

КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ «ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ И МИГРАЦИЯ В МЕНЯЮЩЕМСЯ МИРЕ»

УДК 314.745.3–054.72 + 316.422 + 327(569.4) + 327(47 + 57)

S. Lissitsa

WHAT IS VITAL FOR INTEGRATION? RUSSIAN IMMIGRANTS AND ISRAELIS SPEAK THEIR MIND

This research focuses on criteria for evaluating the success of sociocultural adjustment among CIS immigrants in Israeli society. The research objective was to explore: how immigrants and hosts defined the criteria of integration, i.e. what are the requirements an immigrant has to meet to be accepted as a full-fledged member of Israeli society. The research methodology combines qualitative and quantitative methods.

Key words: migration, sociocultural adjustment, CIS immigrants, Israeli society, criteria, integration.

Israel is known as a society of immigrants. The patterns of immigration were established during the state's initial forty years, and, in consequence, the practices of institutional absorption became an integral part of Israeli culture, economics, and politics. In social research as well, immigration and absorption occupied a central place [3, 14]. These studies were carried out for the most part from the perspective of the absorbing establishment, the policy question guiding them being how to induce change in the immigrant population so they would rapidly adapt culturally and socially to the Israeli mainstream. The criteria for successful absorption were typically defined according to the judgment of the researchers. The mass immigration from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS, the former Soviet Union) at the beginning of the 90s challenged this outlook and made necessary a rethinking of both theory and practice. This article shifts the focus of discussion from the success of absorption to its criteria. What is demanded of the immigrant in order to become an Israeli? What does s/he need to change, and what is s/he allowed to retain? These questions can be summarized in one general question: What are the conditions of entry into Israeli society? We assume that the conditions of entry are an expression

of an essential segment of the values of the target society. No less important is the attitude of the immigrants: What are they prepared to give up, and what do they insist on retaining? We are therefore describing an interaction between two populations rather than the policy of one population towards absorption of the other.

For this shift in approach, a new conceptual framework is needed for comprehending the processes of integration. Key words such as “absorption”, “assimilation”, “adaptation”, and “re-socialization” have been replaced by more symmetrical concepts: “conflict”, “exchange” and “integration” [11]. These key words are more appropriate for the analysis of reciprocal relations between hosts and immigrants without presuming the existence of a dominant culture whose superiority is accepted by all.

Two major characteristics distinguished international waves of migration in general and Jewish migration to Israel:

A. The relative dimensions: the percentage of immigrants in Israel’s population was greater than that in other countries of immigration. At the beginning of the 1990s, more than 50 % of the Israeli population was born outside the country, in contrast to the United States, Germany, or France – 9 %; Canada – 16 %; Australia – 23 % [15].

B. Jewish migration to Israel was defined as “aliya,” accompanied by the narrative of a “return home” and supported by the sense of sharing a common Jewish tradition. This tradition, despite its diversity (from ultra-orthodox to secular nationalist), provided a central element in the self-definition of both the immigrants and the hosts. It was recognition of being Jewish that determined who was allowed to immigrate to Israel [2, 7].

Aliya was considered one of the main objectives of the state of Israel and one of the justifications for its existence. This position was expressed in the basic policies of every Israeli government, in the platforms of most political parties, and in the responses to many public opinion surveys. Unlike most countries of immigration, which made receiving citizenship dependent upon some minimal time in the country and other conditions, Israel granted citizenship to Jewish immigrants immediately upon arrival [6].

Most of the empirical descriptions set out here, not to mention the theoretical assumptions adduced to explain them, are in need of reconstruction in view of the situation created by the wave of immigration from the CIS beginning in the 1990s. The uniqueness of Russian Jewry in comparison with other Jewish Diasporas was recognized even before the most recent wave of immigration. The Jewishness of the Russian immigrants was quite different from that of most Jewish Israeli citizens, even the most secular ones [10]. The difference stemmed mostly from the three generations of religious, political, and cultural severance between Russian Jews and the rest of the Jewish people. Some observers have gone so far as to define the Jews of the CIS as a population that underwent denationalization [8, 19]. Small but influential circles were intensively occupied with nurturing Jewish culture while keeping a low profile towards the outside world [12]. Despite these phenomena, most of Soviet Jewry continued in the direction of cultural assimilation, while achieving excellence in the general Russian culture.

An important characteristic of this wave of migration was its large scope in both absolute and relative terms (approximately one million persons and about 15 % of the entire Israeli population). This immigration was also unique in having impressive human resources. For example, the percentage of those with a higher education is both greater than that of the population in the CIS and greater than that of the host Israeli population [13]. However, this advantage was constrained by an inability to “translate” the resources into economic returns or professional status [17].

The critical situation of the CIS in the beginning of the 1990-th was not perceived by the immigrants as being permanent. The expectation was that it would gradually stabilize and improve. Moreover, the tremendous resources that had been accumulated in the former Soviet Union were expected to enable the CIS to regain respected global status. For these reasons, the sense of dependence on the target society of those emigrating from the CIS was not as great as it had been among the immigrants from Europe or countries of the Middle East during the 1950s. The conditions of exchange between the host society and the immigrants had become more symmetrical. It quickly became clear that the destination society needed the immigrants and not just the opposite. Israel needed Jewish immigration in order to balance the considerable natural increase of the Arab population (whether in Israel or in the Palestinian territories) [16]. Furthermore, the immigrants’ high level of human resources contributed to the growth of Israel’s economy as a whole [18].

It may be said that the Russian-Jewish community in Israel is one of the largest and most developed Russian communities outside the borders of the CIS. Actually, an extensive press has arisen around the immigrant community as well as radio and television stations. They have also developed self-help associations, educational institutions (from kindergarten through teachers’ seminars), and two or three political parties (which survived until 2003) [4, 5, 10]. Altogether, it is a vibrant and creative community.

Overall, the Russian community in Israeli society developed respectively to global trends. Most western societies have become pluralistic, and multicultural ideologies have become acceptable. These developments have pushed the image of the “melting pot” to the margins of public discourse, even when this image was factually justified (Yuchtman-Ya’ar, 2002). Accordingly, we posit that criteria of integration have changed as well.

Research Objectives

- To clarify the criteria of immigrants integration;
- To evaluate the perceived importance of each criterion among immigrants and veterans;

Methodology

This study is based upon both qualitative research, used in order to clarify central issues of concern to the Israeli establishment in matters of immigrants integration and to construct the research instrument, and quantitative research used in order to estimate the perceived “importance” of the various criteria of integration.

Procedure

1. Qualitative research — expert interviews

An exploratory pilot study with experts in matters of absorption (ten 90-minute interviews). We defined as experts people who played leading roles in the process of sociocultural adjustment of CIS immigrants. Some were national or municipal level government officials, while others were active in the private sector such as journalists, psychologists etc. In compiling the list of experts an effort was made to ensure: (a) a fair representation of local versus central government personnel; (b) a variety of professional spheres (politics, media, and psychology); and (c) representation of immigrants as well as the host population. Respondents were briefed about the aims of the study: to clarify the concept of sociocultural adjustment and its spheres and to indicate the essentiality of main criteria in each sphere.

2. Quantitative research

The quantitative stage was conducted by telephone survey. Immigrants and Israeli hosts answered parallel questionnaires, the immigrants in Russian and the veteran Israelis in Hebrew. The questionnaire used in the study was formulated as a result of the expert interviews described above and in-depth interviews with 15 veteran Israelis and 15 immigrants.

The goal of the telephone survey was to assess the importance immigrants and host population attached to criteria of sociocultural adjustment. The standard question in the survey was: What should be demanded of an immigrant for him/her to be recognized as an Israeli? Among the listed “conditions for acceptance” were skills, achievements, resources, attitudes, and behaviors. The survey questionnaire included 67 items, each of them considered to be a criterion of sociocultural adjustment. The phrasing of these items was uniform: “For each of the following characteristics, please note to what degree it is vital or not vital if the immigrant is to be considered fully integrated into Israeli society. Give a grade from 1 to 10, with 10 denoting a characteristic vital to sociocultural adjustment (without which it would be impossible to integrate) and 1 denoting a characteristic that is not needed at all.” The internal consistency of the scales was high (Cronbach’s alpha: 0.91 among immigrants and 0.94 among host Israelis).

Participants

Two parallel representative samples, one of immigrants from the CIS ($N = 510$) and the other of native-born Israelis or Israelis who immigrated before 1989 ($N = 502$). The samples were taken randomly from 75 localities. Gender and age groups were determined by quota according to Central Bureau of Statistics data.

Findings

In this section, we present the findings of in depth interviews with absorption experts and survey findings.

In-Depth Interviews with Absorption Experts

The interviews were conducted with the aim of clarifying the concept of *integration* from the perspective of people playing various roles in the absorption process. The respondents were also asked to break down the overall concept into spheres: economic status, housing and employment, social, cultural, educational, psychological, and political.

We began with a simple question:

What Is Integration?

A. I. (immigrant from Former Soviet Union, female), a journalist and past advisor to the Minister of Immigrant Absorption, asserts:

“Integration occurs when people accept you for your personal abilities, when your career isn’t influenced by your accent. That’s the basis of integration. ...when a person has the freedom to choose whether or not to change as s/he wishes and not because of some outside demand. Integration means to be accepted as “one of us”... But in Israel only one doctrine exists — of uniformity. Israeli society is ready to accept you (not to integrate but to accept) only on one condition — if you reject all you have brought with you, the things that constitute your essence; in other words, we are actually speaking of assimilation and not integration.”

This respondent’s approach regarding the second generation is slightly different:

“Your children have two choices: either they stop being your children and become the ‘children of the education system’, or they become bicultural, and that’s better than anything else: they adapt their behavior to their surroundings: they act differently with ‘the Russians’ than with the Israelis.”

From this expert’s words, we learn that control over the process of integration resides mostly in the hands of the hosts: it is they who determine the degree of the immigrant’s success (recognition of the immigrant as “one of our own”). We also learn what means are employed by the Israelis: low evaluation of immigrants’ abilities and exaggerated demands for change. For the first generation, A. I. recommends minimal integration: each sector should remain in its own social-cultural framework, with Russian culture being of equal weight to that of Hebrew culture. For the second generation, she is more ready for compromise: the children should grow up in a bicultural space.

A. M. (native Israeli, male), Director General of the Joint Distribution Committee, Israel, shares the opinion that integration is primarily the responsibility of the natives, but he softens the conflict by shifting the emphasis from cultural controversy to interpersonal relations:

“It seems to me that if an immigrant has no Israeli friends, we [that is, the host society] have failed. When integration succeeds, there will be networks of mixed friendships. Perhaps not in the closest circle, but at least in the second circle. When an immigrant meets an Israeli, the conversation between them needs to consist of more than just ‘shalom’ (The Hebrew word for ‘Hello’).”

The interviewee refers to interactions at the personal level, which accumulate and create social solidarity between the various sectors. Because of limited informal contact at the personal level, integration of the immigrants is blocked and social solidarity is impaired.

A. M. applies the same socio-psychological approach to the terror attack at the Dolphinarium Disco club in 2001, explaining:

“There were people who said that the large percentage of Russian immigrants among the victims is an indication of their social isolation.”

This quotation indicates that social integration of the young immigrants has yet to occur. They have insulated themselves within their community and have not acquired veteran friends. It is reasonable to assume that in the workplace and schools young immigrants maintain interactions with Israelis of their age, but these Israelis have not yet penetrated the immigrants' circle of close friends and the two communities spend their free time separately.

It may be observed that the facts can be interpreted in various ways: the immigrants' social isolation may be attributable to exclusion by the host society, to the immigrants' own preferences or to a combination of both reasons.

Y. K. (immigrant, male), a politician, emphasizes the individual emotional viewpoint and offers some comparative comments. It is not the objective quality of Israel that determines the ability to integrate but rather its adaptation to "my" needs and interests. To a certain extent he agrees with the opinion that integration depends more on people than on institutions:

"My definition of successful integration is the feeling that you're at home; you feel comfortable, even though there may be practical problems (employment, security)... For me, this is expressed by the fact that in Russia I didn't feel at home, because of anti-Semitism. Even now, when I visit Russia, I don't have the feeling that I'm at home. The same is true in the United States. And precisely in Israel, I do feel at home. It's my country; it is considerate of my mentality, my uniqueness, and my interests."

M. G. (native Israeli, female), Director of the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption, juxtaposes the objective-social and the psychological approaches:

"Integration consists not only of the subjective feeling of the immigrant; one also needs the perception of the hosts. Integration will be complete only when the target society recognizes the Israeliness of the immigrants."

The four experts quoted above approach the subject from three perspectives:

- The values approach (equality, free choice, and multiculturalism).
- The standpoint of personal relations between immigrants and hosts.
- The basis of the immigrants' personal welfare ("to feel comfortable").

It would appear that the immigrant-experts are more concerned with equality and less with reciprocity, while the opposite is true of the experts among the Israelis who see integration more in terms of reciprocal and not necessarily egalitarian relations. The main disagreement among the experts is about who has the chief responsibility for the success of integration: the immigrants who are obliged to adapt or the host society that must accept them as full-fledged members of Israeli society.

On the other hand, it is widely agreed that integration is a process rather than a state of affairs: changes occur in each sphere of integration, and the relative importance of these spheres also changes. In the first stages, the instrumental spheres are the most important: income, employment, housing, and basic Hebrew, whereas in the more advanced stages, the cultural, social, and political domains assume greater importance.

With the passage of time, the referential context in which the immigrants see themselves also changes; they wish not only to survive but also to regain the same social and professional status they had before migrating. In the next stage they

begin to compare their situation to that of Israelis “who resemble them” demographically and educationally. This hypothesis was advanced by Adler [1] and formulated in terms of Maslow’s [9] hierarchic model of needs. It is suggested that migration causes a shock from which ensues a temporary retreat from such “high” needs as social benefits and self-realization to basic, almost biological needs (food, housing, and security). As time in Israel increases, immigrants return to their usual level of needs. An increase in expectations demands an ongoing process of advancement, in order to maintain an optimistic outlook. This is reflected in the words of Y. K. (immigrant), a former advisor to Prime Minister Netanyahu:

“The immigrants go up to the top of the hill and think they have already reached the summit; and they still do not know that entire mountains await them. Of course, an immigrant expects of himself that he will reach the same social level to which s/he had been accustomed.”

Factors Facilitating Integration

The difficulty of integration varies for different groups of immigrants. Some integrate better and more quickly than others. Our respondent-experts identified characteristics that predict smoother and more rapid integration:

– Demographic characteristics: young age, technical (rather than humanistic-cultural) profession, small but stable family, urban background, origin in one of the European republics of the CIS.

Apparently, the respondents were thinking mostly about economic-professional integration: origin in one of the European republics, for example, while easing economic mobility, does not ensure cultural-social integration. On the other hand, those coming from Asian republics feel less commitment to Russian culture (having become aware of it only during the previous generation), so they are more receptive to Israeli culture. The outbreaks of violent nationalism in most of the Asian republics starting in the late 1980s should also be taken into consideration. They have transformed immigration from these lands into an almost irreversible process, similar to Asian and African immigration during the 1950s and 1960s.

– Psychological characteristics – flexibility and willingness to change, communicative skills, an objective view of themselves, and a sense of humor.

A. M. (native Israeli, male), Director General of the Joint Distribution Committee, emphasizes:

“The ability to communicate with people, that is, the talent to build informal networks, is very important.”

S. W. (immigrant, female), Deputy Mayor of a small city, asserts that attitudes too are likely to ease integration and not only resources or abilities:

“Integration is easier for those who do not have overly high hopes, constructive people who are ready to work with the materials that life gives them.”

An important resource for integration in Israel today is the ability to improvise in all spheres of life. According to Y. K. (immigrant, male), a politician:

“Those who have experienced the capitalist reality before migrating integrate much more easily in the professional sphere.”

A similar argument is heard from L. S. (immigrant, male), responsible for immigrant absorption in a medium-sized city:

“Integration is easier for people who know how to sell.”

The above statements express the principle that the process of integration depends on harmony between the two sides: it is not only the conditions and resources provided for them by the absorbing society that influence the immigrants’ ability to integrate but also the newcomers’ personality characteristics. Various indicators of flexibility (young age, small family) are general factors that aid in coping with any crisis or transition.

Cultural Sphere: Experience and Contribution

The cultural sphere received much attention from the experts.

H. R. (immigrant, male), journalist, fears a distortion of the immigrants’ culture because of the influence of the hosts:

“When immigrants from the CIS go to concerts mostly to show off their jewelry — that will be an indication that they have already integrated into Israeli culture.”

This ironic and patronizing view of the Israeli attitude towards music applies to the affinity to culture in general: in contrast to the spirituality and universality proclaimed by the immigrants are the materialism and provincialism they attribute to the Israelis. This attitude is criticized by an Israeli expert, A. M., Director General of the Joint Distribution Committee, Israel. He tries to show understanding towards the sense of cultural superiority on the part of the Russian immigrants and also towards the natural limitations of a culture that has arisen in a small country:

“It is clear that this is what happens when immigrants from a large and sophisticated empire are brought to a small country. Perhaps it is difficult for us who have grown up inside Israeli culture to see this. We possess the superiority of belonging to the founders. The absorbing group has a tremendous advantage. They are here, they are in command of the language, and they have power. With all due respect to the attempts of the Russians to retain their special culture, they know that eventually they need to be absorbed. They also say they want to know Hebrew. There is an internal tension in such a situation: “I want to retain the original culture while at the same time I want to be an Israeli.”

For many of the CIS immigrants, the price of multicultural compromise seems very costly in terms of cultural integrity. In a multicultural reality, it is difficult to preserve the cultural level internalized in the past. There is always a contradiction between the aspiration to retain the original culture in its purist form and the need for multicultural balance.

Have the Immigrants Changed Due to Contact with Israeli Society or Vice Versa?

It is easy to identify the influence of the Israeli environment on immigrants from the CIS. Most of them speak Hebrew on an instrumental level; they have overcome many practical difficulties, and their political orientation is taking shape.

M. G. (Israeli, female), Director General of the Ministry of Absorption, describes the influence of Israeli society on the immigrants in the sphere of popular culture:

"I was impressed by the extent to which CIS immigrants participate in television programs. They feel as though it is completely natural to compete with the Israelis and with other immigrants. Our policy is to initiate a large number of cultural events open to different circles of the Israeli public."

It is more difficult to identify the influence of the immigrants on Israeli culture and society. But the respondent provides an example of such influence as well:

"I think that their contribution has been enormous, even though Israeli society is not sufficiently aware of it. How would the security, economic, and cultural aspects of Israeli society appear today if not for this wave of immigration? A concrete example of cultural cooperation is the Gesher Theater. It was the initiative of a group of immigrant actors who were "adopted" by the Ministry of Education and Culture. Today most of their performances are in Hebrew, but without a doubt, the style remains Russian."

H. R. (immigrant, male), journalist, presents another example of the influence of the "Russians" on secular Israeli society:

"Now the Israelis are no longer irritated by the fact that the Russians celebrate New Year at the end of December. One needs to reserve place in advance in an Israeli restaurant for New Year's Eve, and seated there, one finds Israelis. If there is Mimuna (a holiday celebrated at the last day of passover, which is not actually very connected to Judaism), why shouldn't there be a holiday like New Year's Eve? It is one of the elements of popular culture. The intercultural gap has decreased."

S. W. (immigrant, female), Deputy Mayor, describes the influence of the CIS immigration in the educational sphere:

"In many localities the range of activities for children and of cultural programs for adults increased significantly. Both the supply of and demand for these activities expanded as a result of the influence of the Russian immigration."

A. I. (immigrant), journalist, presents an example from the sphere of consumerism:

"Russians distinguish between holiday clothes and everyday clothes. For Israelis this distinction had not been significant, but the very existence of the new consumer, who wanted to buy special holiday clothes, influenced what the garment industry produced."

In conclusion, the influences are mutual, even if not exactly symmetrical. The immigrants are integrating into Israeli society, but at the same time, they are causing changes in it. Three dimensions are discernible in these transformations: (1) the appearance of new distinctions (differentiation between holiday and everyday

clothing, between national and international holidays); (2) enrichment (additional activities and initiatives); and (3) enhanced tolerance (expansion of the range of legitimate behavior).

These transformations have suited the interests of a part of the host population who aspire to an open, more varied and free society. For example, reinforcement of multiculturalism is likely to advance the interests of all the non-hegemonic cultures, thereby paving the way for additional developments in the same direction.

Core Subjects

Towards the end of the in-depth interviews, we asked the respondents to suggest three main questions that would give the most valid indication of the extent to which the new immigrant had become an inseparable part of Israeli society.

Some of the questions dealt with specific subjects:

Economic-Employment

– Are you satisfied with your income? Does your work enable self-fulfillment?
Do you have economic and job security?

Cultural

– Are you interested in Israeli culture? Do you like Israeli music, Israeli movies, Israeli theater?

Social

– How many Hebrew-speakers do you invite to your birthday party? How many telephone numbers of Israelis are listed in your personal telephone book?

Other questions dealt with general feeling:

- Do you feel at home in Israel?
- Do you feel accepted by Israelis?
- Would you prefer to live in Israel or in some other country?
- Are you optimistic about the future of your children in Israel?
- After a soccer game between Russia and Israel you hear someone say: “Our team won.” Which is the team you think of?
- When asked: “Where are you from?” Would you respond: “from Tel Aviv” or “from Kiev?”

Some of our experts emphasized that as they saw the situation, the subjective characteristics are the most important. Still, the first set of core questions concern objective conditions: income, employment, housing, education. We suggest that the objective conditions of integration and the subjective reaction to them resemble the two blades of a pair of scissors that together cut the paper.

Objectively speaking, according to the experts’ perceptions the immigrant is at the same time both from Kiev and from Tel Aviv, but the decisive factor determining the extent of integration is how s/he defines her/himself. Something similar may be said about the Israeli and Russian soccer teams. They are both “ours”, but with which of them does the immigrant identify more? According to the experts, a decision in favor of Israel constitutes an important criterion for integration.

Findings of the Quantitative Research

Organization of the Criteria by Sphere (Factor Analysis)

Because of the large number and varied types of criteria, a more efficient organization of the content is called for. Factor analysis resulted in the identification of 12 spheres of integration¹.

Within the two groups, the correlations between each of the spheres are positive, and most are statistically significant. Cronbach’s alpha for all of the spheres is 0.83 among the Israelis and 0.78 among the immigrants.

Table lists the 12 factors. The importance of each factor is calculated according to the average importance of the items contained in it. In order to examine the differences between immigrants and veteran Israelis an independent samples t-test was conducted.

Spheres of integration and their average importance.
Means (scale 1–10, 1—a characteristic that is not needed at all and 10—a characteristic that is vital to integration), Standard Deviations, t-values

Sphere of integration (two items that were included in it)	Immigrants’ Means	Israelis’ Means (SD)	t (d.f.) ¹⁾ (SD)
<i>Psychological integration</i> (preservation of self-respect during integration; preservation of parental authority)	8.96 (1.22)	8.56 (1.41)	**4.8 (1008)
<i>Children’s schooling</i> (success of immigrants’ children at school; participation of immigrants’ children in extra-curricular activities, youth movements, etc.)	8.55 (1.31)	8.32 (1.51)	**2.5 (1009)
<i>Housing</i> (owning apartment; living in proximity to public transport and shopping centers)	8.23 (1.32)	7.38 (1.58)	**9.4 (1009)
<i>Preservation of socio-economic status</i> (employment that matches immigrants’ qualifications; preserving immigrants’ social status as it was prior to immigration)	8.17 (1.72)	7.45 (1.84)	**6.4 (1010)
<i>Basic Hebrew</i> (verbal fluency; ability to write a simple letter)	8.03 (1.82)	7.49 (1.74)	**4.8 (1009)
<i>Current socio-economic status</i> (monthly income not less than average Israeli income; job security)	7.91 (1.64)	8.05 (1.33)	–1.4 (1010)
<i>Israeli identification</i> (identification as Israeli; pride in Israeli nationality)	7.73 (1.57)	8.34 (1.45)	–6.4** (1009)
<i>Affinity to Russian culture</i> (read literature in Russian; respect for Russian culture)	7.65 (1.96)	6.06 (2.06)	**12.6 (1009)

¹⁾ Differences between immigrants and Israelis significant at $p < .05$ (*) or $p < .01$ (**).

¹ For purposes of factor analysis, the two samples were combined without weighting them according to their percentage of the population. This research decision is an expression of our hypothesis that integration is an interactive process. The two groups have equal influence on the success or failure of integration.

Sphere of integration (two items that were included in it)	Immigrants' Means	Israelis' Means (SD)	<i>t</i> (d.f.) (SD)
<i>Israeli culture</i> (respect for Israeli culture; consumption of Israeli culture)	7.45 (1.68)	7.55 (1.66)	–94 (1010)
<i>Social relations</i> (close friendships with Israelis; positive attitude toward Israelis)	7.30 (1.78)	8.04 (1.58)*	–7.0** (1010)
<i>Political integration</i> (understanding of Israeli politics; participation in Israeli general elections)	7.24 (2.31)	7.53 (2.02)	–2.1* (1007)
<i>Adopting Israeli life style</i> (Israeli style of clothing; Israeli names for newborn children)	5.51 (1.96)	7.14 (2.06)	–11.7** (1007)

Differences between Immigrants and Israelis

All the spheres seem to be important or fairly important. No sphere received an average mark lower than 5: in other words, the respondents tended to be severe in their criteria for integration.

The difference in the degree of importance assigned by the immigrants vs. the Israelis was significant in ten of the twelve spheres of integration. Significant differences were not found concerning economic-employment status in Israel and integration into Israeli culture.

The most important spheres of all for the immigrants were psychological integration, education of the children, housing, retaining economic-employment status. The least important spheres of all for the immigrants were personal relations between immigrants and Israelis, political integration, and adoption of an Israeli style of life.

The Israelis attached most importance to psychological-personal integration, identification with Israel, and education of children. They attached least importance to the affinity to Russian culture and adopting an Israeli life style.

The immigrants and veteran Israelis agreed about the great importance of the psychological sphere (preserving self-respect and parental authority) and the education of children and the relatively lesser importance of adoption of an Israeli life style.

To summarize these differences in a single number, a Spearman rank order correlation was calculated for rankings of the spheres by the immigrants and the Israelis. The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was 0.40, which denotes a moderate association between immigrants' and veterans' rankings.

Conclusion

This study attempted to gauge what is considered a "successful" process of socio-cultural adjustment and to identify the criteria for this success. In the study we clarified whether the end point of the process, or the "ideal integration", was

perceived differently or similarly by the two sides involved. The first step in this direction was to emphasize the concept of recognition as a complement to the concept of identity. As was stated in one of the in-depth interviews: *integration can be considered to have occurred only when the target society recognizes the Israeliness of the immigrants*. This addition transforms identity into a social and even a political concept. The interaction between two groups does not relate to the abstract idea of integration (about which all agree) but rather to the direction of the process: who needs to adapt to the customs of whom and to what extent. Or, in sociological terms: what changes in identity, values, and behavior are necessary for the Israeliness of the immigrant to be recognized. On the other hand, to what changes are the immigrants ready to agree in exchange for recognition of their integration.

The findings show that a wide range of criteria are assessed as being important or at least fairly important by the immigrants and the Israelis. The range of importance varies between 5.5 and 9.5 (out of a possible 10), with the differences between the Israelis and the immigrants being mostly relative.

However, the differences that are found between the immigrants and the Israelis are not a matter of chance. The two different perceptions of the process as a whole are expressed in the importance attached to the various criteria of integration. The Israelis are more interested in the immigrants' identification with the state of Israel, personal relations between the immigrants and hosts, and the newcomers' consumption of Israeli culture, whereas the immigrants do not tend to adopt Israeli behavior patterns, and they emphasize their affinity to Russian culture.

Another important difference between the groups has to do with their perspective of time.

The Israelis tend to focus on long term criteria. They attach importance to Israeli identification, personal relations between immigrants and Israelis and adoption of Israeli life style, more than immigrants. The immigrants, in contrast, ascribe greater importance to immediate needs: housing, preservation of socio-economic status and command of basic Hebrew. These conclusions correspond to Maslow's hierarchic model of needs (1970) that were applied by Adler (1977) to the context of immigrant integration: as long as basic needs such as food, shelter and employment (which are immediate) are not met, people cannot deal with more abstract and long-term needs.

Israelis and immigrants agree on the great importance of children's success. For the Israelis it is part of their vision of long-term absorption, including the blurring of intercultural differences. For the immigrants it is the source of immediate satisfaction and pride as well, but they expect that the next generation will continue to be involved in Russian culture.

At the same time, preservation of self-respect and parental authority is greatly valued by both groups. It may be suggested that the importance attached by Israelis to the preservation of parental authority and self-respect among the immigrants reflects the understanding that this will serve to prevent the development of a culture of poverty among the immigrants.

Multiculturalism seems to have become an important factor in the study of sociocultural adjustment. In other words, the tolerance of host Israelis towards

cultural, social and psychological continuity combined with immigrants' willingness to make some of the changes required from them seem to be the major catalysts for relatively smooth sociocultural adjustment.

1. Adler S. (1977). Maslow's need hierarchy and the adjustment of immigrants. *Intern. Migration Rev.* 11 (4). P. 444–451.
2. Ben-Rafael E. *Jewish Identities: 50 Intellectuals Answer Ben-Gurion*, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2002.
3. Eisenstadt S. N. (1954). *The Absorption of Immigrants*. L. : Routledge and Kegan Paul.
4. Elias N. (2003). *From the Former Soviet Union to Israel and Germany: The Role of Mass Media in the Social and Cultural Integration of Immigrants*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Department of Communications, Tel-Aviv University.
5. Feldman E. (2003). "Russian" Israel: Between two poles. M. : Market DS. (Russian).
6. Friedlander D., Goldscheider C. (1979). *The population of Israel*. N. Y. : Columbia University Press.
7. Gitelman Z. (1995). *Immigration and identity: The resettlement and impact of Soviet immigrants on Israeli politics and society*. Los Angeles, CA : Wilstein Institute of Jewish Policy Studies.
8. Gozman L. (1997). Is living in Russia worthwhile // Lewin-Epstein N., Roi Y., Ritterband P. (eds.), *Russian Jews on three continents* (P. 406–415). L. : Frank Cass.
9. Maslow A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. 2nd ed. N. Y. : Harper and Row.
10. Remennick L. (2007). *Russian Jews on Three Continents. Identity, Integration and Conflict*. Transaction Publishers. New Brunswick (USA), L. (UK).
11. Remennick L. (2003). What Does Integration Mean? Social Insertion of Russian Jewish Immigrants in Israel // J. of Intern. Migration and Integration Vol. 4 (1). P. 23–48.
12. Rotenberg V. (2000). On the Self-Definition of Jews from the Former Soviet Union Now Living in Israel. *The Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*. 4 (19). P. 213–220.
13. Sikron M. (1998). "Human Capital of Immigration and Processes of Immigrants' Occupational Integration" in Sikron M. and Leshem, E. (eds.) *A Portrait of the Immigration* (P. 127–181). Jerusalem : Magness. (Hebrew).
14. Shuval Y. (1963). *Immigrants on the threshold*. N. Y. : Atherton Press.
15. Simon R. J., Lynch J. P. (1999). A comparative assessment of public opinion Toward immigrations and immigration policies // *Intern. Migration Rev.* 33 (2). P. 455–467.
16. Sofer M., Schnell I. (2000). The Restructuring Stages of Israeli Arab Industrial Entrepreneurship // *Environment and Planning A*. Vol. 32. P. 2231–2250.
17. Tzaban Y. (1997). The quandaries of an Israeli minister of absorption. In N. Lewin-Epstein, Y. Roi, & P. Ritterbrand (eds.), *Russian Jews on three continents* (P. 128–134). L. : Frank Cass.
18. Weiss Y., Gotlibovsky M. (1995). *Immigration, search and loss of skill*. Tel Aviv : Foerder Institute Working Paper, 34.
19. Weber J. (1994). Introduction. In J. Weber (ed.), *Jewish identities in the new Europe* (P. 1–32). L. : Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Рукопись поступила в редакцию 7 ноября 2013 г.

С. Лиссица

ЧТО НЕОБХОДИМО ДЛЯ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ: РУССКИЕ ИММИГРАНТЫ И ИЗРАИЛЬТЯНЕ РАСКРЫВАЮТ ДУШУ

Исследование фокусируется на критериях оценки успешности социокультурной адаптации иммигрантов стран СНГ в израильское общество. Цель исследования — изучить, каким образом иммигранты и хозяева определяют критерии интеграции, т. е. каким требованиям должен удовлетворять иммигрант, чтобы быть принятым в качестве полноправного члена израильского общества. Методология исследования сочетает в себе качественные и количественные методы исследования.

Ключевые слова: миграция, социокультурная адаптация, критерии интеграции, израильское общество.

Израиль известен как общество иммигрантов, в котором практики институциональной ассимиляции являются неотъемлемой частью культуры, экономики и политики. Однако большинство работ по иммиграции написаны с позиции ассимилирующего истеблишмента, а критерии успешности ассимиляции определялись самими исследователями. Следует расширить предмет анализа и рассмотреть не только степень успешности интеграции, но и критерии, по которым эта успешность оценивается. Потому более адекватным представляется подход к иммиграции не как к политике ассимилирующего большинства населения, а как к взаимодействию между двумя группами населения. Отсюда смена категорий: понятия «поглощение», «ассимиляция», «адаптация» и «ресоциализация» заменяются на более симметричные понятия «конфликт», «обмен», «интеграция», которые более отражают двусторонность отношений между старым и новым населением, не предполагая изначально существование некой доминирующей культуры, чье превосходство признано всеми.

Необходимо учитывать особенности израильской иммиграции: во-первых, масштабность иммиграционного процесса (в начале 90-х гг. более 50 % израильтян были рождены не в самом Израиле); во-вторых, идеологические основания (иммиграция евреев понималась как «алийя», была вписана во все направления государственной политики и обеспечивала гражданством «на въезде»; главным же нарративом, опиравшимся на уверенность в общем культурном наследии, было возвращение домой). В сравнении с другими диаспорами уникальность русских евреев, которые религиозно, культурно и политически были отрезаны на протяжении жизни трех поколений, признавалась и до массовой иммиграции в начале 90-х гг. Но само количество перебравшихся в Израиль (около миллиона человек, почти 15 % населения Израиля), а также впечатляющий потенциал новоприбывших человеческих ресурсов (процент людей с высшим образованием в этой группе превосходил как страны СНГ, так и сам Израиль) поставили волну иммиграции русских евреев особняком. Если прибавить к этим характеристикам ощущение русскими евреями временности пребывания в Израиле, сопряженное с надеждой на исправление

ситуации в покинутой стране, и потребность Израиля в новых человеческих ресурсах для конкуренции с палестинцами, то станет понятно, почему отношения между израильтянами-«ветеранами» и иммигрантами оказались более симметричными. Также мультикультурализм, распространявшийся по миру в тот период, заместил идею «плавильного котла» и существенно преобразовал критерии интеграции.

Исследование нацелено на прояснение критериев интеграции иммигрантов и оценку значимости каждого критерия среди иммигрантов и «ветеранов». Были проведены интервью с экспертами (десять полуторачасовых интервью с ответственными чиновниками, государственными и негосударственными соцработниками, журналистами и психологами), глубинные интервью с представителями обеих групп населения (15 израильтян и 15 иммигрантов) и телефонный опрос (на основании интервью были сформулированы 67 вопросов, касающихся критериев социокультурной адаптации для 510 иммигрантов и 502 израильтян).

По анализу интервью можно заключить, что эксперты подходят к вопросу успешности интеграции с трех позиций: с позиции ценностного подхода (равенство, свобода выбора и мультикультурализм соответственно; для успеха интеграции необходимо создание условий, институтов для реализации прав новоприбывших), социокультурного подхода (включенность иммигрантов в общественную и экономическую жизнь, т. е. успешно интегрированный новоприбывший начинает «чувствовать себя как дома»), межличностного подхода (включенность иммигрантов в личные отношения, признание их в качестве израильтян со стороны «ветеранов»). По-видимому, эксперты-иммигранты более озабочены равенством и меньше взаимностью, тогда как эксперты-израильтяне видят интеграцию скорее двусторонним и не обязательно уравнивающим процессом. Главное расхождение проявилось в вопросе об ответственности за успешность интеграции: иммигранты обязаны приспосабливаться или принимающее общество должно гарантировать полноту прав. Однако все признают, что интеграция — это процесс, а не состояние: каждая сфера интеграции подвержена изменениям, и даже значимость самих сфер меняется. На первых этапах более важными являются инструментальные сферы (доход, занятость, жилье, базовое знание языка), на последующих стадиях культурные, социальные и политические аспекты выходят на передний план.

Уместно вспомнить пирамиду потребностей Маслоу, использованную Адлером для изучения миграции: первоначальное стремление выжить сменяется желанием достичь прежнего профессионального и общественного положения, а затем ожидания формируются уже в системе координат принявшего общества, — «ветераны» того же возраста, образования, профессии становятся референтной группой, по достижениям которых и оценивается собственный уровень успешности.

Степень адаптивности зависит от демографических характеристик (возраста, профессии, происхождения и семейного положения, а также от страны выезда, поскольку эмигранты из стран Центральной Азии, не рассчитывавшие на возможность возвращения, были более мотивированы на интеграцию)

и от психологических черт индивидов (гибкость, обучаемость, общительность, чувство юмора и др.).

Культурные ценности и сходство культурных ориентиров, по мнению экспертов, играют важную роль в интеграции. Так, русские евреи внесли существенный вклад в культурную жизнь Израиля (театр Гешер, празднование Нового года, обеспечение культурного досуга детей и взрослых, потребительские предпочтения в одежде и др.), что поставило их в более выигрышное по сравнению с другими иммигрантами положение. В результате анализа интервью экспертов можно выделить разные сферы показателей успешности интеграции: экономическая (доход, трудовая самореализация, уверенность в занятости), культурная (интерес и любовь к израильской культуре и искусству), социальная (межличностное общение с израильтянами-«ветеранами»). Таким образом, одни эксперты уделяют внимание объективным критериям, другие — субъективным оценкам иммигрантами своего положения, но для всех в центре остается вопрос самоидентификации: считают ли иммигранты себя израильтянами («если известно, что проходит футбольный матч Израиль — Россия и слышится возглас “наши победили!”, о какой команде вы подумали?»; «если вас спросят “откуда вы?”, что будет первым ответом: “Киев” или “Тель-Авив”?»). В целом для телефонного опроса было выделено 12 сфер критериев успешной интеграции.

Все сферы оказались важными для опрашиваемых, ни одна не получила оценку менее 5 (из 10). Для иммигрантов наиболее значимыми были психологическая интеграция (сохранение самоуважения и родительского авторитета), образование детей, жилье, достижение прежнего социально-профессионального положения, а наименее важными — межличностные отношения с израильтянами, политическая интеграция и принятие израильского образа жизни. Израильтяне высоко оценили личностно-психологическую интеграцию, израильскую идентификацию и образование детей.

Таким образом, отвечая на вопрос, одинаково ли представляют себе успешную интеграцию иммигранты и «ветераны», следует подчеркнуть, что идентификация и признание тесно связаны и что взаимодействие двух групп населения оценивается не по абстрактной идее успешной интеграции, но по направленности процесса: какие изменения идентичности, ценностей, поведения иммигранта необходимы для того, чтобы его признали израильтянином, и на какие изменения иммигрант готов пойти, чтобы добиться такого признания. В ходе исследования обнаружено, что различия в оценке значимости критериев интеграции не случайны. Израильтяне выделяют самоидентификацию иммигрантов, межличностные отношения и погружение в израильскую культуру, тогда как иммигранты не очень заинтересованы в принятии моделей поведения израильтян и сохраняют приверженность русской культуре. Более того, израильтяне предпочитают критерии, связанные с долговременной перспективой (идентичность, связи, образ жизни и культура), иммигранты же большую значимость придают непосредственным нуждам (жилье, достойное социально-экономическое положение и знание языка), что вполне соответствует уже упоминавшейся пирамиде потребностей Маслоу. Однако и те и другие

включили в первостепенные критерии образование детей, т. е. возможность их будущего социального роста, что вписывается и в видение долговременной интеграции израильтянами, и в понимание удовлетворения непосредственных нужд иммигрантами, хотя для иммигрантов важно поддержание следующим поколением связи с русской культурой. Также обе группы придали приоритет сохранению самоуважения и родительского авторитета; для израильтян предположительно это служит залогом того, что среди иммигрантов не укоренится «культура бедноты» и не разовьются агрессивные формы поведения.

Мультикультурализм, сыгравший важную роль в понимании социокультурного приспособления и выразившийся в толерантности израильтян к культурным, социальным и психологическим традициям иммигрантов, при условии их готовности корректировать некоторые из сторон этого наследия, стал основным катализатором относительно безболезненного процесса социокультурной интеграции.

УДК 314.745.3–054.72 + 327(560)

Е. В. Грунт

ВЛИЯНИЕ РУССКОЯЗЫЧНОЙ ЭМИГРАЦИИ НА РЕКОНФИГУРАЦИЮ СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА ТУРЦИИ

В статье рассматриваются основные тренды в современной культуре Турции, анализируются проблемы формирования русскоязычной диаспоры, ослабления диаспоральных связей, влияния третьей волны русских эмигрантов на изменение культуры Турции.

Ключевые слова: миграция, волны миграции, социокультурное пространство, эмиграция, реконфигурация, Турция, диаспора.

Страны, которые объединяют не столько географическим, сколько «культурно-религиозным» понятием «мусульманские страны», до недавнего времени имели закрытый («замкнутый») тип культуры [3], длительное время развивались на своей собственной духовной основе и не имели мощных миграционных потоков. Несмотря на то что в современной Турции проживает более 94 % мусульман, в Египте — более 90 %, в Арабских Эмиратах — около 70 %, а Индонезия является самой крупной по численности мусульманской страной в мире [7], последние десятилетия свидетельствуют об изменении состава населения этих стран в результате массовой миграции. Миграционные процессы не только меняют расово-антропологическую основу этих стран, но и подрывают ее идентичность, изменяют их социокультурное пространство. Большой поток мигрантов сюда сегодня идет из России и стран СНГ. Как