

Acculturation of Soviet Immigrant Parents in Israel and Greece

Shmuel Shamai, Zinaida Ilatov, Anastasia Psalti and Kiki Deliyanni¹

The present study explores the acculturation process of Soviet parents who immigrated to Greece and Israel in the 1990s. We compare the parenting styles in coping with host school systems in their respective countries, Israel and Greece. The study combines two different theoretical models: Ogbu's minority groups typology and a model of immigrants' parenting styles. Two samples of parents of elementary schoolchildren were selected, more than 100 from each country. The results point out differences and similarities between the samples. For each group primary and secondary profiles were constructed based on the results. Parents belonging to the primary Pontian Greeks' profile preferred their children to study in Greek and were not critical of the education system. They were involved in their children's education, but to a lesser extent than they had been in the USSR. The primary profile of Soviet Jews constituted parents who wanted their children to study in both languages. They were critical of a variety of aspects of the educational system. They were very much involved in their children's homework, more so than they had been in the USSR. They expected the school to be instrumental in future job training.

Israel and Greece were two among many countries to host the massive immigration from the former Soviet Union (FSU) beginning in the late 1980s as a result of radical changes in the Soviet political system and its emigration policy. Soviet immigrants to both of these countries arrived within the same time period sharing similar backgrounds and expectations. However, the two groups differed in many ways, and this paper explores their divergent experiences.

Little empirical research on immigrants' acculturation through parenting is to be found in comparative ethnic studies, despite the significance of this matter. Young adults, who restart their life in a host country as parents, deal with two life cycles: theirs and their children's. Their own views are

¹ Shmuel Shamai, Tel-Hai Academic College, Israel Golan Research Institute, University of Haifa, Israel, Zinaida Ilatov, Golan Research Institute, University of Haifa, Israel, Anastasia Psalti and Kiki Deliyanni, Department of Psychology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

shaped by their children's experience in the education system, while they, too, are shaping their children's views.

This study probes the acculturation process by comparing the parenting styles of Soviet immigrants as they cope with the school systems in the host countries, Israel and Greece. The study is grounded in a number of different theoretical models: Parekh's typology of multicultural relations, Ogbu's minority groups' schooling typology, and Roer-Strier's model of immigrant parenting styles.

Parekh (2000) replaces the term pluralism with diversity and seeks to explain its relationship to multiculturalism. According to him, three forms of diversity exist in modern society, and multicultural society can exhibit all three forms simultaneously. *Subculture diversity* refers to a society with many groups that have different beliefs and lifestyles but "all share their society's dominant system of meanings and values and seek to carve out within it spaces for their divergent life style.... They do not represent an alternative culture but they seek to pluralize the existing one" (3). *Perspective diversity* argues that many groups in a society are critical. In consequence, they try to challenge the existing culture and to create a new social order "represent[ing] a vision of life the dominant culture either rejects altogether or accepts in theory but ignores in practice" (4). *Communal diversity* is evident when communities are well organized and live by their own systems of beliefs and practices, which they accommodate in order to survive within the mainstream culture. These three forms of diversity can exist simultaneously.

This paper explores issues of diversity with respect to the two ethnic communities that emigrated from the former Soviet Union. The immigrants of the 1990s arrived in Israel in a period of globalization, a process that facilitated and legitimated transnational diasporic networks of immigrants. According to Goodman (1997), cultural linkages created by migration can be sustained and reproduced, thereby opening possibilities for transnational culture. Moreover, international migrations, in particular, and globalization, in general, have reshaped notions of national boundaries and national identities (Laguerre, 1999). Globalization enhances understanding of immigrant integration in the political and cultural realms, which concern assimilation, ethnic pluralism, and border-crossing expansion of social space (Faist, 2000).

Minority Status and Ogbu's Schooling Typology

Minority status and schooling are the focus of Ogbu's (1983) typology. Ogbu divides minority groups into three categories. *Autonomous Minorities* are composed of immigrants and/or their descendents. They are not totally subordinate economically or politically, nor are they represented with the ideology of innate inferiority, but they may be subject to some prejudice and

discrimination. They do not necessarily regard the majority group as their reference group or want to assimilate. They are free to advance in the social and occupational hierarchy of the society. They may have distinctive racial, ethnic, religious, linguistic, or cultural identities guaranteed by tradition. In many cases, they occupy and control distinct geographical domains while participating in supralocal politics. They may compete with the dominant society. Often such minorities have a cultural frame of reference that encourages and displays success.

Immigrant Minorities, which are also composed of immigrants and/or their descendents, have usually moved voluntarily to their host society. They occupy the lowest rung of the socio-economic ladder, lack political power, and enjoy low prestige. They hold instrumental attitudes to their host society. They may accept prejudice and discrimination as the price of achieving their ultimate objectives although they may also resist these practices.

Caste Minorities are involuntarily a permanent part of their societies, for example, the indigenous peoples of Australia or the African Americans in the United States. They are regarded by the dominant society as inherently inferior in all respects. They are stigmatized and excluded and are not allowed to compete for desirable roles on the basis of their individual abilities. They are regarded by the dominant group as inferior and ranked lower than the dominant group in all desirable respects. Their reference group (as with autonomous minorities) is the affluent members of the dominant group.

The two types that are applicable to this study are the autonomous and the immigrant minorities, both of which may sometimes resist and defy the dominant culture of the host society. These types differ in their self-perception, attitudes and behavior relative to their relations with the dominant group. Autonomous minorities may even look down on the dominant group, as they do not regard it as their reference group. This is particularly true if the immigrants of the autonomous group feel that they come from a culture that is not inferior, as is the case with the Soviet immigrants to Israel. This group "is confident about its past educational experience and imported skills, and sees them as relevant to education in their new environment" (Eisikovits, 1995: 250).

Immigrants and Style of Parenting

In the lives of individuals and families, immigration can be characterized as a disruptive process somewhat congruent with a crisis situation. According to Bar-Yosef (1981), migration is one of the most obvious instances of complete disorganization of the individual's role system, which can mean some disturbance of social identity and self-image. The old social identity is inappropriate, being in general entirely different from the actual identity

conferred on the immigrant by the absorbing society. Thus, immigration can be a traumatic event that influences family life, relations in the family, and the socialization process during childhood (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Sluzki, 1979; Barankin et al., 1989).

In this study, we have used Roer-Strier's (1996) conceptual model of immigrant parenting, which distinguishes three styles of immigrant parenting: Kangaroo, Cuckoo, and Chameleon.

The *Kangaroo style* is based on the metaphor of child protection and perceives parents as the major source of socialization for their children. They maintain the culture of their country of origin and protect their children from the host society's culture, which is perceived as a threat. Parents preferring this parenting style tend to espouse a conservative elitist ideology that regards the host culture as inferior.

The *Cuckoo style* of parenting imitates the behavior of that bird, which lays its eggs in the nests of other birds, leaving them to be hatched and cared for by the bird-in-residence. Families that adopt the Cuckoo style usually tend to trust the socialization agents of the receiving society more than themselves. These parents perceive the host culture as more modern and advanced than their culture of origin.

The *Chameleon style* takes its name from this creature's ability to change its color and to merge into the background. Families that assume this style are aware of the differences between the home and host cultures and encourage their children to live in harmony with both. They encourage their children to behave, dress, eat, and speak as is customary in the indigenous society when not at home, while simultaneously adhering to their original cultural behavior at home. These families manage to preserve both the ties to their original culture and the sense of continuity with the host culture. They maintain a bi-cultural identity.

If these three categories are taken not as separate profiles but as forming a continuum between two poles, from separation to integration, specific groups can be placed somewhere between two categories, and not necessarily fitted to one precise category only. Roer-Strier's model of parenting takes a psychological perspective from which to explain the acculturation of migrating groups to a host country, while the Parekh and Ogbu typologies apply a sociological framework. Thus the findings in this study emerge from a more holistic paradigm and are more generally applicable to the acculturation process of migrant parents.

Russian Jews

Russian Jews have a long history of settlement in territories of the FSU. Evidence exists of Jewish settlements on the shores of the Black Sea in the first millennium (Dubnov, 1975). Until 1772, the Jews were not allowed to settle within the boundaries of Russia. The situation changed during the reign of the Empress Catherine II, who embarked on an assertive military policy on the southern borders of the Russian Empire. Vast territories were annexed to it, including modern Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, and Eastern Poland. Numerous Jewish populations inhabiting these territories automatically became citizens of Russia. The Jewish population was restricted in its movement and freedom of settlement in accordance with decrees on the Pale of Settlement.

On the eve of the great reforms of the nineteenth century, the Tsarist government and Jewish elites attempted to establish a policy of “selective emancipation.” In contrast to Europe, the Jews in Russia were to be integrated not into society at large but into various estates (*sosloviia*). The judicial reform of 1894 abolished the Pale of Settlement, leading to a marked rise in the Jewish presence in the Russian capital and in large and small towns throughout the empire (Dubnov, 1975).

The end of the nineteenth century witnessed not only the onset of the Russification of the Jewish intelligentsia, but also the emergence of Jewish cultural networks (popular press, literary journals, theatre, books, etc.). Jewish activities were evident in three main trends: the integration of Jewish culture into the dominant Russian culture, the renaissance of Modern Hebrew, and the turn to political activism.

The urban migration of hundreds of thousands of Jewish families started after the October 1917 Revolution. The Jews rapidly adopted the modern way of life of secular Soviet citizens and lost contact with their traditional Jewish culture. Specific features of Jewish culture such as the Yiddish language, religious practices, and the maintenance of Jewish households gradually faded. The secularization and Russification of Jews was part of a general assimilation, promoted by official Soviet suppression of traditional Jewish life (Levin, 1988). Jews were deprived of their cultural institutions and synagogues; their schools were closed; and Jewish cultural organizations were banned during the 1920s and 1930s.

The creation of the State of Israel in 1948 was followed by a major anti-Jewish purge in the Soviet Union. After the death of Joseph Stalin in 1953, the repression eased, yet in most respects, official policy toward the Jews remained unchanged until the time of Gorbachev. Jews were subject to discrimination in the spheres of education and work due to the Soviet quota system, which was supposed to secure for national groups equal access to education and professional occupation. In reality, the system of ethnic quotas

limited the opportunities of particular national groups, especially the Jews, as their national quotas were soon filled (Korey, 1973; Levin 1988). Nevertheless, in 1989, the Jews constituted the Soviet Union's best-educated national group.

The Jews' loyalty to the Soviet state, especially after the creation of the State of Israel, was regarded as ambiguous. Jews were excluded from serving in the Soviet diplomatic corps and from influential political positions. Soviet Jews spoke Russian as their native language and identified themselves with Russian culture (Gorlizki, 1990).; effectively, they were "culturally Russians, but legally and socially Jews" (Gitelman, 1972).

The Jewish immigrants' cultural experiences of their life in Russia play an essential role in the acculturation process in Israel. This is evident in two contexts simultaneously: the local Israeli and the transnational global. In the Israeli context, FSU immigrants are visibly different both culturally and demographically from most sectors of Israeli society. Large sectors of Israeli Jewish society display attitudes of basic hostility to the new immigrants (Leshem, 1998). Negative attitudes are apparent across all sectors of veteran residents. Soviet Jews are seen as not "Jewish" enough for the religious sector and not Zionist enough for the secular sector of Israeli society.

On the other hand, in the global context, new immigrants feel themselves different from the veterans. Most Russian Jews see Israel as an "Oriental," "non-European" state ruled by religious laws and less advanced than Russia. The Jewish Russian community in Israel figures as part of a transnational community united by a common language and cultural affinities (Remennik, 1999; Siegel, 1998). The new immigrants from Russia have every opportunity to keep and explore ties with their previous social, professional, and cultural networks, which was impossible prior to perestroika. They are also able to generate new, transnational networks.

A considerable number of immigrants to Israel are non-Jews, most of whom entered Israel due to mixed marriages. The influx of non-Jewish immigrants from FSU poses a challenge to the Israeli authorities and to civic society. From the viewpoint of Israel, immigration was "the *raison d'être* of the Jewish State" (Jones, 1996: 9). Zionist ideology always leaves an open door to any Jew worldwide characterizing Israel as a site for Jewish refuge. Israel provides new immigrants with more economic rights (in housing, home appliances, personal goods, tax breaks, education, and job training) than any other country.

From 1989 to 1997, some 722,400 Soviet immigrants entered Israel (Israel Ministry of Absorption, 1998). In 1995, the median age of Soviet immigrants was 36.2 years, whereas the Israeli median age (Jews only, including immigrants) for that year was 29 years (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1998: p. 3). Highly educated professionals accounted for 58% of immigrants,

including the academic and free professions, as opposed to 27% of veteran residents (Ministry of Absorption, 1997). Of the 1992 FSU immigration, 36.2% were scientific and academic workers, of whom only 7.1% actually worked in this category. In 1995, the same numbers respectively were 22.0% and 2.3% (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1996). The immigrant workforce is characterized mainly by underemployment (Ministry of Absorption, 1998).

According to the Israeli government's model of "direct absorption" for the FSU immigrants, they were allowed to choose where to settle. They did so mainly in urban areas all over the country. Many immigrants could not afford expensive apartments in the major cities so they settled in small development towns. This changed the demographic as well as the cultural characteristics of many such towns that had been inhabited mainly by Oriental Jews (Gonen, 2000; Siegel, 1998). The Soviet immigrants now comprise 20% to 50% of the population of these towns.

In 2000, there were 112,413 immigrants from the FSU in the formal education system in grades one through twelve. (Israel Ministry of Education and Culture (2002). Based on data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, 2001, they composed 9.98% of the student population. Of the new school classes formed in Israel in 1995, 44% were created due to an influx of immigrants (Israel Ministry of Education and Culture, 1995).

The main task in the absorption of immigrant students was seen as Hebrew language instruction (Horowitz, 1998). Supplementary lessons for immigrant students were subsidized: extra lessons once a week in their first year; 1.8 weekly hours for two years in junior high school, and two weekly hours for students in the eleventh and twelfth grade studying for their matriculation exams (Israel Ministry of Education, 1993/1994). Schools with a high percentage of immigrants (10% and over) received funding for four weekly hours of Hebrew instruction per student (Israel Ministry of Education, 1994). An additional budget, the so-called "absorption basket," transferred directly to schools, was provided for textbooks, teaching aids, school trips, and direct help, amounting to NIS (New Israel Shekels) 500 per student (more than \$100).

Earlier, from the end of the 1950s, the Education Ministry's main efforts had been devoted to the advancement of immigrant children from Asia and North Africa. The prevailing ideology was the "melting-pot," which, in fact, adopted a highly assimilatory position. In consequence of the flow of immigrants after the 1967 war, the Ministry established the unit for Immigrant Absorption. From the 1990s, it also began to distribute resources, mainly in support of the weaker groups, for example, Ethiopians and Caucasus Jews (from the Caucasus and Asian parts of FSU).

In the courses sponsored by the Ministry of Education, the education of minorities is seen through two basic contrasting perspectives: one is the

“cultural deficits” model, which focuses on compensatory and enrichment programs to improve the chances of integration. The other is the “cultural relativistic model,” an egalitarian model that stresses the legitimacy of living as cultural collectivities outside the mainstream (Modley, 1986). Traditionally, in Israel, “cultural deficits” was the principal model. Although it did not suit the FSU immigration of the 1990s, Israel has been slow to move to the relativistic model.

Prior to the 1990s, the Israeli government took responsibility for national (general) policy on immigrant absorption. It established absorption centers for the well being of the immigrants, providing housing, cultural and educational activities, and Hebrew classes. However, in the 1990s, the policy was changed to the so-called direct absorption model. The government withdrew its comprehensive responsibility and supported the FSU immigrants economically and by other means, but did not try to direct their day-to-day life (Siegel, 1998). The hidden message of this type of absorption was that the immigrants should assume this responsibility themselves. The education system acted similarly. The Ministry of Education let school principals assume responsibility for absorption policy and its implementation. No guidelines were written, and no extra supervision was added or implemented.

In the past, new immigrants in Israel often suffered difficulties with the prospect of assimilation (Smootha, 1978). According to one view, this situation has not changed: Israel has never adopted pluralism as an official policy or as an educational policy (Horowitz, 1991). Swirski (1990) views the situation in the educational system as one of explicit assimilation. Traditionally, the Israeli educational system has de-socialized new immigrants from their previous culture and socialized them to their new Israeli identity (Bar-Yosef, 1981). “In Israel, the dominant culture has always emphasized a unifying attitude towards Jewish immigrant groups in a perspective of Jewish nation building” (Ben-Rafael, 1996: 140). However, according to other views, Israel is becoming a more pluralistic nation, which practices a policy of cultural pluralism with the current wave of FSU immigrants (Smootha, 1994). The assimilation process in the educational system belongs to the past, and for the last two decades, there has been a shift towards pluralism and multiculturalism (Eisikovits & Beck, 1990). Iram holds that a profound change occurred in the Israeli educational system during the 1970s and 1980s, which resulted in cultural pluralism. The Soviet and Ethiopian immigrants raised the issue of the proper balance between the need to preserve their former culture and the ability of the educational system to meet this need (Iram, 1992). According to this view, the Israeli host society and the FSU immigrants are both adjusting to each other as part of the process. It seems apparent that as a result of the immigrants’ integration, Israel is developing a more pluralistic society than before.

The Pontian Greeks

At the end of the 1980s, Greece, traditionally an emigrant-producing nation also became a host to immigrants and refugees. Most immigrants coming from the former Soviet Union were of Greek origin. Known as Pontian (or Pontic) Greeks, they traced their origins mainly from Pontos on the coast of the Black Sea.

Greeks lived along the Black Sea littoral and in the mountains of the Caucasus, where over 75 Greek colonies were founded around 1000 BC (Agtzidis, 1991, 1995; Fotiades, 1995, 1997; Georgas & Papastilianou, 1993; Kassimati, 1992; Kokkinos, 1991; Kotsionis, 1995; Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou, 1991). Between the 15th and 20th centuries C.E, owing to the Turkish occupation of their homeland, large numbers of Greeks migrated from mainland Greece, Asia Minor, and the southern coast of the Black Sea to regions in what is today the FSU. They settled mainly on the east coast of the Black Sea, as well as in the urban centers and the interior of Georgia, including Abkhazia, and Armenia. In 1918, more than 700,000 Greeks lived in that area. Greek communities prospered financially and culturally, and Pontian-Greek civilization grew at an unprecedented rate, especially between 1917 and 1937.

Pontian Greeks founded a number of Greek schools and churches and resisted any effort to assimilate. For the first time, intellectuals started writing on various literary and linguistic issues in the Pontian dialect. Furthermore, in Sukhumi (Georgia), the Greek publishing house, Communist, expanded its activities. Greek schools and teaching academies were established, and the Greek National Theater was founded. In the 1920s, Greek communities raised the issue of their autonomy, which resulted in the creation of three autonomous Greek provinces in southern Ukraine and a semi-autonomous Greek province in the Kuban valley of south Russia.

During the Stalinist era, Pontian Greeks were persecuted and deported to Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Siberia, and the remote steppes of Central Asia. In 1985, when Gorbachev came to power instituting a policy of Glasnost, the Greek language and culture could be renewed. Despite this renewal, the resurgence of nationalist conflicts and Islamic fanaticism resulted in the repatriation of thousands of Pontian Greeks to their ancestral homeland. The main factors contributing to their migration included: 1) a personal desire for return to their ancestral homeland; 2) the presence of relatives already residing in Greece; 3) the expectation of a better life and working conditions; 4) the desire to raise their children in a country where the existing language and religion would reinforce their ethnic identity; 5) the civil wars and persecution of minorities in the former Soviet Union; 6) neglect by the post-Soviet state with its lack of support (financial, psychological, etc.) for Pontian

Greeks; and 7) the efforts of the Greek state to strengthen the country's demography and economy through a policy of repatriation.

Small numbers of Pontian Greeks began emigrating from the FSU to Greece in 1987, and the flow continued through the next decade. According to the Panhellenic Union of Pontian Associations, 68,000 Greeks from the FSU migrated to Greece between 1989 and 1993 (Papatheodosiou, 1994). The Greek state adopted a unified integration policy and made limited arrangements for these immigrants, who are known as "repatriated people" (Bada-Tsomokou, 1997). A three-phase process of repatriation is accomplished under the aegis of the National Foundation for the Reception and Settlement of Repatriated People of Greek Descent. In the initial phase, immigrants are received at hospitality centers where they can remain for 15-20 days. In the next phase, they move on to reception settlements where they can stay for 6-7 months. Ultimately, they are encouraged to resettle in areas of permanent residence.

Kassimati (1992) points out that Pontian Greeks arrived in Greece at a time when the country faced significant financial difficulties. The efforts of the Greek state to make a smooth and speedy entry into the European Union demanded measures that would stabilize the Greek economy as well as the reduction of inflation rates and state deficits. These policies resulted in an economic recession and an increase in unemployment rates. In consequence, it became increasingly difficult for the Pontian Greeks to find employment. Moreover, the Pontian Greeks were fewer in numbers than the Russian immigrants to Israel. Consequently, they had relatively less influence on the Greek economy than the latter group had on the Israeli economy.

Upon their arrival in Greece, the Pontian Greeks have encountered significant problems accessing employment and maintaining financial resources. Their financial situation exacerbates the inevitable difficulties with social, cultural, and psychological adaptation and identity-formation (Bada-Tsomokou, 1997; Kassimati, 1992; Kokkinos, 1991; Kotsionis, 1993, 1995; Vergeti, 1991). In Greece, the Pontian Greeks have a higher educational level than the native-born population. Specifically, slightly over 27% of Pontian Greeks have a higher education degree compared with only 7% of the native population. Two thirds (66.2%) of the Pontian Greeks have completed secondary education and gone beyond, compared with only one third (32.2%) of the native population (Greece in Figures, 1999). Yet most of them work as construction workers, cleaners, market vendors, farm workers, or craftspeople; jobs that have little relevance to their previous experience, education and training.

Part-time employment, underemployment, and unemployment are the defining characteristics of the Pontian Greek immigrants' work and occupation

in Greece. No official data are available on the demographics of Pontian immigrants. However, Kasimati (1992) reported the following figures. Most of the Pontians (78%) are employed as technicians and laborers, compared with 42% of them in the FSU and 42% of the native Greek citizens. This increase is matched by a decline in the self-employed (24% of Pontians in the FSU; and 5% of Pontians in Greece, compared with 13% of native Greek citizens) and also a decline in office (white-collar) employees (from 8% before immigration to 0.5% after immigration, as against 11% of native Greek citizens). About the same percentage of all three groups, approximately 10% are employed in the "services."

A significant issue for the Pontian Greek immigrants is the education of their children in the Greek education system. During the last decade, the number of repatriated and foreign students in Greek schools has grown. In 1991-92, 6% of the student population was not born in Greece. Of these students, 49% were from the FSU and 24% were from Albania. According to Damanakis (1997), more than half the foreign and repatriated students attended school in Athens and Thessaloniki, the two major urban centers in Greece (38% and 16.2% respectively).

Official educational policy for the immigrant students in Greece has evolved through three distinct phases; a "welfare-charity" phase (1970-1980) in which a melting pot ideology was prevalent; an "assimilation-compensation" phase (1980-1990) with a number of compensatory measures undertaken for immigrant students; and the current phase (1990 to present) in which a "compensatory-pluralistic" framework underpins the process for dealing with immigrant students (Damanakis, 1997).

In 1983, the law regarding receiving classes and tutorial classes for repatriated and foreign students was amended. A receiving class was formed if there were at least nine repatriated or foreign students in the school. These students received intensive Greek lessons two to three hours daily, followed a separate curriculum, and were mainstreamed only occasionally. Only three students were required for a tutorial class to be formed. These students received up to eight hours per week of remedial teaching after the end of the school day. This law also provided for immigrant students to receive heritage language and culture lessons for two to three hours weekly after completing the regular school schedule and curriculum. However, this aspect of the law was never implemented.

In 1996, the Greek legal code was amended, and, for the first time, the term "intercultural education" for immigrant students was introduced. Several of the "special schools for repatriated students" are now called "schools for intercultural education." In addition, the Special Secretariat for the Education of Students of Greek Origin and of Intercultural Education and the Institute for

the Education of Students of Greek Origin and of Intercultural Education were founded, and a number of intercultural education programs began to be implemented. Despite these efforts to adapt Greek schools to current economic and social developments, they still remain primarily monolingual and mono-cultural schools promoting and perpetuating the ideal of cultural homogeneity. The lingering 'melting pot' mentality effectively prevents the Greek educational system from meeting the educational and psycho-social needs of Greece's recently formed multicultural student population.

The Pontian Greeks maintain national and transnational connections. Some 300 different associations of Pontian Greeks exist in Greece. Pontian organizations are to be found all over the world, creating a transnational network of Pontians. Many of these associations and federations publish their own newspaper or magazine, for example, *Archion tou Pontou* [Archives of Pontos]. Several conferences have been held to discuss Pontian issues. Some took place in the FSU with the participation of Pontian organizations worldwide. For example, in 1989, the first Greek Conference was held in Gelendzhik, in the Russian republic's part of Kavkaz, and in 1999, the scientific conference "The Genocide in Pontos as Part of the Asia Minor Holocaust," was held in Boston, Massachusetts in the United States. Nevertheless, because these organizations tend to conduct their activities within the Pontian Greek community, they have limited influence on the dominant culture and a narrower power base than the Soviet-Israeli associations.

Two research questions were proposed for the study: 1. Which parenting style typified the Greek and the Israeli immigrant parents? 2. Which category in the Ogbu typology most suited the Greek and the Israeli immigrant parents?

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Two sample groups were drawn by ethnicity and country of origin. A comparison of the sample populations by ethnic history and demographics is provided below followed by a detailed description of the sample and the data collection methods.

Although both ethnic groups originated in the Soviet Union and are comprised of children of similar ages, there are notable differences with regard to their circumstances. The Soviet Jews are older than the host population in Israel, whereas the Pontian Greeks are younger on average than the native Greeks. The Pontian Greeks have larger families than the Jewish FSU immigrants. The Jews originated mainly from large urban centers in Europe

whereas the Pontians came from rural areas and smaller towns in the so-called “national republics” of Georgia (Caucasus) and Kazakhstan (Central Asia).

Both groups suffered discrimination, but the Pontians also lost most of their civil rights and were subject to a forced internal migration within the Soviet Union. The Jews were more assimilated and more rooted in the Russian culture and Soviet economy than the Pontians who were marginalized from the mainstream culture and occupied a lower socio-economic status than the Jews. The Pontians did not assimilate but retained their own unique culture and dialect, whereas the Jews did not keep their language (Yiddish) and formed affiliations within the dominant Russian culture. The Jews’ circumstances caused them to view Russian culture as their frame of reference; thus they still preserve some of their cultural and social connections with their former place of residence. Although many members of both groups still live in the FSU, the Israeli immigrants are far more active in maintaining ties with their past affiliation in the FSU.

The geographical regions where the Pontians resided in the 1990s became steadily less stable with intermittent internecine conflicts disrupting the area. In contrast, the areas where most of the Jews resided were stable and peaceful. In consequence, the push and pull factors for migration differed between the two groups, as we shall discuss below.

The Soviet Jews settled all over Israel while the Pontians settled mainly in the largest urban centers of continental Greece. This was due to the relative size of the two groups. The Jewish immigrants numbered about one million, too large a group to be accommodated altogether in the center of Israel. Since less than 100,000 Pontian Greeks emigrated to Greece, they could be concentrated in one area. Moreover, the higher educational and socio-economic backgrounds of the Soviet Jews allowed them greater mobility within Israel than the Pontian Greeks enjoyed within Greece.

Sample size in the two groups was similar ($n = 101$ in Greece; $n = 116$ in Israel). In both samples, the majority of respondents were female (73% in Greece; 82% in Israel). Years of residency in the host country were also similar (5.8 in Greece, 5.4 in Israel with no significant difference by T-test). The samples differed regarding immigrants’ place of origin (74% of the Israeli sample and only 16% of the Greek sample originated in Russia and Europe). Likewise, years of education were also significantly different (mean years of education = 13.9 of the Greek sample and 15.0 for the Israeli sample with a significant difference by T-test: 3.28; $p=0.001$).

Israeli sample

The study in Israel was conducted in a northern Jewish town (population 6,000) inhabited mainly by Israeli-born Jews, with an average ethnic mix of Sephardi and Ashkenazi Jews. The group of Jewish immigrants from the FSU that had settled in the town constituted about 29% of the population. In 1997, more than 20% of all students at local schools were new immigrants. The Israeli data were collected in 1998 by a Russian-speaking researcher, who interviewed 82.9% of all elementary school immigrant parents in their mother tongue at their homes.

Greek sample

The Greek sample was drawn from 31 public schools in the Greater Metropolitan Area of Thessaloniki, the second largest city in Greece. The schools were randomly selected from areas of the city where large numbers of Pontian Greeks lived. The researcher visited the selected schools and gave the children questionnaires in both the Russian and Greek languages. The children were directed to take the questionnaires home to their parents, who were asked to complete and return them. The response rate was 48.1%, which was considered quite high. The data were collected in 1997.

FINDINGS**Push-Pull Migration Factors**

The different motives for immigration were probed. The main pull factor for the Russian Jewish migration was the improvement of opportunities for themselves and their children. The main pull factor for the Pontian Greek migration was the strength of their attachment to their ethnic group. Both groups were also subject to factors that pushed them towards emigration from the FSU, although the Russian Jews experienced these factors to a greater extent than the Pontians.

Language Acquisition

Language acquisition is a major component of the acculturation process. It reflects an attitude toward the local language and is an important step for communication and social integration (Ben-Rafael et al., 1994). The questionnaire probed two aspects of language acquisition by adult immigrants in both countries: 1) self-reports of proficiency in the host country's language, and 2) language use of mother tongue and host language within and outside the home.

In the Israeli case, Russian-speaking immigrants were exposed to two language networks: Hebrew and Russian. The exposure of adult immigrants to

the Hebrew language was restricted mainly to everyday communication, and less to professional or official communication. Most of the new immigrants came to Israel as adults and had difficulty employing the Hebrew language for everyday situations. Their attitude toward the host country's language could be characterized as instrumental: it was a key to successful integration into professional and job markets. Their needs to communicate culturally and for information purposes could be met by the Russian language network.

The Russian language network functioned not only in the family and in everyday communication, but also through highly developed media including press, broadcasting, and entertainment (Markowitz, 1993, 1995; Horowitz & Leshem, 1998). These networks operate at three interrelated levels: the local, the national or Israeli level, and the transnational level reinforcing Russian language usage and retention.

The data regarding the language proficiency level proved similar for the two groups. Less than 1% stated that they did not speak Hebrew or Greek. A small number (1%) of the Israeli sample ($n=116$) and 7% of the Greek sample ($n=101$) knew only a few words and phrases. The most common answer was that they could communicate with friends and neighbors (54% of the Israeli and 46% Greek sample). In both samples, 22% answered that they read and wrote well, while 22% of the Israeli sample and 24% of the Greek sample stated that they had no problem with the language. The categories were ranked from 1 to 5, and the mean was found to be almost the same in the two groups (Israeli sample 3.7, Greek sample 3.6); according to T-test the differences were not significant. These results are somewhat surprising, as the Pontian Greeks were more exposed to the Greek language before their immigration than the Russian Jews were to Hebrew. Spearman correlation coefficient was computed between the language proficiency and years of residence in the host country, $r=-0.410$ ($p=0.000$) for Israelis and $r=-0.305$ ($p=0.002$) for Greeks. The longer the parents had lived in Israel and Greece, the better their proficiency with the local language.

Another aspect of language acquisition was its actual use by the immigrants in different spheres, namely at home and outside. Israeli as well as Greek parents used "only the mother tongue" at home more than outside. Greek respondents (29%, $n=101$) more than Israeli (4%, $n=116$) used only the local language outside; none of the Israeli sample and only 3% of the Greek sample used that language at home. The use of both languages was found to be very common in both samples: 44% of the Israeli and 66% of the Greek respondents used both languages at home. Out of the house most of the Israeli sample (90%) and well over half of the Greek sample (65%) spoke both the local language and their mother tongue. The latter was used exclusively at home more by the Pontian Greek sample (56%) than by the Israeli sample (31%). Both

groups (6% Israeli sample and 5% Greek sample) rarely spoke only their mother tongue outside the home.

The Israeli respondents retained their previous language more than the Greeks both in and outside the home. Regarding the language spoken at home, the Israeli sample used Russian as the mother tongue, while for the Greek sample both the Greek and the Russian languages were spoken. Outside the home, respondents of both groups spoke both languages, while the second largest category in the Israeli sample spoke the mother tongue and the second largest category of the Greek sample spoke the local language. One possible explanation for this difference may be the similarity of the Greek language to the Russian language, which was spoken with a Greek Pontian dialect, compared to the strong distinction between the Hebrew and Russian languages spoken by the Israeli sample. Another reason for the difference between the two samples could be the greater demands of the Greek host society on Pontian Greeks to speak only Greek if they wished to be considered Greeks

Preferred School Language

Parents were asked what language they preferred their children to be taught at school. Most of the Greek parents (59%, $n=101$) preferred the local language (compared with 22%, $n=116$ of the Israeli sample), whereas most Israeli parents (78%) preferred both mother tongue and local as the schooling language (compared with 37% of the Greek sample). Only a small fraction (1% of the Israeli sample; 3% of the Greek sample) preferred Russian as the language of instruction. Again, the Greek respondents tended to make more use of the local language than the Israeli respondents, who leaned more toward retaining their previous language as the language of instruction. The difference was found statistically significant by T-test ($T=5.254$; $p=0.000$).

Spearman correlation coefficients were computed between the preferred language at school and language proficiency, $r=-0.042$ for Israelis; $r=-0.209$ for Greeks ($p=0.036$). No connection was found between these two variables for the Israelis. There was a positive correlation between the Greek parents' proficiency with Greek and their preference for the use of Greek at school; the higher their proficiency the more they preferred the use of Greek in the schools. Similar results were found regarding preferred school language and number of years' residence in the host country (Israelis: $r=0.08$; Greeks: $r=-0.226$; $p=0.023$). No connection emerged between these two variables concerning the Israelis, but the longer the Greek parents lived in Greece, they more they preferred the use of Greek at school.

Immigrant Parents and Schooling

Immigrant parents' adjustment to the Israeli and Greek school systems was probed with regard to questions concerning satisfaction with and involvement in school. Siegel (1998) called the most recent wave of immigration to Israel "Parental immigration." One of the main push-pull factors for immigration to Israel was the parents' attempt to safeguard their children's future. They attributed great importance to the children's education, which was understood as an investment in the future. Their expectations of the Israeli school system were based on two kinds of standards, those of the last school in the FSU as to discipline, fundamental knowledge, respect for teachers, physics-mathematics orientation and those of a "modern technological culture" with a universal character.

Parents were questioned about their expectations of school in terms of its instrumentality in their children's future plans. Fifty-five percent of Israeli respondents and 29% of Greek respondents were certain that schooling would help (much/very-much) their children to find good jobs in the future. Israelis (62%) more than Pontian Greeks (35%) thought that school could help in the future because "school studies provide knowledge useful for the future." The differences with respect to both questions were statistically significant (T-test: $p=0.000$). Thus the Israeli parents expected to use the school in a more instrumental manner to improve their children's chances in the future.

Only 6% of Israeli respondents were convinced that their children had more opportunities for their future life in the FSU, as opposed to 49% of the Greek parents. This reflected the more optimistic view of the host country held by Israeli parents.

Satisfaction with School

The parents were asked about their satisfaction as well as their dissatisfaction with various aspects of the school environment in the host country as compared with previous conditions in the FSU. The question was open and the parents could give more than one answer using a multi-response procedure. Some parents answered more than one answer, thus, the number of answers are not equal to the number of parents. The categories selected are not exclusive, and parents could select more than one category together. The data presented in Table 1 and Table 2 are derived from a number of answers involving different aspects of the school atmosphere as opposed to any physical conditions present in the school.

Pontian Greek parents manifested more satisfaction than Israeli parents about almost all aspects of present as well as past schooling of their children. Only 21% of the Israelis gave one or more reasons for satisfaction with the new school, while the majority (66%) of the Greeks did so. The

most frequent reason for Israelis' dissatisfaction with the new school was the level of academic achievement. Regarding the new school, most Israeli parents were satisfied with the extra-curricular activities.

Table 1. Parents' satisfaction with school dynamics

School environment	Israeli parents		Greek parents	
	New school	Previous school	New school	Previous school
<u>Aspects</u>				
Classes / education	19%	40%	65%	43%
Teachers/ teaching	7%	6%	8%	14%
Excursions/extra-curriculum activities	48%	19%	13%	11%
School climate	26%	26%	10%	22%
School function	-	9%	3%	8%
Everything	-	-	1%	2%
<i>Total responses – Count</i>	27	47	154	184
<i>N valid cases</i>	24	36	67	78

Table 2. Parents' dissatisfaction with school

School environment	Israeli parents		Greek parents	
	New school	Previous school	New school	Previous school
<u>Aspects</u>				
Classes / education	33%	17%	38%	48%
Teachers/ teaching	-	-	15%	11%
Excursions/ activities	53%	63%	7%	2%
School climate	13%	17%	28%	34%
School function	1%	2%	12%	5%
Everything	-	-	-	-
<i>Total responses - Count</i>	67	60	68	44
<i>N valid cases</i>	55	54	40	30

Israeli parents expressed more criticism than Greek parents about the present school as well as the previous one. Close to half of the Israeli parents mentioned at least one aspect of dissatisfaction with the new and the previous school. The number of Greek parents who criticized the new and the previous schools was smaller than the number of Israelis and lower than the number of parents who were satisfied with the school. In contrast to the Greek parents, the Israelis tended to be more critical than satisfied. This held for the new and the old schools. To probe the difference between the two sets of answers, satisfied vs. dissatisfied, a ratio was constructed: the ratio of actual number of

satisfied parents who answered (“valid cases”) divided by the number of dissatisfied parents who answered. The higher the ratio, the more satisfied the parents were, and the lower the ratio, the more dissatisfied the parents were. The index for the Greek parents was 2.6 (78/30) regarding the previous school and 1.67 regarding the new school. The Israeli parents’ ratios were 0.6 and 0.44 respectively. This ratio manifests the differences between the two groups, demonstrating that the Pontian Greeks were much more satisfied with the school. The connection between the number of years of education and the criticism against school and levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction was not found using Pearson correlations.

Parents’ Involvement in Children’s Studies

An important dimension of parenting style and school-parent relations was the amount and kinds of help with homework that parents’ provided to their children. In the previous school, the Greek parents (n=99) helped their children in preparing homework significantly more than the Israeli parents (87% and 72% respectively; T-test=-2.73; p=0.002). The trend was contrary in the new school (56% of the Greek sample; 77% of the Israeli sample; T-test=3.28, p=0.001).

Parents’ Visits to School

Parents’ involvement in their children’s schooling also included visits to the school to find out about their children’s performance and behavior, as well as to inform the teachers of their children’s difficulties. Table 3 sets out data on the frequency of school visits.

Table 3. Parents’ visits to school

Visits	New school		Previous school	
	Israel	Greece	Israel	Greece
Frequency				
Never	1%	30%	1%	13%
Only on parents’ day	57%	43%	47%	41%
3 - 6 times a year	14%	7%	1%	6%
Every month	22%	18%	25%	34%
Almost every week	6%	1%	26%	6%
Mean	2.8	2.2	3.3	2.8
Total Count	102	116	116	99

Both groups visited the new school less than they had visited the previous school. Israeli parents visited the previous and the new school more often than the Greeks. Ninety-nine percent of the Israelis visited the new school at least on parents’ day, compared with a significant group of Greeks who never visited the new school.

DISCUSSION

Pontian Greeks and Russian Jews emigrated from the FSU at the same time. Their background evinced both similar and different features. The data presented in this study indicate differences between the groups, but also within them. Each group was composed of subgroups with a different focal point. Among both Israelis and Greeks at least two subgroups existed, characterized by specific narratives. We termed these the primary and the secondary narrative-profiles.

To construct these narrative-profiles the following eight variables were considered: Language use at home; Language use out of the home; Preference for language of instruction in school in the local education system; Parents' satisfaction with school; Parents' help with children's homework; Parents' visits to school; Parents' expectations of school studies for finding a better job in the future; Parents' views about usefulness of school knowledge for future life in general. Two narrative-profiles of parents were traced in both samples. The primary profile was developed on the basis of the highest frequency in each of these categories. The secondary profile was developed on the basis of the second highest frequency and contained at least 20% of the parents' answers regarding each category.

In the Greek sample, 62.7% of the parents matched at least five of the eight possible variables with 42.5% matching at least six and 16.2% matching at least seven variables. With regard to the Israeli sample, 86.1% of parents matched at least five out of the eight possible variables with 62.6% matching at least six and 30.4% matching at least seven of the variables. Thus, the Israeli parents constituted a more homogeneous group than the Greek parents, as they better matched a similar profile.

Pontian Greeks who constituted the primary profile spoke both languages (Greek and mother tongue) at home and outside the home. They preferred their children to study in Greek in the local education system. They held positive non-critical views of the education system. They were involved in their children's education but less than they had been in the FSU regarding help with homework and school visits. This group had low expectations of the school for future job training. They did not think highly of the usefulness of knowledge gained at school.

Pontian Greeks constituting the secondary profile spoke the mother tongue at home and mainly Greek outside. They preferred their children to study in both the Greek and Russian languages in the local education system as opposed to Greek only instruction. They did not hold positive views of the education system and were critical of a variety of its aspects. They were not involved in their children's schooling regarding help with homework, and they

never visited the new school. This group of Pontian Greek parents had many expectations of the school for future job training, and thought highly of the usefulness of school education.

Pontian Greek Parent Profiles

<u>Components</u>	<u>Primary profile</u>	<u>Secondary profile</u>
Language use at home	Greek and mother tongue	Mother tongue
Language use outside	Greek and mother tongue	Greek
Language of instruction in school in the local education system	Greek	Both
Parents' satisfaction with school	Positive	Critical
Parents' help with children's homework	Less than in previous school	Less than in previous school
Parents' visits to school	Less than in previous school	Never
Parents' expectations of school	Low	High
Parents' views about school studies	Low	High

Israeli Parent Profiles

<u>Components</u>	<u>Primary profile</u>	<u>Secondary profile</u>
Language use at home	Mother tongue	Hebrew and mother tongue
Language use outside	Hebrew and mother tongue	Hebrew and mother tongue
Language of instruction in school in the local education system	Hebrew and mother tongue	Hebrew
Parents' satisfaction with school	Critical	Positive
Parents' help with children's homework	More than in previous school	Less than in previous school
Parents' visits to school	Less than in previous school, but regularly	Less than in previous school, but occasionally
Parents' expectations of school	High	Low
Parents' views about school studies	High	Low

Soviet Jews who constituted the primary profile spoke their mother tongue at home and both their mother tongue and Hebrew outside the home. They preferred their children to study in both languages in the local education system. They were not satisfied with the education system and were critical of a variety of its aspects. They helped their children a great deal with their homework, even more than previously in the FSU. They visited the school at least occasionally or even regularly. This group of parents expected the school to be instrumental in future job training, and thought highly of the usefulness of school education. Soviet Jews forming the secondary profile spoke their mother tongue and Hebrew at home and outside the home. They preferred their children to study in Hebrew in the local education system. They were fairly satisfied with the Israeli education system, mainly with school trips and extra-curricular activities, and did not criticize it. They rarely helped their children with their homework, as they had done previously in the FSU. They visited the school only occasionally, but they did not fail to make these visits. This group of parents did not expect school to be instrumental in future job training and did not think highly of the usefulness of school education. Thus in the Israeli and Greek cases, the primary and secondary profiles were representative of most of the parents, although other profiles of smaller groups were to be found. The profiles were based on generalizations, thus a specific parent could hold views of both primary and secondary subgroups regarding different issues. Moreover, a specific profile could have characteristics of different typologies of parenting style and minority status.

CONCLUSIONS

Parents' profiles in the Israeli and the Greek sample were compared with minority types (Ogbu) and parenting styles (Roer-Strier). The Pontian Greeks' primary profile can be classified mainly as Immigrant minority type and a Cuckoo style of parenting. As representatives of an immigrant minority, they preferred the local language, Greek, as the language of instruction at school. They also had low expectations of school, yet, they were non-critical of the new education system. Their acquiescence in this regard conveys a tacit acceptance of the cultural supremacy of the dominant group. Along the continuum between the Chameleon and the Cuckoo parenting style, Greek parents of the primary profile were closer to the latter. However, they were involved in their children's schooling, a feature characteristic of the Chameleon type.

The secondary profile of the Pontian Greek parents tended more toward the Autonomous than the Immigrant Minority type, and more towards the Chameleon than the Cuckoo parenting style. They preferred their children

to study at school in Greek, but they also spoke their mother tongue; they were both critical of school and had high expectations of it. They spoke their mother tongue at home, and Greek outside the home, as is typical of the Chameleon parenting style and also of Autonomous minorities. However, they were not involved in their children's education, a position more typical of the Immigrant type and Cuckoo style. The Soviet Jews' primary profile was quite distinctly the Autonomous Minority type, which is congruent with the Chameleon parenting style. Their language use was Russian at home and Hebrew and Russian outside the home. They were critical of their children's new school and were closely involved in their children's homework. They visited the school regularly and had high expectations of school. The Russian Jews' secondary profile matched the Immigrant Minority type and the Cuckoo parenting style. They spoke Hebrew and Russian at home and outside the home. They preferred Hebrew as the school's language of instruction. They were satisfied with the local education system and were not involved in their children's education. Their low expectations of school can be regarded as matching an Immigrant Minority type, but not a Cuckoo parenting style.

Some respondents in both groups of parents did not belong to either of the two profiles, and were closer on the continuum to the Kangaroo style of parenting. These parents preferred Russian as the school language, were highly involved in their children's studies, helped them a lot, and visited the school almost every week. On the Autonomous–Immigrant Minority continuum, they appeared at the "far" extreme of the Autonomous Minority.

The two Israeli profiles matched the two models of minority typology and of parenting styles better than the two Greek profiles. This difference also highlights the difference between the Greek and the Israeli sample. The two different profiles of each group point to the complexity of the situation. Jewish immigrants in Israel demonstrate a diverse range of acculturation styles (Ilatov and Shamai, 1999). Members of the receiving society demonstrate a range of attitudes towards them (Shamai and Ilatov, 1998). Both groups utilize different strategies to cope. The Immigrant Minority type has similar features to the Cuckoo parenting style, while the Autonomous Minority type has similar features to the Chameleon and Kangaroo parenting styles. Although the samples differ, particularly in that the Israeli sample resided in a small peripheral town, while the Greek sample resided in a large urban center, the findings of difference between the samples cannot be attributed to localized demographic differences between the samples. The Israeli sample from the small town while emigrating from large urban centers in the FSU, manifested a powerful and pronounceable profile, which is congruent with the national situation of the Soviet immigrants in Israel (Shamai and Ilatov, 1998). The Pontian sample was characterized by the national framework of maintaining

connections within this ethnic minority in Greece (Kassimati, 1992). The Israeli sample retained its national and transnational diaspora networks as well. Soviet Jews saw themselves as part of a global Russian culture, which they tried to preserve in Israel. The Jewish community in the FSU was more resourceful and numerous than the Pontian community in the Caucasus and Kazakhstan. Thus, transnational migration for the Jews was more important than it was for the Pontians. This can also partly explain the difference between the groups. The differences between the two profiles can be attributed to the differences regarding the situation and views of each group before and after immigration. Most of the differences can be attributed to the differences that existed before immigration. The parenting style model for the two groups differs with regard to strategies of behavior. Most of the Israeli-Soviet sample belonged to the Chameleon style, and the implication for them and for Israeli society is that they are part of the change in Israeli society, which now is more pluralistic than ever before. They influence the way Israeli society treats its minorities. Israeli society allows ethnic groups more space than before, due to a cultural negotiation process initiated by the immigrants. This occurred during the 1990s, when Israeli society was ready to accept the new non-assimilatory reality. Another implication is that this style of parenting also means adopting a more critical view of Israeli society, namely opting out of the educational system and starting a Russian-style educational system. This is a recent development in Israel. The significance for the Pontian Greeks is the acceptance of the current assimilatory context in the host country and the lack of interest or ability to change it. For the most part, the Pontian Greeks have adopted a Cuckoo style of parenting; thus they have no separate educational, social, or political aspirations as a group. This situation accords with the largely assimilatory approach of Greek society and does not create a conflict with it.

These differences can be also analyzed by means of the Ogbu classification. The classification of Israeli immigrants as “autonomous minorities” and the Greek immigrants as “immigrant minorities” supports the implications discussed above. The FSU Israeli immigrants try to establish their own educational system, not as alternative day schools but as a supplementary education system founded on their own ideology. They accept the mainstream ideology of Israeli society, but they are powerful enough to sustain their cultural frame of reference, which encourages and features success. The Greek sample lacks political power and may accept prejudice and discrimination as the price of achieving their ultimate objectives, which are, in any case, to become part of the Greek society.

The Pontians and the Jews manifest two opposing strategies. The former lived in a non-assimilatory situation in FSU society, and after their

immigration they assimilated into Greek society. Conversely, the Jews, who assimilated in the FSU, do not assimilate in Israel. Their previous experience seems to influence their current strategies of integration into the receiving society. However, this is only one of the effects causing the diversity in the parents' profiles. Other aspects noted, such as different socio-economic backgrounds and the different expectations of school, also affect immigrant parents' profiles. These variables, previous ethnic relations, socio-economic status, and school expectations, have a combined effect, and it is impossible to separate them.

Differences between Israeli and Pontian parents' profiles exhibit three forms of diversity in multi-cultural society, in Parekh's (2000) terms. The Pontian Greeks can be described in two ways. Most of them seem not to be interested in playing the "pluralist game." They prefer to downplay the difference between them and Greek host society. However, some Pontians show certain aspects of "sub-culture diversity," namely that evinced in a society with many groups that have different beliefs and life-styles that share their society's dominant system of meanings and values (Parekh, 2000, p.3).

The Israeli sample participates far more in the "pluralistic game." Their diversity and uniqueness seem to be a lever for advancement and their acculturation to Israeli society includes the three forms of diversity Parekh has posited for a modern society and multicultural society, "sub-culture diversity," "perspective diversity," and "communal diversity."

Similar studies on acculturation aspects of immigrant parents who immigrated from a similar place and at the same time to two different countries are rare. These specific results are not one-dimensional, but point to the complexity of the findings. Many questions still need to be explored in further research.

REFERENCES

- Agtzidis, V. (1995). *Pontian Greeks. From genocide and Stalinism to perestroika* (3rd edition). Thessaloniki: Kyriakides Bros (Greek).
- _____. (1991). The persecution of Pontic Greeks in the Soviet Union. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 4 (4), 372-381.
- Bada-Tsomokou, K. (1997). Greeks from the former Soviet Union in Greece: Exclusion, integration, and the dilemma of identity. In D. Sotiriou (ed.), *Forms of social exclusion and its mechanisms* (pp. 101-118). Athens: Ideokinisi, (Greek).

- Bar-Yosef, R. (1981). Desocialization and resocialization: The adjustment process of immigrants. In E. Krausz (Ed.), *Studies of Israeli society (1): Migration, ethnicity and community* (pp. 19-37). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Barankin, T., Konstantareas, M., & F. de Bosset (1989). Adaptation of recent Soviet Jewish immigrants and their children to Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 34, 512-518.
- Ben-Rafael, E. (1996). Multiculturalism in sociological perspective. In R. Baubock, H. Heller, & A. Zolberg (Eds.), *The challenge of diversity* (pp. 133-154). Aldershot, England: European Centre.
- Ben-Rafael, E., Olshain, E., & Giets, I. (1994). *Aspects of identity and language acquisition among immigrants from the Commonwealth of Independent States*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University (Hebrew).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2001). *Statistical abstract of Israel (52)*. Jerusalem.
- _____ (1998). *Statistical abstract of Israel (49)*. Jerusalem.
- _____ (1997). *Statistical abstract of Israel (48)*. Jerusalem.
- _____ (1996). *Statistical abstract of Israel (47)*. Jerusalem.
- Damanakis, M. (1997). *Educating repatriated and foreign students in Greece. An intercultural approach*. Athens: Gutenberg (Greek).
- Dubnov, S. (1975). *History of the Jews in Poland in Russia*. New York: Ktav.
- Eisikovits, R. (1995). "I'll tell you what school should do for us": How immigrant youth from the former U.S.S.R. view their high school experience in Israel. *Youth and Society*, 27 (2), 1995, 230-255.
- Eisikovits, R., & Beck, R. (1990). Models governing the education of new immigrant children in Israel. *Comparative Education Review*, 34 (2), 177-195.
- Faist, T. (2000). Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 2, 189-222.
- Fotiades, K. (1997). Greeks and the Greek education in the former Soviet Union. In: M. Damanakis (Ed.), *Educating repatriated and foreign students in Greece. An intercultural approach* (pp. 127-141). Athens: Gutenberg (Greek).
- _____ (Ed.) (1995). *The Greeks in the Former Soviet Union (history-education)*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides Bros.
- Georgas, D., & Papastilianou, A. (1993). *Acculturation of Pontian Greeks and Albanian Greeks in Greece: Psychological processes of adaptation*. Athens: General Secretariat of Emigrant Greeks (Greek).

- Gitelman, Z. (1972). *Assimilation, acculturation, and national consciousness among Soviet Jews*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Gonen, A. (1998). Settlement of the immigrants: Geographical patterns. In M. Sicron and E. Leshem (Eds.), *Profile of an immigrant wave. The absorption process of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, 1990-1995* (pp.232-269). Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew).
- Goodman, J. (1997). National multiculturalism and transnational migrant politics: Australian and East Timorese. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*,6 (3-4), 457-480.
- Gorlizki, Y. (1990). *Jews. The national question in the Soviet Union*. London: Graham Smith.
- Greece in Figures (1999). *Greek Financial Directory*, ICAP.
- Greenberg, H. (1979). *Israel social problems in perspective*. Tel Aviv: Dekel Academic Press.
- Horowitz, T. (1991). Awareness without legitimation: The Israel educational system's response to cultural differences. *Studies in education* (55/56), 9-18 (Hebrew).
- _____ (1998). Immigrant children and adolescents in the educational system. In: M. Sicron & E. Leshem (Eds.), *Profile of an immigration wave: The absorption process of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, 1990-1995* (pp. 368-408). Jerusalem: Magnes, (Hebrew).
- Horowitz, T., & Leshem, E. (1998). The immigrants from the FSU in the Israeli cultural space. In: M. Sicron & E. Leshem (Eds.), *Profile of an immigrant wave. The absorption process of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, 1990-1995* (pp. 291-233). Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew).
- Ilatov, Z., & Shamai, S. (1999) "Segmented absorption": Israeli students' view of Soviet immigrant students. In Horowitz, T. (Ed.), *Children of the perestroika in Israel*. Lanham (pp.205-217). MD: University Press of America..
- Iram, Y. (1992). Russian and Ethiopian immigrants in Israel: A comparative perspective on educational absorption. *Education and Society*, 10 (1), 85-93.
- Israel Ministry of Absorption (1998). *Immigrant absorption*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).
- _____ . *Immigrant absorption*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).
- Israel Ministry of Education and Culture (2002). Number of students immigrants. Internet (www1.education.gov.il/olim/natunim2.htm). (Hebrew).
- _____ (1995). *The government of Israel believes in education*. Jerusalem: Israeli Government Publication Department (Hebrew).
- _____ (1994). *Director-General's Circular*, 54:7 (March) (Hebrew).

- _____ (1993/94). *Immigrant pupils in 1994: Survey in three localities*. Jerusalem: Pedagogical Secretariat (Hebrew).
- Jewel, S. (1995). In search of Ogbu. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. April 18-22, 1999.
- Jones, C. (1996). *Soviet-Jewish Aliyah, 1989-92*. Midsummer, Norton, Avon: Bookcraft (Bath) Ltd.
- Kassimati, K. (Ed.) (1992). *Pontian immigrants from the former Soviet Union: Their social and economic integration*. Athens: General Secretariat of Emigrant Greeks (Greek).
- Kokkinos, D. (1991). The Greek state's overview of the Pontian issue. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 4 (4), 312-314.
- Korey, W. (1973). *The Soviet Cage. Anti-Semitism in Russia*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Kotsionis, P. (1995). The historical-cultural identity and educational tradition of Pontian Greeks as a prerequisite for the school integration of their children. *Ta Ekpaidevtika*, 39-40, 33-45 (Greek).
- _____ (1993). The dimension of intercultural education in Greek primary schools. *Sygxrono Sxoleio*, 27, 120-126 (Greek).
- Laguerre, M. (1999). State, Diaspora, and Transnational Politics: Haiti Reconceptualised. *Millennium*, 28 (3) , 633-651.
- Leshem, E. (1998). The Israeli Public's Attitudes toward the new immigrants of the 1990s. In E. Leshem & J. Shuval (Eds.), *Immigration to Israel*. New Brunswick (USA): Transaction.
- Levin, N. (1988). *The Jews in the Soviet Union since 1917. Paradox of Survival*. Vol. I - II. New York: New York University Press
- Markowitz, F. (1995). Criss-Crossing Identities: The Russian Jewish Diaspora and the Jewish Diaspora in Russia. *Diaspora*, 4 (2), 201-210.
- _____ (1993). Israelis with a Russian accent. *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 35 (2), 97-114.
- Modley, K. (1986) Canadian multicultural education: promises and practices. In Banks, J. A., & Lynch J. (Eds.), *Multicultural education in Western societies*. London: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 51-75.
- Ogbu, J. (1983). Minority status and schooling in plural societies. *Comparative Education Review*, 27 (2), 168-190.
- Ogbu, J., & Simons, H. (1998). Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 29, 155-188.
- Papatheodosiou, T. (1994). *The integration of repatriated Greeks from the former Soviet Union in the Greek labor market*. Athens: Institute of Technological Education (Greek).

- Parekh B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism*. London: Macmillan.
- Parselias, A. (1994).. Paper presented at the 3rd Educational Conference of the Teachers' Association of the 5th District of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki (Greek).
- Petrinioti, X. (1993). *Immigration to Greece*. Athens: Odysseas (Greek).
- Remennick, L. (1999). *Case study in transnationalism: Russian Immigrants in 1990s Israel*. Paper presented at the 34th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology, Tel Aviv, Israel, July 11-15, 1999.
- Roer-Strier, D. (1996). Styles of parenting of immigrants and suggestions for preventive intervention and family therapy. *Chevra Urevacha*, 16 (4), 467-481 (Hebrew).
- Shamai, S., & Ilatov, Z. (1998). Education to multiculturalism or assimilation: Mutual relationships between immigrant students and veteran Israelis. Paper presented at the Conference of Israel Sociological Society, University of Haifa, Israel, February 25, 1998 (Hebrew).
- Siegel, D. (1998). *The great immigration: Russian Jews in Israel*. New York: Berghan Books.
- Sluzki, C. (1979). Migration and family conflict. *Family Process*, 18 (4), 379-390.
- Smootha, S. (1978). *Israel: Pluralism and conflict*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smootha, S. (March, 1994). Point to discussion about the influence of the mass immigration from previous U.S.S.R. on the Israeli Society. *Sociology- the News Bulletin of the Israeli Sociological Association*, 13, 6-7 (Hebrew).
- Swirski, S. (1990). *Education in Israel*. Tel Aviv: Brerot (Hebrew).
- Vergeti, M. (1991). Pontic Greeks from Asia Minor and the Soviet Union: Problems of integration in modern Greece. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 4, (4), 382-394.
- Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou, A. (1991). The diaspora of the Greeks of the Pontos: Historical background. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 4 (4), 357-363.