

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

School of Business and Governance

Department of Law

Helina Sildvee

**ESTONIA AND ITS RUSSIAN SPEAKERS:
NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK VS. REALITY**

Bachelor Thesis

Supervisor: Lecturer Vlad Vernygora

Tallinn 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION	4
1. PREVIOUS ACADEMIC RESEARCH ON THE TOPIC	7
2. STATISTICAL INDICATORS THAT REFLECT THE CURRENT SITUATION	10
2.1. The Labor Market	10
2.2. Education	12
3. PREVIOUS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS	15
3.1. National Program 2000-2007	15
3.2. Integration Framework 2008-2013	17
3.2. Integrating Estonia 2020: The Strategy and Social Cohesion in Estonia	19
4. THE ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY	22
4.1. Estonian speakers with Estonian citizenship	23
4.2. Russian Speakers with Estonian Citizenship	25
4.3. Similarities and Differences between the Language Groups	28
4.4. Criticism and Suggestions for Further Research	29
CONCLUSION	31
REFERENCES	33
TABLES	36
APPENDIXES	40

ABSTRACT

Currently, mainly Estonian and Russian speakers demographically make up the Estonian state; however, since the country re-gained its independence, a ‘unified society’ has been a difficult goal to reach for the government. Since 2000, there have been many normative frameworks created in order to mend the gap between the two sizable societal groups yet the reality and the outcome has been rather disappointing. The *status quo* is not in correlation with the laws and the action plans. Thus far, it could be noticed that the Russian speakers have a clear disadvantage in the Estonian society, and this factor has forced them to stay and live in their closed community. For the Estonian government, this is a problem since there is a large group of people who have potential to be active members of the broader Estonian society, but they are choosing to be distant and stay distrustful towards the state. This research is aiming to bring out the fact that there are deficits in the legislation and the frameworks, which is causing the current issue in the Estonian society.

Keywords: Estonian speakers; Russian speakers; integration; government; cohesion

INTRODUCTION

Since Estonia became independent from the former Soviet Union, its ethnical makeup has completely changed when comparing to the first republic times in the 1920s. As of 1991, the Estonian government has worked on various strategic plans to create a new coherent society in the post-occupational period. However, despite the continuous efforts of the government, there is still a large community of Russian speakers that is contrasting to the Estonian speaking society in many multi-dimensional aspects. Moreover, the issue is not only in the obvious factor of a non-coherent society's existence but various statistical indicators show that the Russian language speakers have not been able to perform as well as Estonian speakers in different spheres of life. For example, the data showed that people who only speak Russian (and/or poor Estonian) earn less money, do not have as much high job positions, have poorer results in education and have greater chance to live in poverty (see *Table 2*). It could be suggested that the Estonian governments' main hurdle in the last twenty six years in regards of solving the problem is to find a fine line in policy making where the country's minorities have all the rights to express their culture, whilst showing sincere loyalty to the state where the population's majority speaks Estonian, respects the Estonian culture, and follows the Estonian traditional way of life. The other factor that complicated the whole scheme of actions is that a certain societal segment of the Estonian society is represented by a Russian-speaking community who have been living within the borders of the modern Estonia for centuries. Former President Lennart Meri captured the problem in his 1994 Independence Day speech:

Culture is politics because it is primarily in culture where the national identity becomes apparent – identity is a necessary element, a substance which is difficult to describe, but from which nations are born. Politics is culture primarily because the ultimate aim of politics is to defend the individual, to assist the individual to determine and deepen the characteristics of a person. The primary characteristic of a person is the phenomenon: that a person does not exist outside a culture.

To continue on the position expressed by the country's political elites, former President Toomas Hendrik Ilves and the current Head of the State Kersti Kaljulaid both brought up the issue of Estonian language correspondingly in their 2011 and 2017 Independence Day speeches. Ilves (2011) noted that everyone in Estonia should have an equal opportunity to learn and speak Estonian but also Estonians need to be open to foreign languages, cultures and people – to be successful the citizens and the society needs to be coherent. In her turn, Kaljulaid (2017) was even more frank and stated that

A language is only protected when it is successfully taught to the local people who do not know the language. And the more it is taught to greater numbers of people, the better.

The latter ideally described the current direction in which the strategic plan is heading. Thus far, there are not many academic researches that would analyze the strategic plans formed by the government. Although many scholars were included in the creation process not a lot of follow ups have emerged. In many cases, the academic researchers have the Russians, Grey passport owners and Russian speakers in focus, leaving the Estonian speakers on the sideline offering a one-sided opinion. For example, Kivirähk (2014), Masso (2011), Trimbach and O'Lear (2015) focused on the perspective of the Russian speakers. Also, there is a confusion in the usage of core terminology/notions such as 'Estonian', 'Russian' and 'Russian speakers' – many researches in the field simply lack in explanation of terminology and for example Russian is referred to Russian speakers. This was apparent in all previously mentioned researchers' work. The problem lies in the fact that this is a serious case of misidentifications because there is the question of how the people identify themselves and often 'Russians' and 'Russian speakers' is referred to people with different nationalities such as Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, Belarusians, Ukrainians and others.

The main thesis of this research paper is to tackle the issue on whether or not **the Estonian normative framework of integrating the Russian speakers into the Estonian society is not in correspondence with the current status quo of the Estonian society**. It is clear that up to now the strategic plans have not resolved the issue of closed communities and in some cases the situation has gotten even worse. Firstly, it needs to be understood, what is the country's normative framework on the issue now and how has it been changing over the years since regaining independence in 1991? This will offer some insight how the focus of the government has shifted over the course of the past years and where will it be heading. Secondly, there needs to be a clear comprehension of what the existing state of affairs in Estonia is. The statistics-generated data should give a clearer overview on the subject. Finally

yet importantly, for the purpose of this paper it is necessary to have an analysis of survey-generated opinions on the topic as expressed by Estonian-speaking Estonian passport owners and Russian-speaking Estonian passport owners. This should provide a comparison between the Estonian speaking society and the closed Russian speaking community.

In order to answer each question a different method is required. The first research question will be investigated by the normative discourse analysis. In this case, it is the most useful tool because it will allow researching the previous strategic plans and seeing how they have progressed over the years. Quantitative methods will be used to answer the second question. Statistics, polls and case studies will provide plenty of data on the current situation. The analysis will be concluded on the base of a survey, to provide a comparison between Estonian speaking Estonians and Russian speaking Estonians.

In the first part of this research, I will provide an answer to the first and second research question. The main emphasis is to explain what the current situation is in the Estonian society and to have a full understanding of the frameworks. It is important to see how the strategic plans have changed over the course of the year and where are they heading now. The quantitative data creates a full image of the current situation and shows why the issue is still relevant in the present government. The second part of the research will focus on the survey of twenty Estonian speaking Estonians and twenty Russian speaking Estonians. The survey was conducted electronically and the target group was everyone older than 18. The objective was to get answers from a variety of people with different backgrounds, educations and age. Most people are personally known to the author; however, the Russian speaking Estonian group is mostly composed of random people, who the author was referred to by family and friends. This was a classical survey where the interviewees were sent a structured questionnaire (see *Appendix 1*) and they answered in free form. This type of survey will present the paper with data, that is very personal and it allows for analyzing experiences of people with completely different backgrounds. The paper will conclude with the results of the survey discussed in the context of the research work's main argument.

1. PREVIOUS ACADEMIC RESEARCH ON THE TOPIC

As mentioned before, the issue of integration of Russian-speaking Estonians into the country's society has been a popular object of academic research. However, most of the studies have been done from the view of the Russian speakers. For the purpose of this paper, I will analyze four noticeable academic works describing the issue from the security, educational and social aspects.

Trimbach and O'Lear (2015) brought out the similarities of Narva and the Crimea. There is resemblance between the two towns and thus there truly is the question 'is Narva the next Crimea?' Narva's citizens identify themselves as Narvans rather than Estonians or Russians, they have a strong connection to the Russian media therefore they are acceptable to the Russian political propaganda. All of these indicators were peculiar to the Crimeans, where they had a strong connection to Crimea not to Ukraine or Russian Federation and they also had Russian media widely available. For the Trimbach and O'Lear (2015, 7) research a survey was conducted amongst Narva's college students which proved that 49 percent of the surveyed were not interested in the politics. Kivirähk (2014) also focused on the security related issues and investigated the National Defense Survey answers, by bringing out the differences by Estonians and Russians. On the positive note, the survey revealed that the Russian speakers are willing to protect their homeland in case of attack (Kivirähk 2014, 21). However Kivirähk's (2014, 8) survey analysis also showed that respectively 28% and 22% of people feel 'relatively unintegrated' and 'unintegrated', complimenting the work of Trimbach and O'Lear that the Russian speakers are disengaged from the politics.

Although these researches bring out the fact that after twenty six years the Russian speakers are not integrated into the society nor in Narva and the rest of Estonia. The focus point of the first research is Narva, however the largest community of Russian speakers lives in Tallinn, therefore it is necessary for this thesis to conduct further researches that would include Russian speakers from all over Estonia. Kivirähk (2014) offers a great analysis of the polarity on the situation, however the research fails to explain the term 'Russian' therefore it leaves the term up for interpretation.

Masso's research is about the social aspect of the conundrum. Masso (2011) conducted a survey targeting Estonians and Russian speakers, dividing them into three age groups: first, second and third generation. One of the main outcomes from this research is that Estonia is in post-Soviet transition. The results showed that Russian speakers still have affinity to Russian Federation, and the fondness is higher in third generation age group. As Trimbach's and O'Lear's research said that Narvans have a strong connection to their town, Masso (2011, 11) found that monolingual people will more likely be attached to their local environment. This can also be explained by lower incomes and in various occasions lack of education. In this case, Narva and Sillamäe are clear examples, where the financial and educational status is lower than in rest of Estonia. Another result showed the difference between Estonian and Russian speaking youth. Most of Estonians have affinity towards Western countries such as Canada and the United States. Russian speaking youth do not have such warm feelings, they rather lean towards Russian Federation and former Soviet Union states (Masso 2011, 10-11). Yet again, this proves that integration is still progressing with insufficient results, for the past years, most emphasis is put on the Russian-speaking youth; however, there are little changes in their worldviews. Both Kivirähk (2015, 9) and Masso (2011, 11) affirm that Russian-speakers do not trust in co-operation with NATO and the EU, therefore the task of integrating them into the society is difficult for the Estonian government because of the lack of trust.

The latter research by Masso is great at bringing out the issues of social space on an individual level however there is no research about how the Russian and Estonian speakers influence each other. Masso's paper does not specify the origin of the Russian-speakers nor does it mention where the people were situated. Although Narva (and its neighbouring towns) and Tallinn have both closed Russian communities, the results may vary because of the external factors such as access to Russian media, multi-cultural society, bigger variety of educational choices etc.

Mentioned in previous studies, education is the key role in integration, Lindemann and Saar focused their research solely on figuring out the ethnic inequalities for the second generation Russians (2012). This paper does bring out that five hundred Russian-speakers (the same amount of Estonians) were interviewed in Tallinn and Kohtla-Järve and 58 percent of them had an Estonian citizenship (Lindemann, Saar 2012, 9). The results of the research and survey suggest that the biggest problem is in the educational system, which, from the Russian-speakers' point of view, puts them a disadvantageous position. In the current education system higher education is free in Estonian (for full daytime students), meaning that higher language in Russian is available however it is not affordable for many. As mentioned earlier,

people in Russian speaking communities often earn less; therefore they do not have the opportunity to pursue higher education. Even though the Estonian school system has adapted the 60-40 language system where sixty percent of the classes are thought in Estonian in high schools, the results indicate that the language skills are poor and Estonians are more likely to finish secondary and higher education (Lindemann, Saar 2012, 18-19). Also, Estonians have a higher possibility to succeed in the labor market in better positions and Russian speakers who have an Estonian passport (and speak proficient Estonian) are more likely to continue higher education and also succeed in the labor market (Lindemann, Saar 2012, 19).. In this case one of the key factors are the teachers, because throughout the research it was brought up that they simply are insufficient in teaching in Estonian due to the lack of their language skills. Until now, Russian speakers were more likely to pursue vocational education but in 2017 the schools will also change to the 60-40 language system. Much emphasis is put on education by the state; however, it seems that the system itself has created yet another closed circle.

Lindemann and Saar made an analysis how Estonian and Russian speakers differentiate and how there is another closed loop; however they fail to bring out action plans how to reverse the situation. Their analysis makes a good base for the creation of a framework that would tackle the education issue.

In 2016, there were two projects brought to the attention of the government to try to solve the issues surrounding the problems with the 60-40 language system. Two Russian schools applied for a 60-40 language system exception, they proposed that they would get their students to C1 level by graduation time in exchange to teaching some classes in Russian. However, the Minister of education and researcher Mailis Reps stated that this would be a research period allowed under strict supervision and only for three or four schools. Thus far the project is still being processed and prepared by the government (Reps 2017). Another proposition made it to the voting stage in the Parliament. The draft proposed a new way of auditing the language studies, researches that would focus on why the language system has failed, special apps and free dictionaries for families who want to learn Estonian and language consultations (Pappel 2016). Only 29 members accepted the draft and the coalition was not present to discuss the draft. This does indicate that the issues are not visible and that it is not even a discussion on the level of parliament, even though the draft was not satisfactory it could have been a starting point for change. In this sense it is clear that schools and people from the government see the problem and they are trying to figure out alternatives that would serve their students and Estonia better.

2. STATISTICAL INDICATORS THAT REFLECT THE CURRENT SITUATION

In order to analyze the situation, statistics needs to be reviewed to provide an overview of the actual society is made up of. In many cases the statistics were divided in groups of Estonian and non-Estonian, because of the largest community of non-Estonians living in Estonia are Russians, this statistics were also used to explain the issues regarding integration. In order to analyze the data from all angles, 2015 was the only year where statistics were available on education, labor market and others. The Russian minority consists of 330 258 persons that is 1/4 of all population in Estonia (see *Table 1*). It is a very large community and it is understandable why there is need for an integration framework. The largest groups of Russians are living in Ida-Virumaa and Harjumaa (see *Table 1*). Over half of the Russians live in these areas, proving that they are staying in a community and keeping to themselves. This is also the reason why Narva and Ida-Virumaa is an interest to many researches such as Trimbach and O'Lear and Masso because it is an area that is mostly populated by Russians and Russian speakers.

2.1. The Labor Market

As mentioned in previous researches and frameworks that there is a gap between Russians and Estonians in labor market and income. When looking at the statistics of poverty it is clear that there is a disadvantage when being Russian or Russian speaker. At risk poverty rate ("share of persons with an equalized yearly disposable income lower than the at-risk-of-poverty threshold which is 60 percent of the median equalized yearly disposable income of household members") is higher amongst Russians, Persons whose domestic language is Russian and for people with undetermined citizenship (see *Table 2*). At risk poverty rate for pensioners stays relatively even amongst all groups of people however the material

deprivation rate, “the share of persons, who cannot afford at least 3 items of the 9: 1) to pay rent or utility bills, 2) keep home adequately warm, 3) face unexpected expenses, 4) eat meat, fish or a protein equivalent every second day, 5) a week holiday away from home, 6) a car, 7) a washing machine, 8) a colour TV or 9) a telephone”, indicates a disadvantage to the Russians, Russian speakers and persons with unspecified citizenship (Definitions). In this case the percentage is drastically different; Estonians are 20 percent less likely to be in material deprivation (see *Table 2*). Russians and Russian speakers have a six percent higher rate of being at risk of poverty. There is almost no difference between the Estonians and persons whose domestic language is Estonian; the same applies to Russians and persons whose domestic language is Russian. When observing the rates of people born in Estonia, it shows close affiliation to Estonians (see *Table 2*). This shows that the Russians who migrated to Estonia during or after the Soviet times are more likely to be at the risk of poverty and the second and third generation Russians have a higher chance of making it out of poverty however, the statistics implies that if the domestic language is still Russian, they are stuck in the loop. The pensioners are at the same rate because of the social welfare and how it is operating – it does not differentiate people based on their ethnicity or domestic language.

When looking at the equalized yearly disposable income non-Estonians and people with other citizenships have a disadvantage. Non-Estonians earn almost 2000euros less than Estonians, other citizenships have nearly 3000euros smaller yearly incomes and persons with unspecified citizenship earn around 2700euros less in a year than Estonians (see *Table 3*). Another statistical data that proves the fact that Estonians earn on average more is presented in income quintiles, with the lowest quintile being the “fifth of the population receiving the lowest equalized disposable income” and the highest refers to the “fifth of the population receiving the highest equalized disposable income”. *Table 4* shows how Estonians are earning more by exceeding the percentages of non-Estonians in the fourth and fifth quintile whilst the non-Estonians are in majority in the lowest, second and third quintile. Therefore it supports the previous statistics that non-Estonians, who are most likely Russian descent, because it is the largest non-Estonian community in Estonia, is more likely to be in poverty because their income is smaller.

The reasoning for the small incomes can be found in the fifth table that presents various job positions and what percentages are held by different groups of people on these occupations. 13,9 percent of Estonians are managers, 21,8 percent professionals, 12,5 technicians and associate professionals, 6,1 clerical support workers – all jobs that usually have a higher income. Russians are accordingly obtaining these positions by 7 percent, 15,3 percent, 10,7 percent and 5,9 percent. They are more likely to have jobs as service and sales

workers, craft and related trade workers, plant and machine operators and assemblers and finally as elementary occupation holders (see *Table 5*). The table also shows that persons whose domestic language is Estonian, or who can speak and write in Estonian or who can speak on the level of everyday communication in Estonian are more likely to obtain higher ranking job positions such as manager. 30,9 percent of people who do not know Estonian are craft and related trades workers, 17,2 percent plant and machine operators and assemblers and 18,7 percent have elementary occupations (see *Table 5*). Yet again this shows that vocational schools are important for non-Estonian speakers, therefore approaching the 60-40 language system must be taken in caution by the government.

Unemployment indicator also shows that non-Estonians are more likely to be unemployed. “Long-term unemployment rate describes the share of people who have been unemployed for a year or longer of total labor force” (Definitions). Very long-term unemployment rate is used when the share of people who have been unemployed for two years or longer of total labor force (Definitions).” There were 1,2 percent more of non-Estonians who were long-term unemployed, 0,8 percent more accordingly who have been unemployed in for a very long time (see *Table 6*). Even though the percentages are not drastically different it fortifies the fact that the Russian speakers are at a disadvantage when it comes to the labor market.

2.2. Education

When it comes to the education, the statistics shows results with the same tendency as the labor market. In total the numbers do not seem as different, moreover Estonians learning in Estonian schools seem to be doing worse statistically when it comes to dropping out of school and repeating classes. Of all pupils 1,6 percent of Estonians discontinue their studies whereas 1,1 percent of Russians in Estonian schools drop out and 1,4 of Russians in Russian schools do the same (see *Table 7*). The grade repeaters statistics looks almost the same with in total 1,7 percent of Estonians repeat a class, 1,1 percent of Russians in Estonian schools repeat classes and only 0,8 percent of Russians in Russian schools repeat classes (see *Table 7*). However the statistics look different when observing the same indicators in high school, where the 60-40 language system begins. 7,1 percent of Estonians discontinue their studies at the same time 2,9 percent of Russians in Estonians discontinue their studies in Estonian high school. 41,2 percent of Russians in Russian schools dropped out and 9,3 percent repeated a grade(s) (see *Table 7*). This is a direct result of the current language system, when some opt

for a vocational school instead there is a great number of Russian speakers who stop their education there. When the government opted for the language teaching system the aim was to raise overall knowledge of Estonian. However the current statistics shows that it has started an entity where students give up on their education road.

Another indicator that shows the flaws in the 60-40 system are the results of national exams that the same for the Estonian and Russian schools. For example Mathematics average is lower by 5 percent in Russian speaking schools, history is 9 percent lower and Geography is also 9 percent lower. Estonian as a foreign language average result in Russian schools is 64 percent, however in schools that have language immersion program perform better with 84 percent (Lõpueksamite statistika). The language immersion program is adopted voluntarily by schools which want to start the learning in Estonian in an early grade and it also available for preschools. In preschool the program sees forth that children will be thought in two languages at the same time and half of the group is made of Estonian speaking toddlers and the other half Russian speaking (Keelekümbluse valikuvõimalused). This program is great to train children who are used to hearing one language to them being comfortable around multilingual environment.

However 12,8 percent of Estonians aged 18-24 with below upper secondary education are not in schools or training programs whereas the same statistics about non-Estonians is only 9,2 percent (see *Table 8*). This can be explained by two main factors, Russian speakers are more likely to follow their obligatory education by vocational schools and additional training programs. Also even though Estonians have a below upper secondary education they are more likely to get a job therefore they will not continue their educational road.

In 2015 a study was conducted with the two language groups. A new idea was proposed to the survey takers how would they agree with the idea that there would no longer be different language schools but language branches in one school. Meaning that all the youths would be in one school therefore they would integrate but they would go to different classes where they could learn in their mother tongue and some lectures would be together. 60 percent of Russian speakers agreed with the idea on a middle school level and 67 percent agreed that it would be suitable for high school. The Estonian speakers were far more accepting of the idea with accordingly 81 percent and 86 percent (Linguistic... 2015). However this idea of bringing the schools together is one of the most drastic changes proposed; it would bring down the barriers and encourage the youths to communicate with each other. The Estonians would have more practice for Russian and *vice versa*. Also the Integration Monitoring 2015 results showed that Russian speakers do not have as good results in English as do the Estonians. Therefore even if the youths do not speak Russian or Estonian

well they could communicate in English. Also the monitoring results bring out that the Russian speakers do think that higher education is not as obtainable as it is for Estonian speakers. This belief can explain the lower motivation and the lower results in high schools.

All in all, the statistics show that there certainly is a disadvantage of being Russian or a Russian speaker in the labor market. Also youths who graduate Russian schools tend to score lower than their peers in Estonian schools. These indicators are clearly linked. Even though the frameworks are trying to diminish the issues regarding the youths because they are the most vulnerable the data of the labor market shows more emphasis should be put on the adults as well by trying to close the inequality gap that lies between the Estonian and Russian speakers. Politician Kross and historian/writer Kopõtin had a discussion in 2015 framed up by the newspaper *Sirp* where they both agreed that the current education system desperately needs a reform, also that the emphasis should be on the middle school and the kids should have education in their mother tongue to ensure their success in the future. The two men brought out that the teachers in Russian schools need to undergo significant training and there is a need for new teachers because there is a notable number of teachers who are still stuck in the Soviet Union and their influence to the kids is questionable (Mida...2015). All in all in the article they bring out that the issue should be solved through dialog between the two groups of people and the focus should be especially on the youths because they are our future. Kross says that the kindergarten and high school should remain Estonian; Kopõtin agrees with kindergarten but mentions that the reputation of vocational schools should be raised. Although they say that there needs to be a change they do not see or know of the current problem, that the Russian speakers are clearly at a disadvantage and the way the government has approached the lack of Estonian knowledge, has not paid off.

3. PREVIOUS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

3.1. National Program 2000-2007

The work on the integration process started in 2000 when the first national program was released. The project set the tone for the rest and started the cohesion process that is still ongoing. In total three programs were created until now that still deal with the same issue however throughout time focus points change. Only the first framework was importance of national level, the other two did not have the same level of legality. This part will focus on the contents of these frameworks and analyze what are the shortcomings.

The National Program 2000-2007 focuses mainly on the youths and education by keeping the language as the first priority. The adults and first generation Russian speakers were mostly left out and it was explained by the fact that they already keep to themselves and have formed a strong Russian speaking community (National Program 2008, 18). Throughout the framework it is not mentioned once that the target group is specifically the Russian speaking community nor is the term Russian or Russian speaker used regularly. The program marks also the beginning of the 60-40 language framework; initially only history and Estonian literature were thought in Estonian. Moreover, it was the start of the compulsory citizenship day (National Program 2008, 25). The intent was to bring the youths closer to the state and politics but also since Estonian was not as widely spoken at that time amongst the younger Russian speakers the focus was on changing that. The citizenship day is a project that introduces the government and the part that the citizens have in it. In this case by making it compulsory, all schools were obligated to take part in state related exhibitions, trips, games etc. It was created in the hopes that the youths will grow up having knowledge in the state and being interested in the politics. The citizenship day was the starting point to the national defense classes that were also made compulsory for all schools in the hopes of bringing youths closer to the state. However the results of previous researches by Masso, Trimbach, O'Lear and Kivirähk conclude that already eleven years later youths feel disengaged and uninterested in the politics. This shows that although there have been many steps taken

towards integration; the results are not reflecting a positive outcome. Another change that was brought to the schools was the learning materials, they were changed in the Russian speaking schools because the books were described as “outdated and glorified the USSR” (National Program 2008, 28). As of that time, the Russian speaking schools and Estonian schools would use the same learning materials but in different languages

These changes brought along various issues, the main one being the Russian speaking schools teachers’ lack of Estonian knowledge. Even though they went through a training program, the topic was criticized in the media and it was brought up in the second framework as well. These adjustments were designed to raise the level of Estonian amongst Russian speakers so they would have a better outlook on their future. Due to the fact that the Russian speakers do not speak sufficient Estonian, they often have to accept jobs that they overqualified for. However, despite changes in the educational system, the results of the state exams show that the expected outcome was not reached not after the first framework and nor after the second one.

The adults were approached also by the language issue, where an initiative was started for free language classes for people who do not decide to continue their education and for adults who simply want to learn Estonian. Thus far the language classes had been available without cost before the exam and the number of people who passed the test and received a certificate was unsatisfactory to the state (National Program 2000-2007, 54). Another area that was brought out in the framework was media and how Russian speaking adults were mostly still using Russian media outlets which open them up to all types of Russian propaganda. Although there are newspapers in Russian and radio channel (Radio 4) which are solely in Russian and reflect the Estonian society, politics and also worldwide news, it was not the first choice for receiving news for the Russian speakers because they do not feel that the sources were reliable (National Program 2000-2007, 53). The framework indicates that work needs to be done in involving Russian Federation news and issues as well.

Also concerning the media, the framework brought out that the Estonian media should reflect more tolerance and openness (National Program 2000-2007, 54). At the time, the USSR times were still in the backs of the heads of Estonians, there were not any large movements of nationalism but the Estonian speakers were still patriotic and protected their cultural realm and nationality. This is one of the few times where changes amongst Estonian speakers were mentioned proving that the framework is one-sided. At that point there should have been more cohesion oriented programs to start breaking down the barriers of the Russian speaking closed community and the protective Estonian speakers.

3.2. Integration Framework 2008-2013

The Integration Framework is a continuation of the National Program which aims to create a society in Estonia with a strong identity that has a multicultural nation, who shares democratical values and speaks Estonian in the public sphere (Integration Framework 2008-2013, 2). In comparison to the first framework, this is more thought through and many people from different backgrounds were included in the formation process such as the representatives of 120 cohesion groups, who had the chance to discuss that were actual in their groups. They were part of the draft creation meaning that they had the opportunity to have an input that was not the case during the first framework (Integration Framework 2008-2013, 34). Another structural difference that sets the first two frameworks apart is the yearly reports and a complete reevaluation in after the first half of the process. This will provide freedom of necessary changes however the report showed that even that did not help the outcome of disappointing results. The framework was set up on goals that were derived from statistics. In 2007 there were 344,280 Russians in Estonia (Integration Framework 2008-2013, 5). The framework was created on the basis of integrating Russian speakers into the community but also there was a new chapter that also included the issues surrounding the asylum seekers and the growing issues of the EU.

Education is one of the key approaches also for this Integration Framework and it is continuing the work of the National Program. It is recognized that still there is a great deal of work that needs to be put in the schools programs and into resolving the issues surrounding the 60-40 language system. Additionally the framework adds that there needs to be more co-operation in between the Russian and Estonian speaking schools (Integration Framework 2007-2013, 11). The schools working together is necessary to start a dialog between the two language groups in the hopes that the youth will take these experiences in and use them in their adult life. This would slowly start to work towards opening up the closed Russian speaking communities. Also vocational schools were brought out because Russian vocational schools have proved to have lower than regular high school Estonian speaking skills (Integration Framework 2007-2013, 12). Integration Framework started the process of preparing the vocational schools for going over to the 60-40 system in 2017. Keeping in mind that there was an issue with the high school transition, vocational schools are even more difficult to transition. Mainly because of the professional language that is required therefore the teachers need to undergo specific training. However it leaves open the question how do the Russian speaking pupils will accommodate the changes if their knowledge of Estonian is

still poor? Concerning the adults, it emphasized that the language classes still need to be available for them in every necessary level.

The second main focus point for this framework is the social cohesion. On contrary to the first program many points were brought out that need to improve amongst Estonian speakers and it was presented through statistical measures. Tying in the issues of accepting the Russian speakers and the asylum seekers into the Estonian speaking society is clearly explained by the survey report (2007) that 40 percent of Estonians are not ready to accept multiculturalism or they have preconceptions whilst 36 percent are ready. Another survey result indicates that Estonian speakers too live in a closed community because in 2007 65 percent of Estonians do not have regular contact with people from other nations (Integration Framework 2007-2013, 11-12; 15). It is clear that the issue does not involve only the Russian speaking side; the Estonian speakers should also be on the focus for the government. In order to create social cohesion both sides need to be open to integration. Currently, the main focus is on the Russian speakers and how they need to be integrated to the Estonian society.

Employment was also one of the interest parts for this Integration Program. Differences were brought out between Estonian and Russian speakers and how they perceive the situation. The survey result show that top leaders and specialists are more likely Estonian (31 percent) and 53 percent of manual and skilled laborers are from other nationality. Also there is a 14,3 percent inequality in pay and 52 percent inequality in unemployment. In both cases Estonian speakers have an advantage. When asked equality in job opportunities, pay and all other employment issues, 18 percent of Estonians found the situation equal whereas only 11 percent of other nationalities agreed (Integration Framework 2008-2013, 16-17). This shows that there are disadvantages for Russian speakers and 18 percent Estonians are oblivious to the problem. However the final report shows that inequality is still a problem by 2013 and there are still gaps in between Estonian speakers and Russian speakers. Also the Estonian exam results did not make the expected results nor in youths and adults. Although there were improvements, there still are problems with the 60-40 language system, closed communities and inequalities in job positions and pay between Estonian speakers and Russian speakers.

3.2. Integrating Estonia 2020: The Strategy and Social Cohesion in Estonia

The third framework also has the same underlying as the latter – to create a strong society based on mutual understanding. Although there are many similarities with the second program such as during the creation process focus groups also had a chance to be heard and make suggestions for changes. However Integrating Estonia framework opted for a structural change. Though it is still managed by the Ministry of culture, other organizations and institutions have been involved in the process (Integrating Estonia 2020, 28). With this the Ministry will be able to reach more people and work with specialists. Also problems can be more specifically targeted because of the large number of participants. At the same, unless there is constant supervision, there might be problems with the control of project for example to avoid delays and to see that everything is followed through. Additionally smaller organizations or institutions may not have the financial and staff capability to follow through the project. Finally by having other people involved in the project there might be clashes of ideas or approaches. In order to this program to succeed the Ministry has to be involved in the work of the organizations as well also it is necessary to have an open communication line. From the last integration framework it became clear that funds are not issue, rather the following through process, so during this framework thought has been put into it.

The disappointing results of the second framework are still carried out in this program, with the Russian speaking youths Estonian being still one of the core issues. The goal is set lower than the previous program however the Estonian exam results are expected to be higher in high schools and vocational schools. Furthermore, the vocational schools need to be ready to adopt the 60-40 language system by 2020 (Integrating Estonia 2020, 22). As mentioned in the framework the teacher will have trainings to start preparing for the transformation. However since the Estonian exam results are lower than expected in high schools, all teachers should go through Estonian training. More emphasis should be put on vocational schools because of their profession specific language however high schools have a long way to go. More thought process should have gone into this chapter how to avoid the mistakes made in the high school transformation process because clearly the obligatory trainings did not work as planned. Thus far the Russian speakers had the opportunity to continue their education in

Russian, now they are in a position where this is no longer a chance. From previous experience it is clear that the state expected Estonian to improve with the 60-40 language system, however the results are below expectations. Now the vocational schools are in the same process, following the same steps and from the Integration Framework 2020 the actions do not seem that different. In a longer perspective this might cause disinterest in youths to pursue their education after their mandatory nine classes because they do not want the added stress of learning in Estonian. As mentioned earlier Masso's research also indicated that Russian speakers do not have the funds to pursue going to university or they lack sufficient Estonian (should I use the same citation again?). This might start reappearing with high school and vocational schools where students do not want to or feel unable to continue their education road.

In attempt to get the youths to be more active the framework sets out a plan to bring non Estonian speakers from all backgrounds together to socialize through organizations and activities (Integrating Estonia 2020, 22). This is great tool to create an environment where the people feel accepted and they want to be active, this will encourage them to take up interest in the government, gain some knowledge and eventually learn to trust the system. This action plan is simple yet it has a direct impact on the youths and it makes the youths active in the society rather making obligatory lessons in Estonian.

Since the second framework failed in various social areas with fixing the employment issues being the first, this program will continue the work with a small difference – involving the Employment Center. The Center is engaged to help soothe the situation by offering language courses, career counseling, training programs and so on, even in Russian if necessary. Employment Center will have additional funding from the program to have more focus on the issue of Russian speakers who are trying to enter the labour market (Integrating Estonia 2020, 23-24). Instead of the Ministries having to deal with the issue it is working with an institute that is professionalized in putting people to the job market. The employment center is well experienced and the Russian speakers have high chances of receiving additional training due to the available capacity of the center. In this case emphasis should be put on media that puts the information out there for people, that they have an opportunity to apply for training programs and language courses for free.

Another social project that failed during the Estonian Integration Framework 2008-2013 is the Estonian interaction with others. Still in 2015 only 41 percent of Estonians said that they have had contact with Russians in the previous week whereas 63 percent of other nationalities have had contact with Estonians (Integrating Estonia 2020, 13). Furthermore when asked if they agree with the statement that when there are different nationalities living

in a state, the conflicts in between the nationalities are unavoidable. 65 percent of Estonians agreed with the statement and 62 percent of other nationalities disagreed with it (Integrating Estonia 2020, 14). This shows how the Estonian speakers are still relatively closed and do not have a very high tolerance as they expect nationalities to clash. Therefore the work with the Estonian speakers also needs to continue and the framework sets out that the media has the most importance in this case. Print media, radio, TV and social media should be involved in the process to promote understanding. At the same time, similar programs should be available for the Russian speakers as well so the people are on the same mind space and they would actively think at the problem during the same time period.

All of the three frameworks have three projects in common: they all struggle with finding the best ways to solve the issues concerning Estonian. Starting new programs for adults or changing the system in high schools the problem remains the same even to this day. The second concern is with social inequalities, where the Russian speakers clearly having a disadvantage. Breaking down the barriers of closed communities and providing more equal opportunities for the Russian speakers have been a talking point in all three frameworks. Lastly, the Estonian speakers are briefly talked about. Every situation has two sides, in this case the Estonian speakers should have had more attention since the beginning. The last two frameworks clearly bring out, that the Estonian speakers do not have the mindset of living in a society where there is cohesion and the feeling of one people.

4. THE ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of the questionnaire was to figure how a small group of people perceive the laws and how they individually see the current situation. In total there was 40 answers from which 20 were Estonian citizens whose domestic language is Estonian and the other half were Estonian citizens whose mother tongue is Russian. The questions were the same for both groups in order to see how they perceive their surroundings. The only personal preconditions asked were nationality and mother tongue because the purpose is to find out the similarities and differences between two groups of people, no matter their educational, financial or residential distinctness.

In this analysis the Estonian Integration Monitoring 2011 cluster system will be used to describe the issues concerning the integration process. Kivirähk also used the same parameters to analyze the results of National Defense survey. Cluster A is the ‘successfully integrated’ group which has integrated linguistically, politically and on a social level. Around 21 percent adhered to this group in 2011. Cluster B represents people who have a strong civic relationship, meaning that they are strong in politics and on social level, however they lack linguistically. Estonian Integration Monitoring names this group of Russian-speaking as Estonian patriots of whom are sixteen percent of the Russian speakers. Cluster C consists of people who are ‘Estonian-speaking and critical-minded’ only thirteen percent of people are in this group. They usually have sufficient knowledge of Estonian however they are not incorporated on the social and political level. Cluster C is often used when describing the Russian speaking youths who are disappointed by their disadvantages on the job market and so on. The next cluster D describes people who do not have good Estonian language skills, socially stay more in their closed community and mostly pay attention to their local political affairs. Approximately 28 percent of people are in this cluster and an example of this group would be the Russian speaking citizens of Narva. The final cluster E is made up of 22 percent of unintegrated people, who have little to no knowledge of Estonian, politics and the society. This cluster describes the Russian speakers who still have a Russian passport and who live in the closed community (Estonian Integration Monitoring, 251).

The first part of the survey analyzes the results given by the Estonian speakers who are Estonian citizenship holders at the same time. The second section will be analysis on their counterparts – Russian speakers who have an Estonian citizen ship. Thirdly I will bring out the differences between these two groups of people. Lastly, this work will make a number of suggestions for further research and criticism on zed survey.

4.1. Estonian speakers with Estonian citizenship

The main tendencies that describe this group is that they are relatively oblivious to the problem and they do not have experiences when it comes to the issues regarding integration. This has also been brought out in the two newest frameworks that Estonian speakers did not expect there to be differences between them and Russian speakers.

The first question reads ‘does the Estonian legislation address the factor of Estonian society’s multi-ethnic character? If “yes”, how? If “no”, why?’ 70 percent of people answered that ‘yes it does’. However to the second part how, I did not get many explanations. Most of them answered that the law adheres to everyone and therefore the legislation is sufficient. 28 percent of Estonian speakers answered that the laws are not in correlation and they are insufficient regarding the integration. For example one person answered:

“Generally the Estonian legislation is in correspondence with the international criteria, personally it seems as today’s multi-ethnic principle has not been taken into account – thus far the legislation has followed the previous experience, but multi-ethnicity has become more seriously relevant.” (Interview 1 2017)

Also one person specifically brought out that the legislation is not corresponding to the needs of people who have to learn Estonian, therefore it makes it makes it harder for them to complete the Estonian state exam (Interview 2 2017). Although this was a small survey group there is an understanding that the Estonian society is multi-ethnic and the legislation does not take it into account. Two percent of surveyed did not know how to answer and added at that they have not heard of legislation that would specifically touch this subject.

The second question was also about the legislation and how much to they know about the strategic plans. ‘Does the Estonian legislation address a need for the state to have a strategic policy on integration of the country’s Russian-speaking residents into Estonia-wide

civil society? If “yes”, how? If “no”, why?” The results are relatively similar to the first question. 80 percent answered ‘no, the Estonian legislation does not address the need’ but yet again they lacked in further explanations. Also a few brought out that the current strategic plans are not part of the legislation and rather suggestion plans. The people who said ‘yes’ also did not continue their thought process, however one person brought up the fact that this problem is something that has been a topic of discussion for a long time:

“I remember that the first Integration conference was held in 1996 in Virumaa and the second conference “The Preconditions of other Ethnicities Integrating to the Estonian Society” was also held in Ida-Virumaa in 1998. For the first time Klara Hallik used in her presentation the word integration strategy.” (Interview 3)

This shows that even from a small group of Estonian speakers, there still is some knowledge that has made it to them either through media or education.

The last two questions are about personal experiences and the third one asks: Do you have a personal opinion on the issue of integration between Russian-speakers and Estonian-speakers in Estonia? In this case there are many answers that need to be brought out. For example one person has admitted that they do not see the whole picture, the native Russian speakers that he/she works with have learnt Estonian to perfection and put their children to Estonian schools (Interview 4 2017). A few others also answered that in their friend groups there are quite a few Russians and people from mixed families and everyone gets along fine. This indicates that Estonian speakers have interactions with Russian speakers from mostly cluster A and cluster B. The person from survey 1 also brought out that “a mistake was made by the Estonian government in the beginning of rebuilding up the state by not involving the Russian speakers in the process. Now 25 years later, the people feel sidelined and there are more difficult to integrate”. This would adhere to the first generation Russian speakers who were brought to Estonia by the USSR who most likely are in cluster E and as it seems, on a day to day basis the Estonian speakers do not seem to notice this group of people.

‘Do you have a personal experience of being linked to, or involved into, or imposed onto any of integration-related activities in the context of this questionnaire?’ the fourth question was created to give an opportunity to let people talk about any experience that they have had in the context. All twenty answers came back with ‘no’ and then some added a few general topic related comments. This only certified that Estonian speakers do not have contact with Russian speakers. Survey nr 5 added in his/her answer that integration is natural process and our state still has a long way to go but also that there should be more focus on the people

who live in a ‘capsule’ and have no Estonian contacts. Only some people understood that there is an actual issue, however like the latter answers shows that the problem is amongst Russian speakers and the Estonian speakers do not see the fault in themselves.

The survey has proved several points that the Estonian speakers have little to no exposure to Russian speakers although they are surprisingly aware of the issues that surround the topic. Also two people from 18 knew the history very well and brought out the fact that this has been an issue for a long time however the problem has not been resolved and the process is still ongoing.

4.2. Russian Speakers with Estonian Citizenship

After the initial overview of the Russian answers, the answers are more thought through and people have more experiences and also distrust towards the system. Moreover the Russian speakers are more opinionated and expressive when describing their issues, the results are not surprising because of how they group of people have been described before by other researches and the frameworks. However the some answers provide an in-depth view what do to Russian speakers have to go through on a daily basis. After sending out the surveys to the Russian speakers in two occasions I had to send the Russian version but the answer I received was in Estonian which shows that although they did not understand that somewhat complexly formed sentences, they knew how to express themselves in Estonian. Also in two occasions in an e-mail I received a note saying that the people used someone’s help in translating and writing. Overall the writing I received was well written and easily understandable with minor grammar mistakes.

The results of the first questions show that the Russian speaking is rather fragmented where the people divide into almost four equal groups: people who answered yes, the legislation is in accordance with the multi-ethnicity; no, the legislation is doing very little to the multi-ethnic situation; yes/no, updates should be made and lastly one fourth answered that they have no idea what the legislation says about the topic. One of the most thought provoking answers was from survey 6: “The laws are acceptable for people who were born here (Estonia). People who migrated here after the war feel distressed by the language requirements. Today’s generation do not have such problem.” It is mentioned in previous frameworks and researches that Russian speakers do not trust the Estonian government and they do not feel part from the society and this statement clearly indicates one of the reasons.

However the statistics shows that the younger generations also experience the same issues. For example one person with overall strong negative opinions answered:

“I have not read the legislation but real life shows multi-culturalism does not have a place in this country. For instance in school a teacher wrote a remark in a diary that my daughter spoke Russian in between classes. To my knowledge, speaking Russian is not prohibited by law but in reality it is” (Interview 7 2017).

Yet again this answer showcases why Russian speakers have gained this attitude towards the government.

The second question divided the answers into to two groups people, forty percent who know that there is a strategic plan but they do not correlate it with the law. Three people brought out that they find it is separate from the people. Person from survey eight said that the legislation does not address the situation however the people need it. Although there have been on ongoing strategic plans since 2000 the message does not seem to be making out to the people. The other sixty percent have no knowledge about a strategic plan (fifty percent of those people left the answer blank).

The answers about the personal opinion of the integration also showcased a variety of opinions; around one third said that they not have anything specific to say which shows that people are distant from the topic. In survey eight the person brought out that integration is a long process and no one should feel forced. He or she continued that it is a shame that we live with people who feel unwanted in our society. Yet again it is brought up that people feel unwelcomed in the Estonian society and that thus far the people are going through a process. After 25 years of being re-independent there has been progress made but it seems like the integration progress is at a standstill and the history is repeating itself, with offspring of the Russian speakers are going to through the same issues. One person brought attention to the fact that adults to not have enough opportunities to study Estonian, although there are several institutions that offer language courses, the person stated that the waiting list is too long superficial in order to get proper knowledge of Estonian (Interview 7 2017). This answer offers a great insight to the reality; although there are language courses, they do not fill the needs of the people. However all three frameworks have put this as one of their goals that the work on adult education needs to continue but not only the capacity should also grow bigger. In a complaint like this when the language courses do not provide sufficient vocabulary for the daily use, perhaps the classes should be revised and updated as well. Additionally this shows that all the other programs such as the online courses have failed to reach the people.

For the fourth question about the personal experience I would like to bring out two main answers, firstly from survey eight:

“I have lived twenty years with an Estonian. Our kids speak Russian and Estonian and they are a part of both cultural realms. We have thousands of these kinds of families, why not bring them as an example?”

This is a great point to bring out, that the mixed families should be one of the focus points when talking about integration. Having more multi-ethnic families on the media perspective it should serve as positive image for both language groups. In the frameworks there are projects that are meant for Russian speakers, projects for Estonian speakers and projects that are meant for the youth. The youth projects are often meant to create a dialog between the two groups of people however if the media image would portray the multi-ethnic families it would be a reminder for the adults and also it would also encourage the teens to venture out from their closed communities.

The second answer I would like highlight is a negative experience of a person who tried to become an Estonian citizen however the process was difficult.

“I got my Estonian citizenship after completing the exam for the fourth time. The first three times the commission found the following reasons why I cannot pass the exams: how could you marry an Estonian if even Estonian girls cannot find a man but you did? The second time the commission brought the attention to my jewelry which in their opinion were too expensive. Third time found the commission a flaw in dictation (three were allowed), thereafter they took my oral part preparation papers and looked for flaws in their which In reality were my abbreviations. I asked why did I have to write the dictation and they answered if they think that my Estonian is bad then it is bad. After this experience I promised I would never take this exam again. Years later my new husband convinced me to try again because at that time living with a gray passport was difficult, it was almost like being homeless. Now I am living my life and trying to stay away from integration, just in case.” (Interview 7 2017)

Although this seems as an extreme case, only twenty people answered to this questionnaire. From there this was the most negative experience and definitely it raised the most questions. If the Estonian government has been creating integration programs since 1998, all the presidents since Estonia gained its independence, have emphasized how important it is that every person that lives in this state feels wanted and unified. This person wanted to be an Estonian citizen, clearly studied and prepared for the exam so it remains unclear how the

government's vision and practical side seem so diverged. If I would apply this ratio to the whole Russian speaking community it is understandable how this notion of distrust and living in closed neighborhoods take place.

4.3. Similarities and Differences between the Language Groups

The results of the survey were expected and support the claim that the Estonian current legislation and approach towards integration is not in correspondence with the *status quo*. Not only were the Estonian speakers foreign to the topic, the Russian speakers also are far from the knowledge that relevant specifically to them. A significant amount of both language groups lack the knowledge on the legislation and on the strategic plans. Even though when people answered 'yes' to the second question they did know either how to explain how the state addresses the need or they have some knowledge of it, meaning that they have heard of it but they do not know anything specifically. However, the fact that people do not know or even have not heard of integration programs shows that the government has failed to inform its citizens. This also proves my assumption and confirms my suggestion that more emphasis should be put on notifying the people, both Estonian speakers and Russians speakers.

Overall the Estonian speakers seem to be more knowledgeable about the laws and they have more opinions about the first two questions. Also their answers are more direct and similar to one another whereas the Russian speakers struggled to answer these questions and relied upon their experience. Another difference appears in the second answer since the Russian speakers rely on their experiences more than on their knowledge the results are fragmented and there lacks a common voice. This can be explained by the people being from different clusters. People who agreed with the first question that the law supports the multi-ethnicity are more likely from cluster A, meaning that they are well integrated and they have no problems excelling in Estonian society. These people also did not have specific experiences regarding the topic and answered in the lines of that they have lived in Estonia their whole life and most of their lives; they learnt Estonian, went to Estonian schools and then pursued their careers. The other side of Russian speakers who were not satisfied with the government's approach are most likely from cluster C because all the answers I received were in well-written Estonian; however, they are rather critical. They either are not happy at all or they think that the legislation needs updates where it would be more supporting towards the Russian speaking community.

When it comes to the second part of the survey, Estonians did not have experiences or many opinions to share. One person admitted that they are not seeing the whole therefore they cannot comment on the question. Although some answered that the integrations process should be softer, simple and people-friendly, also several people brought out that it takes a long time and even generations, which is similar to some Russian speakers' opinions. At the same time, the answers showed that Estonian speakers lacked personal approaches, which indicate that they are distant from the problem and they do not understand the struggles that the Russian speakers have to go through. This also showed on the fourth question because many persons whose mother tongue is Estonian left the answer blank, yet again this is an indicator that Estonians do not have multi ethnic relations or they are simply having relations with Russian speakers who are from cluster A or B. Whereas this is the question where most information was received from Russian speakers. Even though they did not have as much knowledge about the legislation they had much experience in the integration field. I was expecting more integration issues deriving from the society however the most answers were about negative feelings about the language law and communication with the state.

Most importantly, there was not a single answer that would explain the current legislation or strategy plans nor from the Estonian speakers or from the Russian speakers. The survey shows that although both language groups show vague knowledge about the legislation they understand that integration is a long process. However also from the results it seems like the process is on a stand still because people are not equipped with the information that would actively benefit the nation of Estonia. Also when talking about personal opinion and experiences, Estonians stayed general and lacked in personal touches. At the same time Russian speakers formed their mostly negative feelings towards the state. In both language groups there were exceptions such as cluster A which does respond similarly to Estonian speakers. Also the small survey group brought out Estonians who understand the issues and even know the history of integrating Russian speakers to the Estonian society.

4.4. Criticism and Suggestions for Further Research

Firstly the survey is based on only forty answers, this provides a small sample to represent hundreds of thousands people. Taking this topic on a larger scale could uncover many stories that would help understand the road of the Russian speakers and their social disconnect with the Estonian speakers. In addition it does not like seem that the survey reached out to people from cluster B, D and E, therefore a larger scale research would bring in more opinions and

this research stayed a bit one-sided. Also if the questions would be simplified or changed to a choice answer test it would eliminate the vague answers and give more precise results. That statistics would be easier to use and it could serve for many further researches. Asking for more personal data could also have helped to analyze the situation even more closely, for example: viewing the same occupation in both language groups.

This topic also lacks investigation amongst gray passport holders; often they are forgotten in the researches or briefly mentioned. Their background could be completely different therefore their obstacles of becoming Estonian citizens are specific to them. Another issue that could be further investigated are the problems with the naturalization laws. This is a topic that has been recently brought up in the media and also the statistics have started changing drastically since 2015. Additionally as mentioned several times throughout this research the Estonian speakers are relatively oblivious to the problem and overall not well educated on the topic. There is a lot of emphasis put on educating and opening the eyes of the Russian speakers; however there is little attention put on Estonian speakers. Focusing on them would provide a different angle that is well researched and the results can be used to create programs that would specifically target the Estonian speakers.

CONCLUSION

Currently the government is creating a closed loop where the Russian speaking youths do not get the proper education, therefore they are not able to obtain higher job positions and they work on jobs that pay less, they lose interest in the government and their role as a citizen and they will find it easier to live in their closed Russian speaking communities because they feel welcomed. Therefore, the state has completely failed in the integration process by instead creating cohesion in society; it has created a gap between Estonian speakers and Russian speakers. Also the government has failed to inform their citizens of the legislation and the programs that adhere to them. By making 60 percent of the lessons obligatory in Estonian, the youths are more likely rebel if they are forced to learn in Estonian. They will more likely to have negative feelings towards the state therefore not wanting to be apart of the society. This was also brought up by the Estonian speakers' answers that the government should have a softer approach and understand that this is a long process. By creating programs in which they feel open, have opportunities to excel and then incorporate the state, this carries bigger chances of success that the youths want to themselves be included in being a citizen and having trust in the government. The Russian speaking adults who have not found their place in the Estonian speaking society, feel unwanted and even if they want to achieve and learn Estonian there is always the possibility that they will be judged or they will be added to a waiting list.

There are systems what the frameworks are trying to make however it is not enough that they are creating social platforms that are news or language learning based. They need to be active; they need to make it out to the people. There needs to be a lot more fuzz around the topic that they websites where they can learn Estonian for free and they can go to the Employment Center and ask for help. In addition, they need to know that there are news sites that offer Russian news that are fair and impartial and that there are options but as long people do not know about it they do not fulfill their purpose.

The other side is that also the Estonian speakers are distant from the problem, the survey results show that although they have knowledge about the integration they lack in experience. The frameworks also stated that there are points that need to be reached on the

Estonian speaking side as well. The government needs to work on the fact that integration is a two-way street. For example if there are Estonian language courses for the Russian speakers why are not Estonian speakers provided with Russian courses to promote mutual understanding. Also mentioned earlier the media carries a great responsibility to advertise tolerance and as Russian speaker brought up in the questionnaire – mutual families. Bringing people on the same level of understanding should be one of the main goals of the state.

Overall integration is very difficult in the Estonian society because Estonians are closed and protective of their cultural and political values. They do not trust the Russian speakers because Estonians affiliate them with the past. This is proved by the results of the framework based researches. The survey showed that there are significant problems with the knowledge about the legislation; however, the experience indicates that there are deficits in the laws and the works of the frameworks. The Estonian government is not doing enough to close the gap between the two groups of people, this shows that the current normative framework is not corresponding to the status quo. Therefore creating cohesion whilst promoting the Estonian language and providing everyone else their national cultural rights, is a difficult task for the government to fulfill. It will take generations to achieve abundance. President Kaljulaid put the notion in a great few sentences that should describe the next goals of the frameworks and laws:

“We can write laws about how to become an Estonian citizen, but not on how to become a part of the Estonian nation. If we would attempt that, we would turn into a totalitarian society, and destroy our freedoms in the name of preserving our conduct.”

REFERENCES

Definitions

http://pub.stat.ee/px-web.2001/I_Databas/Multidomain_statistics/Integration/HHS_01.htm (15.04.2017)

Estonian Integration Framework 2008-2013. (2007) Ministry of Culture.
http://www.kul.ee/sites/kulminn/files/loimumiskava_2008_2013.pdf (14.12.2016)

Estonian Integration Monitoring 2011. (2011) Ministry of Culture.
http://www.kul.ee/sites/kulminn/files/kum_integratsiooni_monitooring_2011.pdf
(15.04.2017)

Final Report 2014 (2014) "Estonian Integration Framework 2008-2013" Ministry of Culture.
http://www.kul.ee/sites/kulminn/files/141127_elk_2008-2013_lopparuanne_loplik_1.pdf (15.04.2017)

Ilves, T.H. (2011) President of the Republic of Estonia Mr. Toomas Hendrik Ilves in the "Estonia" Concert Hall February 24, 2011 <http://arhiiv.err.ee/guid/41202> (13.03.2017)

Integrating Estonia 2020: The Strategy of Integration and Social Cohesion in Estonia (2013)
http://www.kul.ee/sites/kulminn/files/le2020_arengukava_uuendatud_2016.pdf
(14.12.2016)

Interview 1 – 8 2017 Survey Group

Kaljulaid, K. (2017) President of the Republic at the Estonia Theatre and Concert Hall on 24 February 2017 <https://president.ee/en/official-duties/speeches/13091-president-of-the-republic-at-the-estonia-theatre-and-concert-hall-on-24-february-2017/index.html>
(13.03.2017)

Keelekümbluse valikuvõimalused

<http://kke.innove.ee/keelekumblusest/valikuvoimalused> (15.04.2017)

Kivirähk, J (2014) *Integrating Estonia's Russian-Speaking Population: Findings of National Defense Opinion Surveys*. International Centre for Defense and Security Estonia.

Lindemann, K; Saar, E (2012) *Ethnic Inequalities in Education: Secondary-Generation Russians in Estonia*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35:11, P1974-1998

Linguistic Human Rights and Security. Estonian Institute of Human Rights. 2015
<http://aastakonverents.humanrightsestonia.ee/en/2015-survey/> (15.05.2017)

Lõpueksamite Statistika (2015) <http://www.innove.ee/et/yldharidus/pohikooli-lopueksamid/lopueksamite-statistika/2015-aasta-lopueksamite-statistika> (15.04.2017)

Masso, A (2011) *Rethinking of Social Space: Generational and Ethnic Differences in Estonia*, *Geopolitics*, 16:4, P902-925

Meri, L. (1994) President of the Republic of Estonia Mr. Lennart Meri in the "Estonia" Concert Hall February 24, 1994 <https://vp1992-2001.president.ee/eng/k6ned/K6ne.asp?ID=9400> (13.03.2017)

Mida teha venelastega? Sirp.

<http://www.sirp.ee/s1-artiklid/c9-sotsiaalia/mida-teha-venelastega/> (14.05.2017)

Monitoring of Integration in Estonian Society in 2015. Institute of Baltic Studies. 2015
<https://www.ibs.ee/en/publications/monitoring-of-integration-in-estonian-society/>
(15.05.2016)

National Program: "Integration in the Estonian Society 2000-2007" Retrieved from
<http://www.kul.ee/et/integratsioon-eeesti-uhiskonnas-2000-2007> (14.12.2016)

Pappel, P (2016) Stalnuhhin: Coalition is not Interested in the Language Learning of the

Russian Community <http://www.ohtuleht.ee/737534/stalnuhhin-valitsuskoalitsiooni-ei-huvita-vene-kogukonna-keeleope> (15.05.2017)

Reps, M (2017) Repts: Only a few schools would be granted with the language exceptions
<http://www.pealinn.ee/poliitika/reps-keele-erandi-saaks-void-moni-uksik-vene-kool-n186269> (24.03.2017)

Tables 1-8 (2017)

<http://pub.stat.ee/px-web.2001/Dialog/statfile1.asp> (14.12.2016)

Trimbach, J. D.; O'Lear, S (2015) *Russians in Estonia: Is Narva the next Crimea?* Eurasian Geography and Economics, 56:5, P493-504

TABLES

Table 1. Population, 1 January by Year, County and Ethnic nationality

		Total	Estonians	Russians	Ethnic nationality unknown
2015	Whole country	1313271	907937	330258	10844
	Harju county	575601	351024	179210	7077
	Ida-Viru county	147597	28070	107164	1096

Table 2. Poverty and Material Deprivation Rate by Year, Groups of Persons and Indicator

		At-risk-of-poverty rate, %	At-risk-of-poverty rate for pensioners, %	Material deprivation rate, %
2015	Estonians	19,4	43,8	8,1
	Russians	25,6	46,1	25,3
	Persons whose domestic language is Estonian	19,7	44,6	8
	Persons whose domestic language is Russian	25,1	44,7	24,2
	Born in Estonia	20	44,2	11,4
	Persons with undetermined citizenship	29,6	46	32

Table 3. Equalized Yearly Disposable Income by Ethnic Nationality, Year

	2015			
	Total	Estonian citizenship	Other citizenship	Unspecified
Estonians	10874,8	10881,25
Non-Estonians	8928,24	9615,62	7970,09	8105,8
Unit: Euros				

Table 4. Population by Year, Ethnic Nationality and Income Quintile

		Total	Lowest quintile	Second quintile	Third quintile	Fourth quintile	Highest quintile
2015	Estonians	100	18,4	18,4	19,1	20,8	23,3
	Non-Estonians	100	23,8	23,7	22,2	18,2	12,1
Unit:							
percentages							

Table 5. Employed Persons by Year, Indicator, Group of Persons and Major Occupations

			Managers	Professionals	Technicians and associate professionals	Clerical support workers
2015	Proportion of the employed (occupations total=100), %	Estonians	13,9	21,8	12,5	6,1
		Russians	7	15,3	10,7	5,9
		Persons whose domestic language is Estonian	14	22	12,4	6,1
		Persons whose domestic language is Russian	7,2	14,6	10,9	5,8
		Persons who can speak and write in Estonian	9	26,4	14,2	7,2
		Persons who can speak on the level of everyday communication in Estonian	7,4	9,7	9,3	4,6
		Persons who can	5,2	6,6	8,6	9,4

		understand on the level of everyday communication in Estonian				
		Not knowing Estonian	7,7	4,2	8,3	..

Service and sales workers	Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers	Craft and related trades workers	Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	Elementary occupations	Armed forces occupations
12,9	2,1	13	10,1	6,9	0,7
15,6	..	19,1	14,9	10,8	..
12,9	2,2	12,6	10,1	7	0,7
15,3	..	19	15,4	11,2	..
17,5	..	11,8	8,3	5,2	..
17,6	..	18,6	19,5	12,4	..
13,6	..	19,8	23,8	12,9	..
10,4	..	30,9	17,2	18,7	..

Table 6. Unemployment Indicators by Ethnic Nationality and Year

		2015
Long-term unemployment rate	Estonians	2
	Non-Estonians	3,2
The share of long-term unemployed among the unemployed	Estonians	37,1
	Non-Estonians	40,2
Very long-term unemployment rate	Estonians	1,1
	Non-Estonians	1,9

Table 7. Pupils, Discontinuers and Grade Repeaters in General Education

				School levels total		

				Languages of instruction total	Estonian language of instruction	Russian language of instruction
2015	Whole country	Pupils	Estonian	106603	106144	181
			Russian	35900	14069	21784
		Discontinuers	Estonian	1763	1750	10
			Russian	463	157	304
		Grade repeaters	Estonian	1836	1829	4
			Russian	333	157	175

Grades 7-9				Gymnasium (grades 10-12)		
Languages of instruction total	Estonian language of instruction	Russian language of instruction	Languages of instruction total	Estonian language of instruction	Russian language of instruction	
26736	26667	54	20119	19996	10	
9538	2828	6704	5463	4881	565	
312	310	2	1431	1420	8	
85	17	68	375	140	233	
609	608	1	900	897	2	
118	37	81	133	79	53	

Table 8. Persons Aged 18-24 with below Upper Secondary Education, Not in Education or Training by Ethnic Nationality and Year

	2015
Estonians	12,8
Non-Estonians	9,2

APPENDIXES

Questionnaire

General Module

Tere,

Minu nimi on Helina Sildvee ning õpin Tallinna Tehnikaülikoolis rahvusvahelisi suhteid. Oma bakalaureuse töö raames viin ma läbi küsitluse, mille eesmärk on välja uurida 40 inimese isiklik kogemus Eesti-Vene integratsiooni teemal ning nende teadmised sellega seonduva seadustikuga.

Küsitluse vastamine võtab aega umbes 10min.

Kui Teil on küsimusi võite julgelt kirjutada: helina.sildvee@gmail.com

Emakeel:

Kodakondsus:

1. Kas Eesti seadustik vastab Eesti multi-etnilisusele ühiskonnas? Kui jah, kuidas? Kui ei, miks?
2. Kas Eesti seadustik väljendab vajadust strateegilise plaani järele, mis seostaks vene keelt kõnelevaid inimesi Eesti ühiskonnaga? Kui jah, kuidas? Kui ei, miks?
3. Kas Sul on Eesti-Vene integratsiooni kohta isiklik arvamus, mis puudutab vene keelt ja eesti keelt kõnelevaid inimesi? Mis see on?
4. Kas sul on isiklike kogemusi, mis seonduvad integratsiooniga selles küsitluse kontekstis? Palun jaga seda