



THE RUSSIAN DIASPORA - A RESULT OF TRANSIT MIGRATIONS OR A PART OF “THE RUSSIAN WORLD”

Svetlana Maximova¹, Oksana Noyanzina^{1*}, Daria Omelchenko¹, Irina Molodikova²,
Alla Kovaleva¹

¹Altai State University, Barnaul, Russia

²Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Abstract. Ethnic and language groups always migrated, occupied and colonized territories, dominate, assimilated, integrated or coexisted. During last three decades, the Russian Federation is one of countries with the most active migration movements, and Russian diaspora counts more than 150 millions of people, compatibly with the China one. Nowadays, in the context of global economy and technologies, it is dynamical transnational network, developing as transnational structure with certain social, political and economic potential. The goal of the article is to evaluate the number of the Russian diaspora and its dispersion all over the world, such as the Russian-speaking community, explore its qualitative characteristics, including ethnic and language identity, language behavior and attitudes to the inclusion into the “Russian World”. Research (2016 - 2017) covers Russian and Russian-speaking communities in 60 countries of the world (sociological survey, n = 1700, respondent’s age 18 and older. To evaluate the number and dispersion of the Russian diaspora we used data of the Russian migration statistics, UN statistic data and open data of population census in accepting countries, where the Russians migrated for the last twenty years. Describing characteristics of the Russian diaspora the used a set of variables, indicating affiliation to huge migration flows, peculiarities and hierarchy of identities, language and cultural behavior, strategies of preservation and translation of language and national culture, further migration attitudes.

Key words: Russian diaspora, Russian-speaking communities, migration, transit migration, identity, language, migration attitudes.

Introduction

Despite constant migration of ethnic and language groups in the World history, only after the Second World War new patterns of international labor migration created new mosaic of use of languages and dispersion of languages all over the world. In such migration of peoples and languages, the notion about “the melting pot” became a myth, and numerous researches of the last years fix the growth in ethnic identity and self-consciousness of various diaspora groups. Hence, language movements raise questions, requiring for political, social and educational solutions, and for new directions of scientific and research exploration, also. Migration flows lay in the base of language movements and in the focus of international community and some governments, which pay a special attention to them, especially – to the question of international migration. International migration – is a complex motion, however, no one country is not free from its consequences. Indeed, almost all counters are the countries of origin and destination of migrants. Migration is multi-dimensional, complicated for exploration, because it may occur several times in individual’s life, and because of deplorable lack of data about immigrant’s movements. In particular, because of the reason, the most of developing countries could not realize relevant policy, based on statistical data analysis. According to the UN population statistics (**Population and Vital Statistics Report**, 2017), during the last decade (for the period of 2005 – 2015s) an international migration intensified, increasing from 191 269 100 of persons in 2005 to 221 714 243 of persons in 2010, and 243 700 236 of persons in 2015 (excluding refugees, forced migrants and related categories of population).

The existing data about global bilateral migrations, unfortunately, are incomplete and often incompatible because of different approaches to evaluate migration and its indexes by national statistical services. That is why it is quite simply to evaluate the number of residents in the country or to compare between countries, than to evaluate movements of people flows for a certain period. In countries, there the collection of demographical data is complicated, the given work is extremely difficult. However, data about movements are necessary to understand contemporary trends of international migration and to work out relevant policy.

In the context of studying Russian diaspora, it is necessary to evaluate its number. Theoretically, the term “diaspora” is rather well spread, but its meaning “stretches” by different intellectual, cultural and political themes and understood as it was convenient. Dispersion of the term “diaspora” led to its dispersion in semantic, conceptual and disciplinary areas. Some approaches (Sheffer, 2003) link it with migration and labor migrants, who support in a certain extent emotional and social connection with homeland. Nowadays, in determining diaspora the most popular approach is determination by the country of origin, considering “classical” diaspora as the “lost” together (Baumann, 1996) such as trans-ethnic, trans-border and linguistic communities. From this point of view, the immigrant communities are diaspora, even if they are assimilated deeply. Therefore, diaspora is a wide set of ethnic-cultural or determined by the country of origin communities. According to another approach, the application of term “diaspora” is possible to a huge number of cases: almost to the each population, which can be categorized and have some extent of dispersion in the space. The term include not only specific ethnic groups (Greeks, Armenians or Jews), but groups, having wider semantical meaning – immigrants, expatriates, refugees, labor migrants, exiles, abroad and ethnic community (Tölölyan, 1991).

As the ethnic migration increased and population diffused, diaspora became spread and diversified. Some authors (Değirmen, 2008) are writing about the formation of new diaspora of the 21st century, understood as not only as a part of nation abroad, having common mental, cultural and historical roots and trying to support connection with historical homeland, but as a dynamic transnational network, developing as trans-national structure with certain social, political and economic potential in new context of global economy and technologies.

A number of approaches (Collyer, Düvell and de Haas, 2012) consider diaspora in terms of “transit migration” and “transit countries”, emerged in theories in response to changing patterns of migration. Accordingly, a term “diaspora” can be described in terms of intentions of the migrant,

duration of the migration, the relationship between legal status and transit when and how migrants define themselves as “in transit” (Düvell, 2008), irregular migration (Hugo, Tan, and Napitupulu, 2014) and a country of transit too (Kuschminder and Siegel, 2016; Collyer and de Haas, 2012; Düvell, 2014).

The Russian diaspora is the transit one. In the beginning of 1990s, the size of Russian diaspora outside the CIS countries and Baltic States was about 2 millions of people. Dominantly, it resided in the USA (about a half of diaspora), in Israel and Germany (about 300 000), the Latin American countries (about 150 000) and Canada (about 100 000). Before and after the revolution of 1917 and several migration flows in the Soviet period the diaspora started active formation in a result of migrations. The Soviet Union collapse and creation of new independent states produced new strong migration flows in post-Soviet period and considerably increased the size of Russian diaspora.

The goal of the article is to evaluate the number of the Russian diaspora and its dispersion all over the world, such as the Russian-speaking community, explore its qualitative characteristics, including ethnic and language identity, language behavior and attitudes to the inclusion into the “Russian World”.

Materials and methods

Research (2016 - 2017) covers Russian and Russian-speaking communities in 60 countries of the world (sociological survey, n = 1700, respondent's age 18 and older). To evaluate the number and dispersion of the Russian diaspora we used data of the Russian migration statistics, UN statistic data and open data of population census in accepting countries, where the Russians migrated for the last twenty years. Describing characteristics of the Russian diaspora the used a set of variables, indicating affiliation to huge migration flows, peculiarities and hierarchy of identities, language and cultural behavior, strategies of preservation and translation of language and national culture, further migration attitudes.

Results.

During last three decades, the Russian Federation is one of countries with the most active migration movements. By the evaluation of the UN Department on economic and social affairs (2015), in the period of 1990 – 2005s the Russian diaspora occupied the first place by the size of diaspora group in the world and only in 2010 – 2015 it replaced for the third position and gave place to India (1st place) and Mexico (2nd place). At present the size of the Russian diaspora (Russians, living abroad) exceed 150 million of people, similar as the China one. However, according to the Ministry of International Affairs data, only 15 millions of Russian citizens remained in registers of Russian consulates as constantly living abroad that constitutes about 10% of all Russians outside the Russian Federation.

Abel and Sander (2014) estimated migration flows larger than 50 thousands of people between countries and regions by 5-year cycles for the period of 1990 – 2010s, basing on state statistics of 123 countries of the world. According to the collected data, for the period of 2005 – 2010s the general direction of emigration of the former USSR residents were European countries, and immigration – countries of the Western Asia and the Northern America. During five years 2 100 358 of people entered the territory of the former USSR states, lived out – 2 453 295 of people. Herewith, in the period of 1990 – 1995 the structure and volume of migration flows had a quite different character. Thus, data did not fix migration flows over 50 thousands of people, general directions of migration – the Europe and, in considerably lower size – countries of the Southern and Western Asia. For the period 2 7746 348 of people entered the former USSR countries, but moved out 4 415 020 of people. Taking into consideration the absence of migration flows over 50 thousands of people in one direction, the period characterized by active and dispersive settling of Russian-speaking community all over the world.

Unfortunately, for the period from 2007 to 2016 Russian migration statistics took into account such purpose of migration as departure for permanent immigration only in 2007 and 2008

years, since 2009 registering covered the following purposes: “business”, “tourism”, “private”, “transit”, and “service stuff”. Hence, it is rather difficult to specify persons with permanent migration in the general migration movements, i.e. future Russian diaspora. It should be noted here, we consider all former the USSR and the Russian Federation citizens as the Russian-speaking community. Speaking further about Russian diaspora, we are thinking about the Russian-speaking community of the world.

According to the Rosstat data (Rosstat. (2017). Electronic Resource [URL: www.gks.ru]) in 2007 41 210 moved from Russia with immigration reason, in 2008 – 27 031. The top-10 countries of immigration in 2007 were Serbia (5 223 of persons), Germany (4 832), Turkey (4 832), the USA (3 186), France (2 916), China (2 427), Lithuania (2 023), Italy (1 790), Japan (1 292) and Latvia (1 055). In 2008 the first place in the ten most popular countries occupied by Poland (5 332 Russian citizens), 3 662 Russian residents moved for Serbia, 3 041 – Germany, 1 926 – Turkey, 1 667 – Lithuania, 1 1203 – China, 919 – Italy, 906 - France, and 765 – the USA. Total Russian citizens departed for permanent immigration into 47 countries in 2007, 46 countries – in 2008. As we mentioned, in the following years Russian statistics did not registered the corresponding purpose of moving abroad before, but we fixed intensive migration movements of Russian citizens. Thus, in the period of 2007 – 2016 a migration flow abroad constantly increased from 7 492 112 of persons in 2007 to 9 100 667 in 2016, i.e. Russian resident became mobile with different reasons.

The Eurostat data, the UNESCO, the UN Statistics, global-migration.info network, and other statistics databases (The Global Flow Of People. (2017). Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.global-migration.info/>]; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2015). Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.unhcr.org>]; United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2015). Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.un.org>]; World Population Prospects. (2017). Electronic Resource [URL: <http://unstats.un.org>]) let us to estimate migration outflow of Russian citizens in the period of 1990 – 2015. Basing on foreign statistics, 303 169 of persons departed from the Russian Federation for the period of 1990 – 2010s, who moved for 174 countries. During the first five years of the period (1990 - 1995) 58 538 of citizens departure from Russia, than the migration flow reduced to 41 540 in the period of 1995 – 2000s and 39 399 in the period of 2005 – 2005s. But in 2005 – 2010s the Russian Federation experienced huge migration outflow, exceeding previous 15 years – to find a new place of living departure from the country 163 692 of persons.

The leader among foreign countries, which accepted the most part of Russian migration flows, was the Ukraine. Here the general flow of movements occurred in the period of 2005 – 2010s, where 70 444 Russian citizens moved to the Ukraine (total for 20 years – 75 876 persons). The second position occupies the Kazakhstan, which accepted 49 876 of persons with the major peak in 2005 – 2010s. Migration movements to the Germany are stable and often, but the major peak of migration outflow of Russian Germans occurred in 1990 – 1995s, than 222 398 Russian citizens moved out to the Germany. During 2005 – 2010s, 710 Russians leaved for constant residence in the Germany, only.

Among over countries, accepted for the last twenty years more than 10 000 of people from the Russian Federation, are: the Afghanistan (that can be explained from the position of foreign policy of the given historical period) – 17 205 of persons, the USA – 15 474 of persons, the Italy – 12 324 of persons, and the Spain – 11 082 of persons. Among countries, accepted from one to nine thousands of Russians, are: the Czech Republic (8 958 of persons), the Byelorussia (7 624), the Great Britain (5 064), the Iran (4 882), the France (4 284), the Sweden (3 303), the Slovakia (3 097), the Norway (2 804), the Hungary (2 766), the Canada (2 729), the Netherlands (2 726), the Bulgaria (2 344), the Belgium (2 153), the Estonia (1 740), the Switzerland (1589), the Austria (1412), the Israel (1302), the Romania (1246), the Portugal (1231), the Greece (1044), and the Yemen (1014). However, the geography of settling of the Russian-speaking diaspora in a result of migrations is not concentrated only in the Western and the Easter Europe. Former citizens of the Russian Federation are spread all over the world, form the Australia and Oceania to countries of

the Latin and the Northern America. For the 20-years period, Russians migrated for 174 countries (Table 1).

Table 1. Migration outflow of population of the Russian Federation by 5-year periods of 1990 – 2015 by countries of first destination. Top-ten countries: size of migration flows indicated in bold.

Country of immigration	Periods of registration				1990-2010
	1990-95	1995-2000	2000-05	2005-10	
1. Ukraine	0	0	5432	70444	75876
2. Kazakhstan	471	760	1106	47262	49599
3. Germany	22398	6406	6779	710	36293
4. Afghanistan	15693	2	1510	0	17205
5. USA	1392	13742	159	181	15474
6. Italy	430	905	2888	8101	12324
7. Spain	632	549	4232	5669	11082
8. Czech Republic	236	373	775	7601	8985
9. Byelorussia	9	11	2455	5149	7624
10. Great Britain	465	1056	2539	1004	5064
Total 174 countries	58538	41540	39399	163692	303169

Another way of understanding the size of the Russian diaspora is analysis of population census in countries of the world. For example, about citizens of foreign origin or those, which indicated ethnic identity. Nevertheless, the problem is in the access to the data of different years, and the periods of census – in some countries (developing economics, dominantly) census did not conducted more than twenty years, yet. In connection with this, we tried to analyze data on the latest census in countries of the world up to 1995 about number of inhabitants who arrived from the former USSR and the USSR republics. Only the data about the most numerous ethnic and national groups in totality of population are accessible during census in countries. In sociology the classification of identities bases on such indexes as the presence or absence of the identity crisis, strength and presence of decisions about own life and the openness for a new choice. However, the question “That is the ethnic identity?” should be classified as the ethnic one. According to Horowitz (1985: 53) “ethnicity is an umbrella concept, covering groups, differ by color, language, religion; it covers tribes, races, nations and casts”. The latest literature about identity problems follows Horowitz ideas (for example, Varshney, 2001; Chandra, 2004; Wilkinson, 2004; Htun, 2004; Posner, 2005). Furthermore, the division of ethnos for four principle groups could be found almost in all cross-cultural researches and databases, such the “World Population Atlas” (Ethnology Institute by the Russian Academy of Sciences), database on ethnic groups of 190 countries, published by Alesina et al. (2003), and works by Fearon (2003) about the evaluation of number of 160 ethnic groups in the world during the “Minorities in Risk” project (Center for International Development and Conflict Management, 2003).

Herewith, some classifications have no any based methodology. For example, Horowitz indicates such ethnic groups as “Creoles” and “Indians” in Guiana, “Hindu” and “Muslims” in India, “Christians” and “Muslims” in Lebanon (1985), Fearon considered “Hindu-speaking” people as a separate ethnic group (2003), Chandra (2004; 2005) considers regional division of groups. The similar examples we could find during census in different countries, than separate ethnic groups are described as “semi-European”, “Afro-American”, “Latin” and so on. The additional difficulty is the registration of race ethnic differences during census: registration covers “White” or “Black” population, “Europeans”, “Semi-Europeans”, “and Asians”, and so on. Hence, the obtained data based on the census provide incomplete data about dispersion and size of the Russian diaspora.

According to the census data, the Russian diaspora is spread around 35 countries of the world and constitutes 3 323 813 persons (summarizing based on calendar latest census data). The most numerous Russian diaspora registered in the European countries – 906 363 of persons, in the Northern American countries – 336 421 of persons, in the Australia and the New Zealand – 41 141 of persons, in region of the Southern America – 26 745 of persons, but in the African countries registered 1 276 Russian inhabitants. Citizens of the Russian origin occupy different places in the ethnic mosaic of states they are living in. For example, in the Moldova the Russian diaspora constitutes 41.7% of all citizens, in the Lithuania – 46.8%, in the Latvia – 52.7%, the Estonia – 75.6%, Bulgaria – 29.2%. Situation could be explained by former inclusion of these states into the block of countries of the Eastern Europe with close economic and political relations with the USSR. At present, former native Russian population of the Baltic republics becomes “foreign”, having “foreign origin”.

In number of states, ethnic Russians constitutes more that 1 percent of immigrants. Among them are: the Romania (5.8%), the Poland (4.0%), the Czech Republic (2.76%), the Finland (1.91% - data on 2000), the USA (1.69%), the Turkey (1.57% in 2000), the Netherlands (1.49%), the Norway (1.44%), and the Australia (1.07%). Unfortunately, there are no enough data for comparative analysis about the part of Russian diaspora in countries during intercensal periods between countries that could considerably improve the analysis. For example, the part of Russians in the Finland diaspora during the period from 1985 to 2000 reduced from 15.2% to 1.91%/ Here we may suppose the processes of return migration (leaving back to homeland), increasing of migration transit or, for example, the “blurring” of the Russian ethnic identity, assimilation of the Russians in a result of mixed marriages or other reasons. In the Greece the part of the Russian diaspora among “non-Greece” population reduced too: form 6.47% to 0.7% only during the period from 2001 to 2002, on the contrary, in the Turkey during the period from 1999 to 2000 the Russian diaspora increased from 1% to 1.57% (almost about 9 000 of people).

During the county census, the Russian ethnic group was registered in 18 countries as one of the numerous (countries, considering ethnic, but not the race communities) one. The largest group of ethnic Russians (according to the last calendar census) lives in the USA - 2 662 749 in absolute numbers or 1.07% of total population, in the Hungary – 703243 persons or 29.5% of total population, in the Poland – 562069 or 12.96%, and the Canada – 337 960 or 1.14%. Among the former USSR republics, non-members of the CIS the maximal part of Russians in the Estonia – 351 178 of persons or 25.6% of total population.

Thus, basing on the number of ethnic Russians, registered during census only in 18 countries of the world, we may evaluate the size of the Russian diaspora in 4 726 590 of people. Excluding the former USSR republics and countries of the “Socialist block”, the largest Russian diaspora lives in the USA and the Canada. Apart from these two countries, the Russians are among largest diaspora in the China, the Mongolia, the Croatia, the Czech Republic, the Lithuania, the Moldova, the Romania, the Serbia and Montenegro, the Slovakia, the Slovenia, the Macedonia, and the New Zealand.

Despite different estimation data in relation to the Russian diaspora and the Russian-speaking community in the world, a special attention deserves the fact of wide spread of Russian language and ethnic culture all over the world, so as the disperse settling of their natives around the planet. In the context a special interest should be paid to the long-term analysis of language needs as the Russian Federation as all the Russian-speaking in the world with taking into consideration of different economic, geopolitical, cultural and educational factors. However, we should take into account contemporary global tendencies, requiring for the inclusion into global processes in language relation that let to increase the well-being of the Russia, its security and influence in global arena. Understanding the necessity of increasing the level of multilingualism among the Russian-speaking population (for example, the British Council (2016) classified Russia as one of the countries with low level of English), it is necessary to preserve, develop and promote Russian language as one of strategy goals of the Russian state together with perfection of mechanisms of global trade relations, satisfaction of language needs of the Russian business,

realization of country's trade priorities, specifics of developing world markets, priorities of security and diplomacy, social language interests, and educational strategic priorities.

It is necessary to evaluate and understand the world linguistic heritage, such as we value the biological diversity of the planet. From the linguistic point of view, all language are equal (Crystal D., 2016), and cannot be compared from the point of their value. However, as we think about investments, forces or efforts into the study, we start thinking about economic desirability (Graddol D., 2006). Of course, questions of differences between civic and ethnic, national and ethnic identities are under discussion still. May be the question is in the peculiarities of social-historical development of separate states, some of which (Germany, Western Europe) initially developed as ethnic nations. Unfortunately, there are lack of works, considering such dichotomies. Shulman (2002) analyzed data of sociological researches in 15 countries and proved the differences between countries of the East and the West in construction of national identity. Such conclusions lead to the acuteness of exploring the peculiarities of formation of new civic and national identity of population, moving in result of migrations and, in particular, to the evaluation of national identity basing on the ethnic one.

The concept of national identity connected with the idea of nation and sense of belonging to historical society. National identity is forming basing on geographic and political borders, A. Smith (2002) considered national identity as sable and reproducing values, symbols, memories, myths, and traditions of each nation as national differences.

Basing on the data of sociological research among the Russian-speaking population in 60 countries (n = 1700, 2016 - 2017), we fixed following peculiarities of ethnic self-identification of the Russian diaspora. Almost third part of respondents (27% of choice) identify themselves as cosmopolites, the fourth part (25.8%) think them as citizens of the country, and the fifth part has evident national identity (22.2%). Of the next position are respondent who feel themselves as the wester (8.3%) and the eastern (5.5%) people, local (4.9% of choices) and region (4.1%) inhabitants. Among other identities were citizen of own country but with the Russian origin, Russian human, representative of the Russia, patriot, and the European. We consider important to point out almost equal parts of respondent thinking about as national-country as ethnic identities. The dominant orientation of the Russian-speaking abroad is cosmopolitanism.

More than a half of respondents fell themselves as ethnic Russians (40.8%). In total research covered 13 Russian-speaking ethnic groups, living abroad of the Russia. The most numerous ethnic groups (number exceed 17 respondents, except Russians): the French (13.7%), the Polish (8.9%), the Chinese (8.5%), the Mongols (8.1%), and Magyars (6.2%). Part of other participants presented at the lower level (lower than 3.5%): the Kazakhs, the Ukrainians, the Jews, the Brazilians, the Germans, the Byelorussians, and the Indians. Besides, the research covered representatives of 72 ethnic groups more, 3.5% of respondents have mixed identity. The abovementioned validate the assumptions about wider size of the Russian-speaking diaspora in the world, rather than the Russian diaspora in whole. 49.8% of ethnic Russians emigrated from Russia, 45.4% - form the former USSR republics and 4.8% - are transit migrants, who moved from other countries (not the Russian Federation or the former USSR republics). Concluding, the most of respondents are representatives of the first generation of immigrants. Respondents, feeling no Russian identity were born in Russia (5.4%), the former USSR republics (15.3%) and far abroad (79.3%).

The Russian World is a cultural-historical idea about international, interstate and intercontinental community, unified by sense of belonging to the Russia and commitment to the Russian language and culture. As we assumed the absence or presence of the Russian ethnic identity as one of bases for the belonging to the Russian diaspora and the Russian World in total, let us see for the hierarchy of identities (with taking into account only one choice of the alternative by respondent). Natives of the Russian identity are equally valuate (p, $\chi^2 < 0.05$) such identities as cosmopolitanism (34.4%) and own ethnic identity (33.4%), the third place occupies the country identity. Non-Russian respondents at the first position placed civic identity (32.7%), at the second – cosmopolitanism (23.2%), the third place is occupied by ethnic identity (expressed at the level of

15.7%). The Russians, moved abroad in the first generation, have no any close ties with a new homeland and the state. Possibly, the dominance of cosmopolite feelings testifies about absence of sensitive emotional affection with the historical homeland too, that is why the Russians abroad occupy marginal position in relation to the citizenship.

Despite lot of researches of the last years (see, for example, Tishkov), speaking about absence of correlations between the knowledge of native language and ethnic self-identification, the ethnic language proficiency is the dominant base for ethnic self-identification of respondents (74.1%). Ethnicity of parents is no less important factor (69.5%), such as the ethnic education in traditions of ethnic culture (65.0%), understanding of community and relationships with representatives of own ethnos (59.1%), features and peculiarities of ethnic mentality (47.5%). Almost half of respondents indicated the understanding and realization of “ritual” actions of ethnic group: customs and traditions (45.2%), ethnic food (43.6%); the third part of the Russian-speaking community of the world feel important religion and related religious practices (29.0%); 8.1% of respondents wear national clothes, that gives them a sense of ethnic identity. More than a fourth of respondents base own identity in relation with territory of inhabitation (25.9%).

The hierarchy of factors of ethnic self-identification significantly ($p, \chi^2 < 0.05$) differ between groups of the Russian and non-Russian respondents, the Russian respondents often marked such bases of identity as the knowledge of native language (86.3% of Russians and 66.9% of non-Russians), education on ethnic culture (76.1% and 58.3% correspondingly), understanding the (71.8% and 51.6% correspondingly), ethnicity of parents (77.0% and 65.1% correspondingly), twice as likely as the non-Russians marked own ethnic features (61.0% and 39.5% correspondingly). In the contrary, respondents without Russian origin often marked such identifying sign as wearing national clothes (10.9% and 3.4% of the Russian respondents) and living in the homelands (40.0% and 2.1% of the Russians). In both groups, about equally significant were such indicators as following ethnic traditions and customs (46.1% of choices of the non-Russians and 43.8% of the Russians), and eating national food (40.8% and 48.3% correspondingly).

Analysis of open questions about ethnic self-determination confirms the findings about differences in understanding nationality by respondents, having strong Russian identity and not. Non-Russian respondents often did not understand the meaning of the question, because the nationality is prescribed by the place of birth or citizenship: *«It is where I happened to be born and live»*. As one of respondents specified, *«Here in the West, the understanding of nationality is different»*, that illustrates the following: *«J ai fait des démarches pour obtenir la nationalité Italienne qui est celle de mes racines. Mais je suis né français»* (*«My roots are Italian citizenship. But I was born French»*). For part of respondents, questions of ethnicity are not in point of interests, because they live where they are in comfort, have job, but the citizenship and friendship of national are more significant. It is possible “to speak and think in several languages” at the same time and “have no any nationality”, because “classification by ethnos is out of date”, the “civil passport is important”, so as the feeling of “a part of multinational society”. Five respondents indicate, that the Russian language help them to feel Russians, they think in Russian and translate language to children. Three respondents feel Russians because the policy by Vladimir Putin. Moreover, a small part of participants of the research marked put, that they are Russians because have “Russian world perception”, common Russian culture, education, science and way of life, “educational and cultural base” and “are Russians in spirit”.

General reason to study Russian by foreigners is communications with relatives and friends (29.7%), the second position occupies the opportunity to read literature in Russian, listen and understand music (26.8%). The third reason to know Russian – trying to deeply understand and know history and culture of Russia (25.3%), further follows business needs and official negotiations (20.2%), and 13.5% wanted to be educated in the Russian Federation. The non-Russian respondents are attracted by the opportunity to read Russian literature in original and listen Russian songs (38.6% and 23.0% of non-Russians), study history and culture of Russia (31.8% and 18.1% of choices correspondingly), and to be educated in Russia (23.4% and 3.7%

correspondingly). Living in a certain country effect motives to study Russian. Inhabitants of the former USSR republics study Russia to know its history and culture (23.8%), the USA and the Canada citizens feel the same reason (25.3% of choices); citizens of countries with size of the Russian diaspora from 100 to 500 thousands of people want to educate in Russia (38.0%), know its culture and history (33.5%); inhabitants of countries with the size of diaspora from 10 to 100 thousands of people want to educate in Russian (30.6%), know its history and culture (30.6%) and read Russian literature in original (30.0%); the similar motives have respondents from the countries with the Russian diaspora, amount from 5 to 10 thousands of people. In countries with the diaspora from 1 to 5 thousands of Russians the motive of communications with relatives dominate (44.9%), in the group of countries there the Russians constitute less than 1 thousand of people dominates the motive of knowing Russian history and culture (28.4%). The Russian-speaking Russians abroad study Russian to communicate with relatives and friends (32.4%) and read literature in Russian (21.2%), the less expressed motive is to educate in Russia (2.7%), though for non-Russians all motives are equally important, despite education in Russian, that lower than others.

The majority of countries of the world try to popularize own cultural and other heritage. Realizing policy of the “soft power” and cultural diplomacy, states try to enforce own geopolitical positions and resolve inner-political and economic tasks. Russia is highly interested in the same results too, but nowadays, the further integration into the world economic and social-cultural area is difficult due to known inner-political circumstances. As for return migration, 50.5 of respondents have attitudes to visit Russia for a short period (no longer than month), 29.5% of participants of the research are ready to move for a long time, 10.9% are ready to migrate for constant residence and 9.1% do not want to visit Russian in whole. Among the last group of respondents, considerably prevail the USA and the Canada citizens (25.8%), non-native Russians (12.8%), inhabitants of countries with size of diaspora from 5 to 10 thousand of people (12.0%), elderly respondents (11.8%), men (10.8%) and ethnic Russians (10.3%). Considerable part of respondents from countries, there are the diaspora constitutes about 10 – 100 thousands of people (3.1%) and the Muslims (16.0%) want to live in Russia permanently, excluding the former USSR countries. Here, no one of respondents want to move to Russia for permanent residence.

About a third part of respondents in all groups, excluding those with native Russian, the USA, and the Canada citizens, want to visit Russia for a long time, from several months to several years. Inhabitants of the former USSR republics (64.7%), the Russians (55.9%) and native Russian-speakers (57.0%) dominate among respondents, having attitudes to visit Russia for a short period (from 42.8% to 64.7% of respondents in each group). Concluding, Russia is attractive as for Russians abroad as for those who are interested in Russian culture, Russia and all connected. That is why we need to understand the reasons of attitudes to visit Russia.

Tourism, acquaintance with Russian culture (67.1%), search for new emotions (37.4%), communications and new friends (37.3%) were pointed out, as general motives to visit Russia. 32.3% of respondents want to educate in Russia, 27.6% - ready to move for new business partners, 18.8% - for career and salary. We found 11.2% of respondents who wanted to get the Russian citizenship, and 6.3% - who consider Russia as a transit country to search for job in other countries. About 12.0% suggested own alternatives: guest visits of relatives and friends; return home, nostalgia; contacts with Russian authorities; study Russian language and language skills; educating and professional experience; work and business; creation of family, close relations; for personal security; religious tourism; and others.

Bilingualism, sex and religion do not correlate with attitudes to visit Russia, but the ethnic identity does. Hence, the non-Russian respondents rather often want to visit Russia (67.1% and 35.9% Russians) to educate (35.3% and 11.1% Russians), willing to find business relations (2.7% and 16.5% of Russians), career opportunities (18.4% and 10.8% of Russians). Such motives as new emotions and impressions, communications and friends are attractive as for Russians as for non-Russians, living abroad. Among those who want to get the Russian citizenship are 11.2% of non-Russians and 5.9% Russians.

Educational motives to visit Russia significantly vary in explored countries. Educational reasons significantly more expressed in countries with the size of the Russian diaspora less than 1 thousand of people (19.4%), from 1 to 5 thousands (21.3%) and the former USSR republics (17.6%). Here, Russia is attractive for career and incomes (19.4%, 21.3% and 17.6% correspondingly). In sense of realization of business attitudes, Russia is attractive for the former USSR inhabitants (29.4%) and countries with the Russian diaspora higher than 100 thousands of people (26.0%) and from 10 to 100 thousands (27.4%). An attempt to receive new emotions in Russia highly expressed among the former USSR inhabitants (64.7%) and countries with the size of Russian diaspora between 100 and 500 thousands (41.9%).

A lot of subjects of different level, from large international organizations (The Russian World Fund, having branches in 45 countries of the world) to private and public initiatives of foreign citizens, interested in international dialogue with the Russia, and public organizations of the Russian diaspora are involved into the process of popularization of the Russian language and culture. How the Russian diaspora use the existing opportunities to get involved in Russia cultural life and historical events? 53.0% of respondents often communicate with Russian native-speakers, 36.9% participated specialized exhibitions and presentations, 36.8% - participated events, popularizing Russian language and literature, 30.6% - educational and scientific-methodical events, 21.8% - international scientific forums and conferences, including reunions. 17.9% of representatives of the Russian diaspora got familiar with ethnographic, cultural, geographic peculiarities and historical monuments of Russia, 13.8% - participated educational tourism, language schools, and the same part – in the volunteer movements.

Discussion

Recent analysis testifies about rather significant growth of the Russian diaspora for the last three decades, but during the last ten years, the processes of global movements of the Russian-speaking language groups increased. These led to serious changes in the status of the Russian World. From the one hand, spreading all over the world, the Russian diaspora consolidates the status of Russian language and culture as an instrument of attainment to the Russian World, history, scientific and other achievements, Russian mentality and the way of life, promotes to the interest to Russian language from the positions of economic feasibility.

The situation is complicated by the absence of strong evidence in relation to global migrations and unite approaches to the evaluation of the number of the Russian diaspora and the Russian-speaking in the world (Ryazantsev, 2015), which led to problems in understanding of situation with distribution of Russian language and culture in the world. In fact, the information about preservation and development of the Russian World in this or that country depends on tedious work of workers at Russian consulates and consulate institutions, their readiness to work with mass media analysis and statistical data, local expert communities and compatriots. Unfortunately, official data or Russian and foreign state statistical bodies give us incomplete and fragmented picture in relation to the number and dispersion of the Russian diaspora.

As it was mentioned before, data about global bilateral migrations rather often non-compatible because of different approaches to evaluate migration and its indexes by statistical services, and in some countries the collection of demographic data inaccessible. Even Russian migration statistics makes the task of revelation of those who move for constant residence from general migration flow impossible. Nevertheless, population of the Russian Federation actively integrates into the world community, activity of migration movements increases during last ten years, according to the absolute numbers of migration flows.

The Russian diaspora tend to see only instrumental, additional characteristics of the language, which let Russians, living in multinational Russia communicate, and diminish the status of Russian at the world policy arena, technic and educational services in whole. Non-Russian foreigners value status of the Russian as a language of international dialogue and achievements of the world level. It should be noted, that data analysis supported conclusions of statistical analysis

about commencement of young generation of the Russian diaspora to learn Russian and see perspectives for further development in different spheres, including policy and education.

Russian language differently evaluated as by the Russian diaspora as by the non-Russian Russian-speaking community abroad. The most evidently differentiated evaluations of compatriots, either seen no any special status and value of native language and perceiving it as a mean of communication with the Russian-speakers or willing to preserve language and culture, transfer to children, considering it as an ethnic heritage and tie with homeland, its history and cultural values. The Russian diaspora refuse to see attractive and perspective social, educational, economic, and tourist opportunities of Russia and feel positive or neutral to the Russian language and culture.

The non-Russian Russian-speakers balance between “enthusiastic” oriented of exotic, greatness of language and culture, beauty of the speech and great arts, historical achievements, huge territories and huge “suspense”, and “wary”, related with aggressive in their opinion internal policy, “scaring” personality of the Russian leader and military potential of the country.

Conclusions

The descriptive findings let to understand the Russian diaspora. The interest to the study of Russia language and culture is not always conditioned by ethnic origin and Russian ethnic identity. Despite second native language (not Russian) members of the Russian-speaking community abroad continue support and preserve language practices in Russian. However, some respondents, identified as Russians, do not consider Russian as native, and do not try to preserve it and develop.

In contemporary world, language often becomes necessary competence to realize economic (or other) functions, to study it is does not mean understanding culture, historical heritage or other achievements corresponding ethnic culture. Representations about national language integrate into general concept about nation and the state and differ in relation to native language and language of the state of inhabitation, if it differs, foreign or almost unfamiliar. In the last case, representations reflect some general stereotypes and myths of separate people, the mass media, literature and dealing with general system and structure of the language, its complexity, melody, functions and associations with familiar speakers (such as German is the language of Schiller and Goethe, Farsi – language of Omar Khayyam and Rudaki, Russian – language of Tolstoy, Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, and so on). From the one hand, language accepts historical load of inner image of the state and its people, acts as an object, influenced by this image, and reproduced and transformed under real functioning, from the other.

The Russian diaspora has a great potential of collaboration and bases policy in relation to comrades as extremely important. This idea is a result of the realized sociological research among Russian-speaking communities of the world.

Acknowledgments.

An article is prepared under financial support of the project part of the State order by the Ministry of education and science of Russian Federation “Transit migration, transit regions and migration policy in Russia: security and Eurasian integrity”, 2017-2019.

References

1. Abel, G., Sander, N. (2014). Quantifying Global International Migration Flows. *Science*. Vol. 343, Issue 6178, pp. 1520-1522.
2. Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer A., Easterly W., Kurlat S., and Wacziarg R. (2002). Fractionalization. Working Paper 9411. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA 02138 December. **Electronic Resource** [URL: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w9411>].
3. Basic research. Center for International Development and Conflict Management, **Electronic Resource** [URL: <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar>].

4. Baumann, G. 1996. *Contesting culture: Discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Chandra, K. (2005). "Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability." *Perspectives on Politics*, June 2005, Vol 3(2): 235-252.
6. Collyer, M & de Haas, H 2012, 'Developing Dynamic Categorisations of Transit Migration', *Population, Space and Place* 18, 468-481.
7. Collyer, M Düvell, F & de Haas, H (2012), 'Critical approaches to transit migration', *Population, Space and Place*, 407-414.
8. Crystal, D. (2000) *Language Death*, Cambridge University Press.
9. Değrimen, F. 2008. *Russian diaspora and the politics of Russian nationalism in the post-Soviet era*. Middle East technical University. p. 110.
10. Düvell, F. 2008, *Transit Migration in Europe*. First Conference on Irregular Migration. 18-19 June 2008, Tripoli. **Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.cespi.it/PDF/Libia-D%C3%BCvell.pdf>].**
11. Düvell, F. 2014, *Transit Migration in the European Migration Spaces: Politics, Determinants and Dynamics*. In Düvell F C, *Transit Migration in Europe* (pp. 209-236). Amsterdam University Press - IMISCOE Research, Amsterdam.
12. Düvell, F.2012, 'Transit Migration: A Blurred and Politicised Concept', *Population, Space and Place*, 415-427.
13. Fearon, J. (1999). "Why Ethnic Politics and "Pork" Tend to Go Together." Paper presented at SSRC-MacArthur Workshop on Ethnic Politics and Democratic Stability, University of Chicago.
14. Fearon, J. and D.D. Laitin (1996), "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *American Political Science Review*, Volume 90, Issue 4: 715-735.
15. Fearon, J. and D.D. Laitin (2000), "Ordinary Language and External Validity: Specifying Concepts in the Study of Ethnicity." Paper presented at the October 2000 meeting of LICEP, University of Pennsylvania.
16. Graddol, D. (2006) *English Next*, British Council.
17. Horowitz, D. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
18. Htun, M. (2004). "The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives on Politics*, September.
19. Htun, M. Fearon, James (2003). "Ethnic Structure and Cultural Diversity by Country" *Journal of Economic Growth* 8.2: 195-222.
20. Hugo, G. T., G & Napitupulu, C.J. (2014). *Indonesia as a Transit Country in Irregular Migration to Australia*. Irregular Migration Research Programme Occasional Paper Series, Department of Immigration and Border Protection, Canberra.
21. Kuschminder, K. & Siegel, M. (2016), *Rejected Afghan asylum seekers in the Netherlands: Migration experiences, current situations and future aspirations*. UNU-Merit Working Paper 2016-007
22. **Population and Vital Statistics Report. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Statistical Papers Series A Vol. LXIX. Data available at January 1, 2017.**
23. Posner, D. (2005). *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.
24. **Russian State Statistical Service, 2017. Electronic Resource [URL: www.gks.ru].**
25. Ryazantsev, S. (2015). *The modern Russian-speaking communities in the world: formation, assimilation and adaptation in Host Societies*. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6, N 3, S . pp. 155-164.
26. Sheffer, G. (1986). *A new field of study: modern diasporas in international politics*, In Gabriel Sheffer (ed.), *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, London: Croom Helm, pp. 1-15.
27. Shulman, S. (2002). *Challenging the civic/ethnic and West/East dichotomies in the study of nationalism*, *Comparative political studies*, Vol. 3.5 No. 5, June 2002, 554-585. Sage Publications.

28. Smith, A. (2002). When is a nation, *Geopolitics* 7(2): 5–32.
29. Smith, A. *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity* [Text] / A.D. Smith. – Oxford University Press, 2003. - 330 p.
30. Tishkov V.A. (2003). *Requiem on ethnos: research on social-cultural anthropology*. Moscow.
31. Tölölyan, K. (1991). The nation-state and its others: In lieu of a preface, *Diaspora*, Vol. 5, N 1, pp. 3–36.
32. United Nations (1951 and 1967). Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 1951 (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 189 (1954), No. 2545, p. 137), art. 1) and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees of 1967 (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 606 (1967), No. 8791, p. 267), Electronic Resource [URL: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%20189/volume-189-I-2545-English.pdf> and <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%20606/volume-606-I-8791-English.pdf>].
33. The Global Flow Of People. Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.global-migration.info/>].
34. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute for Statistics, Montreal, UNESCO statistics database, available at: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, UNHCR Mid-Year Trends 2015, Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/statistical-yearbooks.html>].
35. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, New York, Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2015 Revision (United Nations publication POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2015/Age), Electronic Resource [URL: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/index.shtml>].
36. Varshney, A. (2002). *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
37. Wilkinson, Steven (2004). *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge University Press.
38. World Population Prospects. The 2017 Revision, available at <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/>; Demographic Yearbook 2015 (United Nations Publication, ST/ESA/STAT/SER.R/45), Electronic Resource [URL: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/dyb/dyb2.htm>].

* Corresponding author. E-mail: noe@list.ru.