2. ETHNOBAROMETER

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE "ETHNOBAROMETER"

The *Ethnobarometer* was planned as a series of periodic sociological studies, focused on topics such as: monitoring and assessing the ethnic situation in Romania; self-perception and the perception of otherness; the dynamics of different ethnic groups' representations and stereotypes; building and assertion of ethnic and national identities; knowledge and impact of public policies in the field of ethnic minorities in Romania; public discourse in different contexts and situations involving the minorities.

The project intends to offer scientifically fundamented data about representations, opinions, assessments, attitudes and behavior constructed through daily interactions or culturally gained by people belonging to different ethnic groups. A series of questions address the evaluation of legislation and political initiative in the area of ethnic minority issues, such as the use of mother tongue in local public administration and instruction in the languages of the minorities. At the same time, this study provides data about the language practices of the majority and minority populations, social distance between different ethnic groups, the dynamics of interethnic interaction, the perception of the role of the Romanian State and of the external national state, Hungary, as regards educational, cultural and economic support for the concerned ethnic minorities.

Given the particularities of sample building, the analyses in the *Ethnobarometer* can be detailed at the level of regions, and as such they reflect differences among social-cultural areas and localities as regards the percentage of different ethnic groups. In the following, as a preface to the results of the above-mentioned survey, we will present some reflections meant to highlight some specific elements of the Romanian model of approaching interethnic relations. Obviously, the results of the survey are yet to be seen by analysts, who will give them an elaborate interpretation and draw conclusions on the topic.

IDENTITY AND OTHERNESS

The way people identify themselves is constitutive to the way they act and relate to the others. Self-identification is a major social process, organizing the perception and the practice of the individuals. It implies many aspects, including identification to a certain culture (language, traditions, customs, specific traditional customs, specific way of

^{*} The text was written by Irina Culic (Identity, Stereotypes, Social Distance), István Horváth (Language and Communicativity), Cristina Raþ (Minority Legislation, Civic Organizations).

doing things, religion), identification to a certain collective history (of the ethnic group's nation or national state, whether he/she holds citizenship of that state or not), a certain potential for mobilization when ethnic/national issues are concerned, and so on.

The notion of "identity" is difficult to grasp and to conceptualize in measurable indicators. We can assert that the scholars in the field of nationalism and interethnic relations reached a consensus on the understanding of ethnicity and ethnic identity, from a constructivist perspective. Thus, Thomas Eriksen¹ stresses that "ethnicity appears and becomes relevant in and through social situations and interactions, and the way people react to situations". Identification also means the appeal to certain categories of representation and description. We normally orient in our everyday life by making categorizations. Using categories simplifies the analysis of the situation and decision-making. At the same time, the categories that we employ may not be accurate, nevertheless, our perception is organized on them and they constitute the basis of our action.

One universal mechanism in the process of identification is that of opposition: one individual or group identifies in opposition to the other individual or group; very often one tends to attribute positive features to his/her ethnic group, in opposition to the other group (which is attributed the opposite negative features). We will analyze the data obtained in the *Ethnobarometer* survey according to this theoretical framework, looking at all aspects of self-identification and hetero-identification.

SELF-IDENTITY OF ROMANIANS AND HUNGARIANS IN ROMANIA

In what concerns the self-identification of Romanians, with respect to regional, national or local dimension, here are the results to the question: "In the first place I consider myself...", followed by a list of attributes.

Romanian	71.1
Regional type (Transylvanian, Oltenian, etc)	24
Eastern European	0.6
Balkanic	0.2
European	1.4
Other	2.3

Self-identity of Romanians

The great majority of Romanians identify themselves with a national type: 71.1% declare themselves simply "Romanians". About a quarter would self-identify primarily with a regional/local type (N=236, weighted) - they acknowledge a stronger regional identity. The analysis of the respondents who gave this answer reveal that,

Thomas Hylland Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism. Anthropological Perspectives*, London, Pluto Press, 1993.

contrary to some expectations, the dwellers of Transylvania do not tend to identify in regional terms in a greater degree than the average regional identification obtained at the national level.

This is not the case for the rest of Romania's cultural areas. The people living in Walachia tend to identify themselves with a regional type relatively in a lower degree than the rest of the regional groups (32.2 % of the respondents from Walachia who identified with a regional type versus 44.0 % of Walachians in the whole sample) and in a greater degree with the national type (as Romanians): 77.5% of all people from Walachia identified themselves in the first place as Romanians, compared to 66.8% of Transylvanians and 63.3% of Moldavians. This is a natural reflex from a population who had relatively fewer problems of identification than the rest of the Romanians: the congruence between the Moldavian and Romanian language and identity has not been so evident, and the administration of the Greater Romania invested substantial efforts to accomplish it²; the identification of Romanians from Transylvania was shaped by the changing position of the province (in relation with the Hungarian Kingdom, respectively the Habsburg Monarchy), by the phenomenon of equivalence between nationality and social status for the ethnic Romanians in Transvlvania, and the role of the Greek-Catholic Church in the rise of the national Romanian conscience among the Romanians from Transylvania³.

	Percentage of the sample	Percentage of those who identified themselves as regional types
Transylvanian	16.2	18.6
North-western	6.2	8.9
Banat	9.4	8.5
Szeklerland	2.7	0.5
Oltenia	10.7	12.7
Walachia	19.4	5.5
Moldavia	21.5	31.3
Dobrudja	4.2	9.3
Bucharest	9.7	4.7

Identification in regional terms by cultural areas

Identification in regional terms by the historical region

	Percentage of the sample	Percentage of those who identified themselves as regional types
Transylvania	34.5	36.5
Walachia (The Old Kingdom)	44.0	32.2
Moldavia	21.5	31.3

2 See Irina Livezeanu, Cultural Politics in Greater Romania. Regionalism, Nation Building & Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1995.

3 See Katherine Verdery, *Transylvanian Villagers. Three Centuries of Political, Economic, and Ethnic Change*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press, 1983.

Very few of the ethnic Romanians declared that they consider themselves East-European, Balkanic or European, in the first place. The prospect for Romanians to develop a supra-national identity is not impending.

The question for Hungarians was formulated differently, that is, the list of attributes was designed so that is relevant for them. We avoided the identification simply as "Hungarians", as we expected that they would have massively tended to choose this alternative. In the following table are the results obtained for the Hungarian sub-sample.

The majority of Hungarians (more than half of them) chose a mixed identification: both as Hungarians and as Transylvanians. In this way they asserted their distinction from the Hungarians from Hungary, nevertheless they acknowledged that they were part of the Hungarians nation. The dwellers of Szeklerland declared their local (particular) identity by choosing the alternative "Szekler". The rest opted for one of the two "official" denominations of the Hungarians: Romanian Hungarian, respectively Hungarian of Romanian citizenship. Both of these denominations elude the regional (Transylvanian) identification, and stress the unequivocal identification with the Hungarian nation and their attachment to the people living in the Hungarian national state.

Self-identification of Hungarians

Identity	%
Hungarian in Romania	15.2
Hungarian in Transylvania	53
Hungarian of Romanian citizenship	15.8
Szekler	12.9
Other	3.1

CULTURAL IDENTIFICATION

The issue of self-identification and other-identification (hetero-identification) of the Hungarian minority member, in the perspective of the triad nationalizing state - national minority - external homeland⁴, is empirically perceptible in the answers given by the Hungarians in self-identification questions, respectively in the discourses of the Romanian politicians. This is how the Romanians and Hungarians in Transylvania define themselves, in the terms of the agreement with statements regarding factual situations (birthplace, ethnic origin, residence), cultural elements, citizenship.

⁴ According to Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

	Romanians about Romanians	Hungarians about Hungarians
1. To be born in Romania (Hungary)	56.3	3.04
2. To be of Romanian (Hungarian) citizenship	37.1	8.2
3. To be a Romanian (Hungarian) mother tongue	41.9	82.5
4. To be baptized in a Romanian (Hungarian) church	30.1	23.5
5. To live in Romania (Hungary)	18.2	2.4
6. To respect the Romanian (Hungarian) flag	14.9	17.3
7. To belong to the Romanian (Hungarian) culture	23.1	44.7
8. To consider yourself Romanian (Hungarian)	40.2	63.8
9. To respect Romanian (Hungarian) traditions	22.5	23.9
10. To speak Romanian (Hungarian) in the family	14.7	25.5

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE 'ETHNOBAROMETER'

Experiencing the situation of being subjects to a national state built by and bearing the name of another nation, the Hungarians tend to identify in terms of their culture in a greater degree than the Romanians (44.7% as compared to 23.1%). Culture functions as a distinction (division) principle: on the one hand it supplies the elements that simultaneously individualize and homogenize them; on the other hand, it consecrates their bond with the Hungarian nation and the legitimacy of their attachment to the external national homeland, constituted as national state of the Hungarian ethnicity. Thus, only 8.2% of the Hungarians in Transylvania believe that being a Hungarian citizen is essential for being considered (identified as) Hungarian, (compared to 37.1% reported by Romanians in order to be identified as Romanian, percentage that may be taken as control figure). Even more arbitrary, and thus the less significant, seems to be the place where one was born, for ethnic self-identification: 3% of the Hungarians, compared to 56.3% for Romanians (the most important defining characteristic for the majority group), consider the birthplace of any importance. What is of most importance for Hungarians is the language (82.5%).

If citizenship (which may be in fact understood as a bureaucratic, administrative element) is not important for the self-identification as Hungarian national or ethnic for the Hungarians in Transylvania, the situation is converse in what concerns the issue of the Hungarian flag, symbolically situated at the confluence of the bureaucratic and the cultural field. Honoring the Hungarian flag receives a more important weight than the one accorded to citizenship (17.3%)⁵. Finally, for both ethnic groups it is important that the person feels himself Romanian (Hungarian), in order to be considered as such. Nevertheless, this should be associated with at least one ascribed characteristic.

⁵ For similar data and analyses see Irina Culic, "Between Civic and National Identity", in Culic I., Horvath I., Stan C. (eds.), *Reflections on Differences*, Cluj, Limes, 1999.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

	Romanians about Hungarians	Hungarians about Romanians
1. To be born in Romania (Hungary)	48.5	11.5
2. To be of Romanian (Hungarian) citizenship	37.4	17
3. To be a Romanian (Hungarian) mother tongue	52.2	75.5
4. To be baptized in a Romanian (Hungarian) church	23.8	20.6
5. To live in Romania (Hungary)	16.3	9
6. To respect the Romanian (Hungarian) flag	9.9	12.4
7. To belong to the Romanian (Hungarian) culture	25.3	37.9
8. To consider yourself Romanian (Hungarian)	41.7	61.1
9. To respect Romanian (Hungarian) traditions	24.1	27.9
10. To speak Romanian (Hungarian) in the family	19.9	22.2

In order	to analyze	e the consistency c	of these	definitions	here are	the mirroring figures
----------	------------	---------------------	----------	-------------	----------	-----------------------

We can notice that both Romanians and Hungarians are (relatively) consistent with their definition of self- and hetero-identity, though some percentages are in reversed order: Romanians tend to stress the importance of language and to decrease the importance of birth-place, in what concern the identification of a person as Hungarian; conversely, though same elements are most important for identifying a Romanian, Hungarians stress more the importance of birth-place, citizenship and residence in hetero-identification of a person as Romanian. Thus, the national identification of Romanians is substantially linked with the territory of the Romanian State and with its administration, while the national identification of the Hungarians is strongly linked with the cultural elements, particularly the language.

Language is, in our opinion, the most important marker of ethnicity. The degree of language preservation (maintenance) is an indicator of nationality

Nationality	%
Hungarians	97.9
Germans	78.9
Roma	40.9
Ukrainians	90
Lipovans	78.8
Turks	90.6
Serbs	89.6

(understood as political form of ethnicity). A greater degree of language maintenance is associated to a higher political mobilization, and, taking into account the communication context, the source of possible tension and confrontation between minority and majority. In the table below, the figures

show the degree of congruence between ethnicity (nationality) and mother tongue, for a number of ethnic groups in Romania (according to the 1992 Census).

STEREOTYPES AND SOCIAL DISTANCE IN ROMANIA

In the approach of minority group-majority group relations, of crucial importance is the way in which these groups perceive otherness, the stereotypes that exist in their perceptions and their influence on behavior and attitudes towards others.

One of the questions in the *Ethnobarometer* tried to measure the stereotypes that function within the Romanian society with respect to one ethnic group or another, and if there were differences between ethnic groups and their stereotypes towards particular ethnic groups, including self-stereotypes. The question was worded as follows: "Which of the following attributes characterize best the Romanians? (Hungarians, etc). Choose three".

	Romanians	Hungarians
Decent	12.5	2.4
Hospitable	18.5	2.7
Intelligent	8.8	0.8
Hard-working	12.2	2.6
Enterprising	2.3	2.7
Trustful	2.5	1.2
Modest	4.9	1.3
Honest	7.7	1.0
United	2.1	9.5
Religious	6.7	14.5
Civilized	2.9	0.6
Clean	2.1	0.5
Selfish	1.5	4.2
Hostile	0.2	8.5
Stupid	0.6	2.7
Lazy	1.9	5.2
Laggard	3.6	5.1
Hypocritical	1.0	9.7
Vain	1.2	2.4
Thieves	1.0	4.0
Divided	3.7	4.4
Superstitious	1.1	6.7
Backward	0.7	6.5
Dirty	0.3	0.7

Stereotypes (representations) of the Romanians

Romanians see themselves as hospitable, decent and hard working (stereotypes often circulated in the patriotic poetry of C19). Hungarians see Romanians as religious (this characteristic usually measures the degree of primitivism - e.g. Romanians are superstitious -, as opposed to civilized), hypocrite (they perceive that Romanians do not respect their promises towards the Hungarian minority) and united (measuring the capacity to act in common, against their group).

259

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

	Romanians	Hungarians
Decent	5.5	3.9
Hospitable	3.8	7.1
Intelligent	4.4	6.4
Hard-working	9.6	15.5
Enterprising	5.1	6.3
Trustful	3.2	9.1
Modest	1.5	2.9
Honest	5.0	8.5
United	10.7	5.2
Religious	3.0	3.9
Civilized	8.2	10.2
Clean	4.7	6.2
Selfish	7.0	2.2
Hostile	6.0	0.3
Stupid	0.8	0.2
Lazy	0.7	0.3
Laggard	0.8	0.4
Hypocritical	4.4	0.9
Vain	8.1	2.0
Thieves	0.7	0.1
Divided	5.4	7.2
Superstitious	0.9	0.9
Backward	0.6	0.4
Dirty	0.2	0.0

Romanians

1.6

1.5

0.8

1.4

2.4

0.8

0.7

0.8

4.4

0.7

0.4

0.7

1.6

2.9

3.7

16.1

3.6

2.0

1.2

20.9

5.2

1.8

8.6

16.1

Hungarians

0.5

0.5

0.3

0.7

2.3

0.1

0.3

0.2

5.4

0.5

0.2

0.4

1.0

1.5 7.1

14.4

4.6

3.6

0.5

16.4

3.3

5.2

12.8

18.0

Stereotypes (representations) of the Hungarians in Romania

Romanians see Hungarians as united (for their collective interests), hard working and civilized. As for Germans, Romanians acknowledge the civilizing influence of their former dominators. Hungarians see themselves as hard working, civilized and trustful. The similarity between the two perceptions, which marks the mutual influence between the two ethnic groups, is important.

In the following table we have the results for the heterostereotypes regarding the Roma (Gypsy) population.

Stereotypes (representations) of the Roma (gypsies)

As one can see from the data, Romanians and Hungarians share the same stereotype of the Roma. Their representation is largely negative, as both groups tend to reject the proximity of the Roma, confirming their marginal position within the Romanian society.

We also analyzed the Romanian and Hungarian stereotypes with regard to Germans and Jews, which are presented in the following tables:

Decent

Hospitable

Intelligent

Hard-working

Enterprising

Trustful

Modest

Honest

United

Religious

Civilized

Clean

Selfish

Hostile

Stupid

Laggard

Hypocritical

Superstitious

Backward

Dirty

Lazy

Vain

Thieves

Divided

	Romanians	Hungarians
Decent	5.4	4.7
Hospitable	2.0	2.6
Intelligent	11.9	14.8
Hard-working	15.0	15.6
Enterprising	9.4	9.4
Trustful	7.8	7.1
Modest	2.0	1.6
Honest	10.3	6.4
United	2.2	3.3
Religious	1.5	2.2
Civilized	18.4	14.8
Clean	7.1	5.1
Selfish	1.7	5.1
Hostile	0.9	0.2
Stupid	0.1	0.3
Lazy	0.2	0.2
Laggard	0.1	0.1
Hypocritical	0.1	0.7
Vain	1.3	2.9
Thieves	0.3	0.1
Divided	1.6	2.2
Superstitious	0.2	0.4
Backward	0.2	0.2
Dirty	0.2	0.2

	Romanians	Hungarians
Decent	5.0	2.8
Hospitable	2.1	1.6
Intelligent	12.8	12.6
	5.3	9.5
Hard-working		
Enterprising	17.7	20.7
Trustful	3.7	2.1
Modest	2.4	1.7
Honest	4.5	4.2
United	5.2	10.5
Religious	12.5	13.9
Civilized	7.1	5.5
Clean	3.7	2.2
Selfish	3.9	3.2
Hostile	1.3	1.4
Stupid	0.3	0.2
Lazy	0.7	0.7
Laggard	0.4	0
Hypocritical	3.5	1.7
Vain	1.9	1.4
Thieves	0.9	0.5
Divided	2.7	1.8
Superstitious	1.5	0.9
Backward	0.1	0.3
Dirty	0.8	0.4

Stereotypes (representations) of the Germans

Romanians and Hungarians again agree in their perception of the German population, which is a very positive one: Germans are seen as civilized, hard-working, intelligent, enterprising and trustful. This very favorable representation is confirmed by the case of the city of Sibiu, in the most recent local elections, where a German ethnic, competing for the German Democratic Forum, was elected as mayor: this was a vote of trust in a whole community, and in the benefits their organization and work could bring for the whole population.

Stereotypes (representations) of the Jews

Again we have an agreement of representation vis-a-vis Jews. Since very few Jews are still left nowadays in Romania, it is impossible that these representations are based on direct experience: the stereotypes reflect the traditional view of Jews as businessmen ("enterprising"), cunning ("intelligent") and following the prescriptions of their religion ("religious").

261

Another question regarding the perception of ethnic groups as collective actors tried to confirm or not several traditional stereotypes. The subjects were asked "Which of the following groups are, generally speaking, the richest /have most political influence/ are most respected? (Rank the first group and the second group). The results are presented in the following tables.

Perception of the richest, most politically influential and most respected groups in Romania. Results for the Romanians

	Richest	Most politically influential	Most respected
Romanians	42.4	79.6	59.2
Hungarians	4.5	5.2	10.5
Roma	19.6	1.5	1.2
Germans	17.9	7.7	23.6
Jews	13.9	4.5	3.6
DK/NA	1.7	1.5	2.0

Perception of the richest, most politically influential and most respected groups in Romania. Results for the Hungarians

	Richest	Most politically influential	Most respected
Romanians	66.2	95.6	83.4
Hungarians	7.2	1.0	9.7
Roma	10.5	-	0.4
Germans	8.4	0.7	4.8
Jews	6.8	2.0	0.7
DK/NA	0.9	0.8	1.1

Romanians are perceived as the richest by 42.4% of the Romanian respondents. Paradoxically, the Roma (Gypsy) are placed in the second place with 19.6%, even though this population, marginal within the Romanian society and rather non-integrated in most state-institutions, such as 'national education' or health, possesses all the characteristics of an underclass. Obviously, having been considered by 19.6% of the respondents as the richest group in Romania, the stereotype of the Roma as holders of gold and precious stones treasures functioned in their choice. Also, the legend built around the wealth of the Roma has been reinforced by the erection of huge mansions of intricate, dubious style, by a number of prosperous members of this group, in various areas of the country. The high percentages obtained by the Germans and the Jews endorse the former economically good and stable situation of two groups, reknown for their entrepreneurial abilities.

The Hungarians from Romania share the same perception, too. Nevertheless, there are several differences. If the hierarchy is almost identical, the figures differ significantly. Thus, the Romanians are seen as the richest group in Romania by 66.2% of the Hungarians. Similarly, the Roma occupy the second position, but with

less conviction: 10.5% of the Hungarians, as compared to 19.6% of the Romanians, believe that the Roma is the richest ethnic group in Romania.

A massive part of the Romanian respondents placed the Romanians on the first place with regard to political influence. Except for the Hungarians whose ethnically-based party Democratic Alliance of Hungarians from Romania - DAHR competed in elections as an ordinary party and obtained representation in parliament as a consequence of the number of votes received, no other ethnic group managed to be politically represented otherwise than by appealing to the prescriptions of the electoral law, which entitles any ethnic group with the right to have one person as a representative in the parliament. Due to the proportional representation electoral system, Romanians occupy most of the power positions in Romania. If members of another ethnic group (apart from Hungarians) occupy influential positions (e.g. president of a relatively significant party), this is not in his quality of that particular ethnic group member, but as a Romanian citizen acting as a politician.

It is somewhat surprising the fact that the Germans are mentioned as the most politically influential group, after the Romanians - they are very few in terms of numbers (at the 1992 Census, 119,462 persons, representing 0.52% of the population of Romania; at present the estimation of the German Democratic Forum is approx. 80,000) and are not politically active at national level. Nevertheless, the image of the whole German community is that of a powerful actor, characterized by the Protestant values of hard-work, frugality, honesty, rationality - this image accounts for the 7.7% obtained by the Germans as the most politically influential group.

The Hungarians have a different perception in what concerns the distribution of power between ethnic groups in Romania. Thus, they feel that this belongs almost entirely to Romanians: 95.6% of the Hungarians considered that the Romanians represent the most powerful group in Romania. Nevertheless, the second position was accorded to Hungarians: 74.9% of the Hungarians believed that, next to Romanians, the Hungarians are most politically influential group in Romania.

SOCIAL DISTANCE

Another series of data that we would like to introduce focuses on the impact stereotypes have on behavior. We have tried to measure the social distance that a group imposes on other groups. Social distance shows the behavioral intentions, the degree of acceptance of persons belonging to other ethnic groups. It can be manifest at different levels : from total exclusion through different intermediate levels to total acceptance.

The results outline an interesting tendency : the Roma have to face the lowest level of social acceptance, which again underlines their marginal situation. They are on the last place after Germans, Jews and Hungarians. It is both interesting and at one point paradoxical also that the Romanian majority and the Hungarian minority maintain a smaller distance between one another than between themselves and the Roma.

	_				
	Romanians	Transylvanians	Walachians	Molaovians	Romanians in Szeklerland
I wouldn't accept the Hungarians in the country	16.7	14.5	19.3	14.2	10.9
I would accept them in the country, but not in my county	19.2	11.1	26.7	14.2	14.6
I would accept them in my county, but not in my town	18.3	10.8	25.5	12.8	14.8
I would accept them anywhere they want to live (in this country)	72.2	84.3	65.3	71.7	82.2

Acceptance of the Hungarians

One can notice that 19.3% of the Romanians from Walachia chose the item: "I would not accept the Hungarians in the country", while only 10.9% of the Romanians living in Szeklerland chose this, though in the public political discourse Szeklerland and Transylvania are the regions where the "Hungarian threat" is present. These differences could be explained by the fact that Romanians in Walachia do not have the same everyday experience of interaction with members of the Hungarian minority as do Romanians in Szeklerland.

To conclude, their opportunities to be informed are confined to intensively mediatized political discourses, which are manipulative and which pursue certain clear-cut interests. On the other hand, the few interactions with representatives of the minorities in general are not relevant and do not help them deconstruct stereotypes and prejudices. On the contrary – even though the experience of these interactions does not match the previously developed images – they reconstruct and strengthen them, preventing the group from forming a rational and objective image.

STATES AND MINORITIES

This section investigates the perception of the role of the state: both the role of the external national homeland state towards its ethno-national kin (Hungary for Hungarians in Romania, Romania for Romanians in neighboring countries), respectively the role of the state of citizenship.

In the following tables there are several results, answering the question: "Do you believe that the Romanian(/Hungarian) state should..."

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE 'ETHNOBAROMETER'

Perception of the role of the Romanian State

	Romanians			Hungarians		
	Agree	Disagree	DK	Agree	Disagree	DK
Grant scholarships for Romanian students from other countries	80.4	12.5	7.2	81.0	11.4	7.6
Stimulate higher educati- on for Romanians abroad	86.1	7.5	6	84.8	7.6	7.6
Support the set up of Romanian firms abroad	76.9	13.8	9.3	76.3	12.5	11.3
Strengthen links with political organizations of Romanians from abroad	81.0	8.5	10.5	80.0	7.6	12.5
Grant Romanian citizenship to Romanians abroad	71.2	16.2	12.6	70.9	15.2	13.9

Perception of the role of the Hungarian State

	Romanians			Hungarians		
	Agree	Disagree	DK	Agree	Disagree	DK
Grant scholarships for Hungarians students from Romania	61,7	25,7	12,5	87,5	7,6	4,9
Stimulate Hungarians higher education in Romania	46,4	31,6	11,9	93,5	3,2	3,3
Support investments of Hungarian firms in Romania	67,5	18,3	14,0	90,9	3,0	6,3
Strengthen links with political organizations of Hungarians from Romania	39,1	43,9	16,8	90,3	3,2	6,4
Grant Hungarians citi- zenship to Hungarians from Romania	37,0	45,9	16,9	80,3	10,5	9,2

If we compare the figures from the two tables, we can see that the Hungarians are consistent in their opinion of the role of the external national homeland state. They believe that the external national state should support the education and the organization of their minority in another state, they should stimulate Hungarian investments in the country where they have an important minority population, and should offer the possibility for ethnic Hungarians to obtain Hungarian citizenship. The relative magnitude of the figures is repeated in their opinion about the role of the Romanian State with respect to Romanian minority populations abroad.

Romanians are not consistent in the evaluation of the role of the external national states in comparable situations: that of the Hungarian State with regard to

Hungarians in Romania, respectively that of the Romanian State with regard to Romanians in neighboring countries (esp. Ukraine). If, in general, they tend to agree with the Hungarians that the Romanian State should provide support in education, political organizations, investments, right of citizenship, they decline the same prerogatives of the Hungarian State towards its ethno-national kin, citizens of Romania: less than half of Romanians agree that the Hungarian State should stimulate Hungarian higher education in Romania, should strengthen the links with Hungarian political organizations in Romania, and should grant citizenship for ethnic Hungarians from Romania. Obviously they use double standards when assessing the situation of the Hungarians minority in Romania, respectively the Romanian minority in a neighboring country. This is due to the perception of threat from Hungary's part (and the permanent fear of secession of Hungarians if granted forms of autonomy, especially territorial autonomy) and lack of trust towards the Hungarian minority as a collective actor (see stereotypes regarding the Hungarians above).

CONCRUENCE BETWEEN MOTHER TONGUE AND DECLARED NATIONALITY

As it has been mentioned before, for different ethnic groups in Romania mother tongue remains an essential dimension through which ethnic belonging is manifest and reiterated. According to the data in the 1992 census, the general tendency of the different ethnic groups is to preserve their mother tongue, in other words there is congruence between nationality and declared mother tongue.

		Declared mother tongue				
	Same as nationality	Romanian	Other			
Romanians	99.87	-	0.13			
Hungarians	97.87	2.03	0.10			
Germans	78.91	11.16	9.93			
Roma	40.86	54.31	4.83			
Ukrainians	91.97	7.11	0.92			
Serbians	89.63	9.40	0.97			
Lipovans	78.79	20.97	0.24			
Jews	9.46	72.09	18.45			
Tartars	93.20	7.19	0.61			
Slovakians	91.46	6.18	2.36			
Turks	90.63	9.08	0.29			
Bulgarians	85.47	13	1.53			

Romania's population after nationality and mother tongue⁶

⁶ A.Radocea, Structura etnică a populației României ⁹i evoluția ei în ultimele decenii, in Recensământul populației ⁹i locuințelor din 7 Ianuaria 1992. Structura etnică ⁹i confesională a populației, The National Statistics Commission, 1995, pp.VII-LXXI, p.XLIV

In the case of Hungarians, the percentage of those whose mother tongue is not the same as their declared nationality is 2.13. In the other minorities we have a significant percentage of people who assume their belonging to an ethnic group, but still declare another mother tongue (Romanian in most cases) than the one of the reference ethnic group.

As regards the data referring to the congruence between declared nationality and mother tongue, resulting from the research, the tendencies are similar; we should note the lower percentage (as compared to the data in the census) of those who declared a different mother tongue from Romanian, though they are admittedly Romanians.

From a strictly mathematical point of view, the differences between the data in the census and those in the survey are due to an error limit which occurs in every survey conducted on samples. Nonetheless, there are at least two elements based on which we can consider our survey reflects a tendency that was less relevant from the census. On the one hand, the survey used more diversified instruments, investigating in depth certain aspects of linguistic socialization, ethnic family background of the subjects, and on the other hand the census is perceived by the population as a rather administrative action, and this probably influenced the subjects in the formulation of answers (especially those referring to nationality and mother tongue).

How well do you speak Romanian?	Romanians
It is my mother tongue	96.4
I speak it perfectly	2
I speak it very well, though with an accent	1
I can make myself understood in most situations	0.4
In some situations I have difficulty making myself understood	-
I only know a few words	0.1
I do not know any word	-
No answer	0.1
Total	100

Romanian fluency in the Romanian population

This hypothesis appears to be reinforced by several elements. To the question "What is the first language you learned?" 2.59% of the Romanians answered it was Hungarian, 2.3% declared that they speak this language with their mother and 1.8% with their father, while in communicating with their grandparents the percentage of those who use Hungarian seems to be even higher. Therefore, the essential elements - such as primary linguistic socialization, social-linguistic environment in the family of origin - confirm that the percentage of those who declare themselves Romanians, though Hungarian also has a significant identity dimension for them, is much higher than that reflected in the census, probably because in that context the subjects concentrated less on the identity dimension of the variable: mother tongue.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

How well do you speak Hungarian?	Hungarians
It is my mother tongue	96.1
I speak it perfectly	2.3
I speak it very well, though with an accent	0.3
I can make myself understood in most situations	0.9
In some situations I have difficulty making myself understood	-
I only know a few words	0.1
I do not know any word	0.3
Total	100

Hungarian fluency in the Hungarian population of Romania

The probability that approximately 2-3% of those who declared themselves Romanian in the census consider Hungarian (also) an important identity dimension is reinforced by the data referring to mixed marriages provided by the census. According to these data⁷ 2.9% of the total marriages were of ethnically mixed type, 12.9% of the married Hungarians have a spouse of different ethnic origin, predominantly Romanian. In 89.2% of the mixed marriages in which one of the spouses declared she/he was Romanian, the other spouse was of Romanian origin, while in 62% of the mixed marriages in which one of the spouses declared his/her Romanian origin the other spouse was of Hungarian origin. Over two-third of the children that originate from mixed Romanian-Hungarian marriages were recorded in the census as Romanians. These data do not reflect the origin of those who have already started their own family, and so the percentage of those that originate from mixed marriages is much higher than one could evaluate from the data presented above.

Taking into account the aforementioned tendencies as regards primary linguistic socialization, the use of language in the process of communication within the origin family and the number of mixed marriages, we can conclude that the percentage of the Romanian population for whom Hungarian has some identity value is considerably higher than that reflected in the data of the census. The socialization tendency in mixed Romanian-Hungarian marriages is predominantly that of assuming belonging to the Romanian group, at least in the context of the census, preserving, however, some elements of culture bearing some identity value.

RECIPROCAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE LANGUAGE COMMUNICATIVITY INDEX

We will not analyze the linguistic policies of the Romanian State, but we will only present a synthetic evaluation of these policies. They are oriented to the use of the official language of the state (i.e. Romanian) in administration, and to the promo-

⁷ In addition to the relevant data from the census (*op.cit.*), we also used those processed in E. Á. Varga's article "A romániai magyarság főbb demográfiai jellemzői az 1992. évi népszámlálás eredményei alapján" in HITEL, IX, 3/1996, pp.68-84.

tion of a differentiated status of this language in communication regulated by legal administrative means, at the same time granting minority languages fundamental language rights in the sectors pertaining to the cultural and linguistic reproduction of the minorities⁸. We want to emphasize this for two reasons, both of which are essential for the mutual knowledge of the languages:

1. Minorities, the Hungarians in this case, have the opportunity to learn and use Romanian both during instruction and later in different institutional contacts;

2. The majority, except for older people, can learn Hungarian only in appropriate everyday communication contexts in communities where Hungarian is spoken.

Consequently, whereas learning Romanian is institutionally supported in the case of minorities, the persons belonging to the majority can only learn the languages of the minorities in an informal context.

	Hungarian	German	Roma
It is my mother tongue	1.1	0.3	0.9
I speak it perfectly	3.8	0.3	0.1
I speak it very well, but with an accent	2.4	0.6	0.4
I can make myself understood in most situations in	2.5	0.8	0.2
In some situations I make myself understood, but with difficulty	3.9	3.1	0.7
I only know a few words of	14.9	15.6	10.3
I do not know any word in	70.8	78.3	84.7
No answer	0.5	0.9	2.5

How well do you speak... (Romanians)

How well do you speak ... (Hungarians)

	Romanian	German	Roma
It is my mother tongue	2.8	0.1	0.6
I speak it perfectly	22.8	0.5	-
I speak it very well, but with an accent	29.1	2.1	-
I can make myself understood in most situations in	23.4	2.7	0.3
In some situations I make myself understood, but with difficulty	17	9.1	0.5
I only know a few words of	4.4	33.5	12.1
I do not know any word in	0.5	51.8	85.6
No answer	-	0.3	0.9

If we take into account a typology that distinguishes between language competence that facilitates active communication and a level of knowledge at which -

^{8~} See the presentation of this typology and the brief analysis of the situation in Romania at http://www.ciral.ulaval.ca/alx/amlxmonde/modeindpfr.htm

though communication is impossible - the subjects have the opportunity to exchange a minimal amount of information in the respective language, then we obtain the following image at national level: 9.8% of the Romanians declare that they do not possess adequate competence to communicate in Hungarian, while 18.8% include themselves in the second category. In the case of Hungarians, 78.1% can communicate actively in most of the everyday situations, 21.4% know some words in Romanian though they do not know enough to call themselves active interlocutors in this language.

Starting from these data, we can calculate the communicativity index in each language at national level. This index reflects the probability that two individuals, randomly chosen, can communicate in a language that is more or less spread in that particular society⁹. Given that we do not have data about the knowledge of Romanian and Hungarian by the members of the other ethnic communities, we calculated this index based on the two investigated communities only.

	Percentage according to the 1992 census	Recalculated percentage
Romanians	89.5	92.65
Hungarians	7.1	7.35

It results that the communicativity index is 0.98, and thus the probability that two randomly chosen persons of the Romanian population cannot communicate in Romanian is 0.02. The communicativity index for Hungarian is 0.16, and therefore the probability that two Romanian citizens selected at random can communicate in this language is somewhat lower than 2 out of 10.

	18 - 35 years	36 - 50 years	51 - 65 years	66 and over	Total
It is my mother tongue	1.54	0.57	0.37	1.71	1.05
I speak it perfectly	4.11	2.30	3.36	5.13	3.67
I speak it very well, but with an accent	2.31	4.60	1.87	0.85	2.41
I can make myself understood in most situations	1.54	4.02	1.87	4.27	2.41
In some situations I can make myself understood, but only with difficulty	4.63	3.45	4.48	0.85	3.88
I only know a few words	14.14	17.82	14.55	13.68	14.90
I do not know any word	70.95	66.09	73.51	73.50	71.14
No answer	0.77	1.15	-	-	0.52

It is interesting to follow the dynamics by age groups as regards knowledge of Hungarian by the Romanians. On the one hand, among those over 66 the percent-

⁹ E.C.Y., Kuo, "Measuring Communicativity in Multilingual Societies: the Case of Singapore and West Malaysia", in *Anthropological Linguistics*, 21(7),1979, pp.328-340.

age of those that speak Hungarian perfectly (or almost perfectly) is significantly higher than the specific level of the middle-aged. This is probably due to the historical context, a fact which is reinforced by our data, namely that in youth they went to Hungarian schools. A part of this category lives in the big cities of Transylvania, where a few decades ago Hungarian was much more often used, and where the long contact with the Hungarian population proved to be a helpful environment for learning the language.

However, it seems that this is not the only pattern of learning Hungarian, because in the 18-35 age group there is a high percentage of those who speak Hungarian well or at an acceptable level. This is due to the increased percentage of those who come from mixed marriages, from ethnically mixed families. Also, it is a result of a more open attitude as compared to the elderly, as regards the use and learning of Hungarian.

	18 - 35 years	36 - 50 years	51 - 65 years	66 and over	Total
It is my mother tongue	4.14	3.38	1.33	1.00	2.78
I speak it perfectly	24.52	27.70	19.47	17.00	22.78
I speak it very well, but with an accent	28.66	32.43	31.86	20.00	29.11
I can make myself understood in most situations	24.84	20.95	22.57	24.00	23.42
In some situations I can make myself understood, but only with difficulty	15.92	14.19	17.26	24.00	16.96
I only know a few words	1.59	1.35	6.64	13.00	4.43
I do not know any word	0.32	-	0.88	1.00	0.51

How well do you speak Romanian (Hungarians)

In the case of the Hungarian population those over 66 know significantly less Romanian than the average, but the level of knowledge increases a great deal in the middle-aged group. In the group of those between 18-35 on the one hand we have the highest number of people who declare themselves Hungarians but consider that Romanian is their mother tongue, and on the other hand there is a slight decrease (as compared to those of 36-50) in the percentage of those who consider that they speak it perfectly or almost perfectly.

The first phenomenon - of assuming the Hungarian ethnic identity and the mother tongue status of Romanian, a group which is increasing in time and in this respect the differences between generations are significant - is due to the increase in the number of mixed marriages. The second phenomenon is explicable by the fact that in the youth the process of linguistic socialization is not finished yet, and in this process school plays an important, though not exclusive, role; language proficiency can be acquired through the use of the language in diverse situations of communication over a long period of time.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

KNOWLEDGE OF HUNGARIAN AT REGIONAL LEVEL

Romanian Hungarian German It is my mother tongue 95.04 1.09 2.52 2.84 2.88 0.73 I speak it perfectly I speak it very well, but with an accent 1.77 2.16 1.09 I can make myself understood in most 7.19 0.35 1.82 situations in... In some situations I can make myself 9.71 4.36 understood, but only with difficulty 23.74 15.64 I only know a few words in 51.80 I do not know any word in . 75.27 _ No answer

How well do you speak ... (Romanians in Transylvania)

Transylvania	Percentage according to the 1992 census	Recalculated percentage
Romanians	73.6	77.96
Hungarians	20.8	22.03

The communicativity index for Romanian calculated in Transylvania is 0.95, and in the case of Hungarian it is 0.33. Therefore, the odds that someone cannot communicate adequately in Romanian is 1 in 20, while the odds that two people from Transylvania can communicate in Hungarian is somewhat more than 3 in 10.

Another region that we analyzed was Szeklerland (conventionally confined to the counties of Covasna and Harghita), which was interesting for two reasons: on the one hand, because it is a region where the linguistic majority speaks Hungarian, and on the other hand, because it has been in the focus of political debates in which the very situation of linguistic minority status of the Romanians living here was the issue.

How well do you speak ... (Romanians in Szeklerland)

	Romanian	Hungarian
It is my mother tongue	97.54	2.46
I speak it perfectly	1.40	12.63
I speak it very well, but with an accent	0.70	7.72
I can make myself understood in most situations	0.35	17.54
In some situations I can make myself understood, but only with difficulty	-	15.09
I only know a few words	-	27.02
I do not know any word	-	16.49
No answer	-	1.05

How well do you speak ... (Hungarians in Szeklerland)

	Romanian	Hungarian
It is my mother tongue	-	99.57
I speak it perfectly	9.79	0.43
I speak it very well, but with an accent	22.98	-
I can make myself understood in most situations	29.36	-
In some situations I can make myself understood, but only with difficulty	29.36	-
I only know a few words	7.23	-
I do not know any word	1.28	-
No answer	-	-

The communicativity index was calculated for the population of Harghita and Covasna Counties¹⁰ (the two main counties of this historical region); we obtained a probability of 0.68 for two randomly chosen persons to the able to communicate in Romanian, and 0.89 to communicate in Hungarian. Therefore, the chances are approximately 3 in 10 for people selected randomly to be unable to communicate in Romanian, and the odds of occurrence of the same situation in Hungarian is 1 in 10.

RECIPROCAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE LANGUAGE AND INTERETHNIC ATTITUDES

We analyzed to what extent mutual language knowledge or lack of knowledge affects attitudes and judgment made by the subjects concerning interethnic relations. For the sake of a more synthesized presentation of the data we reduced the scale of self-assessment to that of language fluency.

Those who consider that the respective language is their mother tongue, that they speak it perfectly or with an accent, and those who declare that they can manage in most of the situations, have been included in the category called: no communication problems. Those who declare they have minimal language knowledge (including "I only know a few words") have been included in the category: difficulty in communication. The latter category also includes those who declare they do not know the language at all.

Level of Romanian fluency	Much better	Somew hat better	The same	Some what worse	Much worse	Cannot assess	Total
No communication problems	4.51	35.28	38.73	10.34	2.65	8.49	100.00
Difficulty in communication	2.11	30.53	36.84	14.74	1.05	14.74	100.00
Does not know	-	-	50.00	50.00	-	-	100.00
	4.16	34.93	37.84	11.23	2.29	9.56	100.00

Are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to last year ? (Hungarians)

10 The population ratio used in the calculations was 18.23% Romanians, and 81.77% Hungarians.

Level of Romanian fluency	Much better	Some what better	The same	Some what worse	Much worse	Cannot assess	Total
No communication problems	26.53	29.71	7.96	13.53	15.12	7.16	100.00
Difficulty in communication	15.79	37.89	10.53	5.26	13.68	16.84	100.00
Does not know	-	50.00	-	50.00	-	-	100.00
	24.53	31.81	8.32	11.85	14.55	8.94	100.00

In the case of the Hungarians one can notice a relation between the level of Romanian fluency and the positive or negative assessment of the evolution of relations between Romanians and Hungarians.

THE PERCEPTION OF THE MINORITY LEGISLATION AND THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL STATE IN THE PRESERVATION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY ABROAD

One of the most controversial issues concerning the minority rights is whether there are or aren't "sufficient" rights for the members of the ethnic minorities. The key word here is "sufficient" and the different meanings that majority and minority attributes to that word. As the following table reveals, what the Romanian legislation considered to be "sufficient" for the national minorities living inside the country it is considered "insufficient" (too few rights) by 83.1% of the Hungarians and "more than sufficient" (too many rights) by 20.3% of the Romanians. The same tendency can be easily noticed taking a look at similar research done in previous years:

	CURS - December 1997 Romanians
Too many rights	28.2
Insufficient rights	4.0
About enough rights	58.5
Don't know	9.4

The differences are minimal if we study the data separately on different regions of the country. However, we could mention that while 68.2% of the Romanians from Transylvania assess that

national minorities have about enough rights and 19.1% of them that they have too many rights, 61.4% of the Romanians from Moldavia are sharing the first opinion and 23.6% the second.

Persons	belonging	to	national	minorities	have	•••
---------	-----------	----	----------	------------	------	-----

Romanians from	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia	Romanians from Szeklerland
Too many rights	19.1	19.3	23.6	27.9
Insufficient rights	12.7	13.6	13.6	6.6
About enough rights	68.2	66.7	61.4	65.2
Don't know	-	0.4	0.9	0.3

It is very interesting to notice that while, at other opinion questions, the percentage of non-answers were around 8% to 10% or even higher, less then 1% of the population investigated refused to answer or didn't know what to answer at this item. In the following, we will try to describe the Romanian population that answered

differently to this question in terms of age, sex, origin, political affiliation etc.

As the next table shows, the age of the respondent doesn't influence considerably his opinion on whether national minorities have or don't have sufficient rights:

Age of the	e of the National minorities have						
respondent	Too many rights	About enough rights	Insufficient rights	DK/NA	Total		
18-25	4.2	4.0	14.0	0.1	22.4		
26-35	3.1	2.8	13.4	0.1	19.4		
36-45	3.4	1.3	6.8	-	11.4		
46-55	3.3	2.1	8.5	0.1	14.0		
56-65	4.2	1.6	15.1	0.1	21.0		
66+	1.9	1.4	8.4	0.1	11.8		
Total	20.2	13.3	65.9	0.4	100		

If we take into account the type of the habitat, we can notice that the majority (67.5%) of the people who assessed that national minorities had too many rights were living in urban areas while the majority (72.4%) of those who considered that they had insufficient rights were living in rural areas. Among those who assessed that national minorities had about enough rights the proportions are almost equal: 54.8% are living in the city and 45.2% in the country. The mentioned differences could be explained by the fact that people living in rural areas have more face-to-face daily interactions with members of ethnic minorities that they personally know and they tend to interpret the minority legislation in terms used by these people. People living in urban areas are more influenced by the political discourse on minority issues and most of them have less close and less frequent interactions with ethnic minorities.

In other words, we can conclude that the nature of social links between people and the type of the discourse they are exposed to have a considerable impact on how they perceive minority legislation.

Type of the					
habitat	Too many About enough I		Insufficient	DK/NA	Total
Habitat	rights	rights	rights		
Urban	13.7	3.7	36.1	0.3	53.8
Rural	6.6	9.6	29.8	0.2	46.2
Total	20.2	13.3	65.9	0.5	100

No remarkable differences can be revealed if we study the distribution of the answers on the historical regions of Romania.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

	Too many	About enough	Insufficient	DK/NA	Total
	rights	rights	rights		
Transylvania	28.0	28.3	30.7	-	29.7
Walachia	45.1	48.0	47.8	50	47.2
Moldavia	26.9	23.6	21.5	50	23.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Analyzing the responses of the subjects in relation to their level of education, we notice a tendency of those with less than an average level of education to consider that national minorities have insufficient rights. Correspondingly, the opposite tendency is revealed among those with a higher level of education (college or university) that rather assess that they have more than sufficient rights. However, it must be mentioned that at all levels of education most of the Romanians consider that national minorities have about enough rights.

The level of	Nat	ional minorities hav	'e	
education	Too many	About enough	Insufficient	Total
	rights	rights	rights	
No education	0.2	0.4	0.3	1.0
Elementary School	0.6	2.4	5.5	8.6
Gymnasium	3.0	3.0	13.8	19.8
Professional	3.5	2.7	10.7	17.1
High school	7.7	4.1	19.7	31.5
College	1.9	0.6	7.0	9.7
University	3.1	0.1	9.0	12.3
Total	20.2	13.3	65.9	100

(The missing 0,5% in the total line represent non-answers to the question about minority rights)

PARTICIPATION IN DIFFERENT CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS

A set of items was designed in order to evaluate the participation of the population in civic organizations. The data confirmed the previous findings of different public opinion surveys: civic organization membership is weakly represented among the population, both Romanians and Hungarians, even though it is somewhat bigger in the case of the Hungarians.

In order to reveal the straight of the link to the particular organization which a person is member of, we asked about the frequency of his meeting with the others. The question referred to the attendance of the subject to the formal meetings of the organization, not the frequency of these meetings. The results were the following:

	Romanians	Hungarians
Every day	6.9	0.5
Once a week	26.4	16.9
Monthly	28.8	17.9
A few times during the year	12.7	18.5
Once a year	4.6	15.9
There are no formal meetings of the members	3.4	4.6
I do not take part at meetings of the members	8.0	23.1
No response	9.2	2.6
Total	100	100

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE 'ETHNOBAROMETER'

Numbers represent percentages of those who are members in different organizations.

It can be noticed that there is a tendency among Romanian people to participate more frequently at the meetings of the organization: 33.3% of association members took part at least once a week, while just 17.4% of the Hungarians do so. Consequently, 39.0% of the Hungarians meet the other members once a year or do not meet them at all, while 12.6% of the Romanians act similarly. These data could be explained by the fact that Hungarians are much more involved in political organizations (DAHR in particular) than the Romanians or the meetings between members of political parties are not very frequent or doesn't have considerable relevance to the members. As the previous chart shows, 15.5% of the Hungarians take part in a political party, while only 4.8% of the Romanians investigated do so. If we take into account just the members of non-political organizations, these differences disappear. Hungarian political associations have a considerable part of "passive" members.

In this way, we can conclude that even if organization membership is more frequent between Hungarians, activism inside organizations (attendance to meetings) is similar in case of both nationalities. Civic activism is connected to the way people perceive their role in the social life and the role they attribute to the state in different public matters. A special set of items was designed to evaluate the opinion of the population on several political issues: they were asked to express their agreement/disagreement on different assertions characteristic to the left/right political wing.

These questions tried to investigate not the electoral intention, but the actual political orientation of the subjects (not always consequent with their voting intention). The main topic was left-right political orientation, authoritarianism, communalism, and etatism.

As the next table shows, a remarkable consensus can be found concerning topics related to a more authoritarian regime. The need for a strong-handed political leader (92.4%), harsher laws (91.7%) and education of the children in the spirit of the respect for the adults (91.1%) express an option for authoritarianism. The fact that 88.7% of the subjects agreed on that one should fight for his/her interests by his/her own, shows the ascendance of individualism and political right. These results should be interpreted in the light of the very strong extreme-right discourse of some Romanian political parties. The lack of a truly charismatic political leader, able to

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

	Agree	Disagree	DK/NA
1. The differences between salaries should be reduced in the benefit of the poor.	79.3	16.6	4.1
2. The state should control the prices of the basic goods.	80.9	15.2	2.8
3. The state should guarantee jobs for all its citizens.	84.7	12.5	2.8
4. Harsher punishments should be introduced in order to reduce criminality.	91.7	5.1	3.3
5. The first thing that a child should learn is respect for the adults.	91.1	6.4	2.5
6. Teachers should pay attention firstly at the more gifted children, not the average ones.	19.3	74.5	6.2
7. The welfare of every individual depends mostly on the state.	58.4	34.7	6.9
8. You can trust nobody except yourself.	70.3	25.2	4.5
9. You must fight for your interest by your own.	88.7	8.5	2.8
10. A strong-handed man is needed in order to improve the situation from our country.	92.4	2.9	4.7
11. Meetings and protests make everything just worse, causing disorder and instability.	47.6	43.1	9.3
12. Having in view nowadays' economic situation, the unemployed people should accept every working opportunity (every job) given to them.	61.5	30.6	7.9

conquer the trust of the population, the increased criminality and the generation gap that has become more pronounced after 1990 (that generated a very negative social representation of the young people) should be also taken in view.

However, on the second place of acceptance can be easily figured out the values of the political left. In the opinion of 84.7% of the people investigated, the state should guarantee jobs for its citizens and it should also control the prices of the basic goods (80.4%). These two items are holding quite an opposite meaning to the one mentioned before; namely "You must fight for your interest on your own". The fact that a proportion of 72.6% (respectively 77.1%) of the people agreed on both items could reveal two different things: firstly, an incongruence in what matters their political thinking; secondly, the difference between the perceived reality, when everybody should follow his/her interests by his/her own, and two aspects of the communist past that they are longing for: working opportunities offered to everybody and low prices of the basic goods due to the economic monopoly of the state.

	You must fight for your interest by your own.					
The state should		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total	
	Agree	72.6	7.1	1.4	81.1	
control the prices of	Disagree	13.7	1.3	0.1	15.1	
the basic goods.	NR	2.5	0.1	1.2	3.8	
	Total	88.7	8.5	2.8	100	

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE "ETHNOBAROMETER"

	Υοι	You must fight for your interest by your own.				
The state should		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total	
guarantee work places for all its citizens.	Agree	77.1	6.5	1.1	84.7	
	Disagree	10.3	1.9	0.3	12.5	
	NR	1.3	0.1	1.3	2.8	
	Total	88.7	8.5	2.8	100	

	You can trust nobody except yourself.					
		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total	
The state should	Agree	58.3	20.0	2.5	80.8	
control the prices of	Disagree	10.2	4.6	0.5	15.3	
the basic goods.	NR	1.8	0.6	1.5	3.9	
	Total	70.3	25.2	4.5	100	

	You can trust nobody except yourself.				
The state should		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total
	Agree	61.8	20.1	2.6	84.5
guarantee jobs for all its citizens.	Disagree	7.4	4.6	0.6	12.6
its citizens.	NR	0.9	0.6	1.3	2.8
	Total	70.1	25.3	4.5	100

	You can trust nobody except yourself.					
Differences between		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total	
salaries should be	Agree	59.4	16.8	3.0	79.2	
reduced in the	Disagree	9.1	7.0	0.6	16.6	
benefit of the poor.	NR	1.8	0.6	1.0	4.1	
	Total	70.4	25.1	4.5	100	

However, when having in view the correspondence between making responsible the individual, respectively the state for the welfare of the population, "only" 53.1% of the people agreed on both the items indicating these:

	You must fight for your interest on your own.					
		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total	
The welfare of every	Agree	53.1	4.2	1.0	58.4	
individual depends mostly on the state.	Disagree	30.7	3.7	0.2	34.6	
mostry on the state.	NR	5.0	0.5	1.5	7.0	
	Total	88.8	8.4	2.8	100	

	You must fight for your interest on your own.				
A strong-handed man		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total
is needed in order to	Agree	698	239	29	966
improve the situation	Disagree	16	13	1	30
from our country.	NR	21	12	16	49
	Total	735	264	46	1045

A less ambiguous indicator of a political-left orientation could be considered the first question of the item: 79.3% of the people agreed on the necessity of reducing the differences between salaries. This should be done in the benefit of the poor strata. Although this data could be easily interpreted according to the Marxist dictum: "From everybody after his capacity, to everybody after his needs", we also should have in view that many people consider the differences between salaries too great and not corresponding with one's working abilities. On the other hand, most of the people who agreed on that item also expressed their preference for a strong-hand-ed man to take leadership.

	A strong-handed man is needed in order to improve the situation from our country.				
The differences		Agree	Disagree	NR	Total
between salaries	Agree	74.6	15.4	2.3	92.3
should be reduced in	Disagree	1.9	0.8	0.3	3.0
the benefit of the poor.	NR	2.9	0.5	1.5	4.8
	Total	79.3	16.7	4.0	100

The same trend (orientation towards political left) is revealed when taking into account that 74.5% of the people consider that teachers should not pay special attention to the specially gifted children instead of the average, and 58.4% of them that the state is the main responsible for the welfare of its citizens. However, the last question should be also seen as an expression of the people disapproval on the fact that individual prerogatives are not sufficiently encouraged while privatization is still not fully accomplished.

"You can trust nobody except yourself" (item that gained the approval of 70.3% of the people) together with "You must fight for your interests by yourself" (88.7%) could be also seen as indicators of social isolation and lack of trust in forms of political or non-political associations. This is underlined by the week participation in civic organizations, as we revealed in the above pages.

The most controversial issue seems to be the attitude towards forms of public protest: while almost half of the people considered that these have only a negative impact on the present situation, other people didn't share that point of view. This could be explained by the fact that most people have both participated in, and personally experienced the negative side effects of the manifestations (from different sectors of industry, agriculture or service work).

Making a comparative analysis of Romanians and Hungarians in terms of their agreement/disagreement on the previously discussed issues, we can find significant differences only in the case of three of them:

		Romanians	S	Hungarians		
	Agree %	Disagree %	DK	Agree %	Disagree %	DK
 The differences between salaries should be reduced in the benefit of the poor. 	78.6	17.2	4.2	88.1	9.4	2.5
2. The state should control the prices of the basic goods.	80.4	15.7	3.9	88.1	9.2	2.8
3. The state should guarantee jobs for all its citizens.	85.2	12.1	2.7	78.5	18.8	2.6
4. Harsher punishments should be introduced in order to reduce criminality.	92.0	4.8	3.2	87.2	8.8	4.0
5. The first thing that a child should learn is respect for the adults.	91.7	5.8	2.5	84.1	13.0	2.9
6. Teachers should pay attertion firstly at the more gifted children, not at the average ones.	19.5	74.2	6.2	16.7	78.4	4.9
7. The welfare of every individual depends mostly on the state.	58.1	34.8	7.1	61.8	33.7	4.5
8. You can trust nobody except yourself.	71.5	24.1	4.5	56.0	39.4	4.5
9. You must fight for your interest by your own.	90.5	6.9	2.6	67.5	27.0	5.4
10. A strong-handed man is needed in order to improve the situation from our country.	93.0	2.5	4.6	85.8	8.2	6.0
11. Meetings and protests make everything just worse, causing disorder and instability.	46.3	44.2	9.4	63.2	29.0	7.8
12. Having in view nowadays economic situation, the unem- ployed people should accept every working opportunity (every job) given to them.	61.2	30.8	8.0	65.2	28.1	6.8

THE MODEL OF ROMANIAN INTERETHNIC RELATIONS AS REFLECTED IN THE 'ETHNOBAROMETER'

A significantly lower proportion of the Hungarians agreed on the two items that indicate individualism: "You can trust nobody except yourself (56.0% of the Hungarians in comparison with 71.5% of the Romanians) and "You must fight for your interest by your own" (67.5% versus 90.5%). Having in view that the proportions of "Don't know"-s and no answers were similarly low in both subsamples, we can conclude that individualistic behavioral patterns are less popular among Hungarians than among Romanians, or, at least, they consider it to be less desirable than the Romanians do. These findings can be explained by the more importance given to the feeling of "us" by a minority population that identifies itself through

opposition to the majority. The social links between people who consider themselves similar under a very significant aspect are as stronger as they differ more from others under that aspect, those "others" (outsiders) are closer and superior in number to them. For Hungarians living in Romania, ethnic identity is one of the very important matters and the pattern we have just described could be a valid one.

The other topic differently evaluated by Romanians and Hungarians concerns the positive/negative role attributed to social movements (manifestations, protests). While the proportions of the Romanians who agreed, respectively disagreed that "Protests and manifestations make everything just worse..." are similar (46.3% versus 44.2%), in the case of Hungarians the proportion of those who agreed was twice as bigger as the proportion of those who disagreed (63.2% versus 29.0%). Could that be explained by the fact that several popular manifestations had a nationalistic character and were directed against the Hungarians? Or by the fact that the Hungarians have greater confidence in the activity of their organizations than have the Romanians?¹¹ We don't have sufficient data available to answer these questions, so let us restrain their meanings to rhetorical ones.

¹¹ Remember that civic participation is more frequent (even though less "intense") among Hungarians than among Romanians, especially concerning political party membership. For more details, see the previous pages.

2. ETHNOBAROMETER

"Interethnic Relations in Romania"

Survey conducted by the RESEARCH CENTER FOR INTERETHNIC RELATIONS May-June 2000

Financed by the United States Agency for I nternational Development

ETHNOBAROMETER: <u>RESULTS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY</u>

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sample used for the first survey of the Ethnobarometer, conducted in 2000, has the following characteristics:

•Volume: 2051 persons aged 18 and over.

Type: Random multi-cluster multi-stratified.

Two representative sub-samples were designed: one for the Romanian population (1253 persons), and the other for the Hungarian population (798 persons). The Romanian population in Szeklerland (Harghita and Covasna Counties) was over-represented (287 persons, standing for 5 persons in the final weighted national sample). The Hungarian population in Romania was over-represented as well, standing for 80 persons in the final weighted national sample.

•Cluster and stratification criteria: The following variables represented main stratification criteria, next to the common ethno-demographic criteria of age, sex, type and size of locality, economic-cultural area: Transylvania, the North-West, Banat, Szeklerland, Walachia, Oltenia, Dobrudja, Moldavia and Bucharest, according to the consecrated methodology; proportion of Hungarians in localities: dominance, majority, parity, minority, lack.

Representativeness: The sample is representative for the adult population of Romania, with the margin of error of 2.0 for the relevant variables. The sample was validated according to the data of the 1992 Census and the updated data provided by the Romanian National Commission for Statistics.

•**Field survey:** The interviews were conducted by Romanian speaking interviewers for the Romanian respondents, and by Hungarian speaking interviewers for the ethnic Hungarian respondents, between May 19 - June 1, 2000.



In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to the period before 1989?

	Romanians	Hungarians
Much better	10.7	24.8
Somewhat better	18.3	30.8
The same	24.0	8.4
Somewhat worse	13.7	11.4
Much worse	10.4	13.0
Cannot assess	32.9	11.5

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.


In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to the period before the previous elections (1996)?

*Only the persons who expressed an opinion.

	Romanians	Hungarians
Much better	5.9	6.8
Somewhat better	26.0	41.0
The same	22.3	18.4
Somewhat worse	10.9	16.5
Much worse	4.6	5.3
Cannot assess	30.2	12.0

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.



In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to the previous year?

*Only the persons who expressed an opinion.

	Romanians	Hungarians
Much better	5.0	3.9
Somewhat better	22.8	33.5
The same	28.8	36.3
Somewhat worse	8.5	10.7
Much worse	3.4	2.9
Cannot assess	31.4	12.8

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to the period before 1989?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Much better	6.4	15.2	6.7
Somewhat better	21.4	18.0	15.2
The same	18.9	8.9	17.9
Somewhat worse	14.6	12.6	14.7
Much worse	9.6	10.7	10.7
Cannot assess	28.9	34.6	34.4

... as compared to the period before the previous elections (1996)?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Much better	3.2	7.8	5.4
Somewhat better	21.1	27.6	28.6
The same	29.4	15.7	27.2
Somewhat worse	12.5	10.2	10.3
Much worse	3.2	5.4	4.5
Cannot assess	30.5	33.3	23.7

... as compared to the previous year?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Much better	4.6	4.8	5.8
Somewhat better	19.6	22.8	26.8
The same	32.1	24.1	33.9
Somewhat worse	10.4	8.7	5.8
Much worse	2.9	3.9	3.1
Cannot assess	30.4	35.7	24.1

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Much better	6.0	11.9
Somewhat better	13.7	40.4
The same	31.6	12.8
Somewhat worse	14.7	10.2
Much worse	15.8	8.5
Cannot assess	18.2	16.2

In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to the period before 1989?

... as compared to the period before the previous elections (1996)?

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Much better	4.6	3.0
Somewhat better	20.7	45.1
The same	38.6	21.7
Somewhat worse	13.0	11.1
Much worse	4.9	3.8
Cannot assess	18.2	15.3

... as compared to the previous year?

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Much better	3.2	5.5
Somewhat better	14.7	33.6
The same	51.6	30.2
Somewhat worse	9.8	11.1
Much worse	3.9	2.1
Cannot assess	16.8	17.4

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

Comparative results from other researches

How do you assess the evolution of the relations between Romanians and Hungarians since DAHR has been in government?

Only Hungarians

	More relaxed	Tenser	The same	Don't know No answer
RCIR 1999	35.8	21.9	35.8	6.45
RCIR 2000	44.9	13.9	38.4	2.8

In your opinion, are the relations between Romanians and Hungarians better or worse as compared to...?

RCIR 2000 Only Hungarians

	Before 1989	Before 1996 elections	Previous year
Much better	24.8	6.8	3.9
Somewhat better	30.8	41.0	33.5
The same	8.4	18.4	36.3
Somewhat worse	11.4	16.5	10.7
Much worse	13.0	5.3	2.9
Cannot assess	11.5	12.0	12.8

ETHNOBAROMETER

Romanians

Which of the following phrases best describs the relations between Romanians and Hungarians in Romania?



Which of the following phrases best describs the relations between Romanians and Hungarians in your region?



INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES



Moldavia

Romanians in Szeklerland

Romanians

292

Conflict

Transylvania

🗖 Walachia

ETHNOBAROMETER

Do you think that ethnic groups or minorities in our country pose a big threat, some threat, little threat or no threat to peace and security in this society? $\dot{}$

Country	1992/1993	1995	1998
Belarus	30	14	14
Bulgaria	46	36	29
Croatia	57	42	39
Czech Republic	44	14	25
Hungary	26	15	19
Poland	35	8	17
Romania	60	33	32
Slovakia	53	49	43
Slovenia	13	20	10
Ukraine	24	15	15
CEE mean	40	25	25

Percentage of perception of big or some threat

^{*} R.Rose and C.Haerpfer, *Trends in Democracies and Markets: New Democracies Barometer 1991-98*, Glasgow, Centre for the Study of Public Policy, 1998, p.41.



INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

294

ETHNOBAROMETER

Romanians

Even though there had existed problems between minority and majority populations in Romania, a conflict similar to the one in Kosovo between the minority (Albanian) and the majority (Serb) populations was avoided. In your opinion, what were the reasons why a violent conflict like the one in Kosovo did not break out in Romania? Choose three reasons.

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
1. The Hungarians in Romania are more compliant than the Albanian minority in Kosovo	5.5	4.2	4.1
2. In their relation with the majority population, the Hungarians in Romania are less obstinate than the Albanians in Kosovo	5.7	8.9	9.4
3. The Hungarians in Romania were better treated (were granted more rights) than the Albanians from Kosovo	21.2	21.1	17.0
4. Romanians, in general, are more tolerant than the Serbs	24.4	23.3	19.8
5. In their relation with the minority populations, the Romanians are less obstinate than the Serbs	13.4	11.5	14.8
6. The Romanian politicians are wiser than the Serb politicians	9.0	10.6	9.7
7. The DAHR politicians are wiser than the Kosovo Albanian politicians	3.8	5.0	6.0
8. The Romanian political system is more democratic than the Serb one	16.9	15.0	13.1

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES



Do you believe that, in the near future, an armed conflict with the neighboring states is possible?

How do you assess that the relations between Romania and Hungary have evolved in the last three years?



296

ETHNOBAROMETER



How do you assess that the relations between Romania and Hungary will evolve in the next three years?

297

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES



Since DAHR has been in power, the situation of the Hungarians in Romania has...

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Improved	44.5	46.1	43.1
Got worse	4.6	6.8	4.4
Stayed the same	27.9	19.9	24.4
Cannot asses	23.0	26.9	27.6

	Hungarians in Romanians Szeklerland Szeklerlar	
Improved	40.8	45.0
Got worse	13.6	5.5
Stayed the same	24.4	23.3
Cannot assess	21.3	25.9



How do you assess the legislation in what regards minority rights? National minorities have...

Comparative results from other researches:

	CURS - Dec. 1997 Romanians
Too many rights	28.2
Insufficient rights	4.0
About enough rights	58.5
Don't know	9.4

"What is your opinion about the present government's activity regarding the minority issue?"

	RCIR	RCIR
	Mar. 1999	Apr. 2000
	Hungarians	Hungarians
It is good	10.4	10.3
Good initiatives, not yet satisfying	61.5	66.8
Nothing remarkable	16.2	12.7
Rather poor	3.6	2.6
Don't know	8.3	7.1

How do you assess the Romanian legislation regarding minority rights?

The national minorities have ...

Romanians

	Transylvania	Muntenia	Moldova
Too many rights	19.1	19.3	23.6
Insufficient rights	12.7	13.6	13.6
About enough rights	68.2	66.7	61.4
Don't know	-	0.4	0.9

The national minorities have ...

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Too many rights	27.9	1.3
Insufficient rights	6.6	87.2
About enough rights	65.2	11.1
Don't know	0.3	0.4

ETHNOBAROMETER

Linguistic practices

Can you speak Romanian?

	Hungarians	Hungarians in Szeklerland
It is my mother tongue	2.8	-
I speak it perfectly, even though Romanian is not my mother tongue	22.8	9.8
I speak it very well, but with an accent	29.1	12.0
I can make myself understood in most situations	23.4	29.4
I can make myself understood in some situations, but with difficulty	17.0	29.4
I only know some words	4.4	7.2
I don't know a word	0.5	1.3

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

301

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

Can you speak the Hungarian language?

	Romanians	Romanians in Transylvania	Romanians in Szeklerland	Romanians from localities where they are not the majority
It is my mother tongue	1.1	2.6	2.5	4.2
I speak perfectly, even though Hungarian is not my mother tongue	3.8	3.1	12.6	23.8
I speak very well, but with an accent	2.4	2.3	7.7	15.1
I can make myself understood in most situations	2.5	7.1	17.5	18.8
I can make myself understood in some occasions, but with difficulties	3.9	9.6	15.1	15.1
I only know some words	14.9	23.8	27.0	15.1
I don't know a word	70.8	51.6	16.5	6.7

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

Note: The option for this typology was determined by the specificity of the topic. The last category refers to Romanians living in localities where the proportion of other nationalities (in most cases Hungarians) is larger than 40%. According to the data of the 1992 Census, approximately 5% of Romanians live in such localities.

	Always	Often	Some- times	Never	It does not apply
At home	1.6	4.3	11.2	82.1	0.9
With friends	1.1	9.1	48.7	40.2	0.8
At work	3.9	14.0	31.7	24.7	25.7
When shopping	6.9	21.9	46.5	23.4	1.4
At the doctor's	18.1	14.1	31.5	34.8	1.5
At the police	70.3	5.4	11.8	6.3	6.3
At City Hall	35.2	7.3	18.4	30.6	8.6

How often do you use Romanian in the following situations?

Hungarians in Szeklerland

Hungarians

	Always	Often	Some- times	Never	It does not apply
At home	0.4	1.7	4.7	92.8	0.4
With friends	-	3.8	34.9	60.9	0.4
At work	0.4	5.6	23.6	53.6	16.7
When shopping	-	4.7	40.6	53.8	0.9
At the doctor's	1.3	3.4	19.1	74.5	1.7
At the police	53.2	8.1	20.9	13.2	4.7
At the City Hall	4.3	2.1	11.9	74.9	6.8

How often do you use Hungarian in the following situations?

Romanians inTransylvania

	Always	Often	Some- times	Never	It does not apply
At home	2.4	2.3	6.6	65.7	23.0
With friends	1.0	3.8	16.1	56.0	23.1
At work	0.6	1.1	8.6	56.7	33.1
When shopping	1.0	0.7	15.0	58.9	24.4
At the doctor's	1.0	0.1	3.4	72.9	22.7
At the police	0.9	-	1.0	73.9	24.1
At the City Hall	1.0	0.1	1.0	74.7	23.2

Romanians in Szeklerland

	Always	Often	Some- times	Never	It does not apply
At home	4.2	3.9	11.3	64.3	16.3
With friends	4.2	9.5	29.3	42.4	14.5
At work	4.6	8.9	16.8	42.5	27.1
When shopping	3.2	9.9	20.8	51.6	14.5
At the doctor's	3.2	2.5	9.9	67.8	16.7
At the police	1.8	1.1	5.7	71.7	19.8
At the City Hall	5.7	3.6	6.0	64.7	19.1

	Always	Often	Some- times	Never	It does not apply
At home	13.1	15.4	16.8	42.8	11.9
With friends	7.2	25.0	36.2	19.7	11.9
At work	2.6	8.6	22.9	19.7	46.2
When shopping	2.5	14.6	44.2	23.4	15.3
At the doctor's	2.5	2.5	28.6	49.9	16.6
At the police	1.3	0.1	20.2	58.2	20.3
At the City Hall	1.5	2.5	27.2	53.3	15.5

Romanians in localities where they do not constitute the majority

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
It upsets me to hear Hungarian spoken around me	27.1	64.0	8.8
It is not polite for two Hungarians to speak in Hungarian when there are Romanians around, irrespective of the topic	71.3	22.6	6.1
The Romanians who learned Hungarian in order to speak with Hungarians they know did right	65.3	22.8	211
Romanians living in areas where Hungarians represent the majority of the population should speak Hungarian	39.2	51.6	9.1
There are many Hungarians who avoid speaking Romanian, even if they can	64.4	51.3	14.3

The figures represent percentages of responses.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

306

The Romantan subsample

	Romanians	Romanians fin Transylvania	Romanians in Szeklerland	Romanians in localities where they are not a majority
Fully agree	54.4	60.8	54.2	40.7
Rather agree	16.9	13.5	16.2	22.0
Rather disagree	9.1	9.5	13.0	15.2
Fully disagree	13.5	13.4	11.6	14.1
Don't know	6.1	2.9	4.9	8.0

It is not polite for two Hungarians to speak Hungarian when there are Romanians around, irrespective of the topic

	Hungarians	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Fully agree	29.8	21.9
Rather agree	26.4	19.3
Rather disagree	18.8	21.5
Fully disagree	22.9	33.5
Don't know	2.1	3.9

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

	Romanians	Romanians in Transylvania	Romanians in Szeklerland	Romanians in localities where they are not a majority
Fully agree	37.3	45.9	52.6	41.8
Rather agree	28.0	25.1	28.4	47.3
Rather disagree	15.3	14.4	7.7	3.6
Fully disagree	7.5	6.5	5.6	6.0
Don't know	11.7	8.0	5.6	1.2

The Romanians who learned Hungarian in order to speak with Hungarians did right

	Hungarians	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Fully agree	80.9	91.0
Rather agree	17.0	8.6
Rather disagree	0.5	-
Fully disagree	0.3	-
Don't know	1.3	0.4

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

Romanians living in areas where Hungarians represent the majority of the popula-tion should be able to speak Hungarian

	Romanians	Romanians in Transylvania	Romanians in Szeklerland	Romanians in localities where they are not a majority
Fully agree	19.8	23.9	18.4	14.4
Rather agree	19.4	19.7	24.4	14.3
Rather disagree	26.2	23.4	30.4	48.9
Fully disagree	25.5	27.2	21.2	19.0
Don't know	9.1	5.8	5.7	3.5

	Hungarians	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Fully agree	54.5	68.4
Rather agree	34.6	26.5
Rather disagree	7.1	3.4
Fully disagree	1.5	0.4
Don't know	2.2	1.3

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

There are many Hungarians who avoid speaking Romanian, even if they can

	Romanians	Romanians in Transylvania	Romanians in Szeklerland	Romanians in localities where they are not a majority
Fully agree	48.4	65.4	59.7	50.1
Rather agree	16.0	13.4	11.6	28.8
Rather disagree	8.8	3.4	10.5	9.4
Fully disagree	12.5	11.2	7.7	11.7
Don't know	14.3	6.6	10.5	0.1

	Hungarians	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Fully agree	19.9	19.4
Rather agree	20.2	14.7
Rather disagree	20.3	22.0
Fully disagree	24.3	25.9
Don't know	15.3	18.1

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

Results from different researches RCIR 2000

Hungarians' attitudes toward the Romanian language Do you agree with the following...?

	Agree	Disagree
Speaking Romanian can only be a good thing	98.0	1.4
Hungarians who speak Romanian find a job more easily	84.0	14.7
Because they are Romanian citizens, Hungarians should speak Romanian	80.9	17.5
In general Romanians are hostile to Hungarians who cannot speak Romanian	64.1	32.1
In many cases the authorities use the Romanian language as a means of oppressing the minorities	57.9	32.5
By imposing the use of the Romanian language in different situations, in fact the state wants to assimilate the minorities	54.8	35.0

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

311

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VLANNEXES

Romanians' everyday interaction with Hungarians

	False	True
I avoid Hungarians	75.9	20.9
I know Hungarians by sight	36.3	62.7
I sometimes shop in a store where the shop-assistant is Hungarian	59.5	39.6
I greet Hungarian neighbors	67.3	32.3
I have had Hungarian work-mates	51.8	48.1
I pay visits to Hungarians	71.6	27.9
I sometimes ask a Hungarian for help	72.2	26.5
I have Hungarian relatives	84.9	15.0
I often consult a Hungarian in personal problems	80.2	18.4

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

ETHNOBAROMETER

Hungarians' everyday interaction with Romanians

	False	True
I avoid Romanians	83.6	15.2
I know Romanians by sight	5.9	93.8
I sometimes shop in a store where the shop-assistant is Romanian	5.8	93.8
I greet Romanian neighbors	28.1	71.5
I have had Romanian work-mates	20.9	77.3
I pay visits to Romanians	42.5	57.3
I sometimes ask a Romanian for help	23.4	76.4
I have Romanian relatives	66.1	33.7
I often consult a Romanian in personal problems	65.3	34.5

The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

Which of the following statements do you agree with? Percentages of agreement

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia	Romanians in Szeklerland
I would not allow Hungarians in the country	14.5	19.3	14.2	10.9
I accept Hungarians in the country, but not in the district I live in	11.1	26.7	14.2	14.6
I accept Hungarians in my district, but not in the locality I live in	10.8	25.5	12.8	14.8
I accept Hungarians to live wherever they want in this country	84.3	65.3	71.7	82.2

	Romanians	Hungarians
I would not allow Roma in the country	38.8	40.7
I accept Roma in the country, but not in the district I live in	21.2	29.8
I accept Roma in my district, but not in the locality I live in	23.1	31.4
I accept Roma to live wherever they want in this country	53.8	46.8

	Romanians	Hungarians
I would not allow Jews in the country	11.7	6.4
I accept Jews in the country, but not in the district I live in	15.6	6.2
I accept Jews in my district, but not in the locality I live in	16.6	9.7
I accept Jews to live wherever they want in this country	80.0	86.0

Attitudes regarding DAHR Question only for Romanians

With which of the following statements do you agree?



The figures represent percentages of responses.

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia	Romanians in Szeklerland
Irrespective of the winners in elections, it is right that DAHR be co-opted in government	14.5	7.7	16.8	10.9
Like any other party in Romania, DAHR may take part in the government coalition	33.7	37.4	30.9	35.9
DAHR may be accepted in Parliament, but it may not take part ingovernment	19.9	19.1	26.4	19.4
DAHR should be accepted solely as a cultural organization of the Hungarians in Romania, without representation in Parliament	25.4	19.8	16.8	19.7
DAHR, as a norganization, should be banned	5.8	12.7	7.7	13.0
Don't know/No answer	0.7	3.3	1.4	1.1

With which of the following statements do you agree?

The figures represent percentages of responses.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

316

Attitudes regarding DAHR Question only for Romanians

Attitudes regarding DAHR Question only for Hungarians

With which of the following statements do you agree?



The figures represent percentages of responses.

		Romanians	ns			Hungarians	ور	
	Rather improve	Rather worsen	Neutral	Cannot assess	Rather improve	Rather worsen	Neutral	Cannot assess
DCR	25.5	10.9	17.8	45.7	39.2	6.3	14.9	39.5
ROD	10.6	15:0	21.6	43.0	1.1	69.4	5.6	23.0
GRP	5.9	42.3	8.9	42.7	0.4	75.0	1.5	23.0
Ъ	15.6	8.2	27.5	48.4	4.2	26.6	20.7	38.5
AfR	11.9	5.7	29.1	52.9	8.7	18.0	18.2	55.1
NUPR	7.7	28.0	13.4	5 .4	0.9	61.1	4,1	34.0
DAHR	23.7	26.3	7.1	42.8	76.2	3.3	7.2	13.2
NPCDP	20.3	11.5	19.2	48.7	24.7	14.0	23.0	38.3
NLP	19.0	6.4	15.4	48.9	23.7	8.3	21.3	46.7

How do the following political parties influence the relations between etimic groups?

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

318

Please name three personalities, organizations, institutions etc that help improve the relations between ethnic groups

Open question

	Romanians	Hungarians
DAHR and DAHR politicians	2.9	30.4
Coalition and Coalition politicians	9.4	8.6
Opposition and Opposition politicians	8.3	1.0
Public personalities (sports, culture etc)	1.1	4.5
NGOs, cultural institutions (schools, theaters etc)	1.7	2.8
Church	1.7	1.5
Press	1.5	0.5
International organizations	0.8	1.5
Other	1.8	2.5
No answer	70.8	46.8

Please name three personalities, organizations, institutions etc that contribute to the deterioration of the relations between ethnic groups

Open question

	Romanians	Hungarians
DAHR and DAHR politicians	8.0	1.9
Coalition and Coalition politicians	3.5	2.2
Opposition and Opposition politicians	20.0	57.3
Public personalities (sports, culture etc)	0.2	0.8
NGOs, cultural institutions (schools, theaters etc)	-	0.3
Church	0.2	0.3
Press	0.5	0.5
International organizations	0.5	0.2
Other	1.0	0.5
No answer	66.1	36.1



The districts where Hungarians represent a majority should enjoy greater autonomy

The Hungarians in Romania could have Hungarian citizenship as well



The figures represent percentages of responses.

ETHNOBAROMETER



The Hungarian State should support the cultural organizations of the Hungarians in Romania

The Romanian State should support the cultural organizations of the Hungarians from Romania



The figures represent percentages of responses.


The Romanian State should provide education in the Hungarian language at all levels

On what condition do you agree with setting up of a university with Hungarian as the language of instruction?



The figures represent percentages of responses.

		Romanians	ns		Hungarians	
	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Grant scholarships for Romanian students from other countries	80.4	12.5	7.2	81.0	11.4	7.6
Stimulate higher education for Romanians abroad	86.1	7.9	9	84.8	7.6	7.6
Support the set up of Romanian firms abroad	76.9	13.8	9.3	76.3	12.5	11.3
Strengthen links with political organizations of Romanians from abroad	81.0	8.5	10.5	0.08	7.6	12.5
Grant Romanian citizership to Romanians abroad	71.2	16.2	12.6	70.9	15.2	13.9

Do you believe that the Romantan State should ...

The figures represent percentages of reporses.

ETHNOBAROMETER

		Romaniars	ور	100 March 100 Ma	Hungarians	Ĭ5
	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Grant scholarships for Hurgarian students from Romania	61.7	25.7	12.5	87.5	7.6	4.9
Stimulate Hungarian higher education in Romania	46.4	31.6	11.9	93.5	3.2	3.3
Support investments of Hungarian firms in Romania	67.5	18.3	14.0	90.9	3.0	6.3
Strengthen links with political organizations of Hungarians in Romania	39.1	43.9	16.8	90.3	3.2	6.4
Grant Hungarian citizenship to Hungarians in Romania	37.0	45.9	16.9	80.3	10.5	9.2

Do you believe that the Hungartan State should ...

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXES

The figures represent percentages of responses.

324

ETHNOBAROMETER



325

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
I would agree unconditionally	16.5	12.8	0.6
If firanced by private sources	14.3	20.4	32.4
If fully financed by the Hungarian State	12.9	17.3	19.4
If fully financed by the Romanian State	2.9	3.8	2.7
If firmanced by both states	14.0	9.5	18.0
On no condition	39.4	36.3	18.0

On what condition would you agree with setting up a university with Hungarian as the language of instruction?

326

		Romanians	5		Hungarians	ans
	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Children of different rationalities learn together with Romanian children	91.2	4.8	3.8	67.5	30.6	1.9
Publications or TV broadcasts that incite to ethnic hate should be banned	87.5	0.8	4.5	94.2	4.3	1.5
Larger a dministrative a utonormy for local communities	32.3	50.7	17.0	87.6	2.8	9.6
In areas where other nationalities represent a maiority, the colice should	t e c	0.11	1.01	00		(
include as many persons of that nationality as nossible	170	ר. ח	ָד 	r.	4. 0	7.0
Adoption of a law of minorities	54.3	27.6	18.1	90.3	1.4	8.4
Stimulate marriages between persons of different nationality	74.5	13.7	11.8	42.7	48.1	9.2
Romanian children have the possibility to learn the lanouages of national	60.4	30.2	9.5	94.3	2.4	3.3
minorities in school				0.07405-0040	100 AB 100 0	

Do you believe that the following will improve the interethnic relations?

The figures represent percentages of responses.

ETHNOBAROMETER

Do you believe that the following will improve the interethnic relations?

Romanian subsample

Children of different nationalities learn together with Romanian children

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	90.7	90.4	93.8
Disagree	3.6	6.3	3.1
Don't know	5.7	3.3	3.1

Publications or TV broadcasts that incite to ethnic hate should be banned

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	82.4	90.2	88.9
Disagree	10.2	6.8	7.6
Don't know	7.4	3.1	3.6

Larger administrative autonomy for local communities

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	37.9	29.7	30.3
Disagree	45.4	54.5	49.6
Don't know	16.7	15.8	20.1

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	32.8	34.7	28.2
Disagree	51.7	50.9	62.8
Don't know	15.5	14.4	9.0

In areas where other nationalities represent a majority, the police should include as many persons of that nationality as possible

Adoption of a law of minorities

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	56.0	60.1	40.1
Disagree	21.1	25.2	40.7
Don't know	22.9	14.7	19.2

Stimulate marriages between persons of different nationality

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	70.0	74.0	81.5
Disagree	11.7	16.8	10.0
Don't know	18.4	9.2	8.6

Romanian children have the possibility to learn the languages of national minorities in school

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Agree	62.0	57.8	63.6
Disagree	25.0	32.8	31.4
Don't know	13.0	9.4	4.9





Romanians are ...



Hungarians are ...

Where you live, do you think that nationality makes a difference when applying for a job?

Romanians are ...

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Advantaged	16.3	25.9	13.8
Disadvantaged	4.2	2.4	1.8
Nationality doesn't matter	68.2	63.9	78.2
It does not apply	3.2	2.6	2.7
Don't know	8.1	5.2	3.6

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Advantaged	5.6	15.7
Disadvantaged	30.0	9.4
Nationality doesn't matter	47.0	46.8
It does not apply	13.9	14.0
Don't know	3.5	14.0

Where you live, do you think that nationality makes a difference when applying for a job?

Hungarians are ...

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
Advantaged	8.1	1.5	0.9
Disadvantaged	5.6	11.3	2.2
Nationality doesn't matter	64.1	51.5	65.8
It does not apply	14.1	23.9	24.0
Don't know	7.7	11.7	7.1

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
Advantaged	33.4	23.0
Disadvantaged	2.1	12.3
Nationality doesn't matter	47.0	44.7
It does not apply	13.6	8.9
Don't know	3.8	11.1

ETHNOBAROMETER

Romanians Richer 90 More influent 79.6 80 More respected 70 59.2 60 50 42.4 40 30 23.6 19.6 17.9 20 10.5 13.9 5.2 10 1.5 1.2 4.5 3.6 4.5 0 Romanians Hungarians Roma Germans Jews

Generally speaking, in Romania who is...?



The figures represent percentages of responses. The difference to 100% represents non-answers.

333

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART M. ANNEXES

Generally speaking, in Romania who is richer?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
The Romanians	37.6	44.5	43.9
The Hungarians	5.8	2.9	6.3
The Roma	17.5	19.6	22.4
The Germans	23.4	16.5	13.7
The Jews	12.0	16.5	10.7
Don't know/No answer	3.6	-	2.9

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
The Romanians	43.5	55.7
The Hungarians	14.7	10.0
The Roma	17.3	5.7
The Germans	15.5	11.0
The Jews	7.6	15.2
Don't know/No answer	1.5	2.4

Generally speaking, in Romania who has more political influence?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
The Romanians	78.0	77.5	86.1
The Hungarians	9.5	3.8	2.8
The Roma	1.5	1.6	1.4
The Germans	3.3	11.2	6.0
The Jews	4.0	6.0	1.9
Don't know/No answer	3.7	-	1.9

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
The Romanians	82.4	92.1
The Hungarians	11.8	0.4
The Roma	0.4	-
The Germans	2.2	1.3
The Jews	1.4	5.2
Don't know/No answer	1.8	0.9

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART M. ANNEXES

Generally speaking, in Romania who is more respected?

Romanians

	Transylvania	Walachia	Moldavia
The Romanians	59.9	56.9	64.1
The Hungarians	6.2	12.6	11.7
The Roma	1.1	1.8	-
The Germans	28.2	23.9	17.0
The Jews	2.2	4.7	2.9
Don't know/No answer	3.3	-	4.4

	Romanians in Szeklerland	Hungarians in Szeklerland
The Romanians	68.5	89.9
The Hungarians	11.8	2.2
The Roma	0.4	-
The Germans	16.8	5.3
The Jews	1.1	0.9
Don't know/No answer	1.4	1.8

During the last period, have you considered leaving the place where you live now and move ...

Romantans

	l'mabout to move	In the near future I make arrangement to move	If a good opportunity arises I will leave	I do not intend to leave	Don't know
a ot 10 city or to a nearby village	1.3	1.4	4.8	87.7	4.9
To a rother settlement in To a rother settlement in	0.8	1.9	5.1	87.6	4.6
ytnuos tranaittib is oT noigen emiss edt nidtiw	0.3	1.4	7	86	5.3
to a different region of Коглалів	0.3	1.7	4.7	85	5.4
γīag∩u H oT	2	0.3	5.4	89	5,4
To Western Europe	0.5	2.1	22.9	69.8	4.7
то а different continent	0.6	1.9	19.1	73	3.8

The figures represent percentages of responses.

ETHNOBAROMETER

l'mabout to move In the rear future I make arrangement to move If a good opportunity arises I will leave I do not intend to leave Don't know
tr nintriW 1. – 2. – 2. – 8. двэп
ttonsoT L. 2. 88 L. ttni Σ. 2. 8.8 L.
fibeoT L. 2. 88 L.
ыйньвот , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Р. 1.3 2.5 22.5 71.3 2.5 2.5
ым от , п. В 22 г.
айірвот , <u>с. 8</u> 2.5 2.5
айіb воТ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

During the last period, have you considered leaving the place where you live now and move ...

The figures represent percentages of responses.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART M. ANNEXES_____

338

Hungarlans



Self-identity: Romanians

In the first place I consider myself...

Self-identity: Hungarians

In the first place I consider myself...



The figures represent percentages of responses.

	Romanians	Hungarians
To be born in Romania	18.8	3.9
To have Romanian citizenship	12.4	5.8
Mother tongue Romanian	14.0	25.6
Romanian religion	10.1	7.0
To live in Romania	6.1	3.0
To respect the Romanian national flag	5.0	4.2
To feel the Romanian culture as his culture	7.7	12.8
To feel Romanian	13.4	20.7
To respect the Romanian customs	7.5	9.5
To speak Romanian within his family	4.9	7.5

In your opinion, what are the most important things for someone to be considered Romanian?

The figures represent percentages of responses.

In your opinion,	what are the m	ost important	things for	someone to	be considered
Hungarian?					

	Romanians	Hungarians
To be born in Hungary	16.2	1.0
To have Hungarian citizenship	12.5	2.8
Mother tongue Hungarian	17.4	28.0
Hungarian religion	8.0	8.0
To live in Hungary	5.4	0.8
To respect the Hungarian national flag	3.3	5.9
To feel the Hungarian culture as his culture	8.5	15.2
To feel Hungarian	13.9	21.6
To respect the Hungarian customs	8.1	8.1
To speak Hungarian within his family	6.7	8.6

ETHNOBAROMETER

	Romanians	Hungarians
decent	12.5	2.4
hospitable	18.5	2.7
intelligent	8.8	0.8
hard-working	12.2	2.6
enterprising	2.3	2.7
trustful	2.5	1.2
modest	4.9	1.3
honest	7.7	1.0
united	2.1	9.5
religious	6.7	14.5
civilized	2.9	0.6
clean	2.1	0.5
selfish	1.5	4.2
hostile	0.2	8.5
stupid	0.6	2.7
lazy	1.9	5.2
laggard	3.6	5.1
hypocrite	1.0	9.7
vain	1.2	2.4
thieves	1.0	4.0
divided	3.7	4.4
superstitious	1.1	6.7
backward	0.7	6.5
dirty	0.3	0.7

Which of the following attributes best describes the Romanians?

A list of 24 attributes was presented. The respondents were asked to choose three of them. The figures represent percentages of responses.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXE_

	Romanians	Hungarians
decent	5.5	3.9
hospitable	3.8	7.1
intelligent	4.4	6.4
hard-working	9.6	15.5
enterprising	5.1	6.3
trustful	3.2	9.1
modest	1.5	2.9
honest	5.0	8.5
united	10.7	5.2
religious	3.0	3.9
civilized	8.2	10.2
clean	4.7	6.2
selfish	7.0	2.2
hostile	6.0	0.3
stupid	0.8	0.2
lazy	0.7	0.3
laggard	0.8	0.4
hypocrite	4.4	0.9
vain	8.1	2.0
thieves	0.7	0.1
divided	5.4	7.2
superstitious	0.9	0.9
backward	0.6	0.4
dirty	0.2	0.0

Which of the following attributes best describes the Hungarians in Romania?

A list of 24 attributes was presented. The respondents were asked to choose three of them.

	Romanians	Hungarians
decent	1.6	0.5
hospitable	1.5	0.5
intelligent	0.8	0.3
hard-working	1.4	0.7
enterprising	2.4	2.3
trustful	0.8	0.1
modest	0.7	0.3
honest	0.8	0.2
united	4.4	5.4
religious	0.7	0.5
civilized	0.4	0.2
clean	0.7	0.4
selfish	1.6	1.0
hostile	2.9	1.5
stupid	3.7	7.1
lazy	16.1	14.4
laggard	3.6	4.6
hypocrite	2.0	3.6
vain	1.2	0.5
thieves	20.9	16.4
divided	5.2	3.3
superstitious	1.8	5.2
backward	8.6	12.8
dirty	16.1	18.0

Which of the following attributes best describes the Roma (Gypsy) in Romania?

A list of 24 attributes was presented. The respondents were asked to choose three of them. The figures represent percentages of responses.

INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN POST-COMMUNIST ROMANIA PART VI. ANNEXE_

	Romanians	Hungarians	
Fully agree	67.5	77.4	
Rather agree	18.3	14.2	
Rather disagree	9.8	3.4	
Fully disagree	2.2	2.6	
Don't know	2.3	2.4	

The fact that I was born Romanian/Hungarian makes me proud

The fact that I was born Romanian/Hungarian makes my life easier

	Romanians	Hungarians	
Fully agree	20.0	19.3	
Rather agree	18.3	22.0	
Rather disagree	38.3	37.6	
Fully disagree	15.8	14.0	
Don't know	7.6	7.1	

ETHNOBAROMETER

	Romanians	Hungarians
To be a good Romanian	22.9	1.0
To promote Romania's interests in any context	19.4	0.4
To defend the majority against the demands of the minorities	1.8	0.6
To promote the Euro-Atlantic integration of Romania	6.7	12.5
To impose an appropriate legislation for environment protection	1.4	4.3
To advocate the alleviation of inequalities in income	10.3	13.6
To persuade foreign investors to invest in Romania	10.1	11.6
To increase the defense capacity of the army to protect the borders	2.3	0.8
To promote harmony between the majority and minority populations	2.7	17.2
To promote the rights of the minority population	1.2	17.9
To honor the national heroes	2.3	0.9
To support the development of education in Romania	8.2	7.1
To insure good relations with the neighboring countries	8.8	11.9
To promote the unification of Bessarabia with Romania	1.9	0.2

Choose three characteristics that the future President of Romania should have

A list of 14 attributes was presented. The respondents were asked to choose three of them. The figures represent percentages of responses.