

PROBLEM OF XENOPHOBIA AND MIGRANT-PHOBIA IN THE YOUTH ENVIRONMENT (ACCORDING TO THE MATERIALS OF SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF STUDENTS' OPINION)

Vasil T. Sakaev¹

The socio-political activity of students and danger of growth of xenophobia and migrant-phobia in the conditions of strengthening of migratory processes determined the relevance of the studied problem. The purpose of article is to analyze and interpret the results of sociological research of a problem of xenophobia and migrant-phobia among young people. The mass representative interrogating of students of KFU, which allowed revealing specifics of perception of migratory processes among young people, became the leading method in research of this problem. In particular, the article reveals the attitude of students to an ethnic variety of the region and determines the level of a social distance to representatives of other nationalities. We managed to uncover students' assessment of the condition of the international relations and the attitude to the facts of ethnic discrimination. The main sources of information dealing with the international relations were established and the leading role of the Internet, electronic and mass media in formation of negative perception of a phenomenon of migration was proved. When researching we succeeded in determining the general level of xenophobia and migrant-phobia of students and proving comparability of levels tolerance/xenophobia of students of the humanitarian and technical courses. Materials of research can be useful when carrying out comparative analyses of level of migrant-phobia in different regions, and to development of measures for counteraction of xenophobia and intolerance among students.

Keywords: xenophobia ; migrant-phobia ; tolerance ; students.

INTRODUCTION

Migratory processes owing to depopulation and reduction of a work force will cause political development of Russia in the XXI century. Throughout centuries, Russia was the classical country of emigration, but, since 1990, it faced mass immigration. The youth and especially students as its most active part is a favorable environment for distribution of various radical ideas. Immigration processes became the significant factor provoking growth of radical moods among young people (Gorchkov & Sheregi, 2010).

The Kazan Federal University (KFU) carried out the researches directed on identification of the relation of inhabitants of the Tatar Republic to migratory processes in the region in 2012-2013. (Ethnicity, religiousness and migrations, 2013; Positive experience of regulation of ethno social and ethno cultural processes, 2014). In 2014, I.B. Kuznetsova and L.M. Mukharyamova (2014) published their work devoted to questions of ensuring social safety at integration of migrants. In

¹ Associate Professor of the Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia, *E-mail: vasil.sakaev@gmail.com*

2014, complex researches of level of tolerance/intolerance in the Republic of Tatarstan were realized within the TEMPUS-ALLMEET project (Existing research review, 2015). However, the given researches did not focus attention on specifics of the attitude to migration among students. In 2013, the author conducted research of opinion of students in Naberezhnye Chelny about socio-political risks of migratory processes (Sakayev, 2015), but it did not set a task of determination of level of xenophobia and a migrant-phobia of respondents. To fill this gap, the new research was conducted in 2014 and its results we represent in the article.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Specifics and level of tolerance of students of the KFU in Naberezhnye Chelny institute became an object of research. Within research tasks to define the attitude of students to a multinationalism as to the characteristic of space were set; to reveal the level of a social distance to representatives of other nationalities; to establish opinion of students on the facts of ethnic discrimination and their assessment of a condition of the international relations; to designate the main sources of information on the international relations; general level of xenophobia and migrant-phobia of students. A separate task was detection of specifics of the attitude to the specified problems of students of the humanitarian and technical courses of preparation. The research had a representative character. During it 220 students of legal department and 229 students of construction department were interrogated. The received results of research were grouped in several thematic blocks.

RESULTS

The first block concerned the questions connected with the personal experience of interaction with representatives of other nationalities. So, 92.4% of respondents declared that they have representatives of other nationalities among friends and relatives. To a question, “how a respondent estimates a multinationality as the characteristic of the region in which he lives”, the following results were received: “is satisfied” and “it is rather satisfied, than it is dissatisfied” – 69.1%, “it is rather dissatisfied, than it is satisfied” and “is dissatisfied” – 7.8%, “I don’t care” – 22.9%. Actually, 2/3 of respondents estimate the multinationality of a region positively. At the same time, among the students of the technical departments the number of those who is dissatisfied made up 3.1% instead of 0.9% – among humanitarians , at the same time, among students of the technical departments the number of those who doesn’t care is significantly less (20.4% instead of 25.4% – at humanists).

Being asked “Whom would you consider to be representatives of other nationality?” 16, 7% of respondents couldn’t answer. The majority of respondents named various nationalities (30 nationalities from the abroad and the Russian Federation were mentioned). Azerbaijanians, Armenians, Tajiks and Uzbeks were often mentioned, Chinese, Georgians, Dagestanis, “Caucasians”, Udmurt, Bashkir,

Chuvash, Russians and Tatars are rarer. Thus, the concept “person of other nationality” is often associated with concrete ethnos. Only 14% of respondents consider these persons as of other nationality, which doesn't belong to the nationality of a respondent, and 5.7% – connected a nationality with existence of citizenship of other state. It is important to note that a certain part of respondents (14.3%) named the existence of different languages, religion, customs, and manner of behavior or appearance as the distinctive sign of other nationality. There were answers connecting “other nationality” with a certain territory: “all from Dagestan”, “all from Middle Asia”, “from the East”, “from Africa”, “everything, all those who are not from the CIS”, “all those, who are not Slavs”. We can state that there are no clear criteria of reference a person to this or that nationality among students.

The second block was devoted to definition of a social distance of students in relation to representatives of other nationalities. The majority of students are tolerant to migrants, except the sphere of the matrimonial relations. Being asked “Do you agree to have relations with people of other nationality?” the following results were received: agree to get married 49.2% (48.3% – don't agree), to be friends – 95.5%, to be neighbors – 92.9%, to be colleagues – 92.9%, to be fellow citizens of one state – 90.4%. At the same time, the question “Do you agree to see persons of other nationality in your country only as tourists” was answered positively by 31.2% of respondents, and 10.5% would prefer not to see them in their country at all. It testifies the high level of xenophobia and a migrant-phobia among students. It is interesting that more students of the humanitarian courses agree to see persons of other nationality in their country only as tourists – 35.7%.

On the basis of the obtained data “Index of a Social Distance (ISD)” of students was calculated. In the questionnaire the seven-membered scale of a social distance of Bogardos was applied for the assessment of a social distance. The question was the following: “Do you agree to enter into below mentioned relations with the representatives of other nationality living in your region?” Variants of the answers: 1. To enter into marriage; 2. To be friends; 3. To be neighbours; 4. To study in the same class / group; 5. To be colleagues; 6. To be residents of the same town / village; 7. To be fellow citizens of the same state. Scale identifies seven possible levels of social distance. Level 1 (to enter into marriage) described the minimum distance that is installed by the respondents with the representatives of other nationalities, which was expressed in the full acceptance of the respondents of other nationalities. Level 7 (to be fellow citizens of the same state), on the contrary, showed the maximum social distance, which is expressed in the rejection of representatives of other nationalities, unwillingness to enter into the close relationship. The results showed that ISD for humanitarian students is 3.474, and for technician students is 3.488. Thus, the most appropriate level of social distance for students is professional contacts and study. The small difference of ISD of

students of humanitarian and technical areas shows that the former tends to make closer social contacts (Table 1).

TABLE 1: THE PROPORTION OF POSITIVE RESPONDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION "DO YOU AGREE TO ENTER INTO THE FOLLOWING RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEOPLE OF OTHER NATIONALITIES?" (% OF POSITIVE RESPONSES)

<i>Respondents' answers</i>	<i>The total distribution of students</i>	<i>Students of humanitarian areas</i>	<i>Students of technical areas</i>
To enter into marriage	49,2	51,3	47,1
To be friends	95,5	95,5	95,6
To be neighbours, live in the same street	92,9	92,9	62,9
To be colleagues (work / study together)	92,9	92,0	93,8
To be fellow citizens of the same state	90,4	89,7	91,1
I agree to see them only as a tourist in my country	31,2	35,7	26,7
I would prefer not to see them in my country	10,5	10,3	10,7

Over 90% of respondents find it unacceptable to show hostility towards representatives of other nationalities, and 8.9% - think it is acceptable, and, among the humanitarians percentage of those who admits the possibility of intolerant behavior is higher than that of "technicians" (10.7% and 7.1%, respectively).

The third set of questions concerned the assessment of the situation in the sphere of interethnic relations. Only a small proportion of students faced with the facts of unfriendly attitude on a national basis concerning themselves (2.4% - often, 18.9% - sometimes), but more often faced with such facts in relation to others (18.3% - often, 65.3% - sometimes) and that is warning results.

To the question "Is there discrimination of any ethnic group in Naberezhnye Chelny", 14.9% of respondents answered positively, 31.0% answered negatively, the rest were at a loss for an answer. It is typical that the proportion of those who was at a loss for an answer is higher among the "technicians" (58.2% and 49.6%, respectively), and among the humanitarians there is a higher percentage of those who believe that there is no discrimination (39.6% and 25.3%). Apparently, these data are explained by higher competence of humanitarian students in the assessment of facts, which can be interpreted as a demonstration of ethnic discrimination. The worrying fact is that almost every sixth student is sure about the presence of ethnic discrimination in the city. When they were asked to clarify what ethnic groups are discriminated, the greatest number of responses were "Caucasians" (34.3% of those who reported about the presence of cases of discrimination), Tajiks (16.4%), Russian (8.9%), Azerbaijanians (6.0%). If you group them by region of origin, it turns out that the most discriminated people are from the Caucasus (52.2%) and Central Asia (38.8%).

In assessment of the ethnic situation in the region, respondents' opinions were divided: 30.3% believe that the inter-ethnic situation is stable; 56.2% believe that the situation is stable, but conflicts can arise from domestic violence; 9.6% said that the inter-ethnic situation is unstable (this answer was chosen by 11.2% of humanitarians and by 8.0% of "technicians").

The fourth unit of questions is related to information about international relations, received by the respondent. Students receive the main information through the Internet (78.4% of respondents chose this answer), television (71.7%), print media (42.5%), friends and neighbors (31.2%), in the family (29.2%), radio (27.6%), school (26.5%), books (22.5%). It means that the Internet and television are the dominant source of respondents' perception of the situation in the sphere of international relations, while others are secondary. Frustratingly look the Positions of the institutions, which function is directly included into the aim of educational nature of the problem, as well as families look really disheartening. Unfortunately, these important institutions are uninformative and do not determine the respondent's perception. It should be noted that for students in the humanities, role of the Internet and television as resources of information is lower, but the role of other variants is higher or even considerably higher (for such sources of information, such as friends and acquaintances, family and books).

Interesting answers were received to the question about the nature of received information about international relations. It turned out that respondents receive most of the positive information, in school (44.1% of respondents chose this option), in the family (40.5%), from friends and neighbors (31.2%), books (33.6%), radio (17.4%). Students get negative information mostly from the Internet (49.2%), television programs (33.9%), and print media (23.2%). The difference between the results refers to the responses which characterize the received information as neutral. Thus, in general, the main sources of information form a negative perception of the sphere of interethnic relations by students. This assessment was supposed, but now sociological data allowed confirming this assumption. Newsletters, talk shows, forums, publications instigate negativity in public opinion, create basics for the rise of xenophobia and conflicts. In turn, insignificant part of the information obtaining in educational institutions and, mainly, its positive nature are motivated by the lack of objectivity in presenting information. Obviously, students don't trust the information from that kind of source, especially if their personal experience suggests something different.

DISCUSSIONS

There is no doubt that these results are due to the influence of not only the information, but also a low level of legal culture and the psychological unpreparedness of the population of the Republic of Tatarstan for the meeting with the mass migration of foreign culture. They clearly show the creation of

potential conditions for the emergence of youth in ethnic conflicts associated with migration. With the increasing of migration flows, it is fraught with serious social and political risks.

M.K. Gorshkov and F.E. Sheregi (2010) pointed out that xenophobia inherent to a less degree of modern Russian youth than the older generation. But, they did not take into account the high degree of involvement of young people into the Internet environment, where an often propaganda of xenophobia and aggressive-minded subcultures are presented, and also social and psychological immaturity of youth. In addition, they observed the perception of the migration by young people, basically, on the example of Russian relations with internally displaced people among the compatriots, but now the main migration flows are connected with economic migration.

Researches of Levada Center fixed a decline (compared to 2013) and the transition of xenophobia hostility towards other ethnic groups in “sleep mode indifference,” which was the result of a public diproblematization of migration agenda and the emergence of a new facility for the xenophobic attacks (“Nazis”) (xenophobic and nationalist mood, 2015).

The studies conducted in the Republic of Tatarstan, on the contrary, pointed out an increase intolerance of host population in 2013-2014. (The most in the age group of 31-55 years), connected with the economic crisis (positive experience of regulation of ethno-social and ethno-cultural processes, 2014).

In the growth of intolerance the factor of the long history of peaceful coexistence between Christianity and Islam in the region seems to have played its role, it was often regarded as a kind of “vaccine” against xenophobia and, as a result, a number of contentious aspects of migration was underestimated (Kuznetsova & Muharyamova, 2014)

CONCLUSION

1. The vast majority of students assessed the multinational region as a positive factor, or didn't attach any importance to it. A significant part of students does not have clear criteria to determine the nationality of a person (formally legal principle, anthropological, territorial, linguistic criteria are used).
2. The research has revealed that professional networking and joint learning is the most appropriate for students' level of social distance with other nationalities. At the same time, 8.9% of the respondents admit the possibility of intolerant behavior towards people of other nationalities.
3. In general, students haven't actually faced the facts of ethnic discrimination against themselves, but 4/5 (4 out of 5) are considered to have witnessed such facts in relation to others. One in six respondents believe that in the city there are discriminated groups, and people from the Caucasus (52.2%) and Central Asia (38.8%) and Russians (8.9%) were named among them. In general, 30.3%

of respondents stated that the interethnic situation in the region is stable, 56.2% felt that the overall situation is stable, but conflicts can arise from domestic violence, and 9.6% claimed that interethnic situation is unstable.

4. The main sources of information about the state of ethnic relations for students are the Internet, television and print media, and they receive mainly negative information from them. The respondents get positive information in their university, family, friends, neighbors, books.
5. Regarding the differences in the level of tolerance of students of humanitarian and technical areas, it should be noted that the survey hasn't confirmed the stereotype rooted in the scientific literature that technical students are more conservative, less tolerant and prone to xenophobia. In many cases, apparently because of "professional competence", humanitarian students demonstrated a more tolerant and flexible position, but on a range of issues their views were more xenophobic than those of technical students.

Thus, it should be noted that among students there is a lack of objective information about migration processes, legal views and tolerant attitudes towards migrants are not completely formed, in some cases there have been noticed some ideas, which can be attributed to xenophobia and migrant-phobia.

Recommendations

With the increasing migration processes in the short and medium term, the results of the research should attract attention from the authorities. It is necessary to intensify proper activities on prevention of xenophobia and migrant-phobia among students through the Internet, print and electronic media, educational institutions; to work out channels of promotion of positive information about the ethnic and migration situation, about the legal basis of ethnic and migration policy. It is necessary to fight against demonstration of nationalism, racism, xenophobia and stop them, otherwise in the future this may lead to a generation of xenophobic and alarmist views on the issues of ethnic interaction and migration. In terms of the multinational character of Russian society and increasing migration flows, it would not be acceptable.

The research materials can be applied in the comparative analysis of the level of migrant-phobia of students in different regions, and for developing measures to combat xenophobia and intolerance among students.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Ethnicity, religion and migration in modern Tatarstan (2013). Scientific edited by Minzaripov R.G. Kazan. Kazan University.
- Exiting research review Republic of Tatarstan (2015), ed. V. Sakaev; TEMPUS ALLMEET, Kazan. Website: <http://allmeet.org> (accessed on 30.01.2015).

- Gorshkov, M.K. and Sheregi, F.E. (2010). Youth of Russia: sociological portrait. Moscow: CSEM.
- Kuznetsova, I.B. and Mukharyamova, L.M. (2014). Social integration of migrants in the context of social security (on materials of the Republic of Tatarstan). Kazan. Kazan University.
- Sakaev, V.T. (2015). Socio-political risks of migration: an empirical study of opinions of students of higher education institutions in Naberezhnye Chelny. Bulletin of economics, law and sociology, 3: 262-264.
- The positive experience of regulation of ethno-social and ethno-cultural processes in the regions of Russia. (2014). Ed. by G.F. Gabdrakhmanova. (2014). Sh. Marjani Institute of History of Academy of Science RT (Republic of Tatarstan).
- Xenophobic and nationalist sentiments among Russians: the data of representative surveys in 2002-2015.(2015).Web-site: <http://www.levada.ru/25-08-2015/ksenofobiya-i-natsionalizm> (accessed on 30.01.2015).