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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Abstract
Within the frames of the international comparative research project ENRI-East, the Russian team studies the Lithuanian ethnic minority residing in the Kaliningrad Region. The main aim of the study is to reveal the ways the European, national and regional identities are formed and realized as well as the relations between individual and group identity among the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority residing in Russia. During the project a variety of interrelated historical, cultural and institutional frameworks have been studied, inside which national identity of the Lithuanians in Russia is formed and realized; as well as the significance of the European, national and regional identities for the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority in Russia; living conditions and lifestyle of the Lithuanian ethnic minority; migration potential, political participation of the Lithuanian ethnic minority; state policy in relation to ethnic minorities in general and to the Lithuanian ethnic minority, in particular, as well as the policy of the Lithuanian Diaspora.

The project involves a detailed quantitative survey of the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority as well as qualitative study applying such sociological method as in-depth biographic interviews with the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority. In order to collect data on this specific group and for a detailed understanding of social context we created “Contextual Report and History of the Lithuanian Ethnic Minority in Russia”, prepared in the course of desk research, including review of scientific literature and analysis of statistics on the topic under study.

1.2 Summary of the Study
Within the frames of the project ‘The Interplay of European, National and Regional Identities: Nations between States along the New Eastern Borders of the European Union’ Lomonosov Moscow State University carried out a complex sociological study correlating and combining various methods of data collection and analysis of sociological data.

1. “Contextual Report and History of the Lithuanian Ethnic Minority in Russia” includes a historical background, analysis of official socio-demographic statistics, a political review, issues of self-organization of the Lithuanian community in Russia. We also did research on the opportunities to study Lithuanian language and to get education in Lithuanian, get access to the mass media publications in Lithuanian, etc.

The main conclusions are the following. The region of the Kaliningrad Region was inhabited in medieval times by tribes of Old Prussians in the western part and Lithuanians in the eastern part by the Pregolya and Alna rivers. The Lithuanian-inhabited areas became known as Lithuania Minor. The Lithuanian-speaking community in East Prussia diminished due to Germanization and assimilation. In the early 20th century Lithuanians made up a majority only in rural parts of the far northeast of East Prussia (Memelland and Minor Lithuania), while the rest of the area was overwhelmingly German-speaking. The Memel Territory (Klaipėda region), formerly part of northeastern East Prussia, was annexed by Lithuania in 1923. After coming to power in 1933, the Nazi regime in Germany radically altered about a third of the place names (the ones not of German origin) of this area by artificially replacing most names of Old Prussian or Lithuanian origin into newly invented German names in 1938.
During World War II the Soviet Army entered the eastern-most tip of East Prussia. The
Potsdam Agreement of world powers assigned northern East Prussia to the Soviet Union pending
the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement. The region was added as
an exclave to the Russian SFSR and since 1946 it has been known as the Kaliningrad Region.

In 1992 an agreement about the status of Kaliningrad and the status of the Lithuanian minority
was ratified between the Republic of Lithuania and the Russian Federation as well as an agree-
ment between the Kaliningrad district and the Lithuanian Ministry of Culture and Education.

In line with the 1996 Federal Law "On National-Cultural Autonomies" over the last ten years in
the Kaliningrad Region the Lithuanian national and cultural movement has been transformed into
an organized regional public association with a clear structure and management. 17 regional and
local Lithuanian cultural organizations (city and district) merged into regional national-cultural
autonomy of Lithuanians Kaliningrad region.

Lithuanian organisations in Kaliningrad work closely with organisations in their mother country.
The majority of the NGO’s and societies’ coordinators and presidents are Lithuanian citizens.
Among the organisations in the mother country are the Kaliningrad region Lithuanian Cultural
Society, the districts’ Lithuanian Cultural Societies and the Lithuanian Youth Union. The Lithua-
nian minority in Kaliningrad also has access to radio channels and, via satellite, to TV from Li-
thuania. Another area in which neighbouring Lithuania is linked to the minority in Kaliningrad is
the shared celebration of Lithuanian state national holidays.

The Lithuanian minority in the Kaliningrad Region of the Russian Federation numbers 13,937
people (2002 census), that is 1.46% of Kaliningrad’s total population.1 According to the local
statistics bureau estimate, however, the number of the Lithuanians in 2007 was near 17,700
people (1.9%).2

In total in the Kaliningrad Region there are 23 centres of the Lithuanian language, including 3
Sunday schools and 16 elective courses. 4 secondary and high schools provide teaching of one or
several subjects in Lithuanian language.

Over the last ten years in the Kaliningrad Region the Lithuanian national and cultural movement
has been transformed into an organized regional public association with a clear structure and
management. 17 regional and local Lithuanian cultural organizations (city and district) merged
into regional national-cultural autonomy of Lithuanians Kaliningrad region. Lithuanian organisa-
tions in Kaliningrad work closely with organisations in their mother country.

2. A sociological survey with the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority was con-
ducted as well. The aim of the survey was to study the ways of formation and realization of the
European, national and regional identity as well as interconnection between individual and group
identity of the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority residing on the territory of Rus-
sia. Four hundred and four people were selected with the use of a snowball sampling for the
quantitative survey.

Analysis of the data obtained in the course of the quantitative study carried out during the project
enables us to make the following major conclusions.

2 http://www.gorodkanta.ru/, http://www.kaliningrad-online.ru/articles0/6718.html
One of the specific characteristics of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region is the fact that half of them as in the past live in the rural area.

The survey findings show that the structure of the identities of the Lithuanians living on the territory of the Kaliningrad Region is determined today not so much by the traditions of the ethnic culture but by the conditions and the nature of the life activities of these people. Survey participants named belonging to a territorial entity as the most important way of identification most often.

The largest percentage of the respondents identified themselves with the Kaliningrad Region. Roughly the same number of the respondents refer themselves to Russia and Lithuania and these numbers are relatively high. Of lower significance is the percentage of respondents connecting themselves with Europe. Contrary to this, the percentage of people who did not feel close to Europe is quite high.

In general, hierarchy of the identities of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region can be considered as one of the characteristics of the crisis society in which everything is aimed at providing conditions for normal life activities. This quality characteristic can be connected with the present state of the whole Russian society as well as this ethnic group.

The findings of the survey show that high level of ethnisation of consciousness is not typical of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region today which is a feature of some other ethnic groups living on the territory of Russia. However, forms of manifestation of this consciousness are determined not by its level itself but by the correlation of significance of ethnic and national (civil) identities.

The majority of the Lithuanians in the region adhere to the modern rational definition of the ethnic belonging. In their opinion, in order to be considered truly Lithuanian, first and foremost, it is necessary to feel Lithuanian (93%), have Lithuanian ancestry (86%) and speak mother tongue (80%). For this it is not necessary to have been born in Lithuania or have lived most part of the life, have Lithuanian citizenship.

The use of the Bogardus social distance scale also provides an evidence of the lack of ethnic tension. Even its indicator that helps to measure maximum degree of closeness (“would accept as close relatives by marriage”) shows that Lithuanians do not have stable ethnic prejudices towards Russian people and other ‘topical’ for the Kaliningrad Region ethnic groups.

According to the survey findings, a natural for the modern world as well process of assimilating a small ethnic group by the dominant one is taking place in the conditions of the lack of ethnic discrimination.

It is important for most of the respondents to have an opportunity to preserve their ethnic customs, traditions and culture (80%), study literature and culture of their ethnic group at school (72%), have their children taught in their mother tongue at school (61%). The existing Regional national and cultural autonomy of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region is aimed at the realization of these opportunities. However, Lithuanian is learnt by no more than 800 people and one or several subjects are taught in Lithuanian only in 4 schools.

Three fourths (77%) of the survey participants know Lithuanian but the majority of them (60%) speak Russian in the family. Another third (36%) speak Lithuanian and Russian at home and just 4% speak only Lithuanian.
If we take into account that almost half of the survey participants were born in the mixed ethnic families, we can assume that many of them while recognizing their officially stated ethnic status in fact have multiple identity. This assumption is proved by the survey findings. Concomitantly, Lithuanians want to nurture in their children raised together with Russian spouse the best traits of their ethnic group.

3. A series of in-depth biographical interviews was conducted with representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority in Russia. The aim of these interviews is to study mechanisms of ethnic self-identification among the representatives of the Lithuanian minority in Russia and how geopolitical changes in Eastern Europe are reflected on the process of their self-identification. Four types of identity were addressed during the biographical interviews: ethnic (connection with one’s ethnic group), national (connection with Russia), regional (connection with the Kaliningrad region) and European (connection with Europe). Respondent selection criteria provided their representativeness by place of residence, gender and age.

Analysis of the data obtained in the course of the biographical interviews makes it possible to do the following conclusions:

Few Lithuanians with strongly expressed ethnic identity remained in the Kaliningrad Region. Respondents with multiple identities prevailed in the study. Many of them felt close to the Kaliningrad Region and Russia.

Not all the respondents of the biographical interviews are proud of being Lithuanian. Five people considered themselves Russian and three of them were women. The majority of the respondents identifying themselves Russian were representatives of the younger generation. Three of the participants of the biographical interviews considered themselves Lithuanian and most of them were men representing different age groups. On the whole, the majority of the respondents considering themselves Lithuanian represented middle-age generation. Two respondents didn’t say who they considered themselves to be.

Most of the respondents have already substantively settled in Russia and many of them don’t want to leave Russia.

Active processes of assimilation, mutual enrichment and interpenetration of cultures were observed. The trend of the gradual loss of Lithuanian language despite the existence of opportunities to learn it has also been outlined. Not all Lithuanians want their children to learn Lithuanian.

The majority of the questioned Lithuanians did not identify themselves with Europe. Contradictory views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were expressed.

Some respondents observed positive outcomes of Lithuania’s joining into the EU and saw it as beneficial to the citizens of Lithuania. Among the positive consequences they named the change of the passport-visa regime and introduction of the Shenghen Visa. It was also stated that it had become cleaner concomitant with more order in Lithuania. Nevertheless, one of the respondents said that due to the small size of the country Lithuania will always be under certain pressure.

Negative views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were also expressed. The “minuses” include dependence of Lithuania on the decision of the EU, deterioration of Russian-Lithuanian relations, eagerness of the EU to reach its own aims, poor job prospects and unprofitability of the transition to another currency. On the one hand, many political issues have been solved but, on the other hand, people’s lives have become harder.
Potential consequences for the Lithuanians living in Russia in the case of Russia’s entry into the EU also seem to be ambiguous. For some people they would be positive and for some, on the contrary, negative.

A minority of the respondents thought that Russia would benefit if it joined the EU.

Many positive traits of the Lithuanian people (diligence, determination, neatness, tidiness, etc.) have been named. Kind-heartedness, readiness to lend a hand and easy-going character have been listed among the positive features of the Russian people. Laziness, alcohol dependency, untidiness and lack of culture have been referred to as the negative traits. Quite often Lithuanians’ stereotypes on Russians appeared to be more negative than their auto-stereotypes. Nevertheless, Lithuanians get on very well with Russian people and many of them have Russian spouses. There are not many examples of insignificant confrontations between these two ethnic groups.

1.3 Summary of Practical Recommendations

Some practical recommendations can be given based on the findings of the quantitative and qualitative studies.

1. The outcomes of the studies should be presented to the central government, regional and local authorities as well as NGOs in order to set up new and further directions for policy-making related to the issues of the ethnic minorities.

2. More detailed research can be done only on the basis of the comparison of the studies conducted in different periods of time. That is why, sociological monitoring of the problems and living conditions of the ethnic minorities should be conducted on the regular basis.

3. The study showed the trend of the gradual loss of Lithuanian language despite the existence of opportunities to learn it. That means that necessary measures should be taken to foster learning Lithuanian especially among young people.

4. Strong processes of assimilation have also been revealed during the study. For more than 10 years the Government of Lithuania actively supported and often funded the work aimed at preserving the language and culture of the Lithuanian Diaspora in the Kaliningrad Region. However, an evident decline in this work has been observed during the recent years. It would be good if the Government of Lithuania could provide more support and funding of such work.

5. Not all Lithuanians living in the Kaliningrad region have access to the newspapers and magazines published in Lithuanian. Wider access to such mass media sources should be provided.
2 LITHUANIANS IN KALININGRAD: A BACKGROUND OVERVIEW

2.1 Russian-majority and Lithuanian-minority relations

2.1.1 Historical overview

The region of Kaliningrad Oblast was inhabited in medieval times by tribes of Old Prussians in the western part and Lithuanians in the eastern part by the Pregolya and Alna rivers. The Lithuanian-inhabited areas became known as Lithuania Minor. The Lithuanian-speaking community in East Prussia diminished due to Germanization and assimilation. In the early 20th century Lithuanians made up a majority only in rural parts of the far northeast of East Prussia (Memelland and Minor Lithuania), while the rest of the area was overwhelmingly German-speaking. The Memel Territory (Klaipėda region), formerly part of northeastern East Prussia, was annexed by Lithuania in 1923. After coming to power in 1933, the Nazi regime in Germany radically altered about a third of the place names (the ones not of German origin) of this area by artificially replacing most names of Old Prussian or Lithuanian origin into newly invented German names in 1938. Until May 1945, the East Prussia and the city of Königsberg were part of the German Reich. By decision of the Potsdam Conference, East Prussia was divided between Poland and the USSR. 2/3 of East Prussia was turned over to Poland, one third including of the city of Königsberg to the Soviet Union.

During World War II the Soviet Army entered the eastern-most tip of East Prussia. The Potsdam Agreement of world powers assigned northern East Prussia to the Soviet Union pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement. The region was added as an exclave to the Russian SFSR and since 1946 it has been known as Kaliningrad Oblast. Almost none of the pre-World War II Lithuanian population (Lietuvininkų) or German population have remained in Kaliningrad Oblast. (Are there figures for migration into Lithuania?)

If “almost none of the pre-World War II Lithuanian population (Lietuvininkų) or German population have remained in Kaliningrad Oblast”

The origin of most of the Lithuanian population in Kaliningrad region is associated with the policy of resettlement from Russian territory, Belarus and Lithuania to Königsberg region formed in July 1946, which was lately renamed to Kaliningrad.

In the postwar period (1945-1948) had mixed population of indigenous people, the military participants of the East Prussian operation and the first settlers. The deportation of the local German population was officially completed by the fall of 1948. Lithuanians were not exposed among the local population and have the opportunity to stay in the region. Thus, the part of Lithuanians presently living in the Kaliningrad region has ancestors who lived here in pre-Soviet period. The issue of indigenous Lithuanians was a "closed" for the study during the Soviet era. Only in recent years it began to attract attention of the researchers.

In the Soviet period Lithuanian population was fairly evenly distributed throughout the region. Lithuanian language and culture in everyday life was not suppressed. In the same time no conditions for their preservation and development were created in the region. However, the Kaliningrad Region has actively cooperated with Lithuania in the field of cultural ties and exchanges.
2.1.2 Political overview

Since the break-up of the Soviet Union, Kaliningrad Oblast has been an exclave of the Russian Federation surrounded by Lithuania, Poland and the Baltic Sea. Borderless travel to the main part of Russia is only possible by sea or air. This political isolation became more pronounced when Lithuania and Poland both became members of the European Union and NATO and entered the Schengen Zone. In the early nineties the discussion came up whether the Kaliningrad Oblast (Minor Lithuania) should reemerge with the Republic of Lithuania. The question was soon dismissed and the embittered relations between Lithuania and Russia improved. In 1992 an agreement about the status of Kaliningrad and the status of the Lithuanian minority was ratified between the Republic of Lithuania and the Russian Federation as well as an agreement between the Kaliningrad district and the Lithuanian Ministry of Culture and Education.

Lithuania's accession to the EU led to a weakening of economic relations between Lithuania and Kaliningrad region. It influenced not only supply of electricity from Lithuania (closure of Ignalina nuclear power plant) and transit of goods through the Lithuanian territory, but resulted in complete cessation of Kaliningrad farmers' retail in agricultural markets of Lithuania.

In recent years, Germany and Lithuania have renewed contact with Kaliningrad through town twinning and other projects. This has helped to promote interest in the history and the culture of the East Prussian and Lietuvininkai communities.

In line with the 1996 Federal Law "On National-Cultural Autonomies" over the last ten years in the Kaliningrad oblast the Lithuanian national and cultural movement has been transformed into an organized regional public association with a clear structure and management. 17 regional and local Lithuanian cultural organizations (city and district) merged into regional national-cultural autonomy of Lithuanians Kaliningrad region. In line with Chapter III (Ensuring the Right of Reservation, Development and Usage of the National Language) of this federal law, which grants the rights for the preservation of minority language.

With the participation of the Kaliningrad Oblast administration in February 28, 2002 the Oblast Duma adopted the Law "On the Cooperation of Public Authorities of the Kaliningrad Oblast and Public Associations". In accordance with this regional law, the regional budget provided for grants of up to 50 thousand Roubles, which increased in 2006 to 100 thousand Roubles, to fund education in the Lithuanian language and the teaching of ethnic culture. This regional law also provides the legal basis for regulation in this sphere. It established the right of organizations to participate in Oblast Authorities working groups and expert councils, and in drafting laws and regulations. The Law also establishes procedures for information exchange and methodical, consultative and institutional support. Representatives of public associations now have the right to participate in tender commissions evaluating bids for state grants.

In 2002 the regional Law of on Ethnic and Cultural Societies and Autonomies was adopted. In the same year Advisory Board for the Lithuanian National-Cultural Autonomy was established in Kaliningrad region to ensure effective cooperation between the authorities and the national-cultural autonomy and associations, as well as ensuring interests of all national minority groups in the development and implementation of regional policies at the Kaliningrad oblast administration. The Board is chaired by the Head of Kaliningrad Administration (Governor).

Lithuanian organisations in Kaliningrad work closely with organisations in their mother country. The majority of the NGO's and societies' coordinators and presidents are Lithuanian citizens. Among the organisations in the mother country are the Kaliningrad region Lithuanian Cultural...
Society, the districts’ Lithuanian Cultural Societies and the Lithuanian Youth Union. The Lithuanian minority in Kaliningrad also has access to radio channels and, via satellite, to TV from Lithuania. Another area in which neighboring Lithuania is linked to the minority in Kaliningrad is the shared celebration of Lithuanian state national holidays. Among them are the Day of Restitution of Independence of Lithuania (from the Soviet Union, 1990) and the Day of Independence from Russia in 1918. On these occasions artist and musicians from Lithuania come to Kaliningrad to take part in the festivities. It does not lead to tensions with the authorities or the Russian majority.

Tolerance and patience in the Kaliningrad region has a special nuance due to the fact that most of the population is not indigenous to the area. High professionalism of Lithuanian diplomats working in the region should be mentioned.

2.2 Demographic overview

2.2.1 The 2000 census

The Lithuanian minority in the Kaliningrad Region of the Russian Federation numbers 13,937 people (2000 census), that is 1.46% of Kaliningrad’s total population. According to the local statistics bureau estimate, however, the number of the Lithuanians in 2007 was near 17,700 people (1.9%).

2.2.2 Geographic Distribution

In 1989 53.6% of the Lithuanians of the Kaliningrad Region lived in cities and 46.4% in villages. Unfortunately, no latest figures are available. In 1996 most of Kaliningrad’s Lithuanians lived in the City of Kaliningrad, Bagrationovsk district, Niemen district, Gusev district, Chernyakhovsk district, Krasnoznamensk district, Nesterov district and in the Slavsk district.


---

3 On 16 February 1918, the Act of Independence of Lithuania was signed and Lithuania declared an independent state based on democratic principles. On these occasions artist and musicians from Lithuania come to Kaliningrad to take part in the festivities.


2.2.3 Religious denomination

Lithuanians are Roman Catholics while Russians are Greek Orthodox.

2.2.4 Education

What statistics are there for the qualifications of the Lithuanian minority?

There are Lithuanian groups in a nursery school in Kaliningrad City and another in the town Sovetsk. In the Kaliningrad districts of Neman, Nesterov and Slavsk there are language classes in primary schools. In other towns children attend extracurricular classes (Panemune and Krasnoznamensk); some towns and cities (Kaliningrad, Sovetsk, Neman, Chernyakhovsk) are home to language schools.

In four state secondary schools one or several subjects are taught in Lithuanian language. There are also several Sunday schools, pre-school and extracurricular classes where children can learn and practice in Lithuanian language and get acquainted with Lithuanian culture. In 1996, 378 people were enrolled in one form of Lithuanian languages courses, 101 of them were school students.

In 1998 there were about 15 Lithuanian teachers working in Kaliningrad district, among them native speakers who moved for the work from Lithuania to Kaliningrad. Their number increased to 39 teachers in 2010. More than 900 students of different ages are learning Lithuanian from them. In a yearly teachers conference representatives from the education ministry of Lithuania take part.7

Total in the Kaliningrad oblast there are 23 centers of the Lithuanian language, including 3 Sunday schools and 16 electives (an optional subject studied by university and high school students

7 Н.А. Дубова, Н.А. Лопуленко, М.Ю. Мартынова: Калининградская Область. Современные этнокультурные процессы, Исследования по прикладной и неотложной этнолгии № 119, Москва 1998
to deepen and broaden their knowledge). 4 secondary and high schools provide teaching of one or several subjects in Lithuanian language.

2.3 Lithuanian self-organization in Kaliningrad

2.3.1 Civil society organization

As mentioned above, over the last ten years in Kaliningrad oblast the Lithuanian national and cultural movement has been transformed into an organized regional public association with a clear structure and management. 17 regional and local Lithuanian cultural organizations (city and district) merged into regional national-cultural autonomy of Lithuanians Kaliningrad region. Lithuanian organisations in Kaliningrad work closely with organisations in their mother country. The majority of the NGO’s and societies’ coordinators and presidents are Lithuanian citizens. Among the organisations in the mother country are the Kaliningrad region Lithuanian Cultural Society, the districts’ Lithuanian Cultural Societies and the Lithuanian Youth Union.

2.3.2 Arts and culture

The Lithuanian community in Kaliningrad strives to make its members acquainted with Lithuanian literature, folklore, national art and traditions, among them choral singing. In the cultural centre of Krasnoznamensk, in the Polish church in Kaliningrad, in evening schools in Sovetsk and in Zelenogradsk the Lithuanian society looks after its community’s art and culture activities. There are libraries in Kaliningrad City, Neman, Sovetsk und Slavsk. The Vydunas museum in Sovetsk is another cultural focus point for the Lithuanian community. The community takes part in events such as the Festival of Baltic Cities, an autumn fair and the opening day of the summer resorts season in Sovetsk.

Midsummer Day is a folk festival celebrated on June 24th all around Lithuania. The traditions include singing songs and dancing until the sun sets, telling tales, searching to find the magic fern blossom at midnight, jumping over bonfires, greeting the rising midsummer sun and washing one’s face with morning dew. These are customs brought from pagan culture and beliefs.

2.3.3 Religious organization

The latter Christian tradition is based on the reverence of Saint John. Lithuanians with the names Jonas, Jon, Janina receive many greetings from their family, relatives and friends. The Lithuanian minority celebrates Catholic Easter and Christmas.

2.3.4 Publishing and the press

The only regional newspaper "Gintaras" (Amber), which was published in Russian and in Lithuanian every two months, ceased to exist in 2007. The Lithuanian minority in Kaliningrad does however receive daily and weekly newspapers from Lithuania.

2.3.5 The media

The Lithuanian minority in Kaliningrad has access to radio channels and, via satellite, to TV from Lithuania.
2.4 Overview of existing surveys

According to available information no sociological surveys among the Lithuanians in Kaliningrad region have ever been conducted.

3 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE ENRI-VIS SURVEY (ENRI-VIS)

Presently, one of the most acute issues of the ethnic minorities is the issue of preserving ethnic identity, mother tongue and traditions of their group especially in the conditions of living outside their Motherland. Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad region are one of these minorities. According to the 2002 All-Russian census, the population of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region was 13,937 people. Out of this, 13,864 Lithuanians could speak Russian. The total number of the population in the Kaliningrad region was 955,281 people in 2002. The majority of these were Russian people (786,885), Belorussians were in the second place (50,748), Ukrainians were in the third place (47,229) and Lithuanians were in the fourth place (13,937). Almost a third of all Lithuanians living in Russia reside in the Kaliningrad Region. The total number of the Lithuanians in Russia in 2002 was 45,569 people (Ethnic Composition and Language Competence, Citizenship, 2004).

History of the Baltic States provides evidence that Lithuanian tribe of the Samogitians had neighbored Prussians on this territory long before the Teutonic Order appeared there. They were the ones who opposed the crusaders’ supremacy longer than the others. Eastern Prussian territory in IVIII and XIX centuries is connected with the work of the Lithuanian enlighteners Donelaitis and Reza who did a lot for preserving Lithuanian cultural heritage. However, according to the modern historians a statistically significant group of Ethnic Lithuanians had not been left in this part of Germany by the beginning of the World War II. In other words, nevertheless they assimilated.

In 1946 after the expulsion of the Germans residents of the neighboring republic settled in the significant part of the territory bordering Lithuania, now the Kaliningrad Region. As a result, an entity that is sometimes called ‘small Lithuania’ was formed.

Unfortunately, present official statistics does not contain data that would allow to estimate the situation of this group in the All-Russian context. However, this problem is partly solved with the use of the findings of the representative sociological survey conducted within the frames of another European project (HITT) by our research consortium.

What is the specifics of the investigated group? It is specific in the fact that half of its people as in the past live in the rural area. For comparison: rural residents compose 23 % of the population in the Kaliningrad Region and 27 % in Russia. This situation impacts educational level and occupations of the local Lithuanians. Almost each fourth of them doesn’t have secondary education. Nearly 60% of this ethnic group are hired workers. Among the professions that they have the most widespread are the following: unskilled workers in agriculture (10%), salespeople, traders (9%), drivers (8%), unskilled workers in construction and manufacturing (7.0%). Each third (34%) participant of the survey had to be once unemployed and look for a job for more than three months.
That is why, Lithuanians’ self-ranking of their social status on a 10-point scale (1 is the lowest and 10 is the highest social status) is more critical than among the population of Russia as a whole, nevertheless these differences cannot be considered to be significant (Diagram 1.).
According to the expert evaluations, during the last 20 years a significant part of the most active and professionally trained representatives of this ethnic group had an opportunity to emigrate to Lithuania and very often even further – to the Western Europe. The most enrooted and if it is possible to say the least passionarian part of the group remained in the region.

Four hundred and four people were selected with the use of a snowball sampling for the quantitative survey. In addition to the traditional survey biographical interviews were carried out with 12 people in July-August, 2010. The main aim of the biographical method is to study the individual’s life at different stages consisting of the childhood up to elderly age. In the sociological study of the formation and change of identity under the influence of various significant historical events and social transformations biographical method can be used for a more in-depth understanding of identity in different socio-cultural conditions. For the participation in the biographical interviews 3 groups of people representing different generations were randomly selected:

1. The younger generation who were born and brought up in the post-communist era (16-22);
2. The middle generation who experienced the transition and are older enough to be the parents of the younger generation (35-50);
3. The older generation who would have experienced the Second World War (65+).

For understanding life priorities of the Lithuanians living now on the territory of the Kaliningrad Region information on the structure of their identities is very important. This is due to the fact that it serves as a coordination system that allows a person to self-identify its place more or less consciously in the social space, construct a hierarchy of his/her social roles.

Presently, social studies are more often focused on doing research on one type of identity: ethnic, political, religious, etc., but its real significance can be understood only by identifying its place in the real structure of the identities of a social group. In this sense ENRI Project has advantages over the others.

Hierarchy of the identities was calculated in this case by three degrees of importance. That is why, it is presented in the ranges on Diagram 2. The survey findings show that the structure of the identities of the Lithuanians living on the territory of the Kaliningrad Region is determined today not so much by the traditions of the ethnic culture but by the conditions and the nature of the life activities of these people. It is remarkable that the ethnic identity itself is on the 6th place among the representatives of this group (Range 9.3) because belonging to it does not provide
Lithuanians of the Kaliningrad Region with any benefits and is not the reason for their discrimination.

Individual’s belonging to a territorial entity (citizens of a particular city/town or rural area, the local world that a person considers to be his/her own) is on the 1st place in this system (Range 4.3). It is not a coincidence that 73.2% of the respondents feel to this or that extent connection with Russia and 90.9% with their settlement.

Diagram 2. Hierarchy of the Social Identities of the Lithuanians Living in the Kaliningrad Region

The last 20 years of the Russian history resulted in a sharp narrowing of a social space for the main part of the population. An ordinary Russian person knows that he/she has the right to travel freely but can’t afford that. A certain local world became the milieu in which the people learned to adapt to new living conditions and in many cases simply survive. That is why, survey participants named belonging to a territorial entity as the most important way of identification most often.

Some respondents of the biographical interviews also identified themselves not simply with Russia but, first and foremost, with the region of their residence: «I am Lithuanian in the Kaliningrad Region”; «I am Lithuanian who lives in the Kaliningrad Region ». These people feel more comfortable here than in other places. The simplest explanation: I got used to living like that. Another one gives preference to the Kaliningrad Region but not Lithuania because his friends live there. The third one was satisfied when he moved to the Kaliningrad Region because he managed to receive financial support and an apartment there. Willingness to stay in Kaliningrad because of the better prospects to get a suitable job was expressed as well. Concomitantly, for one of the respondents Kaliningrad is still alien as he has lived there for only 4 years.

Similar findings were obtained by another indicator of the quantitative study: feeling of the respondents’ connection with different state territorial entities: Europe, Russia, Lithuania, Kaliningrad Region (See Diagram 2).
Diagram 2. Feeling of Closeness to the State Territorial Entities

The largest percentage of the respondents identified themselves with the Kaliningrad Region. Roughly the same number of the respondents refer themselves to Russia and Lithuania and these numbers are relatively high. Of lower significance is the percentage of respondents connecting themselves with Europe. Contrary to this the percentage of people who did not feel close to Europe is quite high.

Social status is on the next place (range 5.2) in the hierarchy of identities of the Lithuanians. It presents the status form of the combination of the determinant factors of the individual’s living activities: profession, income level, age, etc.

It should be noted that in modern Russia age factor has become more significant than it was in other periods of the recent history. For example, it’s almost impossible for unemployed people who are older than 40 years old to get a good job but it is also not uncommon when all the family has to live on the pension of its elderly member. Informal communication that impacts significantly the process of formation and realization of the system of identities often takes place within the individual’s age group, especially in young and elderly age. That is why, belonging to it is one of the most significant identities (range 5.8).

The last in these four identities (range 6.2) is professional belonging, which greatly influences individual’s lifestyle, his/her interests and material capabilities, though its influence is not so great as it was, for example, 40 years ago.

Situation with the gender identity (range 8.7) shows that it is not a priority. Nature of labor in the rural area and the lifestyle on the whole still do not depend much on which part of the humankind a particular person belongs to (“the best” or “the strongest”).

Faith refers to the last three identities of the hierarchy of the forms of self-identification of the surveyed ethnic group (range 15.7). Almost ¾ (70%) of the survey participants think that in order to be considered true Lithuanian it’s important to be Catholic. Almost 2/3 of the respondents (64%) consider themselves Catholic. Only 3% of them as decent Catholics ought to go to the church once a week. 15 % of the representatives of the Diaspora visit a church once a month. The gap between the statements and everyday religious practice is evident. And in this case our respondents are not in any way different from the Orthodox who were surveyed within the frames of other projects. We deal with the widespread “demonstrative” religiosity which is superficially connected with the faith in God. Not without any reason it appeared in this case in one of the last places of the subjective hierarchy of the identities.

Political views (range 17.2) do not have practical implications on the living activity of a particular individual today. Only a narrow social layer of the ‘political class’ can get real benefits from them. Even less people have formed political views and are guided by them in their everyday life.
Representatives of the ethnic Lithuanians of the Kaliningrad Region are not an exception from a common rule. That is why, they almost never participate in the activities of the public political organizations.

As it was predicted, European identity is on the last place in the system of identities of the surveyed group, which is not in any way related to an everyday life even in the most Western region of Russia. Not without any reason less than a third (28%) of the respondents feel somehow connection with Europe. The qualitative study showed that this closeness is not felt on the mental or cultural level but rather on the geographical level: “… We live in Europe”. “I think that everyone who lives in the Kaliningrad Region is European”. “European … because I can also say that I was born and have lived in Europe …. At least, near Europe. I think Kaliningrad Region is Europe ….”. Concomitantly, the majority of the participants of the biographical interviews do not feel their connection to Europe.

A significant part of the respondents (40%) have a positive attitude towards European Union but in this they are not different from other regions of the European part of Russia. A specific study on the attitude towards the European Union was conducted in 2008 and showed that 58% of the survey participants would endorse Russia’s entry into this international organization.

Within the frames of the ENRI project the possibility of Russia’s entry into the European Union was addressed during the biographical interviews. The majority of the respondents considered such opportunity unreal. There were the ones who were ready to discuss advantages and disadvantages of such decision. Freedom expansion in Russia and improvement of Russian-Lithuanian relations were named among the ‘pluses’ (benefits). Loss of Russia’s independence was considered to be one of the ‘minuses’ (costs).

The advocates and opponents of Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were revealed during the study as well. Some respondents observed positive outcomes of Lithuania’s joining into the EU and saw it as beneficial to the citizens of Lithuania. Among the positive consequences they named, first of all, the change of the passport-visa regime and introduction of the Shenghen Visa. It was also stated that it had become cleaner concomitant with more order in Lithuania. Nevertheless, one of the respondents said that due to the small size of the country Lithuania will always be under certain pressure.

Negative views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were also expressed. The “minuses” include dependence of Lithuania on the decision of the EU, deterioration of Russian-Lithuanian relations, eagerness of the EU to reach its own aims, poor job prospects and unprofitability of the transition to another currency. On the one hand, many political issues have been solved but, on the other hand, people’s lives have become harder.

In the respondents’ opinion, many Lithuanians, especially the young people, tended to move abroad. First and foremost it’s related to the impossibility to find a job in Lithuania. “…When I came I was thinking, that, for example, … How many are there ? 3 mln in Lithuania. So, you … ask: «Where is this person, where is that person?». Everyone is somewhere in England, somewhere in Norway and everyone is moving””. There was also a concern that due to Lithuania’s entry into the European Union Lithuanian identity would gradually be lost and that this process has already started. “I am afraid, Lithuanians … entered the EU, … it seems to me they will dissolve in this European Union. They will become a unified European nation. And it will be very hard to find these roots … I think it has already started in seven-mile steps (quantum steps)”. “Always when people get united, something unites them, and then they become a unified homogeneous mass. It is the same in the European Union, it has united … 27 states … and they will all
become something uniform and maybe their territory where they are located will remind them that they” belong to such group.

Only 8% of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region expressed readiness to emigrate to one of the European countries even on the condition of the financial and social support. Other 28% of the respondents do not except such possibility but in-depth interviews show that these intentions have declarative nature. Respondents do not take any practical attempts for their realization. “I don’t want to go anywhere now. Here are my children, they have all settled here, live their lives, and where will I go, who needs me there alone, who? No-one”. “I.: Maybe, children wanted to move to Lithuania? R.: No. I.: But they are Lithuanian? R.: … they are married on Russian, where will they go?! “…in Lithuania… Who will I go to and what will I have there? Nothing.” According to the research findings the main part of those who wanted to move have already made their wish true.

In general, hierarchy of the identities of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region can be considered as one of the characteristics of the crisis society in which everything is aimed at providing conditions for normal life activities. This quality characteristic can be connected with the present state of the whole Russian society as well as this ethnic group.

Let’s turn to the issues of the ethnic and civil identities. The first one is defined by L.M.Drobizheva – the leading Russian specialist in the field of ethnic sociology as “consciousness of the community of people based on the views on their ethnicity, language, culture, history, territory, interests, emotional attitude towards them and under certain conditions readiness to act for the sake of these views” (Drobizheva, 2010: 49).

The findings of the survey show that high level of ethnisation of consciousness is not typical of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region today which is a feature of some other ethnic groups living on the territory of Russia. However, forms of manifestation of this consciousness are determined not by its level itself but by the correlation of significance of ethnic and national (civil) identities.

Diagram 3.
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We noticed the following peculiarity long time ago: no matter how high is the level of ethnic identity of the non-titular ethnic group, it is not connected with the manifestation of ethnic radicalism, if the level of its national identity is higher (right part of the Diagram 3). And, on the contrary, low level of national identity is a favorable condition for the manifestation of such radicalism even if there is middle level of ethnisation of the group consciousness.
In the case of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region these two identities are near each other. Their most emphasized expression (‘proud of being’) is in the state of complete balance. 68% of the survey participants are proud of being Lithuanian and 67.5% are proud of being citizens of Russia.

Biographical interviews also showed that not all the respondents are proud of being Lithuanian. “R.: To be honest, I don’t know what to say. To be proud or not to be proud. Maybe, partly I am proud of having this diligence”. “R.: No, I haven’t got such pride. Lithuanian and Lithuanian. The only thing is that I know the language …”.

“Pride” as an indicator of expression of this or that identity shows that 67% of the survey participants are proud of being residents of the Kaliningrad Region. In contrast, the number of people who were proud of being European appeared to be more than twice lower (very proud – 7.1 % and rather proud – 24.1 %). More people in this group were not proud of being European (not proud at all – 9.6 % and rather not proud – 24.9 %). A higher percentage of people in this group didn’t know how to answer this question (31.5 %). A similar picture was obtained whilst analyzing the responses to the question on the degree of the respondents’ pride of living in Eastern Europe. The largest number of the respondents are not proud of that (not proud at all – 7.4 % and rather not proud– 27.6 %). Only 4.4 % of people are very proud and 25.6 % are rather proud. Again a very high percentage of the respondents (32 %) were unsure how to answer this question (See Diagram 4).

Diagram 4. Pride for Belonging to the Specific Ethnic Groups

For clarification of the degree of ethnic identity of the Lithuanians living in the Kaliningrad Region, initially self-identification of the respondents was analyzed. During the survey respondents were suggested to select the formula that best describes their ethnic identity. The findings showed that more than half of the respondents (48.3%) considered themselves Lithuanians living in Russia. More than third of the respondents (37.7 %) considered themselves Russians of Lithuanian origin. It should be noted that only 7.4 % of the respondents considered themselves simply Lithuanians and 4.2% - Russian people (See Diagram 5).
No ethnic and political acts conducted by the Lithuanians of the Kaliningrad Region have been noted up to now. Another remarkable in this context fact: 16 national and cultural organizations of the Lithuanians have been registered in the region but less than 5% of the representatives of the surveyed ethnic group take part in their activity. The others have different life priorities.

The majority of the Lithuanians in the region adhere to the modern rational definition of the ethnic belonging. In their opinion, in order to be considered truly Lithuanian, first and foremost, it is necessary to feel Lithuanian (93%), have Lithuanian ancestry (86%) and speak mother tongue (80%). For this it is not necessary to have been born in Lithuania or have lived most part of the life, have Lithuanian citizenship.

People realize to this or that extent the difference between ethnic and national identities and do not allocate a special place for their historical Motherland in their future life. Only a fifth of the survey respondents (20%) felt very close to Lithuania. A little bit more than half (51.5%) of the respondents felt rather close to Lithuania. At the same time almost a quarter of the respondents (24.1%) did not feel any connection to Lithuania at all.

For getting a self-perception of any diaspora, attitude of the representatives of the titular ethnic group towards it is important. In this case it is quite tolerant. The number of the respondents who have been discriminated on the basis of their ethnic origin during the last 12 months is within the limits of the margin error typical of such type of study – 3.9%. It should be noted that much tension between rich and poor people in the surrounding them society was stated by 28% of the survey participants. The same level of tension between young and old people was named by 9% of the respondents but similar relations between Russian and Lithuanian people were stated by 1.2% of the respondents.

The use of the Bogardus social distance scale also provides an evidence of the lack of ethnic tension. Even its indicator that helps to measure maximum degree of closeness (“have representatives of another ethnic group as close relatives by marriage”) shows that Lithuanians do not have stable ethnic prejudices towards Russian people and other ‘topical’ for the Kaliningrad Region ethnic groups (Diagram 6.).
Diagram 6. Acceptable by the Lithuanians as Close Relatives by Marriage (%)

The survey findings show that a natural for the modern world as well process of assimilating a small ethnic group by the dominant one is taking place in the conditions of the lack of ethnic discrimination. Participants of the in-depth interviews also realize this fact. I will quote two citations: «…Lithuanian last name but in fact I grew up here. …What kind of Lithuanian can I be?». «We have become completely Russianized …And how can it be different?»

It seems that the Government of Lithuania came up to the same conclusion. For more than 10 years it actively supported and often funded the work aimed at preserving of the language and culture of the Lithuanian Diaspora in the Kaliningrad Region. However, an evident decline in this work has been observed during the recent years.

It is important for most of the respondents to have an opportunity to preserve their ethnic customs, traditions and culture (80%), study literature and culture of their ethnic group at school (72%), have their children taught in their mother tongue at school (61%). The existing Regional national and cultural autonomy of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region is aimed at the realization of these opportunities. However, Lithuanian is learnt by no more than 800 people and one or several subjects are taught in Lithuanian only in 4 schools.

The problems here are not only organizational and financial. During the biographical interviews one young woman said that when she studied in a Russian-language school in the second grade the school wanted to introduce Lithuanian as an elective course for Lithuanian children. The respondent’s mother agreed but the parents of other Lithuanian children were against this idea. As a result, the Lithuanian class was not opened.

It should be noted that in the past 32% obtained education in Lithuanian in the primary school, 14% - in secondary school and 5% - in higher education institutions and professional training schools.

Today ¾ (77%) of the survey participants know Lithuanian but the majority of them (60%) speak Russian in the family, i.e. the least controlled milieu by the society. Another third (36%) speak Lithuanian and Russian at home and just 4% speak only Lithuanian. As a result, inevitable chain reaction occurs which is expressed in the quotation from the biographical interview: “Mother speaks fluent Lithuanian. … I understand everything what she has said … but I can’t say myself” “Children don’t understand Lithuanian. …Children speak only Russian”.

It is important for more than half (55%) of the respondents to have an opportunity to read newspapers and magazines in their Mother tongue. In practice, 43% of the questioned read newspapers in Russian and 5% in Lithuanian. Such situation can be partly explained by the small number of such editions, their unavailability in the rural area. However, the same situation happens with other mass media that exist outside the state borders (Diagram 5).
The overwhelming majority of the respondents (87%) have relatives in Lithuania but only 30% of the survey participants regularly communicate with them over the phone and 12% via the Internet. Each second respondent (48%) has friends in Lithuania but intensity of communication with them is almost the same as with the relatives: 27% communicate regularly over the phone and 20% via the Internet.

Concomitantly, a circle of friends of the respondents with whom they are constantly in touch is selected not by the ethnic criterion. More than half (55%) of the surveyed Lithuanians have friends with different ethnic backgrounds, the majority of the friends of each fourth respondent (27%) are Russian and only 2.5% of the respondents have mainly friends among the representatives of their ethnic group.

If we take into account that almost half of the survey participants were born in the mixed ethnic families, we can assume that many of them while recognizing their officially stated ethnic status in fact have multiple identity. This assumption is proved by the findings of the in-depth interviews.

Only 2 women from the 12 randomly selected respondents appeared to be with strongly expressed Lithuanian identity. The majority of the surveyed, especially young people, could not unambiguously respond to the question on who they feel themselves and suggested different types of palliative responses: «Russian of the Lithuanian origin», «Lithuanian living in the Kaliningrad Region», «Lithuanian but in the soul, probably, Russian». It is a typical expression of the multiple ethnic identity.

The assimilation proceeding in the ‘gentle’ voluntary form means that a person himself/herself and the closest to him people specify their preferences in a particular social sphere. For example, it appeared during the biographical interviews that almost all respondents eat and cook Lithuanian traditional dish – zeppelins (potato-meat dumplings) and Lithuanian cold borsch (beetroot soup). “…If you are in Lithuania make sure to order zeppelins. They are so yummy that you can’t turn yourself away”. One family cooked herring with vegetables and yeasty balls with poppy seed and poppy seed milk based on the Lithuanian recipes for Christmas celebration. Some respondents stated that they liked Lithuanian music and songs. There were respondents who can even sing Lithuanian songs themselves. Quantitative study findings showed that almost an equal number of the respondents liked Russian (18.7%) and Lithuanian (16.7%) music. Nearly half of the respondents did not have musical preferences (47.8 %) and 16.5 % prefer music of other countries.

Several words in conclusion. There is no one correct answer to the question on whether the process of natural ethnic assimilation is good or bad. Before people started to think about this
question, the Phoenicians, the Goths, the Scythians, the Balts, the Prussians and thousands of other peoples died out. It was found out already in the XXth century that large European ethnic groups could also be well assimilated. A great wave of German migration to the USA in the XIXth century in fact cannot be traced now. There is no statistically significant population group in the USA that would even know German now.

The same things happened to two waves of the Russian migration to Europe. It appeared that Russian people can easily melt in the surrounding ethnic milieu if they don’t feel hostility towards them from it. It seems that many politicians should give thoughtful attention to these processes. There would be less baseless fears and mutual offences.

Multiple identity bears itself familiar positive cultural attitude, which can be found in the example of ethnic stereotypes. Many participants of the in-depth interviews name among the typical traits of the Lithuanians: diligence, practicality, determination and neatness. And in this way they are favorably different from Russian people with their laziness, lack of culture, dependency on the ‘demon drink’. However, half of the respondents have mixed families and friends, who cannot be imposed to a person, are more often Russian. Such choice was made by our respondents themselves because Russians are, in their opinion, ‘good people’ and can be easily dealt with. Lithuanians want to nurture in their children raised together with Russian parent the best traits of their ethnic group. Any sensible person would only favor such intentions.

Assimilation process as well as any other process that relates to the interests of people cannot cause counter-reaction. This was stated in this or that way by a significant part of the participants of the biographical interviews. The grandfather of one respondent came to Russia being very old after having lived most part of his life in Lithuania and didn’t feel settled due to lack of readiness in accepting another culture. Thus, he had to go back to Lithuania. Another one misses Lithuania. “… If I had had more freedom I would have never left Lithuania”. The grandchildren are desired to keep Lithuanian traditions and culture. The respondent’s soul and heart are in Lithuania. “I feel that I am here but live there. As we say, head is here but legs are there”. Another respondent also greatly misses this country. In spite of the fact that the respondent’s wife and friends are Russian he tries not to forget about the Lithuanian roots and speak Lithuanian as much as possible.

Another essential point. In our century of individualism important political principles are best learnt at the specific personality level. More and more people with complex ethnic background appear in the globalizing world. This world will be more tolerant if such people know about their ethnic roots.

And finally: the failure of the policy of multiculturalism leads to only one conclusion: the State doesn’t have the right today to exclude itself from regulating a very delicate sphere of interethnic relations. However, it should be guided not by the political ambitions but the old medical principal: “Primum non nocere” (“First, do not harm”)! 
4 MAIN FINDINGS OF BIOGRAPHICAL INTERVIEWS (ENRI-BIO)

4.1 Introduction

This national report for Russia is one of the reports from the qualitative studies of the FP-7 project ENRI-East. It summarizes the outcomes of twelve biographical interviews conducted with the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic minority in Russia. The interviews were carried out applying the guide, mainly common for all the countries and territories, where this study was conducted.

For the participation in the biographical interviews 3 groups of people representing different generations were randomly selected:

1. The younger generation who were born and brought up in the post-communist era (16-22);
2. The middle generation who experienced the transition and are older enough to be the parents of the younger generation (35-50);
3. The older generation who would have experienced the Second World War (65+).

The interviews conducted in Russia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>34 (int.#11)</td>
<td>70 years old (int.#1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(int.#8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 years old</td>
<td>44 (int.#12)</td>
<td>81 years old (int.#6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(int.#9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Brief description of the people interviewed and their life stories, and also from which districts/settlements they come

Interview #1.

The interview was carried out in the Kaliningrad region.

The respondent is 70 years old, male, has secondary professional education background.

He is married, has a daughter from the first marriage, works as a driver.

He is Lithuanian. He spoke Russian during the interview but he can also speak Lithuanian.

In 1940 he was born in NNN, Lithuania. In 1943 his father died. In 1947 his elder sister moved to the Soviet Union. In 1951 he came to visit his sister for the first time. In 1956 he finished school - 8 years [with teaching] in the Russian and the Lithuanian languages in NNN (Lithuania). In 1956 he moved to the Soviet Union. In 1964 he got married for the first time. In 1965 a daughter was born. In 1979 he started living with another woman (his future second wife). In 1990 he registered marriage with the second wife.
Interview #2.
The interview was carried out in the Kaliningrad region.
The respondent is 73 years old, female. She finished only the primary school (4 grades).
She is a widow, has a son - 40 years old and a daughter - 46 years old.
Presently, the respondent is a pensioner. She is Lithuanian. She spoke Russian during the interview but she can also speak Lithuanian.
She was born in the village NNN, Lithuania, in 1937. In 1946 she went to primary school. In 1955 she worked as a house-worker in the village NNN. In 1957 she came to the Soviet Union for the first time. In 1961 she got married. In 1963 she gave birth to a daughter. In 1968 she gave birth to a son. In 1997 her husband died. In 1997 she became officially disabled. In 2010 she visited her full sister in the town NNN, Lithuania.

Interview #3.
The interview was carried out in the Kaliningrad region.
The respondent is 65 years old, female. She finished 8 school grades.
She is a widow, has two adult sons, a grandson and two granddaughters.
Presently, she is retired.
She is Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.
In 1945 she was born in NNN district, Lithuania. In 1945 her father died (mine explosion). In 1946 she moved to the village in another district of Lithuania. In 1952 she went to primary school with the education in Lithuanian. In 1956 she moved to the town NNN in the Soviet Union. In 1962 a son was born. In 1965 she finished an evening school. In 1968 the second son was born. In 1989 she left work because of the poor health. In 2006 her husband died.

Interview #4.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad region.
The respondent is 46 years old, female. She finished 7 school grades.
She is divorced, has a daughter and 2 sons.
The respondent is currently unemployed. She is half-Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.

Interview #5.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 34 years old, female.
She has vocational secondary education. She is married, has 3 children, 2 daughters and a son.
She currently works as a waitress in the health resort. She is semi-Lithuanian.

The interview was conducted in Russian.

The respondent was born in Turkmen Republic in NNN town in 1976. She moved to the town NNN in Soviet Union in the same year. In 1982 she went to the secondary school in the Soviet Union. In 1993 she finished 11 school grades. She studied at the vocational training school. She got married in 2000. Her daughter was born in the same year.

**Interview #6.**
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 81 years old, male.
He finished 7 school grades.
He is married, has a daughter, a son, grandson and granddaughter.
He is retired.
He is Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.

He was born in village NNN, Lithuania, in 1939. He went to school in the village NNN in 1946. In 1954 he moved to his elder brother in the Soviet Union. He joined the Soviet army in 1958. He came back from the army in 1961. He got married in 1961. He moved to the Adygeya Autonomous Region in 1962. He had to come back to the Kaliningrad region due to the clashes in Adygeya in 1975.

**Interview #7.**
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 21 years old, female. She has higher education degree.
She is single and doesn’t have children. She is currently a student. The respondent is Lithuanian.
The interview was conducted in Russian.

She was born in town NNN, Kaliningrad Region, Russia, in 1989. The last time she was in town NNN, Lithuania, was in 1995. She went to school in 1996. She finished school in 2007. She entered Russian University in the same year. In 2010 she was a MA student. She actively visited youth Catholic community till 2007.

**Interview #8.**
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 19 years old, male.
He finished 11 school grades and has secondary education.
He is single and doesn’t have children.
He is currently a student.
His ethnic background is Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.

He was born in NNN town in Lithuania in 1991. In ≈ 1993-94 he moved with the parents to Russia. In 1997 he went to school in the Kaliningrad Region. In 2005 his mother died. He finished school in 2009. He was a second year student in 2010.
Interview #9.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 22 years old, male.
He is single and doesn’t have children. He is a third-year student. His ethnic background is Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.
He was born in town NNN, Kaliningrad Region, Russia in 1988. His father left the family in 1991. He went to school in 1995. He finished 11 school grades in 2006. He entered the university in the same year. He was expelled from the university as a second year student. Later, he became a student of another department at the same University.

Interview #10.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad region.
The respondent is 20 years old, female.
She has incomplete University degree.
She is married and has no children.
She is a student.
She is semi-Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian.
She was born in Russia in 1990. She went to school in 1997. She finished 11 school grades in 2007. The last time she was in Lithuania was in 2007. She entered the university in 2007. She got married in 2010.

Interview #11.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad region.
The respondent is 34 years old, male.
He has secondary education.
He is married and has two children.
He is a driver. His ethnic background is Lithuanian but he has Russian identity. The interview was conducted in Russian.
He was born in the Soviet Union in 1976. He finished secondary school in 1993. He entered the vocational training school in the same year. He went for an academic leave in 1994. He got married in 1995. His daughter was born in 1996. His second daughter was born in 2010.

Interview #12.
The interview was conducted in the Kaliningrad Region.
The respondent is 44 years old, male.
He has secondary education degree.
He is married, has a son.
He also has private business (selling cars).
His ethnic background is Lithuanian. The interview was conducted in Russian but he can also speak Lithuanian.


Four types of identity were addressed during the biographical interviews: ethnic (connection with one’s ethnic group), national (connection with Russia), regional (connection with the Kaliningrad region) and European (connection with Europe).

4.3 Ethnic Identity

It appeared that not all respondents of the biographical interviews are proud of being Lithuanian. “R.: To be honest, I don’t know what to say. To be proud or not to be proud. Maybe, partly I am proud of having this diligence”. “R.: No, I haven’t got such pride. Lithuanian and Lithuanian. The only thing is that I know the language …”.

A minority of the participants of the biographical interviews had strongly expressed ethnic identities. These included women representing different age groups. It should be noted that there appeared to be no men with the strongly expressed Lithuanian identity. Respondents miss Lithuania. “… If I had had more freedom I would have never left Lithuania”. The grandchildren are desired to keep Lithuanian traditions and culture. The respondent’s soul and heart are in Lithuania. “I feel that I am here but live there. As we say, head is here but legs are there”.

The grandfather of one respondent came to Russia being very old after having lived most part of his life in Lithuania and didn’t feel settled due to lack of readiness for accepting another culture. Thus, he went back to Lithuania. When their family gathered for celebration of a holiday and the respondent spoke Russian to her Russian-speaking husband, Lithuanian by origin, elderly people got angry: “Why do we have to speak Russian here just because there is one Russian person among us?”.

The biographical interviews showed that the majority of the respondents have multiple identities. Five people considered themselves Russian and three of them were women. The majority of the respondents identifying themselves Russian were representatives of the younger generation. “I was born here and lived all my life... I don’t know Lithuanian…. That’s why I think that I am Russian”. “Probably, Russian of a Lithuanian origin….. After all, I grew up in Russia”. “I feel myself more Russian … in the soul, I am probably more Russian”.

The mother of one of the respondents is a Gypsy from the maternal side and Lithuanian from the paternal side. She speaks Lithuanian and the respondent considers herself a Lithuanian citizen of the Kaliningrad Region.

One respondent has double citizenship and greatly misses Lithuania. In spite of the fact that his wife and friends are all Russian, he is trying not to forget Lithuanian roots and speaks Lithuanian whenever it is possible. He also sings Lithuanian and Russian songs.

Three of the participants of the biographical interviews considered themselves Lithuanian and most of them were men representing different age groups. On the whole, the majority of the respondents considering themselves Lithuanian represented middle-age generation (44 and 46 years old). “R.: I am proud because my father was Lithuanian”. “I am Lithuanian who lives in the Kaliningrad Region”. At the same time, the latter respondent’s girlfriend is Lithuanian. There is a desire to have a Lithuanian wife and to see future children remembering their ethnicity.
Another respondent considered himself Lithuanian who was born in Russia, “in the soul probably Russian”. There was a respondent who feels that she has more freedom in Russia. “I:...Are you Russian of the Lithuanian origin? R.: That is probably most likely ...I: and maybe you are Lithuanian living in Russia? R.: Maybe so. It is hard to say now. ... I don’t know now who I am and what I am. I am now not this or that”. “I am more for Russians. I don’t know why. The impact of Russia, all that of course”.

Two respondents didn’t say who they considered themselves to be. One of them was a respondent with double citizenship. Another one was an elderly person who knows Russian and Lithuanian. His wife was Russian. However, this respondent doesn’t want to go to Lithuania, because none of his relatives remained there.

Almost all respondents eat and cook Lithuanian traditional dish – zeppelins (potato-meat dumplings) and Lithuanian cold borsch (beetroot soup). “…If you are in Lithuania make sure to order zeppelins. They are so yummy that you can’t turn yourself away”. One family cooked herring with vegetables and yeasty balls with poppy seed and poppy seed milk based on the Lithuanian recipes for Christmas celebration.

Some respondents stated that they liked Lithuanian music and songs. There were respondents who can even sing Lithuanian songs themselves.

4.4 National Identity (connection with Russia)

Most of the respondents have already substantively settled in Russia. “… the roots have already grown in so deeply...”. “… I was born and have lived here in Russia...”.

One woman said that she feels she has more freedom in Russia and has never left the Russian town where she lives.

Many people don’t want to leave Russia. One of the possible reasons for this could be due to mixed marriage (having a Russian spouse).

4.5 Regional Identity (connection with the Kaliningrad region)

The overwhelming majority of the participants of the quantitative survey felt closeness to the Kaliningrad Region. Some respondents of the biographical interviews also identified themselves not simply with Russia but with the Kaliningrad Region. “I: Are you Lithuanian of Russian origin or Lithuanian of the Kaliningrad Region? R.: Probably, Kaliningrad Region because I am more in Russia ...”. “R.: I am Lithuanian who lives in Kaliningrad Region”.

One respondent of the biographical interview felt more comfortable in the Kaliningrad Region than in Lithuania. This was determined to a larger extent by having lived in this region since birth and presence of all the respondent's friends in the region. According to the respondent herself, such feeling of comfort of living in the Kaliningrad Region is due to habit. Another respondent was satisfied when he moved to the Kaliningrad Region because he received financial support including an apartment after he arrived. Another respondent wanted to stay in Kaliningrad Region because of the potential job prospects.

Nevertheless, there was also a respondent for whom Kaliningrad is still alien as he has lived there for only 4 years.
4.6 European Identity

4.6.1 Feeling European

A minority of the respondents considered themselves European and identified themselves with Europe. “... We live in Europe”. “I think that everyone who lives in the Kaliningrad Region is European”. “European ... because I can also say that I was born and have lived in Europe …. At least, near Europe. I think Kaliningrad Region is Europe ....”.

The majority of the respondents did not self-identify themselves with Europe. “I.: ... if we talk about Europe in general do you feel yourself European? R.: No, no, I haven’t got such feeling”.

4.6.2 Attitude towards Lithuania’s entry into the European Union

The advocates and opponents of Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were revealed during the study as well. Some respondents observed positive outcomes of Lithuania’s joining into the EU and saw it as beneficial to the citizens of Lithuania. Among the positive consequences they named, first of all, the change of the passport-visa regime and introduction of the Shenghen Visa. It was also stated that it had become cleaner concomitant with more order in Lithuania. Nevertheless, one of the respondents said that due to the small size of the country Lithuania will always be under certain pressure.

Negative views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were also expressed. The “minuses” include dependence of Lithuania on the decision of the EU, deterioration of Russian-Lithuanian relations, eagerness of the EU to reach its own aims, poor job prospects and unprofitability of the transition to another currency. On the one hand, many political issues have been solved but, on the other hand, people’s lives have become harder.

Some respondents haven’t got a clear view on the way Lithuania’s joining into the EU has influenced everyday life so far. There was an opinion that the real situation in Lithuania is not reflected in words. One respondent didn’t even know that Lithuania had joined the EU.

4.6.3 Attitude towards the possibility of Russia’s entry into the European Union

A minority of the biographical interview respondents expected that Russia’s entry into the European Union would lead to positive outcomes, improving Russian-Lithuanian relations. “It seems to me that probably it would be better …. None the less they have more freedom”. It was also stated that Russian people envied Lithuanians for joining the EU, “because Russia wants to join the EU and … take the positions of the European Union but at the same time … be autonomous”.

According to another point of view, Russia has to preserve its independence. The possibility of Russia’s entry into the EU is perceived as being unrealistic.

There was also an opinion that if Russia joined the European Union nothing would change. “R.: ... it wouldn’t become worse, I don’t know whether it would benefit or not, it depends on the way our people would act (our people’s behavior)”.

Potential consequences for the Lithuanians living in Russia in the case of Russia’s entry into the EU also seem to be ambiguous. For some people they would be positive and for some, on the contrary, negative.

4.7 Stereotypes

A number of stereotypes have been identified during the biographical interviews.
Such traits of the Lithuanian people have been outlined as diligence, neatness and tidiness, determination and fondness of flowers. In the Lithuanian home “… everything is always in its place”. “…They are very neat, they keep everything very clean … and they are doing that not under the whip-lash”. “They are very hard-working…. Russian, we can say, is a good person, I would never say that he is bad …, because they are really good people but very lazy. They don’t want to work and they like to drink. But Lithuanian brings everything home». Inclination of the Lithuanians to the mental labour and the habit to earn much were named as well. Lithuanians are characterized as “hard-working people,” and if they have an aim they would definitely reach it. Willingness to do better than other people was named as a typical trait of the Lithuanians. In their mentality “You are doing well, but I have to do better”.

Lithuanians have a good attitude towards Russian people, pay attention to their kind-heartedness. In particular, an example was given when Russian people looked after the Lithuanian children. Easy-going character of the Russian people was named as well. “…As people Russians are good”. All Lithuanian respondents have Russian friends and they are in good terms with each other. The inclination of the Russian people to physical labor was also mentioned.

Nevertheless, some negative stereotypes of Russians have been listed. These include: laziness, alcohol dependency, poorer upbringing in comparison to the Lithuanians, untidiness and lack of culture. Lack of Russian culture was opposed to the neatness and high cultural level of the Lithuanians. “… when I went to Lithuania, I liked there … that it was clean. I liked that, you came to the bus-stop, nobody pushed you in your back, there wasn’t any hustle, they got into the bus beautifully, not like here (in the Kaliningrad Region – author’s comment)”.

Analysis of the stereotypes also shows that the auto-stereotypes of some Lithuanians are more positive than images of Russian people.

4.8 Assimilation

The findings of the biographical interviews demonstrate active assimilation processes. One respondent thinks that they have become completely Russian because “how can it be different? We live here, … the whole age has been lived here”. “…Lithuanian surname but in fact I grew up here. … What kind of Lithuanian can I be?”; “…I don’t consider myself Lithuanian, I merely was born and grew up among Russian people. I lived following their traditions…”. “I.: In your family, your father is Lithuanian, have any Lithuanian traditions been observed? R.: Hard to say, probably, not”.

It also seems paradoxical that whilst there are opportunities for learning Lithuanian in the Kaliningrad Region a gradual loss of Lithuanian is observed. Presently, there are 23 Lithuanian language centres, including 3 Sunday schools and 16 elective courses in this region. Along with that, «in four … secondary schools one or several subjects are taught in Lithuanian» (Chayauskas). Despite that, many respondents speak badly or don’t speak their mother tongue at all. “… I can’t understand many words now. … I get lost in the words now, I don’t understand them now. …It’s easier for me to speak Russian than Lithuanian”. “R.: What language can I speak if the grandchildren speak Russian and daughter-in-laws do …? R.: It’s the same with the children”. “R.: … (Russian – author’s note) stepfather … was an outrageous opponent of us speaking Lithuanian … as he didn’t like the fact that he couldn’t understand what we were talking about. That is why we started to speak more and more seldom”. So it was gradually forgotten”. “… I don’t know Lithuanian at all because I was born and have lived all my life in Russia. I have been to Lithuania several times”.
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4.8.1 Lithuanian language

Some interviews also showed that a gradual loss of Lithuanian is observed among the Lithuanians living in Kaliningrad along with the change of generations. “Nephews don’t speak Lithuanian. The daughter doesn’t speak Lithuanian at all … And I am trying none the less somehow not to forget Lithuanian”. “Mother speaks fluent Lithuanian. … I understand everything what she has said … but I can’t say myself” “Children don’t understand Lithuanian. …Children speak only Russian”.

It should be noted that not all Lithuanians want their children to learn Lithuanian. For example, one young woman said that when she studied in a Russian-language school in the second grade the school wanted to introduce Lithuanian as an elective course for Lithuanian children. The respondent’s mother agreed but the parents of other children were against this idea. As a result, the Lithuanian class was not opened.

Most or all the friends of the majority of respondents are Russian. “…What friends do you have more, Russian? R.: Probably, Russian. Yes”. “Yes, only Russian”. However Russian friends of the latter respondent are also mainly immigrants from other places, e.g., Kazakhstan. They are meant to be Russian “by blood”.

Some participants of the study are from the families where Lithuanian and Russian holidays have been celebrated, e.g., both Catholic and Orthodox Christmas.

One biographical interview respondent found it simpler to use and communicate via Russian-language websites. He uses Lithuanian websites only for watching Lithuanian channel programs.

Some respondents do not want to move to Lithuania. The reasons for this include the age of the respondents, marriage to a Russian, lack of housing in Lithuania, well-established children’s lives in Russia and Russian citizenship. “I don’t want to go anywhere now. Here are my children, they have all settled here, live their lives, and where will I go, who needs me there alone, who? No-one”. “I.: Maybe, children wanted to move to Lithuania? R.: No. I.: But they are Lithuanian? R.: … they are married on Russian, where will they go?” “…in Lithuania… Who will I go to and what will I have there? Nothing. The house … has been fallen to pieces there, I have sold it …”.

Some participants of the biographical interviews were not interested in the events taking place in Lithuania. “They have separated from Russia and let them live. I.: i.e., it has been cut off and that’s it, yes ? R.: Yes”.

4.8.2 Migration

Many Lithuanians, especially the young people, tended to move abroad. First and foremost it’s related to the impossibility to find a job in Lithuania. “…When I came I was thinking, that, for example, … How many are there ? 3 mln in Lithuania. So, you … ask: «Where is this person, where is that person?”. Everyone is somewhere in England, somewhere in Norway and everyone is moving””.

4.8.3 Impact of the European Union

There was also a concern that due to Lithuania’s entry into the European Union Lithuanian identity would gradually be lost and that this process has already started. “I am afraid, Lithuanians … entered the EU, … it seems to me they will dissolve in this European Union. They will become a unified European nation. And it will be very hard to find these roots … I think it has already
started in seven-mile steps (quantum steps)…”. “Always when people get united, something unites them, and then they become a unified homogeneous mass. It is the same in the European Union, it has united … 27 states … and they will all become something uniform and maybe their territory where they are located will remind them that they” belong to such group.

4.8.4 Faith

Not all participants of the biographical interviews are committed to a Catholic denomination. “Why should I be Catholic if I live in Russia?”. Several respondents were Christened in an Orthodox Church. One respondent had the burial service for her mother in the Orthodox Church. There were respondents who celebrated Orthodox Christmas and colored eggs for Orthodox Easter because there are Russian members in their families.

The Russian wife of one respondent learned to cook traditional Lithuanian dish – cold borsch (beetroot soup). This is another example of mutual enrichment of cultures.

The majority of the respondents did not mention any confrontations between Lithuanians and Russians. They get on well and supported each other, even help to look after the children. Many respondents did not see the difference in the way Lithuanians and Russians treated them. They failed to notice any disagreement or harassment from the Russians’ side related to their (Lithuanians) ethnicity.

However, several respondents noticed some opposition between Russians and Lithuanians. “… I went to my mother to NNN (Lithuania) …”Oh, Russins (scornful word for Russians) have come”. What is it? And I … got very irritated by this, … I came … home, … to my Motherland”. Existence of the Russians’ contempt towards Lithuanians was also discussed. In one case the respondent was discriminated at school because he was called Lithuanian all the time.

This analysis illustrates that few Lithuanians with strongly expressed ethnic identity remained in the Kaliningrad Region. Respondents with multiple identities prevailed in the study. Many of them felt close to the Kaliningrad Region and Russia. The majority of the questioned Lithuanians did not identify themselves with Europe. Contradictory views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were expressed. A minority of the respondents thought that Russia would benefit if it joined the EU. Active processes of assimilation, mutual enrichment and interpenetration of cultures were observed. The trend of the gradual loss of Lithuanian language despite the existence of opportunities to learn it has also been outlined. Many positive traits of the Lithuanian people (diligence, determination, neatness, tidiness, etc.) have been named. Kind-heartedness, readiness to lend a hand and easy-going character have been listed among the positive features of the Russian people. Laziness, alcohol dependency, untidiness and lack of culture have been referred to as the negative traits. Quite often Lithuanians’ stereotypes on Russians appeared to be more negative than their auto-stereotypes. Nevertheless, Lithuanians get on very well with Russian people and many of them have Russian spouses. There are not many examples of insignificant confrontations between these two nations.
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5 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Research conclusions

5.1.1 Ethnic Identity.

Only a fifth of the survey respondents felt very close to Lithuania. A little bit more than half of the respondents felt rather close to Lithuania. At the same time almost a quarter of the respondents did not feel any connection to Lithuania at all.

A minority of the participants of the biographical interviews had strongly expressed ethnic identities. The majority of the respondents have multiple identities.

Almost all respondents eat and cook Lithuanian traditional dish – zeppelins (potato-meat dumplings) and Lithuanian cold borsch (beetroot soup). Some respondents stated that they liked Lithuanian music and songs. There were respondents who can even sing Lithuanian songs themselves.

5.1.2 National Identity.

Most of the respondents have already substantively settled in Russia. Many people don’t want to leave Russia. One of the possible reasons for this could be due to having a Russian spouse.

More than half of the respondents of the quantitative study and almost all participants of the biographical interviews took part in the elections to the State Duma (Parliamentary elections). This illustrates the manifestation of an active civil position.

5.1.3 Regional Identity

The overwhelming majority of the participants of the quantitative survey felt closeness to the Kaliningrad Region. One respondent of the biographical interview felt more comfortable in the Kaliningrad Region than in Lithuania. Another respondent was satisfied when he moved to the Kaliningrad Region because he received financial support including an apartment after he arrived. There was a respondent who wanted to stay in the Kaliningrad Region because of the potential job prospects. Nevertheless, there was also a respondent for whom Kaliningrad is still alien as he has lived there for only 4 years.

5.1.4 European Identity.

A minority of the respondents considered themselves European and identified themselves with Europe. The majority of the respondents did not self-identify themselves with Europe.

The advocates and opponents of Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were revealed during the study as well. Some respondents observed positive outcomes of Lithuania’s joining into the EU and saw it as beneficial to the citizens of Lithuania.

Negative views on Lithuania’s entry into the European Union were also expressed. The “minuses” include dependence of Lithuania on the decision of the EU, deterioration of Russian-Lithuanian relations, eagerness of the EU to reach its own aims, poor job prospects and unprof-
tability of the transition to another currency. On the one hand, many political issues have been solved but, on the other hand, people’s lives have become harder.

5.1.5 Position of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region.

According to the 2002 All-Russian census, the population of the Lithuanians in the Kaliningrad Region was 13,937 people. Out of this, 13,864 Lithuanians could speak Russian. Almost a third of all Lithuanians living in Russia reside in the Kaliningrad Region.

Over the last ten years in Kaliningrad oblast the Lithuanian national and cultural movement has been transformed into an organized regional public association with a clear structure and management.

The Lithuanian community in Kaliningrad strives to get its members familiar with Lithuanian literature, folklore, national art and traditions, among them choral singing.

The only regional newspaper "Gintaras" (Amber), which was published in Russian and in Lithuanian every two months, ceased to exist in 2007. The Lithuanian minority in Kaliningrad does however receive daily and weekly newspapers from Lithuania.

The Lithuanian minority in Kaliningrad has access to radio channels and, via satellite, to TV from Lithuania.

Presently, there are 23 Lithuanian language centres, including 3 Sunday schools and 16 elective courses in this region. One or several subjects are taught in Lithuanian in 4 secondary schools.

A few Lithuanians with strongly expressed ethnic identity remained in the Kaliningrad Region. Respondents with multiple identities prevailed in the study. Many of them felt close to the Kaliningrad Region and Russia. The trend of the gradual loss of Lithuanian language despite the existence of opportunities to learn it has also been outlined. Lithuanians get on very well with Russian people and many of them have Russian spouses. There are few examples of insignificant confrontations between these two nations.

5.2 Practical recommendations

5.2.1 Recommendations for civil society organizations

The study showed that not all Lithuanians are aware enough of their ethnic customs and traditions. It would be good if civil society organizations could arrange events where Lithuanians, especially representatives of the young generation, would learn more about their ethnic traditions.

5.2.2 Recommendations for governmental bodies and officials at local, regional, national and supra-national levels

1. The outcomes of the studies should be presented to the central government, regional and local authorities in order to set up new and further directions for policy-making related to the issues of the ethnic minorities.

2. Strong processes of assimilation have also been revealed during the study. For more than 10 years the Government of Lithuania actively supported and often funded the work aimed at preserving the language and culture of the Lithuanian Diaspora in the
Kaliningrad Region. However, an evident decline in this work has been observed during the recent years. It would be good if the Government of Lithuania could provide more support and funding of such work.

3. Not all Lithuanians living in the Kaliningrad region have access to the newspapers and magazines published in Lithuanian. Wider access to such mass media sources should be provided.

5.2.3 Suggestions for future research and follow-up studies

More detailed research can be done only on the basis of the comparison of the studies conducted in different periods of time. That is why, sociological monitoring of the problems and living conditions of the ethnic minorities should be conducted on the regular basis.
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