



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

Selected by coverage in Social Sciences Citation Index, ISI databases

ATTRIBUTES AND COMMUNICATION STYLE OF ETHNIC GROUPS FROM DOBROGEA REGION. COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

Mihaela SANDU, Georgeta C. COZARU, Andra SECELEANU

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2013, vol. 43, pp. 180-196

The online version of this article can be found at:

www.rcis.ro, www.doaj.org and www.scopus.com

Published by:

Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:

„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,

Department of Sociology and Social Work

and

Holt Romania Foundation

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA

is indexed by ISI Thomson Reuters - Social Sciences Citation Index

(Sociology and Social Work Domains)



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Attributes and Communication Style of Ethnic Groups from Dobrogea Region. Comparative Research

Mihaela SANDU¹, Georgeta C. COZARU², Andra SECELEANU³

Abstract

Romania, after 1989, following the trajectory of a consolidated democracy, managed to be a factor of stability in a region where inter-ethnic issues triggered several conflicts. Although ethno-cultural diversity exerts a global challenge towards the representative democracy, the Romanian model of interethnic relations acquires a particular significance. In the process of interethnic knowledge are involved all cultural patterns, the symbol system, specific languages, experiences and practices of each ethnic group. The perception and interethnic knowledge take institutionalized forms because the strongest influences in their implementation come from the direction of cultural and concrete interaction factors (political, economic, etc..) of ethno-organization. The objectives of the research was to establish the communication style that is dominant among ethnic communities in Dobrogea and to find the differences in perception of attributes which characterize people in general and members of ethnic groups in particular. The research was conducted on a non-probabilistic sample of 350 participants, consisting of 50 representatives for each ethnic group. The results shows that the communication style used by most respondents belonging to the seven ethnic groups surveyed is problem solving. Based on the data obtained, it can be said that the participants were oriented mostly to the choice of positive attributes and that are rather defensive qualities (of inactivity) than qualities involving dynamic. In Dobrogea, the majority and the minority's view on the interethnic relations is different. We identified significant differences in perception between ethnic groups for the same attribute.

¹ "Andrei Șaguna" University from Constanta, ROMANIA. E-mail: mihaela_psy1977@yahoo.com

² "Andrei Șaguna" University from Constanta, ROMANIA. E-mail: cozarugeorgiana@saguna.eu

³ "Andrei Șaguna" University from Constanta, ROMANIA. E-mail: andraseceanu@andreisaguna.ro

Keywords: attributes; communication; ethnicity; discrimination; ethnic group; Dobrogea.

Introduction

In an age where the globalization issue has almost become an obsession, the problem of ethno-cultural communities acquires new dimensions and causes revaluations in terms of both practical solutions that are required - due to multiple challenges of nationalist type- and in terms of expression, used more and more frequently. This situation indisputably reaches Romania as well, which after exiting from communism still keeps some forms of certain types of authoritarianism, from which the exacerbated nationalism may be seen as a sign of a disguised dictatorship that leaves no room for feeble democracy.

The world of the future will be one of diversity, and diversity will be the engine of the evaluations at the global level. Diversity however involves tolerance and dialogue. As UNESCO stated in its *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance* (1995), tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human. So, tolerance is harmony in difference. In the attempt to accomplish this tolerance and protection climate, in our contemporary world, the role of the governments, as well as those of the state institutions is extremely important. The declaration made by G. Ruffolo in 2001, questions the unity in diversity but also cultural cooperation in the E.U. outlining that the European states „must consider culture as an essential element of the European integration especially within the context of EU expansion”. Under the influence of this declaration, there comes the necessity to unveil the minority community condition, of their rights to diversity. The stated principles meant to insure the minority community protection, their integration in contemporary and future life.

Minority community protection is realized relying upon the following principles (Bădescu, 2010; Severin, 2002; Ichim, 2006): (1) The principle of diversity respect: differs from the principle of tolerance, which supposes the arrogance of the hierarchic relation between the tolerated and the tolerant (the minorities are not tolerated, because they have a generated right equal as value with that of the majority); (2) The principle of partnership living: the supposed general minorities are associated to the act of leading, and especially, to the act of governing, without being aware of their number related to the whole population; (3) The principle of positive discrimination supposes the accordance of favors to the minorities, when that is necessary to compensate the numeric inequality between the minority and the majority (such favors take into consideration the right to have initiatives for various domains, or the special rights to control the functioning of the state's institutions, or the non-citizens' rights to vote for the local region etc.); (4) The

principle of preserving the cultural identity takes into account the creation of conditions to maintain the identification elements of a specific community (language, religion, traditions, etc.): the danger of cultural homogenization, appearance and recognition of a single cultural form; the appearance of the cultural and psychological disintegration phenomenon for individuals as well as for societies; (5) The principle of multilateral integration (multiculturalism) goes beyond the simple co-existence, it has to do with each member of every entity, both majority and minority, to learn about, to understand, to respect, and to express himself according to the specific culture values of the other co-living cultural community.

These principles must be understood beyond the asserted theory, because they do not determine just a political or economical vision, but bring in a new paradigm in thinking and intercultural perception (Affaya, 2000). Vaddell (1999) underlined that in spite of the fact that the geographical borders turn almost only virtual, there is a border not to neglect, that of cultural diversity and when we do not take into account the cultural diversity, there appear frustrations leading to intolerance, to community conflict, racism and ethnocentrism. Thus, according to Demorgon (2000), we must take into account that the notion of interculturality is related to the socializing process and includes borrowing phenomena, exchange, interdependence, adapting to other cultures and to history. Ripoll (1999) in his study *Les minorités dans le monde* outlined the fact that in all 185 members of UN, there are 7500 minority ethnical groups and minority communities, talking in 6700 languages and dialects and practice a broad variety of religions. In addition, in the study *Minority Languages in Europe*, published in 2003, it was emphasized the need of a realistic and pluridisciplinary articles of the minority language protection issue (Hogan-Brun & Wolff, 2003).

Analyzing the historical stages in forming modern national states in Balkan Peninsula, we can see the crucial role of linguistics, the cultural homogeneity idea, but also religion in shaping a solid national consciousness (Vavaris, 2007). The multiculturalism of the world is recognized and widely acknowledged nowadays. Questioning on this subject is closely related to the deep gap that we find between ethno-cultural reality of the world, on the one hand, and its ethno-political arranging, on the other hand. Among the 196 countries currently recognized by the international community there are about 600 spoken languages, other sources estimate that this number would be somewhere between 2000-4000 and there live between 4000-6000 ethnicities or ethno-cultural groups (Salat, 2001).

Multiculturalism as a form of legitimating collective rights, emphasizes the idea of cohabitation, but makes use of paradigms such as collective rights, that go beyond the principles of classical liberalism. The development of liberal multiculturalism (Salat, 2001) has as stake a "modern liberalism", able to cope with ethno-cultural diversity and to ensure the balance between societal stability and ethno-cultural equity requirements. In Romania, the main multicultural issues concern the Hungarians and Roma. The evolution of the minority situation has

two dimensions: the simultaneous evolution of integration and community privacy, which together define the specific dynamic of Romanian multiculturalism (Andreescu, 2002). Civic multiculturalism could provide Europe the desired stability, allowing all and each individual to achieve the full satisfaction to be able to live at the same time, within a civilization and a few thousand cultures.

When we refer to the concept of “multiculturalism”, first we consider the issue of cultural diversity. Bhikhu Parekh believes that there are three forms of cultural diversity: *sub-cultural diversity*, *community diversity*, and *perspective diversity*. In terms of *sub-cultural diversity*, it is taken into consideration that the members of a society participate in a common culture, but at the same time, they share a set of beliefs and practices that are particular in certain aspects of life. *Community diversity* requires the existence of some relatively organized communities, aware of themselves and that promote a set of different beliefs and practices, and *perspective diversity* assumes the existence of some members of society who criticize the dominant culture’s values and principles and try to rebuild it after other values, including religious communities (Parekh, 1997: 27).

In turn, Adrian Marino identifies three concerns by the term “multiculturalism”: the recognition of the cultural identity of minorities, the rejection of assimilation tendencies and the disproof of any attempt to assert the superiority of the national identity of the majority on the cultural identity of the minority. Thus, A. Marino points out that if multiculturalism becomes a purpose in itself, it can lead to isolationism, intolerance or even chauvinism, meaning that it gets to identify precisely with the attitudes that they wish to remove from the minds of the majority. In this context, A. Marino believes that promoting multiculturalism should be accompanied, in the Romanian context, by promoting interculturalism. This would involve cultivating dialogue and communication between different cultures, overcoming any isolationism through a process of interdependence, influence, and mutual enrichment, recognition of individual values and real respect for differences (Marino, 2010: 166-172).

Whether advocating for multiculturalism, or if we believe that interculturalism is more complex and beneficial in terms of networking or regulatory requirements, both concepts involve the ideological horizon of growing diversity. This horizon is meant to promote plurality as a shift of the paradigm of the relationship between minority and majority. In this respect, Schöpflin notes that “the central issue in any multicultural context is that each group has self-awareness and affirms their right to power, status, and recognition as a cultural community” (Salat & Nastașă, 2000: 123). In the same order of ideas, Radu Neculau’s analysis shows that multicultural mentality is born amid some attempts to transform and influence the collective representations of the majority group to create an environment of tolerance and respect for diversity. Thus, it takes place a redefinition of traditional space of politics, through the reconstruction of the value systems that integrate cultural difference (Marino, 2010: 166-172). Multiculturalism “appreciates any

cultural community and has a fundamental right to existence and free expression because individual's right to dignity is realized only if he is considered a defined individual, for instance, an individual with his own values, concepts, and social identity" (Ibram, 2011: 183). Correlated with the term "ethnic", the term "ethnicity" is broader treated in the world specialty literature. Coming from the field of ethnology and anthropology, the term has imposed itself first in the Anglo-Saxon cultural space being taken then, since 1970, by specialized writings. The concept of "*ethnicity*" was apparently established in 1953 by American sociologist David Riesman. Taking as its starting point the ethnic diversity of the U.S., to the purpose of using the new term was to remove the pejorative sense of the features related to color differences, language, religion or even origin of certain human groups: black, Hispanic, etc. (Hermet, 1997: 23). Ethnicity refers to cultural practices and attitudes of a community of people that differentiate them from others. The members of ethnic groups conceive themselves as culturally distinct from other groups in society and are perceived as such by these. In order to distinguish these ethnic groups, different characteristics can help, but the most common are: language, history of ancestors (real or not), religion and clothes or ornaments (Giddens, 2001).

Dobrogea, as interethnic living area, gets into focus through an open model of intercultural cohabitation, whose representation is decoded both at the material culture level and at the intangible culture, traditional civilization level of this area. The cohabitation model generated, in turn, free expression, based on the acceptance and understanding of others, of *multiculturalism*. Lucian Boia, referring to ethno-demographic and confessional realities of Dobrogea, said: "*Dobrogea was [...] an uncommon ethnic and cultural mosaic. Nowhere, in such a small space, in Europe could be met such a mixture of languages, religions and ways of life [...] In a bigger or smaller number were represented all nationalities of Europe and Middle East*" (Boia, 2002).

Types of Discourse Concerning the Minority Dynamics

In an elaborate study from 2002, Rus (2002) identified three types of discourse, concerning cultural diversity issue: (1) majority discourse – it dominates the necessity of communication, relationship and opening towards different cultures; (2) minority conformist discourse - it emphasizes the fact they are loyal citizens, that they feel like at home in Romania, they have a good relationship with the others; (3) claiming minority discourse - we are different and we want to stay like that and be accepted like that. In the recently analyzed studies, concerning the minorities' dynamics we can identify aspects like: persecutions against religious minorities, economical marginalization of the minorities, discriminations relying in the ethnical origin and even antiterrorist legislation abuse. In the report realized

by Minority Rights Group International, from July 1st, 2010, from Great Britain, the conclusions are concerned with the persecutions against religious minorities are increasing and they become manifest by an increase of religious nationalism, economical marginalization of religious minority group and antiterrorist legislation abuse.

Following the population structure in Romania, we can see that the biggest ethnical group is represented by the Hungarians (6,6%) and the Rromas (2,5%). As a matter of fact, the Rroma dynamics is carefully monitored by EU, which admits the existence of 10 million Gypsies. 38% of these are stateless and 80% of adults do not have a job. *Le Figaro* (August 26th 2010), commenting upon the UNICEF report concerning the Rroma citizens, consider that most come from Romania and have some integration problems. Nevertheless, we can see that EU does not have an unitary politics (for all members) concerning the Rroma's problems, but every state has its own policy concerning this issue.

Research Methodology

Objectives

The operational objectives of the research are evaluation of the perceptions towards the interaction between the ethnic group living in the same community and to establish the communication style that is dominant among ethnic communities in Dobrogea.

Research hypothesis

In this research we started from the hypothesis according to which, among ethnic groups there are statistically significant differences in the perception of attributes which characterize people in general, and members of ethnic groups in particular and the communication style between ethnic groups in Dobrogea is based on tolerance, on a relationship that minimizes the inter-ethnic problems encountered.

Material and methods

The research was conducted on a non-probabilistic sample of 350 participants, consisting of 50 representatives for each ethnic group, Romanians, as the majority population and other six ethnic communities, such as: Armenians, Rromas, Lipovans-Russians, Turks, Tatars, Greeks. Statistical data on ethnic distribution in Dobrogea on localities were obtained from the County Department of Statistics Constanta and Tulcea. The selection of subjects within each ethnic group was

made using non-probabilistic methods, in an arbitrary way (*convenience samples* - people arbitrarily chosen by the interviewer or from among the people who volunteer). It was made through the snowball method (selection in chain - respondents offered names of other respondents belonging to the population of interest) and through the method of quotas which imposed elections in certain quotas (indicating the frequencies of individuals with certain characteristics), the operator being able to find himself the people who meet the specified quotas.

Results and discussions

Over time, communication has developed and has taken shapes that are favorable to ethnic groups, especially in some cases. The cases are: when they were potential allies in defense against a common and traditional enemy, when the position of certain ethnic groups was determined by the “positive fascination” towards culture and the civilization of other ethnic groups. Another case is when the common conditions made ethnic groups partners imposed by geography and history or when there were common economic and political interests that favored positive interactions.

Table. 1. Data distribution for communication style according to ethnicity

Ethnic	Communication style			Total
	Solving problems	blaming	Solving problems-blaming	
Romanians	33	12	5	50
	13,3%	16,7%	17,2%	14,3%
Turks	36	12	2	50
	14,5%	16,7%	6,9%	14,3%
Tatars	37	10	3	50
	14,9%	13,9%	10,3%	14,3%
Greeks	36	9	5	50
	14,5%	12,5%	17,2%	14,3%
Romas	32	17	1	50
	12,9%	23,6%	3,4%	14,3%
Lipovan-Russians	41	4	5	50
	16,5%	5,6%	17,2%	14,3%
Armenians	34	8	8	50
	13,7%	11,1%	27,6%	14,3%
Total	249	72	29	350
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

The communication style used by most respondents belonging to the seven ethnic groups surveyed is problem solving. Some of them also use blaming in communication, most of them Rromas, but there are also people using equally solving problems and blaming (Table 1). To communicate means to put something together, to relate, to share, to unite. Communication between ethnic groups involves circulation of meanings and nuances of meaning, because people communicate by putting in common emotions, feelings, ideas, opinions, facts. Therefore, communication is possible if relations between ethnic groups are not encumbered by political, ideological, religious restrictions, and if they subscribe to the same general values. Essential in this situation is the fact that, once established, communication is based on a relationship of equality, with a focus on minimizing differences between partners. Referring to the representations through which the seven ethnic groups define people in general and their own ethnic group we started by analyzing their associated attributes to identify them. We will analyze, in fact, how people belonging to the seven ethnic groups make assignments towards people in general and towards the people of their own ethnic group. We have adopted this form of identification of attributes and stereotypes in two aspects as the number of participants to study, belonging to different ethnic groups, was too small and didn't give us the opportunity to detail these attributes *in-group* and *out-group* for each ethnic group in particular. Based on the data obtained, it can be said, at a first sight, that the participants were oriented mostly to the choice of positive attributes, the negative ones being considered, but in a much smaller percent and by fewer participants.

Thus, taking into consideration the total number of participants to the research (350), they generally perceive people as being: *hospitable* (91,1%), *intelligent* (90%), *religious* (88,3%), *optimistic* (86,3%), *kindhearted* (83,4%), *having national dignity* (81,7%), *tolerant with strangers* (80,6%), *courageous* (80,3%), *independent* (80,3%), *grateful* (79,7%), *happy* (78,6%), *honest* (78,3%), *having an open mind* (78%).

The positive attributes assigned to people in general are rather defensive qualities (of inactivity) than qualities involving dynamic. Referring now to the negative attributes, we specify that they are lower as a share of total participants, but there are certain attributes that differentiate from the others. Thus, generally, people are perceived as being: *talkative* (40%), *hypocrites* (39,7%), *quarrelsome* (34,6%), *selfish* (32,9%), *conceited* (28,9%), *violent* (26%), *conservative* (25,7%), *indifferent to others* (25,7%), *with no sense of organisation* (25,1%), *lazy* (24,9%), *individualistic* (23,4%).

The negative representation related to people in general, without thinking of a particular ethnic group, characterizes them as talkative people, with a seed of quarrel, but who also use violence to solve problems. They are also perceived as lacking organizational spirit and lazy at the same time. It is noted that the negative

attributes concern the dynamic part of life, the involvement in activities, but they are not competitive, being traditionalists, proud and indifferent to others. From the data presented above, we see that the majority of participants, regardless of ethnicity, have identified equally both positive and negative attributes of people in general. But let's see if there are any differences in perception between ethnic groups for the same attribute.

To highlight the significant differences we shall perform a comparative analysis of data collected by using the Inventory of ethnic attributes and the *chi-square* test of association. This test is used when we want to test the relationship between two variables, both measured on a categorical type scale. Categorical variables, although they are usually of nominal type, can be both ordinal and of interval or ratio (Popa, 2008). After the comparative analysis by *chi-square* test, for each attribute separately, significant differences were identified for certain attributes (Sandu, 2012: 229-241).

Table 2. Chi – Square test for the attribute “humane”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29,335 ^a	18	,044
Likelihood Ratio	29,120	18	,047
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	,001	1	,990
N of Valid Cases	292		

^a. 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,16

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute „humane” ($\chi^2 = 29,33$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 2). The percentage distribution for the attribute “humane” highlights the fact that the highest percentages were designated by the Romanian, Armenian, Lipovan-Russians and Rromas. They have characterized people in general as more humane than Turks, Tatars and Greeks characterized. The difference in perception does not refer to their own ethnic group, or to a particular ethnicity, but to the people of these communities in general. These differences can be assumed by the fact that participants of the study belong to different communities, but they are found only within Dobrogea.

Tabel 3. Chi – Square test for the attribute “honest”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35,860 ^a	18	,007
Likelihood Ratio	38,026	18	,004
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	,070	1	,792
N of Valid Cases	274		

^a. 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,37

There are significant differences between the ethnic groups' perception of the attribute „honest” ($\chi^2 = 35,86$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 3). The attribute of “honest”, referring to people in general, was identified in a higher percentage by Turks, Tatars, Lipovans-Russians and Armenians and in a lower percentage by Romanians, Greek and Rroma. Even though the number of those who believed that people are honest is majority, the ethnic groups have chosen different percentages that would characterize people as honest. From the total of those who have designated this attribute as characteristic to people, in general more Romanian, Greek and Roma have highlighted that they are honest in a percentage of up to 50%, while many Turks, Tatars, Lipovans-Russians and Armenians have shown that people are honest at a rate of 50-100%, in a range from 0 to 100%.

Table 4. Chi – Square test for the attribute “violent”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31,960 ^a	18	,022
Likelihood Ratio	32,889	18	,017
Linear-By-Linear Association	6,185	1	,013
N of Valid Cases	91		
^a . 25 cells (83,9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,54			

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “violent” ($\chi^2 = 31,96$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 4). Referring also to the negative attributes of people in general, although the number of those who felt that they are violent is greatly reduced, significant differences were found between the perception of participants on this attribute. Thus, many Rroma, Lipovans-Russians Tatars and Greeks consider that people in their community are violent, the share through which they identify this feature lies in the range 50-100%. Those who consider people violent, but not in such proportion, are Romanians, Turks and Armenians.

Table 5. Chi – Square test for the attribute “peaceful”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35,911 ^a	18	,007
Likelihood Ratio	40,255	18	,002
Linear-By-Linear Association	3,400	1	,065
N of Valid Cases	259		
^a . 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,36			

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “peaceful” ($\chi^2 = 35,91$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 5). Following the idea of identifying significant differences of perception on the attributes of people in general, I noticed that these differences occur also for the attribute “peaceful”. People are considered

more peaceful by Romanians, Lipovans-Russians, Armenians and Turks, and less peaceful by Tatars, Greeks and Rroma.

Table 6. Chi – Square test for the attribute “inventive”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29,279 ^a	18	,045
Likelihood Ratio	30,578	18	,032
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	7,496	1	,006
N of Valid Cases	301		

^a. 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,83

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “inventive” ($\chi^2 = 29,27$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 6). There has always been said that “Romanians are inventive”, which is confirmed by our study, but there are differences in perception between participants in the study. How inventive are people in general? Turks, Rroma, Lipovans-Russians, Armenians consider people more inventive, placing them on an interval ranging from 0 to 100% to 50%, and most Romanians, Tatars and Greeks consider them inventive, but their inventiveness is situated below 50% on the same scale.

Table 7. Chi – Square test for the attribute “hospitable”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36,968 ^a	18	,044
Likelihood Ratio	32,193	18	,122
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	3,959	1	,047
N of Valid Cases	317		

^a. 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0,24

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “hospitable” ($\chi^2 = 36,96$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 7). Romanian’s hospitality in general, without making ethnic differences, became proverbial and the large number of participants who assigned this attribute as characteristic to humans confirms this. However, our participants in the study perceive hospitality differently. Thus, Turks, Tartars, Greeks, Lipovan-Russians, Armenians consider that the hospitality of people is stronger, while Romanians and Rroma consider people hospitable, but in a lower proportion. It should be noted that most of the participants belonging to all seven ethnic communities have positioned the hospitality of their people between 51-75%.

Table 8. Chi – Square test for the attribute “beautiful”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35,467 ^a	18	,008
Likelihood Ratio	31,481	18	,025
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	9,651	1	,002
N of Valid Cases	284		

^a. 7 cells (25%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0,61

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “beautiful” ($\chi^2 = 35,46$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 8). Analyzing the data processed in the same manner, of positive attributes, one can notice that as far as the attribute “beautiful” is concerned, the number of participants who characterized Romanians as holders of this attribute is high, but there are also here significant perception differences. Those who consider the people in their community to be beautiful are Greeks, Rroma, Lipovans-Russians and Armenians, and those who consider them less beautiful are Romanians, Turks and Tatars. Without making differences between the seven ethnic groups, it can be noted that most of the study participants have positioned the attribute beautiful between 51-75%.

Table 9. Chi – Square test for the attribute “imprudent”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33,107 ^a	18	,016
Likelihood Ratio	31,036	18	,029
Linear-By-Linear			
Association	2,649	1	,104
N of Valid Cases	79		

^a. 25 cells (89,3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0,61

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “imprudent” ($\chi^2 = 33,10$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 9). Returning to the negative attributes that characterize people, there can identified significant differences for the attribute “imprudent” (imprudent = mindless, without wisdom – in what one says or does; foolish; unwise – The Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language). Those who considered people the most imprudent are Greeks, Lipovans-Russians and Rroma, while Romanians, Turks, Tatars and Armenians appreciate that people are imprudent, but to a lesser extent. It should be noted that there is a small number of participants who consider people imprudent.

Table 10. Chi – Square test for the attribute “calm”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34,017 ^a	18	,013
Likelihood Ratio	31,428	18	,026
Linear-By-Linear Association	4,490	1	,034
N of Valid Cases	244		

^a. 10 cells (35,7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,15

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “peaceful” ($\chi^2 = 34,01$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 10). As already seen above, in the case of the attributes “violent” and “peaceful”, the participants’ perception differs. There are major differences between the perceptions of subjects with regards to the attribute “calm”. Thus, those who consider people very calm are Tatars, Greeks, Lipovans-Russians and Rroma, and those who perceive them as less calm are Romanians, Turks and Armenians.

Table 11. Chi – Square test for the attribute “quarrelsome”

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41,872 ^a	18	,001
Likelihood Ratio	48,141	18	,000
Linear-By-Linear Association	,121	1	,728
N of Valid Cases	121		

^a. 19 cells (67,9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1,18

There are significant differences between ethnic groups for the attribute “quarrelsome” ($\chi^2 = 41.87$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 11). The peacefulness of people is identified by a representative number of the study participants.

The number of participants that consider people quarrelsome is low, since this is a negative attribute, but we can not overlook it, especially since also in the case of this attribute there are significant differences between the participants of the seven ethnic groups’ perceptions. Those who believed that people generally are more quarrelsome are the Lipovans-Russians and the Turks, and the remainder, respectively, Romanians, Tatars, Greeks and Armenians believed that people are quarrelsome, but to a lesser extent than the Lipovans-Russians and the Turks.

The objective attributes are essential for the orientation and regulation of the collective behaviours, but do not provide a full understanding of the ethnic identity. Therefore, we think that the subjective dimension is very important because it draws the attention on the self-identification with one’s ethnic group.

Conclusions

In Dobrogea, the majority and the minority's view on the interethnic relations is different. On the level of the results obtained by applying the opinion questionnaire on interethnic diversity and intercultural dialogue, item analysis provides detailed elements regarding the subjective perception of seven ethnic groups from the territory of Dobrogea. Interethnic relations are of mutual appreciation between both the majority and each ethnicity in particular, and between ethnic groups. The objective attributes are fundamental for the orientation and regulation of collective behavior, but do not provide a complete understanding of ethnic identity. Therefore, we believe that the subjective dimension is very important because it focuses on its own identification with its own ethnic group. The communication style used by most respondents from all ethnic groups is aimed at solving problems, but there are people who believe that the blaming style could be a style that characterizes them, although this style is more concerned with the individual, personal features than with the affiliation to an ethnic group.

The objective attributes are essential for the orientation and regulation of the collective behaviours, but do not provide a full understanding of the ethnic identity. Therefore, we think that the subjective dimension is very important because it draws the attention on the self-identification with one's ethnical group.

Calculating the difference between the weighted averages of the participants from every ethnical group with that of the people, in general, we find the significant difference which has emphasized positive ethnic auto-stereotypes, as well as negative ones. Thus: (1) Romanians self-identify as being individualistic, but also with national dignity; (2) Tatars believe themselves to be hospitable, honest, peaceful and friendly; (3) Greeks label themselves as hard-working, honest, pacific and cordial; (4) Rromas think of themselves as being void of inventiveness and nervous. We consider, because the difference is significant, that attribute is considered to be part of the ethnical auto-stereotype of the ethnical groups (Chelcea, 2004). For all the other ethnical groups, but also for the rest of the ethnical attributes, there haven't been discovered significant differences between the weighted averages of the people, in general, and of the ethnical groups, denoting the fact that the psycho-moral traits that the ethnical groups assign themselves do not differ from the psycho-moral traits of people, in general. They do not differ from this point of view from the other people.

It should be noted that the Turkish, the Lipovans-Russians and the Armenians have not identified an ethnical attribute to differentiate them from the other people and to emphasize an auto stereotype that would describe them as an ethnical group. From this point of view, we cannot speak, regarding these groups, about an ethnical identity, distinct and clear, as they share the characteristics of people, in general.

Starting from the initially established objectives and trying to see the type of interethnic relationships between the study participants, we have identified a total agreement regarding the establishment of relationships with people of other ethnicities. The type of these relationships is, chiefly, one of collaboration, with the exception of the relationships with the Rroma ethnicity, which are conflictual, but also of indifference. The conflicts are much more accentuated between the six ethnical groups and the Rromas, then between the first six groups, as they are perceived by the respondents of the seven ethnicities. The communication style used by the majority of the respondents from all ethnical groups is oriented towards solving problems, but there are also people who think that blaming is a representative style, but this style is more linked to the individual personal characteristics, than to being part of an ethnical group. From the perspective of the initially presumption the hypotheses have been confirmed. The results of our research are in consonance with the analysis of the ethnical relationships performed by Mictat Gârlan, in Dobrogea (Gârlan, 2007). For every ethnic group, the highest closeness rate was towards its members and regarding the retro-evaluation rates about the attitude of the other ethnical groups towards Rromas, these are the lowest ones. Even though the ethnical groups do not have a friendly attitude towards Rromas, there is a certain difference between the closeness rates towards them. For instance, the Lipovan-Russians and the Turkish are much closer to Rromas than the Greeks and Tatars are, but the distance rates are on the direction of rejecting this community. The highest closeness rate towards the Romanian community was from part of the Armenians and the Turkish, and the lowest closeness rate towards the Romanian has been from part of the Rromas, even though some state that they better get along with Romanians than with the members of the own ethnic group.

References

- Affaya, M.N. (2000). L'homme « mondialisé » ou l'interculturalité inégale. L'interculturalité du McWord dans le paradigme globalitaire. *Afers Internacionals*, no. 50, 139 – 144.
- Andreescu, G. (2002). Multiculturalismul normativ, în Poledna, R., Ruegg, F., Rus, C. (coord.) *Interculturalitate – cercetări și perspective românești*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa universitară clujeană
- Bailey, O. G., & Harindranath, R. (2006). Ethnic minorities, cultural difference and the cultural politics of communication. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 2, 299-316.
- Bădescu, I. (2010), *Globalizare, comunicare interculturală, identitate și integrare europeană*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Bucharest
- Bennett, J. M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (2nd ed., pp.109-135). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

- Boia, L. (2002), *România – țară de frontieră a Europei*, București: Humanitas
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the international communication sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 2-14.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2004). Communication among cultural diversities: A Dialogue. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 27, 3-16.
- Demorgon, Jacques (2000). *Complexité des cultures et de l'interculturel*, 2^e éd. Paris: Anthropos.
- European Commission (2009) *Eurobarometer survey on discrimination in the EU in 2009*. Bruxelles
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociologie*, București: ALL
- Gârlan, M. (2007). *Etnopsihologii minoritare în spațiul dobrogean*, Iași: Lumen
- Hermet, G. (1997). *Istoria națiunilor și a naționalismului în Europa*, Iași: Institutul European
- Hogan-Brun, G. & Wolff, S. (2003). *Minority Languages in Europe: Frameworks, Status, Prospects*. New York: Palgrave, McMillan.
- Ibram, N. (2011), *Comunitatea musulmană din Dobrogea. Pagini de cultură și civilizație*, Constanța: Ex Ponto
- Ichim, O (2006). *Comunicare interculturală și integrare europeană*, București: Alfi.
- Lin, Y., & Rancer, A. S. (2003). Ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, intercultural willingness-to-communicate, and intentions to participate in an intercultural dialogue program: Testing a proposed model. *Communication Research Reports*, 20, 62-72.
- Marino, A (2010) - Multiculturalitatea, lumini și umbre, *Altera*, 13: 166-172.
- Parekh, B, (1997) - Religion and Public Life, in *Church, State and Religious Minorities*, London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Ripoll, V (1999). Les minorités dans le monde, in *Le Monde diplomatique*, 318 (46)
- Ruffolo, G. (2001). Unity of Diversities - Cultural Co-operation in the European Union, *Report on cultural cooperation in the European Union, Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport*
- Rus, C (2002). Relațiile interculturale în România din perspectivă psihosociologică, în Poledna, R., Ruegg, F., Rus, C. (coord.) *Interculturalitate – cercetări și perspective românești*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa universitară clujeană
- Sandu, M.L. (2012). *Diversitatea etno-culturală și interacțiunea socială. Studiu de caz Dobrogea*, Craiova: Beladi
- Salat, L. (2001). *Multiculturalismul liberal*, Editura Polirom, Iași.
- Salat, L., Nastasa, L. (2000). Interethnic Relations in Post-Communist Romania, in *Proceedings of the Conference „The Romanian Model of Interethnic Relations. The Past Ten Years-The Next Ten Years”*, Bucharest, 7-8 July, 2000, Cluj-Napoca: EDRC
- Severin, A (2002), Stabilitatea și sfidările multiculturalismului civic în Europa, în în Poledna, R., Ruegg, F., Rus, C. (coord.) *Interculturalitate – cercetări și perspective românești*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa universitară clujeană
- UNESCO (1995) *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. Paris

- Vaddell, E (1999). *Le dialogue avec les cultures minoritaires*, Laval: Presse de l'Université Laval.
- Vavaris, A (2007). *L'altérité musulmane en Grèce. Problèmes d'intégration et exclusion sociale des minoritaires de Thrace*. Genève: Institut européen de Genève.