

## Social sustainability and migration in transit regions of Russia

A Gorbunova<sup>1</sup>, M Cherepanova<sup>1\*</sup> and I Molodikova<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Altai State University, 61 Lenina prosp., Barnaul 656049 Russia

E-mail: cher\_67@mail.ru

**Abstract.** The article presents the results of a population survey on inter-ethnic issues within the framework of sociological monitoring of problems of transit migration, transit regions and migration policy of Russia, including in the context of security and Eurasian integration. The study was conducted in seven territories of the Russian border, in particular, the Rostov region, Orenburg region, Dagestan, Altai region, Moscow, in the Murmansk region, Pskov region. The studied border areas of Russia are characterized by significant migration flows from neighboring countries. Most migrants come from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan. of Ukraine. The problem of adaptation and the integration of migrants into host communities is becoming one of the most significant social tasks for both migrants and the local population. In addition, the importance of studying the forecast of regional national security, identifying conflicting determinants, the knowledge of which will allow to improve social control and management in the sphere of interethnic relations, is increasing. The article presents general and specific regional estimates of the population of host regions in significant areas of optimization of the relationship between migrants and regional communities.

**Keywords:** migration, population, integration, labor market, security

### 1. Introduction

The transboundary nature of the dangers and the growing importance of international and local systemic factors of transit migration actualize the relevance of developing innovative strategic management decisions. Analysis of domestic studies of this scientific discourse allows us to refer to the concept of socially oriented migration policy in the region, developed by N. Tkacheva [6].

The scientific and applied aspect of this approach contributes to effective ethnic identification, by minimizing the level of migrant-phobia, forms tolerance, emphasizes national values, stimulates human rights activities and democratic institutions of civil society.

In the opposite context, an indicator of ineffective migration policy is the lack or weak controllability of increasing migration flows, intense competition for work in regional labor markets, the prevalence of ethnic enclaves, increased national stratification, and the institutionalization of diasporas in certain sectors of the economy and business [1]. These are the main manifestations of social tensions in the field of interethnic relations, the threat to regional socio-economic development of the Russian Federation.

The structure of the migration management system unites such entities as the state migration service, administrative bodies, non-profit organizations, and other structures of modern Russian society. The advantage of a socially determined model is connected with the purposefulness of the

local impact on the “painful” points of the migration process. In this case, not only the interests of society, but also individuals are realized [2].

The scientific specificity of the model proposed by N. Tkacheva consists in the mechanism of migration selectivity, which would ensure a dynamic balance of the legal interests of all the subjects of migration, including social actors, social groups, diasporas, etc.

The social orientation of an effective local migration policy is to optimize the social potential of the migrant population. Due to this, both adequate adaptation and integration of migrants in the conditions of dynamic balance and the balance of ethical and civic identities are achieved.

The study of the basic components of the migration policy of the modern Russian society shows the relevance of the innovative strategic and conceptual transformation of it. Migration, in this context, in our opinion, is identical to the constellation of many factors. Among them stand out experiences and a set of significant factors of social capital of the visiting population. It includes a system of interaction between the state, structures, migration services, diasporas and social mobility actors themselves [6].

## **2. Materials and Methods**

A fragment of the analysis of opinions on the problems of cross-border migration in the border areas of Russia was carried out on the basis of a sociological survey, including a survey of the population in the regions of arrival of migrants. The study was conducted in seven transboundary regions: Altai Territory, Murmansk Oblast, Pskov Oblast, Orenburg Oblast, Rostov Oblast, the Republic of Dagestan, and the Altai Republic (2017–2018). The multistage quota sample,  $N = 300$ , the age of the surveyed representatives of the population is 25-60 years. A sociological questionnaire was used, including 47 questions. The questions were aimed at studying attitudes towards migrant children in schools, restricting migration opportunities, policies regarding violators of migration legislation, forming national enclaves in the regions, the role of diasporas in interethnic integration, etc. This article presents a primary analysis of descriptive statistics. Generalized aggregate opinions of residents of the regions are presented, regional specificity is revealed in their ideas regarding the prediction of social sustainability in the processes of integration and adaptation of migrants in a particular region.

## **3. Results**

One of the indicators of social sustainability is the attitude of the population of the host society to the problem of potential migration. Imagine the data obtained in the study. In the Altai Territory, a quarter of the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia. Supporting the Russian and Russian-speaking population is considered important about one third of the inhabitants. It is important to stimulate the entry into the region of the young and educated by every third person. First of all, it is necessary to support compatriots who want to return, creating favorable conditions for them, which is considered important by 28.4% of all respondents. It is necessary to limit the entry for all supposes only (6.3%) of respondents.

The identified identical response structure of the population is present in the Orenburg region. One tenth of the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia. It is necessary to support the Russian and Russian-speaking population (21.2%). The majority of residents consider it important to encourage young and educated migrants to enter the region in order to reproduce the regional labor market. At the same time, the opposite trend was revealed. The population believes that it is necessary to limit the entry for all (26.3%), and this significantly prevails if compared with other regions.

In the Murmansk region, the population is more relevant to stimulating the entry into the region of the young and educated personnel. So answered about half of the residents. This indicator is maximum in the specified region. It is necessary to support, first of all, compatriots who want to return, creating favorable conditions for them. So consider (29.4%). A small part of the inhabitants of the region believes that it is necessary to limit the entry for all categories of migrants.

In the Pskov region, the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia (24.2%). It is necessary to support the Russian and Russian-speaking population is

considered important (28.5%). This result prevails in the region, compared with other territories. The region has a minimum number of residents who are negatively disposed towards any potential migrants.

In the Rostov region, the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia (16.3%). Supporting the Russian and Russian-speaking population is considered important (27.3%). It is important to stimulate the young and educated people to enter the region (38.1%). It is necessary to support, first of all, those compatriots who want to return, creating favorable conditions for them (15.4%). "It is necessary to limit the entry for all" is supported by 11.3%.

In the Altai Republic, the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia (31.8%), which significantly prevails among other regions. Only 13.2% of the population believe that it is necessary to support the Russian and Russian-speaking population. This opinion is the absolute minimum among the regions studied. It is important to stimulate those young and educated people who enter the region (22.7% in favor). It is necessary to support, first of all, those compatriots who want to return, creating favorable conditions for them, as argued by 27.3%. The republic has a significantly smaller number of residents who are negatively disposed towards any potential migrants. In the republic of Dagestan, the population believes that it is necessary to support everyone who plans to enter Russia, which is significantly higher than in other regions.

Thus, there is a regional specificity, which is manifested in the fact that in the Orenburg and Rostov regions the largest number of people are registered, offering the state to limit the entry of any migrants. Consequently, it is possible to identify the hidden latent potential of the intolerant attitude towards migrants in these regions. The population is more loyal to the policies of the state of accepting migrants of different plans in the Altai Territory, r. Altai, Dagestan.

According to the data presented in the Final Report on Migration Processes of the Federal Migration Service of Russia for 2015 among migrants, children accounted for about 25%. Most of the children arrived with their parents from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Kazakhstan (source: FMS Final Report, 2016).

More than half of the population (60.9%) denied the presence of migrants in their children's schools. Every third representative of the population of the studied border areas (29.1%) noted that children of migrants study with his children, which emphasizes the prevalence of migration processes, as well as actualizes the problem of tolerant interaction between people of different ages. Every tenth person (10.0%) does not control the situation, which, apparently, underlines the insignificance of this situation for some residents.

According to regional data, the prevalence of the arrival of migrants together with members of their families and children is represented in Altai Territory (30.5%), as well as in Rostov (45.2%), Murmansk (44.9%), Pskov (42 %) areas that characterize these areas as the most favorable for the livelihoods of migrant families. The lowest number of migrant children studying in educational institutions was found in the Orenburg Region (8.3%), the Altai Republic (14.7%), and Dagestan (12.4%).

Attitudes towards migrant children in educational institutions in border regions are, on our side, a vivid indicator of integration processes, and on the other hand, of mutual tolerance and culture of interethnic relations, the effectiveness of measures for mutual enrichment of cultures of migrants and the local population of the region.

The results in general to a rather positive interethnic situation in the educational institutions of the regions. Positive attitude towards migrant children was noted (31.9%), rather positive (42.1%). However, (10.6%) representatives of the population indicated a rather negative and (1.8%) negative attitude. Thus, about (12.4%) of the population representatives have a certain conflict potential in attitudes towards migrants and members of their families, which must be taken into account when assessing control and forming a system for optimizing migration processes in the regions. An illustrative example is a migrant from Uzbekistan who emphasizes cruelty towards her younger son, who was systematically bullied by her classmates at school, and the teachers and school administration

tried to ignore these incidents and ignore them [5]. However, in our opinion, such cases are the exception rather than the rule. We strongly believe that aggression between the schoolchildren does not depend on the national factor, but it is largely due to the low level of upbringing, impaired socialization of adolescents, which is of a universal nature.

#### **4. Discussion**

It should be noted that in the Murmansk region, the least tolerant attitude towards the children of migrants in the educational institutions of these regions was revealed, which requires additional research into the causes of this phenomenon. The most positive attitude towards the children of migrants was found in the Pskov and Rostov regions, as well as in the Altai Republic and Altai region. The population of the Orenburg region differs most polarity of opinion, from the most positive to negative.

Comparing the results, it was found that representatives of the population in general about (13%) noted the presence of problems in relations with migrant children in educational institutions. Expressing their personal opinion, already about (18%) residents of the regions see the presence of bad relationships in educational institutions. That is, the public formal opinion of representatives of the population about assessments for the children of migrants is more optimistic than the personal opinion itself. However, it is the latter assessment that indicates the hidden, latent prediction of conflicts, which requires social management and control.

Thus, the duality and ambiguity of public opinion, which does not coincide with the personal emotional attitude of the population, is revealed. This fact testifies to the underestimation of the existence of problems of intolerance in educational institutions of the regions and the need to form a system for optimizing intercultural and interethnic relations. A regional comparative analysis showed that the population of the Altai Territory, the Altai Republic, the Rostov Region, and Dagestan demonstrated the most loyal attitude towards migrants and members of their families. At the same time, the greatest conflict potential can be predicted in the Murmansk, Pskov, and Orenburg regions. Assessing on the whole the level of their loyalty to migration, every second inhabitant of seven border regions positively regards the increase in the intensity of migration flows, objectively assessing the positive, compensatory role of migrants in local labor markets, their occupation of unskilled and poorly paid labor niches. However, more than a third of the population are against migrants, viewing them as competitors for the local population, predicting a rise in national security problems, the likelihood of inter-ethnic unrest, etc. Indicative is the fact that every fifth resident does not have a clear position on this issue. This indicates, in our opinion, that this problem is insignificant, or secondary, as compared to personal, family problems of survival in economically underdeveloped border regions that none of the respondents rated as rich, favorable for life, etc. On the other hand, it is precisely the low standard of living in the regions that is able to reinforce negative attitudes in relation to people of other nationalities and religions. This trend is consistent with other domestic and foreign studies of the described scientific discourse [4].

#### **5. Conclusion**

Based on the proposed data, it can be concluded that it is necessary to develop differentiated mechanisms for regulating migration flows that could be in demand for regional labor markets. These mechanisms should be the criteria for attracting and selecting foreign personnel. Similar trends are partly already being implemented in the Russian Federation. As indicated in the 2015 FMS Final Report, of the number of participants in the State Resettlement Program who came to Russia, about 70% of the representatives have a mature working age, and 40% of them have a higher or incomplete higher education [5]. In general, the obtained scientific data could help to understand the mechanisms and social potentials of interaction between diasporas and government representatives to optimize migration processes in the regions. In the context of global growth of interdependencies of states, the traditional competitive logic changes to the prospect of growing the benefits of the strategy of interethnic solidarity. The ethnopolitical context of diaspora analysis requires the study of the specifics

of the interaction of state-organized communities with ethnocultural associations, since diasporality becomes a significant supranational phenomenon. The results of studying the adaptation and integration potential of diasporas presented in the article are designed to initiate the development of effective and optimal areas of national and regional national policy in modern Russian society. New ethnic diasporas in border regions of Russia are becoming a backbone component in ethnopolitical management.

## 6. Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the project part of the state task “Transit Migration, Transit Regions and Migration Policy of Russia: Security and Eurasian Integration” No. 28.2757.2017 / 4.6 (2017-2019).

## References

- [1] Akayev B H 2013 Islam in Europe: state, adaptation, prospects *Islamic Studies* **4**
- [2] Akhiezer A S 2007 Territorial migration - the realization of the need for the fullness of being *Social sciences and modernity* **3**
- [3] Bedrik A 2007 *Labor adaptation of ethnic migrants in conditions of social risks: the example of the Rostov region* (Diss. Cand. soc. Sciences) (Rostov-on-Don, Russia)
- [4] Brubaker R 2012 *Ethnicity without groups* (Moscow, Russia: Ed. House of Higher School of Economics)
- [5] Clifford J 2014 Diasporas *Cultural Anthropology* **9** pp 302-338
- [6] De Haas H 2010 Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review* **44** pp 227-264
- [7] Fedorova Yu E 2015 Women’s issue in Islam: discourse *Philosophical thought* **10** p 102.
- [8] Fedorova Yu E 2014 Islam in the modern European community: stereotypes and reality *Philosophical thought* **7** pp 99-125
- [9] Glick Schiller N 2009 A global perspective on migration and development. *Social Analysis* **53** pp 14-37
- [10] Grillo R, and Riccio B 2004 Translocal Development: Italy – Senegal *Population, Space and Place* **10** pp 99-111
- [11] Haddad Y 2005 The study of women in Islam and the West: a selected bibliography *Hawwa (Journal of Women of the Middle East and the Islamic World)* **3**(1) pp 111-157
- [12] Ho ELE 2011 ‘Claiming’ the diaspora: Elite mobility, sending state strategies *Progress in Human Geography* **35** pp 757-772
- [13] Horst C 2006 *Transnational Nomads: How Somalis cope with refugee life in the Dadaab Camps of Kenya* (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books)
- [14] Horst C 2008 A monopoly on international tourism and refugee camps *Africa Spectrum* **43** pp 121-131
- [15] Kleist N 2008 In the name of diaspora: Between struggles for recognition and political aspirations *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **34** pp 1127-1143
- [16] Lampert B 2009 Diaspora and development? Nigerian organizations in London and the transnational politics of belonging *Global Networks* **9** 162-184
- [17] Maximova S, Omelchenko D, and Noyanzina O 2018 The analysis of national identification of Russians through images of meta-ethnic groups: the case of four borderland regions *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities* **26**(4) pp 2747-2768
- [18] Maximova S G, Noyanzina O E, Omelchenko D A, Molodikova I N, and Kovaleva A V 2018 The russian diaspora: A result of transit migrations or part of Russia *Opcion* **34**(15) pp 1016-1044
- [19] Totolyan H 2015 *Diaspora as an actor of international relations in the XXI century on the example of the Armenian diaspora* (Dissertation of the Candidate of Sciences)
- [20] Tkacheva N A 2011 *Sociological concept of the region’s migration policy in the system of national security* (Dis. ... Dr. Doc. Sciences) (Tyumen, Russia)