

CULTURAL CAPITAL AND THE RICHES OF MANNA: INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANT SCIENTISTS IN ISRAELI ACADEMIA

Nitza Davidovitch

Ari'el University Centre, Israel
E-mail: d.nitza@ariel.ac.il

Dan Soen

Ari'el University Centre and the Kibbutzim School of Education, Tel-Aviv, Israel
E-mail: soen@macam.ac.il

Zila Sinuany-Stern

Ari'el University Centre and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel
E-Mail: szila@ariel.ac.il

Abstract

The article deals with transnationalism – the flow of cultural capital across borders. Around 16,000 scientists entered Israel during the 1990s. Some of them joined the academic staff. This case study is the first to compare between achievement measures of new immigrant and native Israeli senior academic faculty. It is based on the analysis of performance records of 206 senior faculty members from the Ariel University Centre, out of whom 77 were born overseas. The study analyzes staff who received financial rewards for excellence for the three years 2006–2008, based on their activities, as measured by several criteria: excellence in research, teaching, academic administration, and contributions to the community. On the whole, the study revealed that a larger percentage of immigrant faculty members vs. native Israelis scored on excellence criteria. A discriminant analysis was performed in order to examine to what degree scoring on various excellence criteria distinguishes between immigrants and native Israelis faculty. All in all, the research reveals that immigrant scientists have become well integrated in the analyzed institution; their academic contribution was a major one.

Key words: *transnationalism, cultural capital, absorption of immigrant scientists, academic achievements, academic distinction.*

Introduction

The concept of *transnationalism*, which is described as an integral part of the globalization process, is lately becoming rather popular in social as well as political sciences (Remennick, 2007; Faist, 2000; Portes et al., 1999). Originally coined to describe flows of capital and labor across na-

tional borders in the second half of the 20th century, it was later applied to the study of migrations as well as ethnic Diasporas. Thus, the lens of *transnationalism* became very useful for the exploration of issues like immigrant economic and social integration, identity and cultural retention. Scholars now recognize the split of economic, social and political loyalties among migrants, as well as the gradual attenuation of loyalty to the nation-state as such (Remennick, 2007; Glick Schiller et al., 1995; Guarnizo & Smith, 1998).

Current writings on transnationalism are concerned equally with long-distance economic activities, financial flows across the borders and exploration of socio-cultural dimensions and immigrants' assimilation and identity (Remennick, 2007^a; Alba & Nee, 1997).

Most recent studies dealing with transnationalism focused on emigrants moving from third world countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America to the West (Faist, 2000; Portes et al., 1999; Smith & Guarnizo, 1998). This paper deals with another stream of migrations: those from ex-socialist East European countries to the West.

Immigrant absorption has been one of Israel's major aims since the establishment of the State of Israel. The goals of the Ministry of Immigration Absorption (MOIA) in regards to scientists' absorption as stated are among other things to ensure, to the greatest degree possible, that the scientific potential embodied in immigration is channeled appropriately, facilitating proper personal absorption of scientists, in order to increase Israeli scientific research and technological capabilities (MOIA).

Immigration to Israel

The State of Israel was established on May 15, 1948, a historical event which occurred following two thousand years of Jewish exile and persecution in the Diaspora. The establishment of the state was accompanied by the signing of the Scroll of Independence, which declared that "the State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles" (in Horev, 2006). This statement received its legal authority two years later in the Law of Return, which explicitly stated that "*all Jews are entitled to immigrate to Israel*" (Law of Return, 1950). This legal act transformed the Land of Israel into a world center of Jewish immigration.

The State of Israel was established on a unique ethno-national foundation, seeking to base its existence on waves of external immigration which form an important demographic basis of the Jewish existence in Israel (Sever, 2001). At the time the state was established the Jewish population numbered approximately 600 thousand; today, six decades later, the Jewish population numbers 6 million, of whom 30% were born overseas (CBS, 2008, 59). 75% of the Jewish population in Israel is either immigrants or 1st generation Israelis (ibid.). Israel is a country of immigrants, and from the moment it was established it had to cope with large rates of immigration and the challenges involved in absorbing immigrants. Despite its extensive experience with the absorption of immigrants, it faced a significant new economic, social, and cultural challenge in the late '80s and early '90s.

The Large Wave of Immigration from the Former Soviet Union (FSU) – Unique Characteristics

In 1989 the Soviet Union opened its gates to citizens who wished to leave the country. When the Iron Curtain fell, it was finally possible to leave the country legally after many decades of restricted movement. This point symbolized the beginning of the second wave of immigration from the FSU (the first wave was in the '70s), which became one of the largest mass immigration movements in human history (Gandal, Hanson & Slaughter, 2004). An estimated 1.6 million of former Soviet citizens of Jewish ancestry left the disintegrating former USSR after 1987, drastically depleting their aging Jewish communities left behind. They constituted a huge fountain of human capital. Jews

were the most educated minority group among all FSU nations. Over 60% had tertiary education. Most held professional or white collar occupations (Remmenick, 2007^a; Tolts, 2004). Over 60% of these emigrants moved to Israel; 40% scattered in other Western countries.

Over 720 thousand people entered the country over a period of three years, arousing many concerns of their effect on the structure of society (Kimmerling, 1998). The wave of immigration from the Soviet Union in 1989-1996 expanded the population of Israel by 20% (Geva-May, 2002). By 2008 the number of immigrants from the FSU reached one million, who all arrived in the second wave which began in 1989 and has continued in a more moderate form until the present day (Mey-Ami, 2008). The rate of immigrants from the FSU among the Jewish population in Israel rose from 3.8% in 1990 to 21% in 2005. They are now the largest ethnic group to migrate to Israel (Rajiman, 2009). By virtue of its size and timing the huge Russian migration wave of the 1990s had all the necessary conditions for the development of transnational tendencies (Remmenick, 2007).

The massive wave of immigration from the FSU is unique in its size, composition, and extent. The new immigrants provided material for many studies examining various aspects of their absorption and acclimatization, including: linguistic (Menachem & Geist, 1999; Ben Raphael, Olstein & Gates, 1994; Chiswick & Repetto, 2000; Chiswick, 1998), cultural (Geva-May, 1998; Remennick, 2002), economic (Stier & Levanon, 2003), personal (Epstein & Kheimets, 2001), occupational (Ofer, Plug & Kasir, 1991; Nirel, 1999; Mesch & Czamanski, 1997; Chiswick, Lee & Miller, 2006), mental (Lerner, Kertes & Zilber, 2005), and social aspects (Darr & Rothschild, 2005; Soen, 2001; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1994) and other parameters aimed at evaluating the relationship between the immigrants and their target country.

Aside from the numerical aspects of this wave of mass immigration, it had unique demographic and social characteristics of which some were new to Israel. This population was noticeable for its large proportion of elderly, which was much higher than that in the local population (19% aged 65+ as against 9.9%)! Moreover, its median age was 42.9, comparing with a median age of 28.5 for migrants coming to Israel from Western countries, and median age of 25.4 for migrants coming from Ethiopia (Rajiman, 2009). However, of all immigrants at an age considered employable, 58% were academics, compared to 25% among Israel's existing population (Kimmerling, 1998). According to data from the MOIA, 10.9% of immigrants in 1989-1999 were engineers and architects, 2.3% were doctors, 2.2% were artists, 2.5% were nurses, and 4.8% were teachers. The total number of immigrants who arrived during this decade was 835,240 (MOIA, 2008a). During 2000-2008 the number of immigrants with scientific and academic occupations, in addition to those with liberal and technical professions, reached 31.8%. The total number of immigrants with scientific and academic occupations during these years was 268,287 (MOIA, 2008b). Despite these impressive data one Israeli scholar (Cohen, 2007) suggested that the emigrants who were younger, more educated and had better adjustment potential in the Western economies left the FSU for North America. Those who opted for Israel were their older counterparts. As a result of this self-selection Russian Jews in Israel did not fare nearly as well as their compatriots in North America. Moreover, in Israel they had to cope with a small and saturated skilled labor market (*ibid.*).

In the present study the research team sought to examine another less studied aspect focusing on a certain segment of this population – *the scientists*. Surprisingly, despite the many programs designed in the past and the various proposals for integrating immigrant scientists in academic fields in the future, no extensive study was held on the subject. The lack of updated research on the integration and contribution of immigrant scientists to academia is detrimental to the development of future programs aimed at academic integration. In the absence of data it is difficult to estimate the degree to which the integration of immigrant scientists indeed contributes to Israeli higher education and to the scientists per se.

In this study we have chosen to focus on the quality and degree of the absorption of immigrant versus native Israeli scientists at the Ari'el University Center in Samaria (AUC). The main purpose of the research is to assess the contribution of immigrant scientists in the fields of research, teaching, and contribution to the community.

Immigrant Scientists

The group of immigrants with scientific and academic occupations encompasses many scientists. The MOIA defined scientists as corresponding to one of three different categories: holders of Ph.D. or equivalent degrees who worked in the field of research and development for at least 3 of the 5 years before immigrating and published at least 3 scientific articles or acknowledged scientific studies or registered 3 patents; holders of M.Sc. or equivalent degrees who worked in the field of research and development for at least 4 of the 6 years before immigrating and published at least 3 scientific articles or registered 3 patents; holders of M.Sc. or equivalent degrees who worked in the field of research and development for at least 4 of the 6 years prior to immigrating but produced no articles or patents (see website of the MOIA).

Between 1989-1991 more than 5,300 immigrant scientists fitting these criteria immigrated to Israel (MOIA, 2000). During these years the number of veteran Israeli scientists reached 8,000, including both researchers and academic faculty (Geva-May, 2000). During the period of immigration, scientists constituted 1.2% of all immigrants. The number of scientists who immigrated from the FSU in the last wave of immigration totaled 15,700 by 2008 (Mey-Ami, 2008). During 1989-1999 about 14,000 immigrants appealed to the Center for Absorption in Science (CAS) of the MOIA— 1.4% of all immigrants who arrived in Israel during those years. A large percentage of CAS files – 38% – were opened during 1991-1992 (MOIA, 2008b).

Thus, the population of immigrants from the Soviet Union was, in general, well-educated. In contrast to the typical pattern of immigration, these immigrants did not come to Israel in search of new socioeconomic opportunities (Bhagat & London, 1999); however they perceived their employment as a central aspect of their process of assimilation in Israel (Menachem & Gates, 1999).

These traits raised the economic and social potential of immigration from the Soviet Union (Triponov & Weiner, 1995). The immigrants were acknowledged as “human capital” with a great potential of contributing to the Israeli economy (Darr & Rothschild, 2004; Ofer et al., 1991). Concurrent with the high expectations of these immigrants, local veteran segments of the population developed real concerns. They feared the inherent competition for employment opportunities, rising unemployment, and the utilization of national resources for immigration absorption at the expense of budgets intended for underprivileged and veteran populations (Kimmerling, 1998), as well as overburdening the Israeli welfare system (see also Smooha, 1998).

The potential on the one hand and emerging concerns on the other led to a certain conflict within Israeli society. Some claimed that market forces should be allowed to take their course and that a natural balance and integration of the immigrants would occur spontaneously (Meirson, 1991). Others thought that Israel would not be able absorb the gargantuan workforce arriving at its doorstep without the help of artificial means (Ne’eman, 1991; Darr & Rothschild, 2005). This endeavor helped create various programs for the integration of scientists and academics within the Israeli labor market. Many efforts have been made by the Israeli government to realize the significant human capital of the population of immigrants from the FSU. The question should now be raised— Have these efforts been fruitful? Has the effort to facilitate the employment of immigrants been successful?

Research on the Employment of Highly Educated Immigrants

The recent wave of immigration to Israel, characterized by a high proportion of educated people, is unlike that of the ‘70s (Ne’eman, 1994). Israeli society underwent many processes which reduced immigrants’ chances of becoming integrated, due to contemporary socioeconomic conditions which are less conducive to immigration (Epstein & Kheimets, 2001). The ‘90s were characterized by high rates of unemployment: 10% in the ‘90s versus 3.3% in the ‘70s. During these years no new university-level institutions were opened in Israel, versus the ‘60s and ‘70s in which 3 new universities were established, creating jobs for academics (Davidovich & Iram, 2006). The absorp-

tion policy changed from an institutional policy of “absorption centers” to a policy of termed *direct absorption* (Leshem, 1993), where immigrants were given the option of independently choosing their place of work and residence (Epstein & Kheimets, 2001; Epstein, Kheimets & Oritzky, 2003). This policy tasked immigrants with the responsibility for locating adequate solutions for their needs (Leshem, 1993). At the same time, public consciousness no longer perceived the significance of absorbing immigration, and this was now considered a burden rather than an asset (ibid.). All these conditions made immigration much more difficult. It was almost necessary to initiate interventions in order to enable suitable absorption of immigrants.

When studying the assimilation of immigrants in society, economic-employment integration is considered very significant (Menachem & Gates, 1999). The premise is that such integration is a major indicator of successful assimilation in the target society, as these aspects are central for determining individuals’ feelings of well-being (Stier & Levanon, 2003), belonging and self-esteem. For example, Menachem and Gates (ibid.) found that immigrants’ feelings of attachment and connection to Israel are determined to a great degree by their employment and personal achievements in the country.

Some of the studies examining the integration of immigrants from the FSU in the workforce focused on their integration as a group, while others examined the integration of unique populations among the immigrants.

Ofer et al. (1991) attempted to estimate the integration of immigrants from the FSU in the workforce theoretically via economic models, focusing on aspects related to retaining and changing occupations. Their findings indicated that in order for educated immigrants to become integrated in the Israeli economy it is necessary to radically open the economy to global markets. The researchers also estimated that the best-educated sector would be the most capable of retaining original occupations.

Nirel (1998) examined the integration of immigrant physicians from the FSU in the workforce. Research findings indicate that most physicians who found jobs in their profession succeeded in becoming integrated in their field. The findings indicate improvements in physicians’ job stability, “institutionalization” of positions, professional status, wages, and perceived absorption, as a function of time. According to all these measures, physicians who arrived by June 1992 and were employed in their fields succeeded in becoming integrated in Israeli medical services.

Naveh and King (1999) examined the integration of engineers in the Israeli workforce. Their findings show that although immigrant engineers have significant professional skills and professional experience, only one quarter of all immigrant scientists were employed in their profession, 9% were employed in related professions such as teaching (Geva-May, 1998), as technicians, or in programming, and 66% worked in other professions unsuited to their level of education – almost half were employed as professional laborers and one quarter as unprofessional laborers (ibid.).

Stier and Levanon (2003) examined the employment of immigrants in jobs that are compatible with their skills. The researchers found that most of the immigrants had difficulty finding jobs. Four years after arriving in Israel most were employed in jobs that did not suit their skills. The lack of compatibility between skills and occupation was indeed detrimental to their prestige and social status, but not to their income, which rose despite the element of over-qualification.

Darr and Rothschild (2005) examined the integration of well-educated immigrants in the Israeli scientific community. The researchers found that although the human capital of the immigrants was higher than that of veteran Israelis, this fact alone did not facilitate engineer and scientist assimilation in the Israeli scientific community. The researchers associated this finding with the fact that Israel is a small country and its professional communities are very congested and close-knit, a further obstacle encountered by immigrant engineers and scientists. In any case, while the new immigrants encountered many difficulties, research reveals that a few years after their arrival many of them experienced upward mobility commensurate with their human capital (Eckstein & Weiss, 2004; Semyonov et al., 2002).

Geva-May (2000) examined five projects for the retraining of immigrant scientists as teachers. The research findings indicate that the scientists were successfully employed in the field of teaching and well-integrated as high school teachers. However most were employed in partial positions and had to work at several schools. The researcher stated that despite the occupational success of redirecting scientists to high school teaching, from a social aspect the venture was less successful – most of the scientists did not form friendships with their colleagues, consistent with principals' statements that many parents object to having their children taught by immigrant teachers, despite the fact that 95% of the principals submitted favorable evaluations of immigrant scientists' contribution to the school.

Integration of Scientists in Institutions of Higher Education

As already mentioned, over 15,000 scientists immigrated to Israel over the past two decades. 54% have doctorate degrees and 46% have master's degrees. 64% have degrees in scientific and technological professions, 23% in the life and medical sciences, 13% in the social sciences and the humanities (Epstein et al., 2003). Although many studies have examined the assimilation of the Russian population in Israel, the integration of scientists in academia has been almost completely neglected and little research exists on this subject. Two studies were published by Toren, who explored the topic of scientists who immigrated in the '70s, and Shye et al., who examined the integration of scientists who arrived after 1989.

Toren (1988) interviewed immigrant scientists who came to Israel during 1973–1975. The study included interviews with 207 immigrants from the Soviet Union and 91 scientists from the United States. Research findings include a report on reasons for immigration, factors affecting scientists' satisfaction, and factors blocking their integration in the Israeli labor market (*ibid.*).

Shye et al. (1996) examined the integration of immigrants in academia during 1992–1995. The study analyzed scientists who had been living in Israel for 3 years. Research findings show that 70% of scientists who had been working at universities in 1992 were still working there three years later. 13% of immigrant scientists who had been working at universities had moved to industry by 1995, 7% of scientists who had been in academia were unemployed by 1995, a finding interpreted by researchers as stemming from adjustment difficulties and advanced age.

They further found (*ibid.*) that the proportion of scientists who published scientific articles doubled over this period as did the number of scientists who registered patents, findings credited by the researchers to government assistance afforded to immigrant scientists. Academic colleagues of immigrant scientists reported that the professional skills, integration, and contribution of the latter improved immeasurably over this period. However veteran colleagues estimated that immigrant scientists still had a relatively low chance of remaining at the universities.

Despite the improvements and progress indicated by scientists and their colleagues, the researchers reported that experts and various functionaries feel that long-term integration in the industrial sector is preferable, while only a small part of outstanding immigrant scientists, capable of contributing to basic research at the universities, should remain there.

The abovementioned studies illuminate the subject but do not reflect the current state of affairs as of 2009. Over a decade has passed since the study performed by Shye et al. Immigrant scientists are no longer defined as new immigrants and do not enjoy the benefits and aid programs provided to newly arrived immigrant scientists. Thus we must ask: What is the contribution of immigrant scientists to academic research and development? This question is necessitated by the enormous economic and social effort invested in their integration and follows a government decision received on August 2, 2007 to cancel financial support for the integration of immigrant scientists at research institutions in the field of research and development.

Methodology of Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the achievements of immigrant faculty members at the AUC, versus those of Israeli-born faculty members. Assessments of faculty activities and achievement-based rewards have become important topics over the past four decades (Hearn, 1999; Wadsworth, 1994; Altbach, 2000; Gillespie, Hilsen & Wadsworth, 2002; Kaiser & Neilson, 2002). Faculty members at academic institutions perform a wide range of activities, including: teaching, research, research publications, presentations at conferences, submitting research grants, academic administration, community service, etc. However academic freedom makes it difficult to supervise and report the achievements of faculty in the different areas (Manning & Romney, 1973).

Several methods (e.g. peer assessments, multiple-criteria evaluation, students' evaluation) serve to assess the achievements of faculty members at academic institutions. The main tool for evaluating teaching is the student feedback questionnaire completed at the conclusion of each semester (Kreber, 2001; Davidovich & Sinuany-Stern, 2006; Davidovitch & Soen, 2006). In addition, faculty promotion is based on evaluating the achievements of faculty members as well. Since 1993 many Israeli institutions of higher education have been utilizing annual self-evaluations and evaluations by senior colleagues, based on excellence criteria in the fields of research and teaching. The results of these evaluations are manifested in faculty salaries, in the form of rewards for excellence.

This study shall focus on the academic achievements of immigrant faculty members assimilated over the years at the AUC, versus those of native Israeli research faculty members. The main questions in this study relate to links between the contribution of faculty members, in their fields of activity, as evaluated by "excellence criteria", and their country of origin.

Faculty member eligibility for excellence rewards is based on teaching positions of at least 2/3 and contingent on reaching excellence scores in the top 60% (in actual fact, roughly 40% of the faculty received merit remuneration based on their excellence scores). This group is eligible to receive an annual supplement to their salaries based on achievements during the previous year. The supplement ranges from 7.5% (the lower 20% of the excellence scores) to 15% (the middle 20% of the excellence scores) to 20% (the top 20% of the excellence scores), according to the number of points accumulated. These are the rules of the Council for Higher Education for colleges. At universities there is no limitation of the percentage of those who may receive excellence rewards; however the reward itself comprises a maximum of 13%. This study calculates average scores based on five measures of evaluation, of which the most dominant are: evaluation of all academic activities by senior colleagues, including deans (excellence scores), and student evaluations of teaching (feedback).

The research questions focused on the achievement measures of immigrant faculty members, based on the analysis of personal detailed questionnaires filled in by all faculty members of the institution. On the whole, several points were analyzed: What is their relative weight in the fields of research (e.g. number of articles published in scientific journals, number of books published, research grants, prizes and awards, etc.) teaching (feedback from students, contribution to innovative instruction, etc.) and contribution to the community? What is their relative weight in the field of academic administration (membership in institutional committees, in departmental committees, in national committees, etc.)? What is their relative weight in contribution to the institution's academic reputation (invited lectures and presentations in international scientific conferences, serving on organizing committees of scientific conferences, etc.)? To what degree, if at all, do achievement measures of faculty members in research and teaching depend on other personal variables such as gender, seniority, age, or on variables related to their academic occupation, such as type of faculty, rank, and tenure? This paper deals with *the overall combined achievements* of the FSU scientists

Research Population

This study is based on 206 academic faculty members from the AUC. 62.6% of the faculty members are native Israelis, 19.4% are immigrants from the FSU, 12.1% are US-born, and 5.8%

came from other countries. In order to examine the correlation between faculty member origins and both background data and excellence criteria, the faculty members were divided into four groups of origin: Israel, FSU, USA, and others.

Results of Research

A notable fact emerging from the data is that not only do new immigrant scientists from the FSU account for 20% of the academic faculty, they account for an even larger share in the senior faculty members and typically have higher than average academic ranks, as evident from Table 1. Chi-square test results indicate no statistically significant correlation between academic rank and country of origin ($\chi^2(9) = 7.37, p > .05$) at the AUC. And yet, one should note that while a mere 28.6% of the entire faculty have a rank of professor, 35.0% of all faculty members who are FSU, immigrant scientists have earned such ranking.

Table 1. Distribution of academic ranks among faculty members, by country of origin (2007-8).

Country of origin	Israel		FSU		USA		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor	32	24.8	14	35	7	28	6	50	59	28.6
Senior Lecturer	55	42.6	12	30	10	40	3	25	80	38.8
Lecturer	39	30.2	12	30	7	28	2	16.7	60	29.1
Instructor	3	2.3	2	5	1	4	1	8.3	7	3.4
Total	129	100	40	100	25	100	12	100	206	100

The interesting question that arises from the data regards the effective contribution of these faculty members, above and beyond their high numerical proportion.

To this end, the authors examined the academic “harvest” of these faculty members in terms of scientific publications, lectures at academic conferences, and participation in projects funded directly by the Ministry of Immigration Absorption (MOIA). Participation in projects that are not directly funded by the MOIA was not taken into account because such data lack information on participants’ country of origin. In other words, the contribution of FSU immigrants in funded projects is in fact greater than the (partial) data presented herein.

An overview of the data indicates that FSU immigrants are responsible for a significant cumulative contribution. Thirty of the 109 (27.5%) volumes and periodicals authored by faculty members between 2004 and 2008 were the work of FSU immigrant faculty members. Seven of the 36 (19.5%) patents registered by faculty members in this period were also the work of FSU immigrant faculty members.

Table 2. Books and periodicals authored by faculty members (2004–2008).

Year	By FSU immigrants (N)	%	By other authors (N)	%
2004	4	30.8	9	69.2
2005	9	40.9	13	59.1
2006	6	20.7	23	79.3
2007	9	36.0	16	64.0
2008	2	10.0	18	90.0
Total	30	27.5	79	72.5

Source: Research Authority, Ariel University Center of Samaria.

Table 3. Patents registered by faculty members (2004–2008).

Year	By FSU immigrants (N)	%	By other authors (N)	%
2004	2	22.2	7	77.8
2005	1	16.7	5	83.3
2006	-	-	8	100.0
2007	2	13.3	13	86.7
2008	2	33.3	4	66.7
Total	7	19.4	29	80.6

Source: Research Authority, Ariel University Center of Samaria.

A review of project budgets also indicates the relative significance of FSU immigrant scientists among faculty members. Direct MOIA project funding was reduced from 34.67% of the total project budget in 2004 to 24.16% of the total project in 2007, yet more than this fact indicates the reduced scope of the contribution of new immigrant scientists to the institution's research projects, it indicates the reduced scope of MOIA funding. In total, the project budget increased annually, and the funding detracted from the MOIA budget was supplemented from other sources. In total, the Ministry contributed to 28.17% of the total project budget between 2004 and 2007.

Table 4. Investments of the MOIA in Projects for New Immigrant Scientists in the Institution (2004–2007).

Year	Ministry of Absorption Funding (NIS)	Total project budget (NIS)
2004	1,669,007	4,813,790
2005	1,684,363	5,353,276
2006	1,857,101	7,193,571
2007	1,935,857	8,012,119
Total	7,146,328	25,372,756

Source: Research Authority, Ariel University Center of Samaria.

No less interesting is FSU immigrant faculty's share in academic publications. Two points should be noted. First, FSU immigrants account for 27.8% of all the scientific publications authored by faculty members between 2004 and 2008, which is much greater than their relative proportion of the faculty. Nonetheless, their share in scientific publications is not stable. In 2005, this share was especially high (33.5% of all publications), while in 2004 and 2006 this share was relatively low (25.1% and 24.7%, respectively). Second, FSU immigrant faculty's share in publications naturally differs by department, consistent with their departmental distribution in the institution.

Table 5. Share of FSU Immigrant Authors of Scientific Publications (2004–2008).

Year	FSU scientists (N)	%	Others (N)	%
2004	54	25.1	161	74.9
2005	68	33.5	135	66.5
2006	59	24.7	180	75.3
2007	75	28.4	189	71.6
2008	83	27.7	217	72.3
Total	339	27.8	882	72.2

Source: Research Authority, Ariel University Center of Samaria.

Finally, the following data, relating to FSU immigrant faculty members' share in participation in scientific conferences in Israel and overseas, speak for themselves. FSU immigrant faculty account for a larger-than-proportionate share of conference active attendance. In 2007, a year in which attendance was lower than in other years, FSU immigrants accounted for 20.7% of all conference lectures by institution faculty members. In 2008, this figure increased to 26.9%. In total, 22.6% of all conference lectures by institution faculty members are attributed to FSU immigrant faculty members.

Table 6. FSU Immigrant Scientists' Share in Conference Lectures (2004–2008).

Year	FSU scientists (N)	%	Others (N)	%
2004	38	22.4	132	77.6
2005	51	22.3	178	77.7
2006	52	20.8	198	79.2
2007	44	20.7	169	79.3
2008	59	26.9	160	73.1
Total	244	22.6	837	77.4

Source: Research Authority, Ariel University Center of Samaria.

The descriptive statistics presented above allow us to assess the difference in the academic products of FSU immigrant scientists and other scholars at the Ariel University Center. Recall that the institution established a bonus system for outstanding faculty members. The bonus system is based on scores awarded to faculty members for their contribution in research, teaching, academic administration and community service. Faculty members' performance is evaluated on 10 distinct criteria. The most outstanding faculty members also earn an exemption in teaching obligations (10 instead of 12 weekly hours), in addition to the bonus.

The question is, what weight do FSU immigrants have in the bonuses awarded by the institution? Based on the above figures, we can expect the FSU immigrant scientists to stand out. An analysis of the findings shows that this is indeed the case. Table 7 and the results of a chi-squared test on the data from the 2007-8 academic year show a significant correlation between faculty members' cumulative scores on the 10 bonus criteria (based on outstanding performance) and country of origin ($\chi^2(2) = 7.74, p < .05$). While 38.8% of all faculty members earned a score which awarded them a bonus, over 50% of all FSU immigrant faculty members earned a bonus. In contrast, only 33.3% of all Israeli-born faculty members earned a bonus based on outstanding performance.

Table 7. Distribution of Faculty Members' Scores on Bonus Criteria, by Country of Origin.

Score	Israel		FSU		USA		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fails bonus criteria	86	66.7	20	50	16	64	4	33.3	126	61.2
Satisfies bonus criteria	43	33.3	20	50	9	36	8	66.7	80	38.8
Total	129	100	40	100	25	100	12	100	206	100

Table 7 and chi-square test results indicate a significant correlation between scoring on excellence criteria and country of origin ($\chi^2(2) = 7.74, p < .05$). 50% of faculty members from the FSU scored on excellence criteria, as did 66.7% of faculty members from other overseas countries (except the US); however only 36% of faculty members who immigrated from the USA and 33.3% of native Israelis scored on excellence in the criteria of research, teaching, academic administration, and contribution to the community.

As noted, research is one of the main areas that contributed to the higher scores of FSU immigrant faculty. Therefore, the research team attempted to examine the differences between scores and country of origin of faculty members. Based on an analysis of variance of the data in Table 8, no significant differences were found between the groups of faculty members by country of origin ($F(3,76) = 0.13, p > .05$). Still, it is notable that the achievements of FSU immigrant faculty members were the highest scoring of all groups (44.45 on average, compared to an average score of all groups of 39.04).

Table 8. Research Scores – Averages and SD.

Country of origin	Average	SD	N
Israel	36.69	33.53	43
FSU	44.45	36.54	20
USA	42.33	34.21	9
Other	39.12	28.98	8
Total	39.04	33.45	80

If this is not enough, an in-depth analysis indicates that 68.8% of all FSU immigrant faculty members also received an extra reduction in their teaching load, compared to 41.2% of the other new immigrants and compared to 34.2% of Israeli-born faculty members.

The figures in entirety speak for themselves.

Summary

The above article examined the extent of immigration of scientists from FSU to Israel, and dwelt on the problem of their absorption and integration into Israeli academe. As a case in point, the paper focuses on the absorption of FSU immigrant scientists at the Ariel University Center of Samaria, in an attempt to assess these scientists' contribution to the institution.

An analysis of the data available to the researchers indicates that FSU immigrant faculty members constitute 20% of the senior faculty, and 35% of the top-ranking faculty members (of a rank of professor), which is much higher than their proportion in the total number of faculty members.

An analysis of the data also indicates that these scientists do not only stand out in the institution in terms of their relative weight, but their effective scientific contribution is also disproportionately high. They account for a disproportionately high percentage of outstanding faculty members and for a disproportionately high percentage of faculty members who have earned recognition for their performance in research. Moreover, the findings of this study indicate that not only does this group's contribution exceed the contribution of other faculty groups at the institution; the FSU immigrant faculty members are at the top of the pyramid, by virtue of their entitlement to a reduction in their teaching load. This bonus is awarded to the faculty members who earn the highest evaluation scores. They also earned the highest scores in scientific publications. Almost 69% of the outstanding FSU immigrant scientists earned a reduction in their teaching load, compared to 41% of the outstanding new immigrant faculty members from other countries, and compared to only 34% of the outstanding Israeli-born faculty members.

All in all, there is no doubt that their contribution has significantly enriched the institution.

Moreover, the research findings indicate that immigrant scientists have become well integrated at the AUC, which is an integral part of the Israeli academic world. These findings are of great importance inasmuch as the problem of the émigrés social integration is concerned. Employment in par with one's skills and qualifications is known to be the major gateway for newcomers to both economic well-being and social integration. Far from being occupationally downgraded, the immigrant faculty excelled. Across post-Soviet Jewish diaspora, the share of professionals who could regain their original occupations is thought to lie between 15% in Germany and 30% in the US and

Israel (Remmenick, 2003). These scholars belong to the 30% who might be deemed a success story. Moreover, one has to bear in mind that the workplace is also a meeting place between the immigrant and their local Israeli peers. The moments of physical co-presence and face-to-face conversation induced by working together enhance “networked sociality” as well as friendship (Urry, 2003) thus contributing to transcendence over time of the boundaries of ethnic community, and gradual inclusion of the members of the immigrant scholars into the hegemonic majority’s personal networks (Remmenick, 2007).

To sum it all, this case study serves to show that the FSU scientists’ transmigration may be judged a success story for both sides: On one side, their absorption in the Israeli academic world facilitated their integration into the Israeli society. On the other side, their academic distinction greatly contributed to the development of Israeli higher education institutions. It seems that the foreign born have contributed disproportionately to Israeli academia. Thus, Israel is benefitting from investments made by other countries.

References

- Alba, R. D. & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 12, 502–551.
- Altbach, P. G. (Ed.) (2000). *The changing academic workplace: Comparative perspectives*. Chestnut Hill, Mass: Boston College.
- Ashkenazi, D. (1995). Immigrants on ice. *Ve’adim: Professional Magazine of Labor Relations in Israel*, 85, 56–57. (in Hebrew).
- Ashkenazi, D. (1997). Why were they not assimilated. *Status: Monthly Magazine for Management Thinking*, 67, 52–54. (in Hebrew).
- Barada, M. (2006). *The Kamea Program*. Jerusalem: The Knesset (Israeli Parliament), Information & Research Dept. (in Hebrew).
- Baruch, A. (1997). The Kamea Program – Lasting assimilation of scientists. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 3, 184–186. (in Hebrew).
- Baruch, A. (2000). Ten-year anniversary of the scientists’ immigration: Intermediary summary. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 4, 158–180. (in Hebrew).
- Becker, H.S. (1962). The nature of a profession. In N.B. Henry (ed.), *Education for the professions – The 61 yearbook of the NSSE* (pp. 27–46). Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ben David, Y. (1985). Universities in Israel: Dilemmas of growth, variety, and management. In W. Ackerman, A. Carmon, and D. Zucker (eds.), *Education in a Developing Society: The Israeli System* (I, pp. 527–562). Tel Aviv – Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuhad Publication and Van Leer Institute. (in Hebrew).
- Ben Refael, A., Olstein, A. & Geist, A. (1994). *Aspects of identity and language in the absorption of immigrants from the CIS: Research report*. Tel-Aviv: Tel Aviv University. (in Hebrew).
- Berry, John W. (1997). Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–68.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2006). *Israel Statistical Annual*, 57. Jerusalem.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2007). URL: http://www.cbs.gov.il/reader/?MIval=cw_usr_view_SHTML&ID=389 (in Hebrew). Accessed March 24, 2010.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2008). *Israel Statistical Abstract* 59. Jerusalem.

Chen, D. (ed.) (1998). *The School of Education towards the 21st century*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University. (in Hebrew).

Chiswick, B. (1998). Hebrew language usage: Determinants and effects on earnings among immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Population Economics*, 11, 253–271.

Chiswick, B.R. & Repetto, G. (2000). Immigrant adjustment in Israel literacy and fluency in Hebrew, *IZA Discussion Paper*, 177.

Chiswick, B.R., Lee, Y.L. & Miller, P.W. (2006). A longitudinal analysis of immigrant occupational mobility: A test of the immigrant assimilation, *International Migration Review*, 39, 332–353.

Cohen, A. & Kirchmeyer, C. (1994). Unions and ethnic diversity: The Israeli case of East European immigrants, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 30, 141–158.

Cohen, Y. (2007). Self-selection and earnings assimilation: Immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Israel and the United States. *Demography*, 44(3), 649–668.

Davidovich, N. (2004). *Development trends of the regional colleges and their consequences for the Israeli system of higher education*. Thesis submitted for degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Bar Ilan University. (in Hebrew).

Davidovich, N. & Iram, Y. (2006). Higher education in Israel at a crossroads: The effect of regional colleges on the map of higher education in Israel, *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1, 271–285.

Davidovich, N. & Sinuani-Stern, Z. (2007). Level of achievements of men and women in academia: A case study: The Academic College of Judea and Samaria. *Sugyot Hevratot Beyisrael*. Volume 3, Tel Aviv. 21–44. (in Hebrew).

Davidovitch, N. & Soen, D. (2006). Using students' assessments to improve instructors' quality of teaching. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30(4): 351–376.

Doron, A. (1993/1994). Conclusions and recommendations of the national committee for long-term planning of the absorption of immigrant scientists. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 1, 201–207. (in Hebrew).

Doron, R. (1995). The attitude of faculty to Russian immigrant absorption in Israeli colleges for the training of technicians and practical engineers. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 20, 107.

Eckstein, Z. & Weiss, Y. (2004). On the wage growth of immigrants: Israel, 1990-2000. *Journal of the Economic Association*, 2(4), 665–695.

Epstein, A., Kheimets, N. & Oritzky, M. (2003). The contribution of intercultural bridging mechanisms to the integration of scientists. *Gadish: Journal for Adult Education*, 8, 137–155. (in Hebrew).

Epstein, A. & Kheimets, N. (2001). Israel between 'ethnographic multiculturalism and distinctive pluralism'. The integration of former residents of the CIS. *Mifneh: Platform for Social Matters*, 35, 23–29. (in Hebrew).

Eyal, B., Giladi, A., Hupert, D. & Fine, B. (1997). The Kamea Program – Lasting assimilation of scientists. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 3, 184–186. (in Hebrew).

Faist, T. (2000). *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Friedberg, R. M. (2000). You can't take it with you? Immigrant assimilation and the portability of human capital. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 18, 221–51.

Gandal, N., Hanson, G. H., Matthew, M. J. & Slaughter, J. (2004). Technology, trade, and adjustment to immigration in Israel. *European Economic Review*, 48, 403–428.

Geva-May, I. (2000). On impacts of comparative policy analysis. Immigration to Israel: What other countries can learn. *International Migration*, 38, 3–46.

Geva-May, I. (1998). Policy feasibility and immigrant absorption in a mass immigration context: The case of scientist retraining in Israel, *Review of Policy Research* 1541-132X, 15, 226.

Gibson, M. A. (1997). Complicating the immigrant/involuntary minority typology. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 28, 431–454.

Gillepsie, K. H. (ed.), Hilsen, L. R. & Wadsworth, E. C. (ass. eds.) (2002). *A guide to faculty development*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L. & Szanton Blanc, C. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68, 1, 48–63.

Greenwald, A. (2000). *Second session: Opening the gates of higher education – public policy considerations*. Position paper presented at the third annual “Besha’ar” conference: Window to the Academic Dream. Tel Aviv. (in Hebrew).

Guarnizo, L. E. & Smith, M. P. (1998). The locations of transnationalism. In M. P. Smith & L. E. Guarnizo (Eds.): *Transnationalism from below* (pp. 3–34). Comparative Urban and Community Research Series, V.VI. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Hawkins, H. (1993). American universities & the inclusion of professional schools. *History of Higher Education Annual*, 13, 53–68.

Hearn, J. C. (1999). Pay and performance in the university: An examination of faculty salaries. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 391–410.

Helman, A. (1998). Studies as a socioeconomic investment. *Afikei Haskala*, 58 (February), 5–8. (in Hebrew).

Horev, S. (2006). *The Independence Scroll of the State of Israel and its signatories*. Haifa: Duchifat. (in Hebrew).

Iram, Y. (1978). The effect of traditions in higher education on the academic course of the Hebrew University. *Iyunim Behinuch*, 28, 123–140. (in Hebrew).

Iram, Y. (1983). Vision and fulfillment: The evolution of the Hebrew University, 1901–1950. *History of Higher Education Annual*, 3, 123–43.

Iram, Y. (1999). Unity versus diversity in pluralistic societies. In R. Laor and D. Man (eds.), *Diversity and Multiculturalism in Israeli Society* (pp. 11–14). Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University. (in Hebrew).

Israeli, A. (1997). Master plan: Israeli regional colleges. *Feedback – applied research, planning and consultation for educational, welfare, and labor systems*. Jerusalem. (in Hebrew).

Kaiser, A., & Neilson, E. (2003). Effects of performance-based compensation and faculty track on the clinical activity, research portfolio, and teaching mission of a large department of Medicine. *Journal of Medical Education*, 78(7), 690–701.

Kheimets, N. & Epstein, A (2001). English as a central component of success in the professional and social integration of scientists from the former Soviet Union in Israel. *Language in Society*, 30, 187–215.

Kimmerling, B. (1998). The new Israelis: Multiple cultures without multiculturalism. *Alpayim: Multidisciplinary Journal for Study, Thought, and Literature*, 16, 264–308. (in Hebrew).

Kreber, C. (ed.) (2001). Scholarship revisited: Perspectives on scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Law of Return (1950). URL: www.knesset.gov.il/laws/special/heb/chock_hashvut.htm (in Hebrew). Accessed March 24, 2010.

Lerner, J., Kertes, J. & Zilber, N. (2005). Immigrants from the former Soviet Union, 5 years post-immigration to Israel: adaptation and risk factors for psychological distress. *Psychological Medicine*, 35, 1805–1814.

Leshem, A. (1993). Israeli society and its attitude to the immigrants of the ‘90s. *Bitahon Sotzialy*, 40, 54–73. (in Hebrew).

Luria, S.E., & Luria, Z. (1970). The role of the University: Ivory tower, service station, or frontier post? *Daedalus*, 99, 75–83.

Manning, C.W. & Romney, L.C. (1973). *Faculty activity analysis: Procedures Manual. Tech Report No. 44*. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, CO.

Meirson, B. (1991). Immigrant-scientists should preferably be integrated in existing frameworks. Interview with Dr. Baruch Meirson. *Jews of the Soviet Union*, 14, 231–239. (in Hebrew).

Menachem, G. & Geist, A. (1999). Language, employment, and affiliation with Israel among immigrants from the CIS in the '90s. *Megamot: Journal for the Behavioral Sciences*, 40(1), 132–148. (in Hebrew).

Mey-Ami, N. (2008). *Integration of immigrants in industry, business, and science*. Submitted to the Committee for Immigration, Absorption and the Diaspora. (in Hebrew).

Miller, R.I. (1990). *Major American higher education issues and challenges in the 1990s*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Ministry of Culture, Science, and Sports: URL: <http://www.most.gov.il/> (in Hebrew). Accessed March 24, 2010.

Ministry of Industry, Trade, and Employment: URL: <http://www.tamas.gov.il/NR/exeres/C6DF0E1A-6480-4AFC-8B0C-FE05929061C9.htm> (in Hebrew). Accessed March 24, 2010.

Mizrachi, Y. (1994). *History of the tension between liberal general higher education and disciplinary specialized higher education and examining possibilities of a balanced curricular program at the regional colleges*. School of Educational Leadership, Jerusalem. (in Hebrew).

MOIA web site: URL: www.moia.gov.il/Moia_he/Scientists/AbsorptionCenter.htm. Accessed March 24, 2010.

MOIA (2008). *Immigration to Israel summary data for previous years*. Ministry website: www.moia.gov.il/Moia_he/Statistics/ImmigrationToIsraelPrevYears/ Accessed on January 10, 2009. (in Hebrew).

MOIA (2008). *Data on immigrant scientists for the years 1989-1999*. Ministry website URL: www.moia.gov.il/Moia_he/Statistics/Stat+89-99. (in Hebrew). Accessed February 29, 2009.

MOIA (2000). *Treating scientists: The crux of the problem – long-term absorption of scientists*. URL: www.moia.gov.il/NR/rdonlyres/F7889A5-046B-4FAB-B788-83CE0E520FD2/0/4.doc. (in Hebrew) Accessed February 29, 2009.

Ne'eman, Y. (1991). Integration of scientists and academics. *Hamifal: Platform for the promotion of issues related to labor productivity, efficacy, and management*. July, 16-17, 19, 37. (in Hebrew).

Ne'eman, Y. (1993/1994). Integration of immigrant scientists in the seventies and nineties, *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 1, 194–200. (in Hebrew).

Ne'eman, Y. (2000). From a struggle of individuals to a national struggle, *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 4, 37–39. (in Hebrew).

Nirel, N. (1999). *Employment of immigrant physicians from the former Soviet Union in 1998: Summary of research findings*. Jerusalem: Brookdale Institute. (in Hebrew).

Ofer, G., Plug, K. & Kasir, N. (1991). Employment of immigrants from the Soviet Union in 1990 and consequently: Retaining and changing occupations. *Economic Quarterly*, 148, 135–180. (in Hebrew).

Pazi, A. (January 2002). Universities under siege, space for thought. *Bashaar*, 18 (in Hebrew).

PBC (Planning & Budgeting Committee) (2008). *Annual report No. 33, 2005/6*. Jerusalem: CHE. (Hebrew).

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217–237.

Rabi, S. Bhagat, R. & London M. (1999). Getting Started and Getting Ahead: Career Dynamics of Immigrants, *Human Resource Management Review*, 9, 349–365.

Raijman, R. (2009). Immigration in Israel: A map of trends and empirical research: 1990–2007. *Israeli Sociology*, 10(2): 339-380.

Remmenick, L. I. (2007). Former Soviet Jews in Israel and in the West: Integration, exclusion and transnationalism. In L. Remennick & A. Prashizky (Eds.): *Immigrant Scholars write about identity and integration* (pp. 3–23). Ramat-Gan: Sociological Institute for Community Studies, Bar-Ilan University.

Remmenick, L. I. (2007). *Russian Jews on three continents: Identity, integration and conflict*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Remmenick, L. I. (2003). Career continuity among immigrant professionals: Russian engineers in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(4), 701–721.

Remennick, L. I. (2002). Transnational community in the making: Russian-Jewish immigrants of the 1990s in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 28, 515–530.

Rothschild, L. & Darr, A. (2005). Technological incubators and the social construction of innovation networks: an Israeli case study. *Technovation* 25, 59–67.

Rubinstein, A. (1994). *The Regional Colleges. Israeli Policy on College Development*. Jerusalem: Center for Research of Israeli Social Policy. (in Hebrew).

Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., & Kotsubinski, E. (2002). *Soviet immigrants in the Israeli labor market: A study of the first decade*. Final report to the Freiderich Ebert Foundation (unpublished).

Sever, R. (2001). Mixed in or intermingled: Conceptual basis for the examination of multiculturalism issues. *Gadish: Journal for Adult Education*, 7, 45–54. (in Hebrew).

Shye, S. & Weil, M. (1993). *The absorption of immigrant scientists*. Evaluation report submitted to the Israeli Ministry of Science and Technology.

Shye, S. (1996). *Integration of immigrant scientists 1992-95: Evaluation of aid systems*. Gutman Center for Applied Social Research, Megama – Consultants for Management and Planning. (in Hebrew).

Shye, S., Duchin, R., Sableson, A., Veil, M. & Haklay-Kaufman, Y. (1996). *Integration of immigrant scientists, 1992–1995: Evaluation of government aid systems*. Submitted to the Ministry of Immigration and the Ministry of Science and Arts. (in Hebrew).

Slavin, M. (1989). Employment of immigrant scientists (Israeli events), *Mada: Scientific Newspaper for General Interest*, 33, 264. (in Hebrew).

Smith, M. P. & Guarnizo, L. E. (Eds.) (1998). *Transnationalism from below*. Comparative Urban and Community Research Series, V, VI. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Smootha, S. (1998). The implications of the Transition to Peace for Israeli Society. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Sciences*, 555, 26–45.

Soen, D. (2001). The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming – Integration of Russian immigrant children in Israeli schools. *Education & Context*, 23: 91–106. (in Hebrew).

Solutions for the employment of immigrant scientists (1997). *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 3, 187–191. (in Hebrew).

Stier, H., & Levanon V. (2003). Finding an adequate job: Employment and income of recent immigrants to Israel. *International Migration*, 14, 81–107.

Sinuany-Stern, Z. & Davidovich, N. (2007). The relationship between teaching and research activities of faculty: Case study of College of Judea and Samaria. *Moscow State University Journal of Education, Pedagogical Series* (2). (in Russian).

Smilor, R. W. (1993). *The Entrepreneurial University: The role of higher education in the United States in technology commercialization and economy development*. UNESCO.

The Helsinki Group on Women and Science (2002). *National Policies on Women and Science in Europe*.

Tolts, M. (2004). The post-Soviet Jewish population in Russia and the world. *Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe*, 1(52), 37–63.

Toren, N. (1988). *Science and cultural context: Soviet scientists in comparative perspective*. New York: Peter Lang.

Toren, N. (1991). Utilization of the facet theory for analyzing the attitude of immigrant scientists to their jobs. *Megamot: Quarterly of the Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 431–442. (in Hebrew).

Triest, Y. (1997). To pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant (Jeremiah 1:10). *Mikbatz*, 3, 55–78. (in Hebrew).

Triponov, A. & Weiner (1995). Scientist discourse. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 2, 215–222. (in Hebrew).

Trow, M. (1970). Reflections on the transition from mass to universal higher education. *Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy*, Winter, 1–42.

Tzaban, Y. (1994). Eight thousand scientists are a solution and not a problem. *Jews of the Soviet Union in Transition*, 1, 217–219. (in Hebrew).

Urry, J. (2003). Social networks travel and talk. *British Journal of Sociology*, 54(2), 155–175.

Wadsworth, E. C. (ed.) (1994). To improve the academy resources for faculty. *Instructional and Organizational Development*, Vol. 13, New Forms Press.

Yaoz, H. & Iram, Y. (1987). Changes in the curriculum in comparative nonfiction literature. *Iyunim Behinuch*, 46/47, 152–170. (in Hebrew).

Yehuda Halevy (1943). *Songs of Zion*. Tel Aviv: Mahbarot Lesifrut. (in Hebrew).

Advised by Mircea Berteu, Babes-Bolyai University, Romania

Nitza Davidovitch	Head, Academic Development & Assessment Unit, Ari'el University Centre, Ari'el Israel. E-mail: d.nitza@ariel.ac.il Website: http://www.ariel.ac.il
Dan Soen	Ph.D., Head of Sociology & Anthropology Dept., Ari'el University Centre and the Kibbutzim School of Education, Tel-Aviv, Israel E-mail: soen@macam.ac.il Website: http://www.ariel.ac.il
Zila Sinuany-Stern	Vice-Rector, Ari'el University Centre and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel E-mail: szila@ariel.ac.il Website: http://www.cs.bgu.ac.il/