

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

Faculty of Social Science

Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies

Arsen Danylyuk

**CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF PERCEPTIONS OF DISCRIMINATION
AMONG RUSSIAN-SPEAKERS OF ESTONIA**

Master Thesis

Supervisor: Piret Ehin, PhD

Tartu 2018

I have written this Master's thesis independently. All viewpoints of other authors, literary sources and data from elsewhere used for writing this paper have been referenced.

.....

/ signature of author /

The defence will take place on */ date /* at */ time /*

..... */ address /* in auditorium number */ number /*

Opponent */ name /* (..... */ academic degree /*),
..... */ position /*

Non-exclusive license for reproduction of thesis and providing access of thesis to the public

I, Arsen Danylyuk

(author's name)

(personal code _____),

herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to:

Causes and Consequences of Perceptions of Discrimination among Russian-Speakers of Estonia

(title of thesis)

supervised by Piret Ehin,

(supervisor's name)

1. To reproduce, for the purpose of preservation and making available to the public, including for addition to the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright.
2. To make available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives until expiry of the term of validity of the copyright.
3. I am aware that the rights stated in point 1 also remain with the author.
4. I confirm that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe the intellectual property rights or rights arising from the Personal Data Protection Act.

Tartu, _____ *(date)*

_____ *(signature)*

Table of Content

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2. Perceived Discrimination: Causes and Effects | 9 |
| 2.1 Main Concepts - Perceived Discrimination..... | 9 |
| 2.2 Theoretical Background: Social Identity Theory and Proposed Correlates of Perceived Discrimination | 10 |
| 2.2.1 <i>Determinants of Perceived Discrimination</i> | 12 |
| 2.2.2 <i>Socio-Demographic Determinants of the Perceived Discrimination</i> | 16 |
| 2.2.3 <i>Impact of Perceived Discrimination on Political Attitudes</i> | 20 |
| 2.3 Hypotheses | 23 |
| 3. Empirical Analysis and Results | 25 |
| 3.1 Status of Russian Speakers in Estonia..... | 25 |
| 3.1.1 <i>History</i> | 25 |
| 3.1.2 <i>Current State of Affairs</i> | 26 |
| 3.2 Methodology | 28 |
| 3.2.1 <i>Selection of the Dataset</i> | 28 |
| 3.2.2 <i>Selection of Statistical Methods</i> | 29 |
| 3.3 Operationalization of Selected Variables | 31 |
| 3.4 Descriptive Statistics | 32 |
| 3.5 Determinants of Perceived Discrimination among Russian Speakers in Estonia 35 | |
| 3.6 Perceived Discrimination as a Determinant of Institutional Trust of Russian Speakers in Estonia | 37 |
| 3.7 Summary of Empirical Findings | 39 |
| 4. Discussion and Conclusions | 40 |
| Bibliography..... | 45 |
| Appendices..... | 51 |

Abstract

Perceived discrimination as a social and political phenomenon has received considerably less academic attention in post-Soviet countries than, for example, in the United States or Western Europe. The following study aims to test whether Russian-speakers in Estonia have higher level of perceived discrimination than Estonian-speakers. Then, the author defines factors that determine perceived discrimination using binary logistic regression. Finally, it is tested whether perceived discrimination determines higher or lower levels of institutional trust. It is, consequently, concluded that Russian-speakers are generally more likely to feel discriminated against. Also, a set of factors that determine levels of perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers is defined, among which the strongest ones are presence/ absence of citizenship and employment status. Finally, the author found a causal link between perceived discrimination and institutional trust, whereas those Russian-speakers who feel discriminated against have lower levels of institutional trust.

Keywords: perceived discrimination, Russian speakers, Estonia.

1. Introduction

Most countries in the world are multiethnic. However, since the modern perception of state arose from the nation state model, often ethnic majority groups have a more privileged position in the society compared to ethnic minorities. As a legacy from the Soviet era, Estonia has a significant Russian-speaking minority which composes 25% of the entire population. The tensions between the Estonian-speaking majority and Russian-speaking corresponded with the geopolitical tensions between Russia, on the one hand, and Estonia and other Baltic countries, on the other. Given this, the problem of discrimination of Russian speakers in Estonia received additional attention from politicians, publicity and academia. In turn, this makes it even more important, from a social point of view, to look at how this is reflected on the subjective side by assessing levels of perceived discrimination in Russian speakers in Estonia.

The tension between the Russian-speaking and Estonian-speaking communities has deep historical background. Estonia managed to proclaim independence from Russian Empire when the latter was exhausted by the First World War and communist revolution. That-time government chose liberal path of state-building, which attracted many dissidents from the Soviet Union, mostly Russians, who, in fact, obtained cultural autonomy during the first independent period. However, persons who came to Estonia after 1940 and their descendants were not considered as indigenous Estonian residents.

The research evolves around three main research questions that are accordingly reflected with the posed hypotheses. The first research question is whether Russian-speakers in Estonia and ethnic Estonians differ in their levels of perceived discrimination. The second research question that author attempts to answer is a combination of factors that determine perceived discrimination in Russian-speakers in Estonia. Finally, the third research question of this study is whether perceived discrimination may impact political attitudes, namely institutional trust of Russian speakers in Estonia.

In order to properly answer these questions, the author has to fulfill several objectives. The first objective is to find substantial theoretical background for this research and study what has been done previously to research the given topic in other countries or using similar methodology. The second objective is to find factors that determine perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers in Estonia. The third

objective is to establish a causal link between perceived discrimination of Russian speakers and their political attitudes (institutional trust).

The academic relevance of the study is that there is a significant academic gap on the research of perceived discrimination in Estonia. On the other hand, perceived discrimination has been studied extensively in the United States and Finland, however, in Finland such studies have mostly utilized qualitative non-representative methodology (e.g. Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Solheim 2009). The study is very relevant in terms of its findings since it reveals that the group that feels discriminated against tends to disidentify itself with the majority population, which falls in line with the social identity theory, utilized as a theoretical background for the given research. The social identity theory has been successfully utilized in a number of studies of perceived ethnic discrimination, including the Latino community in the United States, where the national minorities were proved to disengage from interaction with the majority group to the extent of discrimination of the former (Wiley, Lawrence, Figueroa, Percontino 2013). However, this framework has not been utilized in Estonia. Further, the problem of disengagement appears to be one of the most crucial, especially for the societies that have significant share of minorities, making the issues of societal division very likely. Some of the studies suggest that the patterns of immigrants' disengagement from the mainstream culture and society is a case in most of the international communities, where the minorities were not indigenous, but came during recent stages of state-building. Such situation creates significant distance between the exclusive group of immigrants and exclusive or inclusive group of majority. The implication of cultural disengagement leads to substantial gaps and inconsistencies between the dominant identities of majority population and groups of minorities (Jensen 2008). While such frameworks were widely utilized for similar research in some multicultural states like the United States, the Netherlands and Finland, very little is known about the state of perceived discrimination of the Russian speakers in Estonia.

Discrimination in Estonia has not been complexly. Rather, scientists attempted to study some of the factors that might cause some ethnic groups to feel discriminated against. For example, Charles Kroncke specifically examined the wage discrimination in Estonia based on ethnic factor. He made a clear distinction between these two groups implying that there is discrimination in wages (Kroncke, Smith 1999). In contrary, my

research utilizes the quantitative methodology that has become possible with the introduction of new variables in the European Social Survey dataset. Moreover, perceived discrimination has been understudied in Estonia even with the convenient qualitative psychological approaches.

There is a substantial amount of studies that paid attention to objective discrimination, describing discrepancies in access to public goods, employment, wellbeing (Hughes 2005; Elsuwege 2004; Lauristing et al 2011). While the set of these articles may be helpful for the given thesis in terms of providing a background for reflection, there is still a lack of explanation of perceived discrimination, meaning that a subjective side of an issue is not discussed. Therefore, perceived discrimination of Russian-speakers in Estonia appears to be a very relevant topic.

The structure of the thesis reflects research questions posed by the author. First, theoretical background and a set of previous empirical studies will be outlined to establish a context of the research. Then, a simplified quantitative analysis will be carried out to test the first hypothesis. After, a two-stage empirical analysis will be delivered to address the second and third hypotheses of the study. Finally, the author offers his conclusions and discusses weaknesses of the given study and potential prospects for further research.

2. Perceived Discrimination: Causes and Effects

2.1 Main Concepts - Perceived Discrimination

Discrimination is defined as a behavioral representation of a negative attitude towards a particular group of people based on such factors as body appearance, race, age, ethnicity, political perceptions (Banks, Hudson, Kohn-Wood 2007). Typically, the concept of discrimination is referred to its objective nature, when certain discriminatory practices are observed from outside the actual interaction. Objective discrimination may be observed on the levels of legal treatment, cultural and ethnic relations, in case these patterns highlight tangible discrepancy treatment based on various factors such as gender, age, race and many others. On the other hand, assessing objective discrimination does not outline personal understanding of this problem from the discriminating and discriminated parties. Therefore, it is possible to utilize the concept of perceived discrimination. Pascoe and Richman (2009) define perceived discrimination as discrimination which is reported by the victims of discriminatory actions, and this may not be supplemented by the actual evidence, thus, posing a problem for academia and this research in particular. Therefore, the main distinctive feature of the perceived discrimination is that it was experienced by the subjects of social interaction and reflected on the cognitive level.

According to Hausmann, Kressin, Hanusa and Ibrahim (2010, 2), the perceived discrimination is the perception that one has experienced differential and negative treatment because one belongs to a particular group. According to Shaikh et al. (2005), this mode of discrimination is a “subjective experience of differential treatment based on appearance, language, religious or socio-cultural characteristics”. Further, the authors provide very applicable explanation of the difference between perceived and non-perceived discrimination, arguing that the perceived ethnic discrimination goes beyond the “objective” discriminatory cases noted by the third parties, not directly involved in the interactions; rather, it might be covert forms of discrimination, being noticed only by the victims, putting self-reports as the only viable source of this information.

2.2 Theoretical Background: Social Identity Theory and Proposed Correlates of Perceived Discrimination

The phenomenon of discrimination could be hardly called as an individual process. Instead, there is a common position that any type of discrimination is a process that involves large groups of people, which means that both discriminated and those who discriminate belong to social groups. Therefore, it leads to a perspective that discrimination is based on the social constructs such as race, ethnicity, gender etc. (Gardner, Gilbert, Fiske, 1998). While it remains a contested assertion that race and gender are purely social constructs, it is evident that ethnicity certainly is. Thus, from this perspective, it is justified to utilize the theory of social identity as a background for this study.

Most of the studies on the perceived discrimination, although conducted under psychological qualitative non-representative framework, are held under the theory of social identity (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Solheim 2009). It asserts that people tend to subjectively categorize themselves into “we” and “other” (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, Donaldson 2001). This categorization is implicitly determined by the externally constructed factors or, in other words, some characteristics such as language, age, race, ethnicity. In fact, under this framework, the perceived discrimination is defined as the feeling of unfair treatment based on the belonging to some group (Sanchez, Brock 1996). The general statement of this theory is that the discriminated and dominant groups co-exist within the shared space in their daily activities which put additional pressure on the former and may trigger anxiety and explicit confrontations.

The social identity theory originates from a series of studies conducted by Taifel and his assistants, who determined that an individual develops personal identity through the process of social categorization and further reference to particular groups (Teifel 2010). While the process is complicated and lengthy, a person defines his or her belonging based on shared characteristics such as race, ethnicity, language, gender and age. Therefore, finally, an individual creates a specific system of outlook: ingroups and outgroups, when the first is a group of belonging and the second is a group from outside. Simultaneously, when the person has a certain scheme of groups of belonging, he or she tries to implement or support the superiority of these group over other outgroups. In case if the superiority is established, a person obtains a positive self-

identification. However, on the other hand, if a person belongs to the inferior group which is evidently worse than other group (s), a person develops negative self-identity which results in attempts to belong to superior group or deprivation (Tajfel 2010). Negative self-identification may become a determinant of various societal issues, the most common of which is an attempt of an individual to eliminate any association with the group of belonging. In turn, often this leads to identity crisis, as personal frustration caused by not belonging to the superior group leads to deterioration of personal identities, involving cultural, ethnic, economic factors.

Tajfel (2010) grounded his Social Identity Theory on a set of empirical observations, and his main interest was driven by the ethnic and racial developments inside the country in 1960's, as well as preliminary military conflicts. Particularly, he studied the inter-group relations between the White and Black populations in the United States, successfully applying his theory to explaining the evolvement of specific cultural patterns of Black population. Similarly, he argued that presence of obvious inter-group boundaries (in this case it was race) determined very low integration of these groups and, hence, discrimination. Another example used by Tajfel was a general conflict between warring sides in military confrontations, whereas soldiers refer to some indicators of belonging to a certain group, e.g. clothes patches, language, color of skin to define "friends and enemies". Derived from this, reference to any sort of indicators facilitates individuals in process of distinction of others on "we" and "they", which in many cases leads to objective, and, consequently, perceived discrimination. From this, it is evident that the process of formal distinction of in-groups and out-groups is always determined by specific factors that could be identified by both sides. In reference to Tajfel's argument, it is clear that these factors are typically the most evident ones, and herein they will be called socio-demographic factors. These are the factors that depict some social characteristics of an individual, and they are visible for other members of society, and this is why Tajfel claimed that race and language are the strongest factors that define between-group boundaries. Based on the previous arguments, language and race are the factors that define disassociation between the groups, which, in turn, causes the feeling of being discriminated against in the minority group.

2.2.1 Determinants of Perceived Discrimination

Once again, it is important to note that perceived discrimination is a different concept from discrimination as an objective phenomenon. Thus, the former is a concept that is sensitive to the perception of the person or group of people that are subjected to actions that could be treated as discriminatory. Among the most obvious factors of perceived discrimination researchers outline color of skin, language, and culturally defined behavioral patterns (Phinney, Madden, Santos, 1998). While the skin color or other body features may not be relevant in this study, the issues of language and culture differences are expected to be relevant when analyzing Estonian and Russian-speaking communities in Estonia.

A set of studies indicate that perceived discrimination is often a case in multicultural societies, where there is a clear distinction between majority and minority groups (Linder 2010). However, there is still a dispute whether language disparities may be enough to trigger significant distancing between the ethnic groups and, thus, reciprocal discrimination. It is evident that language composes one of the most important, if not the most, elements of national identity of an individual (Simpson 2008). With the specific reference to Social Identity Theory, the people form groups based on the differences and similarities between those; thus, people with the same language are more likely to form a perceived group. Consequently, there is no question why national identities are so dependent on the common language, and why societies with several languages in use experience problems with national identities (Ukraine, Belgium, several post-Soviet countries). Taifel and his colleagues also developed a point that for member of one group it is very common to express favoritism, while individuals from outgroups are very likely to be discriminated, undervalued, criticized or humiliated. Therefore, from this standpoint it is evident that language is likely to become a determinant of discrimination, especially in the multicultural societies.

The feeling of discrimination may be specifically heated in those multiethnic societies where national languages are established, which is a case for most of the countries in the world. Typically, the concept of national language evolves around the issue of its privileged position, which, in turn, favors speakers of this language, and puts those who speak different language into an inferior position. This, in turn, expands the

gap between the superior and inferior groups which are often defined by the languages they speak, driving interethnic conflicts. Often, the conflict is determined either by the frustration of individuals from the inferior group with the fact that they cannot identify with the superior group due to the language they use, or with the exact fact that a part of their identity is considered as something negative.

While the occurrence of discrimination in multicultural societies is evident, it supports the point about the objective discrimination, but the perceived discrimination is still under question. Therefore, it is important to research more the factors that affect the perception of discrimination. The first factor that is believed to determine the extent of perception of discrimination is the clarity of the discriminatory action, while the more ambiguous action, when the reference to the group is blurred, discrimination may not be reported as perceived (Crocker 1999). For instance, according to this perspective, state policies that negatively treat certain ethnic groups may result in perceived discrimination, while the mistreatment at the workplace is likely to be referred to personal capabilities, thus, not assumed as discrimination.

Another significant determinant of the perceived discrimination is the repetitiveness of the discriminatory actions by the “typical” discriminators against “typical” victims. This works as a common scheme of convenient human interactions, reproduced through the social structure. While the studies present no evidence in the European countries, there is a significant scholar base of such researches in the US, which uncovered that the mistreatment from White people against African American people was often treated by the latter as discrimination, hence signaling about the perceived discrimination (Mills, Gaia, 2012).

Ethnicity incorporates a broad spectrum of factors that determine perceived discrimination. Some scholars suggest that when a person belongs to a minority group, he or she is more likely to report discriminatory actions from the people from majority group. This involves such factors as the level of knowledge of the language of the majority group and acculturation. On the other hand, people from minorities that were able to learn the language, accommodate behavioral patterns, convenient for a given entity, and develop a stable multicultural social network feel less discriminated (Stevenson 2010).

On the other hand, some social scientists are not sure about positive link between language and cultural assimilation and decrease of perceived discrimination. Some researchers suggest that the mentioned factors decrease the social distance between the minority and majority populations, although do not eliminate the differences between them (skin color, accent), thus, maintaining the principle of self-identity and distinguishing between “we” and “they”. Consequently, in some cases, the societal developments that were expected to reduce perceived discrimination, appear to facilitate it, bringing up great theoretical ambiguity in this research.

It is argued that perception of discrimination is a subjective action, therefore, it involves the process of cognition from the person who is being exposed to such actions. Consequently, some of the scholars disagree that perceived discrimination is uniquely dependent on the external societal characteristics, but rather, is derived from the inner personal specification. This is a so-called attributional approach to perceived discrimination which reviews beliefs and dispositions as the main determinants of perceived discrimination (Phinney, Madden, Santos, 1998). While numerous variables proved to correlate with perceived discrimination, two of them were outlined as the most significant, having the strongest links. The first socio-psychological determinant of high perceived discrimination is mastery or, in other words, control over life. As shown in a number of studies, people with lower sense of control over their lives tend to report discrimination more often (Cassidy, 2004). However, it was also proved that minorities in general tend to experience less control over their lives due to financial and other complications, caused by the majority populations, which makes unclear the nature of the causal link. The second important variable is self-esteem which, however, does not provide as clear evidence as the control over life. While some studies propose that low self-esteem led to more cases of reported discrimination, other support a point that high self-esteem leads to the higher level of perceived discrimination (Crocker 1999). It is then assumed that high self-esteem makes person think the negative events may not occur since the personal skills are high enough to prevent negative events, while the guilt is put upon the shoulders of “typical perpetrator”, majority population that usually discriminate minorities.

Another variable that may have an impact on the perceived discrimination is the level of personal competence, which results in the ability of an individual to communicate with the representatives of another group. While in case of ethnic discrimination this involves knowledge of the second language, it also involves the skill to maintain interactions with the representatives of a different ethnic group, which establishes that simply knowing a language is not enough, but the cultural and linguistic patterns are vital. Therefore, the frequency of communication with another ethnic group may have different effect on the perceived discrimination, since the level of competence is the crucial factor (Phinney, Madden, Santos, 1998). Therefore, it could be assumed that the higher personal competence as a variable has a significant impact on the level of perceived discrimination, regardless of the fact whether a person knows the language of the majority group.

Finally, a strong ethnic identity is believed to have reverse correlation with the levels of perceived discrimination, meaning that a weak national identity may lead to higher perceived discrimination. While it is evident that strong national identity correlates with high self-esteem (Gong 2007), the ambiguous nature of the latter complicates the prediction. However, a set of studies imply that having a strong national identity helps representatives of minorities to experience less perceived discrimination (Berry et al. 2006; Mossakowski 2003).

Therefore, it could be concluded that there are certain determinants of perceived discrimination that evolve around the social identity theory. The primary determinant of ethnic discrimination is the separation between ingroups and outgroups that result in favoritism towards the former and prejudiced attitudes towards the latter. Secondly, languages as the most important elements of national identities for groups that do not differentiate based on body features present a very significant determinant of intergroup discrimination that in case of society with clear majority population results into perceived discrimination towards the minority. The second factor of perceived discrimination is the clarity of the discriminatory action, therefore the ambiguous discrimination may not result into perceived discrimination. Thirdly, discrimination is more likely to become perceived if the traditional “typical perpetrators” and “typical victim” structure is reproduced in the situation. Further, this triggers the situation when

representatives of the minority group tend to report discriminatory actions against them more frequently, compared to majority groups. However, it became evident that the ability to learn second language and maintain contacts with the majority group leads to less perceived discrimination. It is also clear that decreasing the social distance between these groups may not ultimately lead to reduction of perceived discrimination, and each case must be uniquely analyzed. Additionally, several personal characteristics were outlined as the determinants of perceived discrimination: low control over life has proven to increase the level of perceived discrimination, while self-esteem was reported as an ambiguous but significant variable. Also, personal competence as an inner characteristic significantly determines the level of perceived discrimination and affects whether the fact of knowledge of the second language results into less discrimination. Finally, it was found that strong national identity is likely to decrease perceived discrimination, although due to its direct correlation with self-esteem certain predictions are impossible.

2.2.2 Socio-Demographic Determinants of the Perceived Discrimination

The previous subsections assessed theoretical perspective on the issue of perceived ethnic discrimination with a reference to social identity that further evolves into ethnic identity. Such elements as language and control over one's life were mentioned. While the former could be easily measured using appropriate datasets, control over own life may become a problem if the variable is not specifically operationalized in the survey. Additionally, the previous subsection provided a perspective on deeper psychological traits that could trigger or inhibit the feeling of perceived discrimination. This subsection, on the other hand, will assess the socio-demographic determinants of perceived ethnic discrimination that have already been utilized as independent variables in regression analyses of perceived discrimination in various countries.

Asserting that the entire minority group in a country will feel equally discriminated would be a short-sighted and weak assumption. As it is shown by a number of studies, members of one minority of a country (in this particular case, members of Latino minority in the US), may differ in their perception of discrimination (Michelson 2003). It poses additional complication to this study to establish the factors that determine the extent of perception of ethnic discrimination. Several longitudinal

studies found a set of independent variables that had significant impact on the perception of discrimination. Specifically, Gallegos (2010) published her study in which she used a longitudinal dataset from merged surveys of 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2007. Her intention was to assess the changes in perception of ethnic discrimination among members of Latino community and establish the factors that were most significant in determining this perception. She utilized a method of multiple regression that enabled to distinguish factors by the strength of their impact on the feeling of discrimination. In her study, she included such independent factors: total annual income, citizenship, partisanship, marital status, employment status, education and gender. The variable of place of birth was only later included in the 2007 wave. The study unveiled unexpected results that most of the factors had different impact on the perception of discrimination. However, some trends were still established: the total annual income variable was the strongest factor in 2002 and 2007, while in 2004 and 2006 it was the second strongest. Another very important variable that had effect on the dependent variable was citizenship (respondents were asked whether they had American citizenship, applied for it, were rejected or did not have). Another important factor of perception of discrimination was employment status (Gallegos 2010). The variables mentioned above are all present in the European Social Survey, seventh wave, making it possible to employ the methodological approach and independent variable set into the regression model.

Another quantitative study indicated that citizenship could be an important factor of perceived discrimination, especially, in such areas as health care and other public services. An absence of citizenship restricts members of minority from receiving public services, generally accessible for the members of the majority groups and this factors triggers higher perception of discrimination. The study also indicted the importance of education and personal income as variables that would facilitate access to health care services (Campesino et. al. 2012).

Some studies indicate the significant effect of gender as a variable that determines differences in perceptions of discrimination. It is worth to note that this was not a gender discrimination, but ethnic discrimination of different minority groups in the US. The study by O'connor, Tilly, and Bobo (2001) indicated that the impact of gender

on perception of ethnic and racial discrimination is different among numerous minority groups in the US. Another socio-demographic variable that is expected to have effect on the perception of ethnic discrimination is age. The variable of age in this regard must be analyzed from two perspectives. The first perspective is age itself as a quantitative variable that describes the amount of time the human spent in his or her life. Another aspect of age is a more complicated understanding of generations of minorities. The first, simplistic, perspective on age is expected to have certain influence on perception of ethnic discrimination due to several reasons. According to a number of studies, age is admitted as one of the most frequent perceived factors of discrimination. For instance, in study analyzing discrimination factors in Netherlands, authors concluded that age was the most frequently mentioned cause of discrimination with ethnic factor being the second (Andriessen, Fernee, and Wittebrood 2014). So far it is complicated to establish whether age has any impact on perceived ethnic discrimination, although this variable will be included in the model and tested for the respective correlation or causational link.

The second dimension of age, generations of minorities, is believed to be a very strong predictor of perceived ethnic discrimination. A vast number of studies, conducted mostly in the US, claim that the generation of immigrants is very important when assessing their personal level of perceived discrimination (Torres 2014; Sabatier, Berry 2008). The problem of perceived ethnic discrimination with reference to age and generation of a person is assessed in a relation with the concept of acculturation and assimilation. As stated by a number of researchers, there are several processes that immigrant coming into country may be involved in. These are assimilation, integration, marginalization and separation. The first two depict engagement of the minority into a larger ethnic majority by either giving up their cultural features or their legitimization in the dominant culture respectively. The second two refer to the processes that lead to disengagement between the majority group and ethnic minorities (Sabatier, Berry 2008). However, then there is a question whether age or generation of the migrants play crucial role in one of four of these processes. According to several studies, age and generation of the migrant, in particular, play very important role (Robinson 2005). The mechanism of impact of age and generation on these four processes is that typically the first generation of migrants deprive themselves from the majority ethnicity due to

language and cultural boundaries; being unable to adopt certain behavioral patterns leads to disengagement from a mainstream society and, hence, higher perception of ethnic discrimination associated with limited communication, absence of citizenship, appropriate health care etc. On the other hand, the next generation of migrant, being born in the country of living, proceeds with their secondary socialization in kindergartens, schools and universities where many representatives of ethnic majority study too. Even though, this might lead to deeper separation into ingroups and outgroups, it creates a background for intercultural dialogue. Moreover, children of the migrant develop needed language skill and are no longer limited only to the social circle of their ethnic group. Additionally, the next generations of the migrants have definitely more legal perks than their parents, as most of the countries grant citizenship to the people born on their territory. However, this particular moment must be meticulously assessed in the case of Estonia since children of residents without citizenship are not ultimately granted with Estonian citizenship, although there is still a simplified procedure for them.

Consequently, ethnic discrimination was usually referred to the groups that recently came to a certain territory of living of a majority group like political refugees and economic migrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti 2006). A number of studies shows that the time spent in the foreign country is a valid predictor of perceived discrimination, although there is ambiguity on whether it occurs on the individual or group level. Amuedo-Dorantes and De la Rica (2007) provide a valuable evidence that economic immigrants are especially exposed to the time effect of discrimination against the newcomers, arguing that the first generation of immigrant suffer the most from the discrimination, and the factors include linguistic and cultural segregation. Moreover, some of the results suggest that the first generation of immigrants tend to suffer more from mental diseases than their descendants, associated with the higher exposure to anxiety and depression, referred to a feeling of disconnectedness from the native country and inability to engage in the convenient societal interactions in the new community (Gee, Ryan, Laflamme, Holt 2006).

Overall, based on analysis of previous empirical studies, it is evident that scientists are yet to come to a consolidated conclusion on particular factors that drive perceived discrimination. However, a group of factors that were proven to have

significant causal link with perceived discrimination, consists of income, citizenship, employment status, potentially gender, age, generation of minority, time spent in foreign country. These factors had various impact on perceived discrimination depending on the local context, thus requiring additional empirical check.

2.2.3 Impact of Perceived Discrimination on Political Attitudes

While the previous section discussed individual level characteristics that are correlated with perceived discrimination, this section treats perceived discrimination as an independent variable and inquires about its effects on political attitudes. The issue of political attitudes of ethnic minorities has not received enough academic attention until the recent years, especially in the European countries, due to the fact that most of the large migrant minority groups were formed in late 1980's-90's. In regard to post-Soviet states, there had been no such issue as ethnic minority until the collapse of Soviet Union in 1991, or at least, it was forbidden to operate with such concepts. However, the dissolution of the USSR unveiled numerous ethnic-related issues in almost all post-Soviet states. One of them is that Russian-speaking minority typically have different political attitudes, compared to the ones of the indigenous populations. One of the tools used by social scientist to measure political attitudes is to appeal to the concept of institutional trust – trust of individuals in various political institutions. There are numerous confronting assumptions on the role of institutional trust in the contemporary democracy. Some argue that institutional trust is crucial for performance of parliaments and the consequent executive efficiency of governments. The institutional trust provides politicians and officials with stronger hand in decision-making, hence, improving the process of governance (Hetherington 1998). The absence of political trust might have ambiguous consequences in terms of their nature and direction; institutional distrust may lead to collapse of authoritarian regimes, but for democratic countries this might also affect well-being of citizens. Some authors argue that a lack of institutional trust deteriorates performance of local institutions as a result of combination of factors. Firstly, growing distrust leads to deconsolidation of political powers in the local parliaments, complicating the process of making vital decisions. Secondly, distrust in healthy democracy decreases confidence of representatives and officials, which affects performance of the overall political system (Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2001). A

more general assumption is that institutional trust is a significant determinant of civil society, which is a vital element of modern participatory democracy (Putnam 1995).

Another dimension of this problem is differentiation between institutional trust of ethnic majority and ethnic minorities. The European academia provides very little evidence on this regard, although there are substantial findings by the American scholars. The issue of institutional trust is not as straightforward as it might seem from the first glance. According to a set of studies, institutional trust is a variable that is unstable throughout a person's life regardless of political events. Specifically, the comparative study of Latino and White teenagers in California showed that Latino teenagers are more trustful in the government than their White peers, although this assumption is only valid for above 15 years old. As indicated by the researcher, the age of 15 indicates a person first impression about the state system and, especially, state-provided services. Added by the author, the main reason for institutional trust deterioration at this age is realization of ethnic discrimination from peers and state (Michelson 2003). On the other hand, the representatives of African American racial minority, adolescents at the age of 11-14 were more likely to have significantly lower institutional trust given that resulted in further deterioration in the future. The authors claim that educational system may become a strong driver for perceived discrimination, leading to lower institutional trust in the future (Yeager, Purdie-Vaughns, Hooper, Cohen, 2017).

However, the studies do not provide clear perspective on the relation between engagement of ethnic minorities into the mainstream society and rise or fall of institutional trust. The studies carried out in the US showed that incorporation of ethnic minorities into larger mainstream American society led to the decrease of the institutional trust of the migrants; these results, however, were very sensitive to the location, political preferences of the local majority community and that-time party in office (Michelson 2003). The author also indicates the problems of the abovementioned studies as those conducted during 1970-80's political instability in the US, when incoming migrants could have been more optimistic about the federal government, while the majority was conscious about the reality and hence had lower political trust.

A set of empirical studies indicate that most frequently majority and minority groups would have different levels of institutional trust due to the fact of different experience. While it is unwise to establish a common trend like “indigenous people have higher institutional trust” as it was presented in the previous paragraph, there is, however, an assumption that cultural assimilation will result in similar levels of institutional trust (Bonner 2009). Consequently, a general assumption is that majority and minority groups usually have different levels of institutional trust.

Another study indicates that institutional trust among immigrant is a variable rigid to change. The results show that institutional trust is what being internalized during the process of primary socialization. Therefore, it opposes the previous statement that says that the institutional trust of the minority groups tend to meet the levels of majority group with the process of assimilation. Additionally, the first and the second generation of migrants are very likely to have lower institutional trust compared to majority population. However, it was also added that such situation exists due to the fact that in most countries social and political conditions for the majority and minority groups are different, hence affecting experience of these people the result in the respective trust. Consequently, if the conditions in the country are similar for majority and minority groups, the enhanced process of assimilation will lead to migrants faster obtain the same level of political trust as indigenous citizens (Dinesen, Hooghe 2010).

The situation when majority and minority groups have equal conditions is very rarely. More frequently, states have strict legal requirements towards incomers and, consequently, privileged conditions for locals or majority. As mentioned previously, socio-economic status is proven to be a significant determinant of feeling of ethnic discrimination; in countries where immigrants can hardly obtain decent education and job, the feeling of ethnic discrimination will be considerably higher compared to the states where life chances for majority and migrants are equal. This, in turn, through a process of perception and experience of migrants will be transformed into overall perception of political system as being efficient or inefficient in delivering justice to everyone. Therefore, inability to obtain proper socio-economic status will result into strong feeling of discrimination that leads to lower institutional trust (Alesina, La Ferrara 2002).

Also it is important to elaborate on the previous studies about the relation between perceived discrimination, generation of the migrants and their political trust. A general idea is that both first, second and third generation migrants would have their institutional trust directly dependent on the level of perceived discrimination. However, it is also argued that the impact of perceived discrimination towards migrants will be of different strength depending on the generation of migrants and their sensitiveness to various types of ethnic-based discrimination. First of all, the studies indicated that in the European Union, in general, the first generation of migrants tends to have the highest rates of perceived discrimination reported. Consequently, this number decreases with the second and third generation respectively. As for the types of discrimination, ethnic perceived discrimination is reported to have the strongest impact on the level of institutional trust in the 1 generation migrants, while the second and third generations were proven to have institutional trust less dependent on their feeling of ethnic discrimination, but dependent on age, gender and socio-economic discrimination. Additionally to ethnic discrimination, the institutional trust of migrants of first generation is dependent on religious discrimination, as the first generation migrants tend to follow their traditions. Altogether, the results of the study proved that ethnic and racial discrimination has the strongest effect on deteriorating ones institutional trust (Jeong 2016).

Unexpected results are presented in the study by Roder and Muhlau (2011), who claim that the first generation of incomers might tend to have higher institutional trust, even though, the second and third generation have lower trust. This is explained by the psychological effect after an origin country is changed to a host country, when a drastic difference in quality of services and life is not sensitive to the feeling of discrimination. On the other hand, the second and third generation migrants are observed to have lower institutional trust since they are not affected by the “country change” effect and can subjectively assess how they are treated compared to the members of the majority ethnic group. However, this explanation can hardly contribute to the case of Estonia, where the Russian speakers do not perceive themselves as migrants.

2.3 Hypotheses

The following subsection presents a layout of hypotheses stated after a thorough scrutinization of the theoretical material. Testing the first, general, hypothesis will

create a background for further analysis. While in the literature it is stated that ethnic minorities tend to have higher levels of perceived discrimination, this variable has not been tested before in Estonia.

H1: The Russian speakers in Estonia have higher levels of perceived discrimination compared to Estonian speakers.

The first hypothesis is very general and, hence, confirming or rejecting it would not bring sufficient amount of new information to the academia. Therefore, it is important to elaborate on more detailed hypotheses. The methodology of the research enables to establish causal link between independent and dependent factors. Consequently, this enables to elaborate on a more specific hypothesis.

H2: Citizenship, level of education, socio-economic status, age, and gender are factors that determine the level of perceived discrimination of the Russian speakers in Estonia. Derived from this, Russian-speakers who hold Estonian citizenship are believed to have lower levels of perceived discrimination. Lower levels of education and socio-economic status are believed to be associated with higher likelihood of perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers. Also, older Russian-speakers will have higher likelihood of perceived discrimination.

Finally, it is important to work out the third hypothesis that would represent the assumption that the levels of institutional trust are dependent on the levels of perceived discrimination. According to the studies, reviewed previously, it is believed that people with higher levels of perceived discrimination will have lower institutional trust.

H3: Perceived discrimination is a significant determinant of the level of institutional trust among the Russian-speakers. Consequently, those Russian-speakers who feel discriminated will have lower levels of institutional trust.

3. Empirical Analysis and Results

Estonia presents an unprecedented case for studying problematic ethnic relations in context of post-Soviet countries. The empirical analysis is interesting from a standpoint that population of Estonia which consists mainly of two large ethnic groups, Estonian and Russian-speakers, is less integrated than in many of the post-Soviet states, highlighting the controversy between being certainly the most economically developed post-Soviet country and having, simultaneously, split society.

3.1 Status of Russian Speakers in Estonia

The main purpose of this study is to find whether there is any perceived ethnic discrimination of Russian speaking people in Estonia, to define the main factors that affect this situation, and to determine whether perceived discrimination causes specific political attitudes represented by different levels of political trust. However, before the actual analysis is carried out, it is important to provide a general background for understanding the conditions in which Russian speakers in Estonia reside today. The following subsection will assess the current state of the Russian speakers of Estonia in terms of their historical roots in Estonia, their role during the Soviet occupation and their status in contemporary independent Estonia.

3.1.1 History

The Russians or, as they are referred to in this research, Russian-speaking residents of Estonia compose the second largest ethnic group in the country after Estonians. According to the 2011 data, about 25% of the Estonian population is composed of ethnic Russians. In addition, other Russian-speaking minorities, such as Ukrainians or Belorussians constitute another 3% of the population. The Russian population is not equally distributed among the regions of the country with the highest concentrations in the regions of Ida-Virumaa and near the urban zone of Tallinn..

The main mass of Russophones or their ancestors came to Estonia after 1940 which is considered as a beginning of the Soviet occupation that ended in 1991 when the independence was restored. Historically, the first appearance of people who might have been called Russians was a military campaign by Kievan Knight Yaroslav that resulted in conquest of the local settlement, establishment of Tartu fortification, which

was later given up to local tribes. From that time, there were minor cultural or economic interactions between the Russians and tribes that later merged into one Estonian nation. The next wave of Russian immigration was in the 17th century when several groups of Orthodox Old Believers escaped from religious repressions in the Russian Empire. The amount of people that moved from the current territory of Russia is estimated no more than 5,000 people. At this point, ancestors of the Old Believers might be considered as indigenous residents of Estonia (Laur 2000).

The next wave of Russian immigration was during the 19th century, when the Estonian territory became a part of Russian Empire, and Russian workers participated in industrializing the region. However, the intensity of the Russian immigration was not high since workers were willing to go back to their own places, and starting from 1721 to 1881 the population of Russians increased only to 3%. The Estonian liberation war against Russia, led to the first proclamation of the Estonian independence, and the communist revolution triggered influx of Russian immigrants who were running from the communist repressions. However, there were hardly 8% of Russians in Estonia before the end of war with communist Russia in 1920 (Laur 2000).

The last period of Russian massive immigration to Estonia followed the advancing of the Soviet troops during the last periods of the Second World War. After the war was finished in 1945, the Estonian territory was fully occupied by the Soviet regime which enhanced the policy of mobility of Russian population to other corners of the Union up until its dissolution. Namely, with the flow of time there was clear tendency of increase of share of Russians in the overall Estonian population, as in 1960 20% of the Estonian population were ethnic Russians, in 1970 – 25%, and in 1980 – 28%. By the end of existence of the Soviet Union, the Russian-speaking population comprised more than 30% of the total population. The percentage was one of the highest among the former Soviet republics. (Laur 2000).

3.1.2 Current State of Affairs

Currently, there is considerable amount of public criticism of the level of integration of Russian speakers in the Estonian society. This followed a set of actions at the beginning of 1990's when the Estonian Citizenship act was passed in 1992. This law adopted the policy, previously introduced by the Estonian government in 1918,

according to which the right for citizenship was granted to individuals by their decent, their place of birth, marriage with an Estonian person and naturalization. Individuals that entered Estonia after 1940 and their descendants were not considered as being automatically eligible for the Estonian citizenship and had to pass the procedure of naturalization in case they wanted to obtain Estonian citizenship. This situation caused significant dissatisfaction of the Russian-speaking community in Estonia since they were the largest minority, although most of them were not considered eligible for automatic citizenship due to the abovementioned reasons. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, 32% of that-time population did not have any citizenship. However, the percentage significantly decreased, reaching 7% of the population in 2011. Until 2010, starting from 1991, more than 150,000 persons obtained Estonian citizenship through the process of naturalization, although 145,000 acquired Russian citizenship. Currently, it is estimated that 90,000 residents of Estonia have grey passports (no citizenship), and dominant majority of them are Russian-speaking (Järve).

Aside of a formal absence of citizenship, the owners of “grey passports” are not entitled to vote on national elections. On the other hand, according to the Estonian Constitution, only Estonian citizens have the right to vote on national elections and referendums. Citizens of other countries, EU or non-EU states, and stateless persons (including owners of “grey passports”) have the right to vote only on local council elections. Additionally, non-citizens are not limited in terms of mobility in the European Union countries, although they no right to employ in other EU countries under rules common for the EU citizens.

The abovementioned issues related to the problem of non-citizenship of people in Estonia has been causing significant criticism from the Russian government that claimed that the Estonian government violated basic rights of Estonian population. As a response, Russia introduced visa-free regime for non-citizens of Estonia; similarly, Russia maintained a simplified procedure of obtaining Russian citizenship until the very beginning of 1990’s, resulting in that nearly the same amounts of non-citizens of Estonia received Russian and Estonian citizenship until 2010 (Vihalemm 2009).

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Selection of the Dataset

The empirical character of this master thesis determined a need for appropriate dataset of quantitative data which would include specific socio-demographic variables, an explicit variable for perceived discrimination, variables that would allow to identify the ethnicity of respondents and variables pertaining institutional trust. The primary dilemma was to choose between three survey studies: However, the purpose of this particular study was to research the issue of perceived discrimination, and this explicit variable was only present in the last, seventh wave of the European Social Survey. Additionally, there is an explicit section on institutional trust both in Estonian and European Union institutions. Altogether, European Social Survey is a longitudinal study of different social and political indicators, conducted in 36 European countries with periodicity of two years. Aside of the fact that ESS 2014 was the first wave to include perceived discrimination variable, it was also the most up-to-date dataset. The selection of this dataset simultaneously limits the scope of potential results, given that relations between Estonian and Russian-speakers in Estonia passed through several stages. Hypothetically, if the given variable was included in previous waves of the dataset, the results might have been different, taking into account early years of Estonian independence and confrontation with Russia or, for instance, Bronze Soldier Night, the events of which caused outrage of Russian-speaking Estonians and Russian state. The availability of the required variables and the fact that this was the latest wave of the survey determined that European Social Survey (Round 7, 2014) was utilized for this study.

The statistics derived from the given dataset is representative of the population of Estonia. The total sample of the study is 2015 respondents aged from 15 to 99. The gender distribution of the sample is unequal with 835 males (40,7%) and 1216 females (59,3%) which might cause certain issue when analyzing gender discrepancies for some factors. The participants of the study were selected by random probability sampling, applicable for large samples.

Since the design of the survey was utilized with minor changes in 36 European countries, it is advised by the authors of the study to utilized proper weighting

techniques to avoid certain statistical errors. The European Social Survey guidelines suggest utilizing either Design Weight or Post-Stratification weight in case only country is analyzed. The Design Weight is suggested to apply for countries with unequal distribution of individuals with certain societal characteristics. The Post-Stratification weighting has to be applied when the problem of low response rate occurs, and the collectors of the data have to substitute missing values with full answers. The composition of the country-specific Estonian dataset, and considerations about the regional distribution of the Russian speakers in Estonia implies that the Design Weight must be applied to the dataset. Consequently, the dataset was weighted using a standard SPSS procedure of weighting cases by one particular variable. Even though, the intention of the study was not to estimate the regional discrepancies of any of chosen factor, the decision was to assure a complete absence of statistical errors in further procedures.

3.2.2 Selection of Statistical Methods

Depending on the specificity and construction of the scales, different methods of testing have to be applied. The first stage of primary descriptive statistic will require utilization of for univariate statistics to represent whether two or several specific groups differ by one variable. The statistical difference will be tested by Chi-Square Test (Satorra, Bentler 2001).

Another type of descriptive statistics will require looking into whether Russian-speaking respondents differ from Estonian speaking respondents in certain variables. Therefore, the analysis will involve a set of tests when at least two variables and two groups will be involved. An appropriate method of testing differences for two dichotomous variables is Independent Samples T-test, which analyzes statistical significance of difference between percentage values (Satorra, Bentler 2001).

Further, the descriptive statistics will require comparison between two groups (e.g Estonian speakers and Russian speaker) in variables that have continuous scales. For this, Chi-Square test is inappropriate due to its sensitiveness to sample size and large standard deviation that is typically present in variance of continuous variables. Therefore, the Independent Sample T-Test will be used as a reliable method of testing differences between mean values of two independent groups (Norušis 2006.).

Finally, the main goal of the project, finding factors that affect perceived discrimination and effect of perceived discrimination on institutional trust will be delivered by binary logistic regression. The binary logistic regression is referred to advanced statistical models as the main purpose of it is determine the outcome of dependent dichotomous variable by independent continuous or categorical variables. In this research, binary logistic regression will be used to test the second hypothesis. A specific requirement for the dependent variable is that it has to be dichotomous, so the model can properly predict an outcome. On the other hand, predictors or independent variables can be continuous, ordinal or categorical. A particular function in SPSS enables to include such variables in the model without recoding them into dummies (dichotomous variables) (King, 2008).

General Linear Model will be used to define a link between the perceived discrimination variable and variables pertaining institutional trust. However, a problem arises since institutional trust variables in European Social Survey dataset are designed as interval scale where 0= no trust at all and 10= complete trust. The composition of these variables makes it inapplicable to use binary logistic regression to establish a link between perceived discrimination and institutional trust. Therefore, the original design was later amended as for the second stage of statistical analysis it was decided to utilize General Linear Model, capable of predicting dependent continuous variables by independent dichotomous ones (Kleinbaum, Mitchel 2010).

Additional problem that has to be controlled on both stages of modeling is possible collinearity of independent variables. This has certainly to be adjusted in the first model of binary logistic regression, as several factors will be included as independent variables. For the second stage of analysis, subjective wellbeing (level of happiness) will be used as a control variable, as it is proven to have impact on institutional trust (Hudson, 2006). The essence of collinearity is that it increases the final coefficient of the regression model when the independent variables correlate between each other. In order to test multicollinearity, the Variance Inflation Factor will be calculated by running simple linear regression and checking VIF factors for each of the independent variables. The VIF coefficient can be ignored if it is not higher than 5 (Craney, Surles 2002). The VIF coefficient of 5 implies that correlation $r^2=0.8$. In

other words, 80% of the variable could be explained by the correlator. It is, however, expected, that no independent variables for the first binary logistic model have unacceptable collinearity.

3.3 Operationalization of Selected Variables

The operationalization of variables included in empirical analysis is very important since making a mistake at this stage would result in distorted regression model and wrong conclusions. As it has been mentioned previously, the variable of perceived discrimination had not been present in European Social Survey datasets until 2014. Before that, there were numerous attempts to operationalize such variable by constructing index variables, although their reliability is contested. In this particular case, the variable of perceived discrimination is explicitly represented in European Social Survey dataset. The question in the survey was: “Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?”. The scale is dichotomous with 1= Yes and 2= No.

Belonging to an ethnic minority is measured via language spoken at home. Therefore, it was advised to operationalize this variable through the first language spoken at home, as such approach has been successfully utilized in recent studies (Mateos 2011).. Therefore, for this purpose, the variable “Language most often spoken at home: first mentioned” was used. It was, however, argued by some scholars that the Russian language is not a good indicator of the Russian ethnicity since migrants from former Soviet republics other than Russia may also use it (Fought 2006). Therefore, it was decided not to operate with the concept of ethnicity but to use a language factor instead due to inability to observe other ethnicities of the Russian speakers in Estonia.

Another variable which might be a significant determinant of perceived discrimination is age. Age is a separate variable in the European Social Survey and it is measured as continuous variable.

Also, gender was included in the analysis as in the set of previous studies, it had significant impact on perceived discrimination. In ESS gender is coded as dichotomous variable where 1= male and 2= female.

Citizenship could be another determinant of perceived discrimination. The last wave of European Values Survey also has explicit variable “citizenship”. The respondents answered to a question: “Are you a citizen of a country?”. The variable has a categorical dichotomous scale with 1= Yes and 2= No.

Socio-Economic status was defined as a significant determinant of perceived discrimination. The European Social Survey dataset provides various ways to measure income, e.g. the variable is “Feeling about household income nowadays”. The respondents were asked: “Which of the following descriptions on this card comes closest to how you feel about your household’s income nowadays”. The respondents choose one of four categories: “living comfortably on present income”, “coping on present income”, “finding it difficult on present income” and “finding it very difficult on present income”. Even though, these categories are very broad and present subjective perception of socio-economic status, this variable is valid for further analysis. Later, the variable “Unemployed for more than 3 months” with answer options “yes” and “no” was included in the analysis.

Education was considered as one of potential determinants of perceived discrimination. In the European Social Survey there was a country specific variable for education. The variable had 15 different values for education. Due to Estonian translation of the types of education, it was recoded into the following categories: 1=education until 9th grade. 2= professional education on evening schools, college. 3= bachelor, master or doctoral degree..

For the second stage of analysis, establishing link between perceived discrimination and institutional trust, six variables were included, pertaining to trust in “country’s parliament”, “legal system”, “police”, “politicians”, “political parties”, “European Parliament”. For these variables an interval scale was used with options from 0 to 10, where 0= no trust at all and 10= complete trust.

3.4 Descriptive Statistics

The primary descriptive statistics presented in this study is the percentage distribution for languages spoken at home. Estonian language is spoken at home of 62.7% of respondents, and Russian is spoken at homes of 37% respondents. It was then

decided to recode this variable with only Estonian and Russian languages included as other languages compose only 0.3% of the variance.

Assessing perceived discrimination is the primary purpose of this study. Therefore, a first comparative descriptive statistics is introduced. Herein, Russian speakers and Estonian speakers are compared in their levels of perceived discrimination. As it is seen from the table, in total, 10.7% of the population in Estonia feel discriminated in country. As for the Russian speakers, they have considerably higher rate of perceived discriminated (23.9%) compared to only 3.1% of Estonian speakers. While this descriptive statistics provides only a general understanding of perceived discrimination in Estonia, it implies that language as a proxy of ethnicity could be the associated with perceived discrimination, since this grouping variable revealed significant differences between the Russian speakers and Estonian speakers. The Chi-Square and Cramer's V tests for significance of differences are in the appendixes.

Table 1

Crosstabulation of language spoken and home and perceived discrimination (%)

| | | <u>language at home</u> | |
|---|-----|-------------------------|----------|
| | | Russian | Estonian |
| Member of a group discriminated against in this country | Yes | 23.9% | 3.1% |
| | No | 76.1% | 96.9% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Source: ESS2014

After, perceived socio-economic status was analyzed. In Estonia, 13% of people live comfortably on their present income. 56.4% of people cope on present income. 23.3% of people think it is difficult to live on present income. Finally, 7.4% think it is very difficult to live on present income. The Chi-Square test that proves significance of the differences between groups may be found in the appendixes section. Consequently, it is possible to confirm the first hypotheses which states that the Russian-speakers in Estonia have higher levels of perceived discrimination compared to Estonian speakers. This is due to the fact that Russian speakers are more likely to feel discriminated.

Table 2

Perceived socio-economic status (%)

| Status | % |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Living comfortably on present income | 13.0% |
| Coping on present income | 56.4% |
| Difficult on present income | 23.3% |
| Very difficult on present income | 7.4% |
| Total | 100.0% |

Source: ESS 2014

The educational distribution in Estonia becomes a complicated task for measurement since the only valid variable in the dataset is country-specific variable. The variable has 15 values which are not ordinal or continuous; they must be treated as disproportional nominal values. Table 3 represents descriptive statistics of educational level of people in Estonia for a recoded variable. A full secondary education (including vocational education) is the most frequent educational status of Russian speakers in Estonia (71%). 13.3% of the population have education of less or equal to 9th grade of school, and 15.3% of Russian-speaking Estonians have university degree.

Table 3

Educational Status of R speakers (%)

| Education Type | Percent |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Education until 9 th grade | 13.3 |
| Technical or Vocational Education | 71.4 |
| University Degree | 15.3 |
| Total | 100 |

Source: ESS 2014

For the second stage of the empirical analysis where the impact of perceived discrimination on political attitudes is assessed, it is important to draw a basic statistics on whether Russian speakers and Estonian speakers of Estonia have different levels of institutional trust. The nature of variables of institutional trust makes it applicable to use Independent Sample T-test, as the variables are continuous from 0 to 10 (0= no trust at all; 10= complete trust). In a table below, it is shown that Russian speakers have significantly lower levels of trust in all entities included in the analysis, such as parliament, legal system, police, politicians, political parties, and the European Parliament; higher mean values represent higher trust in particular institution.

Table 4

Differences between Institutional Trust of Russian Speakers and Estonian Speakers in Estonia

| | Russian | Estonian |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Trust in country's parliament | 3.73 (2.521) | 4.77 (2.413) |
| Trust in the legal system | 4.53 (2.502) | 5.61 (2.456) |
| Trust in the police | 5.60 (2.532) | 6.41 (2.379) |
| Trust in politicians | 3.20 (2.356) | 3.65 (2.162) |
| Trust in political parties | 3.32 (2.286) | 3.50 (2.124) |
| Trust in the European Parliament | 3.57 (2.567) | 4.90 (2.399) |

Significant at $\alpha < 0.01$. *Note.* Figures shown are mean values with Standard Deviation in parenthesis. Source: ESS2014

3.5 Determinants of Perceived Discrimination among Russian Speakers in Estonia

The perceived discrimination of Russian speakers in Estonia was analyzed using binary logistic regression. Overall, the model performs well, correctly classifying 78.5% of cases, which is a slight improvement compared to 75.9% of correctly predicted cases without using the model. The model is very good in predicting those who would not feel discriminated with 98.2% of correct predictions, but has lower performance in regards to predicting those who do feel discriminated with only 4% of correct predictions. Before the model was run, the author selected cases for “Russian speakers” so to avoid including Estonian speakers in the model, as the author intended to find out why some Russian speakers feel discriminated and others do not. Consequently, there were 759 cases included in the analysis. There is no multicollinearity in the model: The Variance Inflation Factor was within acceptable threshold of 5 for each variable.

Among the factors that determined perceived discrimination and were outlined from the previous studies, it was found that one of the most important predictor of perceived discrimination among Russian speakers in Estonia is citizenship. The odds of Russian speakers without citizenship feeling discriminated against were 1.55 times the odds of a Russian speaker with citizenship having a subjective sense of discrimination. The effect is significant at (give 0.05 level).

“Mother born in a country” also was a significant predictor of perceived discrimination, as the odds of Russian speakers mothers of whom were not born in the country feeling discriminated against were 1.45 times the odds of a Russian speaker whose mother was born in Estonia. The effect is significant at (give 0.05 level).

Age was a significant predictor of perceived discrimination, although its coefficient was 1.014, providing little explanatory improvement. However, it did show that younger people tend to have higher odds of feeling discriminated.

Finally, the strongest predictor of perceived discrimination among Russian speakers in Estonia was employment status. The odds of Russian speakers who had been unemployed for more than three months feeling discriminated against were 2 times the odds of a Russian speaker who had not experienced such unemployment. The effect is significant at (give 0.05 level).

The model also showed that some of the foreseen factors were insignificant in predicting perceived discrimination in Russian speakers in Estonia. In particular, the effects of gender, education and subjective perception of socioeconomic status were insignificant.

Table 5

Results of Logistic Regression (Odds Ratios and Wald Coefficients)

| Variable | Odds Ratio* | Wald* |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Citizenship | 0.449 | 15.259 |
| Unemployed for more than 3 months | 1.968 | 12.974 |
| Age | 1.014 | 5.081 |
| Mother Born in Country | 0.565 | 4.177 |

*Odds Ratios and Wald significant at $\alpha < 0.05$. *Note.* Results for Education, Subjective Socioeconomic Status and Gender were not reported as the impact was not significant. Detailed results of logistic regression are in the Appendices. Source: ESS2014

3.6 Perceived Discrimination as a Determinant of Institutional Trust of Russian Speakers in Estonia

The General Linear Model provides a toolkit to assess the relationship between dichotomous variable as an independent one and continuous variable as a dependent one. For this particular stage of analysis, six separate General Linear Model analyses were conducted. The Variance Inflation Factor was within acceptable threshold of 5 for each variable. Those who feel discriminated, have significantly lower level of trust in parliament (mean= 2.63) than those who go not feel discriminated (mean= 4.09). However, the model explains only 8% of variability of “Trust in country’s parliament” variable.

Perceived discrimination also is a significant determinant of trust in the Estonian legal system ($R^2 = 0.1$, $\alpha < 0.01$). Mean trust in legal system is lower for those who feel discriminated (mean= 3.5) than for those who do not feel discriminated (mean= 4.85). On the other hand, the explanatory capability of the model is a bit better than for “trust in country’s parliament”, with 10% of the variability of “Trust in legal system”.

Perceived discrimination is a valid predictor for “Trust in police”, although the R^2 is only 0.06 ($\alpha < 0.01$), meaning that perceived discrimination and happiness explain only 6% of the variability of trust in police. Those who feel discriminated have lower trust in police (mean= 4.98) than those who do not feel discriminated (mean= 5.82).

Russian speakers who feel discriminated have considerably lower level of trust in politicians (mean= 2.35) while those who do not feel discriminated have higher level of trust in politicians (mean= 3.49). Overall, the model explains 7% of the variability of “trust in politicians” ($\alpha < 0.01$).

Similar pattern could be traced in trust in political parties. With R Square 0.055 ($\alpha < 0.01$) Russian speakers who feel discriminated against have lower trust in political parties (mean= 2.56). Those Russian speakers who do not feel discriminated against, have higher trust in political parties (mean= 3.57).

Finally, the trust in European Parliament was assessed. Similarly, the trust was higher for those who do not feel discriminated. Specifically, for those who feel discriminated the mean for trust in European Parliament is 2.58, and for those who do not feel discriminated the mean value is 3.91. The explanatory capability of the model is weak, as R Square is 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.01$), meaning that 5% of the variability of trust in European Parliament among Russian speakers in Estonia is explained by perceived discrimination.

The table below shows results for each of six separate General Linear Models, where for each of them “perceived discrimination” and “happiness” were used as a predictor. Detailed tables from SPSS output may be found in the appendices.

Table 6

Results of General Linear Models*

| Variable | R Square | Exp. B (Discriminated - No) | Exp. B (Happiness) | Intercept |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Trust in Country's Parliament | 0.08 | 1.412 | 0.198 | 1.316 |
| Trust in the Legal System | 0.1 | 1.246 | 0.265 | 1.828 |
| Trust in the Police | 0.06 | 0.779 | 0.241 | 3.435 |
| Trust in | 0.07 | 1.094 | 0.203 | 1.046 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Politicians | | | | |
| Trust in | 0.055 | 0.964 | 0.149 | 1.607 |
| Political | | | | |
| Parties | | | | |
| Trust in the | 0.05 | 1.3 | 0.103 | 1.915 |
| European | | | | |
| Parliament | | | | |

*Significance at the level of $\alpha < 0.01$. Source: ESS2014

3.7 Summary of Empirical Findings

The first hypothesis was that the Russian-speakers in Estonia have higher levels of perceived discrimination compared to Estonian-speakers. 23.9% of Russian-speakers and 3.1% of Estonian-speakers feel discriminated against, which proves that those who speak Russian in Estonia are more likely to feel discriminated against.

The results of the logistic regression imply that the second hypothesis “Citizenship, education, socio-economic status, age and gender are factors that determine the level of perceived discrimination of the Russian speakers in Estonia” can only be partially confirmed. Firstly, such factors as education, subjective socioeconomic status and gender did not have any impact on the probability of the person to feel discriminated against. Such factors as citizenship, employment status, “mother born in Estonia” and age are significant in predicting perceived discrimination of Russian speakers in Estonia.

The third hypothesis “Perceived discrimination is a significant determinant of the level of institutional trust among the Russian speakers” is fully confirmed. It is evident that perceived discrimination of Russian Speakers in Estonia is a valid determinant of their institutional political trust. Undoubtedly, those Russian speakers who feel discriminated have lower levels of institutional trust for each of the studied dimensions..

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The author of this study posed three objectives. The first objective was to find a substantial theoretical framework, and this was done appealing to Taifel's Social Identity Theory, which explained how language and other factors can determine perceived discrimination. The second objective of the study was to find the factors that determine perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers, and this was achieved by running binary logistic regression with the selected variables. Finally, the third objective of the study was to establish a link between perceived discrimination and institutional trust, which was achieved by running General Linear Models. Aside of this, the author highlighted a significant discrepancy between shares of Estonian-speakers and Russian-speakers who feel discriminated in Estonia.

The theoretical framework for this study was composed of theory of social identity, which is based on viewing society in terms of "we" and "they", or "ingroups" and "outgroups". Within this framework, a set of factors that cause perceived discrimination was outlined. From different contexts, such factors as age, level of education, socioeconomic status, generation of immigrants, language proficiency, social cohesion with a dominant group, citizenship, were outlined. Also, from theoretical analysis, it was evident that perceived discrimination has potentially significant impact on institutional trust as the groups of individuals that feel discriminated against may be generally less optimistic about democratic institutions.

For the empirical analysis the author utilized the 2014 ESS country-specific dataset. Overall, information of 2051 respondents was analyzed. Before analysis, the design weight, post-stratification weight and population size weight were applied. A two-stage analysis was conducted. The first stage aimed to define the factors that determine perceived discrimination among Russian speakers in Estonia through binary logistic regression, and the second stage aimed to define the impact of perceived discrimination on institutional trust through General Linear Model. The results show that absence/presence of citizenship, employment status, age, place of birth of mother are significant determinants of perceived discrimination for Russian speakers in Estonia. Also, it was found that perceived discrimination is a significant predictor of institutional trust for Russian speakers in Estonia; specifically, those Russian speakers who feel

discriminated have considerably lower levels of institutional trust compared to Russian speakers who do not feel discriminated.

Overall, the results of binary logistic regression that aimed to define the factors that determine perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers in Estonia and General Linear Model that provided assessment of impact of perceived discrimination among those Russian-speakers who feel discriminated on their levels of institutional trust represent moderate compliance with the conclusions of previous empirical studies. Binary logistic regression, on the one hand, confirmed assumptions that absence/presence of citizenship, employment status and age as the basic socio-demographic variables determine the likelihood of a person feeling discriminated against. On the other hand, the results of the regression model present the weakness and ambiguity of age as a determinant of perceived discrimination. Also, the results show that in Estonia neither educational level nor socio-economic status determine perceived discrimination among Russian-speakers. This certainly rejects the assumptions of previously discussed studies in which these variables appeared to be significant determinants of perceived discrimination in several iterations. As for the General Linear Model, it supplements the assumptions about institutional trust laid in previous studies. It is evident that feeling of being discriminated against determines lower levels of institutional trust among Russian-speakers in Estonia, and it may provide a background for reflection on how the institutional trust in this category might be enhanced so to secure political stability in the future.

Taking into account the results of descriptive statistics pertaining perceived discrimination among Estonian and Russian-speakers, it is possible to integrate the findings with the previous studies. According to Phinney, Madden and Santos (1998), language is one of the primary factors that determine perceived discrimination, and here it is evident that Russian-speakers are more likely to feel discriminated. This also goes in line with Simpson's assertion (2008) about Social Identity theory, according to which language becomes a factor of separation between groups. In a broader context, this supports Stevenson's argument (2010) that a fact of belonging to a minority group at least indirectly determines higher levels of perceived discrimination.

The results of this logistic regression model may be compared with the previous studies mentioned in this paper. Specifically, it will be useful to refer once again to the

longitudinal study of Galegos (2010), in which the author outlined that perceived discrimination in members of Latino community in the US is determined by these factors: absence/ presence of citizenship, education, employment status and income. Her assumption may be applied to the case of Estonia only partially, given that citizenship and employment status have impact on the perception of discrimination among Russian-speakers, while income and education status do not have any significant effect. The results of this study are also complemented by the conclusions of Campesino et al (2012) who argued about essential role of citizenship in perceived discrimination. The given study indicated ambiguity between Estonian case and several assumptions about factors that determine perceived discrimination. Particularly, O'connor, Tilly, and Bobo (2001) argued that gender was a significant predictor of perceived discrimination among ethnic minorities in the US, although the direction differed from minority to minority; this study, however, indicates no significant impact of gender on perceived discrimination. Torres (2014), Sabatier and Berry (2008) argue that age is a significant determinant of perceived discrimination, and in most cases older members of ethnic minority are more likely to feel discriminated. In Estonia members of Russian-speaking community represent completely different situation, whereas younger Russian-speakers are slightly more likely to feel discriminated, which provides a background for further research. One of the potential assumptions for younger Russian-speakers having higher likelihood of feeling discriminated is relation to employment status. Generally, younger member of society encounter issues of employment more frequently, than the older member, which indirectly may cause higher perceived discrimination

The results of the General Linear Model that assessed the impact of perceived discrimination on institutional trust may be integrated with previous studies. The study of Michelson (2003) found that teenagers among Latino minority in the US have lower institutional trust compared to their White peers, and one of the reasons was that they encountered country's bureaucratic system which made them feel discriminated; in this particular case, a reference to younger Russian-speakers may be done, as based on results, younger Russian-speakers are more likely to feel discriminated, thus they have lower institutional trust. Another assumption may be linked to Dinesen and Hooghe argument (2010), whereas institutional trust may be linked to assimilation which, in turn, is linked to perceived discrimination. Based on this, minorities that are more

assimilated with the majority group, will have lower levels of perceived discrimination and, consequently, higher institutional trust. From this, it may be assumed that Russian-speaking community is not much assimilated with the Estonian-speaking community, which results in high perceived discrimination levels in the former and lower institutional trust. It may be argued that lower institutional trust leads to malfunctioning democracy and deterioration of effectiveness of social institutions, such as legal or enforcement system (Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2001; Putnam 1995). For Estonia, this carries dangerous potential for social uprisings which have happened in the past already (Bronze Soldier Night), and given the current tensions, low institutional trust among Russian-speakers can be one of the triggers of it.

When the research was conducted, the author encountered certain difficulties associated with the absence of particular variables in the dataset, absence of relevant previous studies, novelty of the applied methodology, and size of the dataset. Potentially, the research could be improved in case additional variables were present in the dataset. Specifically, to test level of integration of Russian-speakers, it would be useful to assess their proficiency in Estonian language or intensity of communication with the Estonian-speakers

One of the most significant issues that arose in the empirical study was that education was articulated by many researchers as a valid predictor of perceived discrimination. However, in this particular case, education did not provide any explanatory power to the model. This might be due to the fact that current Estonian society evolved from Soviet Union, where education was easily accessible by citizens. Also, the author did not find any evidence that age affects level of perceived discrimination, unlike in a number of other similar studies.

From a methodological point of view, the proposed binary logistic regression model possesses certain weaknesses, such as low predictor capability for “Discrimination - yes” cases. Additionally, the pseudo-R coefficients such as Nagelkerke were considerably low, even though, not eliminating the relevance of the model. From the technical perspective, utilization of SPSS software disabled to calculate marginal effects, which are important to assess the strength of the model.

As for the second stage of the analysis, the author found significant differences for mean values, although overall the models had very low R Square coefficients. The

tools of SPSS did not provide an opportunity to assess dependent variables altogether, which might improve the overall strengths of the model.

Given research provides substantial implications for further study, showing that significant number of Russian speakers do not possess citizenship, thus feel discriminated. This provides a background for further analysis of their political attitudes that reach far beyond institutional trust. It is found, however, that the researched factors do not fully explain the nature of perceived discrimination of Russian speakers. This implies that other factors might be tested in the future, for instance language proficiency of Russian-speakers, or the intensity of communication with Estonian-speakers, as this was outlined in a number of previous studies, but the variables are absent from the datasets. Also, General Linear Model explain small percentages of variability of a particular dimension of institutional trust, meaning that there are other factors to be taken into account.

Bibliography

- Alesina, Alberto, and Eliana La Ferrara. "Who trusts others?." *Journal of public economics* 85.2 (2002): 207-234.
- Amuedo- Dorantes, Catalina, and Sara De la Rica. "Labour market assimilation of recent immigrants in Spain." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45.2 (2007): 257-284.
- Andriessen, Iris, Henk Fernee, and Karin Wittebrood. "Perceived discrimination in the Netherlands." (2014).
- Banks, Kira Hudson, and Laura P. Kohn-Wood. "The influence of racial identity profiles on the relationship between racial discrimination and depressive symptoms." *Journal of Black Psychology* 33.3 (2007): 331-354.
- Berry, John W., et al. *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation across national contexts*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2006.
- Bonner, Dean E. *A comprehensive examination of the determinants and consequences of political trust among Latinos*. Diss. University of New Orleans, 2009.
- Campeano, Maureen, et al. "Perceived discrimination and ethnic identity among breast cancer survivors." *Oncology nursing forum*. Vol. 39. No. 2. NIH Public Access, 2012.
- Cassidy, Clare, et al. "Perceived discrimination and psychological distress: the role of personal and ethnic self-esteem." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 51.3 (2004): 329.
- Chanley, Virginia A., Thomas J. Rudolph, and Wendy M. Rahn. "Public trust in government in the Reagan years and beyond." *What is it about government that Americans dislike* (2001): 59-78.
- Craney, Trevor A., and James G. Surles. "Model-dependent variance inflation factor cutoff values." *Quality Engineering* 14.3 (2002): 391-403.

- Crocker, Jennifer. "Social stigma and self-esteem: Situational construction of self-worth." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35.1 (1999): 89-107.
- Dinesen, Peter Thisted, and Marc Hooghe. "When in Rome, do as the Romans do: the acculturation of generalized trust among immigrants in Western Europe." *International Migration Review* 44.3 (2010): 697-727.
- Elsuwege, Peter van. "Russian-speaking minorities in Estonia and Latvia: Problems of integration at the threshold of the European Union." (2004).
- Ensher, Ellen A., Elisa J. Grant-Vallone, and Stewart I. Donaldson. "Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances." *Human resource development quarterly* 12.1 (2001): 53.
- Fought, Carmen. *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Gallegos, Jenny. "Perceptions of Discrimination: An Analysis of Four National Surveys of Latinos; Findings from the Pew Hispanic Center/Kaiser Family Foundation National Survey of Latinos." *McNair Scholars Research Journal* 6.1 (2010): 7.
- Gee, Gilbert C., et al. "Self-reported discrimination and mental health status among African descendants, Mexican Americans, and other Latinos in the New Hampshire REACH 2010 Initiative: the added dimension of immigration." *American Journal of Public Health* 96.10 (2006): 1821-1828.
- Gong, Li. "Ethnic identity and identification with the majority group: Relations with national identity and self-esteem." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 31.4 (2007): 503-523.
- Hausmann, Leslie RM, et al. "Perceived racial discrimination in health care and its association with patients' healthcare experiences: does the measure matter?." *Ethnicity & disease* 20.1 (2010): 40.
- Hetherington, Marc J. "The political relevance of political trust." *American political science review* 92.04 (1998): 791-808.

- Hudson, John. "Institutional trust and subjective well-being across the EU." *Kyklos* 59.1 (2006): 43-62.
- Hughes, James. "'Exit' in deeply divided societies: regimes of discrimination in Estonia and Latvia and the potential for Russophone migration." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 43.4 (2005): 739-762.
- Järve, Priit. "1 Estonian citizenship: Between ethnic preferences and democratic obligations." *гражданство* (2009): 45.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, et al. "Perceived discrimination, social support networks, and psychological well-being among three immigrant groups." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 37.3 (2006): 293-311.
- Jasinskaja- Lahti, Inga, Karmela Liebkind, and Erling Solheim. "To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination." *Applied Psychology* 58.1 (2009): 105-128.
- Jensen, Lene Arnett. "Immigrants' cultural identities as sources of civic engagement." *Applied Development Science* 12.2 (2008): 74-83.
- Jeong, Hoi Ok. "A New Typology of Perceived Discrimination and Its Relationship to Immigrants' Political Trust." *Polish Sociological Review* 194.2 (2016): 209-226.
- Kallas, Kristina. "Etnicheskaya politika v stranakh Baltii—Kristina Kallas." (2014): 550-552.
- Kleinbaum, David G., and Mitchel Klein. "Ordinal logistic regression." *Logistic regression* (2010): 463-488.
- Kroncke, Charles, and Kenneth Smith. "The wage effects of ethnicity in Estonia." *Economics of Transition* 7.1 (1999): 179-199.
- Laur, Mati. *History of Estonia*. Avita, 2000.
- Linder, Wolf. *Swiss democracy: Possible solutions to conflict in multicultural societies*. Springer, 2010.

- Lindzey, Gardner, Daniel Gilbert, and Susan T. Fiske. *The Handbook of Social Psychology: 2-Volume Set*. Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Mateos, Pablo. "Uncertain segregation: the challenge of defining and measuring ethnicity in segregation studies." *Built Environment* 37.2 (2011): 226-238.
- Marju, Lauristin, Vihalemm, Triin,. "Integration in Estonia: different ways." *Impact of Culture on Integration: Conference Proceedings*. Tallinn: Gravitas Consult. Vol. 200. 2012.
- Michelson, Melissa R. "The corrosive effect of acculturation: How Mexican Americans lose political trust." *Social Science Quarterly* 84.4 (2003): 918-933.
- Mills, Daniel, and A. Celeste Gaia. "Prototype Use in Perceptions of Prejudice in Interactions Between Whites and Latinos." *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research* 17.1 (2012).
- Mossakowski, Krysia N. "Coping with perceived discrimination: does ethnic identity protect mental health?." *Journal of health and social behavior* (2003): 318-331.
- Norušis, Marija J. *SPSS 14.0 guide to data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2006.
- O'Connor, Alice, Chris Tilly, and Lawrence Bobo, eds. *Urban inequality: Evidence from four cities*. Russell Sage Foundation, 2001.
- Pascoe, Elizabeth A., and Laura Smart Richman. "Perceived discrimination and health: a meta-analytic review." *Psychological bulletin* 135.4 (2009): 531.
- Phinney, Jean S., Tanya Madden, and Lorena J. Santos. "Psychological variables as predictors of perceived ethnic discrimination among minority and immigrant adolescents." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28.11 (1998): 937-953.
- Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital." *Journal of democracy* 6.1 (1995): 65-78.
- Robinson, Lena. "South Asians in Britain: acculturation, identity and perceived discrimination." *Psychology and Developing Societies* 17.2 (2005): 181-194.

- Röder, Antje, and Peter Mühlau. "DISCRIMINATION, EXCLUSION AND IMMIGRANTS'CONFIDENCE IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN EUROPE." *European Societies* 13.4 (2011): 535-557.
- Sabatier, Colette, and John W. Berry. "The role of family acculturation, parental style, and perceived discrimination in the adaptation of second-generation immigrant youth in France and Canada." *European journal of developmental psychology* 5.2 (2008): 159-185.
- Sanchez, Juan I., and Petra Brock. "Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: is diversity management a luxury or a necessity?." *Academy of Management Journal* 39.3 (1996): 704-719.
- Satorra, Albert, and Peter M. Bentler. "A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis." *Psychometrika* 66.4 (2001): 507-514.
- Simpson, Andrew. *Language and national identity in Africa*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Stevenson, Luna. *Assimilation and Discrimination*. Diss. Oberlin College, 2010.
- Tajfel, Henri. *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Torres, Stephanie. "Language Difficulties, Cultural Conflicts, and Perceived Discrimination across Generations of Latino Youth." *DePaul Discoveries* 2.1 (2014): 12.
- Vihalemm, Triin, and Veronika Kalmus. "Cultural differentiation of the Russian minority." *Journal of Baltic Studies* 40.1 (2009): 95-119.
- Wiley, Shaun, et al. "Rejection-(dis) identification and ethnic political engagement among first-generation Latino immigrants to the United States." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 19.3 (2013): 310.

Yeager, David S., et al. "Loss of Institutional Trust Among Racial and Ethnic Minority Adolescents: A Consequence of Procedural Injustice and a Cause of Life-Span Outcomes." *Child Development* 88.2 (2017): 658-676.

Appendices

Table 7

Results of Binary Logistic Regression – Model Summary

| Step | -2 Log likelihood | Cox & Snell R Square | Nagelkerke R Square |
|------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 738.635 ^a | .073 | .110 |

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001. Source: ESS2014

Table 8

Results of Binary Logistic Regression – Classification Table

| | | Member of a group discriminated against in this country | | Percentage Correct |
|---|-----|---|-----|--------------------|
| | | Yes | No | |
| Member of a group discriminated against in this country | Yes | 7 | 166 | 4.0 |
| | No | 10 | 536 | 98.2 |
| Overall Percentage | | | | 78.5 |

Source: ESS2014

Table 9

Results of Binary Logistic Regression – Variables in the Equation

| | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) |
|-------------------------|-------|------|--------|----|------|--------|
| Citizenship | -.802 | .205 | 15.259 | 1 | .000 | .449 |
| Age | .014 | .006 | 5.081 | 1 | .024 | 1.014 |
| Gender | .346 | .186 | 3.458 | 1 | .063 | 1.413 |
| Mother Born in Country | -.571 | .279 | 4.177 | 1 | .041 | .565 |
| Unemployed for 3 months | .677 | .188 | 12.974 | 1 | .000 | 1.968 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|------|-------|---|------|-------|
| Education | | | 1.040 | 2 | .594 | |
| Education(1) | .290 | .385 | .566 | 1 | .452 | 1.336 |
| Education(2) | -.030 | .270 | .012 | 1 | .912 | .971 |
| Subjective soc.-ec. Status | | | .161 | 3 | .984 | |
| (1) | .076 | .430 | .032 | 1 | .859 | 1.079 |
| (2) | .108 | .303 | .127 | 1 | .722 | 1.114 |
| (3) | .119 | .312 | .146 | 1 | .702 | 1.127 |
| Constant | 1.026 | .739 | 1.929 | 1 | .165 | 2.791 |

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: ctzcntr, agea, gndr, mocntr, uemp3, education, hincfel. Source: ESS2014

Table 10

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in Country's Parliament

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 1.361 | .328 | 4.147 | .000 | .717 | 2.005 |
| Happiness | .198 | .042 | 4.660 | .000 | .114 | .281 |
| Discr - No | 1.412 | .212 | 6.655 | .000 | .995 | 1.828 |
| Discr - Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. Source: ESS2014

Table 11

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in The Legal System

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 1.828 | .331 | 5.531 | .000 | 1.179 | 2.477 |
| Happiness | .265 | .043 | 6.201 | .000 | .181 | .349 |
| Discr – No | 1.246 | .212 | 5.867 | .000 | .829 | 1.663 |
| Discr - Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. Source: ESS2014

Table 12

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in Police

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|--------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 3.435 | .330 | 10.394 | .000 | 2.786 | 4.084 |
| Happiness | .241 | .043 | 5.643 | .000 | .157 | .324 |
| Discr - No | .779 | .214 | 3.647 | .000 | .360 | 1.199 |
| Discr - Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. Source: ESS2014

Table 13

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in Politicians

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 1.046 | .309 | 3.381 | .001 | .439 | 1.653 |
| Happiness | .203 | .040 | 5.072 | .000 | .124 | .282 |
| Discr - No | 1.094 | .199 | 5.500 | .000 | .704 | 1.485 |
| Discr - Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. Source: ESS2014

Table 14

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in Political Parties

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 1.607 | .303 | 5.297 | .000 | 1.011 | 2.203 |
| Happiness | .149 | .039 | 3.800 | .000 | .072 | .226 |
| Discr – No | .964 | .195 | 4.946 | .000 | .581 | 1.346 |
| Discr - Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Table 15

Results of General Linear Model for Trust in the European Parliament

| Parameter | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intercept | 1.915 | .349 | 5.488 | .000 | 1.230 | 2.600 |
| Happiness | .103 | .045 | 2.287 | .022 | .015 | .192 |
| Discr – No | 1.300 | .222 | 5.850 | .000 | .864 | 1.736 |
| Discr – Yes | 0 ^a | . | . | . | . | . |

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. Source: ESS2014