious identity; British citizenship and gender identity (see Appendix 2, Q1). We were aware that using such prestructured form of self-reported measures of identity obscured the judgement of the extent to which subjects provided an accurate and full report on their identity. However, there is also some evidence that open-ended technique (free-format "Who am I?" question) similarly does not solve this problem of restriction (Burns, 1979). Deriving
the content of this measure from the previous study we were confident that our measure was firmly rooted in what the population under investigation considered pertinent for their self-definitions.

Identity-structure was assessed retrospectively at three time-points: T1: in the past, before disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia; T2: in the past, upon the outbreak of the war and just before migration; and T3: in the present, upon migration. It was decided that in the layout of the questionnaire the three time-frames were to be presented one next to another. This may have produced the problem of response bias through direct comparison between identities at three time points. However, it was also evident that this layout of questions might have removed inconsistencies, as the timing and sequencing of the events could have been made more apparent through direct comparisons (see Scott and Alwin, 1998). Furthermore, given the length of the questionnaire, it was very important to minimise the time people spent on each question, thus reducing fatigue and increasing the response rate.

Self-related emotion scale, Q2-Q4

In order to measure the evaluative dimension of each of these identity-components across three time-points, measures of emotion were introduced into the questionnaire. This way the affective commitment (Hormuth, 1990, Stryker and Serpe, 1982), or the value dimensions (Breakwell, 1986) of each identity-aspect were investigated. The measure involved indicating on a five-point Likert-type scale (including '9' as 'not applicable' response category) the extent to which each of the seven predetermined emotions described how they felt about each of the nine identities across three time-points. The seven emotions were derived from the frequency counts of the emotions most commonly used in interviews. These emotions were as follows: happy, angry, guilty, proud, uncomfortable, threatened and sad. Feeling uncomfortable was introduced after consultation with a few former-Yugoslavs, as it was concluded that it encompassed a number of vague emotion-terms such as anxiety, feeling bad, etc. The three time-frames
for which the information about people’s self-related emotions was required were as above: T1 - in the past, before disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia; T2 - in the past, upon the outbreak of the war and just before migration; and T3 - in the present, upon migration.

Socio-interactive network - social commitment, Q5

In order to measure the social relationships constitutive of the migrants’ social network, the ‘social commitment’ measures were introduced. These were based on the idea that social relationships were central to the self-concept in that they specified the structure (and content) of people’s identity (Stryker, 1987; Hormuth, 1990; Thoits, 1983b). Of course, broader social structure and social influence processes (i.e. social representations) were also thought to lay the limits of identity-dynamics (Breakwell, 1986). These, however, were not directly measured in this questionnaire, although their importance and possible modes of influence were to some extent revealed in the interview-study, and inferred (through the meanings of different identity-aspects) from the questionnaire-study.

The measure required from respondents to indicate the extent to which certain given social relationships were important or central for them. A seven-point Likert-type scale was used with response categories ranging from ‘1’ “Not at all important” to ‘7’ “Extremely important”, including ‘9’ – “Not applicable” response. The significant relationships included those related to the family (parents/grandparents, children, siblings, spouse/partner, boyfriend/girlfriend); friends; work/student colleagues; superiors (mentor/boss); other foreigners/migrants; members of the old ethnic community (e.g. the older generation of immigrants organised around the Church or ethnic community institution); co-patriots within ethnic group from the current wave of immigrants (e.g. Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian); other former-Yugoslavs (regardless of their ethnic background); and neighbours.
Social network change, Q6

In order to measure the perceptions of the nature and direction of change in people's immediate social network with migration, subjects were asked to indicate which of the social relationships listed had significantly changed. Three types of change in social ties were measured: frequency of contacts, closeness or intimacy achieved in these relationships, and the amount of instrumental dependence upon these ties. The measure required from respondents to specify on a 5-point scale whether there was a decrease ('1'), increase ('5') or stability ('Remained the same' response category of '3') in these three characteristics of social interaction with migration ('9' indicated 'Not applicable' response category).

Emotional effects of social support change scale, Q7

In order to estimate the evaluation of the overall change in people's immediate social context, that is the affective dimension of this change, people were asked to indicate the extent to which any of the nine emotions provided in the questionnaire applied to them, when thinking about the nature and amount of change in their social network. The nine emotions of happiness, anger, guilt, feeling uncomfortable, excitement, sadness, emptiness, feeling content and threat were measured on a seven-point scale (from '1' "Not at all" to '7' "Extremely").

Identity states and identity threats scale, Q8

In this section four identity-states and their threats were measured, and these were: continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem. It was of importance to make a distinction between the two constructs of identity state and identity-threat. Previous literature by and large confounded the two variables, assuming that low states also implicated threat. The qualitative analysis in this thesis suggested that individuals differed in terms of the level of state that was perceived as threatening. For instance, for some people more distinctiveness was threatening, or even lack of change (stability or consistency) was undesirable. For this reason, the construct of identity-state was
operationalised as an individual’s sense of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem. Threat to these states was operationalised as the level of dissatisfaction with these states, or rather, a person’s desire or willingness to incur changes in these states.

There were sixteen statements describing each of the four states (and threats), measured on the 7-point scale ranging from ‘1’ – “Not at all” to ‘7’ – “Extremely”. Each state (and threat) was operationalised using four randomly distributed items. In order to account for acquiescence response set (the error of the “yes”-man, Guilford, 1954, p.231), positively and negatively worded items were introduced in random order to prevent subjects merely ticking down the same column. Identity-states were operationalised by asking people how true of them were some of the statements provided. Identity-threats were operationalised by asking people to indicate how much they would want each of these states to change. Respondents were requested to provide answers on the two sorts of questions for each statement.

*Self-efficacy* scale was adopted from the Generalised Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES), translated by Mary Wegner from the original German version by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1992): four items were selected and adapted for our study from a 10-item GSE scale. It was intended to assess the strength of an individual’s belief in his or her own ability to respond to novel or difficult situations and to control and deal with them. Some of the items included: “No matter what comes my way, I am usually able to handle it”; and “I easily lose sense of control over my life when I face difficulties”.

*Self-esteem* scale was adopted from the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), the most widely used measure of self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1989). This scale conceptualised self-esteem as perceived self-worth. Four items were used, such as: “All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure”; or “I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others”.
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Self-continuity scale was devised with the aim of measuring the extent to which respondents felt that they had changed. The four items included statements such as: “There is no connection between myself now and myself in the past” or “No matter what happens to me I stay the same sort of person”.

Distinctiveness scale tried to capture people’s general feelings of distinctiveness or uniqueness, as well as their feeling of distinctiveness with reference to their national/cultural/contextual background (specific distinctiveness). The items measured how similar or distinctive (unique) people had felt to be, for instance: “On the whole, I stand out as an individual in comparison to others” or “I am not different to other people in the similar situation as me”. (Subsequent principle components analysis showed that all four items of both specific and general distinctiveness loaded on one factor, indicating one underlying construct.)

Qualitative measure of coping, Q9
The following section asked respondents to specify what they had done in order to bring about the change in those identity-states they were not fully satisfied with. This was a free-format question, and respondents were asked to give written answers in the space provided.

Coping with threats scale, Q10
The next section included 23 coping items, operationalised to capture coping with threats to identity conceptualised by Breakwell (1986). The items used in the current scale were partially derived from Carver et al. (1989) COPE scale, a multidimensional coping inventory developed in order to assess situational and dispositional coping. The items from this scale were selected and adapted to suit the conceptual framework of coping adopted in this study, on the basis of Breakwell’s (1986, 1988) classification of coping strategies into intra-psychic, inter-personal and collective coping strategies. The items were measured on a seven point scale from ‘1’ “Not at all true” to ‘7’ “Absolutely true”.
Intra-psychic strategies operate at the level of cognitions and emotions, rather than in terms of action, and they rely upon processes of accommodation/assimilation and/or evaluation (Breakwell, 1988). These include deflection strategies (refusal to modify either the value or the content of identity) as well as acceptance strategies (revision of one or both of these dimensions of identity). Some items that captured deflection strategies included - “I try not to think about the problematic situation”, or “I repress my emotions not to allow stressful situations to affect me.” The acceptance strategies were operationalised as follows: “I tend to change myself in anticipation of a difficult situation”, or “I try to see the problem in a different light, to make it seem more positive”.

Inter-personal coping strategies rely upon changing relationships with others (Breakwell, 1988), and among them are: self-isolation (e.g. “I withdraw from the outside world in order not to feel uncomfortable about my situation”), negativism (e.g. “I oppose the demands to conform to the pressures of the changing circumstances”) and compliance (e.g. “I accept the need to behave the way other people expect of me under the changed circumstances”). It became evident in the process of devising this scale that a number of these strategies overlapped, and that their clear classification was sometimes difficult to achieve. For instance, inter-personal strategy of isolation (e.g. “I turn to work or other substitute, non-social activities to take my mind off things”) could also be interpreted as the intra-psychic strategy of deflection, or not thinking about the problematic situation. Nevertheless, with the emphasis of the inter-personal items being upon other-oriented behavioural strategies (rather than those entailing thought or emotion), some degree of confidence was achieved that the classification of items in terms of inter-personal coping orientation was viable.

Collective coping strategies involve inter/intra-group orientation and behaviour. Some of the collective coping strategies operationalised in this questionnaire were: group support and sharing (“I like to gather together with other people who are in the similar situation as
me so that we could share our feelings and thoughts about the problem”; group action/representation (“I try to make other people understand and appreciate my position and cultural background”), or passing (“I try to avoid the people in the similar situation and background as me and stick closer to those better-off”). Again, the examples of these strategies could also be classified as inter-personal strategies. We would argue that the collective orientation most often subsumes inter-personal behaviour as well, and therefore, the distinction may be not as acute in reality as in the current conceptual framework. Nevertheless, the distinction is useful not least as it allows greater conceptual clarity.

The coping strategies were assessed retrospectively: people were asked to indicate the way they coped since migration up to the present time, and in the past, prior to their migration and disintegration of the former Yugoslavia.

*Evaluation of the success of coping scale, Q11*

A short scale was devised in order to assess people’s own evaluations of the coping they employed in order to deal with identity-threats. The scale was measured on a 7-point scale indicating people’s agreement with the coping-assessment options provided. Nine categories of coping assessment were incorporated, encompassing evaluations of their intended or incidental effects and effectiveness when dealing with threat. The question posed was: “On balance, I find that the way I have dealt with stressful situation proved to be”, and some of the nine categories of evaluation of coping were: effective; a failure; too demanding; coincidentally positive for other areas of my life; helpful in maintaining my previous sense of self; helpful in changing my self-concept for the better.

*Demographic and life-events measures, Q12-Q23*

In the last section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to provide some background information about themselves. They were asked to indicate their age, gender, marital status (e.g. single, married, living with a partner, divorced/widowed),
employment status (e.g. in paid employment, in voluntary employment, studying, retired); their perceived social class (working, middle class, upper class); the length of residence; the sense of belonging to an ethnic group and which one; and the four life events of material loss, family member loss, family persecution and personal experience of persecution.

Finally, respondents were invited to comment on the questionnaire or add any information that they considered important but had not been elicited by its questions.

5.3.4 Sampling and procedure

The sample was drawn from the population of the former-Yugoslav immigrants in Britain who arrived to this country since the beginning of the war in Yugoslavia in 1991. A total number of subjects who completed the questionnaire was 110. The study was conducted in Autumn 1998.

The method of collecting the data – the type of data and the procedure of data collection – was analogue to that in the previous study, whereby considerations of the situation, socio-historical context and purpose of the study drove the choice of data-collection method. Snow-ball technique was adopted here as well, given the situational (no official listings) and socio-historical (the inter-ethnic nature of the conflict, etc.) context of the study. Another problem uncovered in relation to this population of immigrants related to the communist regime and the specific psycho-social effects that such structural and ideological constellation of state had created. Fear and the suspicion of public enquiry, coupled with the politically sensitive status of the respondents most of whom were asylum seekers, created a further barrier that had to be overcome in order to access the information needed. The problem this created was not only restricted to actually getting the respondents to agree to participate, but also to initiating a full and genuine disclosure necessary for this kind of research. Furthermore, it became apparent in the process of data
collection that many respondents found the written, structured format of the questionnaire a difficult medium for self-reflection. It was therefore decided that the researcher was to play an active part in the respondents' completion of the questionnaire. It was a fruitful way of conducting questionnaire-based survey, as it minimised variation in the actual interpretations of questions: although a great deal of effort was made in the process of designing the questionnaire to simplify it and reduce the number of possible meanings of questions, the very nature of the study presupposed multidimensionality of categories of response. The presence of the researcher and her aiding of the respondent in completing the questionnaire actually focused people's interpretations of questions to those meanings actually intended by the question. Furthermore, a highly "discursive" culture characterising the former-Yugoslavs, indicated that many people were capable of the kind of self-reflection asked of them in the course of this study only through an engagement in interaction and one-to-one communication. The classification and prestructuring of their responses made sense only if coated in a life-story framework of information elicitation. Talking about oneself seemed easier for many, than writing about oneself.

Issues pertaining to the researcher-role in the interview-study applied to the questionnaire-study as well. Trust and accountability, ensuring anonymity and confidentiality as well as researcher responsibility were important aspects of conducting the survey. A cover letter further confirmed the respondents' rights in terms of confidentiality of the information they provided.
Chapter Six

QUALITATIVE STUDY: MIGRANTS' CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF THREATS TO IDENTITY

6.1 Research Aims

The present study examines adaptation processes that occur following longer-term voluntary or involuntary migration. In order to illustrate some arguments concerning the effects of threat to identity, a study is presented that was conducted in 1997 with immigrants who have recently moved from the former-Yugoslavia to Britain as a result of the war in their country.

The focus of the present study is upon identity-threats: whether migration is threatening and what threats are prominent for this population of migrants will be examined. We look at the ways identity is conceptualised in the face of threat, and examine some assumptions embedded in migration literature, specifically, the SIT (Tajfel, 1981) and SCT (Turner et al., 1987, 1994) - based predictions. Identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986) is adopted here, as it postulates several important qualifications with respect to identity-adaptations and adaptation process. As discussed in chapter three, it is accepted here that people are motivated not only to achieve a desirable state of self-esteem, but also that of distinctiveness, continuity and self-efficacy. Threats to identity are here defined in subjective terms, emergent when people's perceived desirable states of continuity, self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy are evaluated as unsatisfactory. Identity-adaptations are carried out in the process of dealing with the perceptions or experiences of threat through the process of adaptation or coping.

The processes of adaptation will be examined through the respondents' narratives about what they consider to be threatening, and their efforts to discount these threats. Identity-adaptations will be investigated in relation to the ways people conceive of their identity-structure and categories of identification - the meanings they construct for different aspects of identity, and the emotional connotations these have.
6.2 Analysis

The choice of the method, sampling and the procedure have been described and explained in chapter five. To recap, 24 former-Yugoslav immigrants who arrived to Britain since 1991 were interviewed, using a semi-structured questionnaire. All interviews were taped, transcribed and translated into English. In order to explore the participants' view of the event or an object of investigation, interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA, Smith, 1996a, Smith et al., 1999) was used. The aim of this analysis was to learn about the subjects' inner psychological world, be it "in the form of the beliefs or constructs that are evidenced in the accounts they give of their situation, or where the nature of the account itself articulates some part of their self or identity (Smith, 1996a). Accessing meanings inherent in the participants' experiences is central to this form of study" (Smith, 1996b). Thus, in Smith's terms, the analysis is phenomenological, since "it is concerned with an individual's personal perception or account of an object or event as opposed to an attempt to produce an objective statement of the object or event itself" (Smith et al., 1999: 218). However, it is also an interpretative endeavour, since in order to get close to the participant's personal world, a researcher needs to engage in an interpretative activity. The basic difference between IPA and discourse analysis (DA, e.g. Potter and Wetherell, 1987) rests in the respective theories' assumptions about the role of cognition and language: whereas both DA and IPA accept a very important, powerful role of language, IPA differs from DA in that it does not dismiss the reality of enduring cognitive or emotional structures and processes behind discourse/language. Although recognising that these structures are not transparent in people's discourses, the IPA is committed to an analytical process that will hopefully expose some of these underlying processes and structures.

What follows is a brief description of the IPA criteria for analysing data. These criteria have been followed in the analysis of the data presented below.
The aim of this analysis has been to try and identify shared experiences across a relatively large number of participants (larger than 10). Smith et al. (1999) recommended a slightly different approach to the analysis of larger samples than to those of case-studies, partly due to its time-effectiveness, and partly due to the nature of the very process of sequential analysing.

The first step involved reading closely each transcript, detecting the important terms and issues in the transcript, which would, upon the following reading soon be categorised according to the more systematised "themes". This is considered an initial phase of "coding" the material, whereby, due to larger numbers of respondents, the codes are related to broader sections of the transcript (usually paragraphs), although they could sometimes relate just to one or two sentences.

When the transcript was coded like this, the codes were examined for whether they could be grouped into more general, "higher-order themes", and thus, clusters of themes were grouped together. This coding process was repeated for each interview in turn. It is important to emphasise that, although in this initial stage of coding, an attempt was made to look at each interview transcript afresh, the sequential nature of the analysis of the larger sample of data inevitably worked to sensitise the researcher to certain aspects of the data.

The next stage in the analysis involved identifying shared themes across the interviews. It included looking at the seemingly disparate themes across transcripts, and detecting general, broad categories that could explain them. In so doing, the researcher engaged in a form of relational, analytic thinking whereby the emerging categories had to connect the relational themes, bringing them together.

This way, the following stage of the analysis took place. How these themes should be brought together, within as well as across different transcripts required searching for patterns, connections and tensions within data. Links, as well as the possible
inconsistencies and conflicts between different concepts were sought. This also involved reflecting on how different categories related to each other, where they linked together, and where they were in conflict. In the table of themes (Table 3), in this chapter, the four broad categories were linked, and some domains of overlap between them were detected. This search for links was also apparent in the ‘results’ section of this chapter, where many themes were examined for their role in connecting different super-ordinate categories.

Conflicts and inconsistencies in people’s accounts were also in the focus of this analysis. These were given a special focus, as they illustrated some ways in which people resorted to coping with threats discursively. These inconsistencies were therefore treated as examples of the underlying process of adaptation (see section 6.4.2.2).

Across the transcripts, many basic themes had their counter-themes (e.g. control vs. lack of control), but each of these were selected to explain a particular higher-order category, or in the case of the current data, were the exemplars of a particular identity-process at work (e.g. negotiating one’s self-efficacy). The same themes were characterised often by differing emotions, again an example of the multiple meanings emerging from particular experiences characteristic of the sample as a whole (e.g. the problem of distinctiveness and self-esteem of the minority status).

Here, it is important to make three caveats: each quotation in itself should not be treated as evidence for the emerging argument in the analysis. However, the analysis brings together a whole range of quotations which, taken together, firmly ground our argument in the data. We would hope that the story emerging from the richness of the data will bring attention of the reader to the irreducible complexity of the issue in question – that of identity-adaptation. Second, the number of instances and their prevalence in this data was considered to be of lesser importance to that of the power and richness of particular passages which highlight the themes. The themes were
selected also on the basis of the extent to which they help illuminate other aspects of
account. Finally, the analysis presented here was not based on the "grounded theory"
approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1990), as the researcher was already sensitised to a
particular approach to the phenomena under investigation: the analysis was informed
by our goal of investigating the issues related to identity, but also by a particular
theoretical position in relation to the problem of identity-adaptation and coping
adopted here. That this position and approach, however, was not haphazard was
evident in the very detailed review of the prior literature in both the domain of identity
and that of migrant adaptation. Our aim in this study was, hence, to determine whether
respondents had experienced threat to their identity as a consequence of migration, to
illustrate how they reported their efforts at adaptation to these threats.

6.3 Representing the "Other": researcher-interviewee relationships

Another important issue should be addressed before engaging in the interpretative
activity of analysing people’s accounts. This pertains to the issues of bias and
subjectivity, and of the researcher’s ability to represent the "Other" through the prism
of one’s own perspective.

This research programme has been an attempt to answer some important questions
pertaining to identity conflicts emerging from rapid social changes. The initiative for
it came from my awareness that these experiences were common to a large part of the
population of the former-Yugoslav migrants, and that as a researcher, but also
someone deeply affected by the issues, it would be possible for me to represent a
veritable picture of the situation of many. What was particularly striking, was that for
all the media, political and public attention directed towards the conflict, no answers
were still available to all those directly affected by it.
A large impetus for conducting this research was my awareness that my own experiences would bring me closer to the participants, the similarity in experiences thus enriching my interpretative power through the greater potential to empathise.

However, soon after the first interviews had been conducted, the issues of representation, or giving voice to the "Other" (Wilkinson and Kitzinger, 1996), and "appropriation" (Opie, 1992) of other people's experiences came to light. Encounters with the people whose stories about loss, suffering and pain reverberated with the experiences that became increasingly more difficult to understand or represent with each new encounter, revealed the danger in assuming that being from the same country would increase one's truthfulness or appropriateness in representing the Other. It became clear that the similarities of experiences that should help voice people's pleas, were increasingly overridden by the differences in experiences. Oguntokun (1998) beautifully described the realisation that "apparently salient similarities can easily be rendered unimportant by even more salient differences, leaving an apparent 'insider' and her research participants separated by a yawning experiential chasm" (p. 523). The extent to which this process of voicing the world of the "Other" was a difficult task became evident to me when a woman who was contacted for an interview replied: "What do you want to hear about my experiences? What can I possibly want to tell you? You, or anyone else. The only people who will be hearing about my experiences are those in the War Crimes Tribunal in Den Hague. I want justice, not sympathy."

The experiences many of the interviewees reported were not the only basis for this "experiential chasm". At times, the differences in ethnic backgrounds brought to light the reality of diverse meaning and representational systems endorsed by my interviewees and me. This reminded of a danger in assuming homogeneity of the people who shared their Yugoslav origin.
This brought home the issue of objectivity and bias, so commonly addressed in the battle for scientific acceptance. It became evident that subjectivity was built into the research process, as it is a particular way of relating to those one is trying to represent. The researcher-interviewee interaction is a peculiar kind of a relationship, and although in the process of interpreting migrants' experiences and their "inner world" it is important to be able to "understand" and empathise, it is necessary to acknowledge that complete veracity in doing this is improbable, if not impossible. The analysis that follows should be read with the awareness of the tremendous efforts that have been put into representing and interpreting people's accounts so that they resemble respondents' experiences of threat as truthfully as possible, however, this analysis, just as any other interactive, interpretative process, is a subjective effort.

6.4 Results

6.4.1 Loss

Migration and the civil war - the two most important contextual changes in the lives of the former-Yugoslav respondents have left people reckoning the magnitude and severity of losses experienced. The loss of the country, status and job, material possessions, family or friends, security and future, even a category with which they can identify are powerful aspects of the migrants' new experiences. They challenge their identity, facing a difficult task of wrestling a coherent sense of identity from the fragmented and transformed nature of a new context. In the pages that follow, an attempt will be made to make sense of the complex processes of adaptations and identity-adaptation under the conditions of uncertain and disputed social context.
"Q: Tell me something about yourself?
R: I am 26, from Sarajevo, the place that I used to love very much, where I was studying. I came here four years ago because of the war; I escaped from Sarajevo, and have been living in London since. Now, I am suffering.
Q: Why?
R: Because sometimes I miss everything. Secure life, secure future. It still could be worse.
Q: What could be worse?
R: Like staying there, starving, fighting, and maybe even dying." (Male, 26, Bosnia)

"Back home I used to have some status. Here, how you can erase that notion of yourself, it is another question. I used to have a very good status, my job was highly valued, and this gave me some sort of identity. Here, I don’t know what to identify with. I am trying to find something, but it is very hard." (Male, 39, Bosnia)

6.4.2 Social comparisons: diachronic perspective

6.4.2.1 Juxtapositions of selves in an attempt to restore continuity and self-efficacy

In large part, the respondents’ evaluation of their situation reflects their need to attribute responsibility for the inter-group conflict within their country of origin, and to establish their own position within it. Whether the conflict was inherent to the system in which they were brought up or externally imposed; induced or accidental; inevitable or pointless; represents the questions perpetually addressed by these migrants. Of twenty-four respondents, 23 engaged in attempts at explanation. Of those, 15 found the historical and social context prior and during migration in their country ambiguous, difficult to predict and impossible to understand. Eight respondents claimed that the events had had an element of inevitability, to have understood the events that made them leave the country, and to have been able to predict them prior to the war and migration. This attribution of responsibility for the conflict had strong emotional connotations (see Table 3. for the category count):
[3] "I couldn't predict this, although I had always been well informed, and I liked history, I liked discussions... But hardly anyone could anticipate this situation. I blame the communists here totally. They had no morals, and offered the power to the nationalists. I wasn't in any national party, although I was a member of the Communist Party. When the Party had disintegrated, I felt a huge relief. The society had turned upside down totally; nothing could have been achieved without personal contacts at the time. I don't know, this war was totally pointless. It didn't have to happen and it could have been stopped much earlier."
(Male, 46, Bosnia)

[4] "In Yugoslavia I was only sad when I fell in love. Here, I am sad when I am sick of everything, when I am thinking - if it could only be as before, when I did not have to worry about how to survive, if I could only go back for a few days... I get sad when I wonder why everything had to happen this way. If only everything could stay as it was before. Then, I would have gone back. If only nothing had changed. But since I know how much has changed - I have no desire to go back. Although I am not that sad - no, I am indifferent." (Female, 22, Bosnia)

[5] "Looking from this perspective, I was more than happy there. I was working in the town I was born in, with the people from the same generation... I always wanted to do something useful for the State which had then fallen apart, imagine my despair! (Male, 39, Bosnia)

In these excerpts, the memory of the recent catastrophic change in the home country weaves together different thoughts and emotions. The difficulty in making sense of the historical change in the home-country, the socio-historical void caused by the sudden eruption of the war and the disruptive and destructive nature of the event to the perceived continuity of the social and individual life within it represent the sources of conflict and confusion for the respondents. Their own relationship to these events is ambivalent: sadness, disbelief, guilt and anger represent the emotions usually reported. These represent the affective components of their perceptions of the social context. The social context is not perceived in one-to-one manner; it is given a subjective meaning
through the operation of emotions, and it seems that, when there is a negative emotional reaction, the position of threat probably has resulted in an individual experiencing it.

However, the need to make sense of the changing socio-historical context is discussed with reference to the personal life history. A temporal perspective of one’s identity emerges as one of the most prominent characteristics of identity. In the process of accounting for their new positions in the entirety of unexpected contextual changes, people’s narratives evolve in clear juxtapositions of the past and the present identity.

[6] “I am happy that I left the country, although it has been a sort of a set of unfortunate circumstances. When the war had started I thought I was going to fight there. But when Milošević started the politics that he then pursued, I realised that there was no point in going back. If I’d stayed in Yugoslavia then, I would probably have been under a serious pressure from the media to conform - and would have probably gone to the war. But under the circumstances I couldn’t see the point at all. Now that I’ve come here to England I have suddenly acquired a completely different perspective on Yugoslavia and the whole war.” (Male, 29, Serbia)

[7] “The situation was totally absurd. I can cope with most things - I could understand the Croats, I have many Croatian friends. But when your own aunt decides not to speak with your mother, that becomes an absurdity. I had many traumas then. I was 17-18 then. When I arrived here I did not know how to act: whether to start going out or not, how to relate to people, whether to communicate with anyone, what to do. Even today I still feel a bit confused - definitely introverted.” (Female, 22, Croatia)

[8] […] First, I don’t know whether I will stay here, for how long, or whether I should go back to Serbia. And even if I go back to Serbia, I do not know where to go there. I am totally confused - I don’t really know what my aim is. I would go back gladly, maybe not to Sarajevo, but to Serbia, but everything is telling me that it is not a good option. When I left Sarajevo in the first place to go to Belgrade, I thought I was going to stay
there for ever, but I could only stay there as a refugee, although they did not give me even that: the refugees could be Muslims or women or children, but the healthy Serbian men had to go back to Bosnia to fight... I wish I could go back, though, because I’ve got nothing to live for here. I would never be nearly as happy here as I could be there. I can’t find a decent job here. This is my experience of England. We are different... After work I feel empty... ” (Male, 39, Bosnia)

In almost all of the extracts presented above, temporal representations of the self are juxtaposed – one’s current identity seems to emerge from the intricate relationship between the past and the future identity. The evidence from the above excerpts shows that continuity is perceived not only in relation to the past identity and the possible (future) identity. Here, the reference to the possible identity in the past seems to represent an important evaluative component of the current identity-structure. What one could have been or become if the situation was different, tells a story of complex interaction of making sense of the socio-historical context and the various options for the expression of identity. This is the psychological environment in which threat can be experienced: this incongruence between the possible identity in the past and the present identity seems to be threatening to one’s perceptions of continuity. Similarly, lack of future identity, as seen in a few extracts above, removes the coping possibilities for an individual, and also results in threat to continuity, but also to self-efficacy. The inability to make sense of the future must be tied in with the diminished beliefs that one’s actions can produce a desired effect. This is especially evident in the Extract (8) where absence of future orientation seems to create closure on coping abilities. Overall, the past identity – as a representation of oneself before the eruption of the war and migration - was evaluated as positive by 19 respondents, and only four interviewees evaluated themselves in the past more negatively to that in the present. Of 14 people who made reference to the future identity, nine saw their future in the positive light, and five felt that they were stripped of any sense of anticipation of the future or hope for the better. Nine respondents discussed the image of the future
identity as it was seen in the past – for four of them, this representation was perceived as positive, and for the rest - as negative.

Such temporal comparisons are not limited to the personal attributes. Comparing the past and present coping efforts also inform individuals about the current self-concept and the domains of change. Twelve people have engaged in comparing the way they used to deal with threat in the past to that in the present.

[9] “I feel I have adjusted here, I don’t feel fine every day; but I feel OK I feel a bit more passive about things now. Not everything can affect me. Back home I used to be much more highly strung. Now, I am a bit more tolerant – whatever happens, fine. [...] In the past, I always wanted to prove the things right or wrong, now I have no energy to discuss things with people. I don’t care what others think. I don’t like this change. I would like to be more “reactive” and feel more. But I don’t often even notice that I have become indifferent...” (Female, 23, Bosnia)

Here, the comparison between the coping patterns in the past and in the present are evaluated, showing that the current attempts at coping emerge not exclusively as a result of current context. Sources of threat, therefore, are not limited to a personal or social identity in the current social context.

6.4.2.2 Identity-inconsistencies and search for continuity and self-efficacy

Aligned with this issue of diachronic comparisons is a question of identity-inconsistencies. Inconsistent self-presentations – often expressed in an immediate vicinity of each other – are frequently found in both temporal and synchronic comparisons of identity. The narratives of ten people have been characterised by frequent inconsistencies in accounts, in various domains of their self-presentation – identity-states, identity-aspects and their evaluations, evaluations of the coping strategies:
"I usually don’t have a problem of getting on in a new culture, that’s my upbringing, I can quickly pick up the language, etc. All I need is to create. I never worry about money or a career, it is just that I have to create. I always managed what I wanted to achieve – I am persistent. [...] I used to believe when I was younger that I had some sort of control, but no, I have no control whatsoever. Well, I do have some sort of control – I paint, but I am aware how minor I am. What does it mean that I can exhibit here, and not in Croatia my home-country. Total lack of control!" (Female, 22, Croatia)

Two completely opposing identity-statements are presented here. The first paragraph in this excerpt reveals the interviewee’s cognitions about her identity, but is matched with an almost conflicting statement about it in the second paragraph, this time in the concrete context of migration. Both statements negotiate one’s sense of self-efficacy as well as continuity: being always in control in the first paragraph, and currently having no control – (as negotiated in relation to a specific domain of painting), co-exist in the narrative. There are contradictory self-evaluations with respect to the motivation for self-efficacy: “I used to believe that I had some control” and “I have always managed whatever I wanted to achieve” are congruous self-representations, although in contradiction with the current identity as seen in its specific domain (being an artist in migration), which seems to be threatened. SCT argues that depending on the contextual conditions, different aspects of identity will gain salience, and impact upon one’s evaluation of the self. However, it seems here that some need for identity-stability also exists. Here, contrasting self-evaluations are given, depending on the representation of identity used: overall identity vs. specific identity-aspect. The threat to self-efficacy is experienced in relation to the latter, the self-category of an “artist” which seems to be a central identity-aspect in her overall identity-structure.

It is interesting to speculate how she reconciles these apparently inconsistent identity-evaluations: one might assume that the evaluation based on her being an artist is isolated, “compartmentalised” in the overall structure, which enables her to protect the
rest of her identity. The extent to which this will be a viable option, however, is largely dependent upon the relative importance of this identity. It is therefore important to note, focusing upon just some aspects of identification can be informative, but not sufficient in our understanding of the full complexity of identity-processes in question. One should be sensitive to people's efforts in bringing together the memory of all aspects of their identities and the identity as emerging form the immediate context, when evaluating their new position.

6.4.2.3 Diachronic comparisons of social categories: negotiating old and new loyalties and attachments in search of continuity

Temporal representations of identity are also related to people's past and present conceptions of the broader social categories to which they belong. Such temporal comparisons, however, acquire a new feature in people's life histories: the changing nature of the groups' meanings in accordance with the changing social context.

[11] "I identify as a former Yugoslav, as a person who was born in the old Yugoslavia, in the cosmopolitan Yugoslavia. London suits me partly because it is so cosmopolitan just as Sarajevo used to be. I am proud to be former-Yugoslav. I am not ashamed. I think that the Serbs and Montenegrins appropriate this Yugoslavian identity undeservedly, without any basis for that. That's not fair" (Male, 25, Bosnia)

[12] "Identity is my problem. I feel that I belong to this rump Yugoslavia. I don't belong to Bosnia, - maybe only mentality-wise, but I don't belong to the new state as it is now. I don't feel that I belong to that regime. Whereas, Yugoslavia - maybe because of the symbols, something immaterial, I feel that I belong there. Ethnically I am a Serb. This means something, now, because psychologically one needs an ethnic identity if one is without a state. That's the meaning. But being a former-Yugoslav used to mean the most to me. These identity issues are my biggest problem, and I am trying to resolve it. Because here, if you haven't got some diplomatic representative, you are also
isolated in the British system. All foreigners have some embassy or a representative body, and they are, after all, protected. Here, I have a Yugoslav embassy that doesn’t want me, and the Bosnian embassy I don’t want since I do not belong there. So who am I, after all? Belonging is a need.” (Male, 39, Bosnia)

R: I used to feel very much a Yugoslavian before. But once Yugoslavian meant Serbian, I don’t feel that way any more. I am an Albanian... [Being Yugoslavian] actually didn’t mean nationality. It meant something else – some kind of unity, something different, it was almost like saying you are European. I was happy with that. [...] But once Yugoslavian started meaning Serbia – well, I am not Yugoslavian any more.
Q: How does it make you feel that your identity has changed?
R: Well, I had to search for my identity. It was like going through the history that I’d never liked. And I was thinking, how come I was fooled into believing that something like that (having a Yugoslavian identity) was possible and that I as an Albanian was thinking that I was Yugoslavian. So you can say that something of a nationalistic idea came into my head. And also I have seen that actually there is nothing wrong with being an Albanian, even being outside of the (Albanian) borders – because borders are nothing but human inventions.
Q: So, when you said that it was unpleasant for you to realise that you were fooled by certain ideology, what did you mean?
R: You see, in the past, I was led to believe that the Albanian nation in Kosovo was different from the Albanian nation in Albania. In fact we are all the same. It just happened that we were living within two different countries. I used to think also that I had a feeling that I was escaping from what I was, and I felt really bad about it.” (Male, 27, Kosovo)

The three paragraphs above represent three different ways of reflecting upon national/ethnic identity-aspect whose meanings and context of expression have dramatically changed in the recent years. In the first excerpt, the “disappearing” (Yugoslavian) social category lives on psychologically, and its current social representations are being questioned. A personalised meaning of this category is
adopted, and used in order to assert continuity on an individual level - cosmopolitan values as the salient meaning of one’s identity, especially in the context of migration and a need for adaptation to a new culture. The second excerpt shows a person’s struggle in his attempts to reconcile the old and new possibilities of identification. Coming from Bosnia but not wanting the Bosnian identity as it is represented in the present is contrasted to the feeling of belonging to rump Yugoslavia but not being accepted there. Above all, the interviewee here fundamentally nurtures the past former-Yugoslavian identity that is no longer available in the repertoire of social categories. Here also, the social identity assumes a personal meaning of “being represented abroad as a foreigner”. And finally, the third paragraph exemplifies a person’s attempt to invalidate a particular representation of social categories as they exist in the present, and as they were in the past social context. The past identity-aspect (being Yugoslavian) is dismissed as “ephemeral” and “unreal”, the present identity-aspect asserted as “eternal” and “quintessential”, and the context refuted as irrelevant. Here, the specific reality of the national boundaries between the two groups (Albanian-Yugoslav boundaries) is rejected, and it gives way to their “psychological reality” (the Kosovo and Albanian “Albanian” identity).

We can notice that this process of juxtapositions of the old and new identity-aspects in people’s narratives are carried out in the process of defining social categories of identification in a way which attributes personal meanings to them. Both SIT and SCT based their hypotheses about processes of social identity upon the assumption that the social and personal identities represent two facets of the self primed by social context. We can see, though, through these past-present comparisons, how specific identities assume their meanings through personal desire to achieve continuity, and in this way, social categories are becoming “personalised” or “individuated”. For instance, in extract (11), the “cosmopolitan character” of the Yugoslav category lives on in the respondent’s conception of self, and the positive value of the identity-aspect is achieved with reference to abstract standard of “cosmopolitanism”, as a personal meaning of the identity extracted from the category. Also, being “Yugoslav” in extract
(13) is given exactly the opposite meaning: it is equated with the very exclusionary category of being “Serbian”.

The above paragraphs show different ways in which continuity threat is constructed: here, old and new identity-aspects are juxtaposed in people’s narratives: some people feel loyal to their old categories of identification, interpreting the new context in a way which supports their identity-structure. It is possible to argue that this way, threat to continuity is avoided (Extr. 11). Others are forming new attachments, again renegotiating the social context to fit their new self-concepts (Extr. 13). Here, change, rather than consistency and identity-stability, is perceived as a way to avert threat to continuity – change is seen as a development, and as such, continuity. Some are experiencing threat to continuity, as the connection between the past and the present self is no longer possible to maintain (Extr. 12). In short, for all three respondents, threat to continuity is imminent, but how continuity is constructed, and therefore responded to, is not uniform, and this co-varies with the meanings different identity-aspects assume for individuals.

For most of the respondents, once an unproblematic and rarely questioned aspect of identity – national or ethnic category - now represents a source of threat: 17 respondents have claimed at some point of their interview, that not knowing where they belong was a major problem they have to face. However, what is common to these apparently conflicting processes is that they are always negotiated in a way which establishes continuity. Even when continuity is perceived to be problematic (as in extract 12), indicating threatened identity, the discourse people employ shows that they actively struggle to achieve continuity as a desired end-state. These extracts question the SCT’s emphasis on contextually determined social categories people adopt, indicating that identities are not all that easy to discard, and that when the decision to no longer endorse old categories of identification is made, this is done by establishing their sense of continuity with the new identity-aspects and through selectively attending to different aspects of social context.
In short, the importance of temporal considerations for our understanding of complex adaptation-processes is emphasised here. Migration profoundly affects people both on an individual and a collective level, and is not confined merely to considerations of competing categories of identification. It may also involve palpable challenges to many of the usual bases for identity definition: interpersonal relationships, material possessions, normative beliefs, established behavioural patterns and emotions.

We argued that diachronic comparisons are essential in people's attempts to deal with uncertain and conflicted identity-aspects. In the process, they are constructing the meanings for different aspects of self: we have seen people's discursive creativity in their efforts to establish identities that will maintain their sense of continuity, as well as self-efficacy. This process is interwoven with that of attributions that are employed in order to make sense of different social contexts. The complex way in which threat to continuity is often constructed is here recognised.

This takes us further to discuss the ways in which these constructions take place – how the processes of synchronic social comparisons are negotiated.

6.4.3 Social comparisons: Synchronic perspective

6.4.3.1 Minority group status and selectivity of comparison dimensions: self-esteem and distinctiveness threat

In their discussions of the processes of social identity under the situation of negative social comparison and ensuing threat, SIT primarily studies the social comparison along single dimension (between the in- and the out-group), as defined by social context. In the context of migration this paradigm has been applied through the measures of ethnic (in-group) identification and the perceptions of out-group discrimination. As stated in introduction, the threat in this theoretical paradigm is often defined as emerging when the group to which one belongs is perceived to have lower status when compared to the relevant out-group. Indeed, it is evident from the
data that the majority of respondents recognise a minority status of their group in the new social structure, and 18 of them see this status as negatively evaluated by the majority culture. However, how and whether the awareness of the minority group status inevitably leads to its acceptance and the ensuing threat, or whether alternative ways of dealing with it are employed, will be examined further in this section. In the following extracts we will see how these predictions map onto people’s identity-adaptations:

[14] “We are dynastic nation, we are more dignified than the rest of the Balkan people. The English have to learn from us. [...] Although, they think that we are just like the rest of the Balkan peoples - primitive, complicated, backward. It affects me personally. I told my English teacher when he provoked me to say something about Clinton: I said, ‘certain Mr. Clinton should try and read not only one paragraph from the book about the Muslims, but also another one, from the book about the Serbs, and learn how the Serbs have suffered in the hands of Muslims and Croats’. Diana disappointed me when she went to Bosnia and talked with all those Muslims back there. I always felt sorry for her, but now I don’t think much of her any more. This is the media war, based entirely on propaganda. This is an “oil-war”, because Muslims are protected so much.” (Female, 46 Croatia)

The above excerpt is a clear example of in-group bias and search for positive comparative dimension for the in-group under the conditions when low status of the in-group in a new social structure is perceived. However, this is not a straightforward verification of in-group bias prediction: what we can also detect in this paragraph is that the social comparisons between the groups that were salient in the social context prior to migration (in the former-Yugoslavia) are also constitutive of self-evaluations. The comparative context is much more complex as it includes the local comparative groups, i.e. other “in-groups” or referent “out-groups” such as former-Yugoslav ethnic groups. The local milieu is here translated into the new social context: despite the awareness of the disadvantaged position that her ethnic group holds in the new social comparative context, the interviewee’s identity-evaluations (her self-esteem) are here
negotiated in the context of social comparisons with, what are now also considered, other minority groups. Therefore, the minority status is not disputed; but its evaluation is made with respect not to the superior reference group, but other groups of equal status, the groups that constituted the inter-group comparative context for individuals primarily in the past, and now also in the present social context. Most recent interests in taxonomy of threats among SIT-researchers emphasised that, on occasion, individuals are ready to sacrifice their positive social identity and accept an inferior position on some negative stereotypic traits of the in-group, in order to maintain group distinctiveness (Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996; Branscombe et al, 1999). Here, other important processes emerge: the relevant social context primed by respondents is that which allows them the habitual representation of the group they belong to, and the identity they derive from that group. For this person, the meaning of the respondent’s ethnic group has been developed with reference to other Balkan nations, rather than the British. It is the British treatment of her group relative to the other Balkan ethnic groups, that is a salient basis of comparison, not the social comparison with the British as a majority group. Therefore, the motivation for positive identity is not exclusively derived from the momentary structural position of the group within a society. Memory and the historical conception of one’s group and its content, play a role in selecting the aspects of the social context that will be relevant for an individual’s self-definition. This will also shape what will be considered threatening: real threat to positive identity, as well as distinctiveness and continuity emerges, in the above excerpt, from the new way in which her own group is perceived relative to the referent other groups (e.g. Muslims), by the dominant group.

A number of alternative social comparison dimensions were used by respondents in order to establish positive self-evaluation: six individuals have compared their own group to other former-Yugoslav ethnic groups – four of these comparisons were self-enhancing, and two with the negative consequence for the in-group. Five individuals used cross-generation comparisons whereby age was perceived as the main determinant of successful adaptation: three such comparisons were self-enhancing,
and two indicated perceived threat to self-esteem and distinctiveness. The common comparison for people’s self-evaluations has been that between migrants and those in the home-country who did not migrated — eleven social comparisons were used, all defining “migrant” identity in positive terms — as courageous, active or self-efficacious. Four individuals have compared themselves to other cultural groups such as — other Europeans, Eastern Europeans or races, three of these comparisons being of negative consequence for one’s self-esteem. Class was made an important evaluative dimension by three respondents — two of whom perceived their position in terms of class negatively. Six people compared different generations or waves of migration within an ethnic group, five deriving positive self-evaluations from these comparisons. And finally, rural-urban comparisons have been also mentioned by two respondents, and for both these comparisons have been self-enhancing.

Some of these comparisons will further be illustrated in the following excerpt, which shows that comparisons can take into account the complex nature of the social context in terms of its multicultural characteristics.

[15] “The only thing I don’t like here is a strong hierarchy. They are very much a class society, racism is strong. I think that the English do not want to mingle with foreigners. Although it is the omen of the big cities. It is hard to get to know them. I’ve got bad experiences with them. Maybe because we are from Eastern Europe, they think of you differently. Depending on the circle you are in. They take you wrongly. At the beginning it affected me a lot, but then I became tough and it was easier to accept it. Maybe I have just created wall due to many bad experiences. ” (Female, 22, Croatia)

[16] “I arrived here, as an au-pair, to a typical middle-class family in England. I thought at the time that they were looking at me from above, the way they would think of Russian girls, and I had some sort of complex of inferiority. I definitely felt some sort of complex. (Female, 29, Serbia)
"[...] We have no basis here to express what we are, it is hard to find such basis here. Very few people know about us, know anything about us, what we are. Everyone knows about the French and Italians, and no one knows anything about us. You have nothing collective to cling onto. You are here on completely individual basis, whereas they all have something to ally with. And then you start relying on those who are sensitive enough to be able to detect that problem of yours. I have some friends here and they are all some sort of artists, but they are the most sensitive, and they figure out things very quickly."

(Female, 29, Serbia)

In all of the above excerpts, the interviewees recognised the minority status of their groups and low distinctiveness, and the threat to one’s sense of distinctiveness is discussed in the context of multiple group comparisons. In the latter extract, the low distinctiveness of the group of identification is perceived not only with reference to the dominant category (the English), but also with reference to other categories constituting minority social groups. Furthermore, the problem of low distinctiveness and self-esteem is dealt with neither by individual mobility (an attempt to disidentify), nor collective creativity strategy (e.g. in-group bias). Rather, a different referent group (e.g. the artists) is chosen as the comparison criterion that removes the threat to distinctiveness, as it crosscuts the boundaries between the salient comparative (ethnic) categories. This way, the structural position of the particular group in question – ethnic group - is not disputed (adhering to reality constraints, Ellemers et al, 1999), and the ethnic-group loyalty is not curtailed, although positive sense of identity is subsumed under a different, non-comparative group. This supports Hinkle and Brown’s (1990) argument that situations may lead individuals to switch from comparative to non-comparative processes in order to meet social identity needs. It also shows how flexible people are in defending their sense of positive identity: a range of comparison dimensions will be employed when evaluating one’s position within social structure, and, as seen from the above excerpt, this will depend on the content and the structure of the overall identity: some identity-aspects will assume priority whereas others will be demoted in significance in maintaining a positive sense
of self. Outside of laboratory context, individuals are much more creative with respect
to their environment, and, when given opportunity, resort to many possible
alternatives of dealing with threatened sense of self before resorting to out-group
derogation Mummendy and Schreiber (1983) showed for instance that out-group
derogation is not necessary in order to achieve a positive identity, partly due to the
availability of other comparison dimensions. All these multiple reference points
indicate one's efforts at establishing a viable sense of identity, often by their selective
choice of comparative dimensions. This selectivity in social comparisons indicates
also the active, constructive nature of identity and the processes of adaptation, as well
as the subjective nature of threat.

6.4.3.2 Social comparisons and the choice of coping strategies

Efforts to cope with threats to distinctiveness can further be examined in the following
extracts:

[18] "I have adjusted already, maybe twenty percent of it - the
food is all right, the life -habits- the ethnic habits and
traditions I got used to, the style of life, dress code, these
habits are taken on. But I think that I am too temperamental and
from a too expressive culture, so that I could never be able to
become English. We are different, we are finer, better people,
and have a friendlier attitude. We are ready to forget more
quickly than the English. We have had a better upbringing and
have stronger culture than the English. We are cleaner, more
hygienic. That's all their hunger for colonies, they have become
an agglomerate of cultures, so that the English culture is lost
among all these imported cultures, and that is their desire to
be a colonial empire, they are to be blamed. The only worthy
thing here is their English language.
[...] I feel good here. I would like to belong here, although I
can't say that I do, because every day here is a potential day.
I would like to belong to this culture, on a particular level. I
think I could create a nice circle of English friends."
(Female, 23, Croatia)
Reading the above paragraph one is struck by the contradictions in the respondent’s out-group evaluations. The first paragraph is a clear example of the in-group bias: derogation of the out-group and enhancement of the in-group is almost a textbook example of the predictions of the SIT and SCT in terms of maximisation of inter-group differences and in-group enhancement. However, it does not seem to correspond neatly to the subsequent expressions of her aspiration for out-group identification expressed in the extract that follows: here, we witness a direct contradiction to the previous out-group derogation strategy, as seen in the respondent’s need to adapt to a new culture, to belong or pass to the out-group. If a need to belong to a particular group presumes a positive perception of that group with the aim to manage one’s positive sense of self, than simultaneous derogation of the out-group to which one desires to belong, and the subsequent claims of the desire to pass into that group, as seen in the paragraph before, would seem contradictory to SIT predictions. This data could be interpreted in terms of a combined use of different coping strategies in the respondent’s attempt to both ward off threat to negative distinctiveness and self-esteem, and to negotiate a sense of continuity with the past identity. Thus, both creative collective strategy of selectivity of choice of inter-group comparison dimensions that ensure positive in-group evaluation, and the readiness to establish individual mobility through inter-personal coping strategies co-exist, with the clear aim to harmonise the past, present and possible self-conceptions, negotiating different identity end-states: positive distinctiveness and self esteem on one hand, and sense of continuity, on the other. We could argue that this is a clear example of the process of categorisation and re-categorisation, a common strategy when the social context is radically transformed or still volatile.

More specifically, the above paragraph brings to light some simplistic interpretations of SIT in terms of its predictions that inter-group differentiation is related to two possible outcomes: in-group bias and social creativity/action on one hand, and individual mobility, on the other. Although the majority of individuals have engaged
in some form of inter-group comparison, the count of instances of in- or out-group bias as well as in- or out-group derogation shows that the awareness of the minority group status does not necessarily lead to in-group bias. Eleven individuals engaged in in-group bias and thirteen expressed out-group bias. Twelve individuals engaged in in-group derogation, and twenty in out-group derogation. There is a big debate as to under what conditions the in-group bias happens (Hinkle and Brown, 1990; Mummendy and Schreiber, 1983, 1984; Mummendy and Simon, 1989, Spears, Doosje and Ellemers, 1999; Spears and Manstead, 1989; Van Knippenberg, 1984), and the above analysis seems to support the argument about people’s flexibility in responses in the face of inter-group comparisons.

Such and similar examples of the alternative use of different coping strategies abound in the interviewees’ narratives. Many are shown in the process of negotiating conflicting allegiances: as many as 16 individuals have talked about conflict or co-existence of two or more categories of identification:

[19] “I am an immigrant, although it annoys me, because I would want to be more a part of this community. For two years here I didn’t want to be in touch with anyone from our country. But then, you can’t run away from your roots, we have common language and experiences, we can communicate. Also, you know that we are something else, we are immigrants. [...]”

Here, the issue of belonging is the main source of identity conflict, and simultaneous process of asserting different ways of coping with the threat of identity-conflict emerges. First, the interviewee discusses her frustrations created by the sense of being “outside” the dominant group, and refutes the category of an immigrant, as she wants to belong to the new culture. And yet, the sense of “belonging to her roots” is metaphorically treated here as the “eternal ties” that determine one’s allegiances indefinitely. Being foreign represents external barriers to passing into another group, making the effort to adapt inconceivable. This may be seen as threat to distinctiveness
emerging from perceiving oneself in relation to two salient groups. This, subsequently, is negotiated in terms of inter-group differences:

"[...] Before, I wanted to adjust here more, but now less and less because I can feel great difference, and I will always feel it. I am neither here nor there, and sometimes I feel a bit lost, don’t know where I belong. [...]"

These perceived cultural differences describe the difficulty and psychological perplexity in the face of her inability to decide what her identity-allegiances will or might be. Finally, however, her narrative progresses into the position whereby belonging is defined on a different level – the level of inter-personal relationships.

"[...]You feel that you don’t belong anywhere. Maybe it’s better. I lost this sense that I belong anywhere and I don’t mind it any more. It is not important any more. I think I could live anywhere. I don’t feel discriminated against. Everything depends on your own flexibility, who you are with, how you relate to others, you have to treat everyone individually, and I am trying to find the people who are like me in that sense." (Female, 28, Bosnia)

This cognitive position is now negotiated in terms of inter-individual adaptation and interactive patterns regardless of people’s group belonging. This is, however, not to be equated with disidentification. The strategy employed here is that of changing self-evaluations, and a shifting focus from inter-group to inter-personal perceptions and self-evaluations. The context is no longer defined in terms of the groups or categories that constitute it (although they exist in the respondent’s cognitive representation of the context), but in terms of the local interactive patterns. The coping employed is that of re-evaluating the aspects of identity that are threatened by the new context. The interpretations of the SIT that low in-group status would implicate low self-esteem and identity strategies that would either imply strengthening of in-group identification or adoption of the out-group identity seem unsustainable here. From the above
paragraphs, both are discussed, but neither fully employed – a “third way” of substituting group-level evaluations of identity by inter-individual action as a source of evaluations of identity is adopted in the process of self-enhancement. Further, this excerpt is powerful as it questions the SCT’s argument that the motivational force for people’s identity-protection is to seek to organise information in terms of the most meaningful and parsimonious set of self and other categories. They can, we should argue, choose not to employ the “categorising” schemata in order to make sense of the self in the world, and to substitute it by the emphasis on the inter-personal aspect of it (rather than group or category). Sixteen respondents chose inter-personal comparisons at some point in their interview as a source of self-enhancement, leading to positive self-evaluation. This raises the question of whether SCT predictions only work for people who are not in a context of massive and important change.

This finding leads to another interesting theoretical point: categories are not the only aspects that are to be called into one’s self-definition according to the social context. Interpersonal relationships largely provide the basis for the enactment of certain categories, and they also represent the possible sources of threat (as will be seen in the section 6.4.5). Categories are not simply a number of stored items in our memories that are brought into life when needed. The above paragraph showed that the likelihood of self-definition in terms of a category does not depend upon the salience of inter-group context (which is an overarching, dominant context in this discourse), but upon the habitual expression of that category – its enactment in inter-personal relations. When it is no longer a viable basis for self-evaluation through interaction with others, people may choose (or be forced) to attenuate its influence in their everyday life. So, people’s use of different categories as the meaningful source of self-definition may be contingent upon the extent to which they satisfy their motivational needs in daily interactions with others, and as such are routinely enacted.
6.4.4 Construction of identities and conflicting allegiances

It has been argued above that reactions to migration cannot be fully understood merely by reference to the perceived structural properties of the inter-group context. Even when a dichotomous representation of the social context is salient (and the minority-majority group comparison is employed), the content of what constitutes the minority group is still disputed. Being an immigrant, a refugee, a foreigner, stranger or a guest are new labels and categories that make the structural properties of the new social context as it is perceived by the respondents. However, using these categories to define one’s new position requires that an individual simultaneously comes to terms with the meaning of these categorisations. The “minority” status is often not sufficient to predict the nature of threat experienced, and therefore, people’s adaptational efforts.

6.4.4.1 Defining the meaning of the “minority group”: distinctiveness threat

For our respondents, being an immigrant often requires dealing with the two opposing, but equally derogatory representations - that of an intruder (in relation to the host-country) and of a traitor (in relation to the home-culture). The count of instances shows that such representations are equally prevalent: 8 individuals negotiated the issue of being a traitor, and 8 that of being an intruder (some of them have negotiated both).

[20] “I am an immigrant here. I am just trying not to be a gastarbaiter (guest worker). I am not a person who came to this country to make money, to buy a Mercedes and build a house. I am not that. I consider myself a person... I am not somebody with a narrow mind and somebody with the peasant’s mentality. I am not that at all. I consider myself a cosmopolitan person. So wherever I go I wouldn’t have too much problem in understanding others. And the only thing that I will refuse to understand is violence within any country. So, yes, I am an immigrant.” (Female, 27, Bosnia)
[21] "[...] Maybe those people from Sarajevo would hate me if I'd
gone back. Because all these years of war I have been here, safe.
[...] It is very possible that those people would hate us, who
managed to escape to come here to Britain. So I feel that it
would be another struggle to make myself accepted back home. The
biggest struggle, maybe even bigger than here. I hope I am
wrong." (Female, 35, Bosnia)

[22] "I wouldn't want to call myself an immigrant. It sounds
really bad. I always used to think that immigrants are after
money, after better jobs, and that sort of things. Me feeling
that - that hurts [...] It really makes me feel that I am an
unwanted person, in the sense that I've got a job that one of the
British may have had, I've got the place at the University that
one of the British may have had. I really don't want to think
that way. I want to think that we are all equal - I feel that if
you are better, you deserve to have better things." (Male, 26,
Kosovo, Serbia)

Being a foreigner, a member of a minority group, or a refugee, have often placed
individuals at risk of prejudice, negative representation, or stereotyping. However,
these stereotypes are not adopted in one-to-one manner, and from some of the
paragraphs above, it is evident that people are very apt to re-create the meanings of
the established categories, and thus prevent the minority-group categories' negative
impact upon people's self-evaluations. Nine individuals engaged in re-negotiating the
negative meaning of the category of an immigrant, refugee, foreigner or a stranger.
Seven of them, although recognising their belonging to a minority category, rejected
the label as descriptive of themselves. In the process of negotiating these, respondents
have to deal with the threat of too much negative distinctiveness (twelve respondents)
or too little distinctiveness (four respondents), depending on the perspective they
adopt. Both raise distinctiveness in a sub-optimal fashion (Brewer and Pickett, 1999).
They both reflect distinctiveness based on exclusion:
R: "I am a refugee, and that sounds terrible, really bad. Why?"

R: Because those word sounds so... I don't know how to explain. When you say to people here that you are a refugee, everyone turns their head away from you. But I understand those people. I could never imagine myself as a refugee - this has just happened to me. I was at the wrong place, wrong time [...] Sometimes when you watch TV and see people leaving their homes in their villages, you hear them saying they are refugees, and then you realise that you are a refugee as well and I don't want to be seen like that.

I: Why?

R: I hate to find myself in the situation when people are asking me if I have ever had a cooker or ever seen a microwave. I've never thought of myself as a refugee, I was studying in Yugoslavia, and it suddenly happened and I couldn't do anything about it. Probably no one could do anything about it" (Male, 26, Bosnia)

[24] "We expected that the war would finish soon. However, time is passing, and there is no end to the war, however, it is difficult to adjust to this environment here. Here you have great alienation; everything is so different from what we are used to. The contacts with the English are sporadic and superficial. They are closed nation, are used to live this way. You can't expect - we are nothing special, they have had those like us for decades. We are not here because they like us, but because they have to follow the international conventions. They probably relate to everyone who comes here from wherever - just like this, the way they treat us. Why this is like that, I don't know, probably they are a rich society, so they can afford it." (Male, 45, Bosnia)

Heightened sense of distinctiveness can often occur due to the minority, out-group position in relation to the dominant culture. Many factors affect negative evaluation of excessive distinctiveness: foreign accent, perceived negative representation of the in-group, increased visibility through exposure of the British public to forceful images of the in-group through the media, perceived shifts in social class as a member of the minority group within a new structure, etc. In the above extract, for instance, the popular
representation of refugees as poverty-ridden, displaced citizens of the undeveloped third world is at odds with the newly emerging category of so-called “urban refugees” (UNHCR), a close description of the respondents in this study, for many, also, an accurate one.

Conversely, loss of distinctiveness may be reported in relation to the dominant group who lump all the members of different out-groups together. This can simultaneously lead to fear of the blurring of ethnic/cultural, historical as well as individual differences that exist within a “composite” group (as in the above extract).

The following excerpt illustrates clearly how people negotiate different meanings of the three categories that in fact all implicate the “minority group” status:

[25] “Q: Do you feel that you are a stranger in this country?
R: Yes I do, I feel like a stranger here... Not really like a stranger, but like a guest. You come to visit your friend, and you stay at his home, and he makes you feel comfortable, but you really don’t feel comfortable, but you have to stay there. And I will always feel like a guest. And that’s OK, as long as they keep me here. Even in my country if I ever go back, I will feel like a guest because things are different now. The things have changed and probably the way people look at me now has changed. You know, four years is a long time. And I will not spend here only four years but more, and when I go back there I will be a guest there as well.
Q: Do you feel like an immigrant here?
R: No, never... You know, the word ‘immigrant’ - when it comes to immigration, I will always think about the classes of history and all those people we learned about who betrayed the country when emigrating, that’s why. I don’t feel that I’ve betrayed my country. That’s stupid, I know, but I don’t. It’s much easier to say, OK, I am a refugee.
Q: Do you think of yourself as a refugee?
R: I don’t think about myself like that often. But when I have to go to the Home Office, when I have to go to the Social Benefits Agency, I feel - oh, look at yourself how low you are now, you
used to be a normal person, to enjoy yourself. You know, only in those situations I think of myself like that. When I meet the English people and when they ask me where I am from, I think — OK, what will this guy think of me when he finds out that I am a refugee, from Bosnia and all these things, that I am a refugee. I feel distant from them. And I don’t like that kind of feeling, and I am trying to break away from it. You know, I never had any kind of complex in my life, but this has become a social complex, and you can’t go straight to people and ask — oh, can I sit here, etc., as you would do in your country. They would probably not like me because I am from Bosnia". (Female, 25, Bosnia)

The first category of identification — a “stranger” or a “guest”, emphasised a strong sense of distinctiveness both in relation to the mainstream new culture, and to the culture that is left behind, implicating heightened individuation, and often a sense of isolation and marginality. This extract, in fact, illustrates neatly Berry’s (1997) description of “marginalisation” acculturation strategy, or Park (1950) and Stonequist’s (1964) definition of a “marginal man”. However, already in the next extract, a powerful sense of “obligation” or “responsibility” towards one’s country and culture — not wanting to feel that she betrayed her country by emigrating — indicate a different issue at hand: it is the question of maintaining a sense of connection with her past through adhering to the beliefs and norms instilled into her through her culture and the social influence processes - through “classes of history”. This is an example of the powerful role of the motive to maintain sense of continuity (be it in terms of category of identification, meanings attached to it, or beliefs surrounding one’s category of identification in a broader sense), which impels the respondent to reject a minority category (of an immigrant) often used to label people and their new situation. And finally, being a refugee, the category that she recognises has the most direct consequences for her everyday life, however, is a forceful source of threat. She is vividly disturbed by the identity-implications of her new category-label. And this affects her primarily at the level of interaction with the “out-group”. Although she rejects the label, she recognises its real-life implications: through this
discourse, she negotiates this category of identification, coping with the evident threat.

Something else is emergent from this long excerpt: simultaneity of two sources of threat, associated with two, apparently similar, but in actuality quite distinct categories of identification - an immigrant and a refugee. We see that one is a source of threat to continuity, whereas the other, a source of threat to distinctiveness. It is possible that these two overlap, but the respondent has chosen to clearly distinguish between these categories, in terms of their consequences for her identity – the threats they impose upon it. Thus, what is considered a minority position, can affect a person in a very different way, depending on the way in which he or she constructs this category. This is even more salient in the following excerpt:

[26] Q: Do you have problems with the fact that you are an asylum seeker, especially in relation to the British people?
R: No, because I have some wonderful friends who are British. They helped me a lot. I experienced more unpleasant things caused by my people than by the British. Although I don’t want to provoke anyone, and I am keeping a low profile. The English don’t understand much, so I don’t feel threatened at all that they are putting me down because I am Yugoslav or Bosnian or a refugee. I am quite comfortable here. My biggest difficulty, however, is how to create a kind of a model in my life. I lost everything there, and with it the idea of what I want to be. So, I need English people to help me get that idea as to what I want to be. It is a slow process. We all came here as formed individuals, adults, almost. And then, we had lots of tragic things happen to us – this displacement. So, I need help in order to acquire new ideas about my future.” (Female, 31, Bosnia)

Although the negative value of the minority status (as perceived by the dominant group) is often recognised by the respondents, it may not always, however, be a source of threat. In fact, there are circumstances when the need for positive distinctiveness gives way to other, more pressing motives - in the above extract, we
have seen, it is the threat to continuity which informs the respondent’s perceptions of her position in the new society, and the way in which the preferred way of relating to the “dominant” group should evolve. This extract exemplifies the way in which individuals differentiate between different sources of threat, whereby some of them pose more pressure upon an individual to resolve the ensuing threat. This poses an interesting question of what the determinants of the varying relative salience of different threats within an identity structure actually are.

The social structure that constitutes the migrants’ current context of adaptation is often not limited only to the “host-country”. Individuals frequently negotiate their new positions both with respect to the old and the new social structures, which again draws attention to the importance of the temporal dimensions of identity. Thus, we have seen, even those categories whose contents are, by their very nature threatening (since they are defined by the structural properties of the context in terms of the minority group), assume different meanings for different people, with different implications for perceived threat and coping. Threat to distinctiveness especially, it has been shown here, is dependent upon people’s perspective, determining their choice of coping with threats. Now, it will be of interest to see how other categories of importance for individuals are constructed, and what meanings they assume.

6.4.4.2 The meanings and content of identities and social contexts

The content of identity, the meanings people attach to different categories, and the way migrants weave them together and select particular dimensions of different identity-aspects in order to construct a consistent identity, represent important aspects of identity-adaptation. As seen, this is done in an attempt not only to ward off threat to self-esteem, but also distinctiveness, continuity, and self-efficacy. First, we here describe some of the common ways in which people conceptualise their group identities, with special emphasis upon the differences between their ethnic and national identity-aspect.
[27] "I am a Serb and I will primarily support my people. In essence, though, I am a Yugoslav, meaning I will respect you if you respect me" (Male, 28, Serbia)

[28] "I hated the former-Yugoslavia, I hated the whole system, this idea of Yugoslavia could not work, and I had to go to the war to defend my country (Croatia) against it, this dragon of communism. [...] I am a Croat, and this means everything to me: it is the place you were born, the food you eat, the music you listen, it is your roots". (Male, 28, Croatia)

Extract (27) defines the ethnic and national identity-aspect as a continuum: the latter is defined in terms of the preferred inter-group ideology of mutual tolerance. However, such a positive representation of the category of Yugoslavs is not uniform across the sample. In the context of the recent inter-ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia, Croatian, Albanian and many other identity-aspects have been defined in contrast to the Yugoslavian identity, and made possible only in the context of deconstruction of the category on the national level. The two identity-aspects have often been treated as mutually exclusive in the course of social change. In the last paragraph, the "dragon of communism" is a powerful, iconic representation of the national category as an embodiment of all evil.

People attach different meanings to the same categories: the category of Yugoslavs represents a peaceful solution to some people, but a source of conflict and threat to others. Whereas this category is the only identity choice for some, for others it means the negation of the identity-aspect that was conferred upon them in the past, and for many, this category is negotiated in the context of the multiple category matrix. SCT argued that the relationship between different categories within the hierarchy of categories reveals much about the meanings of these categories for the self-concept, depending on the context that determines particular hierarchy of the categories involved. Often, however, the context of identity-hierarchies is itself a subject of debate, and hierarchies are not necessarily always determined by the contextual
possibilities for identity-choice. More specifically, Hopkins and Reicher (1996) contended that the comparative framework is not unproblematically given and that self-categories are not mere consequences of the social context. They argued for the position that all the relevant terms are at least potentially open to argumentation. In these situations, the process of categorisation is less than straightforward, and people engage in a process of negotiating the ways of identification with different groups by choosing the social context that will reinforce their category-allegiances. Such situations, when social context is open to argumentation, can often be highly threatening for individuals, as seen in the following paragraphs:

[29] R: "I am a lost case - the identity - totally lost. Forgotten my own language, don't know which language to speak, where I belong to, without a country, without any properties, totally lost. This is some sort of temporary home for me, but I feel like a Gypsy. I feel more like a Serb, and I feel the Serbian side much more, but I can't repress the Croatian side either. I don't feel that I am welcome in Croatia, it is not my home, and I am not thinking of going back to Croatia at all, ever [...].

I: Do you feel like an immigrant?  
R: I do feel like an immigrant. But it is so hard to accept it. When I say that I am an émigré coming from that country - Yugoslavia, I feel bad. I don't really know where I am really from. I would like to go back to Lika (Croatia), where I grew up, although it is not possible. I am an urban person, I don't like it. I adore the former Yugoslavia, I never thought I was going to leave it for good, I never thought I was ever going to become an émigré. I always wanted to live in Yugoslavia. In the past I travelled a lot, but I knew where my home was. Now I don't know it any more. Serbia is not my mentality, and they consider me a foreigner as well partly because of my accent, partly because of the way I think - it is different, I don't like the Serbian mentality. In Croatia I do feel like at home, although I feel that I am not accepted there. I don't feel free there. If things ever change there, I would go back instantly. That's the only country where I can live. You can speak I don't know how many
"languages, but you will create a masterpiece in a language you dream in; we only love in one language." (Female, 23, Croatia)

The sense of continuity in the excerpt above is negotiated against perceived radical change in both the structural factors (e.g. group permeability) and contextual factors (loss of material properties, the characteristics of different cultures, national borders). Definitions of categories are being debated: for instance, in the last excerpt, being Serbian is a familial legacy, and is an aspect of identity, but both structural (permeability) and cultural (different mentality) barriers to belonging to that group are recognised. This identity-aspect does not provide positive self-esteem for the respondent. Croatian identity is also strongly felt, and is defined in terms of sense of the past within a particular place (continuity), where the language and different experiences were shared by members of that community. Here, also, structural and ideological barriers to belonging are prominent, and her self-efficacy is not supported by this identity-aspect, given the respondent's exclusion from free participation in the life of the social group. Being Yugoslavian and being an emigrant are the two conceptually conflicting categories that co-exist in her identity-structure: the former is salient as it provides positive identity and high self-esteem, and the latter, emerges out of the need for continuity (migration from the disappearing Yugoslavian state). The conflicting categories have a strong emotional connotation: emigration is associated with the feelings of guilt for deserting the strongly salient identity. Thus, it seems that these people are trying to negotiate their ethnic/national identity-aspect in the face of threat of the still changing and uncertain category-meanings and group-relations.

Each category has a set of meanings or representations that define it. The category that becomes central in the individual narrative to a large extent depends upon the past self-concept and the material and psychological value placed upon the past and present identity-aspect by an individual. However, these processes are intrinsically tied to the individuals' global picture of history and the socio-historical context within which their life is being realised. This common confusion that the respondents report in dealing with their changing identities often is linked to the roots of the conflict that has triggered their
movement, as well as the attempts at explanation, which give history its form and
meaning, and individual life its role and position within the web of inter-personal and
inter-group relationships. Whether the conflict was predictable or not, intrinsic or
externally caused, necessary or not, are the questions that respondents are trying to
answer, the questions that seem to be crucial in their attempt to place their identities
within the context of social history, and establish sense of continuity. Who the actors in
the conflict are, the questions pertaining to the definitions of a “good or a bad nation”,
and how one’s position is defined in the light of conflicting interpretations of these inter-
group relations, occupies a large part of the respondents’ discourse. Sensitive to
historicity, puzzled by the constructive and malleable nature of truth, these individuals
are probing their memory of their past life in order to establish a critical supportive
element for their identity claims, and establish some sense of personal continuity and
self-esteem. Thus, as shown in some earlier paragraphs in this chapter, perceptions of
one’s position in the social structure, and the perceptions of social context are highly
subjective, imbued with a degree of attributional ambiguity from which large variations
in identifications and coping are evident, (although, this is not to deny that these
perceptions emerge from the ideology and the social structure that people have brought
to their new context from the prior culture).

Establishing a sense of continuity and the complex task of wrestling the category of
identification out of the complexity of possible options does not preclude the
recognition of personal change. In fact, the majority of the subjects (N = 22) claimed that
they had changed, and 19 of them – said it was a positive change. For some, both
positive and negative change had ensued, and a few expressed negative evaluations of
their identity in the present in comparison to the past. Nevertheless, the change does not
mean discontinuity, and this has been argued in the previous sections.
6.4.4.3 Identity-hierarchy and centrality of identity-aspects

SCT places strong emphasis upon contextual determinants of identity salience (the conditions of “fit” of a category) and its impact upon behaviour. Although they accept that accessibility of a group category will depend on personal values, goals, and category-hierarchy as it exists in the particular context in question, the theory is only interested in the short-term properties of self: the momentary salience of specific identity. Little is said about the ways in which different identity-aspects in the hierarchy relate to each other and to the identity as a whole, as well as their influence on identity across time, since the identity-aspects (and the identity-structure) are not granted continuity.

[30] "[...] When I brought my older son here, to England, it was because those in Belgrade wanted to send him to the army there, and then send him back to Croatia to fight. I said – no, my son was going to go to school like any normal child, and I took him overnight and transported him to London. I know that my life has become a torture since I came here, but at least they (my sons) have some future now...

[...] I would like to stay here for a while, until my children have established themselves here, however, I would like to go back as soon as possible, in order not to lose my identity. I will try to see how to get a Yugoslavian passport and to go there to settle down. We lost our roots in Croatia; I don’t want to lose them in Serbia. But I definitely don’t want to grow old here, let alone die in this country.

[...].I haven’t sinned, I haven’t done anything wrong to either a Muslim or a Croat, but I am proud to be a Serb and I am fighting for it, for my child, for my brother, for my homeland, I will die for them.” (Female, 46, Croatia)

Here, different identity-aspects are initially discussed as distinct from each other, in the sense that they create conflicting action orientations – to flee the “homeland” (and one’s ethnic group) on one hand in order to save the children, or to nurture one’s roots in the home-land, on the other. So, we see that the role of a parent motivates the
interviewee’s actions in terms of migration, and is central here; however future expectations are determined on the basis of her ethnic category of identification. Although initially conflicting, the two identity-aspects merge, as in the last sentence of the quote, where ethnic identity-aspect is constitutive of the feelings of kinship, a very frequent definition of this category. In this excerpt the specific social context determining the choice of social categories is not determined by the current group relations that prime group categorisation, but by the past and the future social context, and their corresponding self-categories. In this temporal perspective of self, the way certain, more central categories influence the use and endorsement of others in varied contexts shows how the importance of understanding interactions between identity-aspects over time changes the predictions SCT makes about the interaction between the social context and category-salience.

[31] "I am a Croat, my parents are Croats, I feel I belong there. My parents, even during the former-Yugoslavia always used to say that they were Croatian. And they were so happy to see Croatia as an independent country finally. I often hurt them when I tell them - 'you have your country finally, although you haven’t got anything to eat'. Then I ask them - 'what was wrong with Yugoslavia, we used to live well?'. And my dad - a very clever man - would say - 'if we stayed together for another five years, we wouldn't have had anything to eat, just like in Russia'. I like to say that I am Croatian, but I don’t hate people from Belgrade. And I will always stay Croatian. I wouldn’t mind becoming a British citizen, but I love my home." (Female, 27, Croatia)

Here, the family identity-aspect seems to be an important medium of ethnic identification: the parents’ strong identification with the ethnic category seems to provide the foundation for her category choice, and this is especially notable when she probes her parents’ allegiances, in the light of the previous availability of the Yugoslav category. Just like in the previous extract, the ethnic category of identification interacts with the family category here, and the latter seems to hold a
central position in her identity-hierarchy, defining the evaluations of changes in other aspects of her identity. The questions of the enduring impact of an identity-aspect upon one’s behaviour and its interaction with other identity-aspects is brought into focus here. As stated before, identity-elements are not only transitory mediators of action in the specific social context: they also provide a more stable motivating force for one’s actions, and have a specific evaluative and affective function in the overall identity structure. They extend over time, and their contextual salience is often defined by their centrality relative to the overall identity structure: certain identity-aspects will be more likely to affect people’s interpretations of the social context than others, more likely to shape their behaviours, and in this vein, more influential with respect to other identity-aspects. Although SCT recognises the need to match both the stimuli of categories in the social context and their relative salience or accessibility in the identity structure, they have cut short in postulating the predictors for specific identity salience (e.g. why and how do we retrieve specific identities according to the demands of the social context; what happens with these identity-aspects when the social context does not prime them).

To summarise, we have shown how different identities-aspects assume central position in the overall identity-structure, thus determining self-evaluations and evaluations of an alternative aspect of identity. Also, we have seen how people negotiate different allegiances - people do not accept social categories and their meanings unquestioningly, on the contrary, these are negotiated, in a way which alleviates the threat posed to one’s sense of continuity. We see that people engage in the process of constructing the meanings of both the context and their identity by selectively choosing the aspects of the context that allow them a desired, continuous identity.
6.4.5 Social support as sources of threat

Previous analysis focused upon the ways and extent to which people refer to the social groups and categories that constitute their context in the process of making sense of their identity. However, from the initial analysis of the data, it emerged that references to groups and categories did not seem to be the only sources of information for identity-adaptation and adaptation process. What other sources of threat people refer to when discussing their self-concepts will be a focus of the following section.

Many respondents talked about the increasing difficulty in maintaining or creating new contacts, as much with those from the host-group, as with those from one's own cultural milieu. Changing patterns of relationships, lack of communication means and perceived inter-group and inter-cultural differences often prevent the formation of new social ties, or maintenance of the old ones. Fourteen individuals have talked about the changing levels of closeness in social ties upon migration; eight have mentioned the changes in frequency of contacts and three the changing levels of dependence upon others. Decrease in closeness was the major complaint - loneliness and superficiality of contacts were often explained with reference to the cultural differences encountered.

[32] "[...] I have no close friends here, which is terribly sad. In Sarajevo I used to have a friend I grew up with. I have no one remotely as close here at all, although, I think that I am a very open person, easy going. I do not understand why I haven’t got a close friend. Whether this is because I built a fence around me or for some other reason, I don’t know [...]” (Male, 25, Bosnia)

[33] "I am terribly lonely. This is my greatest problem. Although I am fighting it as much as I can. I am trying to keep in touch with the few people I know, to go out with some of them. But they are few and far between, and we are all very far away from each
other. I contact my sister, but both of us are so empty, we have nothing to say to each other". (Male, 39, Bosnia)

Most interviewees expressed strong emotions while discussing the new realities of their everyday life and the magnitude of its change; the amount of change or threat experienced is often discussed in terms of the inadequacy or lack of interactive network. Most respondents (N=19) cited family as the most important source of social support. As such, worry about the family is often identified as the most common source of distress in the new situation: not being able to be near those close to them, fearing for their position back home, or being anxious and feeling responsible for them in the host-country (if the family has migrated with them), are the factors that affect people's understanding of the new role they have to face upon migration (see Table 3). Sadness, fear or guilt are the emotions mentioned frequently in relation to the respondents' family. For some, their family's reaction to their life in emigration (often talked about in terms of fear, worry or sadness at their absence) represents an additional aspect of threat.

[34] "My biggest worry is my family. I miss them too much. But I can only imagine how much they miss me. [...] I haven't seen my dad for three years now, and I saw my mother some time ago. I can't explain how I felt. I can't even imagine how she felt. They are getting older. My mother has changed too much, and I have changed as well." (Male, 26, Bosnia)

For the majority of migrants, the process of learning about the new culture has been largely an individual experience, in which they were left to their own resources to find their way around the new context. Lack of social support (especially in the ethnic community) or the perceived discrepancy between their own cultural/ideological position and that of the rest (of the ethnic community or the host culture) were perceived to further the isolation of many.
Some participants, however, have felt that their situation as a migrant was an individual experience that others could not understand and should not interfere with, and so the potential for a formation of close ties was limited.

[35] "The biggest change so far is this sadness which I don't want to show. I don't want others to know what I feel. I like to show that I am happy, have no problems, that I am really OK. But I know that I am not." (Male, 26, Bosnia)

Others, however, have talked about "culture fatigue" or interaction saturation, leading to a form of seclusion and further distancing from the mainstream.

[36] "I haven't got any English friends right now. Among our people, I know a few - mainly au pairs. Sometimes, you see, you get tired of friendships. You try to maintain your friendships throughout the years you are here, and eventually get tired of them." (Female, 22, Croatia)

[37] "Everything is different here. There are too many people running around you all the time, things are too fast. You know, the same thing day in, day out - working in a restaurant, then going out, and always surrounded by people. There is no point in working like this, going from one restaurant or pub to another. I have to find a regular job, to find a normal, decent job, find some direction in life. What I really want is to cut down on the number of people around me - to be left with just a few friends, my wife and my kids, if I am ever to have them, and go away somewhere remote, isolated." (Male, 28, Croatia)

Overall, the emphasis in most of the interviews has largely been on the nature of the immediate social environment. The importance of a strong social support during prolonged environmental and social change has been recognised by previous research as the most important deterrent of threat (e.g. Hormuth, 1990). However, social network is often first to undergo transformation with migration. The resulting change in the nature of the respondents' social life, an increased isolation or perception of
oneself as either overly or insufficiently distinctive and feeling unable to fulfil everyday social obligations due to perceived cultural, social or structural barriers, place high demands on people’s abilities to cope. The threat of the changing nature of social support is a significant blow to the migrants’ perceived sense of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Although the current study does not allow it, it would be of interest to examine to what extent people’s identification is actually correlated with the importance of different interactive patterns: SCT emphasises individual cognition, neglecting the “shared” aspect of that cognition. We would argue that identity is enacted and reconstructed in everyday life in interaction with others. When this interactive pattern dissipates, threats to identity ensue, as they no longer provide the usual sources of support for identity.
Table 3: Frequency count – list of dominant themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for meaning</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal comparisons</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past identity – positive</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future identity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible identity in the past</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- negative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity-inconsistencies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause of the war - attributions</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of control</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad feeling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety/Stress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty/No future</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering/Pain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced migration</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling lucky</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary migration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority group status</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-negatively evaluated</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-group bias</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-group derogation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group bias</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group derogation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of immigrant</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigner/Stranger/Refugee</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really bad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling lost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively affected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling unwanted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed/Down</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intruder (host-country perceptions negative)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traitor (home-country perceptions negative) 8
Re-defining the meanings of the minority group 9
Rejecting the label of the minority group 7
Too much negative distinctiveness 12
Too little distinctiveness (negative) 4

Inter-personal comparisons – positive self-eval. 16
Comparisons: different ethnic groups 6
- positive self-evaluation 4
- negative self-evaluation 2
Comparison: generations 5
- positive self-evaluation 3
- negative self-evaluation 2
Comparison: migrants – non-migrants (home) 11
- positive self-evaluation 11
Comparison: other migrant groups 4
- positive self-evaluation 1
- negative self-evaluation 3
Comparison: classes 3
- positive self-evaluation 1
- negative self-evaluation 2
Comparison: waves of immigrants 6
- positive self-evaluation 5
- negative self-evaluation 1

Social support change positive 4
Social support change negative 21
Social support – changes in closeness 14
Social support – changes in frequency 8
Social support – changes in dependency 3

Emotions
- Marginality/Isolation 8
- Loneliness 6
- Fear 1
- Sadness 1
- Family 19
- Tired of contacts 5
- Empty 9

Missing the family 13
Feeling bad because the family are missing them 7

Identity conflict (category negotiation) 16

Not knowing where one belongs 17

Emotions
- Feeling bad 6
- Anger 3

Ethnic identity category 9

continuity/distinctiveness/
self-efficacy/self-esteem
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling like a loser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National (Yugoslav) category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal change-positive</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal change-negative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continuity/distinctiveness/self-efficacy/self-esteem
6.5 Discussion

Summary of key findings:

- The evidence presented suggested that this population of immigrants experienced threat to four identity-states of self-esteem, continuity, self-efficacy and distinctiveness.
- Temporal comparisons of categories of identification under the circumstance of the changing inter-group boundaries and meanings evolved in a way which allowed people’s selective choice of the properties of the social context that supported their identity. This, however, was often done taking into account the constraints of the reality.
- People frequently gave inconsistent self-accounts, perhaps indicating their active efforts in dealing with threat.
- Most respondents recognised the minority status of their in-group in the new social structure, and 18 of them saw this status as perceived negatively by the majority culture. However, the awareness of the minority status was not necessarily related to the perceived threat to identity or in-group bias/out-group derogation as ways of negotiating one’s low self-esteem and distinctiveness.
- People were capable of using a number of different social comparisons that often crosscut the minority-majority comparison dimensions. Furthermore, people’s self-evaluations were often given in the context of their local milieu – their inter-personal relationships.
- Minority group status was also subject to construction – its meaning was negotiated both in terms of the current socio-structural context and the context of their home country. Furthermore, people often re-constructed the negative meanings of the social category in order to deal with threats to identity.
- There was a great deal of individual variation in the extent of change in distinctiveness and continuity needed for identity-threats to be perceived. This implicates the subjective dimension of identity-state and the threat related to it: how people construct distinctiveness, continuity or other identity-motives (i.e. the desired
level and form of identity-state) will largely determine which sources will be threatening, and the way these will be responded to.

- Perceptions of one's position in the social structure, and the perceptions of social context were highly subjective, imbued with a degree of attributional ambiguity from which large variations in identifications and coping were evident.
- The majority of subjects claimed to have changed, and evaluated this change as positive. This indicated some important issues related to the conceptualisation of threat to continuity.
- Social support breakdown was associated with perceived threat to continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy or self-esteem. It was a powerful source of people's self-evaluations and emotions.
- People's evaluations of their identity and context had a strong emotional content.

The aim of this study was to isolate the main sources of threat as perceived by the interviewees and their responses to them, and also to examine identity-adaptations under the circumstances of new, challenging or uncertain social contexts. Its most salient cognitive and emotional aspects were presented here.

The study presented evidence of the existence of four types of threat: self-esteem, self-efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness. Very few prior theoretical efforts have been made to establish the types of threat, and those which have done so, defined these types as affecting either personal (see Higgins, 1987 for review), or social (Branscombe et al, 1999) identity. The current work is significant because it illustrates that such distinction between two "aspects" of identity (personal and social) is often difficult to sustain in real life, as seen in many of the presented excerpts where personal meanings were ascribed to different identity-aspects, and very idiosyncratic meanings emerged from the combination of identity-elements. Threats to identity often were evident in people's efforts to negotiate inter-relationships between different aspects of identity.
The respondents seem to have been involved in a meaning-making process, and the diverse ways in which they endeavoured to establish the meaning structure were presented here. For most of them, the search for meaning incorporated attempts to understand both the old and the new social realm, and the implications it had for their identity. In general, it was found that people negotiated their identity-adaptations with reference to their past, present and future identity, as well as the future possibilities that the past had held for them. The analysis showed that such temporal framework was very prevalent. It is important to note that the temporal comparisons have not been imposed by the structure of the interview-schedule: the opening question in each interview – “Tell me something about yourself”, was almost invariably followed by the temporal representation of one’s identity by respondent, that is an assertion about their identity before and after the event of migration.

Furthermore, the temporal comparisons of different aspects of identity were characterised by attempts at explanation: understanding the historical processes and social forces that were constitutive of a person’s past and present social context, as well as positioning oneself within the forces of history, were important aspects of these temporal comparison processes. Under the circumstances of the changing inter-group boundaries and category-meanings, then, temporal comparisons evolved in a way that allowed people’s selective choice of the properties of the social context that supported their identity.

The temporal perspective on identity has for a long time only marginally been discussed by social identity theorists: in their emphasis on the ongoing inter-group relationships and their socio-cognitive formulations, the most prominent social identity theories such as SIT and SCT have not aimed to develop a temporal model of self. (Indeed, explanations of identity per se was not the aim of SIT which focused primarily upon inter-group behaviour). This has been reflected in the short-term, temporary changes based on temporary threats receiving a sole attention of most
As Branscombe et al. (1999) and others have recently argued, losses that result in long-term changes are characterised with possibly substantially different coping/adaptation processes. In many of these interviews the threats to identity are an ongoing process. And yet, people seem to be able to function even under the circumstances of a chronic threat. This might be the consequence of the coping people use that is not limited just to inter-personal/group coping. For instance, IPT suggests that one strategy open to the individual is to seek compensatory enhancement of other elements of identity. The parts of identity that are still threatened are demoted in significance or segregated (a sort of psychological quarantine). This may work if the target for threat is some discrete, narrowly circumscribed or non-central element of identity. When the target for threat is fundamental to the identity structure (in both content and value dimensions), it seems unlikely that such a strategy would be particularly effective.

Threat to continuity was perceived when the meanings of different categories of identification (e.g. ethnic and national) were conflicted, equally salient or contemporaneous for an individual, and when no alternatives were established yet to resolve this conflict (e.g. merging the two identity-elements under the same representation, discarding one of the identity-aspects, reconstructing the social context to suit one’s representation of identity). It seems that people are capable of isolating certain elements of their identity, maintaining their current identity content despite the chronic threat it engenders. SCT argues that self-categories are changeable and subject to re-construction at each new encounter with the new stimuli, but the current data shows that even if preserving certain identity-elements is a constant source of threat, people still are unwilling to discard them, instead opting for either demoting them in their significance, or isolating them in the total identity-structure. Even when alternative self-categories are adopted, the painstaking effort is put into establishing a sense of continuity between the past and the present self. The current study shows the extent to which the selective choice of properties of the context in the process of adaptation is important as coping strategy in the face of threat to continuity, the fact
omitted by SCT theorists, who failed to recognise individuals' active relationship with their environment.

These temporal comparisons pointed to some interesting ways in which new identity-aspects were being constructed, or old ones re-negotiated, in the face of the disputed and evanescent socio-historical context. This is important because the way one constructs new identity-components for oneself will largely determine future perceptions of threat, coping strategies as well as a degree of adaptation to the new social context. In fact, temporal comparisons seem to be a *sine qua non* of identity-adaptations and coping with change. As temporal comparisons are deeply rooted in the socio-historical context, the questions pertaining to the traditional ways of studying the choice of comparison dimensions and identity-processes become relevant. In fact, laboratory studies and the focus upon the current contexts of social comparisons and inter-group relations as defined by a researcher, poorly explain such complex inter-group and social processes as those encountered in the most recent Yugoslavian conflict. We have seen that it is not a coincidence that people use temporal comparisons whilst creating meanings for their, often battered sense of self, and that in the process they employ the discursive strategies that weave together various explanations of the history and society conditioning their lives. An in-depth interview-procedure allows us to capture these complexities, is an adequate method for studying temporal processes of identity, and demonstrates the prevalence and significance of these processes.

Although temporal dimension brings into focus the need for continuity, two things are evident from the current study: the demands for continuity precluded neither the possibility of identity-inconsistencies as occurring in their discourses, nor people's endorsement of change. In fact, there was a substantial number of instances of identity-inconsistencies, and the majority of respondents maintained that they had changed in the course of migration, and this for the better, in comparison to their past identity. Still, their evaluations of their past identity were rarely negative. This could
be an example of the powerful capacity of people to maintain a certain necessary level of positive self-evaluation, even under the very disadvantaged conditions. It could further be argued that people often simultaneously negotiated identity-maintenance and contextual requirements for change, in effort to establish continuity of their identity. We saw that inconsistencies rarely represented threat to individuals, but rather, were frequently themselves the evidence of people’s efforts to establish continuity with the past when the social context stripped them of any support for their old identity-elements. The discourses reported here may be the evidence of coping with change at hand, in people’s efforts to ward off threat. Inconsistency also illustrates that rather than creating identity each time anew when defining oneself in a particular situation (such as an interview), people are bringing together different identity-aspects, and evaluations and motives associated with them. Furthermore, rather than using a particular category as a clearly defined, self-contained and circumscribed construct available in a particular context, inconsistencies reflect the contested nature of people’s cognition – including categories (see. Billig, 1987, Reicher et al., 1997). This may represent the exact mechanism in which people are negotiating the relative importance of some, over other identity-aspects. What seems inconsistent for the observer, however, may find a comfortable place in people’s identity, as long as it helps establish their continuity, in the process of search for new ways of self-expression in the changed and novel social context.

However, continuity is not uniformly defined. Many people, as mentioned above, removed threat to continuity through the endorsement of self-change. In fact, it is quite possible that the lack of change, under the circumstances when the change is desirable and forced upon respondents, might act as a source of threat. This is because, as Breakwell (1986) asserted, continuity should not be equated with consistency; it is, rather, a subjective experience of a thread connecting people’s past, present and their future within their identity. Overall, a great deal of variation in the way people construct continuity and the perceptions of threat is reported here. What is perceived as threatening, therefore, is dependent upon people’s definition of the
motives, i.e. the nature and magnitude of the identity-states that are desirable. This lack of uniformity in the perceptions of threat is evident with respect to distinctiveness principle as well.

There has been a considerable consensus in the respondents' perception of their position relative to the dominant culture. Being a member of a minority group or a group with derogated status affects people's sense of distinctiveness. However, from the above evidence, it has emerged that there is a great deal of individual variation in the extent of change in distinctiveness needed for identity-threat to be perceived. The same position (of a minority group member) can lead to too much distinctiveness for one person and too little for another. Vignoles, Chryssochoou and Breakwell (2000) have recognised that a great deal of inter- as well as intra-group variation may emerge in relation to the ways distinctiveness is achieved. They have distinguished between different sources of distinctiveness: separateness, difference and position. These 'sources of distinctiveness' represent different aspects of the relationship between self and others, which may be emphasised in order to achieve a sense of distinctiveness.

It has been shown that people are able to reject or re-create the meanings of the minority-group status in their attempt to ward off threats to identity. As observed in the section 6.4.4, these definitions run parallel to the newly emerging greater differentiation of a single category — such distinction being made between the rural vs. urban refugee, as well as the awareness of the alternative representations of different types of immigrants. People use all the available representations and definitions in society in the process of self-evaluation. Furthermore, they often resort to the comparisons that do not prime the minority-majority inter-group differentiation, using alternative comparisons such as within ethnic group, between different generations, different minority-cultures, and others. Many of these social comparisons crosscut the home-host dimensions of comparisons.
This finding is not new: many have recognised selectivity and creativity in people's choice of social comparisons when not forced into the contexts set up by the researcher (Hopkins and Reicher, 1996; Mummendy and Schreiber, 1983; Crocker and Major, 1989; Doise, 1988; Reicher, Hopkins and Condor, 1997.). It has been rarely discussed, though, what factors determine this selective choice of comparison dimensions. From the above analysis we could see that individuals evaluate themselves on various dimensions, which often cut across a number of different identity-aspects. Individual's self-evaluations are not based on a single identity-aspect. There are many different ways of establishing meaning for one's identity, and, as Doise (1988) asserted, categorisation and inter-group comparison are not the only aspect of self-evaluation. As it has been shown in the current analysis, people frequently reject the possibility of using inter-group differentiation, instead focusing upon inter-personal self-evaluations. Furthermore, important identity-aspects exist within a network of other identity-aspects. We have touched upon some ways in which one identity-aspect might be perceived as influencing other identity-aspects, changing their meanings and relative value.

The way people will derive their sense of distinctiveness, therefore, will largely depend upon the contents and subjective meaning that an element of identity might assume for an individual. The significance of the importance of inter-relationships between different identity-aspects within a structure, as well as people's selective choice of these when discussing different threats, points to the subjective nature of perceptions of their position in relation to others, and hence, indicates different ways of perceiving and responding to threat: first, the same position often leads to different ways in which continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem or self-efficacy are perceived. This is, as has been presented here, partly determined by the way people construct both the context supporting their identity, and the meanings of different social categories and identity-aspects, as well as their inter-relationships. Many authors have accepted this subjective dimension in perceiving and dealing with threat (e.g. Deaux and Ethier, 1998; Breakwell, 1986, 1988; Rosenberg, 1979). Given the recognition of
people's active efforts to adapt, the SCT's postulates about the determinants of the process of selection – and therefore perceptions of threat - emerging from the stimuli in the social context, seem problematic. It is not being denied here that the social context and socio-historical conditions largely shape people's perceptions of themselves and their environment, creating convergence of group-members' responses to certain contexts. However, this process is also based on people's definitions of what constitutes threat, often emerging from their representations of different aspects of self.

The current analysis further suggests that the same identity-states (identity-motives) do not universally determine the experience of threat across situations. Some evidence already exists that, for instance, distinctiveness may sometimes override the need for positive identity (Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996; Jetten, Spears and Manstead, 1999), and in fact may not be contemporaneous with the motivation for positive self-esteem. Breakwell (1987) suggested that different identity motives of self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity may relate differentially to each other, depending on the cultural, developmental and contextual determinants. Here, we have shown how, given the meaning a category of identification or the label implicating the self is constructed, different types of threat are experienced. What will be experienced as threatening, that is the sources of threat, are therefore derived from the particular way in which identity is constructed, rather than some intrinsic property of identity or a category, such as its minority position.

What has not been examined here, but should be a very important step forward in investigation of different threats, is the co-occurrence of different threats. It would be important to examine, for instance, whether each type of threat occurs in the reports of all interviewees; also, it would be of interest to examine whether some identity-threats – such as distinctiveness and self-esteem – always co-occur in people's reports. The scope of this thesis forced us to omit the exploration of these issues, but the future work should attempt to systematically examine these relationships, both in relation to
people's narratives about the threats they are experiencing, and in a more controlled contexts, such as questionnaire-investigation or experimental work.

One of the most frequent sources of threat reported by the respondents has been the disrupted social network. This change has been reported in relation to the home-culture, the co-patriots who had emigrated and settled in the new country under similar circumstances, and their family. However, for many, such an interrupted social network has not been replaced by new social ties with the members of the host-society, or the support from the ethnic community in the host-country. Perceived inter-cultural differences acted as a barrier to the new social relationships with the members of the host-culture.

Change in social support has attracted lots of attention in migration literature (e.g. Bochner, 1985; Jerusalem et al., 1996). However, much of this work has had a strong clinical or counselling emphasis, and there have been few attempts to understand the link between the changing social network, and coping process and identity adaptations (e.g. Hormuth, 1990; Stryker, 1987; Thoits, 1991). We have shown here how social support breakdown is associated with perceived threat to continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy or self-esteem. It is also a powerful basis for people's self-evaluations and a source of emotions. This finding is important, as it recognises that the sources of threat are not only derived from the macro-social characteristics of the new environment. The micro-social context, or the local milieu, where an individual most commonly establishes the self-other relationship, is – not surprisingly – a common basis for evaluations of threat. In the following chapter, the role of social support change – its nature and magnitude – will be examined more closely with respect to perceptions of threat.

One of the major advantages of having adopted a qualitative approach to this study is that it allows us to see clearly that when people talk about real threats to identity derived from macro- and micro-societal changes, everything they say is imbued with intense emotional connotations. The interviews show that discussion of these threats to
continuity, distinctiveness, efficacy and esteem are emotionally charged. Dealing with the emotions (most often painfully negative emotions) is an integral part of the task of identity reconstruction. At points the interviews seem to suggest that only when the emotions are tamed (separated from their referents) is it possible to be constructive in the cognitive and social task of renegotiating elements of identity. The role of emotions as a constitutive part of threat has only recently been recognised, and that mainly in relation to the threat of inappropriate categorisation (see Branscombe et al, 1999 for review). What role emotions serve and how they feature (are manifested) in the experience of different types of threat has not been investigated. The following chapters will attempt to examine some of these issues.

To conclude, the aim of this study has been to look at manifestations of adaptation processes and identity-adaptations under conditions when people are actively struggling with demands for change. More specifically, we have looked at migrants' conceptualisation of what constitute threats to their identity and the attempts they are making to adapt to the enduring changes. We expected on the basis of IPT (Breakwell, 1986) that experiences which challenged self-esteem, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and continuity would be perceived as threatening and would initiate identity reconstruction. The study shows evidence that this is the case. However, it also emphasises that identity reconstruction is an on-going process. There is no evidence that these migrants have so reconceptualised their identities that they have eliminated the threats. Quite the contrary, the threats are still there, still attacking viability of their identities. They use various coping strategies but these are only partially, if at all, successful. It may be that in time the threats will dissipate, perhaps as a result of new societal changes or different individual mobility opportunities, but work such as this emphasises that many threats to identity are chronic. A weakness of social psychological models of identity processes and adaptation is that they do not explain how individuals continue to function effectively as social agents when living with chronic threat. Work like this suggests that it is important to develop a better understanding of the impact of chronic identity threat.
Chapter Seven

EXPLORATION OF FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH IDENTITY-ADAPTATIONS, AND THE SOURCES OF THREAT

7.1 Research Aims

The previous study enabled us to delineate some processes involved in adaptation, and a picture emerged uncovering their full complexity, such as many prior theoretical models failed to account for. It was shown that adaptation represents an act of coping directed at removal of threat. The kind of threat that was experienced by respondents depended upon the way individuals constructed an identity-state as an identity-motive. It was also shown that identity-adaptations were a constructive process of negotiating different meanings of identity and its aspects. The section that follows will be aimed at investigating the ways in which these factors interrelate. The aim of this study will be:

a) to study factors associated with identity-adaptation: the factors associated with changes in identity-structure and some specific identity-aspects will be investigated, and some socio-psychological theories will be examined in relation to these questions;

b) to investigate the factors representing the sources of threat, i.e. explore the relationships between different sources of threat and threat and state variables;

c) to look at the connection between the threat and its sources and the overall effort invested in coping with these, i.e. the magnitude of coping.

These three aims are derived from the theoretical position adopted in this thesis. First, the process of adaptation represents perceptions of threats to identity and all actions, thoughts and emotions invested in dealing with these. Further, threats to identity are differentiated on the basis of the motivation/identity-state that underlies each of them, and these are continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy state. These threats are also differentiated by other factors (sources of threat) such as:
demographic/situational characteristics of the respondents, their immediate social/communicative network (social support), their current identity-structure and the respondents’ perceptions of the magnitude of change in this structure over a specified amount of time (e.g. in the period prior and post migration). Finally, emotions represent a source of threat, and are directed both at the person’s identity-structure and their immediate social context.

The study is based on a questionnaire-survey (see chapter five) conducted in autumn 1998.

In order to suggest the sorts of analysis that will be pursued here, the variables selected for investigation should be framed in a form of testable hypotheses. This is in no way an exhaustive list of the hypotheses that are testable, although they answer some of the theoretical queries suggested in the previous chapters. Those selected for investigation cover both the demographic information about the respondents (sex, age, length of residence, life-experiences and religious commitment), those pertaining to identity (identity-aspects as well as its overall structure; emotions; identity threats and states; magnitude of coping), as well as social context (social network, social network change and emotional responses to these changes).

In the section that follows, the analysis will be limited to the main effects, in which zero-order correlations are of interest. Such a simplistic approach is adopted not with the aim of testing causal relationships, but of establishing the possible ways of further pursuing more complex models. This is therefore an exploratory study. This will enable us to eliminate some unsustainable predictions, limiting the investigation to fewer variables. On the other hand, some possible mediating and moderating effects will also be postulated and investigated further in this thesis. The mediating effect can best be explored through partial correlations in regression analysis. The moderating effects will also be investigated, in terms of interactive effects of two variables upon the third one.
Most of the constructs measured here are described in chapter five (section 5.4). Some of the relationships hypothesised in this chapter, however, have been based on the new measures constructed out of the existing ones. These were: overall identity states (a measure of the total "identity-satisfaction" or the general level of identity-state as a mean of the sum of the composite measures of four identity states of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy); overall identity-threat (similarly constructed composite measure of the overall experience of threat); coping magnitude or effort (constructed as the mean of the overall coping people reported, or the overall intensity of coping); the number of negative life events (as a sum of the four life-events measured); the magnitude of the overall identity-structure change at three time-intervals: T1-T2, T2-T3 and T1-T3; and the decrease or increase in the overall change in social support in terms of closeness, dependence upon relationships and frequency of contacts with people. The reasoning behind the construction of some of these new variables will be explained in section 7.3.

7.2 Research hypotheses

7.2.1 Main theoretical hypotheses: Identity-based predictions

7.2.1.1 Emotions

1) As emotions provide meaning-structure to people's experiences, it is hypothesised that negative emotions – both with respect to identity and social environment will be related to the perceptions of threat – both specific and general, and greater magnitude of coping. Positive emotions will be related to higher identity-states.

7.2.1.2 Social support

Rather than studying the type of social support – in terms of its function (e.g. instrumental vs. emotional) or source (e.g. ethnic community or host-members), here,
the number of social ties as well as the subjective experience of social support (Thoits, 1983a; Bar-Tal and Jacobson, 1998) is investigated.

First, some of the already criticised accumulation of social support hypotheses (Thoits, 1983a, Dohrenwend and Pearlin, 1982) will be tested:

2) The more relationships endorsed (the more extensive “social support” an immigrant reported), the lower overall and specific threat experienced, and the higher overall and specific identity states.

3) A more extensive social network is related to less coping effort (its magnitude).

*Social support change:*

4) The more overall decrease in closeness in social support— the lower continuity state, and the more perceived threat to continuity. It will furthermore be related to lower states of self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy, and to the higher perceived threat to these states. Increase in closeness is also related to low continuity state, although it is predicted here that this will not be related to the perception of threat to continuity. Also, there will be less perceived threat to distinctiveness and self-esteem (higher states), as close relationships usually provide positive feedback for one’s self-evaluations, increasing one’s self-esteem and sense of distinctiveness. Higher self-efficacy state is also hypothesised to be related to the increase in closeness, since establishing closer social ties might constitute an aspect of self-efficacy, or indeed enhance it (the relationship here is certainly reciprocal). Of course, the opposite argument could be proposed as well: the increased closeness with others might indicate the diminishing individuality and self-reliance, and therefore, heightened reliance upon others may indicate threat to self-efficacy, as well as distinctiveness. Finally, it is predicted that the increase in closeness will be related to less coping.

5) Decrease in frequency is predicted to lead to lower specific identity-states, and higher threat to these states.

6) Increase in frequency is also predicted to be related to low continuity state, but no such prediction could be made with respect to threat to continuity. It is also predicted here that the increase in frequency of contacts would relate to lower threat to
distinctiveness. Higher state of distinctiveness is possible as a result of increased frequency of contacts. And lastly, higher self-esteem and self-efficacy state, as well as lower threat to these states will be perceived by those reporting higher increase in frequency. Less coping will be related to the increase in frequency.

7) Decrease in dependence will be related to lower continuity state, although here as well, no relationship is expected between this variable and threat to continuity state. The perception of the decrease in dependence within relationships might be also related to the increased state of distinctiveness (low threat), and higher self-efficacy and self-esteem state (low threat). It is expected to be correlated with greater magnitude of coping.

8) Increase in dependence might be related to the diminished sense of control, and therefore lower specific states to identity, especially self-efficacy, continuity and self-esteem, including higher threats to these states. Therefore, less overall state, and higher overall threat is also predicted to relate to the increase in dependence. More coping is expected as well, as the increase in dependence might be interpreted also as an artefact of the coping under the conditions of threat.

9) The more decrease in closeness and frequency of social support—the greater magnitude of coping.

10) Decrease in closeness and frequency, as well as increase in dependence perceived with respect to social support change will be related to negative affect reported with respect to social support change, and negatively related to the positive affect about the social support change.

11) The more central the identity, the more important the social relationship that supports it (Stryker, 1987; Hormuth, 1990; Stryker and Serpe, 1982, 1994; Thoits, 1983b). In order to test the relationship between the importance of an identity-aspect and the social relationship that might predict the level of commitment to this identity-component, zero-order correlations are to be calculated between nine identity-aspects and twelve social ties measured in the data: those identity-elements that are central for an individual should be positively correlated with the social ties supporting them.
12) Overall change in closeness, frequency and dependence in social network of a migrant is related to the overall perceived change in identity-structure.

7.2.1.3 Identity structure: importance of identity-aspects

13) It is predicted that overall identity change across three time-points will be related to lower overall and specific identity states (especially state of continuity) and higher overall and specific identity threats (especially threat to continuity), for all three time spans of identity change (T1-T2; T2-T3 and T1-T3). Overall identity change at all three time-points should be related to higher magnitude of coping.

Changes in collective identity-aspects such as ethnic, Yugoslav and religious identity will affect identity states and threats in different way. SIT predicted that perceptions of threat will depend upon the strength of in-group identification. More recently it has been recognised that the perceptions of threat will also depend upon the type of threat, which will be taken into account in the following set of hypotheses. Since the basic tenet of the following set of predictions is that different types of threat and states will be associated with the same identity-aspect differently, due to diverse meanings various identity-elements assume for individuals, predictions about the coping magnitude will be difficult to ascertain. These are therefore omitted from the analysis.

14) Ethnic identity: High importance of ethnic identity at T3 (present) will be related to higher continuity state and lower threat although lower self-esteem state and higher threat (e.g. Branscombe and Wann, 1994; Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey, 1999). Higher ethnic identity might as well be associated with higher self-esteem state. Strong ethnic identification will be related to less threat to distinctiveness and high distinctiveness state, even though (as illustrated in the previous chapter), the respondents were by and large aware of the negative societal representation of their ethnic group in the new country (see Branscombe et al, 1999; Mlicki and Ellemers, 1995). Also, it is predicted that strong ethnic identification will relate to low self-
efficacy state and its threat (this hypothesis is specifically related to this particular sample in question), as the lack of the expected ethnic community support within this group of immigrants has failed to foster material and informational support necessary for the sense of “empowerment” and agency that groups usually provide.

15) Yugoslav identity: High importance of Yugoslav identity in the present should also be related to lowered state of self-esteem and higher perceived threat there. It must be added here that, due to the circularity of self-esteem hypothesis, high self-esteem might also be related to high in-group identification (Branscombe and Wann, 1991; Marmarosh and Corazzini, 1997; Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey, 1999)

As above, it should be related to higher state of continuity. However, it is possible that the heightened importance of Yugoslav identity is also related to threat to continuity, as the perceived membership of this category makes the disparity between the social and psychological reality (i.e. the category of “Yugoslavs” seizing to exist in the macro-social realm) salient and thus potentially threatening to one’s sense of continuity. Furthermore, contrasting hypotheses could be made in relation to self-efficacy: both lower and higher self-efficacy states could be associated with Yugoslav identity being central. Higher self-efficacy state and lower threat might be hypothesised on the basis of the meanings this category of membership has assumed for many individuals, as illustrated in the interviews analysed in the previous chapter (e.g. anti-nationalism, individualism, mutual respect and tolerance, etc.). On the other hand, absence of a collective institution supporting this category of membership undermines the provision of informational and material support needed (at least initially, upon arrival) for a sense of control to be maintained. Furthermore, the contrasting hypotheses could be made with respect to threat to distinctiveness: the stronger identified respondents would report less threat to distinctiveness (higher distinctiveness-state, Mlicki and Ellemers, 1995).

16) Religious identity: Given the communist regime from which the migrants have arrived, the higher importance of religious identity in the present will be related to less continuity state, but will not be simultaneously positively related to more threat to continuity (since religion supposedly provides a strong explanatory framework from
which environment- and identity-change could be understood). High importance of religious identity will be related to less threat to distinctiveness, and higher distinctiveness state, lower self-esteem state and higher threat to self-esteem (although the opposite applies as well, due to the circularity of the self-esteem hypothesis, see the hypotheses 14 and 15), but lower self-efficacy state, and possibly, higher perceived threat to self-efficacy. The latter hypothesis is derived from the role of religion in providing the explanatory framework that often removes personal agency, and hence a sense of control over people’s environment and their life.

Some of the above hypotheses have been made on the basis of SIT predictions, and hence, have related the current importance of identity-aspects to the perceptions of threat and identity-states levels. However, the perception of the relative importance of identity-aspects across time, that is the perceived direction of change in the importance of identity-components through time might prove to be better indicator of threat. Another set of hypotheses is thus created, and both of these will be tested.

17) Ethnic identity:

a) Decrease T1-T2 will be related to the higher threat to self-esteem and distinctiveness (lower states) (Branscombe et al., 1999). Continuity state should be lower, and threat enhanced. Finally, self-efficacy threat will be higher for those reporting decrease in identification just before emigration, as ethnic identity in the context of inter-group conflict might facilitate a sense of empowerment.

b) Increase T1-T2 will be associated with low continuity state and higher threat, higher self-esteem state (and lower threat) (Branscombe et al., 1999; Branscombe and Wann, 1991; Marmarosh and Corrazzoni, 1997; Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey, 1999), high distinctiveness (low threat) and high self-efficacy (lower threat) due to the collective support available to the individuals endorsing this identity-aspect at the time before migration (increased power of national/ethnic groups, group-affiliation, etc.).
c) Decrease T2-T3 will also be associated with low continuity state and higher threat here, but also higher distinctiveness threat. Low self-esteem could be predicted on the basis of the decrease in this identity-aspect representing an “exit” strategy (de-identification) under the conditions of threat. Decreased importance of this identity-component during this period will be related to more threat to self-efficacy: a weak, disorganised and, as perceived by many, an ineffective group support might pose a threat to self-efficacy in the new context, and this identity-aspect may then be demoted in importance for an individual.

d) Increase T2-T3 will positively relate to continuity state (low threat) and self-esteem state (threat low). Simultaneously, it might indicate high distinctiveness state, and low threat to distinctiveness (Mlicki and Ellmers, 1995), although high threat to distinctiveness is also predictable due to the negative representation of the in-group in the new context. Finally, self-efficacy will be higher (no self-efficacy threat).

e) Decrease T1-T3: predictions follow the hypotheses for the decrease in ethnic identity importance T2-T3 (17c).

f) Increase T1-T3: predictions follow the hypotheses for the increase decrease in ethnic identity importance T2-T3 (17d).

18) Yugoslav identity:

a) Decrease T1-T2 will be associated with low continuity state and high threat to continuity, but also threat to self-esteem (low self-esteem state). Furthermore, distinctiveness threat will be higher, as well as self-efficacy, as the break-down of the institutions supporting this category of membership undermines the sense of empowerment residing in this identity-aspect; furthermore, the break-up of the country (often resulting in the decrease in Yugoslav identification) might be perceived as unpredictable and uncontrollable, further reducing a sense of control.

b) Increase T1-T2 will be associated with higher sense of continuity (lower threat), as this sort of change may represent a strategy of re-asserting the categories of identification, when the changing social context demands radical re-structuring of identity. Self-esteem threat will be lower (the state of self-esteem being higher),
distinctiveness state higher, although threat to distinctiveness could be both lower (Mlicki and Ellemers, 1995) and higher as a result of the social influence processes at the time (directed at removing the Yugoslav category of membership from the repertoire of categories as a viable and positive identity-aspect). Finally, self-efficacy state might be higher, and hence the threat to self-efficacy lower, possibly as a result of the meanings that the Yugoslav usually assumes (strong emphasis upon individuality as a value, and the negation of self-definition in terms of ethnicity, see chapter five and six). Alternatively, it is possible to predict that the lack of institutional support for the Yugoslav category of membership might negatively affect self-efficacy, leading to threat for those continuing to endorse this identity-aspect.

c) Decrease T2-T3 will be associated with low continuity state (higher threat), low distinctiveness and higher threat, and low self-esteem and high threat here. Self-efficacy will be low, and its threat high, as the lack of institutional support for this category of membership, which in the past used to be the only legitimate and representative group (representative of its members through embassies abroad, sport teams, etc.), might lead to diminishing sense of agency.

d) Increase T2-T3 will be associated with higher state of continuity and less threat, higher sense of self-esteem (less threat), higher distinctiveness, although also both low threat and high threat to these could be predicted (the latter not only due to the negative representations of the former-Yugoslavs in Britain, but also due to the broader social structure not accepting the Yugoslavian category of identification). And finally, self-efficacy state associated with the increase in Yugoslav identity might be higher, and threat low, partly due to the individualistic ideology underlying the meanings of this category.

e) Decrease T1-T3: predictions follow those for the decrease in Yugoslav identity importance T2-T3 (18c).

f) Increase T1-T3: predictions follow those for the increase in importance of Yugoslav identity T2-T3 (18d).
19) **Religious identity:**

a) Decrease T1-T2: predictions follow those for ethnic identity decrease T1-T2 (17a).

b) Increase T1-T2 is related to lower continuity state and higher threat (due to the communist, or anti-religious prior ideological context); high self-esteem state (low threat); high sense of distinctiveness and low threat (since with the outbreak of war religion and its ideology were being popularised and promoted); and higher self-efficacy and lower threat (as a result of the source of power that group-based institutions such as church represent for individuals during the war, objectively but also ideologically: the religious authorities before and during the war often engaged in creating meaning-structures used to answer the questions of personal and collective control, responsibility, future outcomes, etc.).

c) Decrease T2-T3: predictions follow those of ethnic identity decrease T2-T3 (17c).

d) Increase T2-T3 is related to lower continuity state and high threat (due to prior communist regime in their country of origin), high distinctiveness state and both low and high threat (the latter due to negative social representations of the in-group), high self-esteem and low threat, and low self-efficacy state, including higher threat (as the religious belief structure rarely facilitate individuality and agency promoted in the Western society).

e) Decrease T1-T3 is associated with low continuity state and high threat, low self-esteem state and high threat, although low as well as high threat to distinctiveness could be predicted. Also, it will be associated with lower self-efficacy state and higher threat here.

f) Increase T1-T3 will be related to low self-continuity and higher threat, high self-esteem and low threat, higher distinctiveness, as well as low/higher threat to distinctiveness, and high self-efficacy and low threat.
7.2.2 Ancillary hypotheses: Demographic variables

7.2.2.1 Age

It is generally accepted that older age is related to greater difficulty in adaptation as it implies less flexibility (Berry, 1997), but also is related to greater sense of control and autonomy (Scott et al., 1989, Ward and Kennedy, 1994). Some hypotheses can therefore be derived:

20) Older immigrants will experience more specific threat to perceived self-esteem, continuity, self-efficacy and distinctiveness; however, they will simultaneously report higher identity-states, especially continuity state, as they are less likely to undergo change with migration. It is possible that they will report lower distinctiveness state (as with migration the factors contributing to an individual's sense of uniqueness—such as status, occupation, material wealth, etc., could be more likely to undergo change); higher self-esteem, although lower self-efficacy state.

21) Increase in age will be related to less identification with the host (British) nationals, and more identification with ethnic/home culture (e.g. Lalonde et al, 1992; Knight et al., 1993, Rosenthal and Feldman, 1992).

22) Increase in age will be related to less flexibility in social interactions, resulting in decrease in closeness and frequency in contacts ("social adjustment", Ward and Kennedy, 1994). However, dependence upon social ties will increase, as the independence established with age in the home-country is likely to be disrupted with immigration (due to the loss of status, material possessions, occupation).

23) Previous literature on migration has established that the older immigrants report higher psychological well-being (Ward and Kennedy, 1994; Scott et al., 1989). Therefore, more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions about one's identity (at T1, T2 and T3) are expected to be related to age.

24) However, due to the nature of changes in their social environment, older immigrants are thought to report more negative emotions and fewer positive emotions with respect to their social network.
7.2.2.2 Sex

Although the previous findings are inconclusive and contradictory, a large proportion of them predict sex-difference in adaptation – specifically, women were thought to be more at risk of psychiatric disorder and likely to report less adaptation (see Berry, 1997, Scott et al, 1989).

25) Females will perceive more threat and lower identity-state (both general and specific).

26) Females will report greater importance of ethnic identity, less perceived change there over time and with migration, and less importance of the host-country (British) identity.

27) Females will experience more negative emotions (both with respect to identity and social support).

28) Females will report more negative change in social support (decrease in closeness and frequency of social support), as they are often considered less likely to establish new social networks (e.g. Jerusalem, Hahn and Scharzer, 1994), due to, according to some authors, low level of autonomy and high level of role rigidity (Scott et al., 1989).

7.2.2.3 Length of residence

Most of the previous theoretical and empirical frameworks agree that the length of residence in the host-country is related to higher level of adaptation, and an immigrant’s greater degree of stability. The disagreements, however, emerge with respect to the path undertaken by immigrants in the process of adaptation, or the phases of adaptation, ranging from the assumptions about straightforward progression into more self-satisfaction accompanied by more self- and cultural-awareness (Adler, 1975; Oberg, 1960), to the U-curve hypothesis (Lysgaard, 1955), indicating the curvilinear relationship between the length of residence and adaptation. Overall, the assumption is that increased familiarity with the new culture leads to better adaptation – both in terms of self-satisfaction and satisfaction with the social environment. The
hypotheses posited here will examine the assumptions about the linear relationship between length of residence and adaptation.

29) The longer a person stays in the country, the less perceived threat to continuity. However, continuity state might be perceived to be higher for those recently arriving to the country, as they have not yet fully engaged in re-structuring of their identity, demanded by sudden change in their social context. Furthermore, the length of residence will be associated with higher self-esteem, self-efficacy and distinctiveness state, and less threat to all three identity-states. Similarly, less overall threat and higher overall state will be reported.

30) The length of residence will be related to higher importance of British identity (T3) and less perceived importance of ethnic, religious and Yugoslav identity (also at T3). Similarly, perceived decrease in the importance of the three collective identities at T1-T3, T2-T3 and T1-T3 will be higher for those who have stayed longer in the country.

31) However, whether there will be a higher degree of the overall perceived identity change is dependent upon the time-span of the perception of change. There is some indication that with the longer residence in the country, the supportive elements for one's identity are re-established, thus stabilising identity-structure, with the effect of different identity-aspects reaching their base-level of importance (e.g. Adler, 1975 assumed that final stage of adjustment indicated "cultural relativity" and equal endorsement of the home- and host-culture). Therefore, the length of residence will be positively related to the identity change between T2-T3 and negatively related to the identity change T1-T3.

32) Accordingly, the length of residence will be related to less perceived decrease in closeness in migrants' social ties (with migration). It will also be related to less perceived decrease in frequency of contacts. Finally, there will be more perceived decrease in dependence upon their social network for those who have spent longer period in the country (autonomy achieved, Adler, 1975).

33) The length of residence will be related to less negative affect and more positive affect with respect to one's social network change. There will be less negative affect.
and more positive emotions reported with respect to people's overall identity structure at T3 (present).

34) People who have spent longer in the country will report more coping magnitude (during their life in emigration) than the later arrivals, partly due to the context in which they have arrived (usually the very beginning of the conflict), and partly because they have had longer period to employ a range of coping in different domains.

7.2.2.4 Religious commitment

Religious commitment is often thought to provide a sense of personal security and meaning in life often lacking upon migration; however, being one of the aspects of in-group identity, it also means that its higher importance will be related to lower self-esteem, and more perceived threat (Branscombe and Wann, 1994; Branscombe, Schmitt and Harvey, 1999), according to SIT. The predictions based on theory of social identity were provided in the hypothesis (16), section 7.2.1.3.

35) Greater importance of religious identity will be related to more overall positive emotions and less negative emotions related to one's identity (at least at T3).

7.2.2.5 Life-events

Given the characteristic (war-related) nature of the negative life events measured in the questionnaire, some predictions made are specific to the sample in question. Here, the "accumulation hypothesis" is tested, as a number of negative life events influencing identity-response (Thoits, 1983b).

36) The higher the number of negative life-events - the more threat to identity (both overall and specific), and the lower identity-states (again, both overall and specific).

37) The more negative life-events reported - the more coping employed (coping magnitude).
38) The more negative life-events reported – the more negative affect experienced, both with respect to identity and social support change.

39) The more negative life-events reported – the more change in identity-structure reported:
   a) the more overall change at all three points of time;
   b) the more increase in significance of certain identity-aspects (e.g. the ethnic, religious and Yugoslav identity), especially between T1-T2 and T1-T3 due to the inter-group context increasing the likelihood of experiencing the four negative life-events: the experience of the war-related life-events will strengthen group-based identification.

7.3 Measurement scales

Demographic variables: Sex (Q. 12) was represented as a dummy variable, whereby female was coded ‘1’. Age (Q. 13) was measured in years. Marital status (Q. 14) and employment (Q. 15) were not coded, since these items were reflected in other variables in our sample (e.g. social support). Socio-economic status (class) (Q. 16) was dropped out of the analysis, since it made no sense to many participants in the study, as they were brought up under the communist regime (officially classless society).

Accumulation of negative life events (Q. 20 – Q. 23) was measured as a sum of life events; the number of life events experienced was limited in the data to four: loss of material possession, loss of a member of family, a member of family persecuted/tortured during the war, oneself persecuted/tortured during the war. The accumulation of life events variable was calculated by summing up each of the four (nominal-level) life-events measures, creating a new interval level variable with the range of values from ‘0’ to ‘4’.
Identity change scales (Q. 1)

Two separate types of scale were created: the overall amount of change between T1 and T2, T2 and T3, and T1 and T3; and the direction of change for the nine identity-aspects (decrease or increase in importance of each of the nine identity-elements).

**Overall identity change:** In order to compute the overall identity change, the amount of change for each specific identity at three time-points had to be derived first. This variable was computed using the command *absolute value* (T1-T2, or T2-T3, or T1-T3). These new values indicated the amount of absolute change in the salience of nine identity-aspects at different points in time (regardless of direction of change).

Subsequently, the *overall perceived change* in salience of identity at three time points (T1-T2, T2-T3 and T1-T3) was computed from the mean value of the sum of differences for each identity-aspect (e.g. *overall identity change* T1-T2=mean [ethnic identity-changeT1-T2, religious identity-changeT1-T2, Yugoslav-identity changeT1-T2, etc.]). The latter computation of the three scales of perceived overall change in importance of identity-aspects at three time points ranged from ‘0’ to ‘6’ on interval measurement scale.

In order to evaluate the effect of different direction of change in importance of specific identities, another set of identity-change variables had to be computed – this time each indicating the decrease and the increase in importance of the three group-based identity-aspects in question (ethnic, religious and Yugoslav) at three time-points (before the break-up of the war [T1], just before migration [T2] and in the present [T3]). Three measures of change were then calculated for each specific identity endorsed: change T1 to T2; change T1 to T3; and change T2 to T3. First, the “importance of identity” scores were subtracted from T3 scores and T2 scores (e.g. T3-T2; T3-T1; and T2-T1). After the subtraction, then, the negative values indicated decrease in importance, and the positive values indicated increase in importance. In order to achieve a consistent direction in scoring, the negative values were then recoded into positive (e.g. ‘-3’ was recoded into ‘3’) so that higher scores indicated greater degree of decrease in importance. New variables were thus computed.
indicating “decrease in importance” and “increase in importance” of specific identities for three time-points (T1-T2, T2-T3 and T1-T3). Eighteen new variables were created (for the three identity-aspects in question, which decreased or increased at three time-points). The decrease and increase in importance of specific identity variable ranges from ‘0’ to ‘6’.

Social Support Scales (Q. 5 – Q. 6)

Social support accumulation variable (Q. 5): because data were limited with respect to specific numbers of relationships enacted by an individual in the sample, social support accumulation variable was measured here as the sum of social positions held by an individual. However, as the variable “importance of social support” was measured on the interval scale (range ‘1’-‘7’), it was first important to dichotomise the variables, so that the higher scores on the scale (from “somewhat important” coded as ‘4’ to “extremely important” coded ‘7’) were re-coded into ‘1’ (indicating endorsement of relationship), and the lower scores (ranging from ‘1’-‘3’), including “not applicable” score of ‘9’ were re-coded into the value of ‘0’. Thus, twelve variables indicating the social ties held were dichotomised, and these were: parent/grandparents; children; siblings; partner; friends; work/student colleagues; superiors (boss, supervisor, etc.); other foreigners/migrants; members of the first wave of immigrants; co-patriots within the ethnic group; other former-Yugoslavs; neighbours. The social support accumulation variable was successively incremented by ‘1’ if the respondent had a spouse/partner, a child, close friends, etc. The social support accumulation ranges from ‘0’ to ‘12’ in value, and was measured at T3 (“in the present”).

Social support change (Q. 6): The original values were transformed, and several separate scales were computed in order to determine the direction and degree of the overall change. These scores were computed for each of the three types of change: in closeness, frequency of contacts and dependence upon different relationships people had reported. Due to a large number of missing values on the variable “child”, this
variable was removed from the subsequent analysis. The variables boyfriend and spouse were merged in order to create one variable “partner”. In order to specify the direction of change - that is whether the change involved decrease or increase in closeness, frequency of contacts or dependence upon relationships, new, separate scores were computed for decrease and increase on these dimensions. Since the original scale measured decrease, stability and increase in these dimensions on a 5-point scale, whereby maximum decrease was indicated by 1, stability by 3, and maximum increase by 5, in order to determine the amount of the overall change, some transformations were performed. The scores on the original scale ranging from ‘1’ to ‘3’ were recoded so that “no change” (‘3’) was recoded into the score of ‘1’, and maximum decrease (‘1’) was recoded into the score of ‘3’. Similarly the scores for “increase” with the values from ‘3’ to ‘5’ on the original scale were recoded so that no change (‘3’) was indicated by ‘1’ on the “increase scale”, and maximum increase (‘5’) was recoded into ‘3’. Thus, nine “decrease” variables and nine “increase” variables were created for each type (closeness, dependency, frequency of contact) of change.

Finally, the overall score for decrease and increase on nine relationships for each type of change (closeness, dependence, frequency) was computed using the mean command from the SPSS menu (e.g. overall decrease in closeness = mean[decreased closeness with parents, decreased closeness with siblings, decrease closeness with friends, etc.]). Six new variables were created - overall decrease in closeness, in dependence, in frequency of contacts; and overall increase in closeness, dependence and in frequency of contacts.

Emotions Scales (Q. 2, Q. 3, Q. 4 and Q. 7)

Overall negative and positive affect with respect to identity-structure (Q. 2 – Q. 4): In order to specify the valence (dimension) of the overall emotion experienced, the “overall negative affect scale” was created at three points in time (T1, T2 and T3). The overall negative affect was calculated summing up the five overall negative emotions (anger, guilt, sadness, threat and feeling uncomfortable) for each of the three
time-points, thus creating three new “overall negative affect” scales. All three newly created scales were highly reliable: negative affect at T1 (before the break-up of the war) had the standardised $\alpha=.90$; negative affect at T2 (just before migration) had the standardised $\alpha=.91$; and negative affect at T3 (present) had the standardised $\alpha=.91$.

The positive affect scale could not be created as only two “positive emotions” were initially measured – happiness and pride. For that reason, the two were treated as separate measures of positive affect at three time-points.

**Negative and positive affect due to social support change (Q. 7):** Apart from the measures of emotions experienced with respect to one’s identity-structure at three time-points, the emotion scale was calculated indicating the emotions experienced in relation to the participants’ perception of change in social support, (“social commitment affect”), in the present. A principal component factor analysis was computed on nine emotion items (happy, angry, guilty, uncomfortable, excited, sad, empty, content and threatened). Two factors were extracted with the loadings over .65. All items were included, three constituting the factor called “positive affect” and six constituting the factor called “negative affect”. Both factors had very high loadings (see Table 4). Cronbach alpha indicated very high reliability for negative affect scale (Standardised $\alpha=.88$) and moderate reliability for positive affect scale (Standardised $\alpha=.69$)

**Table 4: Pattern matrix for emotions related to social support change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identity states scales (Q. 8 – “How true of me”)

Principal factor extraction with oblique rotation was used on 16 items of “identity states” scale. These items were designed to measure four states of continuity, self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy (four items measuring each construct). Five factors were extracted with a cut of .45 for the inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor. They accounted for 70% of variance in the sample. All items loaded on factors: four items loaded on the factor called “continuity”, four on “distinctiveness”, and four on self-efficacy. All three factors had very high loadings of the items specifically designed to operationalise the three identity-states. However, four self-esteem items loaded on two separate factors, namely, “positive self-esteem” and “negative self-esteem. Loadings of variables on factors, communalities and percents of variance are shown in Table 5, and Factor Correlation Matrix was shown in Table 6. Reliability analysis performed on each of the factors indicated high consistency of all four scales: standardised Alpha for the “Continuity state” scale was $\alpha=.83$; the “Self efficacy state” scale was $\alpha=.75$; the Alpha for the “Distinctiveness state” scale was also high with $\alpha=.75$. Finally, the “positive self esteem” and “negative self-esteem state” items were collapsed to glean the standardised Alpha of $\alpha=.70$ (correlation between the two factors was $r=.50$, $p=.000$.)
Table 5: Factor loadings on identity-states factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFSOLVI</td>
<td>-.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFHAND1</td>
<td>-.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFCTRL1</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFDEAL1</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIALL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFALL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISML1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFSML1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHAPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFAIL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.854</td>
<td>.04645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESGOOD1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.830</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESWRTH1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCHNG1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSAME1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSIMI1</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>-.690</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCONN1</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>-.632</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pct. of Var. 24.6 15.3 14.1 8.8 7.4

Factor 1 Self-efficacy state
Factor 2 Distinctiveness state
Factor 3 Self-esteem positive state
Factor 4 Self-continuity state
Factor 5 Self-esteem negative state

Table 6: Factor correlation matrix for identity-states variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.11862</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>-.11117</td>
<td>.04645</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>-.21116</td>
<td>-.05171</td>
<td>-.03480</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>-.32618</td>
<td>-.11250</td>
<td>.00466</td>
<td>.18035</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identity Threat Scale (Q. 8 – "How much I want it to change")

Principal Components Analysis with Oblique rotation was carried out on 16 identity threat items. With the cut of .45 for the inclusions of variables into the factor solution, three factors were extracted. Communality values were relatively high, indicating that factors successfully explained the variables. These factors accounted for 61% of
variance. All items loaded on factors: three out of four “continuity” items loaded on factor called “threat to continuity”. All four “distinctiveness” items loaded on the “threat to distinctiveness” factor. However, the items operationalised for the concepts of self-efficacy and self-esteem (four for each) loaded on just one factor. Cronbach Alpha was estimated for the two factors of “threat to continuity” and “threat to distinctiveness”, with $\alpha = .78$ and $\alpha = .76$ respectively. The third factor was split into two: the four “self-esteem items” were checked for reliability and so were the four “self-efficacy” items: Cronbach Alpha for “threat to self-esteem” was $\alpha = .87$, and for “threat to self-efficacy” was $\alpha = .80$. The correlation between the two scales was high, $r = .69$. Communalities, individual variables' loadings and factor correlation matrix were given in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7: Factor loadings on identity-threat factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFCTRL2</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFHAND2</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFDEAL2</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFAIL2</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHAP2</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSOLV2</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESWRTH2</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESGOOD2</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSIMI2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCONN2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSAME2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISML2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIALL2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFALL2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFSML2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCHNG2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. of Var.</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 1: Self-efficacy/self-esteem threat
Factor 2: Continuity threat
Factor 3: Distinctiveness Threat
Table 8: Factor Correlation Matrix of identity-threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.28305</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.46341</td>
<td>.22263</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall states:** In order to calculate the overall level of identity-states, the aggregate of the four composite measures of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy was computed. This scale was calculated in order to measure the level of satisfaction with oneself.

**Overall threats:** Similarly, an aggregate measure of the overall experience of threat was computed summing up the four composite threat measures of self-continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. This was in order to create a variable measuring the magnitude of threat experienced by the respondents (regardless of the type of threat).

**Magnitude of coping:** In order to determine the amount of coping effort in the present (indicated on the scale from ‘1’ to ‘7’), the mean value of the sum of 23 coping items was calculated. The newly created scale ranged from ‘1’ to ‘7’.

### 7.4 Results

#### 7.4.1 Main theoretical predictions: Identity-based hypotheses

**7.4.1.1 Emotions**

Table 9 shows that almost all relationships between emotions and identity threats and states were in the predicted direction, and were statistically significant. Only the emotions reported by respondents for the period before the outbreak of war (T1) formed no significant correlations with any of the threat, state or coping variable. Negative emotions were generally related to more overall and specific threat, as well
as more coping magnitude. Furthermore, negative emotions at T2 were correlated with the magnitude of coping variable. Positive emotions mainly related to identity-states in the positive direction, and only the positive affect in relation to social support and overall happiness at T3 were negatively related to threat – the former to threat to continuity, and the latter, to threat to self-esteem.

7.4.1.2 Social support

The correlation matrix between the importance of the specific social relationship and the importance of a specific identity (both measures indicating these levels in the present) is presented in the Table 10. What seems striking from this correlation table is that the importance of family identity was indeed correlated highly with the four "family"-related social relationships (the child, the parents, the partner and the siblings), but also, strong correlations existed between the importance of the family and that of friends and the other former -Yugoslavs. As expected, the importance of ethnic identity was associated with the importance of other members of ethnic group, as well as the members of the older generation of immigrants usually gathered around ethnic community. The importance of occupational identity was highly positively correlated with the importance of the superior (boss), other colleagues, the child, and for some reason, negatively correlated with the importance of the siblings. Religious identity, just as ethnic identity, correlated extremely highly with the importance of other members of ethnic group and the first wave of immigrants around the ethnic community. Finally, the importance of the host-culture identity (British identity) was positively related to the importance of neighbours, and the importance of the first generation of immigrants around ethnic community.

Although the accumulation hypothesis predicted that the greater number of social ties would be related to less perceived threat to identity and higher identity-state, the variable was associated in the predicted direction with only one identity-threat, and the significance level here was small (Table 12): fewer important relationships
reported were associated with the higher threat to self-esteem (r=-.19, p=.05). Of the five identity-states variables (four specific and one general), three were correlated in the predicted direction with the number of social ties reported: distinctiveness state, esteem state and overall state were all found to be positively correlated with the number of important relationships. No relationship was found between social support and magnitude of coping.

However, the relationships between changes in social support and identity threats and states were shown to be much more complex (see Table 11). As predicted, decrease in closeness was associated with the greater likelihood of the experience of threat – specifically, continuity and efficacy threat, and also with the overall threat. Furthermore, it was related to the lower continuity and self-efficacy states, as well as the overall state. All relationships were highly significant. However, lower continuity state was not confined to the experiences of the decrease in closeness only – increase in closeness also created less sense of continuity, but no threat was related to this type of social support change. Contrary to the predicted, self-efficacy threat was likely among the subjects reporting overall increase in closeness with migration. Interestingly, overall decrease in frequency of contacts was in no way associated with any of the identity-variables. Unexpectedly, however, the increase in frequency of contacts was associated both with higher overall threat, and higher specific threats to self-esteem and self-efficacy. Finally, associations between changes in dependence upon the overall social network and identity-variables were tested. Both decrease and increase in dependence were found to be associated with the higher distinctiveness state. No relationship between any of the social support change variables and magnitude of coping was reported.

Some changes in social support were shown to be associated with the negative affect: high positive correlation existed between decrease in closeness and negative affect (r=.27, p=.004, N=109), whereas increase in closeness was related to positive affect
(r=.20, p=.042, N=109), as expected. No other social support variables were related to the affect reported with respect to these changes.

The test of the relationships between social support change and identity structure change (regardless of the direction of change) showed positive relationship between the overall change in all three social support variables (regardless of direction of change) and the overall identity change as it was perceived to have occurred after migration (between T2 and T3, see Table 13). This was understandable, given that the social support change the subjects were asked to report were those that had happened in that period.
Table 9: Correlation between emotion variables and identity threat, state and coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Affect T1</th>
<th>Happiness T1</th>
<th>Pride T1</th>
<th>Negative Affect T2</th>
<th>Happiness T2</th>
<th>Pride T2</th>
<th>Negative Affect T3</th>
<th>Happiness T3</th>
<th>Pride T3</th>
<th>Negative Affect re. Social Support</th>
<th>Positive Affect re. Social Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.240*</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.330**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.477**</td>
<td>-0.252**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.204*</td>
<td>0.235*</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive. Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.404**</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.299**</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>-0.242*</td>
<td>0.198*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.203*</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.375**</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>-0.364**</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.405**</td>
<td>0.260**</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.400**</td>
<td>0.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>0.340**</td>
<td>-0.193*</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.336**</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.309**</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.243*</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Magnitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.216*</td>
<td>0.289**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.280**</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.228**</td>
<td>0.224*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 10: Correlation between importance of identity in the present and importance of a social relationship in the present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Family Identity</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Material Status</th>
<th>Occupation Status</th>
<th>Religious Identity</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Yugoslav Identity</th>
<th>British Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior/ Boss</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.606**</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First wave</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic co-</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriots</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.325**</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former-</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.217*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavs</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Correlation between decrease and increase in overall closeness, dependence and frequency of social contacts with identity threats, states and magnitude of coping variables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease in closeness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in closeness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease in dependence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in dependence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decrease in frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
Table 12: Correlation between the number of important social ties and threat, state and coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of social ties</th>
<th>Continuity State</th>
<th>Continuity Threat</th>
<th>Distinctiv. State</th>
<th>Distinctiv. Threat</th>
<th>Efficacy State</th>
<th>Efficacy Threat</th>
<th>Esteem State</th>
<th>Esteem Threat</th>
<th>Overall State</th>
<th>Overall Threat</th>
<th>Coping Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 13: Correlation between overall change in identity at three time-points and overall change in closeness, dependence and frequency of social contacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall decrease in closeness</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T2</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T3</th>
<th>Overall identity change T2-T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.238*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall decrease in dependence</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T2</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T3</th>
<th>Overall identity change T2-T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.297**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall decrease in frequency</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T2</th>
<th>Overall identity change T1-T3</th>
<th>Overall identity change T2-T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
7.4.1.3 Identity-structure

Some of the analyses above have already tackled the ways in which identity structure and the migrants' perceptions of its changes relate to the social network and its changes. Here, some other hypotheses tested in relation to the way identity-structure change operates will be reported.

Before embarking upon other analyses, descriptive analysis of the mean importance of each identity was conducted (see Chart 1). Family identity was consistently the most important aspect of identity at three points in time (m(T1)=6.4, m(T2)=6.6 and m(T3)=6.7), and its importance increased with the break-up of the war. The least important aspects of identity throughout the three time-points were reported to be the ethnic and religious identity, with the mean scores to be regularly below m=2.5.

The hypothesised relationship between the overall identity change and overall and specific threat and state was only partially supported (see Table 14). The perception of the greater overall change in identity both in the period prior to migration and post migration was related to the increase in overall threat, and decrease in overall state. However, the overall identity change prior to migration (T1-T2) was related positively to efficacy and esteem threat, and negatively to continuity state, but not to continuity threat. The changes in identity as perceived after migration (T2-T3) were positively related to distinctiveness, efficacy and esteem threats, but again, the relationship did not occur with respect to continuity threat, although the increase in identity change for this period was associated with the decrease in the sense of continuity. The lack of relationship between identity change and threat to continuity, despite the lowered continuity state, points to some other issues relating to the nature of continuity threat, as will be explored further.

The hypotheses directed at testing the SIT-based association between the group-based (ethnic, religious and Yugoslav) identity-aspects and perceptions of threat was not
supported. The level of importance of these identity-aspects in the present showed no significant relationship with identity-threats or states. The only hypothesised and confirmed relationship was that between the importance of religious identity and the higher distinctiveness state (although the subjective meaning of this increase in distinctiveness as positive or negative had not been assessed prior to its measure) ($r = .23, p = .022, N = 98$). As the lack of results such as these could be interpreted as the outcome of the “exit” coping strategy, another set of analyses were performed to show how the perception of change in these identity-aspects impacted upon perceived threats and states to identity. These relationships are represented in tables 15-17.
Table 14: Correlation between overall identity change (T1-T2; T1-T3 and T2-T3) and identity threat, state and coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Continuity State</th>
<th>Continuity Threat</th>
<th>Distinctiv. State</th>
<th>Distinctiv. Threat</th>
<th>Efficacy State</th>
<th>Efficacy Threat</th>
<th>Esteem State</th>
<th>Esteem Threat</th>
<th>Overall State</th>
<th>Overall Threat</th>
<th>Coping Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall id. change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-T2</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.269**</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>.239*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall id. change</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.217*</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-T3</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall id. change</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.281**</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>-.209*</td>
<td>.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-T3</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
The results related to the changes in ethnic, religious and Yugoslav identity as perceived to have happened between T1 (prior to the break-out of the war) and T2 (prior to migration):

The increase in importance of ethnic, Yugoslav and religious identity during the period before and just upon the break-up of the conflict understandably related to the current less perceived continuity. No relationship was shown to exist between the increase in importance of ethnic identity and any threat variable. Unexpectedly, self-esteem was perceived to be under threat for those individuals for whom Yugoslav identity gained in importance, whereas increase in religious identity importance was linked with more distinctiveness. As predicted, decrease in Yugoslav identity and the decrease in religious identity were related to the lower efficacy-state, and thus, to the perceived threat to self-efficacy.

The results related to the ethnic, religious and Yugoslav identity changes perceived to have happened between T2 (prior to migration) and T3 (at the present):

As above, the increase in ethnic identity importance was linked to the lower state of continuity. Less continuity state was reported in relation to both decrease in the importance of religious identity, and of the Yugoslav identity. Distinctiveness state was lower for those who reported decrease in importance of religious identity, and, supporting the predictions, self-esteem state was lower for those who reported the decrease in Yugoslav identity-salience. Unlike the predictions, decrease in religious identity was related to threat to self-efficacy, whereas increase in the Yugoslav identity was related to threat to self-esteem. Increase in religious identity, was related to more threat to distinctiveness, according to our alternative prediction.
The results related to the identity changes perceived and reported to have happened between T1 (prior to the break-out of the war) and T3 (at the present):

Decrease in the importance of ethnic identity was related to higher distinctiveness state, contrary to our prediction. Increase in importance of Yugoslav identity was related to more threat to self-esteem, also contrary to the predictions. Other relationships of importance were those of the experiences of threat to distinctiveness when Yugoslav identity as well as religious identity increased in importance, contrary to SIT predictions, but according to the predictions taking into account representations of the groups. Self-efficacy state was negatively related to the decrease in religious identity importance, that is, the less important the religious identity reported, the less self-efficacy state, contrary to predictions.

Chart 1: The change of mean importance of identity-aspects across three time-points.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Continuity State</th>
<th>Continuity Threat</th>
<th>Distinctiv. State</th>
<th>Distinctiv. Threat</th>
<th>Efficacy State</th>
<th>Efficacy Threat</th>
<th>Esteem State</th>
<th>Esteem Threat</th>
<th>Overall State</th>
<th>Overall Threat</th>
<th>Coping Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Decrease T1-T3 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Increase T1-T3 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.304*</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.315*</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Decrease T2-T3 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.202*</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.221*</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Increase T2-T3 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Decrease T1-T2 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.206*</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugosl. Id. Increase T1-T2 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.279*</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>-.272*</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 16: Correlation between decrease or increase in importance of religious identity, and threat, state and coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relig. Id. Decrease T1-T3</th>
<th>Continuity State</th>
<th>Continuity Threat</th>
<th>Distinctiv. State</th>
<th>Distinctiv. Threat</th>
<th>Efficacy State</th>
<th>Efficacy Threat</th>
<th>Esteem State</th>
<th>Esteem Threat</th>
<th>Overall State</th>
<th>Overall Threat</th>
<th>Coping Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.263*</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. Id. Increase T1-T3</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.245*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. Id. Decrease T2-T3</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.212*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. Id. Increase T2-T3</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.244*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. Id. Decrease T1-T2</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.349**</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig. Id. Increase T1-T2</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 17: Correlation between decrease or increase in importance of the ethnic identity, and threat, state and coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic id. Decrease T1-T3</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Continuity State</th>
<th>Continuity Threat</th>
<th>Distinctiv. State</th>
<th>Distinctiv. Threat</th>
<th>Efficacy State</th>
<th>Efficacy Threat</th>
<th>Esteem State</th>
<th>Esteem Threat</th>
<th>Overall State</th>
<th>Overall Threat</th>
<th>Coping Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic id. Increase T1-T3</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic id. Decrease T2-T3</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.264*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.243*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic id. Increase T2-T3</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic id. Decrease T1-T2</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic id. Increase T1-T2</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.263**</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.217*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
7.4.2 Ancillary predictions: Demographic variables

7.4.2.1 Age

A number of postulated relationships between age and other variables have been supported by our analysis. Although there is no evidence of the postulated relationship between perceptions of threat and age, there is a positive relationship between the increase in age and continuity state, as expected (r=.23, p=.018, N=110). However, contrary to the predictions, older age is associated with more negative affect both as reported in the present and as reported to have occurred in the past, prior to the outbreak of the war (p=.19, p=.045, N=110 and r=.23, p=.016, N=110 respectively). Some relationship between the perceived change in social support and age does exist, although not as predicted: rather than reporting decrease in closeness and frequency, older generation seems to report less increase in the two types of changes in social support (r=-.28, p=.004, N=110 and r=-.27, p=.005, N=106 respectively). Thus, the factor that defines the older people's relationship with their social environment seems to be related not to the acquisition of new social ties, but rather, the maintenance of the old ones. No relationship between older age and changes in dependency was detected. As predicted, however, a positive relationship also exists between the increase in age and the negative affect reported with respect to the overall change in social support, as postulated (p=.22, p=.02, N=109).

Older age seems to be related to less identification with the host-culture (r=-.23, p=.04, N=78), and more salient Yugoslav identity in the present (r=.20, p=.035, N=109), as predicted, although no such relationship existed between age and ethnic or religious identity.

7.4.2.2 Sex

It has been hypothesised that there will be significant differences between males and females in their ways of perceiving threat and the levels of their identity-states (25),
their levels of emotionality (27), their perception of changes in social network upon migration (28), and their proclivity to identify with ethnic and host-nationals group (28). Females were thought to be more susceptible to negative perceptions of their identity-states, threats, emotions, and more in-group oriented. A series of independent t-tests indicated no support for any of the predicted relationships.

7.4.2.3 Length of residence

There was very little support for the hypotheses relating length of residence to better adaptation, measured in terms of identity states and threats, emotions and social support. The only significant relationships existed between the length of residence variable and identity-change variable, but in the direction opposite to that predicted: a positive relationship existed between the length of residence and the increase in importance of ethnic identity (T2-T3)(r=.27, p=.014, N=81), and the former and the increase in importance of religious identity (both T1-T3 and T2-T3)(r=.29, p=.005, N=95 and r=.27, p=.014, N=82, respectively).

7.4.2.4 Religious commitment

The results pertaining to the SIT-based predictions are reported in section 7.4.1.3. A strong religious identification implied more recalled overall happiness at T2 (just before migration) (r=.23, p=.023, N=98). However, it also was related to more negative affect related to the overall change in social support (r=.28, p=.008, N=97).

7.4.2.5 Negative life-events

The number of negative life-events variable seems to have been related to the lower threat to self-esteem (r=-.24, p=.011, N=110), thus countering the hypothesised increase in threat with the increased number of negative life-experiences. Other threat and state-variables were not related to the number of negative life-events reported by the subjects. Furthermore, it did not seem to be related to the magnitude of coping.
Emotions were similarly not associated with the number of negative life-events, although some identity-change variables seem to have been related. More negative life-events were associated with more perceived identity-change between T1 and T2 (the period before and after the outbreak of the war, but before migration) \((r= .24, p= .013, N=110)\). As predicted, negative life-events had some impact upon people’s perception of the changes in their identity-aspects based on group membership: there was more reported change in ethnic identity between T1 and T2 \((r= .20, p= .034, N=109)\). However, contrary to predictions, when tested for the direction of change, it appeared that ethnic identity as perceived by the subjects between T1 and T2 decreased in importance \((r= .26, p=.027, N=70)\), and that the Yugoslav identity had undergone apparently less increase in importance between T2 and T3 (before migration up until present) \((r= -.26, p=.038, N=65)\) for those who had experienced more negative life-events. Overall, there was some evidence supporting the hypothesised relationship between life-events and the changes in identity-structure.

### 7.5 Discussion

**Summary of key findings:**

- All emotion variables were related in predicted direction to identity-states and identity-threat variables, indicating the importance of the emotional component in perceptions of identity-threats and evaluations of identity-states. Emotions were also the only identity-based variables related to magnitude of coping variable.
- The relative importance of identity-aspects was related to the relative importance of social ties that supported them, showing that individuals’ immediate social network (and not only the social structure), was constitutive of their identity.
- Stability of social network was correlated with stability of identity – both in terms of the overall change of identity, and in terms of the of identity-states and threats to these states experienced.
- The changes in social support, however, did not uniformly relate to all identity states and threats, as well as identity-structure changes: different type of social support
change related to different states and threats. Understanding how perceptions of social support change impact upon identity-states must be founded in our understanding of the way people commonly represent these changes, as well as the subjective meaning of these changes (based on migrants’ identity-structure/content as well as actions taken to deal with potentially threatening changes).

- There was no support for the SIT-based prediction that the collective-identity salience (e.g. ethnic, Yugoslav, religious identity) would be associated with self-esteem (although there is some evidence that it will increase distinctiveness state). However, when taking into account the direction of change in importance of these identity-aspects, some predicted relationships with threat and states were supported, pointing to two sets of issues: the meanings of different identity-aspects; and the notion of their relative importance and interaction in time.
- No gender difference on any of the designated variables was apparent. Gender differences are expected only under the conditions whereby normative cultures of host- and home-country are so different that the opposing behavioural prescriptions emerge from the two.
- Increase in age was not associated with the decrease in social network, although its relationship with satisfaction with oneself was ambiguous. The issues pertaining to the age-related variability in the desired end-states and the social representations endorsed by different generations, are considered in the discussion.
- The length of residence was not a significant variable in most (bar two) hypothesized relationships.
- Greater importance of religious identity related to heightened distinctiveness state, but no relationship between other states or any threat variables was found, only partially supporting SIT-based predictions. It was related to more emotions (positive and negative).
- The number of negative life-events variable did not significantly correlate with people’s identity states and threats. The issues pertaining to the meanings these life-events assumed for an individual as perceived in the totality of their life-experiences,
as well as the coping developed to deal with them, were offered as an explanation for the lack of predicted relationships. Some SIT-based predictions were not supported.

7.5.1 Identity-based predictions

Before focusing the discussion upon the main and ancillary theoretical predictions in this chapter, it is important to explain the absence of differentiation between self-esteem and self-efficacy threats, emergent from the Principle Component Analysis, section 7.3.

Within social identity paradigm, self-esteem has been treated as a motivational force behind the cognitive process of social comparison, an approach that has been criticised for treating self-evaluation as a passive process (see Abrams and Hogg, 1988). Abrams and Hogg reviewed some literature which considers action (and a person's beliefs about it) as closely tied to self-esteem: as Gecas and Schwalbe (1983), Bandura (1981; 1982), McClelland (1975), and also Marx (1844/1963) have argued, self-knowledge is arrived at through action, which in turn boosts one's self-esteem. Breakwell (1988) also argues that self-esteem can sometimes operate in tandem with self-efficacy, and cites Seligman (1975) who evinced that the absence of self-efficacy can be associated with feelings of futility, alienation and helplessness. The above literature, therefore, may allow the prediction that there would be a degree of overlap between the two constructs.

The findings reported in this chapter, however, have shown an interesting pattern: whereas PCA has loaded the self-esteem and self-efficacy threat items on a single factor, it differentiated between the self-efficacy and self-esteem states factors. One of the possible explanations is that, although respondents may have treated self-esteem and self-efficacy states as conceptually separate, under certain conditions — such as the situation of sudden and major shifts in environment — the two might co-occur as the salient motivation forces. This way, the threats to both of these identity-states may have become phenomenologically/experientially similar or at least overlapping.
The decision to treat the two threat variables of self-esteem and self-efficacy as separate is made not only on the basis of the two often being treated as conceptually distinct constructs (e.g. Breakwell, 1993), but also because the states of self-esteem and self-efficacy have in fact been empirically separated in this study, indicating their different phenomenological status. It would be of interest therefore to investigate in more detail whether and to what extent the sources of the threats to these two states indeed overlap, in order to explain the current findings. What sources of threat are constitutive of different types of threat will be investigated in the following chapter.

7.5.1.1 Emotions

Strong correlations between emotions and state/threat variables supported the conclusions from the previous chapter, which illustrated that accounts of self-esteem, self-efficacy, continuity and distinctiveness had a strong emotional component. Therefore, the experience of threats and identity-adaptation would require that people simultaneously deal with these emotions. As will be seen in the further analyses, these emotions were attached both to identity-structure, and to the social milieu of the migrants, and many changes in these domains were accompanied by negative affect. It is also interesting to note that emotions were the only identity-related variables whose relationships with the magnitude of coping were significant. The lack of the predicted relationship between the coping magnitude and other variables tested in this chapter, points to the need to develop more differentiated measures of coping processes, that is the measures which take into account differences in response to distinct types of threat within this population under investigation. This issue will be explored in more detail in chapter nine.
7.5.1.2 Social support

The first set of correlations was carried out in order to test the prediction that the central identity-aspects were supported by the relationships people entered and considered important – and as expected, there was some evidence that was the case (see Table 10). A number of theories (e.g. Stryker and Serpe, 1982 1994, Serpe, 1987, Hormuth, 1990, Thoits, 1983, 1991.) have considered micro-social structures paramount in predicting the relative importance of different aspects of identity for an individual, as the meanings of different identity-components partly reside in the social relationships forming people’s immediate social context. While the present analysis was only of exploratory nature, not providing a complete set of tests, the pattern of significant effects has suggested that this theoretical assertion could hold. The full test would involve first, a free-format questionnaire, whereby individuals would be free to decide upon the number and sort of identity-aspects and relationships supporting their identity. Furthermore, it would be of importance to measure the number of activities surrounding each identity-aspect – that is the time, energy, effort invested in each of them. Also, the number of people involved in each of the relationships (extensiveness and complexity of the social-network defining each element of identity) would also help understanding the true relationship between these constructs (see Thoits, 1983b). Without testing these aspects of social network as well, the issue pertaining to the extent to which the social network was really perceived as supportive of people’s identity would be difficult to answer.

Nevertheless, within the limits of this study, the theoretical assumption about correspondence between a person’s immediate social network (and not only the social structure in its broader sense), and their identity structure was shown to have some validity. Although this finding is not new, it is a step towards a novel exploration of the role of the micro-social structures in their impact upon different types of long-term threats, examined in this thesis.
The accumulation hypothesis that indicates that the extensiveness of social network relates to the heightened satisfaction with oneself (less threat, higher states), and that it provides more support for people's adaptation, was partially supported here. The evidence provided was primarily in terms of the lower perceived threat to self-esteem for those with higher number of important social ties. Furthermore, correlation with identity-states showed that distinctiveness state, self-esteem state and the overall state were all positively related to the number of social ties available to an individual. One problem with this analysis, of course, rests in the difficulty of ascertaining the direction of causality. It is quite possible that the experience of threat to self-esteem and higher identity states themselves determine one's ability to interact with others, as successful social interactions imply a level of positive self-esteem. Thus, the experience of social support may be an integral part of self-esteem and higher identity states, as well as subjective well-being (Turner, 1983). Furthermore, loss of self-esteem itself can often deter the providers of social support from actually offering support (Taylor and Aspinwall, 1996).

Some other tests carried out here, as discussed below, also questioned the viability of the accumulation hypothesis: the measure of change in frequency of contacts, for instance, showed that the decrease in frequency of contacts did not feature as a significant variable in the correlation matrix with the states and threats variables, whereas the actual increase in frequency was perceived as threatening. For all these reasons, despite the existence of some relationships in the predicted direction, in order to understand fully how social support relates to one's identity, it is important to study the subjective perceptions of its changes.

Testing the relationship between the perceived change in social support and identity threats and states gleaned some interesting results: continuity state was affected both by increase and decrease in two types of changes – in closeness and frequency of social contacts with migration. Threat to continuity variable was only correlated with the decrease in closeness variable. Self-efficacy, on the other hand, showed the
opposite pattern of relationships: the state of self-efficacy was correlated only with the
decrease in closeness (more decrease - less efficacy state); however, threat to self-
efficacy was correlated with three social support variables: both increase and decrease
in closeness, as well as increase in frequency of contacts (unlike the predicted
relationship). Contrary to expectations, self-esteem threat was also higher for those
who had experienced more increase in frequency of contacts. Distinctiveness state
was the only variable correlated with (both) increase and decrease in dependence upon
people.

Such results pose two sorts of questions: one is related to the issues pertaining to the
nature of social support change, and their relationship to identity, that is, the kind of
changes in people’s environment that would be perceived as threatening. The other
focuses upon the nature of identity states and their threats: what it is about different
types of states that they are affected by perceived changes in environment in different
ways. Here, we begin with the former issue.

The conclusion at the broadest level seems to support the basic assumption in this
thesis (Breakwell, 1986) that the stability of identity – conceptualised here in terms of
higher identity-states and lower threats to these states – seemed to be associated with
the perceived stability in social relationships. Changes in social support, however,
were not related to the negative identity-outcomes in a uniform way: that is, different
types of changes in social network were related to different identity-states and their
threats. For instance, both increase and decrease in social support closeness,
dependence or frequency has been found to relate to an identity state or threat, which
might indicate that the amount of change in itself, regardless of the kind of change,
may be related to identity-imbalances and threats. Furthermore, the kind of social
support change that was desirable for an individual was a matter of subjective
interpretation of the respondents. There may be an optimum amount of closeness,
dependence or frequency of contacts needed in order for the social network to be
supportive. Some deviations from it might be perceived as threatening (see Taylor
and Aspinwall, 1996). For instance, contrary to the “accumulation hypothesis” (e.g. Thoits, 1983b) which predicts that the expansion and omnipresence of social network benefits individuals, in this study, the increase in frequency of contacts was perceived as threatening to both self-esteem and self-efficacy. The question needed to be addressed, of course, is what is the habitual way of interacting with people, which would satisfy identity-needs, (or be perceived as “supportive”, Turner, 1983), or rather, of the representations of the type of relationships supporting identity.

However, an alternative explanation could also be offered. The increase in frequency of contacts, but also in commitment (closeness, intimacy), might be related to the perceived prior loss of some aspects of identity and the relationships that support them, whereby seeking out more contacts or deepening the existing ones should point to the existence of threats in that domain. For instance, when the old social context dissipates, the likelihood of the social network undergoing change is greater, and this often leads to loss in some aspects of one’s identity. Maybe it is the loss in these elements of identity and social network (for instance, in the case of migrants, lack of contacts with the family, loss of social status and occupation with the clearly defined set of obligations and interpersonal expectations), which might have led to the expansion of the social network in the new context, as a way of substituting for the loss of the old support. The relationship between threat and increase in frequency as well as intimacy is suggestive of the role of coping activated when people’s old social context is removed.

Of course, as mentioned above, emphasising the subjective nature of these factors is not to deny the socially constructed ways of perceiving these changes and their effects. For instance, decrease in closeness and increase in frequency of contacts, the only two variables related to the overall threat, were also most frequently correlated with the specific identity state or threat variables. It could be speculated, from this, that the specific type of social support change most pervasively affected people’s identity, for this sample. As Thoits suggested (1983b), the value of a social
relationship might be culturally determined, and extending this argument, the way of interacting with people might also be normative. There is vast literature by now on the cultural differences in the pattern and nature of self-society interaction and the related psychological consequences of culturally different ways of interaction within society (e.g. Rhee et al., 1995; Triandis, 1995; Kim, 1994; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Markova, 1987). The balance of some culturally preferred pattern of interaction and the nature of maintenance of social network might undergo change under the new socio-cultural circumstances. This could induce a specific response to the type of changes in the environment perceived to have happened by the members of this sample of immigrants. For instance, if the value of a social relationship rests in its intimacy (closeness) dimension (regardless of the social function of this relationship — e.g. business, leisure), any change in this dimension of interactions within a new environment could be perceived as an attack upon the dominant values of the home-culture. In other words, the nature of social support (network) is culturally normative, and so are the perceptions of its changes.

Another conclusion drawn from this series of correlations relates to the nature of different identity states and threats to these states. First, it was apparent from the data that in order for the level of continuity state to be lower, any change in social environment — and not just that which reduced the person’s social network — could be implicated. This, however, was unrelated to the perception of threat to continuity, as it was affected only by the decrease in closeness of social contact. There was possibly an optimum amount or nature of change in people’s immediate environment they could tolerate before they perceived it as threatening to their sense of continuity. Alternatively, certain changes in the environment, although altering a person’s perception of continuity, may not be perceived as threatening (to be tested further in this thesis).

The opposite held true for efficacy, as mentioned above — threat to efficacy occurred for two types (frequency and closeness), and both levels (decrease and increase) of
social support change whereas efficacy state was only affected by the reduction in
closeness of social ties. Sometimes, certain environmental conditions might be
perceived as threatening, without affecting the levels of efficacy-state, possibly due to
the effective role of coping directed at removing the threat before it alters the identity-
state. In this case, both decrease and increase in closeness of social ties, as well as
increase in frequency of social contacts might have indicated the prospective (further)
reductions in control of the environment, and hence, lowered self-efficacy. On the
other hand, given the social desirability of self-efficacy as a principle in modern
society, especially in the Western cultural system, the need to change the current
levels of self-efficacy (i.e. perceptions of threat to self-efficacy) may actually be an
artefact of adaptation process, a move towards the cultural norm of proactive
behaviour. That is, the very nature of adaptation to the host-culture representations of
a person (e.g. Logan, 1987; Markova, 1987; Shweder and Bourne, 1984), may create
constancy in perceptions of threat to self-efficacy (or rather, the need to enhance one’s
agency), as well as prevalent reports of high self-efficacy. Of course, as the detailed
examination of the dominant representations, values and norms of each of the
respective cultures has not been investigated here, the current interpretations are
speculative, and therefore in need of further research.

These differential patterns of relationship affecting identity states and identity threats,
when correlated with social support change, showed that these two measures (of
identity-state and threat) were indeed different constructs. Furthermore, although one
was to expect that different identity-states would overlap to a degree, this preliminary
exploratory analysis indicated a significant degree of independence between these
four states. People possibly vary in terms of the salience of identity-state (self-esteem,
self-efficacy, continuity or distinctiveness) informing their action, at any particular
point in time, and in a particular culture.

Looking at the correlations between social support change and affect related to it, only
the change in closeness was related to emotions, so that more closeness corresponded
to more positive affect, and less closeness to more negative affect. This is not at all surprising, as the intimacy of relationships is inseparable from the emotional content of identity.

Finally, the existence of relationships between the overall identity change and social support change (regardless of the direction of change in either of the variables), lends some support to the assumption about the correspondence between the identity structure and the social structure. However, such a relationship was tested at its most rudimentary level, as neither the hierarchy of identity or that of an individual social network, nor the direction of change in these structures was assessed here. However, the relationship worked in the predicted direction, which contributes to the kaleidoscope of evidence in support of the basic assumptions in this thesis.

7.5.1.3 Identity-structure

The descriptive statistics showed that indeed, respondents differentiated between identity-aspects in terms of their importance, and that the mean importance of all identity-elements for the whole sample across three time-points was changing in different ways for different aspects of identity (see Chart 1, section 7.4.1.3). Furthermore, the overall change in identity structure was often perceived as threatening, both between T1-T2 and T2-T3. The indication that the overall change in identity structure would be perceived as threatening is important, as it supports the assumption postulated here that any change – even if it is perceived as positive – might, because of its magnitude, be a source of threat, as it requires the shifts in self-conceptualisations that in themselves are highly demanding. Furthermore, it adds to the evidence for the basic tenet in this thesis that, in order to assess the impact of any change upon identity (in terms of its threats), a person’s overall identity-structure (and the ensuing changes within this structure) should be investigated, rather than focusing upon just one aspect of identity.
The predictions based on SIT (Tajfel, 1978, Tajfel and Turner, 1986) positing that, under certain conditions of inter-group comparison, higher level of importance of a group-based identity-aspect (at T3 – in the present) would be related to the self-esteem and distinctiveness variables, was not supported here. For this reason, an alternative approach was adopted, taking into account relative importance of people’s group-based identity-aspects – and how they were perceived to have changed over time (upon the break-up of the war, and after migration). A series of hypotheses were postulated and tested, and the results were mainly in the predicted direction.

An increase in importance of some of these identity-aspects mostly related to the states and threats in the predicted direction, although just a few of them were actually significant: the increase in religious identity T1-T2 was linked to more distinctiveness state (supported), and distinctiveness threat was related to changes in religious and Yugoslav identity T1-T3 (supported). The increase in Yugoslav identity, however, was associated with more threat to self-esteem both for T1-T2 and T2-T3 changes (not supported). Furthermore, as expected, both the increase and decrease in importance in these three identities were related to low continuity state (supported) – no threat in this domain was reported. Also, the decrease in some of these identity-aspects was associated with lower identity-states, namely – decrease in self-efficacy (religious identity T1-T2 and T1-T3 – supported, and Yugoslav identity T1-T2 - supported), distinctiveness state (religious identity T2-T3 - supported), and self-esteem state (Yugoslav identity T2-T3 - supported). One such change in importance (of religious identity for T1-T2 period) was accompanied by the heightened threat to that state (self-efficacy)(supported).

Although a number of relationships were supported, not all the predicted relationships were significant (e.g. the relationship between the increase in ethnic identity importance and threat), and those predicted in the direction posited by SIT were mostly not supported – such as the relationship between self-esteem threat and the increase in importance of Yugoslav identity. Other relationships, (e.g. distinctiveness
threat) have been predicted in this thesis on the basis of the characteristics of the particular sample in question, whereby the meanings of different identity-aspects have been taken into account.

From the above results, therefore, two issues could be raised: first, that of the meanings of identity-aspects in question, and secondly, the notion of their relative importance and their perceived temporality. As regards the former, it is evident that the changes in different identity-aspects were correlated with identity end-states and threats to these states differently. The hypotheses themselves were based on the knowledge of the meanings that embellished the three identity-aspects, and it was argued, and mostly supported that their relationship to states and threats would not be uniform. Therefore, the meanings of groups, the historical context in which these meanings are constructed or being changed, as well as their position relative to each other (the latter not examined here), are important factors influencing people's self-evaluation. For instance, the correlation between the increase in Yugoslav identity importance and higher self-esteem threat may have been due to the way individuals constructed this category of membership (which is now no longer a part of the existing social context). As seen in the qualitative chapter, this identity-aspect was for many respondents a symbol of personal values they had endorsed, and frequently was treated as a "supra-category", thus negating inter-group comparisons, at least between the ethnic groups involved in the war. As such, although perceived as a group identity, endorsing this identity-aspect might not have been supported in the real context of inter-group comparisons, the support otherwise available to those whose group memberships were institutionalised in a form of embassy, ethnic-community, or media-representation.

Contrary to the predictions based on SIT-assumptions, no relationship between the current levels of strength of identification and identity-states and threats was significant, however, when temporal changes in identity-aspects were introduced, many significant relationships emerged. People's self-evaluations, it seems, were not
based on the current levels of self-identification, but instead, on the memory of their importance, or the meanings different identity-aspects assumed for an individual across time (or biographically). As the increasing number of theorists are asserting (e.g. Breakwell, 1986, Condor, 1996, Cinnirella, 1998), understanding the nature of identity must take into account the temporal trajectory of an individual and social life: perceptions of identity-aspects in time, where they came from and where they are going, form an important source of self-evaluations, and what might be perceived as threat. Some identity-aspects are discarded, whereas others gain in importance, and this might be determined by the already established identity-structure. For instance, certain identity-aspects are so important, that removing them from the identity-structure might pose more threat to the overall identity than constantly residing in the position of threat by holding onto these identity-elements, as they provide meanings for the whole "set" of other identity-components within the identity-structure. This process, we would argue, emerges from people's own conceptions of how to achieve the meaning for their identity, given the salient motivation (identity-state) guiding identity-construction. This is a very important issue, as it moves the discussion of threats away from the assumption of the automatic experience of threat when huge demands for changes occur, or at least away from the simplistic assumption of the identity functioning being managed in a similar fashion, across situations, by responses to particular types of threats. It also raises the issue of chronic threats to identity, rarely discussed in literature to-date.

Of course, understanding the ways in which the changes in centrality of identity-aspects might work to enhance or dampen the perception of threat is difficult to explain if the way in which different identity-aspects interact in identity-structure is not considered, that is, the meanings certain identity-components assume in adaptation process, and the way these meanings are interrelated. For instance, increase in importance of national identity might be contemporaneous with the decrease in importance of ethnic identity, caused be the war. As the scope of this thesis is limited, this issue will not be pursued here, although it is important to acknowledge that full
understanding of identity-adaptation should incorporate a complex analysis of identity-structure changes.

7.5.2 Demographic variables

7.5.2.1 Age

The Results section showed that some of the migration-literature regarding the hypotheses with respect to older immigrants (see Scott et al., 1989, Berry, 1997, Beiser et al., 1988) were not fully supported: the hypothesis about greater psychological well-being and self-satisfaction of older immigrants, (measured here as the levels of identity states and perceived threats to identity, as well as the positive affect about oneself reported) was characterised by ambiguous results. Higher levels of negative emotionality for older immigrants were reported both with respect to one’s identity-structure, and one’s perceived change in their social environment with migration, although no relationship with threat emerged as significant, and more continuity state was reported by the older migrants. Furthermore, the lower levels of social well being have often been attributed to their social inflexibility (Searle and Ward, 1990; Ward and Kennedy, 1994), and hence, it was predicted here that migration would lead to the decrease in older people’s social network both in terms of frequency and closeness of contacts. This prediction was not supported either, instead showing that – if lack of social flexibility was salient at all for this population of immigrants, it was related to the difficulty in establishing new social ties, that is, the lack of increase in closeness and frequency in their social contacts. This finding, however, might not be indicative of the lack of social flexibility in the process of adaptation among older immigrants. Instead, it could be argued that older people placed less emphasis upon expansion of their social network as the matter of course, settling for the beneficial effects of the established relationships. It is possible to argue that the dynamics of the psychological function of social support changes developmentally, as people place different emphasis upon the aspects of their relationship with social environment, depending on the desirable end-states of their
identity. As Breakwell (1986) argued, the actual end-states considered desirable are temporally as well as culturally specific.

The frequently replicated finding that older immigrants are less likely to adopt a new, host-culture identity and values and more likely to stick to the old collective identities (Lalonde, Taylor and Moghaddam, 1992; Lalonde and Cameron, 1993; Mason and Denton, 1992; Cortes, Rogler and Malgany, 1994; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota and Ocampo, 1993; Richman, Gaviria, Flaherty, Birz and Wintrob, 1987; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1992), found its support in the current analysis as well. The older migrants were less likely to endorse the new, British identity as salient in their overall identity structure, and they endorsed Yugoslav identity more strongly than their younger co-patriots. No relationship existed between age and the strength of ethnic and religious identification, which was probably indicative of the specific socio-cultural context of this population of migrants (e.g. strong post-WW2 Yugoslavian nationalism, accompanied by the state-organised suppression of ethnic identities, communist ideology that orchestrated dissemination of such beliefs, etc.). This finding, however, might not have been due to the older-immigrants lesser flexibility in discarding the old, and adopting the new, "more functional" identity-aspects in the new social context. Indeed, this pattern might have been due to a number of contextual factors, such as restricted physical mobility; greater isolation by the virtue of lower employability, less English-language fluency, overall, less exposure to the dominant culture and its representations. Furthermore, the lack of host-national identification, and the increased importance of the home-culture identity corresponded with the older migrants' heightened sense of self-continuity. Discarding old identity-aspects and adopting the new ones, might not always be an optimal way of responding to the changes in one's environment. For instance, an individual might choose to reside in a constant position of threat by strongly identifying with the "minority-group" identity, rather than jeopardising their sense of continuity. The relative salience of different identity-states across time and contexts, therefore, plays an important part in determining people's perceptions of what they will perceive as threatening at any one
point in time. It gives some indication as to what will determine variations in meaning of the identity-aspects people endorse – it seems that the salient end-state of identity represents the important motivation guiding people’s quest for meaningful identity.

Thus, generation differences in representations and socialisation processes might affect the ways in which specific change in social context is perceived and dealt with (although there is no reason to suspect that the basic identity-mechanisms would change biographically). As there was no relationship between age and threat, despite the experience of negative affect with respect to the older people’s identity and social environment, it seems that the *increase* in age in itself might not be indicative of the greater vulnerability to threat. Individual differences in coping with negative experiences, as well as the possible cohort differences might explain the lack of linear relationship. For instance, there may be a curvilinear relationship between age and threat – whereby very old and very young immigrants might be less susceptible to threat than those falling in the mid-range. These cohort differences could be emergent from different social representations, normative behaviour and future projections affecting different generations. Again, the importance of both developmental and cultural context must be taken seriously in order to understand the full complexity of adaptation process across life-span.

### 7.5.2.2 Sex

Lack of any gender-effect shows that looking at gender differences without understanding the ideological backdrop that defines the role and structures life of different sexes – fails to make strong predictions about gender differences in adaptation. Gender gains its meaning only in certain cultural contexts – the movement from one to another culture may or may not result in gender issues becoming salient. Where gender identity in two countries is actually embodied in a similar normative culture, gender is not expected to be an important differentiating factor.
7.5.2.3  Length of residence

The length of residence seemed not to be a significant indicator of the level of adaptation – neither in terms of identity-states, threats, emotions nor social support. Contrary to predictions, length of residence was positively correlated with the increase in the home-culture identity (ethnic and religious).

Lack of support for the common predictions in migration-literature points to the simplified and static way of looking at the process of adaptation as linear, largely neglecting the specifics of the context of migration for different migrant populations. First of all, the structural and representational affordances provided by a particular host-culture will largely specify the framework for the processes of adaptation (see Berry, 1997, Breakwell, 1986). Furthermore, the extent, domain and nature of identity-adaptation will also vary culturally, some cultures constraining individual attempts to accommodate new elements into their identity-structure and content, or discard the old ones, and thus the normative culture people are emigrating from is an important determinant of identity-adaptation and coping choices. The conditions under which an individual has emigrated (e.g. voluntary v. forced migration), further affect people's adaptation efforts (Berry, 1997). Finally, people's identity-structure and content may vary in flexibility (or amount of commitment to different aspects of identity, Breakwell, 1986; Hormuth, 1990), and hence, the domain of identity that will undergo change will vary depending on the past identity-structure and actions undertaken to ward off threat to its identity-elements.

It seems that length of residence can not be used of its own right, in order to explain adaptation. A whole plethora of other factors are implicated – such as representations and structures dominant in both home- and host-society, identity structures and content, as well as coping undertaken in order to deal with threats. For this reason, length of residence will be omitted from the future analysis.
7.5.2.4 Religious commitment

Two different lines of thought have been tested in the above analysis: one predicting beneficial effects of religious identity upon psychological well-being (see Scott et al., 1989), and the other, testing the inter-group based hypothesis (SIT). The latter, as has been evident from the literature review has produced two almost opposing hypotheses, due to unclear role of self-esteem in inter-group comparisons.

The hypotheses that were supported mainly related religious identity to affect: positive affect at the outbreak of the war (T2) was correlated with the current salience of religious identity. This could be understood with reference to some assumptions about the "protective" role of religion under stressful conditions. Religious identity may provide a meaning-structure, stronger sense of belonging, and possibly curtail loss of control under disturbing circumstances (such as the sudden, vicious inter-ethnic war in the former-Yugoslavia), by providing the explanatory framework for the unexpected events. Furthermore, religion is often an agent of affiliative behaviour, and hence can facilitate social interaction. However, such an explanation is very limited, as religious identity was not correlated with any of the threat or state-items, and was in fact strongly correlated with the negative affect associated with social support at T3 (in the present). If the above explanation was to be upheld, religious commitment should in fact act as a coping resource for the effects of the changing social support upon people's sense of well-being (emotion valence and levels).

Contrary to SIT predictions, salience of religious identity was not related to any of the threat-measures; the only support SIT received was that religious identity related positively to distinctiveness state. Although, at first sight, this relationship seems to support the SIT prediction that heightened distinctiveness would be desirable for high-identifiers (Branscombe et al., 1999; Spears, Doosje and Ellemers, 1999), it would be difficult to draw conclusions about the subjective experience of the increased state of distinctiveness, as the distinctiveness threat was not correlated. For what levels of
distinctiveness the threat occurs remained unresolved here (as the qualitative analysis showed, the same position within the social structure was indeed interpreted by different individuals to impact upon their sense of distinctiveness in different ways).

Although no threat item was associated with the salience of religious identity in the present, negative affect related to social support, as seen, was highly correlated with this identity-aspect. Here, the relationship of religious identity importance with negative affect was not paralleled with its relationship with threat, indicating the possibility of the more complex relationships in operation. The zero-order correlations (Table 9) between affect and threat/state items, showing a very powerful connection between affect and both threats and states in the predicted direction – might point to the possibility that the impact of negative affect was moderated by patterns of coping, thus protecting identity states and alleviating threat. It may also indicate the mediating role of identity-state for the effect of affect upon identity-threat, and this latter assumption will be explored further in this thesis.

7.5.2.5 Negative life-events

Before embarking upon interpretation of the results, it would be useful to discount some criticisms on methodological grounds related to the study of accumulation of life-events. It has been argued that self-reported measures of negative life-events often confound an individual's personality or psychological state with their reported number of negative life-events (Thoits, 1983a). However, the probability of something like that happening in the current sample is unlikely, as the measure of negative life-events has been limited here only to those life-events specific to the war context. They were clearly defined types of life-experiences and of a limited number, and thus, there was no danger of the subjects' differential interpretation of the nature and occurrence of these events. The life-events that were selected here were easy to ascertain factually, and hence, it was believed, should not mirror the personal characteristics of the respondents.
From the results reported, the theoretical viability of the “accumulation of life-events hypothesis” (Thoits, 1983a, Dohrenwend and Pearlin, 1982) - that is of the linear relationship between the number of life events and the experience of threat, negative emotion, or heightened coping efforts, might be disputed.

Contrary to the expected, no support was lent to the hypothesised positive relationship between the number of negative life-events experienced upon the outbreak of the war, and heightened threat, lower identity-state or more negative emotions experienced in the present. In fact, the only significant relationship to threat showed the reduction in perceived threat to self-esteem with the increased number of negative life-events. Such a puzzling finding might indicate that the emphasis on the number of life events placed the focus upon wrong issues with respect to the nature and experience of threat. The above finding might have been the consequence of the comparison people drew between different contexts and events that occurred at different points in their life. By comparing different life-experiences (for instance those causing them to leave - such as negative life-events measured in the questionnaire, against those caused by the process of migration) and their relative threatening nature (threat here measured as it occurred in the present), life-experiences gain different meanings: people’s ability to see themselves in their temporality, (instead of simply in terms of the current socio-historical context), makes the predictions of what constitutes threat to their identity much more difficult to ascertain. Furthermore, lack of the effect of the accumulation of life-events variable upon threat, and, if anything, its apparent role in reducing threat to self-esteem, might also have occurred as a result of the development of new coping strategies in people’s effort to deal with the increasing environmental strains, thus making an individual fit to cope with the subsequent drawbacks (Breakwell, 1986). The kind of coping people use specifies the conditions under which the likelihood of the specific event (or number of events) impacting upon threat is substantially reduced, which explains the role of coping in protecting current levels of identity-states (Wheaton, 1985).
The accumulation of life-events hypothesis does not account for the flexible nature of people’s identity, and their capacity to learn and adapt their behaviour in a way which accommodates their everyday functioning to the requirements of the new social context, preparing them for the future assaults. Thus, the meanings that different life-events have for individuals (Bar-Tal and Jacobson, 1998) will be given more attention further in this thesis.

Given the nature of the inter-group conflict which created the context in which the sort of life-events that were measured here had occurred, it was further hypothesised that the increased number of war-related life-experiences would impact upon people’s group-based identities—national, ethnic or religious identity. Although there was some support for the relationship between the identity-change and the number of negative life-events, the correlation was not in the predicted direction. In fact, ethnic identity, whose importance should have been on the increase with the increased number of negative life-events, according to the inter-group-based social identity theory, had plummeted during the period before and after the outbreak of the war. It is possible that under the circumstances when inter-group conflict is so abominable that only disidentification is a useful way of coping, migration itself may be a way of coping with threat.

In conclusion to this chapter it should be emphasised that most of the relationships tested here have been assessed independent of each other, as the nature of the study is to assess the main effects, thus isolating those relationships whose significance levels lent some support to the predictions. However, how these relationships interact, and whether their impact is indeed independent, remains to be further tested.

The exploratory nature of this chapter aimed at testing some main effects, hypothesised by earlier migration and identity literature in connection with migrants’ adaptation. Overall, most support was established for those predictions that
incorporated a more complex understanding of identity-adaptation, treating it in terms of complex interaction between identity structure/content and socio-historical context. Here, also, the sources of threat to identity and the possible relationships of these sources to identity-states have been isolated. It was established here that a more differentiated measure of coping would be required in order to plot its relationship to threats and identity-states.

This preliminary set of analyses was intended as a pre-modelling procedure, shaping the subsequent testing of the more complex models. From the results above, it is evident that many ways in which previous literature has explained the process of migrant adaptation are too simplistic. The following two chapters will explore in more detail the relationships between the sources of different threats to identity and the relationship between identity-states and identity-threats. They will also investigate the within-sample differences in response to threat, and map out the relationship between the coping process, and identity states and threat.
8.1 Research Aims

The aim of the previous chapter was to extract a more systematic picture from the potentially complex system of interdependent variables. In the following section a path-analytic model will be proposed and tested, explaining the four identity-threats of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem, their sources as well as the interrelationships between these sources of threats.

The following chapter will explore the inter-relationships between the variables through the nested regression analysis. Breakwell, Fife-Schaw and Millward (1994) argued that the potential in using the nested regression or "stage model" rests in the progressive building of the model through different stages or blocks. Movement from one stage to another is expected to be dependent on the effects at the prior stage. Furthermore, such a procedure allows full explanation of all the relationships between the variables at each stage of the model.

The model tested here was based on some theoretical statements argued in the introductory chapters (e.g. chapter three). Here, the model proposed enables us to generate some testable hypotheses.

The four negative life-events were expected to significantly impact upon cognitive and affective processes - abundant literature on migration has indicated that negative life-events experienced prior to migration aggravated the migrants' conditions and capacity to adapt, their effects often being pervasive and over a long period. Thus, we would expect negative life-events having an impact at each stage of the model. It will affect people's
interactive patterns upon migration; they will have a profound effect upon identity-structure, often inducing more identity-change; they will relate to negative affect more and negatively relate to the positive affect. They will contribute to people's evaluations of their current states of identity. They will affect perceptions of threat, especially of continuity, self-efficacy and distinctiveness. Some differences in the power of negative life-events to influence psycho-social variables will be observed, depending on the intensity and negativity of the life-events experienced. For instance, the loss of material possessions will have a less threatening impact than the experience of personal persecution.

Interaction network, as a part of an immigrant's social structure, is expected to provide support for identity-elements. The changes perceived in the social support are expected to lead to the shifts in the person's identity structure.

Emotions are meant to be an inseparable part of the self-related cognitions and those cognitions relating to the aspects of the social environment, making them subjectively significant. Therefore, it is expected that the magnitude of identity-change would be predictive of negative emotions: T1-T2 change would predict more negative emotions at T2 and possibly in the present (T3), and less negative emotions at T1; it will also predict less positive emotions at T2 and T3, and more positive emotions at T1. The rationale behind this is that the perceived magnitude of change between different time-points will be related to the ways in which the past self is remembered, and the present self experienced. Perceptions of change in the social structure will predict the affect reported about these changes – the predictions here follow those in chapter seven. Both the increases in magnitude of identity change and social support change will be predictive of lower state of continuity; also, the more change in identity reported, the more threat to continuity will be experienced (the identity-state mediating the effect of identity-change upon continuity threat). Of course, the previous chapters suggested that continuity state may not be a direct predictor of continuity threat, the relationship to be tested further in
this chapter. Similarly, perceived change in social network will lead to lower continuity, as well as the perceptions of threat there – as seen from the previous chapter, decrease in closeness will be predictive of threats to continuity. Both increase and decrease in closeness will be predictive of threat to self-efficacy, continuity and self-esteem, and increase in frequency will relate to threats to self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Threat variables will be imbued by emotions: it is expected that the feelings of threat will include the negative emotions surrounding either or both one’s identity- and social structure. Affect provides the evaluative basis from which perceptions of threat emerge.

Finally, identity threats will be largely determined by identity-state variables, so that continuity threat will be predicted by continuity state; distinctiveness threat by distinctiveness state; self-esteem threat by self-esteem state and self-efficacy threat by self-efficacy state. This is because identity-states represent aspects of motivation process from which identity-threats are being evaluated.

For the clarity of presentation, the Results section will describe the patterns of relationships block by block. However, the Discussion section will primarily focus upon the final path-diagrams predicting four identity threats and the respective states: the four diagrams representing different types of threat and their sources.

8.2 Results

It has been decided that, in order to investigate the determinants of each of the proposed variables in the model, a series of nested regression analyses should be carried out. The resultant path diagrams were depicted in figures 1 through 7. They were constructed using only significant beta weights derived from regression analyses. For clarity, each block of analysis is shown separately, however, it is important to emphasise that the path diagrams need to be seen as part of an integral whole.
Figure 1 shows that the effect size of the variance accounted for in the social support and magnitude of identity change variables, was very small (on average, $R^2$ is less than .07). The experience of loss of material possessions accounted for 5% of variability in the perceived increase in closeness in social relationships, indicating that those who had not lost material possessions on average would report more increase in closeness with people upon migration ($\beta$=-.24). Loss of material possessions related in the same direction to both the perceived increase in frequency and decrease in dependence upon others ($\beta$=.19 and $\beta$=-.24, respectively), accounting for 3% of variance in both. This may be explained on the basis of the material possessions, apart from being an instrumental resource for individuals, actually providing a migrant with a “position” within a social network. That is, any form of loss potentially affects the bases for one’s identity such as social network (through lack of independence, reliance upon others, social comparisons, or simply through the pressures for change upon one’s subjective sense of continuity with the past). Another life-experience, the personal experience of persecution in the home country accounted for 3% of variance in decrease in dependence on others, but also for 6% of variance in identity change between T1 and T2. The relationships here were positive, indicating that people would report less dependence upon others, and more identity change T1-T2 (before migration, upon the outbreak of the war), if they had been persecuted ($\beta$=.19 and $\beta$=.27). Finally, 3% of identity change T1-T3 was predicted by increase in closeness, in positive direction ($\beta$=.20). As seen from the Figure 1, increase in closeness variable mediated the effect of material loss upon magnitude of identity change T1-T3.

Figure 2 shows a very complex network of relationships predicting emotion-variables. Of eleven emotion-variables only negative affect experienced at T1 (before the whole trouble had started in the home country) was not predicted by any of the designated variables. For the rest of them, only negative affect with respect to the social support change was characterised by a small effect size: 5% of variance of negative emotion with respect to
social support was explained by decrease in closeness upon social ties, in positive direction (β=.23). Positive affect about social support change was also predicted by the changes in closeness, in the predicted direction (R²=.09) – decrease in closeness was negatively related to positive affect (β=-.27), and increase in closeness was positively related to this emotion (β=.31), indicating that emotions are indeed a fundamental aspect of perceived closeness with other people. Three identity-related emotion-variables – negative affect about identity at T2, negative affect about identity at T3 and happiness at T3 – had medium effect sizes (R²=.23, R²=.13 and R²=.12, respectively). The rest of the emotion variables had only very small percentage of variance explained.

Most affect variables were predicted by life-events variables. Persecution of the family members positively predicted positive emotions of happiness and pride at T1 and T3, although it also was related in positive direction to negative affect at T2. All beta weights here were quite high. Pride reported about one’s identity at T3 was predicted in the negative direction by the experience of loss of a family member during the war (β=-.20), indicating that those who have experienced this life-event felt less proud about themselves in the present. Ten percent of variance in happiness at T2 (upon outbreak of the war) was explained by identity change T1-T2 (β=-.25). Identity change T1-T2 accounted for 6% of variance in pride at T2, and this also was in negative direction (β=-.26). Besides persecution of family, family loss and identity change T2-T3 explained 23% of variance in negative affect at T2. The analysis showed that, as expected, those whose members of family had been persecuted during the war experienced more negative affect (β=.42), although contrary to expectations, those who had experienced loss of family member(s) were less likely to report negative emotions about their identity at T2 (β=-.29). Greater magnitude of identity-change predicted more negative affect at T2 (β=.19).

Finally, 13% of negative affect reported with respect to people’s present identity structure (T3) was predicted by family loss (β=-.23), the experience of being persecuted (β=.21),
and decrease in frequency of contacts with migration ($\beta=.22$). Again, contrary to expected, family loss was less likely to produce negative affect in comparison to those who had not reported this negative life-event, although being personally persecuted understandably led to more negative affect. However, family loss was negatively related to pride about oneself at T3 ($\beta=-.20$), although persecution of family member(s) positively related to it, the two life-event variables predicting only 6% of variance in this emotion. Twelve percent of happiness at T3 was predicted by the experience of self-persecution in the predicted direction ($\beta=-.31$), although having had a family member persecuted led to more reported happiness about oneself at T3, contrary to the expected ($\beta=.35$).

Of course, the relationships reported here were those with direct effects upon affect variables. The path diagram (Figure 1), however, points at some mediating effects upon affect variables: magnitude of identity change T1-T2 variable seems to mediate the effect of the experience of persecution upon happiness and pride about one’s identity at T2. Also, increase in frequency mediates the effect of material loss upon negative affect about one’s identity in the present.

Overall, most of the relationships with affect-variables were in predicted direction, although it seems that persecution of family and family loss at times had surprising effects upon emotion – family loss was predictive of less negative affect, and family persecution was predictive of more positive affect at T3 (as well as T1).

The inconsistent ways in which life-event variables were predictive of outcome variables suggested a need to carry out Kendall’s tau-b nonparametric correlations between the four life-events variables. Of these, two significant relationships emerged: those whose family members were persecuted were more likely to report a) that they also lost their family members ($r=.202, p=.035$), and b) that they were personally persecuted as well ($r=.395, p=.000$). No other relationship between the four variables was significant,
indicating very distinct *combinations* of life-experiences affecting different people, i.e. that people are reporting quite different patterns of life-experience. Some of the apparent inconsistencies of the findings linking life-events to other variables in the model will be further explained in the Discussion section in this chapter.

Figure 3 indicates that self-esteem state had 26% of variance explained by three variables directly: both positive and negative affect with respect to social network change ($\beta=.33$ and $\beta=-.26$, respectively), and the experience of the loss of a family member indicated, surprisingly, increased self-esteem ($\beta=+.21$). The two affect variables also mediated the effect of social network change: negative affect mediated the effect of decrease in closeness, and the positive affect that of both decrease and increase in closeness of social network.

Figure 3 also shows that the two direct predictors of continuity state were the overall identity change T1-T2, and the decrease in closeness. Identity change predicted 21% of variance ($\beta=-.28$), whereas closeness decrease predicted 14% of continuity state ($\beta=-.34$). Overall, the effects were in the predicted direction.

Efficacy state ($R^2=15$) was directly predicted by two variables: negative affect with respect to one's identity at T3 ($\beta=-.20$), and decrease in closeness ($\beta=-.27$). The negative affect T3 further mediated the effect of decrease in frequency of contacts, family member loss, and personal experience of persecution.

Finally, distinctiveness state was poorly explained by the variables entered: only 10% of variance in distinctiveness state was accounted for, and this through just two variables: the feeling of pride with respect to one's identity at T2 ($\beta=.23$). Pride mediated the effect of identity change T1-T2 upon distinctiveness (less identity change more feeling of pride at T2). Decrease in dependence upon others was predictive of higher distinctiveness state in the positive direction, explaining 6% of variance ($\beta=.25$).
For clarity, in the presented diagrams, the four path analyses for four identity-threats will be presented separately. In the diagrams, only significant direct and indirect relationships will be drawn. Once again, of course, the model should be seen in its entirety, and the full picture should include the path-diagrams from Figure 1 through 7.

Self-esteem threat (Figure 4) was explained by four variables: perceived increase in frequency of contacts with migration predicted higher self-esteem threat ($B=.25$); greater identity change T1-T2 also predicted more threat in this domain ($B=.28$); the lower perceived self-esteem state led to higher perceived threat, as expected ($B=-.36$); and finally, but unexpectedly, the negative life experience of family member being persecuted led to less self-esteem threat ($B=-.19$). Self esteem state further mediated the effect of positive and negative affect upon the changes in social support, and each of these being experienced with respect to the perceived decrease and increase in closeness with others upon migration.

Distinctiveness threat (Figure 5) was directly predicted by four variables: more perceived overall identity change between T2 and T3 led to more perceived distinctiveness threat ($B=.20$). More negative affect experienced about one's overall identity structure in the present led to more threat to distinctiveness ($B=.22$), but was also mediated via self-efficacy state, another predictor variable. Self-efficacy state as well as self-esteem state negatively predicted distinctiveness threat ($B=-.21$, and $B=-.24$, respectively). Three of these predictor variables mediated the effect of other variables: negative affect T3 mediated the effect of family loss, personal experience of persecution and decrease in frequency of social contacts with migration. Self-efficacy state mediated the effect of decrease in closeness within social network as well as negative affect a T3. Self-esteem state mediated the effect of negative affect about social support, positive affect about social support and family loss. Finally, the two affect variables with respect to social
support were themselves the mediators of the effect of increase and decrease of closeness, upon self-esteem state.

As much as 30% of variance in continuity threat (Figure 6) was explained exclusively by emotion-variables, and the remaining 5% by continuity state. All relationships were in the predicted direction: negative emotion with respect to the social network change led to more continuity threat (β=.40), whereas positive emotionality in this domain was negatively related to continuity threat (β=.22). Seeing from the previous path-diagram, these two variables also mediated the effect of the decrease in closeness upon continuity threat, and positive affect about social support also mediated the effect of the increase in closeness within social interactive network. Somewhat unexpectedly, negative affect reported about identity structure at T1 negatively related to continuity threat (β=.19), indicating that those who had felt negatively about one’s identity at T1 were less likely to experience threat to continuity. Contrary to this, negative affect at T2 indicated more threat to continuity (β=.24). It also mediated the effect of family loss, family member persecution and magnitude of identity change T2-T3 upon threat to continuity. The opposing directions in which the two composite measures of negative affect at two different time-points influenced continuity threat is interesting, as it shows that the memory of different life-periods indeed was imbued by different subjective meanings. Although the finding might seem illogical at first, a powerful capacity for identity-protection and re-construction is hidden behind these relationships, and this will be discussed in the following section. Finally, continuity state mediated the effect of identity change T1-T2: more identity change at this point led to less perceived continuity.

Self-efficacy threat (Figure 7) had 42% of variance accounted for. Four variables accounted for the variance in self-efficacy: more negative affect expressed about the change in social support indicated more efficacy threat (β=.26). Greater magnitude of identity-change T1-T2 and more increase in frequency of contacts both positively predicted efficacy threat (both with beta weights of .24). Finally, self-efficacy state
predicted almost 16% of variance of its own, in the expected direction (β = -.34). Self-efficacy state mediated the effect of negative affect about one's identity in the present and the effect of the perceived decrease in closeness with people upon migration, the variable also mediated by negative affect about social support. Another mediated variable — that of negative affect about one's identity at T3 mediated three variables: two life-experience variables of family loss and personal experience of persecution, as well as decrease in frequency of contacts with migration.

Table 18: Summary of sub-analyses for the path analyses of processes of threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable*</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social support change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness increase</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency decrease</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency decrease</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of identity change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity change T1-T2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity change T1-T3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity change T2-T3</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy T1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud T1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect T2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy T2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud T2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect T3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy T3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud T3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect re. social support</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect re. social support</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem state</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness state</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity state</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy state</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem threat</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness threat</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity threat</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy threat</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only the outcome variables with the significant F-value are presented.
Figure 1: Predictors of change in social support and magnitude of identity importance**

* R^2 figures are adjusted

** Colour coding introduced for clarity of presentation
Figure 2: Predictors of emotion**
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* R² figures are adjusted
** Paths mapped for predictors of identity and social support change are omitted for clarity
Figure 3: Predictors of end-states of identity**
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* R² figures are adjusted
** Paths mapped for predictors of identity change, social support change and emotions are omitted for clarity.
Figure 4: Predictors of identity-threat: self-esteem**

* R² figures are adjusted  
** Only the paths that were significant direct or indirect predictors of identity-threat are included
Figure 5: Predictors of identity-threat: distinctiveness**

* R² figures are adjusted

** Only the paths that were significant direct or indirect predictors of identity-threat are included
Figure 6: Predictors of identity-threat: continuity

* R² figures are adjusted
** Only the paths from significant direct or indirect predictors of identity-threat are included
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Figure 7: Predictors of identity-threat: self-efficacy**
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* R² figures are adjusted
** Only the paths from significant direct or indirect predictors of identity-threat are included
8.3 Discussion

Summary of key findings:

- The path diagrams confirmed the predictions that the four identity threats of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy are characterised by different underlying psychological mechanisms.
- Of four identity-threats, three of them were predicted directly by corresponding identity-states. Only distinctiveness threat was not predicted by distinctiveness state, instead it was predicted by self-efficacy and self-esteem.
- The difficulty in capturing the constructs as complex as identity-threats (e.g. distinctiveness threat) necessitates a more in-depth investigation of these psychological mechanisms, more refined operationalisations of the construct, and this may be achieved by complementing quantitative data with the insights emerging from the qualitative data.
- Although affect represented strong predictor-variables of identity threats, the path diagrams indicated that emotions and threats were distinct constructs; identity-states were often mediators of emotions.
- Emotions were explained by all three types of predictor variables: life-events, magnitude of identity change and social support change. Emotions, therefore, impart subjective meaning to people's cognitions and experiences.

The results indicated that the four identity-threats are indeed both conceptually and empirically distinct constructs. As predicted, all four identity-threats were explained by different paths, indicating that they are indeed differentiated on the basis of their sources: continuity threat was directly predicted by continuity state and four emotion variables. Self-efficacy threat was directly predicted by self-efficacy state, but also a particular type of change within people's social network change (increased social network), negative emotions with respect to the social network change (specifically decreased closeness), and perception of identity change in the periods up to migration.
Self-esteem threat was directly predicted by self-esteem state, but also social support change (increase in frequency), identity change (T1-T2) and the family members being persecuted. Only distinctiveness threat was not directly predicted by distinctiveness state, instead, being predicted by the perceived levels of self-efficacy and self-esteem, as well as identity change (T2-T3) and negative affect about one's identity at T3.

It was noted in the previous chapters that there were notable variations in the way threat to distinctiveness (Figure 5) was constructed. Being a refugee was threatening because this category of identification gave an individual either too much and too little distinctiveness, both raising distinctiveness in a sub-optimal fashion (Brewer and Pickett, 1999). Both of these sources of threat reflect the distinctiveness based on exclusion:

"When you say to the people here that you are a refugee, everyone turns their head away from you. But I understand those people. I could never imagine myself as a refugee - this just happened to me. I was at the wrong place, wrong time [...] Sometimes when you watch TV and see people leaving their homes in their villages, you hear they say they are refugees, and then you realise that you are a refugee as well and I don't want to be seen like that..." (Male, 26, Bosnia)

"Here, you have great alienation; everything is so different from what we are used to. You can't expect - we are nothing special, they have had those like us for decades. We are not here because they like us, but because they have to follow the international conventions. They probably relate to everyone who comes here from wherever - just like this, the way they treat us. Why this is like that, I don't know, probably they are a rich society, so they can afford it." (Male, 45, Bosnia)

Inherent to the perceptions of threat to distinctiveness, we have argued, is the subjective interpretation of the level and nature of distinctiveness considered optimal for an individual. This finding is consistent with the recent research that demonstrates different
ways in which distinctiveness is constructed, and points to the discrete forms of distinctiveness that are functional for people’s self-perceptions both within and between groups and cultures (Vignoles et al., 2000).

The problematic nature of distinctiveness, or rather the simplistic way of conceptualising it is reflected both in the lack of direct relationship between distinctiveness state and its threat, and in a small effect size for the state of distinctiveness (not exceeding 10% of the variance explained)(Figure 5). As argued above, such poor explanation of this construct may be found in the restricted measures employed here in order to tap the processes underlying this construct. According to Branscombe et al. (1999) there are three ways of defining group-distinctiveness: in terms of boundedness of a group, its relative size or infrequency of the group (e.g. minority vs. majority), or in terms of the nature of its content dimension. Depending on how distinctiveness is construed, different bases for the perceptions of threat will be created: minority group may be attractive because it is separate, or “distinctive”, or it may be so due to the positive identity that its “distinctive” content provides for an individual who identifies with it (e.g. Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Breakwell, 1987, 1986). It is also possible that distinctiveness is represented as a social value itself (see Vingoles et al., 2000), as when the Western modern culture places an emphasis upon individualism and uniqueness (e.g. Breakwell, 1986, 1987). This traditional connection between distinctiveness and self-esteem may explain the current results, whereby both low self-esteem and low self-efficacy state are sources of threat to distinctiveness.

This argument might not apply to the group-level analysis only. As the recent research showed, distinctiveness may be achieved on both the individual and social level in a variety of ways, and this will depend upon cultural as well as inter-personal differences in constructing distinctiveness. Vignoles et al. (2000) distinguished between difference, separation and position as sources of distinctiveness, each encompassing a specific, often culturally defined way of perceiving oneself in relation to the other. Difference
represents distinctive properties of an individual (e.g. in terms of specific content of their identity); separateness is given in the sense of 'boundedness', as a basic perceptual and cognitive process. Position is conceptualised as a representation of the self in relation to others, within the system. It may be seen as conceptually opposite to separateness. Each of these dimensions may be differentially valued both within a specific culture, and by an individual, and may be differentially used in different contexts for different identity-aspects. If the operationalisation of distinctiveness fails to capture these nuances in the ways in which people construe their sense of distinctiveness, it comes as no surprise that distinctiveness is often very difficult to capture as a construct independent of self-esteem. The failure of distinctiveness state to predict threat to distinctiveness in the current set of results may be due to exactly this inter-individual (within-group) difference in the perceived sources of distinctiveness.

It is indicative that the higher distinctiveness state (Figure 3) is predicted by only two variables – decrease in instrumental dependence upon others, as well as the sense of pride before migration. The two concepts could be interpreted as the constructs emphasising one’s separation from others (decrease in dependence) and increased sense of uniqueness (pride). These possibly reflect the adaptational changes in the ways people construe distinctiveness, especially if a shift from the “Marxist collectivist” ideology (Markova, 1997) or indeed a more traditional (patriarchal) culture, to the Western “individualism” has already taken place. This was powerfully expressed in many of the respondents’ quotations:

“There, everyone knew your roots; here, no one knows who you are, and everything starts from the scratch, the very beginnings. There, everyone treated you the way they used to 15 years ago, when you were still a child; here, you can be someone else, you can be who whatever you decide to be.” (Male, 28, Croatia)

“England gives me more choice and freedom than I could ever have had in Yugoslavia. Here, I can choose between different possibilities of
living my life. What I always hated about Yugoslavia and my parents, well, all the rest of the average Yugoslavs, was that their whole life was predetermined for them: the school, then work, family, and then you die. England gives me most of the things that I am looking for.” (Male, 25, Bosnia)

"Yugoslavian parents usually sacrifice their life for their children, so that they would eventually have someone to look after them when they grow old. Luckily, my brother is living with my parents, so I don’t have to worry about it. When you can make your own decisions, that’s luck. You have to be wrong in order to be right, so you have to try everything. I can feel my parents’ sadness, though, and this is affecting me.” (Female, 28, Serbia)

Furthermore, the absence of one-to-one relationship between the distinctiveness threat and state indicates that there may have been massive degrees of coping within the sample which moderated the relationship between the state and the threat. The coping profile of respondents could provide answers as to under what conditions specific states would be directly predictive of the specific threats, that is, to what extent individual agency is implicated in the negotiation of the culturally specified optimal meaning for distinctiveness.

As we have argued earlier, distinctiveness is not the only identity-motivation: continuity provides people with the meaning for their identity as well (Giddens, 1991; Cinnirella, 1998; Chandler and Lalonde, 1995). Almost all the variance in continuity threat (Figure 6) was explained here directly by four emotion-variables: the negative and positive affect about social support was predictive of continuity threat in the expected direction, whereas the path-analysis indicated that less negative affect reported at T1 and more negative affect reported at T2 was also predictive of more threat to continuity. Unexpectedly, the perceptions of magnitude of identity and social support change were not directly predictive of threat, but the four affect variables mediated the effect of social support change (the decrease and increase closeness), identity change T2-T3, and also of some
life-events, upon continuity threat. Continuity state also mediated the effect of identity change T1-T2 as well as decrease in closeness, and this in the predicted direction.

Such findings showed that the mere perception of change was not sufficient to cause threat to one's sense of continuity. Rather, these changes needed to gain a subjective meaning, be reflexively understood (Giddens, 1991) by an individual: threat to continuity was emerging out of people's evaluations (emotions) of their past and present identity (and its social context). James (1890/1950) argued that the sense of continuity is inextricably bound with the emotions about the self—how one felt in the past constitutes a part of the current knowledge of self, in order for it to be felt as continuous: "A uniform feeling of warmth, of bodily existence (or an equally uniform feeling of pure psychic energy) pervades them [aspects of self] all; and this is what gives them generic unity and makes them the same kind" (p.335). In discussing the role of emotions, both Arnold (1970), and later Crawford et al. (1992) proposed that objects of our consciousness (both past and current) exist through their emotional component. Giddens (1991), in relating identity to the moral prerogative of "being true to oneself" (authenticity), recognised that the sense of continuity or "personal growth" depends on conquering emotional blocks and tensions that prevent us from understanding ourselves as we really are. Therefore, in order for the threat to continuity to be felt, emotions have to play a pivotal role.

Threatened sense of continuity may come as a result of certain aspects of our identity being stripped of the necessary "feeling of warmth and intimacy", to use James' term, in order for the sense of temporal coherence or unity to be broken. In other words, negative affect surrounding certain aspects of identity might indicate that the positive meaning constitutive of our subjectivity through time is curtailed. That is, threat to continuity might represent the threat to the positive sense of identity through time.

"Looking from this perspective, I was more than happy there. I was working in the town I was born in, with the people from the same generation... I always wanted to do something useful for the State which had then fallen apart, imagine my despair! [...] Back home I used
to have a very good status, my job was highly valued, and this gave me some sort of identity. Here, I don’t know what to identify with. I am trying to find something, but it is very hard. " (Male, 46, Bosnia)

Identity, as experienced self-reflexively, is embellished with emotions. It seems that only when emotions are tamed (separated from their referents), that the threat to continuity could be removed.

Emotions, as well as continuity state, mediate the effects of perceived magnitude of identity-change through the whole life-trajectory (since before the outbreak of the war – T1 until the present), as well as the perceptions of changes in commitment, or closeness with others. Intimacy, or closeness, is evaluated against the backdrop of the changes in the large-scale systems, such as migration or war (Giddens, 1991). However, it can also be a social value, as argued in chapter seven. Furthermore, the self-monitoring, or the perception of self through life-trajectory give the identity the needed meaning. Thus, both intimacy within the relationships, as well as perceptions of identity-changes, are necessary in order to establish meaningful identity, and as we have seen here, are intimately tied to continuity – the level of state of continuity, as well as the perceived threat.

In short, the emotions related to the changes in people’s social context and their identity directly impact upon threat to continuity, whereas people’s cognitions about these changes are mediated through the continuity state. This is an important finding, as it shows that threats to identity are not exclusively related to lower states – there are situations when emotions, and identity and social-context related cognitions are implicated in threat directly, thus refining the predictions of when the threat would be perceived.
A fairly large proportion of variance in self-esteem state (Figure 4) was predicted by two variables: positive and negative affect about the change in a person’s immediate social network. The positive affect mediated the effect of both increase and decrease in closeness upon self-esteem state, in the predicted direction. The direct impact of positive and negative affect with respect to one’s social network upon self-esteem state showed the significance of emotion processes as independent predictors of self-esteem. Whereas SIT argued that a mere cognitive representation of an inter-group context was sufficient to produce an impact upon self-esteem, explicitly rejecting the role of affiliating behaviour, the current study illustrates the significance of the emotional meaning of the immediate social context for positive self-evaluations. Earlier work – both within migration/inter-ethnic contact and social-support literature (e.g. Thomson, 1995; Rosenberg, 1979; Stryker, 1987; Thoits, 1991; Taylor and Aspinwall, 1996) revealed the significance of the nature and role of social network in supporting one's need for self-esteem. Furthermore, in the light of the findings from the previous chapter (chapter seven), where no significant correlation between group-based identity-aspects and any of the identity-related states or threats was found, the current finding successfully revealed the importance of the emotive component of social context for an individual’s self-evaluation. As Rosenberg (1979) argued, people’s self-esteem is expressed, and self-evaluations made within the micro-social realm in which people habitually operate. We would argue that social relations are sealed by emotions that make people’s immediate social environment meaningful. We would also argue that this immediate social environment forms a basis for self-evaluations, and lays the foundations for their self-esteem.

Self-esteem threat was predicted by four variables: low self-esteem state; increased interaction with others; people with the family background of persecution expressed less threat to self-esteem; it was also predicted by perceptions of identity change. The negative relationship between the family persecution variable and self-esteem threat (that is – those who have had their family members persecuted experienced less threat to self-
esteem) seems puzzling, given a host of findings that the negative life-events lead to lower well-being and self-esteem (Berry, 1998; Scott et al., 1989). People seem to be able to block off the threatening experiences, their identity apparently not affected by those terrible events. As seen from the qualitative study, if not probed, the full extent of the negative impact of these events would not be revealed. Breakwell (1986) argued that certain threats, if chronic, may be so abominable, that an individual seizes to be self-reflexive. However, this finding might be made more sense of if the role of coping is examined: if indeed those who have experienced negative life-events were found to cope in a way which deflected their attention away from the problematic aspects of their experience, this would be the evidence for the individuals succumbing to the threat. This will be examined in the next chapter.

Threat to self-efficacy (Figure 7) was predicted by the effect of affect (negative affect with respect to social support change at T3), perceived magnitude of change in identity T1-T2, perceived increase in the number of contacts, as well as self-efficacy state. Interestingly, the first three predictors of efficacy threat here have been described by Bandura (1997) as cognitive, affective and selective processes determining self-efficacy. Of course, these were not directly measured in the current study, and the interpretation offered here in the light of Bandura’s theory does not follow from it directly.

It is not surprising that the identity change as perceived in the period T1-T2, was the strongest predictor of the self-efficacy threat: it is in this period of massive social upheaval in people’s country that their prior identity was forced to change. The mere magnitude of the social change that, as was illustrated in the chapter six, challenged many people’s capacity to explain and understand their own position within the irreversible course of events, and pushed many of them into even greater uncertainty of exile, threatening their self-efficacy beliefs.
"My life is not normal at all here - my status, my physical insecurity affects my psychological security. Although, I do feel better this year... I don't know whether it is because the war ended. It is very anxious and stressful having someone else always having the last word over your life: you have no power to decide, no control of your life whatsoever - both here and there, and that's hard, I feel helpless." (Female, 29, Serbia)

Furthermore, self-efficacy was not solely directed towards one's actions and self-relevant thoughts, it also related to emotions - effective control over one's emotions is known to be related to high sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1997). Negative affect about one's social environment signals the absence of the capacity to deal with the emerging changes, and as such is a warning sign to one's perceived self-efficacy.

Bandura proposed that the choice of social context a person enters also shapes efficacy beliefs. If such changes in the environment are not directly induced by an individual, for instance when the increase in frequency of contacts or decrease in closeness with people occurs as a consequence of forced migration, threat to self-efficacy ensues.

It is interesting that of the two social support change variables in the path-diagram, increase in frequency affected self-efficacy threat directly, whereas decrease in closeness affected it indirectly, through the negative affect and self-efficacy state. If closeness is a fundamental attribute of social interaction, possibly emerging as a social value for this group of people (see also Giddens, 1991), then changes in this domain automatically impact upon the state of efficacy. However, increase in frequency of contacts is possibly a more ambiguous type of a change: earlier social support literature predicted that the number or extensiveness of the social network positively affected identity-evaluations (Thoits, 1983a). More recently, it has been recognised that the extensive social network is not always supportive (Taylor and Apsinwall, 1996; Turner, 1983).
"Everything is different here. There are too many people running around us all the time, things are too fast. You know, the same thing day in, day out - working in a restaurant, then going out, and always surrounded by people. There is no point in working like this, going from one restaurant or pub to another. I have to find a regular job, to find a normal, decent job, find some direction in life. What I really want is to cut down on the number of people around me - to be left with just a few friends, my wife and my kids, if I ever have them, and go away somewhere remote, isolated." (Male, 28, Croatia)

Increased number of contacts with others may indicate reduced capacity to control the choice and nature of contacts with others, the problem common in the event of migration, thus leading to threat to self-efficacy. Also, increased contacts with others may be a way of coping with the imminent threat: dissipation of the old network often creates a void, giving way to the increased amount of contacts as a way of re-building the lost social ties and the diminishing social competence. Whichever way the direction of the relationship goes, this certainly emphasises the need to understand the subjective meaning of the social support change.

In these diagrams, the relationships between life-events and affect, threat and state variables were apparently rather inconsistent. Two life-events were predictive of self-efficacy threat only indirectly: personal experience of persecution predicted negative affect about one's identity at T3, as expected; however, family loss was predictive of less likelihood of negative affect at T3, which is surprising. Similarly, family loss predicted less negative affect at T2 in another path-diagram (Figure 6, continuity threat). Whereas family persecution predicted self-esteem threat directly (see Figure 4), it was predictive of continuity threat only through negative affect about oneself at T2 (Figure 6). Furthermore, it is interesting that, although family persecution was positively related to negative affect about one's identity at T2 (Figure 6, continuity threat), its negative relationship with self-esteem threat is more than surprising.
The apparent inconsistency of the results revealing different ways in which these life-events have affected people, especially given the very high correlation between the two variables of family member and personal experience of persecution, is puzzling. A closer look at the data, however, indicates the possible operation of distinct combinations of life-events as distinct patterns of life-experiences for this group of respondents. As seen from the correlations between the four life-event variables, family persecution seems to correlate well both with family loss and personal experience of persecution, the latter two not being correlated with each other. The absence of personal experience of persecution as a predictor in the “continuity threat” diagram (Figure 6) could mean that the family persecution mopped up all the significance of this variable as a predictor, and therefore, the impact of the family persecution variable could actually have represented its combined effect with the personal persecution variable. This absence of the personal persecution variable as a predictor simultaneously justifies the presence of separate paths for the two otherwise highly correlated life-events variables (family loss and family persecution) in this diagram: the family persecution appearing as a significant predictor in this model, may have been experienced in quite a distinct way if combined with the experience of personal persecution, than when accompanied by the family member loss.

This is further supported if we consider the separate paths for family loss and personal experience of persecution in the self-efficacy diagram (Figure 7), both of which were uncorrelated life-events, and both of which affected negative affect in different ways. Bar-Tal and Jacobson (1998) have argued that the external events are subjectively perceived and interpreted, and we would add, they are often interpreted not as isolated instances, but as interrelated events, frequently forming clusters. For instance, if a person’s family has been persecuted, it is quite likely that they would themselves also experience persecution. Furthermore, if one’s family members have been persecuted, it is probable that some of them would have been killed or have died in the process. The two clusters of events may have completely different meanings and symbolic significance for individuals. Their actual meaning should be understood with reference
to the coping strategies, as a factor underlying these distinctive ways in which life-events were experienced and given different emotional significance, and these ought to be investigated in future.

Lower self-efficacy state (Figure 3) was explained by negative affect about oneself at T3, which mediated the effect of life-events variables and the decrease in frequency of contacts, as well as the social support change – the perceived decrease in feelings of closeness provided by their social network. Thus, another apparent inconsistency resides in the different paths of prediction between social support change and self-efficacy threat. Whereas decrease in closeness and frequency of contacts impacted upon threat to self-efficacy via low self-efficacy state and negative affect at T3, increase in frequency of contacts had a direct relationship with the threat to self-efficacy. The explanation for this may be found in the threatening effect of sudden increase in frequency of contacts in relationships, regardless of the initial levels of efficacy-state, whereas other changes in interactive network exist only for those individuals whose levels of efficacy state are low anyway. For instance, even for highly efficacious individuals, increase in frequency of contacts may be something that is an emerging property of the current social context, and not in their control. On the other hand, decrease in both closeness and frequency of contacts may not only affect low self-efficacy state, but also be precipitated by it (see chapter seven).

These separate diagrams delineate the need to treat the constructs of state and threat as separate. As mentioned in chapter seven, threat to self-efficacy might be an artefact of the process of adaptation. The perceived need to establish more control over their life (as this was the way threat to self-efficacy had been operationalised in this study), may reflect the respondents' shift towards the Western cultural norm and requirement of total and constant monitoring of one's actions in the risky society (Giddens, 1991).
"I have always thought of myself as someone who was going to leave the country. Ever since I fell in love with physics, I've dreamt that I was going to work for NASA. This was only possible abroad, not in Yugoslavia. So I used to read newspapers, trying to find a place, somewhere closer to my dream. I wanted more from my life, which I couldn't get in Yugoslavia. I always knew I was going to leave for the West. [...] I am not happy with the style of life right now, I would want to have a bit more free time, more time for myself, more control over it, but you can't do anything about it as an individual. You have to accept it. Luckily I have a choice between what I want to do and what I don't want to do. The rest of it is outside of my control. I perceive my work as education, each day is different from another, and I am learning a lot." (Male, 25, Bosnia)

As seen from the above excerpt, the person emphasises the different possibilities as well as values about the extent to which choice is paramount in people's life, in two cultures. The West gives opportunities, gives freedom. Freedom has been described as a defining feature of the Western society by 11 respondents in the qualitative study. And yet, the limits to that freedom, the limits to the extent to which one can control one's life are also recognised. This is a paradoxical situation in which the very existence of the value of freedom and self-control simultaneously produces the changing expectations with respect to it – people are in quest of maximising this freedom, through the increased self-efficacy.

In short, this chapter emphasised the distinct psychological mechanisms underlying four identity-threats. The path-analyses showed that different identity-threats were predicted by different combination of their sources – the four identity-threats and the corresponding states were defined by very distinct combinations of emotional, cognitive, contextual and situational predictors, indicating conceptually distinct phenomena. Furthermore, the lack of one-to-one relationship between distinctiveness state and threat drew attention to the importance of a more differentiated conceptualisation of this identity-motive.
Many affect variables emerged as direct predictors of identity-threats, although often, their impact upon identity-threats was mediated via identity-state. This is important, as it reveals that identity-threats should not be equated with emotions, although the latter are often a constitutive part of this experience. Also, it grounds the conceptual distinction between the states and the threats in empirical data: identity-states could be understood as some average level of identity-motive that, if low, may lead to threat, but is certainly not its only determinant. The threat will ensue if the low state is also accompanied by negative affect as well as the perceived changes in the social, environmental and identity-realm.

The implication of this finding rests in the requirement to distinguish between the position of threat (i.e. their sources) and its experience: it is wrong to assume that threat is experienced if low scores on identity-states are observed. These may be threatening only if we are aware of the way people construct their threats. That is, if an identity-state of continuity, for instance, is constructed in terms of development, and therefore change rather than stability representing a valued and desired identity-state from which continuity is evaluated, than this is important to know before low scores on “continuity” dimension of self-evaluation are interpreted. Furthermore, the significance of this finding with respect to the vast “minority group status” literature rests in the difficulty of assuming that the specific consequences of identity will be observed based on one’s category of identification. As seen, people derive their identity-evaluations from their overall identity-structure, and not only that — the perceptions of their social context as well the emotions attached to these will affect people’s perceptions of threat. There are inter-individual differences, even within a single cultural group, in the way threats are perceived, and these reside in the way people construct various dimensions of their identity — both the meaning of their identity and their position within a web of social relationships, as well as the motivation to achieve this meaning (levels of identity end-states). Future studies should develop the more layered conceptualisations and measures
of the sources leading to the experience of threat, in order to explain vast individual variation in adaptation even within a single migration group.

The ways coping strategies people use moderate the impact of different threats upon identity states will be examined in the next section. It may well be that for different groups of people, even within the same ideological and cultural framework, certain identity-principles/motives chronically (or temporarily) have greater prevalence, depending on the coping style they have opted for. In the following chapter it is our aim to examine two issues: one, the existence of various coping alternatives within a single cultural group; second, the moderating effects of these coping patterns upon the relationship between threat and state.
9.1 Research Aims

Previous chapter examined a generic model of predictors of identity-threat, investigating the interdependence between identity-states, affective, cognitive, situational and socio-structural variables, as the sources of four identity-threats of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. The results suggested that for the whole sample, different combination of variables predicted different identity-threats. Only three state-variables – continuity, self-esteem and self-efficacy, seemed to be the most powerful predictors of the four threats: continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem. This pointed to the possibility of the varying salience of the four states for this sample of immigrants. It has been argued that a full picture of adaptation process will not emerge unless people’s coping behaviour is examined.

Earlier literature suggested the need to study people’s coping preference in order to understand the full range of responses to such a pervasive position of threat as migration (Thoits, 1992; Burnam et al., 1987; Crocker and Major, 1989; Ethier and Deaux, 1994; Breakwell, 1986, 1988; Branscombe et al., 1999). Some findings in this thesis indicated the importance of taking into account people’s coping orientation, as well. It was for instance suggested that distinctive ways in which different situational variables impacted upon identity states and threats may have been contingent upon the coping people adopted in order to deal with the threats imposed by these life-events. Further justification for a need of exploration of the moderating effects of coping orientation rests in the observation from the previous chapter that one identity-state – distinctiveness – was not predictive of any identity threats measured. It was suggested that the type of a state salient in predicting the identity-threats possibly varied within the sample. Furthermore,
the correlation analyses from chapter seven, revealing some unexpected results with respect to the effects of the type of social support change upon identity threat and state variables, called for the observation of the coping processes people employed when their old social context dissipated. The positive relationships between the increase in closeness and frequency of contacts on one hand and the threat variables on the other, as well as their negative relationship with the identity-state variables indicated the possible differences in subjective interpretation of these socio-structural changes, thus requiring investigation of the coping conditions defining the framework of these perceptions.

The following chapter seeks to establish the existence of different coping orientations across the sample, and lay the basis for the differentiation between the individuals using these distinct coping styles: situational, demographic, cognitive/affective, threat and identity state variables were examined for their power of differentiating between the coping styles that people had adopted. Further, it was decided to examine the moderation effects of coping: the aim was to test for what types of coping people's perceptions of threat will vary. In other words, it was of interest to examine whether and in what way the choice of coping strategy influenced the relative salience of the identity-state from which identity-threats will be observed.

9.2 Results

9.2.1 Coping strategies – patterns of responses across the sample
Two Cluster Analyses were performed to classify participants into groups on the basis of the coping strategies they have used in the period during the migration up until now. The Quick Cluster method was used which produced a three-cluster solution on the recent coping strategies measures. For the coping strategies in the present the first cluster contained 29 individuals, cluster 2 contained 45 individuals and cluster 3 - 36 individuals.
In order to specify the pattern of group differences on both sets of measures, Discriminant Function Analysis was used.

9.2.2 Group Differences

Discriminant Function Analysis (Stepwise Method) was performed using 23 coping strategies items in the present as predictors of membership in three groups. Two discriminant functions were calculated with a combined $\chi^2(16)=206.73$, $p<.001$. After the first discriminant function was removed, there was still strong association between groups and predictors with $\chi^2(7)=94.155$, $p<.001$. The two discriminant functions accounted for 57% and 43% of variance of the between-group variability, respectively. As seen in Table 19 and Figure 8, the first discriminant function significantly separated the first group from the second group with the third group lying in between, whereas the second discriminant function separated the third group from the other two groups. The loading matrix with correlations between the predictors and the first discriminant function suggests that the intra-psychic strategies separated cluster 3 from the clusters 1 and 2; the first canonical discriminant function was best interpreted by inter-personal isolation ($r=.67$) and collective support ("actively organizing exchange of information")($r=.50$). The second canonical discriminant function was best explained by intra-psychic strategy of refocusing attention ("not thinking about problematic situation"), separating the first group of subjects (who scored higher on this measure) from the other two groups ($r=.63$). (See Table 21 for Discriminant Function Coefficients and Table 20 for means for three group on each discriminating variable).

Table 19: Summary of Canonical Discriminant Function on cluster groups for coping orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Canonical Cor</th>
<th>Sig. p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Separation of centroids for three groups based on coping orientation

Table 20: Means for three groups on eight discriminating coping variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td>m=4.24</td>
<td>m=4.00</td>
<td>m=4.76</td>
<td>m=5.04</td>
<td>m=5.60</td>
<td>m=3.48</td>
<td>m=6.0</td>
<td>m=5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=2.15</td>
<td>SD=1.96</td>
<td>SD=1.77</td>
<td>SD=1.61</td>
<td>SD=1.37</td>
<td>SD=2.31</td>
<td>SD=1.18</td>
<td>SD=1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td>m=4.51</td>
<td>m=5.73</td>
<td>m=5.13</td>
<td>m=4.20</td>
<td>m=3.00</td>
<td>m=1.75</td>
<td>m=3.82</td>
<td>m=2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=4.51</td>
<td>SD=1.28</td>
<td>SD=1.48</td>
<td>SD=2.16</td>
<td>SD=1.43</td>
<td>SD=1.25</td>
<td>SD=2.00</td>
<td>SD=1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td>m=2.66</td>
<td>m=3.16</td>
<td>m=3.52</td>
<td>m=2.17</td>
<td>m=2.06</td>
<td>m=1.52</td>
<td>m=3.77</td>
<td>m=2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=2.67</td>
<td>SD=1.83</td>
<td>SD=1.78</td>
<td>SD=1.38</td>
<td>SD=1.93</td>
<td>SD=1.18</td>
<td>SD=2.14</td>
<td>SD=1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21: Standardised Canonical Discriminant Function coefficients for coping orientation as a distinguishing criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective support</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Representation</td>
<td>-.447</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing behaviour</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance/Isolation</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refocus</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Repression</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compartmentalism</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pooled within-group correlation between eight predictors is shown in Table 22. Overall, there were no high correlations between variables within-groups; each of them, therefore, should be treated as a separate predictor of discriminant functions. Inter-personal isolation correlated negatively with the collective support ($r=-.20$), as expected, indicating that those who engaged in organizing exchange of information among members of the same cultural and ethnic background were unlikely to turn to non-social activities when dealing with threat. Furthermore, negative correlation between inter-personal isolation and inter-personal behaviour change/compliance ($r=-.15$), showed that those who turned to non-social activities were less likely to accept the need to change their behaviour when relating to others, seeking adaptation through compliance. There was a positive correlation ($r=.25$) between refocus of attention (decision not to think about the problematic situation) and change of behaviour through inter-personal compliance. The latter adaptive strategy was negatively correlated with emotion repression ($r=-.14$), as would be expected. Positive correlation ($r=.23$) between compartmentalism and refocus of attention indicates that not thinking about the problematic situation was simultaneous with the attention being redirected away from the aspect of the self that is under threat.
Table 22: Within-group correlation matrix for coping strategies within the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collectiv</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Changing</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Avoidance/Isolation</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Refocus</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Emotional repression</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Compartmentalism</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the DFA showed that the three groups of people had distinctively different coping styles they were employing in the period since their arrival to Britain: cluster 1 was less likely to employ intra-psychic (affective/cognitive) strategies, and was characterised by high scores on collective and inter-personal (behavioural) strategies; these people were therefore labeled the "Collectives". By contrast, cluster 3 was more likely to use intra-psychic (affective/cognitive) strategies, scoring low on inter-personal and collective (behavioural) strategies; they were named - the "Introspects". Finally, cluster 2 was characterised by the use of both types of coping, and were hence called the "Eclectics".

In the next section it is our aim to determine what factors - both demographic and psychosocial - differentiate between these three groups. Crosstabulations and one-way ANOVAs were conducted in order to test whether there were significant differences between the three groups in terms of four life-events (family loss, family-member persecution,
personal persecution and material loss), gender and age of the respondents. See Tables 23-29 for the summary of the results.

The cross-tabulations showed that the three groups differed significantly on two dimensions: loss of family-member, loss of material possessions, and gender. Among the *Introspects* there was a significantly higher number of respondents who had experienced loss of one or more family members ($\chi^2 = 10.726, p=.005$) than in the other two groups, with 56% of the *Introspects* having lost their family members as opposed to 21% and 27% of the *Collectives* and the *Eclectics*, respectively. Furthermore, the comparatively fewer *Eclectics* reported loss of material possessions (58%) than the respondents in other two groups (*Collectives*—79% and *Introspects*—81% of individuals having reported the loss of material possessions with the war) ($\chi^2 = 6.38, p=.041$). The two groups—the *Collectives* and the *Introspects* were split along the gender dimension as well ($\chi^2 = 11.44$, $p=.003$), as the *Collectives* were predominately female respondents (72% within the group) whereas the majority of the *Introspects* were male respondents (60% within the group). The *Eclectics* had a more-or-less equal male-female ratio (53% females and 47% males within the group).

One-way ANOVA conducted on the dimension of age showed that there were significant differences between the *Collectives* on one hand and the other two groups in terms of age distribution ($F(2,107) = 6.768, p=.002, \eta^2 = .112$). Among the *Collectives*, 52% of people were over forty years of age, as opposed to 34% of people from the *Eclectics* and 17% of the *Introspects* being over forty years old.

Table 23: Summary of the univariate analysis of variance of age across “coping orientation” groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2664.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1332.12</td>
<td>6.78**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24: Summary of the cross-tabular analysis of the differences between the three "coping orientation" groups on life-event variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Event</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Cramer's $\hat{V}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Loss</td>
<td>10.73**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Persecution</td>
<td>1.707</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally Persecuted</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Loss</td>
<td>6.378*</td>
<td>.241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>11.44**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01

Table 25: Cross-tabulations: Coping-orientation group differences of the experience of family member loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Orientation</th>
<th>Family Loss</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family Loss</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family Loss</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family Loss</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family Loss</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26: Cross-tabulations: Coping-orientation group differences of the experience of material loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Orientation</th>
<th>Material Loss</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Material Loss</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Material Loss</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Material Loss</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Material Loss</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Cross-tabulations: Coping-orientation group differences of the personal experience of persecution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Orientation</th>
<th>Personally Persecuted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Personally Persecuted</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Personally Persecuted</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Personally Persecuted</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Personally Persecuted</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28: Cross-tabulations: Coping-orientation group differences of the experience of family member persecution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Orientation</th>
<th>Family Persecuted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Family</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Cross-tabulations: Coping-orientation group differences in gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Orientation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Group</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Sex</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further exploration of other psychological dimensions on which the groups differed prompted the use of a series of Bonferroni adjusted one-way ANOVAs and MANOVAs. MANOVA was used in order to estimate the mean differences between the three groups on a number of combined dependent variables, accounting for the Type I error due to multiple tests of (likely) correlated dependent variables.

The differences between the groups of individuals using distinctive patterns of coping strategies in the present were computed on the following measures: identity-threat, identity-state, overall specific dimensions of emotions at three points of time, overall increase and decrease in closeness, frequency and dependence in relation to social support, positive and negative affect related to this change in social support, and the magnitude of the reported identity change at three points of time. The summary of the analyses is given in Table 30.

MANOVA was conducted on four identity states of self-continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem as dependent variables. The combined dependent variables were not significantly affected by the group membership (Wilks $\Lambda=.923$, $F(8,208)=1.06$, $p=.391$, $\eta^2=.039$) on difference between these groups. However, MANOVA on the four combined composite measures of threat to these identity states (threat to continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy) as dependent variables showed a significant effect (Wilks $\Lambda=.831$, $F(8,208)=2.524$, $p=.012$, $\eta^2=.089$). A unique contribution in predicting differences indicated that threat to continuity contributed to the difference between the groups ($F(2,107)=6.88$, $p=.002$, $\eta^2=.11$). Bonferroni adjusted one-way ANOVA showed this measure to differentiate between the Collectives and the other two. Table 32 shows that the Collectives reported significantly higher threat to continuity ($F(2,107)=6.89$, $p=.002$) than the other two groups.

MANOVA on emotion dimensions reported with respect to respondents' overall identity-structure was conducted for the emotions at three time-points: before the outbreak of the
war (T1), upon the outbreak of the war/before migration (T2), and in the present (T3). The emotion dimensions analysed for their contribution to the difference between the three groups were as follows: overall negative affect, overall happiness and overall pride (for three time-points). MANOVA on combined composite measures of these emotion dimensions was significant (Wilks $\Lambda=.755$, $F(18,198)=1.65$, $p=.049$). Between-subjects tests showed that only negative affect at T2 and negative affect at T3 significantly differentiated between the three groups ($F(2,107)=7.24$, $p=.001$, $\eta^2=.12$, and $F(2,107)=3.51$, $p=.033$, $\eta^2=.06$). Bonferroni corrected ANOVA (Table 33) indicated that the difference on the dimension of negative affect at T2 occurred between the Introspects - who scored significantly lower - and the other two groups ($F(2,107)=7.24$, $p=.001$); also, the difference on the dimension of negative affect at T3 was evident between the Introspects and the Collectives, whereby the former scored significantly lower ($F(2,107)=3.51$, $p=.033$).

No significant effect of three groups was found on overall magnitude of identity-change at three time-points: between T1 and T2, T2 and T3, and T1 and T3. Similarly, no significant effect occurred on the dimensions of increase and decrease in closeness, frequency and dependence in social contacts. However, the emotional response to these changes - that is, positive and negative affect related to social support change differed among the three groups of people: one-way ANOVA was performed on these two dimensions of emotionality (Table 34). The Collectives felt significantly more negative about the overall change in social support than the Introspects ($F(2,106)=3.616$, $p=.030$). It was the Eclectics, however, who felt significantly more positive about the overall change than either the Collectives or the Introspects ($F(2,106)=6.684$, $p=.018$).
Table 30: Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the way the coping orientation distinguishes between threat, state, affect and cognitive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>df₁</th>
<th>df₂</th>
<th>Multivariate F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity states</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity threats</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Emotions</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>1.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Change</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall decrease in: closeness, depend., freq.</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall increase in closeness, depend., freq.</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative/positive affect re. social support change</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>5.78***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Univariate Analysis of Variance on identity states as DV (coping orientation as IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity state</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness state</td>
<td>248.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124.03</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem State</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy State</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Univariate Analysis of Variance on identity threats as DV (coping orientation as IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Threat</td>
<td>339.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>169.56</td>
<td>6.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness Threat</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy Threat</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem Threat</td>
<td>98.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F statistically significant at p<.05
** F statistically significant at p<.01
***F statistically significant at p<.001
Table 33: Univariate Analysis of Variance on affect re. identity structure as DV (coping orientation as IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect T1</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness T1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride T1</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect T2</td>
<td>235.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117.85</td>
<td>7.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness T2</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride T2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect T3</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>3.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness T3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride T3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F statistically significant at p<.05
** F statistically significant at p<.01
***F statistically significant at p<.001

Finally, in order to test for the group differences in the nature of identity-state predictive of the threat to identity-states, bivariate correlations were conducted between “overall threat” variable and the “overall state” variable. For the Collectives and the Introspects the correlation coefficient was extremely high: r=-.625, p<.001 and r=-.572, p<.001, respectively. However, no significant correlation emerged between the two variables for the Eclectics (r=-.285, p=.058), indicating low presence of threat for this group of people.

9.2.3 Moderation effects

In order to test the buffering effect of the specific profile of coping (that is, the conditions specifying the relationships between identity states and threats), a series of simple
regressions were conducted between identity state variables (as IV) and identity threat variables (as DV). The decision to use regression coefficients rather than correlations was based on the argument proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986), indicating that, unlike correlations which are influenced by changes in variances, the regression coefficients are not affected either by differences in the variances of the independent variable, or the differences in measurement error of the dependent variable. The summary of the analyses are given in the Table 35 and Figure 9.

Of the three groups of people using specific coping profile, the moderating effect of the eclectic use of strategies upon the prediction of continuity and distinctiveness threat was characterized by the lack of significant relationship between these threat variables and any of the identity-state variables. Thus, the effect of the joint use of collectivist coping preference and the “affective-cognitive or intra-psychic coping style” led to no relationship between identity-states and threats for continuity and distinctiveness not being significant, and the moderately predicted effect sizes of efficacy threat ($R^2=.22, \beta=-.49$) and self-esteem threat ($R^2=.11, \beta=-.36$).

For the Collectives, continuity state predicted 19% of variance in continuity threat ($\beta=-.46$). Self-efficacy state predicted 46% of variance in self-efficacy threat ($\beta=-.62$), and continuity state predicted the remaining 7% of variance in self-efficacy threat (overall adjusted $R^2=.53$), with relatively large beta-weights ($\beta=-.62$ and $\beta=-.29$, respectively). Self-esteem threat was predicted by self-esteem state (30% of variance in self-esteem state, $\beta=-.40$), and self-efficacy state (the remaining 8% of variance in self-esteem state, $\beta=-.36$). All relationships were in the predicted direction, and as expected, pointed that there was no clear one-to-one relationship between threats and states: the level of identity-threat was not contingent upon the lower levels in the specific, corresponding state exclusively.
The combined collective/inter-personal and intra-psychic coping style moderated the effect of self-efficacy state upon self-efficacy threat ($R^2=.22$, $\beta=-.49$), and the effect of self-esteem state upon self-esteem threat ($R^2=.11$, $\beta=-.36$). Here also, the effect was in the predicted direction and, as expected, the low levels of the specific identity-state were predictive of the threat to that state.

The moderation effect of the intra-psychic coping employed showed different patterns of relationships: three threat-variables – distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem threat were all predicted by just one identity-state – lower self-esteem. Self-esteem state explained 47% of variance in distinctiveness threat ($\beta=-.67$); 23% of variance in self-efficacy threat ($\beta=-.5$); and 43% of variance in self-esteem state ($\beta=-.67$). Only threat to continuity was directly predicted by another state – the corresponding continuity state ($R^2=.15$, $\beta=-.42$). All in all, it seems that focusing upon intra-psychic or affective-cognitive coping method, presupposed salience of self-esteem as identity-motivation determining the levels of other identity-threats (except for continuity threat).

Table 35: Summary of the moderating effect of coping upon the prediction of threat from identity-states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ Value</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectives</td>
<td>Continuity Threat</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinctiveness Threat</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy Threat</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem Threat</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectics</td>
<td>Self-efficacy Threat</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem Threat</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspects</td>
<td>Continuity Threat</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinctiveness Threat</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy Threat</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem Threat</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 9: Moderation effects of coping profile for the effect of identity state upon identity threat.

**Collectives**
- Continuity State → Continuity Threat: \( R^2 = .19^* \)
- Self-esteem State → Distinctiveness Threat: \( R^2 = .28 \)
- Self-efficacy State → Self-efficacy Threat: \( R^2 = .53 \)
- Self-esteem State → Self-efficacy State: \( r = .57 \)
- Self-efficacy State → Self-efficacy Threat: \( r = .36 \)

**Eclectics**
- Continuity not predicted
- Distinctiveness not predicted
- Self-efficacy State → Self-efficacy State: \( r = .49 \)
- Self-efficacy State → Self-esteem State: \( r = .36 \)

**Introspects**
- Continuity State → Continuity Threat: \( R^2 = .15 \)
- Self-esteem State → Distinctiveness Threat: \( R^2 = .47 \)
- Self-efficacy State → Self-efficacy Threat: \( R^2 = .23 \)
- Self-esteem State → Self-esteem Threat: \( R^2 = .43 \)

Bivariate correlation between overall state and overall threat variables:
- \( r = -.625, p < .001 \)
- \( r = -.285, p = .058 \)
- \( r = -.572, p < .001 \)

\(*R^2\) figures are adjusted.
9.3 Discussion

Summary of key findings:

• There were distinct clusters of people using different ways of coping with threat: collective/inter-personal orientation (Collectives); the intra-psychic orientation (Introspects); and the combination of the two (Eclectics). The coping profile of the Eclectics supported the assumption that different levels of coping were not mutually exclusive, but that the individuals differed in the variety and range of the coping employed.

• Contingent upon the coping style people adopted, these three groups of people varied in the levels of threat to continuity experienced, the emotions underlying identity-processes, as well as to age, sex and the life-events experienced as background to the choice of coping.

• Coping orientation moderated the interaction between identity states and threats: whereas for the Eclectics two specific states and threats were mutually related in one-to-one fashion, and two threats were successfully averted, for the Introspects the main source of evaluation of threats was self-esteem. For the Collectives, combinations of states were salient in perceptions of a specific threat, and three identity motivations of continuity, self-esteem and self-efficacy impacted upon the experience of all four threats.

• Distinctiveness state was not predictive of any threat, supporting the conclusions from the previous chapter that a more evolved way of measuring this construct should be employed in the future.

The aim of this part of investigation was to establish whether individuals differed in terms of the coping activities they had used since migration, and if so, what psychological processes characterized these distinct patterns of coping.
Cluster and Discriminant Function analyses revealed an interesting pattern of results: they distinguished between three distinct profiles of dealing with threats related to migration. It is important to recognize that the existence of distinctive patterns of coping does not preclude a degree of overlap on other coping measures. Nevertheless, the variation between the three groups of individuals on the eight items that differentiated between them was sufficiently systematic to allow some conclusions about different orientations in dealing with migration.

Two of the three groups — the Collectives and the Introspects — used contrasting profiles of coping: whereas the Collectives were characterized by the notable lack of self-focused coping efforts such as dealing with the threatened aspects of identity ("compartmentalism"), coming to terms with the changing situation ("refocus of attention"), not dealing with the emotions resulting from the ensuing threat ("emotional repression"), or indeed turning to the activities which prevented them from thinking about the problematic situation ("avoidance/isolation"), the Introspects seem to do the opposite, focusing inward for the solutions of threat. Simultaneously, whereas the Collectives were more likely to seek collective support, comply with the inter-personal requirements to change behaviour, or promote their cultural background, the Introspects seemed to be less group- and others-oriented in their dealings with the threat of migration. The Eclectics, however, were more seemingly flexible in their use of coping strategies, which spanned both the intra-psychic and inter-personal/collective orientation.

These different patterns of coping response to threat seemed to echo Breakwell's (1986, 1988), and Crocker and Major's (1989) classification of coping strategies in terms of either focusing upon the socio-structural context at hand and one's position within it in order to remove or modify the threat on one hand, or with one's attention directed toward the content and structure of identity, re-constructing the meanings of different identity-aspects or altering their value in order to modify the perceptions of threat, on the other hand. Indeed, the example of the Eclectics shows that these two differing foci in the
process of coping are not necessarily mutually exclusive – they co-existed in the repertoire of activities (in thought or action) directed at dealing with threat, the two coping orientations influencing each other.

Further tests of difference between these three groups indicated that they are differentiated on the basis of various demographic, situational and psycho-social variables. The tests of demographic and situational characteristics of the three groups of people showed different gender and age distribution, as well as different likelihood of experience of the two types of loss with migration – family and material possessions, for three groups.

The predominance of female respondents among the Collectives is not consistently supported by the available research on gender differences in coping style. The evidence for female preference of pro-social activities is contradictory: for instance, Monnier et al. (1998) have reported that women are more likely to use pro-social coping than men (albeit, in a different context of study – that of a work place), resulting in the increased social support network. The established social support literature, however, portrays women as not more supportive, but more dependent upon social support than men (Jerusalem and Mittag, 1997). For instance, Jerusalem, Hahn and Schwarzer (1995) have found that women are less successful in creating new friends with migration than men.

Similar contradiction in assumptions plagues the age-specific coping: traditional literature describes how older people cope in terms of accommodation, disengagement, self-transcendence (see Coleman, Ivani-Chalian and Robinson, 1999); for instance, older immigrants have been found to be less oriented toward establishing alternative social networks (Cwikel and Rozovski, 1998). On the other hand, in their study of Bosnian refugees in Norway, Van Selm, Sam and Van Oudenhoven (1997) have reported that feelings of competence are more characteristic of the older refugees. Such contradictory findings say more about the conceptual weakness of most studies in failing to understand
gender and age differences in the context of the social influence processes that lay the
limits of gender/age-specific behaviour and expectations.

Nevertheless, results like these hint at the problematic treatment of the determinants of
coping choice by SIT: the proponents of this theory have been arguing that the context
which makes the inter-group comparison salient, and the properties of the social structure,
instigate collective or individual coping orientation through the motivation for positive
self-esteem. The cognitive and motivational processes on one hand, and the social
structure on the other, therefore, have been taken to constitute universal determinants of
coping processes. The current set of results reflect, however, certain demographic as well
as situational commonalities among the groups of people sharing their profiles of coping.
Of course, we are not arguing here that the processes of identity differ across age and
gender, however, the representational structures emerging from different normative
cultures of different age- and gender-categories, may influence the relative salience of
certain psycho-social elements. Emergence of age and sex as significant differentiating
factors between at least two coping orientations in this sample renders the SIT argument
about the universality of predictors of coping outcomes within a single minority group,
less tenable. Although the causality of the relationship between the demographic and
situational variables on one hand and the coping choice on the other, could not be
established from the simple statistical analysis performed in this study, a more complex
picture seems to be emerging.

Furthermore, the three groups differed on the basis of how much threat to continuity they
experienced, how bad they felt about themselves both in the past – upon the outbreak of
the war, and in the present, and how positive as well as negative they felt in relation to
their social network. It is significant that no group was significantly differentiated in
terms of the levels of any identity-state. Whereas the Collectives reported more threat to
continuity and more negative emotion than the other two groups, as well as less positive
affect with respect to social support, the Introspects reported less negative affect about
themselves and their social environment, although the Eclectics reported more positive affect with respect to social support.

The findings are interesting not least because, in the crudest sense, they showed that the strategies oriented towards dealing with one’s cognitions, emotions and threats (intrapsychic strategies) were indeed associated with fewer negative emotions being reported (as seen from the comparisons between the Collectives and the Introspects). What it also showed, from the evidence of the nature of the cognitive/affective processes characterising the Collectives and the Introspects, was that different strategies had different functions. Although mere self-involvement seems to help to a large extent in dealing with the negative emotions that presented threat to an individual (as evident among the Introspects), the emergence of positive emotions with respect to one’s social environment is contingent upon coping being directed both at the inter-personal/collective and intra-psychic level (as in the case of the Eclectics). In other words, the non-use of coping efforts at the interpersonal-collective level, entails the absence of intense emotions – both positive as well as negative - in the inter-personal domain.

Furthermore, although it is expected that the deflection of the self-focused attention (as for the Collectives), by not thinking about oneself, isolating the threatened elements of one's identity, or not acknowledging one’s emotions should, at least in the short run, result in the absence of emotions – or at least the absence of negative affect as an evaluative aspect of self, the opposite relationship emerged: the Collectives reported significantly more negative affect than the others. Of course, the direction of causality here is unresolved, as it may just as well be that the excess of negative emotions extending through time and across domains necessitated the use of a strategy that was useful in averting one’s attention away from the emotional turmoil. On the other hand, certain contextual changes (such as migration, loss of a country, war, loss of material possessions, friends or family members, etc.) are so pervasive and irreversible, that
isolating the aspects of identity affected by these changes – by not acknowledging the need for change in their content or value dimensions – might result in the emergence of a chronic anxious state and dissatisfaction with oneself. It was the Collectives who reported most threat to continuity, making it possible to argue that averting attention away from the threatened aspects of the self and the new context, exacerbated perceived lack of continuity, as no or little attempt was thus made to re-negotiate identity-elements in the light of the changing situation. The respondents may have been unable to conceptualise change in terms of development, rather than a break in continuity, this inability institutionalised in the specific coping strategies used to block off the threatened aspects of self. With time, the incoherence between the inner world and the external reality might become increasingly difficult to control, threatening people’s continuity:

“...I am not employed, and no one is asking me anything about my life here, no one is complaining about me being here, and this has been going on for years. No one is forced to do anything they don’t want to do here. This is a bit of a conflict that we are finding problematic. We expected that the war would finish soon. However, time is passing, and there is no end to the war, however, it is difficult to adjust to this environment here. Here you have great alienation, everything is so different from what we are used to.”
(Male, 45, Bosnia)

As seen from the above excerpt, the threat to continuity is tied to the delay – it only emerged when the friction between the reality and the inner world extending over a longer period of time. The initial apparent continuation of the previous life in the hope that the conditions for re-living it would be re-established with the end of the war, slowed down the process of accommodation to the new social context, thus giving way to the emergence of threat. The absence of self-involvement created new discontinuities.

In short, these coping patterns were characterised by very distinct psychological processes, specifically emotion and threat-responses. The distinct ways in which different
coping profiles seem to have been used in order to deal with emotions (although, it should be added, the direct causal relationship was not measured here), contributes to the finding from chapter six, which revealed that managing one’s emotions represented an important aspect of adaptation processes.

The prediction that the type of coping orientation would moderate the level of state which determines the perceptions of threat was tested subsequently (Figure 9), producing an interesting pattern of results: it showed that depending on the coping profile people adopted, different states were salient predictors of different threats. It was expected that the lower specific identity-state would lead to the perception of threat to that specific identity state. Such relationship was not characteristic for all of the three coping orientations.

For those who used collective/interpersonal coping orientation (Collectives), states of continuity, self-efficacy and self-esteem had a very strong impact upon the respective threats, indicating that for the collective orientation, the chronic low states of continuity, self-efficacy and self-esteem induced the experience of threat. Furthermore, the exclusive one-to-one relationship between the state and the threat existed only for continuity principle.

Self-esteem was predictive of distinctiveness threat. Unlike the growing literature on distinctiveness (e.g. Brewer, 1991; Branscombe et al., 1999; Mlicki and Ellemers, 1996; Jetten, Spears and Manstead, 1999) where it is argued that distinctiveness may be an identity-motive providing the meaning for an identity quite independently from self-esteem, the current study seems to provide evidence that, for this group of people, distinctiveness is an aspect of the evaluative process in the search for positive identity (Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Breakwell, 1987). Furthermore, there is some evidence that for those using collective coping orientation, invariably seen to be a coping alternative of high identifiers, the need for distinctiveness may override the need for positive identity.
(Doff, 1998, cited in Branscombe et. al, 1999). Yet again, self-esteem seems to be the only predictor of the threat to distinctiveness in this study. This may well be, however, due to the failure of capturing a true nature of distinctiveness state in the current study, thus other identity-motives stepping in. For instance, the distinctiveness derived from the position of a person within one's social network (Vignoles et al., 2000) may have been the main source of distinctiveness for these respondents, so that, when the measure of distinctiveness state was not operationalised as such, self-esteem state took over as a predictor. This speculation is probable, given the amount of negative affect that the Collectives have experienced with respect to social support change.

The Collectives have experienced threat to self-efficacy when their self-efficacy and continuity states have been made salient. Low levels of continuity can often be found to co-occur with the low levels of self-efficacy. In fact, threat to self-efficacy may arise out of the break in the continuous sense of control over one's life:

"Here, my days are so monotonous, I have no friends here. The only bright point are these lessons of theology in our Church. However, I feel saturated, I can't see clearly any more, I often do not understand what people are saying, I can't cope with this any more. Back in Yugoslavia, I went to college, I used to be a good student, I'd had 26 years in a full-time employment,... this is now too much, I am too tired to start learning the language all over again. And where can I start from here? From cleaning and nannying... " (Female, 46, Croatia)

For those using collective coping orientation, neither self-efficacy state nor continuity state could be successfully regulated, thus resulting in the experience of threat to self-efficacy. The perceived lack of sources of support within collective institutions supporting the identity (e.g. lack of support within local ethnic communities) may have exacerbated low self-efficacy, leading to threat. Also the changes – at both macro and micro-social level, may have made those using collective coping orientation even more vulnerable in the face of social discontinuity. For instance, by focusing one's efforts upon
maintenance of efficacy and continuity through the collective orientation, the coping efforts may result in the changes in identity that have previously been unforeseen. If the need for change and adaptation to the new circumstances is not fostered (and the collective orientation is often precipitated upon a very insular attitude), than the discontinuities between the past and the present will grow with time, and these will most probably be reflected in one domain that individuals find particularly difficult to cope with – sense of control.

Similarly, self-esteem state and self-efficacy state are salient sources of threat to self-esteem, in tandem. Overall, the lack of clear one-to-one relationship between threats and states for this group of people indicates that the way people perceive threats to their identity will be contingent upon the identity-motivation (state) most likely to gain salience given the specific coping orientation chosen. It seems that for the Collectives, the coping strategy used failed to remove the threats. Extremely high correlation between the overall threat and overall state variables further confirmed that threats to these states were not removed when using collective/inter-personal strategies.

The Eclectics, or those who used a combination of strategies, had neither distinctiveness nor continuity threat predicted by any of the state variables, and only a small proportion of variance in self-esteem threat was explained by its state, whereas self-efficacy threat was explained by self-efficacy state. One conclusion to be drawn from this is that incorporating coping strategies which dealt with threat both at the level of interactive behaviour, and the intra-psychic processes, successfully removed threat to continuity and distinctiveness, attenuating the salience of the respective states as sources of threat. The absence of significant relationship between the overall threat and the overall state for this group of individuals further confirmed the findings that the eclectic use of coping seems to be working for this group of individuals.
However, the *Introspects* had an entirely different approach to dealing with threats. The preponderance of self-esteem as a predictor of distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem threats offers one conclusion: although inwardly focused coping regulated the states of self-efficacy and distinctiveness, another identity motivation — self-esteem — stepped in, thus affecting distinctiveness, efficacy and esteem threats. The use of intra-psychic strategies may have accentuated self-esteem as the main source of identity-evaluations. The effect of other identity-motivators such as self-efficacy or distinctiveness have either been mopped up by the prevalence of self-esteem as the most important motivating factor, or in fact, threats emerging from the low levels of these states have already been dealt with, thus leaving self-esteem as the remaining important source of threat. Of course, it is important to recognise that whether the salience of a particular identity state was the effect of the specific coping orientation, or has primed a specific way of coping, is unresolved. All in all, intra-psychic coping will interact with the need for positive identity, which will define whether one will perceive him or herself as insufficiently distinctive, non-efficacious or indeed low in self-esteem. Given that the three coping styles were not associated with different identity-states, and that there was a very strong and highly significant correlation between overall identity threats and states for the *Introspects*, it is possible to conclude that the intra-psychic strategy disconnected specific threats from the specific states, instead allowing other states to take over in salience.

As argued in chapter three, self-esteem is not the universal motivator from which threats to identity are evaluated and perceived. However, if one’s actions and thoughts are primarily focused inwardly, thus attenuating negative affect (as seen from the above MANOVA), in the event of self-esteem state being low for this group of people, it will become the most pervasive source of different types of threats, influencing people’s self-evaluations.
There is also a possibility of certain situational determinants of people’s identity-operation that converged for this group of respondents, resulting in self-esteem being salient for the operation of identity. The descriptive statistics indicated that this group of people – the *Introspects* – had the highest incidence of negative life events happen to them compared to the other two groups. Therefore, the type of the negative life events experienced may have induced convergence in personal/subjective meaning of the position of threat, generating similar coping and adaptation processes.

In conclusion, current set of results have shown that within the population of immigrants from the same cultural background, who shared the context of their migration (in terms of their host-culture), there were three distinctive ways of dealing with threat: the group of people using mainly collective/inter-personal orientation; the group using mainly intra-psychic orientation; and those using the combination of the two. There were notable variations between these three groups in the ways and success of dealing with threats, variation in affective processes underlying identity-processes, as well as differences in the relative salience of the state determining the type of threat experienced, all contingent upon the coping style people adopted. Certain coping patterns more successfully removed threat (e.g. *Eclectics*) than others. Some coping orientations were associated with the preponderance of one identity-motivation over the other, in constructing and perceiving threats. It was shown here that different levels of coping were not mutually exclusive, but that individuals differed in the variety and range of coping employed.

Coping processes were not solely contingent upon the changes in the levels of self-esteem; rather, there was evidence that different types of coping interacted with different types of state to identity – such as continuity. The goal of this study to establish the pattern of interaction between identity states/threats and coping orientation in the process of adaptation was achieved, as it was shown that the patterning of threat is emergent out of a complex interaction between people’s coping orientation and the subjective meanings of different identity-states, that is their relative salience for an individual. This
supports some recent assumptions that different types of threat would be related to
different types of response, within a single minority group (Branscombe et al., 1999).
However, the pattern of results showed that within a minority group, similar type of a
threat would be associated with different responses, depending upon the salient identity-
state or identity-motivation to achieve meaningful identity in the new social environment.
This finding further contributed to the need to recognise the individual variations in the
way people deal with threatening situations.
Chapter Ten
DISCUSSION

The current research set out to explore the process of adaptation and identity-adaptation among the immigrants whose move was triggered by sudden, radical and long-term changes in their social context. Despite a vast literature in this area, the literature review revealed that much of the information about immigrants’ adaptation was incoherent, often contradictory and sometimes, its conceptualisations inadequate. It was necessary to first establish the prior conceptualisation and operationalisation of adaptation, before suggesting its more comprehensive model. The model proposed here differentiated between identity-adaptations as the changes in identity-structure, and adaptation processes as adaptive coping with threat.

The research reported in this thesis plotted the complex relationships between the sources of threat to identity, the level of threat, identity-state, emotional reaction and coping strategy. This is a significant contribution to the research to-date, as it shows that several models of identity/inter-group processes are inadequate. This research suggested a working model from which adaptation could be studied.

The following sections will identify a number of ways in which the findings in this research programme have contributed to and extended the prior research in this area, suggesting some theoretical and methodological improvements in this domain of study.

10.1 Identity-structure and social context

A vast number of studies on migrant population has been done within minority group status paradigm. The "minority group" studies are based on the assumption that, in certain contexts, categorising oneself in terms of a salient group will be guided by the
motivation to achieve a comparably favourable representation of the self in terms of that
group. The minority status is thus potentially threatening for the individuals concerned,
and this minority position within a new social structure will be dealt with by resorting to
a range of coping strategies. Such studies have been most powerfully expressed in the
paradigm of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and self-
categorisation theory (Turner et al., 1987, 1994). The implication of this paradigm for
migration literature is the assumption that the minority status would almost always be
threatening, leading to the migrants either moving away from their in-group or behaving
in a way that enhances their group's position either cognitively or socially as well.

However, application of this paradigm has not always been successful. Among the
problems delineated has been the theory's assumption that the minority group position
would directly affect immigrants' self-evaluations, failing to recognise that its impact will
be felt as long as that identity-aspect is indeed important in an individual's overall
identity structure. This research pointed to the importance of studying identity-structure
as comprised of its identity-elements. Also, the temporal perspective of identity was
shown to be an important determinant of the way identity-aspects were constructed, and
the threat perceived.

In this research-programme (chapter six), it has been shown that, although individuals
recognised the minority status of their new position as migrants, they did not necessarily
derive their self-evaluations from this category of identification. This was often achieved
by selection of the social context that made different aspects of identity salient. However,
it was demonstrated that this selective process did not happen at random. For this group
of participants, sense of continuity was particularly pertinent. Prior research rarely
brought to bear the question of diachronic nature of identity and group relations. This was
reflected in many minority-group studies failing to conduct the prior checks of the
chronic, temporal importance of ethnic identity, or examining the historical conditions of
inter-group relations. Low minority group identification (e.g. weak ethnic identity) was
usually taken to indicate self-rejection or individual mobility strategy in the face of threat, rather than the particular group membership not featuring as an important aspect of one's overall identity in the first place. The significant contribution of this research is that it focused upon temporal properties of identity: in chapter seven, it was found that the strength of in-group identification was not a predictive factor of the experience of threat and that the actual temporal perception of identity-change better predicted a range of identity-threats.

What the current studies also suggested was that, although the collective identity-aspects people endorsed (e.g. ethnic or Yugoslav category) were established as minority categories in the new social context, the way these related to the perceived threat differed for different types of collective identity-aspect. Whereas most of the minority status studies assumed that a minority group membership would be threatening, just a few of them accepted the possibility that different types of collective or “minority” identity-aspects would be related to different levels and types of motivation for inter-group action (e.g. Sagiv and Schwartz, 1998; Carr, Ehiobuche, Rugimbana and Munro, 1996; Barreto et al., 1999; Spears et al., 1999), and that, in fact, much of their meanings would be determined by their position in the identity-hierarchy relative to other aspects of identity (e.g. Hedge, 1998; Ros, Cano and Huici, 1987; Huici, Ros, Cano, Hopkins, Emler and Carmona, 1997). The significance of the current research rests in the recognition of the need to differentiate between different identity-aspects within an identity-structure, as this information may reveal the meaning-structures that underlie people’s identity-adaptations. In chapter six, for instance, it was shown that when faced with such complex context as the former-Yugoslavia, where there were many competing categories of identification and a very volatile social structure, individuals were selective in the choice of the identity-aspect that was most meaningful for their self-definition.

Although SCT (Turner et al., 1987, 1994) accepts that different categories indeed have different meanings, it is attributed to the causal role of social context. What this thesis
demonstrated, however, was that there was no direct link between the available categories of identification and the immediate social context (chapter six), and, even when such match was extant, that people differed in terms of the meanings they attributed to different categories (chapters six and seven), as well as contexts (chapter six). People perceived their social context in a way which suited their self-definitions.

It is important to recognise people's active role in perception of social context. It establishes a view of identity-adaptation as a constructive process, rather than a passive acceptance of the available stimuli, or complete adoption of the position (identity-aspect) ascribed to a migrant by the outside observers. It posits that the process of migration involves an interactive relationship between the migrant and his/her environment, recognising the reciprocal influences of the inter-group contact and migration processes. The recognition of an interactive relationship with one's social context also shifts the focus away from the immediate cognitive processes to the historical view of identity-adaptation. In order to understand their social context and their own position within it, individuals must be able to see it as it extends through time – from the past into the future. People's self-definitions are based on these temporal evaluations.

In the light of this, some hypotheses were made in chapter seven, with respect to different effects of the temporal representation of the distinct collective identity-aspects endorsed, and many of the hypothesised relationships seem to have supported the assumption in this thesis that identity-aspects adopted may have very different effects for identity-processes, depending on their history and meanings. The future research should therefore establish the content and the meanings of identity and its aspects as derived from their inter-relationships within the identity-structure, through time, before making conclusions about the psychological consequences of the minority-group membership in the specific socio-structural constellation.
It was argued in this thesis that different types of categories could be used to differing
effects among different individuals, such as when Yugoslav national category was used in
order to transcend inter-group comparison context, changing the perceiver level of
comparison to that of supra-category. Thus, for instance, endorsing a particular self-
category may not represent a path to de-individuation for all migrants, as postulated by
the SCT, but for some of them, it is a means of coping by establishing distinctiveness in
relation to both the in- and the out-group members.

This is a significant finding, as it has important implications for SCT (as well as SIT) for
a number of reasons. The distinction between different “levels of categorisation”,
characterising different identity-aspects in terms of a degree of perceiving oneself as
similar to the group-prototype (collective, de-individuated vs. personal, individuated) is
in fact difficult to sustain empirically, as identity has multiple functions. Although seen at
the group level, a category might have a function that leads to greater individuation. This,
of course, will depend on the meaning of an identity-aspect and its interrelationship with
other identity-components, but also on the motive that is a salient guiding principle for
identity in the given social context. In chapter six, we demonstrated how different
categories and roles (different aspects of identity such as ethnic and family identity) were
overlapping, influencing the meaning each identity-aspect would assume within this
interrelationship. In fact, social comparisons were often conducted taking more than one,
frequently conflicting identity-aspects as comparative basis (thus cross-cutting different
comparison dimensions). Such way of constructing one’s overall identity contributed to
the idiosyncratic way of defining specific identity and the variations in perceiving threat
to identity. It was also shown in this thesis that the overall identity-structure and people’s
own construction of its changes were significant parameters relating to the four identity-
motivations and threats to continuity, self-efficacy, distinctiveness and self-esteem, as
seen in chapters seven and eight.
So, the role of categorical self-definition is not just in maximising the meaning of an identity-aspect in a particular social context in terms of the meta-contrast ratio (as the main principle of categorisation process). There has been some speculation as to what extent positive self-categorisation is a guiding principle of identity. In this thesis it was demonstrated that a search for continuous, distinctive and self-efficacious identity were also a desirable ways of constructing the meaning for identity. Furthermore, some evidence was presented here showing that an identity-component was often defined in terms of inter-personal relations, thus short-cutting the self-categorisation process. In fact, the changes in immediate social relationships represented a potent source of threat to identity. It was shown in this thesis that different social relationships were indeed implicated in different self-definitions (through the correlations between identity-aspects and social relationships). These findings contributed to the current debate about the status of cognitive, self-categorising processes as the only way of establishing the meaning for one’s identity; what the findings in this thesis showed was that, in fact, much of the meaning for people’s identity was derived from the social ties they endorsed – meaning-making rarely happens in isolation from relational processes.

Thus, a self-category will be used for self-definition in a particular context to the extent to which this identity-aspect will be maximally meaningful in this context, which may not be only with reference to macro-societal factors. Furthermore, the meaning is not an inherent property of a particular category (entirely dependent upon categorical representation of reality), but will be related to different ways people construct this reality, and this will depend upon the way people are motivated to achieve this meaning. This was defined in this research programme in terms of four identity-principles of continuity, self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy. Second, the meaning of an aspect of identity will further be achieved in an overall identity-structure of identity. The structure of identity embellishes each individual aspect of identity with the meaning derived from its position in relation to other identity-aspects. Within a structure, different identity-aspects will have different importance, and the way they will be implicated in
self-definition will largely depend upon the extent to which their inter-related and individual meanings help an individual achieve the desired identity end-state. Studies seven and eight showed that overall identity-structure and the way it is perceived in time indeed significantly related to the way people perceived their four identity states and the threats associated with them.

Given these different determinants of the way people would achieve meaningful identity – that is, that both social context and categories of identification are not a given, but evolve in the active process of construction in order to maintain the desirable levels of identity-states, the constructs of the normative and comparative fit postulated by SCT seem to be difficult to sustain.

Future study of identity-adaptation of immigrants and minority groups should not focus upon just one dimension of their identity – that dimension assumed by the researcher to be the salient determinant of their life-outcomes. The study of immigrants’ identity-adaptation should be embedded within a model of identity which recognises the importance of idiosyncratic ways of achieving self-definition in a particular context, developing measures that will incorporate these constructive processes. These measures should tap the participants’ own constructions of their identity through time. They should measure the relative importance of different aspects in the structure of identity and provide a more detailed account of the extent to which the meanings between them overlap. This is important, as it allows better understanding of the individual variation in the likelihood and the type of threat experienced when a person is likely to be vulnerable.

10.2 Threats to identity

Migration involves palpable challenges to different aspects of self-definition, in the process of maintaining a desired identity-state. This has made the investigation of the motivating factors in adaptation process (identity-states), and the threats ensuing when
these are challenged, the focus of this thesis. In fact, the definition of processes of adaptation adopted here was in terms of a constructive process of coping with threats to identity. This research made the following significant contributions to the current understanding of identity-processes and adaptation, as it: examined the types of threat likely to be experienced and the relationships between the sources of threat; emphasised the need of distinguishing between the position of threat and the experience of threat.

It was pointed out in this thesis that most of the prior research failed to distinguish between the objective and subjective definitions of what constitutes threat: within “stress-paradigm” research, stress has been often confounded with the measures of the more enduring characteristics of an individual (Berry, 1998; Lazarus, 1997; Thoits, 1983a); and in the social identity paradigm it has been assumed that the experience of threat would be inherent to the position of threat such as minority-group status (e.g. Ellemers et al., 1988, 1993; Ellemers and van Knippenberg, 1997). Furthermore, the group of studies conducted within the SIT paradigm theorised about threat to just one identity-motivation of self-esteem.

The weaknesses of some of these models were addressed in this thesis by some conceptual and methodological refinements of the construct of threat. We have commenced this research programme by making two very important assertions: a) the need of considering identity-threats other than self-esteem was recognised; Breakwell’s (1986) classification of identity-threats into threat to continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy was adopted in this research; b) the importance of making a conceptual and operational distinction between identity-states and the more transient experience of threat was emphasised. Identity-states were defined as enduring motivations for continuity, self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy, whereas identity-threats have been predicted to emerge when people’s own perceptions of the level of desirable identity end-states have been challenged. It was believed here that by clarifying this distinction, the danger of attributing certain reported effects to the
occurrence of threat where they instead were the evidence of an established way of conceptualising one’s identity, would be avoided.

Both qualitative (chapter six) and quantitative study (chapters seven, eight, nine) confirmed the distinction between four identity-threats. In chapter eight, four distinct paths emerged which explained continuity, self-esteem, distinctiveness and self-efficacy threats. Each identity-threat of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy were characterised by distinct sources of threat, and different patterns of relationships between the sources which included identity-states, identity-structure change, changes in the immediate social context, emotions as well as life-experiences. Postulating the working model of adaptation-process, we argued that threats to identity would be constructed depending on cultural, developmental, contextual as well as individual factors. The cultural and developmental effects (through the processes of social influence and representation) were not explicitly studied here. However, it was possible to infer their potent role through the considerations of different meanings of the macro-social categories (e.g. ethnic, Yugoslav, religious), micro-social changes (changes in social support) and demographic categories (e.g. age, sex), in relation to threat and state variables, as seen in chapter seven. Also, it was demonstrated in this research-programme that for all types of threat, people’s construction of the changes in their identity structure, as well as the changing patterns in their social network were related to threat both directly, and indirectly, through identity-states. Furthermore, emotions provided these changes with meaning, as they frequently represented the mediating variables of these relationships.

The significance of these findings is not only in that they supported the recognition of the need of giving the four identity-motives and threats of continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy (Breakwell, 1986) an equal status in theories of identity. They also demonstrated the ways in which the four identity-threats (defined by the operation of these motives) could be differentiated in terms of their sources. These findings
contributed to the growing literature that has recognised the need for the inclusion of identity-motivations other than self-esteem into theoretical models of identity (e.g. Abrams and Hogg, 1988; Deaux, 1993; Brewer, 1991; Breakwell, 1986). The second issue raised in this thesis was that of the distinction between the four states of identity as main motivational processes, and threats to these states. This distinction was an important step toward specifying at what point a position of threat would be experienced as threatening. The findings reported in this research-programme confirmed this distinction between the two constructs. The way people perceived threat was found to be strongly related to their levels of identity-states. Further support for this conceptual distinction was found in the fact that distinctiveness threat was not characterised by one-to-one relationship with its state. There was also some indication that people conceptualised the identity-motive of continuity in different ways (chapter six). On the basis of these findings, it was concluded here that there were variations in the ways people constructed different identity-motives guiding their perceptions of threat, and that future conceptualisations and operationalisations of identity-threats should take into account different ways in which people construct the underlying identity-states (identity-motives).

The major contribution of this finding rests in it showing that, if there are varying ways in which people conceptualise their identity-states, and if the low scores on these are not always indicative of the presence of threat, it is the task of the researcher to understand the cultural/normative, developmental but also intra-individual particularities of the sample under investigation, when trying to develop or explain models of psycho-social processes. Such sensitivity to the cultural and temporal (historical and biographical) issues should aid our understanding of the aspects of the social context in which threats to identity are likely, and guide the construction of measures in a way which will recognise different (culturally, historically and developmentally-specific) levels at which some psychological phenomena are expressed. Future research should, therefore, aim to
separate the measures of identity states and other sources of threat, and the experience of threat.

This distinction between the position and the experience of threat is further supported by another significant finding in this thesis. Certain contexts that have traditionally been conceptualised as supportive (e.g. enlarged social network or increased frequency of contacts), or others that have been thought of as stress or threat-inducing (e.g. negative life-events), were not found in this research to be directly correlated with threat, or often impacted upon it in an unexpected direction. The interpretation of such results might either accept that threat was never experienced with respect to these, and that the social context (e.g. social support or negative life-events) did not have the expected meaning for the individuals in question, or, that the coping strategies ensued which modified the meanings of social changes and alleviated threat. In future, the measures should be developed which are culturally sensitive, whereby constructs such as perceived changes in the social network as well as negative life-events incorporate the cultural/normative representations of these constructs. This way, assuming the threatening effect of (what an observer considers) a negative experience, where it is either a cultural norm, or a part of the myth explaining certain frequently occurring changes in order to establish habitual ways of coping with them would be avoided. For instance, loss of family-members in war might have different explanations and attributions in the countries where war is a relatively frequent occurrence, then where war is rarely experienced. This leads us to the issue of the role of coping: if little threat is experienced, is it indicative of the low threat, or of the coping strategy changing the bases on which the initial perceptions of threat will be precipitated?

10.3 Coping with threats

An act of adaptation (or adaptation process) was defined in this thesis as coping with threats to identity. The lack of one-to-one relationship between threat and state in the case
of distinctiveness, as well as some unexpected findings that indicated the existence of within-group individual differences in responding to threat reported in chapters seven and eight, posed the question whether the coping people used successfully removed the threat to the specific state. The study reported in chapter nine was conducted with the aim of investigating the issues surrounding the role of coping as a process of adaptation. In the previous literature coping has either not been directly measured and inferred from the measures of the identity-aspect assumed to be endorsed, i.e. the levels of group identification (e.g. Ellemers et al., 1988; Ellemers et al., 1993) or, when measured independently from identification, the variations in coping response have been attributed to the degree of identification along a single category of identification in interaction with contextual factors (e.g. group permeability, legitimacy, stability) (e.g. Verkuyten and Neke, 1999; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1995; Branscombe et al, 1993; Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, 1999).

However, it was argued here that the coping people adopt would depend upon cultural, contextual as well as individual factors. It would interact with the way people construct their needs for continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficacy. In this sense, it would be both contextually and culturally determined, as certain ways of constructing identity would be preferred culturally, and certain actions of coping with challenges to these definitions would be constrained contextually. Thus, there would be notable differences within a single group of migrants in terms of their patterns of coping, and this would be emergent from the specific – both cultural and idiosyncratic ways of defining their identity-states.

In chapter nine it was first determined that there were indeed individual variations within the population under investigation in terms of the coping patterns adopted, and these included the use of a range of strategies spanning intra-psychic and collective/inter-personal coping. Some of these coping profiles incorporated both levels of coping. Different coping profiles were characterised by different cognitive-affective processes.
There were some variations in the ways these different groups of people experienced threat.

In order to explore the adaptation processes from which these variations were derived, simple interactions between identity states and coping were examined in order to establish the likelihood of a particular coping to curtail threat. This was tested in detail in the study reported in the final part of chapter nine. Indeed, it was found that some coping profiles were, overall, more successful than others, and also that for different coping styles, different identity-states were salient predictors of perceptions of threat.

This finding adds to the available literature which illustrates that different threat-related coping responses will be expected for different types of threats (e.g. Branscombe et al., 1999), although contributes to it the evidence that these threats are in turn evaluated on the basis of the identity-motivations that are salient for the particular coping style.

We are not arguing that the particular patterning of the way specific identity-states relate to the specific coping style is intrinsic or unalterable. For instance, it may not be that for those using mostly intra-psychic coping strategies, self-esteem will always be the most salient identity-state guiding the perceptions of various types of threats. Such interaction may be culturally and situationally specific to this particular group of respondents, as well as specific to their identity structure and its content. Recent literature has recognised that this interaction between what is experienced as threatening and how it is responded to is dependent upon the content of identities, that is the extent to which one is identified with a group (see Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1999). However, strength of identification with a single category of self-definition as the determinant of this relationship is a reductionist way of conceptualising the way people derive meaning for their identity and respond to threats to it. As mentioned above, meanings are constructed within an overall structure of identity. Furthermore, they affect the salience of a particular identity-state from which self-evaluations are derived. Knowing the type of a threat to which an
individual responds may still not allow predictions of the type of a context in which threats will be experienced and for what types of threats responses will be observed. Understanding the salient motivations (identity-states) from which people derive perceptions of threat (and aligned identity-content, cultural as well as contextual determinants of these) is also crucial, and this should be focus of future research.

This thesis explicitly tested the relationships between the type of identity-motivation, threat and coping strategy, which, to our knowledge, has not been done anywhere else in the research to-date. Investigating these relationships is important since otherwise, the failure to observe threat may be wrongly attributed to either it not being salient for the specific group of immigrants, or be treated as evidence of coping. Future research should be able to draw unambiguous conclusions from the observed effects. We would also add that it is necessary to maintain the conceptual distinction between identity-states as evaluative sources of threat and the experience of threat, when investigating their relationship with coping. For what type of source of threat particular way of coping pattern would be observed within a specific sample should be an important indicator of what the potential way of helping a specific refugee population could be. Assuming that all refugees suffer from the same unresolved conflicts is wrong (e.g. the experience of loss, a phenomenon studied widely in migration literature, may not necessarily be threatening to one’s sense of continuity, and this depends upon the way people construct the motive of continuity). Different identity motivations may be salient for different individuals, and this will depend upon cultural, contextual and individual factors.

An important caveat is due here: although throughout this thesis individual as well as cultural influences in defining the way end-states of identity can be achieved and their importance relative to each other have been emphasised, this does not deny the universality of the processes functioning in these constructions. The theoretically defined process of identity may not vary historically or cross-culturally, rather, their manifestations may do so. Different ways in which identity-motivation is constructed and
self-defineds are arrived at in a person's interaction with their social and physical environment may vary phenomenologically, however, the processes underlying these variations remain the same. Therefore, the findings in this study reflected characteristic manifestations of identity-adaptations and adaptation process among a specific group of migrants from the former-Yugoslavia arriving to Britain under particular socio-historical conditions. This is not to deny, however, that certain conceptual definitions investigated here transcend historical, cultural or biographical specificity, such as the fact of threats and identity-states, the fact that identity-structure exists and relates to the experience of threat, etc. Therefore, although the specific situation of the migrants in the current research programme should not be used to explain the situation of other migrant groups, this research has established a conceptual framework from which the situation of other cultural groups should be modelled.

10.4 Some methodological issues

Some problems with the retrospective design employed and data collected in this study were to some extent already discussed in chapter five. Also, the constraints facing the researcher in the process of data-collection in terms of the pool of migrants willing to participate were delineated. There may have been systematic differences between the respondents who were willing to participate and those who were not. For instance, the sensitive nature of the study and the need of the researcher to establish a very trustful and close relationship in the process of conducting the research might suggest that the interview-situation in itself was a coping strategy for many respondents, and that the information about migrant-adaptation was built into or even concealed by the very method used to gauge these processes. The very research setting may have made certain aspects of identity more salient, may have encouraged certain coping behaviour, or contributed to the re-structuring of what was to be considered a threat. However, as indicated by Giddens (1991), in the situation of high modernity, it seems that these reflexive processes can not be avoided. Instead, the aim of the future research should be
to incorporate the measures of this self-reflexivity as much as possible, or devise the measures which take into account the sensitivity of questions. For instance, respondents could be questioned at the end of the interview of the extent to which they are thinking about the issues raised in the interview differently, or the extent to which they have become aware of these issues as a consequence of the research. This should be a crude measure of the extent to which the research process induced certain responses where they would not have otherwise been observed or experienced.

The retrospective method of data-collection may have concealed the causal sequencing of the observed phenomena: for instance, whether continuity threat was experienced for those using only collective/inter-personal coping because this type of coping strategy was failing, or because the level of threat for this group of respondents was so high that they had chosen to avert their attention away from the painful experiences by switching to this type of coping, could not be established in this thesis. However, given the scope of the research, this was not necessarily the goal of this thesis. The important novelty introduced here was that the real interaction between different types of identity-states, threat, and coping was tested and supported, contributing to the newly emerging evidence against the assumption of the uniform response to a position of threat (for instance in a single migratory group), and also resolving the issue of confounding of the enduring identity-characteristics and the experience of threat. Future work should employ prospective as well as retrospective design in order to establish the interplay between the immediate effect of the change triggering possible coping, and the effect of coping in changing the version of these events a posteriori, when reflecting upon these changes.

10.5 Conclusions

This thesis has brought to the attention that migrant adaptation processes and identity-adaptations can not be studied outside of an explicit model of identity that takes into account the complex relationship between intra-psychic and socio-historical factors. In
future, more refined conceptual definitions and operationalisations of adaptation should be constructed with the awareness of variations in people's conceptualisations of what constitutes threat to their identity and their response to it. It is wrong to assume that any one categorical identity is inherently problematic in a particular social context. Instead, the information about threats to identity should be derived from the awareness of how people construct their identity as well as the context in which it is expressed, in order to achieve the desired levels of continuity, distinctiveness, self-efficacy and self-esteem.
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APPENDIX I

Interview-schedule

Topic (I): THE OPENING QUESTION AND THE ARRIVAL TO THE UK

1) Will you tell me something about yourself?
2) When did you arrive here and why?
3) How would you define your decision: as forced or voluntary? What triggered the decision to move?
4) How much did you know about Britain before you moved?

Topic (II): PERCEPTIONS OF THE HOME-COUNTRY

1) How did you think of your country when you were making a decision to leave? To what extent did it influence your decision to leave?
2) What did you think about your position in the society at the time?
3) How did you perceive the war that was emerging at the time? How did you relate to it?
4) What do you think was a general perception or the general climate in the country with respect to emigration: e.g. the general attitudes towards emigration, general attitudes towards the recipient country (Britain).
5) Did you always believe that you were going to leave the country?

Topic (III): WHO ARE YOU? and HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY?

1) How do you identify?
2) Do you think that you belong to any culture or people? What are the characteristics of the culture you belong to?
3) How does it feel to belong to your ethnic/social group? How important is it to you?
4) What does it mean to be a (Serb, a Croat, etc.)? And how does it change over time and with migration?
5) Has your conception of your identity changed since you have arrived into this country, or
since the beginning of the conflict?

6) How does it make you feel?

Topic (III): HOW DO THEY (BRITISH) SEE HOME-CULTURE?

1) How different is British culture from your own?
2) How do you think they perceive you?
3) How do you think they perceive immigrants in general? Do they perceive you in the same way and how does it affect you?
4) How do these views make you feel about yourself?
5) Do you think their perception is accurate?
6) In that respect, have you changed in the way you value yourself?

Topic (IV): OUR ETHNIC COMMUNITY IN BRITAIN:

1) Do you have any contact with the ethnic community you belong to here? How would you describe it?
2) Do you think they offer enough support to the newcomers?
3) How would you describe the ethnic community's relationship with the British society?
4) Do you think your ethnic group is discriminated against?
5) Do you think that you personally are discriminated against and why?
6) How does it make you feel?

Topic (V): ADAPTATION:

1) How satisfied are you with your life here?
2) Do you feel you have adapted to this life/culture? In what respect? Do you want to adapt to it?
3) Tell me something about the British culture: how much do you think you know about it? How much do you understand it? How much do you value it?
4) Did you know much about the British culture when you came here?
5) How do you see yourself in this country/culture? Do you see yourself to be a part of this culture?

6) If not, why? Do you think of yourself as migrant/refugee/stranger? How do you feel about it?

**Topic (VI): SOCIAL SUPPORT AND GENERAL SATISFACTION WITH LIFE:**

1) Who are your friends? Tell me about yours social circle. How much do these relationships mean to you?

2) How easy is it for you to form meaningful relationships with the people from Britain/other foreigners/other former Yugoslav nationals?

3) Tell me something about your family: Are you satisfied with your family life? How does it make you feel?

4) How do your social life and your relationships here compare to those in your home-country? How do you feel about it?

5) Who is in charge with your life now? Is there any difference between the extent to which you had control over you life in Yugoslavia and here, and how?

6) Do you think you are better off now in England than back home? In what sense (materially, spiritually, status-wise)?

7) Are you missing anything here and what is it?

8) How important is it to you?

9) Would you ever want to go back to your home-country and why?

**Topic (VII): COPING:**

1) How much do you think about your life here?

2) What is your biggest worry now?

3) How are you coping with it?

4) How do you feel about what you are now? (content, happy, sad, dissatisfied)

5) What would you like to be different now? How do you deal with it?

6) How do you think about your future?
Dear Participant,

The civil war in the former-Yugoslavia is one of the most vicious inter-ethnic conflicts in the recent European history, that pushed almost 3 million people out of their homeland. As such, it has received a huge media attention, and has been the main focus of the international politics and immigration policy-makers. However, there has been little interest in finding out about the psycho-social effects that this most recent tragic event has had for a large number of individuals forced to leave their country in response to the changes in their home-land. For this reason, we have decided to conduct a comprehensive research on the former-Yugoslavs’ experiences, their changing identities and processes of adjustment with migration. Our work is supported by the University of Surrey.

This survey-study is a second part of the research that already took place last summer here in Britain. Some of you have already participated in the first part of the study, and we would like to thank you very much for the help and co-operation you have given us by being interviewed. Already the information gained from this research is received with high interest among the social scientists in Britain.

We would like to ask you to help us in this project. It is very important that the questionnaire is completed by as many people as possible. We are interested in the experiences of all the people who have arrived to Britain from the former Yugoslavia after its disintegration, regardless of ethnic background, age, or current status in this country.

Some of the questions we ask, you may consider personal. We can assure you that whatever you tell us in the questionnaire will remain strictly confidential. We are registered holder of confidential information under the 1984 Data Protection Act, so all your rights are fully protected by law. You do not have to put your name on the questionnaire. Your answers will be completely anonymous.

We are sure that you will understand why this survey is so important, and we hope you will take part in it.

Yours sincerely,

Lada Timotijević,
SECTION 1

Q1. We would like to know how important different aspects of your identity were for you in the past, and are for you now. We will ask you to think about your different identities at three points in time: 1) how important each of the aspects of identity was for you in the past-prior to disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia, 2) how important they were for you just before you left the former-Yugoslavia, and 3) how important each aspect of identity is for you in the present. In order to do this, you are asked to choose one answer from a scale ranging from "Not at all important" (1) to "Extremely important" (7). If any of the given aspects of identity does not describe you (e.g. If you are unemployed, or are not a British citizen) please use the answer “Not Applicable” (9) from the scale below to indicate it.

Please do this by putting the appropriate answer into the box in each of the columns indicating different points of time: 1) Before Disintegration; 2) Before Migration; 3) In the Present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before Disintegration  | Before Migration  | In the Present  

1. my ethnic identity (Croatian, Muslim/Bosnian, Serbian, etc.)  
2. the (former) - Yugoslavian identity  
3. my occupation (current employment or a position as a student at the college/university)  
4. my family  
5. my material status  
6. British citizenship  
7. my religious identity (Catholic, Muslim, Orthodox or other)  
8. my social status  
9. my gender - being male or female
Q2. We will be interested to know how you feel about each of the aspects of identity now. You will be presented with a number of words describing different emotions. Please indicate to what extent each of the given emotions is associated with each one of your identities in the present. So please, think clearly about each emotion provided, and indicate your answer in the space provided for each of the 7 emotions given below. Please, use the scale below ranging from “Not at all” (1) to “Extremely” (5) to record your answers. If any of the given aspects of identity does not describe you, please use the “Not Applicable” (9) answer from the scale below to indicate it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not at all
- Neither/Nor
- Extremely
- Not Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>happy</th>
<th>angry</th>
<th>guilty</th>
<th>proud</th>
<th>uncom-</th>
<th>threat-</th>
<th>sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. my ethnic identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the (former) - Yugoslavian identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. my occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. my material status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. British citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. my religious identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. my social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. my gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q3. We will also be interested to know how you felt about each of the aspects of your identity at the time, prior to disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia. Like before, you will be presented with a number of words describing different emotions. We will ask you to tell us to what extent each of the emotions describes your past feelings about each one of your identities before disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia. Please use the scale below, ranging from "Not at all" (1) to "Extremely" (5) to record your answers. As above, for those identity-aspects that do not apply to you, indicate it by using the appropriate answer - "Not Applicable" (9) - from the given scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. my ethnic identity
2. the (former) - Yugoslavian identity
3. my occupation
4. my family
5. my material status
6. British citizenship
7. my religious identity
8. my social status
9. my gender
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Q4. We will be interested to know how you felt about each of the aspects of your identity at the time, prior to your migration from the former Yugoslavia. Like before, please use the scale below, ranging from “Not at all” to “Extremely” to record your answers, and if the identity aspect does not apply, indicate it by the appropriate answer (“Not Applicable”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. my ethnic identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the (former) - Yugoslavian identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. my occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. my material status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. British citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. my religious identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. my social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. my gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

happy angry guilty proud uncomfortable threatened sad
Q5. In this section we would like you to tell us about your relationships. First, you will be asked to indicate what are the most important relationships in your life now. Again, please do it by putting the appropriate response in the box provided. The range of possible answers is given on the scale below, ranging from "Not at all important" (1) to "Extremely important" (7). If any of these relationships are not applicable to your situation (e.g. because you have no experience of the particular relationship, such as having children of your own, or because such relationship does not exist any more - e.g. your parents have died), please indicate it by putting into the box the answer “Not Applicable”, (9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. family:

   parents/grandparents
   children
   siblings
   spouse/partner
   boyfriend/girlfriend

2. friends

3. work/student colleagues

4. superiors (e.g. mentor/supervisor, boss, etc.)

5. other foreigners / migrants (i.e. those of non-British cultural background)

6. members of the old ethnic community (e.g. the older generation of immigrants organized around the Church or ethnic community institution)

7. co-patriots within ethnic group (Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian, etc.)

8. other former-Yugoslavs

9. neighbours
Q6. The next question is designed to find out to what extent each of the above relationships has changed with your migration. In order to do this, you will be asked to indicate whether your relationships have changed in a) frequency of contacts on day to day basis; b) closeness or intimacy of these relationships, and c) material dependence upon these relationships. You have a possibility of using 5 alternative answers ranging from: "Decreased" (1) to "Increased" (5) to record the extent to which the three types of change (frequency, closeness and dependence) has occurred with migration. For instance, if you think that the frequency of contacts with other former-Yugoslavs has decreased a lot, put (1); if, however, the closeness of this relationship has slightly increased, put (4), and if your dependence upon them has remained the same as before, put (3). Like before, if the relationship is not applicable to your situation, indicate it using the option “Not Applicable” (9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Remained the Same</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 family:

- parents/grandparents
- children
- siblings
- spouse/partner
- boyfriend/girlfriend

2. friends

3. work/student colleagues

4. superiors (e.g. mentor, boss, etc.)

5. other foreigners / migrants

6. co-patriots within ethnic group
   (Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian, etc.)

7. other former-Yugoslavs

8. neighbours
Q7. Here, we would like to know what are the emotional effects of the overall change in the nature and pattern of your relationships. Please tell us how you feel about the overall change in your relationships. Please read the emotion words below and indicate the extent to which each of these emotions describes your feelings about the overall change in your social life. Use the scale ranging from “Not at all” (1) to “Extremely” (5) to record your answers. If, however, there has been no change in the pattern of your relationships, please move to the Section 3, Q8 in this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither/Nor</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…………… happy
…………… angry
…………… guilty
…………… uncomfortable
…………… excited
…………… sad
…………… empty
…………… content
…………… threatened

SECTION 3

Q8. In the following section we will present you with some statements that other people have made about themselves, describing their current aspects of themselves. We will ask you to tell us how true each of these statements is for you at the moment, and also how far you would wish to change these aspects described in these statements. In order to do this, you will be presented with two columns of answers: first one indicating how true of you the aspects of yourself described in the statements are, and the second one - how much change you would want with respect to each of these aspects of yourself. Please answer the questions by choosing an appropriate answer from the scale ranging from “Not at all” (1) to “Extremely” (7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How true of me How much I want it to change

1. No matter what comes my way, I am usually able to handle it.
2. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. 

3. I am in no way different than most of the people. 

4. I can solve most of the problems if I invest necessary efforts. 

5. On the whole, I stand out as an individual in comparison to others. 

6. There is no connection between myself now and myself in the past. 

7. I can not deal efficiently with unforeseen situations. 

8. All in all, I am happy with myself. 

9. I am not different to other people in the similar situation as me. 

10. There is no clear similarity between what I was in the past and what I am now. 

11. No matter what happens to me I stay the same sort of person. 

12. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. 

13. The unexpected events have not changed the sort of person I am. 

14. I stand out from other people who are from similar background. 

15. I easily lose my sense of control over my life when I face difficulties. 

16. I think that I am no good at all. 

Q9. Now, we will ask you to bear in mind the aspects of yourself that you want to change. Please tell us what you have done in order to bring about the change in these aspects? Otherwise, if you are satisfied with all these aspects of yourself, please go to the Q10. Please, write your answer in the free space provided below:
Q10. We are interested in the **ways you respond to difficult or stressful life-events associated with migration**. You will be asked about what you generally do and feel when you experience stressful events. Again, you will be asked to bear in mind two points of time: the period after your migration (Recently), and the period of your life prior to your migration and disintegration of the former-Yugoslavia (In the Past) stating how true of you each of these statements is of recently, and was in the past.

In order to do this there is a scale ranging from “Not at all True” (1) to “Absolutely True” (7). Please choose the answer that most accurately describes how you respond to stressful situations.

Choose your answers thoughtfully, and make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can. Please answer every item. There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers, so choose the most accurate answer for you - not what you think ‘most people’ would say or do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all True</th>
<th>Neither True Nor False</th>
<th>Absolutely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recently</th>
<th>In the Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I repress my emotions not to allow stressful situations to affect me.

2. I try not to think about the problematic situation.

3. I try to change as a person as a result of the experience.

4. I accept that this has happened and that it can’t be changed.

5. I tend to change myself in anticipation of a difficult situation.

6. I try to see the problem in a different light, to make it seem more positive.

7. I just laugh about the situation.

8. I decide not to think about that aspect of myself which has been negatively affected by the threatening situation.

9. I try to find comfort in my religion.

10. I try to join a pressure-group in order to change the way the society looks at the people in the similar situation as me.

11. I withdraw from the outside world in order not to feel uncomfortable about my situation.
12. I turn to work or other substitute, non-social activities (e.g. watching TV, sleeping, daydreaming, etc.) to take my mind off things.

13. I actively engage in organizing exchange of information among people who are in the similar situation as me.

14. I talk to someone who I think could do something about the problem to help me.

15. I take direct action to get around the problem.

16. I give up trying to get what I want.

17. I accept the need to change the way I behave in order to face the problem.

18. I like to gather together with other people who are in the similar situation so that we could share our feelings and thoughts about the problem.

19. I try to make other people understand and appreciate my position and cultural background.

20. I oppose the demands to conform to the pressures of the changing circumstances.

21. I refuse to believe that it has happened.

22. I try to avoid the people in the similar situation and background as me and stick closer to those better-off.

23. I accept that I have to behave the way other people expect of me under the changed circumstances.
Q11. Now, we will ask you to bear in mind the answers you gave in Q10 about the ways you have coped with stressful situations associated with your migration. We will now ask you to give us your evaluation of the coping strategies you have used in the recent past, after your migration. Please, indicate whether you agree or not with the following statement by choosing the answer from the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On balance, I find that the way I have dealt with stressful situation proved to be:

1. effective
2. threatening to my sense of self
3. a good compromise solution
4. a failure
5. too demanding
6. coincidentally positive for other areas of my life
7. coincidentally deleterious for other areas of my life
8. helpful in maintaining my previous sense of self
9. helpful in changing my self-concept for the better

We would appreciate if you could give us some information about yourself:

Q12. Are you ....  

male □  female □

Q13. How old are you?  

................. years

Q14. Are you ....

single □
married □
living with a partner □
divorced □
Q15. Are you currently.... in paid employment □ □
in unpaid/voluntary employment □ □
studying □ □
retired □ □

Q16. Which of the following do you think best describes you?
   Working class □ Middle class □
   Upper class □ None of these □

Q17. How long have you been living in this country? ................ years

Q18. Do you think of yourself as belonging to any ethnic group? yes □ no □

Q19. If yes, how would you define that group? ...........................................

Q20. Have you ever been prosecuted, imprisoned or tortured in the course of the most recent conflict in the former-Yugoslavia? yes □ no □

Q21. Has any member of your family been prosecuted, imprisoned or tortured in the course of the most recent conflict in the former-Yugoslavia? yes □ no □

Q22. Have you lost any member of your family as a consequence of the war in the former-Yugoslavia? yes □ no □

Q23. Have you lost any material possessions as the consequence of the war in the former-Yugoslavia? yes □ no □

If YES, please specify the extent of the loss:
........................................................................................................................................

If there is anything else you wish to add, please do so in the space underneath.

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY!