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Abstract
Migration as a major global context and the problems of adaptation and socialization of migrants require deeper understanding, analyzing and regulation of the balance in the processes of cultural and language interaction in the contemporary society. Migration is international phenomenon involving a great number of countries and analyzing the experience of these states in their institutional and political management of migration allows undertaking more efficient planning and regulation of this process. This paper offers the results of the comparative analysis of language socialization of migrants of first and second generation in Russian and American regions (case study – Tatarstan, Russia and California, the USA). Being world leaders in attracting migrants Russia and the USA offer a wide range of practices for sociolinguistic analysis. The paper studies qualitative and quantitative parameters of migration processes in the context of language policy towards education and linguistic adaptation (age, gender and level of education). Authors identified major challenges the states are facing while regulating migration – legal issues, infrastructure and mechanisms of integration of migrants belonging to different generations into the system of education. Research also involved analyzing the legal documents on strategic planning of national policy and migration of the Russian Federation and the USA. The results of the research are able to improve and optimize the ways of linguistic and cultural adaptation of migrants in federative states.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The developing migration processes respond immediately to political, economic, and social changes in society. The socioeconomic status indicator of a region is increase or decrease in migration flows that impact on size, sex, age, and ethnic structure of the population as well as quality of life. The migration processes and thereto related migration adaptation and socialization problems in the RF and its regions require monitoring and realignment of sociocultural and language balance in society. As a global trend, the migration processes engage a lot of states and their political and industrial experience in governing migration is to be reviewed and considered while planning the migration policy. The states attractive to migrants (Russia included) face migrant social integration problems that are tackled within the migration policy of each state. Migration policy is “a scope of sociopolitical concepts and views of a state and specific organizational and legal, and socioeconomic events on migration process regulations aimed at creating conditions for social integration of migrants, forced migrants, and refugees” [1].

According to the migration policy analyses by International Organization for Migration (IOM) in 2015 Russia was the third in the world in number of migrants after the USA and Germany. The official data suggest that 46.6 mln of migrants resides in the USA, 12 mln – in Germany, and 11.9 – in Russia. The research shows that in 2015 the number of the international migrants, living in the country they were not born in, added up to 244 mln., the largest number for the whole period of observation (compare: in 2013 there were 232 mln) [2].

According to the Federal State Statistic Service the number of migrants arrived in Russia in 2015 amounts to more than 0.4 mln people whereof children under 14 – 8,5%, people aged between 15 and 24 - 19%, and the middle (working age ) people is over 72,5% [3].

Referring to the data of Migration Policy Institute, in 2015 foreign born inhabitants of the USA under 18 accounted to 3,8 % (over 1.7 mln) of the total migrants number (over 43 mn).

The migration flow breaks down into two groups: free will and forced migrants that in turn can be classified as: foreigners admitted to the state to get education and training; migrants admitted to work; migrants admitted through program for reuniting and starting families; migrant coming to get residency; foreigners admitted for humane reasons. The latter encompasses migrants left their
permanent residency escaping from being stalked, conflicts, repression, ecological calamities or other situations jeopardizing their life, freedom, or livelihood [4]. In West countries there is a developed statistics compiled both from the census and administrative data so as to study migration of various age groups [5].

The data allows studying thoroughly both the migration direction and its social groups characteristics. Saraeva O. V., Andreeva E. M., Marmora L., Mkrtchyan N. V. reflect in their work compliance of Russian migration legislation with the international law, human rights protection, government and humankind interests ration [6], [7], [8], [9]. The cohort aged between 15 and 24 of the most interest since the category is meaningful for the region’s development [10]. In the Western scholarly literature they single out a group among the youth – college bound [11], [12]. This group has a certain age profile, late teens, when people arrive in a country so as to receive education [13], [14], [15].

The first stage of migrants’ residency is the most complicated and unclear period of adaptation and socialization. It has the following characteristics: a new sociocultural environment, physical, psychological, and emotional burden, loss of social communication that leads to anxiety and stress. Social and communicative adaptation is assessed through “competence characteristics: ability to deliver speech relevant to the extra-linguistic factors of the communicative strategy and linguistic behaviour, and identification degree” [16]. The UN Refugee Convention is a legal document monitoring the international legal standards of the migration processes. The migration flow regulation tools include: the UN Resolution (December 18, 1990) and International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers, guidance materials of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, International Organization for Migration, and other legislative documents. The key provisions of the state migration policy in the RF are documented in the federal migration programs. Article 19 in “Decree of the President of the RF N 1666 dd.19.12.2012 on the RF National Policy Strategy till 2025” underlines the necessity of providing integration assistance into Russian society for foreign residence and persons without citizenship having migrated to the RF as a permanent residency. [17]

In other words, the government should assure painless socialization for migrants. A key element in the socialization process is self-identification as a part of the society. Identification is defined by social mobility that directly depends on migrants’ communicative competence.

The paper puts forward the review of a migration situation in the RF and the USA: case study the Republic of Tatarstan, Russia and California, the USA. The objective of the comparative analysis of the linguistic socialization problems amid the first and second generation of migrants in the RF and the USA is to single out peculiarities of migrants’ linguistic integration control within socialization as a tool of migration policy both at the federal and regional levels.

2 METHODOLOGY

The Russia and the US revision analysis is based on typological approach suggested by the UN (IOM) committee of experts. The paper contains the information from the following documents: the census for various periods, state acts as “Devices for implementation of the RF national state policy till 2025” and concepts of the state national policy in the republic of Tatarstan” Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Social Policy Research Associates Programmer Year 2013 the analytical reviews in the field of language policy and language adaptation of Russian and Californian scholars such as Mustafina J., Murzagaleev R., Margie Mc Hugh, Madeleine Morawski. The experience of both scientific methods of migration research and applied technology implementing the migration policy in the countries attractive for migration.

At the first stage there is a comparative analysis of the quantities data of the migration processes in Russia and the USA at the federal level and in Tatarstan and California at the regional level. The characteristics considered are age, education.

At the second stage, descriptive method as a synchronic analysis method is employed. The descriptive units are defined and characterized, the data are generalized and interpreted, the problems and challenges emerging in the regions during the migration processes are deduced.

At the third stage, as a result of the analysis and synthesis the recommendations on more successful migrants’ linguistic socialization in the regions are introduced.
3 RESULTS

Migration has a cause and effect relations: search for a higher life standard that means safety, qualified health service, opportunity to receive a proper education, social security, a consumer basket. The bulk of migration, therefore, consists of migrant workers and migrant students. The paper compares the migration statistic scale in Russian and the USA and in their regions Tatarstan and California.

Table 1. Population according to place of birth in California, U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foreign born</td>
<td>native born</td>
<td>foreign born</td>
<td>native born</td>
<td>foreign born</td>
<td>native born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>43.3 mn</td>
<td>10, mn.</td>
<td>278,1 mn</td>
<td>28, mn.</td>
<td>8,8 mn.</td>
<td>25 mn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31, mn.</td>
<td>8,8 mn.</td>
<td>31, mn.</td>
<td>8,8 mn.</td>
<td>25 mn.</td>
<td>25 mn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term "foreign born" refers to people residing in the United States at the time of the population survey who were not U.S. citizens at birth. The foreign-born population includes naturalized U.S. citizens, lawful permanent immigrants (or green-card holders), refugees and asylees, certain legal nonimmigrants (including those on student, work, or some other temporary visas), and persons residing in the country without authorization. The term "U.S. born" refers to people residing in the United States who were U.S. citizens in one of three categories: people born in one of the 50 states or the District of Columbia; people born in U.S. Insular Areas such as Puerto Rico or Guam; or people who were born abroad to at least one U.S. citizen parent [18].

Table 2. The U.S. population share by age and ethnic characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>population</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Latinos (%)</th>
<th>African-American (%)</th>
<th>Asians (%)</th>
<th>others (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantities date in Table 1 and 2 demonstrate that the intensive immigration (alongside the different rate of natural increase) results in rapid changes of the U.S. population structure. In particular, in 1996 the White was 73.6 % of the total population. The proportion of African-Americans was equal to 12 %, and proportion of Hispanics (mostly from Latin America) – 10.2 %. According to assessments the proportion of the Latinos will have surged by 2050 up to 24.5 %, and the proportion of African-Americans - up to 13.6 %. A significant increase and the proportion of Asian will reach 8.2 %. The data of Census 2001 proves this forecast. So Hispanic have overtaken African-Americans and become the larger minority. It should be noted that the number of Hispanics has increased from 500 000 in 1900 and 41.3 mn in July 2004. At the present they proved a half of population increase.

Among 9 federal districts, the most attractive are Central part and Volga region. The Republic of Tatarstan is one of 4 regions of the Volga region (alongside Samara, Saratov, Nizhniy Novgorod), where reside 42% out of the total population (29 636 574 people) and its 70% of migration increase [19].
Table 3. Quantities changes in population in the RR and Tatarstan in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Population on Jan.1, 2015.</th>
<th>Changes for 2015 (+,-)</th>
<th>Overall population</th>
<th>Natural increase</th>
<th>Migration increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Russian Federation</td>
<td>146 267 288</td>
<td>277 422</td>
<td>32 038</td>
<td>245 384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of Tatarstan</td>
<td>3 855 037</td>
<td>13 693</td>
<td>10 120</td>
<td>3 573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Federal State Statistic Service the population of the RF in 2016 amounts to 146544,7 mln, population growth is 1%, in 2015 – 2%. The total population growth index in 2015 is 1.9 for 1000 people: natural growth index - 0.2; natural increase index– 1.7. Table 3 demonstrate the quantitative characteristics of international migrants spreading by age.

Table 4. Migrants’ age structure in the RF and Tatarstan in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreigners come from outside Russia</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Younger that working age</th>
<th>Working age</th>
<th>Older than working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Russian Federation</td>
<td>598617</td>
<td>65 792</td>
<td>463303</td>
<td>69 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Volga Region</td>
<td>89 251</td>
<td>10 010</td>
<td>68 841</td>
<td>10 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of Tatarstan</td>
<td>7 885</td>
<td>1 031</td>
<td>5 510</td>
<td>1 344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indicator tatistic analysis suggested by the Federal State Statistic Service and Migration Institute by education attainment in the RF and the U.S. as a whole and in the regions (Tatarstan and California) is almost the same [18], [20].

Table 5. Migrants distribution by education attainment in 2015.
As it is shown in the statistics the prevailing ethnic groups among migrants are the Tatars and the Russians – 60% of migration increase. 7.1 % is the Uzbeks, 4.3 % — the Azerbajiani and the Tajicks each. Approximately 15 % of migrants does not mention their nationality. Consequently, the tenth part of the migration increase is the nations of the CIS (The Armenian, the Kirghiz, the Ukrainians, the Kazakhs, etc.). In Tatarstan the change of age structure of migrants that made the migration increase in 90s of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century resulted in decrease in people younger than working age (from 33.2% in 1992 to 15.8% in 2004) and increase in working age (from 59.3 to 67.6%) and older than working age (from 7.6 to 16.6%).

Having compared indicators of the demographic situation resources and migration monitoring in the U.S. and Russia, and its regions, the similar characteristics of the migration flows are highlighted:

- similar migrant age cohort ranging;
- over 80% of the migration flow is at their working age;
- migration intensity depends on the region-donor close proximity: for Russia it's the CIS, for the U.S. – Mexico, Canada.

However, there are some differences. In the U.S. the migration structure has a considerable influence on the racial and ethnic situation in the country. (see Table 2). 40 % of the illegal immigrants are in California (most of them enter the country through the borderline with Mexico). It is expected that the white will make less the half of population for the next decade. However, most regions have a certain ethnic characteristics. For instance, Los Angeles has become the main destination for migrants from Mexico and Asia, Miami – for the Cubans and some other migrants from Ibero-America. Simultaneously, there is a large scale movement of the autochthonous (mostly white) population out of cities that leads to a rapid change of racial, ethnic, and cultural profile of the leading American cities.

In the Russian Federation the working migration has insignificant influence on the current labour market. For the most Russian and the U.S. regions experiencing the demographic decline and, at the end of the past decade, reducing in population at the working age, an opportunity to attract people from other regions of the country is a key factor of economic development. However, the migrant inflow rate are concerning Tatarstan administration: between 2011 and 2015 in Tatarstan the number of migrants registered at the place of residency increased more than 1, 7 times, the head of the republic R. Minnekhanov informed [21].

Migrant integration policy based on the administrative efforts of the accepting country is defined by the distinguishing approach to each category and “integration indicators:

- socioeconomic (employment, income level, social protection),
- political and legislative (including involvement into the political life, taking part in the social institutions);
- social and cultural (language competence, attitude towards the basic norms of the receiving country);
- social and cultural (altitude of receiving country, ethno cultural diversity at the work place and media coverage of the migration problems) [22]

In Tatarstan the migration legalization and naturalization issues are dealt with through integration of the documents as:

- on implementation of the State Programme to Assist Voluntary Resettlement of Compatriots Living Abroad to the Russian Federation (from the cabinet meeting materials September 24, 2015) [24].
- the Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Russian Federation till 2025.
In California:

- **Immigration and Nationality Act**
  On the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, a foreigner can get citizenship of the United States when he was 18 years old, he legally entered the country and lived in it for at least five years, is *highly moral man, with two sureties, may demonstrate proficiency and familiarity with the history of the United States and their institutions, as well as ready to give an oath of allegiance.*

- **WOIA**
  WOIA went into effect in 2015 and supersedes the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998. The new legislation is mainly administrative & consolidated several workforce development programs into the WIOA.

The crucial issue of the migration policy implementation is differentiated linguistic socialization conditioned by age, sex, education attainment, occupation, employment type. A language as an adaptive resource for a migrant has a key role at the labour market, for receiving education and successful integration into society. Table 6 demonstrates how getting a highly qualified job depends on language fluency [18].

### Table 6. Worker’s education and English proficiency in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>U.S. Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Employed Workers (age 25 and older)</td>
<td>23,848,900</td>
<td>103,824,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-educated workers (i.e. Those without a high school diploma)</td>
<td>5,967,100</td>
<td>5,216,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low educated of all workers</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-educated workers (i.e. Those with at least a bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% high educated of all workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient (LED)Workers (age 25 and older)</td>
<td>11,283,300</td>
<td>1,198,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% LED among all workers</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The immigration legislation of the U.S. clearly defines the groups of foreigners whose labour is required by the American society. According to the Immigration and Naturalization Act (1952) and Amendments (1997) (article 203) they are:

- **top experts** (foreigners having an outstanding abilities to science, the arts, education, sports, renowned professors, scholars and experts, managers and leaders working in the international companies (28,6% out of total number of working immigration);
- **foreigners having a degree and outstanding abilities** (28,6% out of total number of working immigration);
- **qualified workers, experts and the other working migrant groups for work that the U.S. lacks workers** (28,6% out of total number of working immigration).

In can be inferred that if a migrant has a degree and linguistic competence, he has great opportunities at the labour market. (see Table 6). The second popular language in California after English is Spanish: 37% out of the whole population speaks Spanish as a native language, 13,8% out of them doesn’t speak or speak broken English [18]. In the Republic of Tatarstan roughly 15% of migration knows neither official language (Russian and Tatar). In 2014 Uzbek is a mother language for 27,8% (40 588), Tadjik - 9.3% (13 680), Ukrainian - 8,7%(12 762), Azerbaijani - 5,0% (7 362), Kazakh - 4,5% (6 606), other languages 11,1% (16324) out of total number of the external immigrants [25]. However, in Tatarstan the peculiarity of the migration flows is that born till 1990s arriving from the countries of the former USSR know Russian. In most neighbouring countries there are Russian medium schools. In Tatarstan, nevertheless, the language competence issue is acute as the rate of both working and education migration of the youth is stepping up (in 2013 – 3,8, and in 2014 – 5,2) [25]. Some migrants prefer the region considering similar language and religion characteristics of the Republic inhabitance. In 2014 Tatarstan was one of 10 most attractive countries for education migration [26]. Opportunities to acquire an official language of the receiving country ride on the
following factors: motivation (e.g. prospects of getting a better job or higher income, or language competence as a naturalization condition); (2) possibilities to learn a language (language courses and conditions of attendance); (3) aptitude for language learning (apart from individual characteristics it is noticed that children and teens acquire easier a new language, and when people emigrate at their old age they do not aspire to learn the language, since the cognitive ability weakens with age; (4) expenditures caused by language learning (time and money required for language learning, does a migrant have such recourses?). California puts forward a pattern of the linguistic socialization for migrants based on WIOA (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) implementation. Besides, in the state the Act of Dream (development, assistance, and education for minor migrants) was adopted. Act adoption speeds up the procedure of citizenship for children-migrants studying at the University and doing service in the Army [27]. In California as well as in Tatarstan (according to the RF Constitution, article 43, Education Act) children of illegal migrants are not limited in getting high school diploma. Working migrants are provided with language courses and possibility to take a language certificate examination. NGO “Novyi Vek” tackles the adaptation issues in the Republic. It has set up a low-threshold center that migrants come to with their problems. Furthermore, the organization basing on the German experience arranges special intro-orientation courses within the population employment promotion programme during 2014 – 2020 in Tatarstan. Since 2015 1,2 thousand of migrants have become students there [28].

According to the U.S. experts, California is changing its conventional melting pot pattern into a puzzle pattern; it means a transition to multicultural society. The survey of 2500 Latinos revealed that 90% deemed it was important to integrate into the American culture as soon and efficient as possible, however, the same 90% stressed out the necessity to be linked to the national culture [27].

The following conclusions can be deduced:

- migration both in Tatarstan and California has an age profile;
- though institutional and legal systems are fully-fledged in both regions, integration infrastructure and tools of engaging the education system in the process of linguistic socialization are more effective in California;
- in California linguistic socialization pattern is differentiated considering age peculiarities, education attainment, and possibilities of further employment in the field of specialization obtained beyond California; in Tatarstan the language education is unified without considering migrants further employment; children-migrant adaptation to the new education conditions and school environment. In Tatarstan according to teachers they (children) experience difficulties in understanding the school material because of lack of medium language [29]. In California children-migrants are also a vulnerable group

4 CONCLUSIONS

The Russian Federation alongside the large countries as the U.S receiving migrants has faced a huge migrant flow. The crucial characteristic of Russia is that it has recently become a country receiving the migrants. Therefore the migration policy aimed at providing solid socioeconomic and demographic development; meeting the economic demands of working recourses, practical population allotment in the Republic; employing the migration processes for socio-economic development; providing national security experiences the period of development. California experience as a leader of the migration movement in the U.S. is interesting for analysis since its population tend to create a multicultural society but preserving the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic identity. In Tatarstan there is a specific migration situation therefore the key implementation issue of the migration policy is differential linguistic socialization conditioned by age, sex, education attainment, occupation, and employment type. Alongside socio-economic, political, psychological, sociocultural integration, it is necessary to adjust tools of language education of migrants and their children, arrange events aimed at their linguistic socialization.
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