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This paper examines relationship between social identities and acculturation strategies of Russians (the ethnic minority) and Ossetians (the ethnic majority) in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (RNO-A). This study reveals the similarities and differences in relationships between social identities and acculturation strategies of integration and assimilation in three generations of Russians and Ossetians, living in RNO-A. The sample included 109 grandparent-parent-adolescent triads from Russian families and 106 triads from Ossetian families (N=645). Acculturation strategies and acculturation expectations were measured with MIRIPS scales, for ethnic, civic, religious, republic, regional identities. Data processing was carried out using structural equation modelling (SEM) separately for the ethnic minority and the ethnic majority. In the Russian sample there is a negative correlation between Russian cultural identity and the preference of assimilation strategy, and a positive correlation between their other (Ossetian) cultural identity and their integration strategy in all three generations. Among Ossetians no clear relationship between their Ossetian cultural identity and acculturation expectations was found in any of the generations. In Ossetian grandparents and adolescents the other (Russian) cultural identity is positively associated with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism. In adolescents (unlike grandparents and parents) this identity also has a positive correlation with the acculturation expectation melting pot. For Ossetian parents and adolescents their own cultural identity is positively associated with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism. For Ossetian parents (unlike for grandparents and adolescents) their own cultural identity negatively correlates with the acculturation expectation melting pot. In both ethnic groups their own cultural identities promote the preservation of their own culture while other cultural identities help them to adapt successfully in a multicultural society.
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Introduction

Practically all contemporary societies are multicultural. Effective intercultural interaction between different ethnic groups in such societies is of great importance.

Researchers use the category ‘multiculturalism’ in the studies of interethnic relations. Multiculturalism is defined differently and takes different forms in, for example, schools, organizations, and countries. In general, multiculturalism tries to foster understanding and appreciation of ethnic diversity by acknowledging and respecting various groups and cultures [Verkuyten, 2005].

Research has shown, that a multicultural ideology contributes to such interaction, due to its ability to promote positive and secure relations between ethnic groups as well as openness to and acceptance of others. [Berry,1984; Berry, Kalin, 1995].

The support of a multicultural ideology is an important indicator in the assessment of a social climate of cultural diversity [Van de Vijver et al., 2008]. On the contrary, an assimilation ideology only declares the equality of various groups. In reality such an ideology justifies the intellectual and moral superiority of the dominant identity and culture [Fredrickson, 1999]. Nevertheless, in some studies the importance of a multicultural ideology is disputed [Barry, 2001], multiculturalism is criticized [Brewer, 1997], and the need to rehabilitate the assimilationist ideology is highlighted [Alba, Nee, 1997; Gans, 1999].

Berry has argued that a multicultural ideology on the level of society manifests as an acculturation strategy of integration at the individual level. The individual level counterpart to an assimilationist ideology at the societal level is the assimilation strategy of minority group members [Berry, 1984, 2001, 2011]. Assimilation is the strategy used when individuals do not wish to maintain the identity of their heritage culture, seek closer interaction with the other culture, and adopt the cultural values, norms and traditions of the new society. When there is an interest in maintaining one’s original culture while also having daily interactions with other groups and acceptance there, it is called integration. [Berry, 2011].

In most studies on the acculturation strategies of migrants and ethnic minorities and acculturation expectations of the host population, the strategy of integration promotes successful psychological and socio-cultural adaptation [Berry, Phinney, Sam, Vedder, 2006]. However, in some studies the importance of the strategy of assimilation in the adaptation of migrants and ethnic
minorities is demonstrated [Grennan, Xie, 2008; Harker, 2001; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk, Kinunen, 2011].

Some research suggests that it seems unlikely that the effects of multiculturalism, integration and assimilation are similar for ethnic majority and minority groups [Arends-Toth, Van de Vijver, 2003]. Verkuyten [2005] has shown that members of minority groups are more likely to endorse multiculturalism more strongly and assimilationist thinking less strongly, while majority group members are more likely to prefer the assimilation of migrants. van Osch and Breugelmans [2012] found similar results in their study of the ethnic majority and five groups of minorities in the Netherlands.

In addition, studies reveal that the choice of acculturation strategies differs among different generations of migrants. In a study of intergenerational differences in the choice of strategy for the acculturation of 3 groups of migrants in Canada (Korean, Vietnamese, East Indian), it was found that Vietnamese and Korean adolescents are more focused on integration, and the East-Indian teens on assimilation while their parents were more focused on the strategy of separation [Kwak, Berry, 2001]. Similar evidence for intergenerational differences in the integration strategy preferred by children compared to their parents were obtained in several other studies [Chung, Okazaki, 1991; Kurian, 1986; Matsuoka, 1990; Nguyen, Williams, 1989; Rosenthal et al., 1996].

Analysing the factors influencing the choice of acculturation strategies of integration and assimilation, the research emphasizes the important role of social identity (ethnic, national, religious) of ethnic group members.

For example, Berry and Sabatier [2010] in their cross-cultural study of second-generation immigrants in Canada and France found that ethnic identity positively correlates with separation and negatively with integration, civic identity positively correlates with integration and negatively with separation. Umana-Taylor and Updegraff [2007], studying Latin America adolescents, obtained similar results.

Georgas and Papastylianou [1998], studying ethnic Greeks who were repatriated to Greece from Albania, Russia, Australia, Canada and USA, found that ethnic Greek identity is positively correlated with assimilation while a mixed identity (e.g. Albanian-Greek or Russian-Greek) is positively correlated with integration. Indigenous identity (e.g. Albanian), correlated with separation. The same results were obtained by Laroche et al. [1998] in a study of French-Canadians.

In studies of different identities in Canada 1974 and 1991, it was found that the dominance of civic identity (Canadian) over ethno-linguistic identity (British-Canadian or French-Canadian) in
1974, and provincial (Quebecois) in 1991 among Canadians of British and French origin, is largely connected with the acceptance of multiculturalism and tolerance [Kalin, Berry, 1995]. In studies on the relationship between multiculturalism and assimilation, and identities in ethnic minority and majority groups [Verkuyten, 2005; van Osch, Breugelmans, 2012], it was found that in minority groups endorsement of multiculturalism correlated with identification with their own ethnic group and positive in-group evaluation. The preference for assimilation in minority groups is associated with low identification with their ethnic group and less positive in-group evaluation.

In contrast, the more majority group members endorse multiculturalism, the less likely they are to identify with their ethnic group and to show negative out-group evaluation and vice versa, the more they endorse assimilationist ideology, the higher their ethnic identification and negative out-group evaluation [Verkuyten, 2005; van Osch, Breugelmans, 2012].

Researchers have mostly studied adolescent samples [Verkuyten, 2002, 2005; Ng Tseung-Wong, Verkuyten, 2013; Umana-Taylor, Updegraff, 2007]. Relatively rare are studies of two generations, such as the study of van Osch and Breugelmans [2012] with representatives of first and second generation ethnic minorities. Some studies examine the relationship between multicultural ideology and acculturation strategies in two generations. Kwak and Berry [2001] found intergenerational differences in relationships between the acculturation strategies of immigrants (parents and children) and their attitudes to maintaining their language and culture, and to endogenous marriages.

When considering the question of the relationship between social identity and acculturation attitudes is important to understand that in a multicultural society, different groups can be formed apart from ethnic and civic national identity.

For example, Verkuyten and Yildiz, [2007] study ethnic, cultural, national and religious identities. Researchers define also identification with the majority group [Gong, 2007], host national identity [Martinovic, Verkuyten, 2012], dual identity [Hong et al. 2003, Dovidio, Gaertner, Saguy 2007] hybrid identities [Sarkar. Allen 2007], flexible identities [Carter 2010], intercultural and multicultural identities [Bauera, Loomisa, Akkaria, 2013], bicultural and marginal identity [Ting-Toomey et al. 2000], bicultural and bilingual identity [Tong, 2014] alternating and blending ethno-cultural orientations [Ward et al. 2013], ethno-national identity [Cara, 2010], provincial [Kalin, Berry, 1995], and place identity [Rico, Jennings, 2012]. In the process of acculturation, according to Flannery et al. [2001], a new ethnic identity can be constructed (e.g. ‘chicanos’ in America).
There are also studies of the relationship between different types of identities [Saroglou, Hanique, 2006; Verkuyten, Thijs, 2012]. Saroglou and Hanique [2006] examine the relationship between Jewish identity with other collective identities (national and transnational) among Jewish adolescents in Belgium.

In some studies, researchers consider intergenerational changes in the relationships between identities. For example, Dimitrova, Chasiotis, Bender, and van de Vijver [2013] studied the transmission of Bulgarian, Gypsy, family and religious identities of adolescent from their mothers.

Verkuyten and Thijs [2012] found that Moroccan-Dutch Muslim adolescents have a higher level of national identity than their parents, but a lower level of religious and ethnic identity. There was a positive correlation between religious (Muslim) and ethnic identities, and a negative relationship with the Dutch identity for adolescents and their parents.

In addition, a study of adolescents from three religious groups in Mauritius (Hindu, Muslim, and Christian), found that adolescents from minority groups have a higher level of religious identity than of civil. The relationship between religious and civil identity was positive, although this relationship within the majority group (Hindus) members was higher [Ng Tseung-Wong, Verkuyten, 2013].

Overall, the analysis of the research shows that ethnic minorities prefer multiculturalism and prefer the integration strategy while the ethnic majority prefers the assimilationist ideology and the assimilation of migrants and minorities. The focus of the studies was mainly on the relationships between ethnic, civil and religious identity, and a multicultural ideology and strategies of acculturation. The results demonstrate that ethnic identity positively correlates with multiculturalism among minorities and with the assimilationist ideology in the majority. The integration of migrants negatively correlates with ethnic identity and positively correlate with civil identity. Different ethnic groups living in the same country demonstrated higher correlations between multicultural ideology and tolerance, and their civil identity than with their ethnic and provincial identities. Most studies were conducted using samples of adolescents; intergenerational research conducted using samples of two generations (adolescents and their parents) was relatively rare. There have been no studies using three generations. The question arises: how relevant is the previous research to the three generations of ethnic minorities and the majority living in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (RNO-A) in Russia?
The context of interethnic relations of Russians and Ossetians in the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania

One of the important issues in RNO-A is interethnic relations and the strategies of mutual acculturation of the titular ethnic group (Ossetians) and Russians as an ethnic minority.

An analysis of the dynamics of the ethnic composition of the population of RNO-A suggests that there is an intensive outflow of Russian population [Vsesoyuznaya, 2015; Itogi, 2004; Itogi, 2012]. Russians constituted around 50% of the population in the 1940–70s, about 30% in the 1970–1990s, and 20% in 2010 in Ossetia.

There is identity transformation among Russians living in RNO-A, they have started to recognize themselves as an ethnic minority [Soldatova, 1998; Vorobyev, 2001; Belozerov, 2001], although they are the majority in Russia as a whole.

The literature shows [Migratsiya, 2013] that attitudes towards the Russian minority in RNO-A are not discriminatory and the Republic is the most favourable place for Russians in the North Caucasus, as the majority of Ossetians are Christians.

However, due to the hierarchical structure of Ossetian society, the incorporation of Russians into the regional political and business elites is difficult. Social stratification contributes to the formation of various sectors of society along ethnic lines. Therefore, ethnic Ossetians dominate parliament in RNO-A [Dzadziev, 2008]. There is also an outflow of Russian youth, who focus on admission into universities in major Russian cities, because they cannot pay for education at the prestigious faculties of the universities of RNO-A [Dzadziev, 2008].

Interethnic tension in RNO-A due to the Ossetian-Ingush conflict and a large number of refugees from South Ossetia and Georgia has led to the growing significance of ethnic identity among Ossetians and among Russians [Soldatova, 1998]. However, ethnic identity is more significant for Ossetians in comparison with Russians, and this tendency is increasing [Kobakhidze, 2005; Vereshchagina, 2010; Gurieva, 1997, 2010]. Russians are more likely to identify themselves with the Russian Federation: more than 50% consider themselves to be primarily Russian citizens [Kolosov, O’loughlin, 2008; Soldatova, 1998; Kobakhidze, 2005; Vereshchagina, 2010; Gurieva, 1997, 2010]. At the same time, Russians have a republican identity more than Ossetians do [Soldatova, 1998].

Research on strategies of intercultural interaction [Gutsunarova, 2010] showed that the majority of Ossetians and Russians living in RNO-A choose a strategy of the equal status
interaction and these ethnic groups are oriented towards integration [Kobakhidze, 2005]. However, Russians prefer equality more than Ossetians do [Gutsunarova, 2010]. This is especially evident in business [Kobakhidze, 2005]: Russians, unlike Ossetians, are more open to joint activities with Ossetians [Gurieva, 1997, 2010]. They demonstrate a higher willingness to cooperate on group and interpersonal levels [Gutsunarova, 2010]. In addition, Russians positively evaluate their last experience of inter-ethnic relations with Ossetians [Soldatova, 1998, Drobizheva. 2003].

Ossetians have a high degree of emotional acceptance of Russians [Gurieva, 1997, 2010] and in general, they have positive stereotypes of Russians. However, Ossetians more frequently demonstrate isolationist attitudes, they have a dominant orientation toward mono-ethnic marriages, they are less ready to accept a person from another ethnic group as a supervisor [Kobakhidze, 2005].

In addition, studies have indicated that socio-cultural context and place of residence have an impact on ethnic attitudes and the interethnic relations of Russians and Ossetians. Russians living in Vladikavkaz, the capital of RNO-A, feel a greater sense of pride in their people, and a higher emotional attachment to them, than Russians living in St. Petersburg do. [Gurieva, 1997, 2010].

In general, the literature and the description of social context allows us to conclude the following:

It is quite difficult to unambiguously determine the status of Ossetians and Russians in RNO-A in the usual terms of ethnic majority and ethnic minority, because Russians are the minority in RNO-A, but they are the majority in the Russian Federation as a whole, while Ossetians are the majority in the RNO-A, but the minority in Russia. In this regard, the choice of the most preferred acculturation attitudes in these groups may differ from those reported in the study of classical variants of ethnic minorities and the majority in other countries and regions (integration or separation for minorities and assimilation for the majority) [Verkuyten, 2005; Kwak, Berry, 2001].

Russians in RNO-A can have both a national and regional identity that orient them towards Ossetian culture. Ossetians can also identify themselves with the Russian culture and language. These complementary identities and their ethnic and civic identity may influence the acculturation attitudes of Russians and Ossetians.

In the last 60 years (a three generation-period of socialization) the social context of interethnic relations in RNO-A has changed significantly. There is the possibility of an intergenerational change in both social identities and acculturation attitudes of the ethnic groups.
The main research question of our study is: What are the similarities and differences in the relationship between social identity and the acculturation strategies of integration and assimilation among representatives of three generations of Russians and Ossetians living in RNO-A?

**Method**

**Participants**

109 grandparent-parent-adolescent triads from ethnic Russian families and 106 triads from ethnic Ossetian families (N=645) participated in the study which was conducted in RNO-A in 2014. Table 1 provides the basic characteristics of these samples.

Table 1. Gender and age characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gender characteristics</th>
<th>Age characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N, %)</td>
<td>Female (N, %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34 (32%)</td>
<td>74 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>29 (27%)</td>
<td>79 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25 (25%)</td>
<td>75 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50 (47%)</td>
<td>56 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>22 (21%)</td>
<td>84 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>81 (80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measures**

The study used scales from the MIRIPS questionnaire (http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips), translated into Russian and adapted for use in Russia [Lebedeva, Tatarko, 2009]:

*Ethnic identity* (significance and positivity) (6 items, for example, ‘I am proud to be Russian (Ossetian)’, all $R^2_{first\ factor} > 67.26$; all $\alpha > .89$).

*National identity* (significance and positivity) (6 items, for example, ‘I feel proud when I hear the anthem of Russia’, all $R^2_{first\ factor} > 63.17$; all $\alpha > .87$).

*Acculturation strategies* (for the Russian minority): *integration* (3 items, for example, ‘It is important to me to be fluent in both Ossetian and Russian languages’, all $R^2_{first\ factor} > 63.71$; all $\alpha > .71$); *assimilation* (4 items, for example, ‘I prefer social activities which involve Ossetians only’, all $R^2_{first\ factor} > 69.51$; all $\alpha > .85$).
Acculturation expectation (for the Ossetian majority): *multiculturalism* (3 items, for example, ‘Russians should be fluent in both Ossetian and Russian languages’ all $R^2_{\text{first factor}} > 64.58$; all $\alpha > .72$); *melting pot* (4 items, for example, ‘Russians should prefer social activities which involve Ossetians only’ all $R^2_{\text{first factor}} > 66.31$; all $\alpha > .82$).

In addition, we used following scales:

*Religious identity* (5 items, for example, ‘My religious identity is an important part of me’ [Verkuyten, 2007; Verkuyten, Yildiz, 2007], all $R^2_{\text{first factor}} > 69.27$; all $\alpha > .81$).

*Republic identity* (4 items, for example, ‘I feel like a representative/resident of the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania’ (developed by the members of International Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research) all $R^2_{\text{first factor}} > 74.11$; all $\alpha > .78$).

*Regional (Caucasian) identity* (4 items, for example, ‘I feel like a part of the Caucasian culture’ (developed by the members of International Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research. Examples) all $R^2_{\text{first factor}} > 82.76$; all $\alpha > .93$).

*Socio-demographic data.* We asked our participants about their personal characteristics (gender, age, education, and ethnicity).

*Data processing.* We used the following methods of data processing: descriptive statistics, Cronbach’s $\alpha$, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), SEM, path analysis with SPSS 22.0 and AMOS 22.0.

**Procedure**

The adolescent participants were recruited from schools and universities in RNO-A. Parents of school students filled out the questionnaires at parental meetings at the schools, and then they were asked to distribute the questionnaires to representatives of their parents. We asked university students to distribute questionnaires among their parents and grandparents. Completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher who administrated the survey. Respondents were not remunerated.
Results

‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities

First of all we reveal the different types of social identities of Russians and Ossetians. Table 2. Significance of social identities of representatives of three generations of Russians and Ossetians (max. 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social identities</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ossetian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adolescents</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>grandparent</td>
<td>adolescents</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>grandparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic</td>
<td>3.98 (.86)</td>
<td>4.00 (.90)</td>
<td>4.09 (.96)</td>
<td>4.19 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.41 (.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national</td>
<td>4.07 (.84)</td>
<td>3.90 (.96)</td>
<td>4.21 (.73)</td>
<td>4.07 (.84)</td>
<td>3.90 (.96)</td>
<td>4.21 (.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td>3.64 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.76 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.05 (.79)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.76 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.05 (.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>republic</td>
<td>4.07 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.96 (.94)</td>
<td>4.30 (.76)</td>
<td>4.07 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.96 (.94)</td>
<td>4.30 (.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional (Caucasian)</td>
<td>4.08 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.85 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.24 (.83)</td>
<td>4.08 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.85 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.24 (.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to reduce the number of different social identities we used the exploratory factor analysis (the method of principal components, rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization). As a result, five social identities—ethnic, national, religious, republic, and regional (Caucasian)—were combined into two factors.

The first factor in the Russian subsample is ‘own cultural identity’ which included ethnic, national and religious identities (% of variance explained: 59 in the adolescent sample, 60 in the parent sample, and 54 in the grandparent sample). The second factor is ‘other cultural identity’ which included republic and regional (Caucasian) identities (% of variance explained: 20 in the adolescent sample, 19 in the parent sample, and 24 in the grandparent sample).

The first factor in Ossetian subsample is ‘own cultural identity’ which included ethnic, republic and regional (Caucasian) identities (% of variance explained: 66 in the adolescent sample, 68 in the parent sample, and 66 in the grandparent sample). The second factor is ‘other cultural identity’ which included national and religious identities (% of variance explained: 17 in the adolescent sample, 16 in the parent sample, and 15 in the grandparent sample).

Further, we study the impact of these two identities (‘own cultural identity’ and ‘other cultural identity’), obtained by the factor analysis, on the preference for acculturation strategies: integration and assimilation. The results of factor analysis allow us to combine identity, ‘belonging
to one's own culture’ in one scale, and identity, and ‘belonging to another culture’ in another scale for the Ossetian and Russian subsamples. Testing the one-dimensionality of the identities scales was carried out using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA).

The scale ‘own cultural identity’ in the sample of Russians consisted of 11 items. The regression weights of items are between .55 and .86. The scale ‘other cultural identity’ in the sample of Russians consisted of 6 items. The regression weights of items are between .55 and .98. The scale ‘own cultural identity’ in the sample of Ossetians consisted of 10 items. The regression weights of items are between .63 and .96. The scale ‘other cultural identity’ in the sample of Ossetians consisted of 8 items. The regression weights of items are between .53 and .98.

Table 3. Characteristics of all models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>own cultural identity</th>
<th>other cultural identity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators of all models meet recommended characteristics [Hu, Bentler, 1999].

**Acculturation attitudes of ethnic minority and majority groups**

For integration and assimilation strategies, a comparative analysis of the means of their significance showed that the integration strategy is preferred to the assimilation strategy among three generations of Russians in RNO-A (t-Student’s for grandparents = 13.727; for parents = 16.977; for adolescents = 18.170. All indicators are significant, p< .0001).

We used MANOVA for intergenerational comparisons of the significance of the integration and assimilation strategies. The analysis showed that the differences between the adolescent, parents and grandparents are insignificant. Wilks's Λ = .978, F(4; 7.239) = 1.810, p = .125, η² = .011. However, we found differences in the significance of the integration strategy between adolescents and their grandparents (this strategy is stronger in adolescents) and between parents and grandparents (integration is stronger in parents).
Table 4. Significance of the acculturation strategies among representatives of three generations of Russians (max. 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation strategies</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
<th>F (2; 3.620)</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>4.17 (.80)</td>
<td>4.12 (.93)</td>
<td>3.87 (1.06)</td>
<td>6.511</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>1.74 (.83)</td>
<td>1.76 (.84)</td>
<td>1.91 (.88)</td>
<td>2.546</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All effects are significant on the level p <.05.

A comparative analysis of the means of the significance of the acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot showed that all three generations of Ossetians in RNO-A prefer multiculturalism to melting pot regarding Russians (t-Student’s for grandparents = 11.277; for parents = 13.381; for adolescents = 14.959. All indicators are significant, p<.0001).

An intergenerational analysis of preferences in the acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot for Ossetians showed no significant differences between generations: Wilks's Λ = .988, F(4; 3.688) = .922, p = .451, η² = .006. Also no differences were found for each strategy separately.

Table 5. Significance of the acculturation strategies among representatives of three generations of Ossetians (max. 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation expectation</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
<th>F (2; 1.844)</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>4.03 (.92)</td>
<td>3.85 (.93)</td>
<td>3.92 (.95)</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melting pot</td>
<td>1.96 (.95)</td>
<td>2.03 (.88)</td>
<td>2.14 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.859</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All effects are significant on the level p <.05.

The relations of ‘own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities to integration and assimilation strategies in three generations of Ossetians and Russians

Analysis of the relationship between identities and strategies of acculturation was carried out using structural equation modelling with SPSS 22.0 and AMOS 22.0.

Below we present the results of the relationship of ‘own cultural identity’ and ‘other cultural identity’ with the strategies of acculturation among three generations of Russians.
The results showed that the ‘own cultural identity’ of Russian grandparents is significantly and negatively related to their strategy of assimilation. This means that the stronger the Russian identity is, the less they prefer assimilation. ‘Other cultural identity’ is significantly and positively associated with both integration and assimilation. This means that identification with the Caucasian culture promotes both integration and assimilation. Both ‘own cultural identity’ and ‘other cultural identity’ are significantly and positively correlated with each other. The strategy of integration is significantly and negatively correlated with the strategy of assimilation.
Figure 2. Model of relationships of the identities and the strategies of acculturation among Russian parents from RNO-A. Indicators of the model: $\chi^2 = 25.0; \text{df} = 23; p = .350; \chi^2/\text{df} = 1.0; \text{CFI} = .994; \text{RMSEA} = .028; \text{SRMR} = .058$.

The results showed that the ‘own cultural identity’ of the parent generation of Russians is significantly and positively related to the strategy of integration, and significantly and negatively related with the strategy of assimilation. This means that the stronger the Russian identity, the higher the orientation to integration and the lower the orientation to assimilation. ‘Other cultural identity’ has a similar effect: it is significantly and positively related to integration, and significantly and negatively associated with assimilation. ‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively correlated each with other. The strategies of integration and assimilation are significantly and negatively correlated with each other.
Figure 3. Model of relationships of the identities and the strategies of acculturation among Russian adolescents from RNO-A. Indicators of the model: $\chi^2 = 33.2$ df = 23; $p = .078$; $\chi^2$/df = 1.5; CFI = .972; RMSEA = .064; SRMR = .058.

The results showed that the ‘own cultural identity’ of the adolescent generation of Russians is significantly and negatively related to the strategy of assimilation. This means, that the stronger Russian identity, the weaker the orientation to assimilation. ‘Other cultural identity’ is significantly and positively associated with the strategy of integration. This means that a strong identification with Caucasian culture promotes an integration strategy. ‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively correlated each with other. The strategy of integration is significantly and negatively correlated with the strategy of assimilation.

An intergroup analysis of the variables (‘own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities, integration, assimilation) included in the model allow us to determine the index of proportionality (proportionality index or Tucker's phi) [Lorenzo-Seva, ten Berge, 2006; Tucker, 1951]. All indexes are above 0.9, which indicates their significance. This allows a comparison of the models of three generations of Russians living in RNO-A.

The analysis showed that the ‘own cultural identity’ of three generations of Russians is significantly and negatively related to their strategy of assimilation, while their ‘other cultural identity’ is significantly and positively related to their strategy of integration.
Moreover, ‘own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively correlated with each other among all generations of Russians. The strategies of integration and assimilation also negatively correlate among all generations.

There are differences among the correlations between ‘other cultural identity’ and assimilation: this relation is positive for grandparents, it is negative for parents and statistically insignificant for adolescents. Also the ‘own cultural identity’ of parents has a positive association with their integration strategy, unlike the adolescent and grandparent association, which is insignificant for both.

Then we consider the correlations between ‘own and ‘other’ cultural identities, and the strategies of acculturation among three generations of Ossetians in RNO-A.

Figure 4. Model of associations of the identities and the strategies of acculturation among Ossetian grandparents from RNO-A. Indicators of the model: $\chi^2 = 33.3; df = 21; p = .043; \chi^2/df = 1.1; CFI = .959; RMSEA = .075; SRMR = .070.$

The results showed that only the ‘other’ cultural identity of the grandparental generation of Ossetians is significantly positively associated with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism. ‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly positively related to each other. The acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot are significantly negatively correlated.
Figure 5. Model of associations of the identities and the strategies of acculturation among Ossetian parents from RNO-A. Indicators of the model: $\chi^2 = 35.4$; df = 21; $p = .025$; $\chi^2/df = 1.7$; CFI = .963; RMSEA = .080; SRMR = .064.

The results showed that the ‘own’ cultural identity of the parents is significantly and positively correlated with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism and significantly and negatively related to the acculturation expectation melting pot, in other words, the stronger the Ossetian identity, the more Ossetian parents prefer the integration of Russians and the less they prefer the assimilation of Russians. The ‘other’ cultural identity has no significant correlation with the acculturation expectations of Ossetian parents. ‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively related to each other. The acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot are significantly and negatively correlated.
The results showed that the ‘own’ cultural identity of the adolescent generation of Ossetians is significantly and positively correlated with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism. This means that the more Ossetian adolescents identify themselves with Russian culture, the more they focus on the integration of Russians. ‘Other cultural identity’ is significantly and positively related to the acculturation expectations multiculturalism, and melting pot. This means that the more Ossetian adolescents identify themselves with Russian culture, the more they are focused on integration and assimilation of Russians in RNO-A. ‘Own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively related to each other. The acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot are significantly and negatively correlated.

Intergroup analysis of the variables included in the model allowed us to determine the index of proportionality (proportionality index or Tucker's phi) [Lorenzo-Seva, ten Berge, 2006; Tucker, 1951]. All indexes are above 0.9, which indicates their significance. This compared the models for three generations of Ossetians living in RNO-A.

The analysis showed that ‘own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities are significantly and positively correlated among all three generations. The acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot have a significant and negative correlation for all generations of Ossetians.

The ‘other’ cultural identity of Ossetian grandparents and adolescents is positively associated with their acculturation expectation multiculturalism (the association is insignificant for
the parents). The ‘other’ cultural identity of adolescents has a positive correlation with the acculturation expectation melting pot (this correlation is insignificant for grandparents and parents).

‘Own cultural identity’ has a positive correlation with the acculturation expectation multiculturalism for parents and adolescents (this relation is insignificant for grandparents). In addition, the ‘own’ cultural identity of Ossetian parents is significantly related to the acculturation expectation melting pot. The significance of Ossetian identity does not promote the assimilation of Russians (the relation is insignificant for grandparents and adolescents).

The choice of the acculturation expectations of Ossetian grandparents is associated with their ‘other’ cultural identity. At the same time the choice of the acculturation expectations of parents has significant correlation with their ‘own’ cultural identity. The choice of the acculturation expectations of adolescents is correlated with the significance of both their ‘own’ and ‘other’ cultural identities.

Discussion

Our study shows that both Russians and Ossetians of all three generations are more oriented toward the integration than the assimilation of Russians in RNO-A. Verkuyten [2005], and van Osch and Breugelmans [2012] found that the minorities largely support multiculturalism, and the majority supports assimilation. Our study demonstrates that the preferences of both Russians and Ossetians are closer to the pattern of ethnic minorities (they both prefer integration and multiculturalism regarding Russians). There are a number of possible explanations for our results: a positive interaction between ethnic groups during their long term contact; a positive history of intergroup relations; the presence of bicultural identities; the simultaneous status of a majority and a minority within the borders of the Republic and in the entire country; or the multicultural views of the habitants of this republic.

The study also showed that Russian adolescents and the parents are more focused on integration than Russian grandparents. These data partly confirm the results obtained earlier in RNO-A by Gutsunarova [2010] who notes that the respondents in the 41–55 age group are more focused on positive equal status inter-ethnic interaction. In our case, integration attitudes have been clearly expressed for both parents (37–60) and adolescents (15–25).

Our results partly correspond with studies of intergenerational differences in the acculturation strategies of three groups of migrants in Canada (Korean, Vietnamese, East Indian). The authors found that Vietnamese and Korean adolescents are more focused on integration, and
East Indian adolescents are more focused on assimilation in contrast to their parents [Kwak, Berry, 2001]. Similar evidence, obtained in several other studies, showed that children were more focused on integration than their parents [Chung, Okazaki, 1991; Kurian, 1986; Matsuoka, 1990; Nguyen, Williams, 1989; Rosenthal et al., 1996].

The analysis of the relationship between identities and the strategies of acculturation of Russians allows us to conclude that in all generations of Russians the strong ‘own’ cultural identity prevents their preference for assimilation, and the strong ‘other’ cultural identity of all three generations contributes to the choosing of an integration strategy. Our findings are different from the results obtained in studies of minority and majority groups in the Netherlands [Verkuyten, 2005; van Osch, Breugelmans, 2012]. The pattern of correlations between identities and the acculturation strategies of Russians does not completely correspond with the minority pattern in the Dutch study. It has similarities with both the minority pattern (negative relationship between ethnic identity and assimilation), and with the majority pattern (a positive out-group evaluation is positively correlated with multiculturalism).

In part, our results are consistent with data obtained by Berry and Sabatier [2010] in a study of four ethnic groups of migrants in Canada (N=323, Greeks, Haitians, Italians, Vietnamese) and 5 ethnic groups in France (N=395, Algerians, immigrants from the Antilles, Moroccans, Portuguese, Vietnamese) where a positive correlation between the identity of the host society (national identity) and the choice of an integration acculturation strategy was found.

Our study also demonstrates that the ‘other’ cultural identity has a positive association with both integration and assimilation only in Russian grandparents. This identity has a negative correlation with the strategy of assimilation in Russian parents. For parents, unlike adolescents and grandparents, their ‘own’ identity has a positive correlation with their integration strategy. In our opinion, taking into account the period of socialization of the parent generation (the collapse of the USSR, and the growth of separatist sentiments in RNO-A) these results show the search for identity, which could be a psychological protection for Russians in the North Caucasus and could help them to adapt effectively to the changed situation. And their own cultural identity plays this role for them.

The study of the relationships between the identities of Ossetians and their acculturation expectations regarding Russians showed that the identification with Russian culture is positively associated with choice of the acculturation expectation multiculturalism in grandparents and adolescents. This identity has a positive correlation with the choice of the acculturation expectation
melting pot of adolescents. ‘Own cultural identity’ is associated with the choice of the acculturation expectation multiculturalism of both Ossetian parents and adolescents.

The research revealed a negative relationship between ‘own’ cultural identity and the acculturation expectation melting pot among parents, unlike grandparents and adolescents. We assume that there is a desire for a positive differentiation of their group and for maintaining ethnic boundaries [Brewer, 2010]. The studies indicated that the ethnic majority often focuses on maintaining its group boundaries [Brown, 2004; Crisp et al., 2001]. However there are examples of maintaining group boundaries among minorities as well [Stefanenko, 2014]. Moreover, the results of a study in the five regions of the North Caucasus (Stavropol province, Karachay-Cherkessia, Kabardino-Balkaria, North Ossetia and Dagestan) showed that Ossetians feel ‘the greatest measure of pride by belonging to their people’ [Kolosov, O’loughlin, 2008. P. 98]. Maybe Ossetians would not like to ‘blur the boundaries of their own ethnic group’.

We also noted that only the ‘own’ cultural identity has a significant relation to the choice of the acculturation expectations in respect to the Russians among Ossetian parents. This probably shows the specificity of parental socialization: it was during a period of increasing ethnic and national awareness and separatist sentiment in RNO-A. In our opinion, these processes could be the cause of the significance of their ‘own’ cultural identity and for the formation of intergroup attitudes.

The results of studies of the relationship between identities and the acculturation expectations for three generations of Ossetians are not consistent with the findings of studies of minorities and majority in the Netherlands [Verkuyten, 2005; van Osch, Breugelmans, 2012]. The Ossetian patterns have similarities with both majority and minority patterns. From our point of view it is an example of intercultural relations between two ethnic groups with similar status in the republic, rather than an interaction between a minority and a majority.

Conclusion

Russians and Ossetians of three generations in RNO-A prefer integration attitudes more than assimilation attitudes. There are no visible intergenerational differences in the preferences of the acculturation expectations multiculturalism and melting pot for Ossetians. While Russian adolescents and parents, in contrast to their grandparents, prefer integration.
‘Own cultural identity’ is negatively related to the assimilation strategy among Russians of three generations. ‘Other cultural identity’ had a positive relation to their preference for the integration strategy. There are intergenerational differences in the relation of the ‘other cultural identity’ to the strategy of assimilation: for grandparents there is a positive association, for parents it is negative. ‘Own cultural identity’ is positively associated with the integration strategy only for Russian parents.

‘Other’ cultural identity’ is positively related to the acculturation expectation multiculturalism for Ossetian grandparents and adolescents. This identity also has a positive correlation with the acculturation expectation melting pot for adolescents (unlike for grandparents and parents). ‘Own’ cultural identity’ is positively related to the acculturation expectation of multiculturalism for Ossetian parents and adolescents. ‘Own cultural identity’ is negatively related to the acculturation expectation melting pot for Ossetian parents (unlike for grandparents and adolescents).

Overall, we can say that the patterns of attitudes of Russians and Ossetians of three generations cannot be unambiguously classified as minority or majority patterns. The identified patterns could show intergroup interaction in a multicultural society between two ethnic groups, oriented toward integration.

The negative relation of the ‘own’ cultural identity to the assimilation strategy and the positive relation of the ‘other’ cultural identity to the integration strategy remains in all three generations of Russians. This shows the stability and universality of these associations for all generations and their possible transmission. Our study did not reveal any clear relationships of ‘own’ cultural identities to the acculturation expectations, which are stable among all three generations of Ossetians. These connections are probably less stable and more dependent on the social context for Ossetians. These assumptions about the attitudes of Russians and Ossetians require additional verification in studies with other samples.

The ‘other’ cultural identity of Russian and Ossetian grandparents plays a significant role: it positively affects mutual integration. For the parents, it can be assumed that the change in social context (the collapse of the USSR, the growth of ethno-national movements in the republics of the North Caucasus), which influenced the socialization of parents generation of Russians and Ossetians, caused the significance of their ‘own’ cultural identity: for Ossetians in their choice of the acculturation expectations of Russians, and for Russians regarding their search for identities which would contribute to an effective adaptation in the changed surroundings.
We can say that adolescents in both the groups are more focused on integration and this is promising for the future of intercultural relations in this republic. No significant differences were found in the mutual acculturation attitudes of Russian and Ossetian adolescents. ‘Other cultural identity’ for both Ossetian and Russian adolescents is related to preference for the integration strategy or the acculturation expectation multiculturalism.

The main limitation of this study is that it was conducted in a society in which both the ethnic minority and ethnic majority belong to the same religious denomination and interethnic interactions are favourable. In order to confirm our conclusions, it is necessary to conduct similar research in societies with visible interethnic tensions and interacting ethnic groups practice different religions.
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