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Types of Capital and Ethnic Identity

Cătălin-George FEDOR¹, Robert Daniel SIMALCSIK²

Abstract: The main objective of our study is to establish the local specificity of the Catholic populations from the villages located in the central area of Moldova and the inter-ethnic relations. We conducted our research in the field in two communities from Bacău County and in two communities from Neamţ County. In our quantitative research we used the inventory of social representations of various forms of capital, based on a questionnaire which was applied to 466 proportionately distributed subjects from the 4 communities indicated above. Among other results, even though they perceive themselves as poor, the Romanians show the greatest respect for their traditions and have “monopoly” over the political capital and over the symbolic capital, respectively.
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1. Argument

This paper aims to makes some differentiations among Catholic communities in Moldova and other communities depending on the way they identify themselves and relate to others. The generalization in the use of the term Csango to name the Catholics of Moldova had several consequences among which a certain type of identity crisis. The main aim of our project is to establish the ethnic identity of Catholic population in the central area of Moldova and the way in which these communities build their ethnic and cultural identity.

2. Literature Review

As we have already stated in a previous study (Fedor, 2014a, 72-76), the definition of ethnic communities includes the definition of some key concepts and their main features. In the traditional approach, the notion of „ethnic community” is closely linked with that of ethnicity, often linked to race (Lieberson, 1961), while ethnicity is correlated with the notion of ethnic group defined in terms of cultural differences (Van den Berghe, 1967), social borders (Barth, 1969) or subjective faith in common origin (Weber, [1922]
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1968). The term „ethnic group” is defined in several ways. It is explained through cultural traits or assessed in terms of socio-psychological belonging (Rosen, 1959). Ethnicity is seen as a way to preserve a given cultural heritage providing a more intimate connection with larger, more impersonal communities (Bruhn, 2005). It reflects the way in which individuals and groups from different cultural environments interact or not with each other (Huijts, Kraaykamp, Scheepers, 2014) and the way in which the ethnic groups integrate into society under the form of spatial (Massey, 1985) or emotional (Ho, Kissoon, 2012) assimilation. Smith (1981), Hutchinson and Smith (1996) respectively, try to provide comprehensive definitions to the ethnic group based on its main features (common origin, elements of common culture, a special feeling of solidarity, etc.). MacQueen, McLellan, Metzger et al (2001) define ethnicity or ethnic community through its social links, feeling of spatial localisation and sharing of common values among its members. Korgen (2008) sees the ethnic community as a collective actor. It is made of people that define themselves as members of ethnic community or who share a common ethnic identity (outlined by Gordon in 1964). Picking up Barth’s argument of 1969, the importance of borders is emphasized in confining ethnic community. As an instrument of a social order as it separates and organises different social groups, borders represent a mechanism involved in building the identity of these groups by shaping their specificity in symbolic, moral or cultural terms (Gheorghiu & De Saint Martin, 2011).

A pertinent study on postmodern approaches has been provided by Cojocaru (2010). So, “the mind is a mirror of identity and the individual habitus is a social construction of the man itself. This habitus is a “map of reality” built by an individual in social interactions with other members of community and is not the reality itself. This process of internalising occurs in the individual mind by means of contact with social bodies to which he belongs and by the influence of social relations he is engaged in (Gergen, 1999)” (stefancojocaru.ro). Similarly, the ethnic habitus (Bourdieu, 1980) is a method of analysis through which we may notice how the socialization process brings with itself, within a distinct social group, a specific way of life and manner of perceiving the world.

The members of an ethnic group have a tendency to categorize the outsiders using stereotypes. The notion of stereotype refers to a set of beliefs, knowledge and expectations of social groups (Fedor, 2014b, 323-324). These are shared by the members of a group (in-group) and/or members of another group (out-group). The stereotypes based on ethnicity are called ethnic stereotypes. These are seen as real „maps of the world” aimed to „clarify the social itinerary of people” (Leyens, Yzerbyt, Schadron, 1996).
3. Research methods

Therefore, we aim to assess the ethnic and cultural identity of the Catholic population in Moldova. The field research took place in two Catholic communities in Bacău County (Faraoani and Prăjeşti) and 2 Catholic communities in Neamţ County (Săbăoani and Gherăeşti). In the quantitative research, we used the inventory of ethnic features and social representation of various forms of capital. We will present specifically these aspects after a short overview of the studied communities and population.

3.1. Short presentation of studied communities (http://statistici.insse.ro)

Săbăoani village is located at the Eastern border of the Iaşi County, on a superior plateau between the rivers Siret-Moldova, north of city of Roman. Most inhabitants based on their own declaration Romanians (95,73%). For 4,21% of the population, the ethnic belonging us not known. Concerning religion, most inhabitants are Roman Catholics (93,61%), with an Orthodox minority (1,89%). For 4,23% of the population, religious belonging is not known.

Gherăeşti is a village in Neamţ County. It is situated in the east of the county. Most inhabitants are Romanian (96,54%). For 3,4% of the population, ethnic belonging is not known. Concerning religion, most inhabitants (83%) are Catholic, with an Orthodox community minority (13,41%). For 3,4% of the population, religion is not known.

Faraoani is a village in Bacău County. Most people are Romanian (93,54%). Main minorities are the Hungarians (1,73%) and the Csango (1,55%). For 2,64% of the population, the ethnic belonging is not known. Concerning religion, most inhabitants are Roman Catholics (95,83%), with an Orthodox minority (1,25%). For 2,64% of the population, the religion is not known.

Prăjeşti is a village in Bacău County. Most inhabitants are Romanian (88,92%). For 11,02% of the population, the ethnic belonging is not known. Concerning religion, most inhabitants are Roman Catholics (78,33%), with an Orthodox minority (10,38%). For 11,18% of the population, religion is not known.

3.2. Quantitative research

We opted for using the inventory of ethnic attributes (Chelcea, 1998) which is the most widely used method for measuring ethnic stereotypes providing most data on their structure, stability and change.

Staring from various types of capital suggested by Bourdieu (1986), we used a simplified tool to capture the social representations on various
forms of capital (economic, political, symbolic, cultural and social) of the researched ethnic groups.

3.3. Sample calculation

In our study, we opted for „random sampling by unrepeatable selection” (Jaba, 2002, p. 283; Fowler, 2002, p. 14).

According to data provided by the National Institute of Statistics for the year 2016, there were 11863 inhabitants in Săbăoani in Neamț County, 6742 inhabitants in Gherăești of the same county, 2333 in Prăjești, Bacău County and 5561 inhabitants in Faraoani (Bacău County) (http://statistici.insse.ro).

Therefore, the size of the population (N) for this research is made of total population of the 4 villages (26499 inhabitants).

Considering the margin of error of 4,5% and using the formula for calculating the size of the sample (Niculescu-Aron, 2005, p. 99), results: n = 466 people, distributed proportionally by 4 villages.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Ethnic attributes

The attributes given by the respondents to the 4 ethnic groups are extremely diverse both in a positive and a negative way. Therefore, in what follows, we will present the most important characteristics of each minority in part:

The respondents considered the Romanians to be hard working, hospitable, intelligent, faithful, good-natured, to maintain their traditions and customs, etc. Being interviewed on the issues which they did not appreciate in the Romanian people, the respondents regarded them as liars, thieves, jealous, selfish, bad people who consume alcohol, etc.

When it comes to the Hungarian population, the respondents considered them as being united, solidary, hardworking, nationalist, respectful, homemaking, cherishing their traditions. While some of the respondents considered the Hungarians’ nationalism to be an asset, others regarded it as negative. Moreover, Hungarians were considered to be bad people, and some of the participants in the study disliked their language.

Most of the respondents we have interviewed agreed that unity is one of the major characteristics of the Gypsies. In addition, their traditions, clothing and dances are some of the characteristics attributed to the Gypsies by the participants in the study. On the negative side, the Gypsies were considered to be thieves, lazy, to have an inappropriate behaviour, etc.
The Csangos were viewed as hard working people who preserve their traditions, faithful, honest but also cowards, corrupt, indifferent, envious, etc.

4.2. Types of capitals

Based on results shown in Table 1, the ethnic group that is dominant economically is made of the Gypsy therefore most respondents declared that the Gypsy are the most affluent (40.7%). Besides the economic capital, the Gypsy predominate socially as it is said about them that they help each other the most.

In what regards the Romanian ethnicity, these are perceived as the poorest but who respect their traditions the most. Romanians own the full „monopoly” over political and symbolic capital.

It may be noted that the Hungarians maintain their political capital but to a lower degree compared to that of Romanians.

Table 1. Out of the following groups, generally speaking, which...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richer (%)</th>
<th>The poorest (%)</th>
<th>Have significant political influences (%)</th>
<th>Are more respected (%)</th>
<th>Respect the most their traditions (%)</th>
<th>Help each other the most (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gypsy</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Csango</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: own processing

Economic capital

Based on distribution by village of respondents’ opinions on the statement that Romanians are richer than the others, we may note that the highest weight is found in Săbăoani (43.8%), followed by Gherăști (22.9%), Prăiești (20.8%) and Faraoani (12.8%). Catholics who declared that Romanians are the richest (30.2%) are more numerous than the Orthodox who stated the same thing (0.7%). With a weight of 67.2%, we find the Catholics who believe that Romanians are the richest group and 1.9% of Orthodox believe that Romanians have more money compared to other ethnicities. Depending on the ethnicity, most Romanians, (31.21%) do not
believe that they are richer than other ethnic groups. The same aspect could be found among the Csango, so 1.9% of total respondents are the Csango and do not consider that Romanians are richer.

Irrespective of the country of origin, most respondents do not agree with the statement that Hungarians are richer. However, if we compare the answers of those who believe that Hungarians are richer compared to other ethnicities, we discover that their weight in Neamț County (27.3%) is higher than in Bacău County (23.5%). Based on the results obtained after sample distribution by ethnic group of the statement that Hungarians are the richest, we may conclude that the highest weight is found in respondents who declared that Hungarians are not the richest, these respondents are of Romanian ethnicity. Out of total respondents, 26.1% declared that Hungarians are the richest and these respondents are of Romanian ethnicity, while 1.0% are the Csango stating the same thing.

Comparing by place of origin the respondents in what regards the distribution of their opinion on the statement that the Gypsy are the richest, we may observe that the highest weight is found among the inhabitants of Gherăești (56.8%), followed by Faraoani (46.2%), Prăjești (45.8%) and Săbăoani (28.8%). 38.8% of the interviewed people who believe that The Gypsy are the richest belong to Romanian ethnicity. Nevertheless, the highest weight of respondents who deny this aspect (59.3%) is found among respondents of Romanian ethnicity. Depending on religious belonging, a weight of 39.9% out of total respondents who believe that the Gypsy are the richest compared to other ethnic groups is found in Catholics. Out of total participants in the study, 1.7% is the weight represented by respondents who believe that the Gypsy are richer, these being the Orthodox.

According to distribution by village of the opinion concerning the statement that the Csango are the richest, we find that only the respondents in Săbăoani (4.8%) and Gherăești (2.5%) believe that the Csango are richer but to a smaller degree. By distributing the sample by county on the statement that the Csango are richer depending on the ethnic belonging, we observe that the respondents in Bacău county, irrespective of their ethnic belonging (92% Romanians and 8% the Csango), believe that the Csango are no richer than other ethnic groups. In what regards the Neamț county, the highest weight is found among people who are of Romanian ethnicity (95.9%) and do not believe that the Csango are richer than other ethnic groups.

We may note that in Gherăești the weight or people who believe that Romanians are the poorest (54.2%) is higher to weights recorded in other three villages, who believe the same thing. In Prăjești, the opinions on the statement Romanians are the poorest are divided, so that half of the
inhabitants of the village agree with this statement and the other half denies it. In case of Săbăoani (73.2%) and Faraoani (67.9%), the weights of respondents who stated that Romanians are the poorest are higher compared to the weights of respondents stating the opposite. In terms of religion, 61.9% who do not believe that Romanians are the poorest are Catholics. It may also be observed that 35.5% out of total respondents are Catholics and believe that Romanians are the poorest. Regarding the Orthodox religion, the weight of respondents who believe that Romanians are the poorest ethnic group amounts to 1.4%, 0.2 percentage points higher than in people who believe the opposite. Ethnically, 63.4% out of total people included in the study are Romanian and believe that Romanians are not the poorest among other ethnic groups. It is interesting to note that the weight of (1.4%) in Csango people who believe that Romanian are the poorest is higher compared to the Csango who do not believe that Romanians are the poorest ethnic group (0.5%).

The distribution of respondents by their opinion on the statement that Hungarians are the poorest shows that 94.9% believe that Hungarians are not the poorest. The comparative results by county shows that the weight of people in Neamț county who agree with this statement (6.4%) is higher than in respondents in Bacău county stating the same thing (1.0%). Out of total interviewed respondents, most respondents belong to Romanian ethnicity and do not agree that Hungarians are the poorest. People who believe that Hungarians are the poorest ethnic group amount to 1.9%.

According to collected data, we may note a weight of 69.5% recorded in respondents who believe that the Gypsy are the poorest. The difference up to 100.0% is represented by those who believe that the Gypsy are not the poorest. Out of those who believe that the Gypsy are not the poorest, the highest weight is found among the respondents in Prăjești (95.8%). On the other hand, we may note that the highest weight of respondents believing that the Gypsy are the poorest is found in Săbăoani (47.8%). After the distribution of the sample by the statement that the Gypsy are the poorest depending on the ethnic belonging, we may observe that out of total participants in the study, 1.9% are the Csango and do not believe that the Gypsy are the poorest. The same opinion is shared by most people of Romanian ethnicity.

A percentage of 73.2% of the interviewed disagree that the Csango are the poorest. The weight of those who believe that the Csango are the poorest amounts to 26.8%, out of total respondents. The distribution by areas of origin of respondents regarding their opinion on the statement that the Csango are the poorest shows the fact that, irrespective of the area of
origin of the respondents, highest weights are recorded among people who believe that the Csango are the poorest (Săbăoani 78,5%, Gherăești 74,6%, Prăjești 91,7% and Faraoani 51,3%). In the distribution of the statement according to which the Csango are the poorest by ethnic belonging, we observe that 71,8% of respondents are of Romanian ethnicity and do not believe that the Csango are the poorest. It is important to note that regarding the Csango, the weight of respondents who believe that these are the poorest is by 0.5 percentage point higher than that of respondents that have the opposite view. In what regards the distribution by county of origin of the sample regarding the statement according to which the Csango are the poorest by ethnic belonging, it is found 5,0% of the interviewed are the Csango from Bacău believing that the Csango are the poorest. The weight of (76,4%) of people from Neamț County, who are Romanian and believe that the Csango are the poorest, is higher compared to respondents in Bacău County with the same view (57%).

### Political capital

The interviewed supporting the statement that Romanians have more political influence represent over half of the respondents (54,3%), declaring that they agree with this statement. The distribution by villages of the opinion of respondents regarding the statement that Romanian have more political influence reflects the fact that most residents of Săbăoani (55,3%), Gherăești (55,6%) and Faraoani (55,1%) believe that Romanians have greater political influence, in case of respondents from Prăjești (37,5%), the situation is different, the most respondents believe that Romanians do not have greater political influence. According to distribution of respondents regarding the statement, according to which, Romanians have greater political influence by religious belonging of respondents, it may be observed that the highest percentage is found in Catholic respondents who believe that Romanians have more political influence (53,4%) and the lowest weight is found in Orthodox respondents, who have a similar opinion related to the influence exercised by Romanians. Ethnically, we may note that the highest percentage is recorded among Romanians, who believe that Romanians have more political influence (53,6%).

Regarding the distribution of respondents in terms of their opinion on the statement that Hungarians have more political influence, it may be noted that most interviewed respondents believe that Hungarians do not have more political influence (60,1%). Sample distribution by opinion of respondents regarding the statement that Hungarians have more political influence, it may be noted that higher weight is recorded both in
respondents from Neamţ County (57.2%), who believe that Hungarians do not have more political influence, and in case of respondents from Bacău County sharing the same opinion (69.6%). Ethnically, it may be observed that in case of Romanians, the highest weight is found among respondents who do not believe that Hungarians have more political influence (58.6%). The percentage is similar in Catholics believing that Hungarians do not have more political influence (58.6%) and the lowest weight is found in the Orthodox respondents believing that Hungarians have higher political influence (1.4%).

The study resulted in a high percentage 96.5% of people who believe that the Gypsy have more political influence. Ethnically, the outcomes show that regarding the Csango all the respondents believe the Gypsy do not have more political influence. Regarding Romanians, although there is a percentage of 2.9% recorded among respondents who believe that the Gypsy have more political influence, most of them (95.2%) believe that the Gypsy do not exercise more political influence.

Most participants included in the study stated that the Csango do not have more political influence compared to other ethnicities, their weight amounts to 97.9% out of total respondents. The outcomes based on the distribution by village of the opinion of respondents on the statement that the Csango have more political influence, it may be observed that in Prăjeşti all the interviewed declared that the Csango do not have more political influence (100%). In the other three villages (Săbăoani with 96.7%, Gherăeşti with 99.2% and Făraoni with 98.7%), the highest percentage is recorded among the respondents who stated that the Csango do not have more political influence. We observe that all the interviewed Csango people declared that they do not have more influence compared to other ethnic groups. Also, it may be noted that irrespective of county of origin of the respondents, most Romanians do not believe that the Csango have more political influence compared to other ethnic groups.

**Symbolic capital**

The highest weight out of total participants in the study belongs to those who believe that Romanians benefit from more respect (63.4%). The weight of 61.6% is recorded in Catholics that agree with the statement that Romanians benefit from more respect. The lowest weight is found in the Orthodox who do not believe that Romanians are representing the ethnic group benefitting from more respect. Based on the sample distribution on the statement that Romanians benefit from more respect by ethnic belonging, it may be noted that both Romanians (62.5%) and the Csango
record higher percentage of those who declared that Romanians benefit from more respect.

Regarding the statement that Hungarians benefit from more respect, 26.8% agree with it. Ethnically, it may be noted that higher percentage is recorded both in case of Romanians believing that Hungarians do not benefit from more respect (71.1%), as well as in case of the Csango having a similar opinion (1.4%).

The assessment of the outcomes shows a higher weight of 95.8% recorded among respondents believing that the Gypsy benefit from more respect, irrespective of the place of origin of the respondents. In opposition, in what regards the people believing that The Gypsy benefit from more respect, the highest weight compared to other villages is found among respondents from Prăjeştii (8.3%). Regarding the sample distribution on the statement that the Gypsy benefit from more respect by ethnic belonging, it is found that there is a high percentage of people who do not believe that the Gypsy benefit from more respect from the others and these are of Gypsy origin (94.5%). Only 3.6% of the respondents believe that the Gypsy benefit from more respect and they are of Gypsy ethnicity. In case of the Csango, a weight of 1.7% may be noted among those who do not believe that the Gypsy benefit from more respect. Depending on the religious belonging, we may note a percentage of 93.6% of Catholics believe that the Gypsy do not benefit from more respect from others. A low percentage of 3.8% is recorded in Catholics who have an opposite opinion. Only 0.5% of total respondents are the Orthodox believing that the Gypsy benefit from more respect.

The weight recorded in people declaring that the Csango benefit from more respect amounts only to 4.7% out of total respondents. If in Săbăoani (2.9%), Gherăeştii (5.9%) and Faroaonii (9%) there were respondents declaring that the Csango benefit from more respect, there were no respondents in Prăjeştii supporting this statement. Based on the sample distribution by religious belonging, we note that out of total respondents, 2.6% are the Orthodox who do not believe that the Csango benefit from a lot of respect. According to an analysis by counties of sample distribution regarding the statement that the Csango benefit from more respect depending on ethnic belonging, we observe that the weight of Romanians in Neamţ County believing that the Chango benefit from more respect is (4.1%) lower compared to Romanians in Bacău county sharing the same opinion (6.0%). Only 1.0% of total respondents are the Csango and believe that they benefit from more respect.
Cultural capital

The distribution of respondents depending on their opinion on the statement that Romanians respect the best their traditions shows that 44,5% of people share this opinion. By comparing by village the distribution of this opinion, we may note a high weight in respondents from Prăjești (70,8%) sharing this opinion. In other villages, the gaps between the respondents sharing this opinion and those who have an opposite opinion are not very big. Over half of Romanians do not believe that Romanians respect the best their traditions (54,3%). Regarding the Csango, the situation is similar, most of them disagree that Romanians respect the best their traditions (1,7%).

26,8% out of total respondents believe that Hungarians respect the best their traditions. Nevertheless, the most respondents believe that the Hungarians do not represent the ethnic group that preserves the best their traditions. It may be noted that both the respondents in Neamț County (26,6%) and in Bacău County share the same opinion (27,5%), having close shares. The distribution of respondents by the statement that Hungarians respect the best their traditions depending on the ethnic belonging shows high percentage both among Romanians (71,8%) and the Csango (1,7%).

38,7% of study respondents believe that the Gypsy respect the best their traditions. 60,1% of Romanians share the same opinion. Nevertheless, 38,0% out of total respondents are Romanians who believe that Gypsy respect the best their traditions. The distribution of respondents based on this statement by religious belonging shows that 37,2% out of interviewed respondents are Catholics sharing this opinion. 1,2% of the Orthodox share the same opinion.

After the sample distribution by the opinion of respondents that the Csango respect the best their traditions, we may observe a low percentage of 17,7% among people supporting this view. We observe that in Săbăoani (22,5%), Gherăești (13,6%) and Faraoani (16,7%) people support this view, while 100% of respondents in Prăjești disagree with this opinion.

Social capital

32,6% out of total respondents stated that Romanians help each other the most. However, most respondents do not share this view. Regarding the distribution by villages, we observe similar percentage in the 4 villages (Săbăoani 33,8%, Gherăești 28,2%, Prăjești 33,3% and Faraoani cu 35,9%) in case of respondents believing that Romanians help each other the most. 65,2% out of total participants are Catholics and they do not believe that Romanians help each other the most. The weight of people who believe that Romanians are solidary people amounts to 32,2% and they are
Catholics. In what regards the Orthodox religion, 2,1% do not believe that Romanians help each other the most and 0,5% believe the opposite. Based on the sample distribution of this statement by ethnic belonging, we note that out of total respondents, 1,9% are the Csango who think that Romanians are not united. In what regards Romanians, we note high weights in people supporting the view that Romanians help each other the most amounting to (65,8%) compared who share the opposite view (32,3%).

Only 19,8% of the interviewed believe that the Hungarians help each other the most. So, most people believe that the Hungarians do not help each other the most. Analysing by county the sample distribution based on the opinion that Hungarians help each other the most, we may state that, irrespective of the county of origin, most respondents believe that Hungarians do not help each other the most (Neamț County 78,6% Bacău County 85,3%). Out of total interviewed, 1,9% are the Csango who believe that Hungarians do not help each other the most. On the other hand, 20,3% of participants are Romanians who agree with the statement that Hungarians help each other the most.

The weight of respondents who believe that the Gypsy help each other the most amounts to (44,5%), close to those who believe the opposite (55,5%). Based on sample distribution of the statement that the Gypsy help each other the most depending on ethnicity, we observe that over half of the respondents do not believe that the Gypsy help each other the most (55,0%).

Regarding the statement that the Csango help each other the most, the highest weight is found among respondents who stated that the Csango do not help each other the most (85,8%). The weight of people from Neamț County who believe that the Csango help each other the most of (15,1%) is higher compared to Romanian respondents in Bacău County (11,0%).

5. Conclusions

Overall, the results show a relatively balanced image of social representations of each studied ethnicity towards other ethnicities. Still, we observe generally a positive attitude towards Romanians, followed by Hungarians and the Csango and less positive towards the Gypsy. Even though they have a self-perception as being poor, Romanians respect their traditions the best and have the monopoly over the political and symbolic capitals. The acknowledged and stated ethnic belonging of the population in the area is reflected in the outcomes of the study. We observe the tendencies to conserve local identities that are found in all communities.
The differentiation towards the members of other groups appears as bivalent and irreversible. The stereotypes function both ways for each ethnicity included in the study. These are set based on the cultural background of each ethnic and religious group and are not just premises to exclude „the other”. The types of capital as social representations plat the role of meaning networks and help us recognize each other and lead us to the idea of accepting the differences and living together.
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