

MEPDEV 2nd: 2016
Central & Eastern European LUMEN International
Conference - Multidimensional Education & Professional
Development. Ethical Values

ROMANIANS AND MIGRANTS - BETWEEN PAROCHIAL
BENEVOLENCE AND A HORIZON FOR DEMOCRATIC VALUE¹

Roxana – Elena Mosor (a)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Ph.D assistant, associate professor at the Faculty of Political Science, Literature and Communication of the "Valahia" University, Targoviste, Romania, roxana_mosor78@yahoo.com, 0723.56.46.22

Abstract

The appearance of the migration wave generates a series of questions regarding Romanians' adaptability to an increasingly globalized world, in which the tolerance exceeds the conceptual stillness and "forces" the attitude and behavioural patterns.

Public reaction on immigrant crisis reveals a dissonance from the principles of tolerance in Europe. It seems that Romanians are not different in terms of views from citizens of other Member States. The comparison requires, however, a high degree of precaution.

Are we really prepared to exit the provincial frames and adjust our attitude, behaviour to a global community where diversity is inherent?

Intensifying migration translates into new challenges for both civil society and Romanian institutions. In the context of the findings revealing mid and long term trends, the rhetoric regarding Romanians adaptability to a diverse and multicultural world, where migration is the cause and the effect, the measurement side should also be taken into account.

This paper proposes a foray into the Romanian values landscape which oscillates between tradition and modernity, the interest being focused on the determinants for dissemination in civil society of attitudinal and behavioural patterns consistent with democratic values that define the Western world.

© 2017 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Migration, tolerance, European values, socialization, political culture.

¹ This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-RU-TE-2014-4-1304.



1. Introduction

Migration, a phenomenon as old as mankind, has recently achieved, once with the deepening of the military conflict in the Middle East, dramatic accents, challenging thus the solidarity within the European Union. The issue of the mass migration has been included in the limelight of the public agenda also in Romania. Social level challenges have added to those of the state policy. People acceptance degree of the migrants (who were called refugees/immigrants in the surveys) has been measured, mainly revealing an unfavourable attitude towards the presence and the settling down of the migrants in our country. At this point, placing us in the latest years context, the attitude towards the migrants, is like „a tip of the iceberg”, Romanians sharing the attitude of rejection of the migrants like other European Union member states citizens, a possible cause being the common concern against terrorist attacks.

„Positions taking” of the people are somehow explicable; they arise from the fear in front of a relatively unknown phenomenon which exceeds the patterns of everyday existence.

On the other hand, lull times during this migration phenomenon highlight an attitude stability of the Romanians contrary to the European model of tolerance and dialogue.

At this point, we are out of the scope of the „surface studies” generated by the immigration wave, in order to get deep into the space of the Romanian values. The discussion about the attitude towards immigrants will be placed in the field of tolerance, as value orientation with a high degree of generality.

2. Problem Statement

2.1. Conceptual approaches

The source of the attitudes and behaviours towards immigrants must be searched in the depths of the values space, as a root of the individual and/ or collective positioning towards the life phenomena occurrences in society.

If Romanians face the readjustment challenge of value space, the question is: are they really following the path towards those values they stated to join? This question triggers consequently another one: who and what mostly influences this pathway. Thus, the value change switches gradually, from the existing hierarchy to the explanations grounded on reasoning and understanding of the governing mechanisms of the natural and social environment. Value orientations of traditionalism – the orientation towards strict compliance with the hierarchy, religiosity, following the “beaten paths” - are replaced by those of modernity – the orientation to openness to change, secularization, risk taking, planning (Vlăsceanu, 2011).

Intuitively, when we consider the migration issues and, more strictly, the attitude towards the migrants we can speak about a conceptual axis, having as starting point the parochial benevolence and at the end, the democratic values as they are defined at the European level.

Parochial benevolence is a composite concept to which the meanings of parochial policy culture are transferred to the term parochial – those of local, provincial or restricted perspective, which are specific to traditional societies, unaware communities of national or global interest issues, whose universe of values is drawn by institutions such as the church or the city house.

The explanation for using the generic term of migrant and not the specific ones of immigrant or emigrant is also rooted in empirical studies (Voicu et al., 2012), which reveal Romania's low level of exposure to the immigration phenomenon and, thus, the lack of primacy of this matter on the public agenda. The attitude towards the immigrants is greatly affected by the perception of the emigrants; lived realities and the institutional mechanisms the immigrants had contact are seen through the emigrants' perspective. Romanian public opinion is more familiar with the emigration phenomenon on the grounds of which its representations are created.

3. Research Questions

3.1. Prizes of the attitude towards the migrants

The appearance of the migration wave generates a series of questions regarding Romanians' adaptability to an increasingly globalized world, in which the tolerance exceeds the conceptual stillness and "forces" the attitude and behavioural patterns.

Are we really prepared to exit the provincial frames and adjust our attitude, behaviour to a global community where diversity is inherent? This question arises amid conclusions of the migration studies: „Romania keeps the characteristic of a mainly emigrational country and becomes, besides a transit country, an increasingly attractive destination for the immigrants. According to a Eurostat forecast, during 2008-2060, Romania will record a net migration rate of at least 18,4 for one thousand inhabitants (1,84%) (...) Romania, as an UE member state, its economic and social development potential along with the forthcoming entry the Schengen Area will make Romania an increasingly attractive destination for the immigrants (...) Romania will cross a period of continuous growth of migration, followed probably by a relative balance between the inflow and influx of migrants to become a large immigration country.” (Alexe, & Păunescu, 2011).

The rhetoric regarding Romanians adaptability to a diverse and multicultural world, where migration is the cause and effect, should consider the measurement side as well. In the context of the findings revealing mid and long term trends, development and implementation of public policies on migration, which take into account these evolutions, are required as forefront preoccupations for the Romanian institutions.

„Romanian migration recorded since 2009 a series of prominent developments which widened and became clearer during 2010. Even though Romanians continue to migrate for employment, the number of departures decreased. These changes refer to the typology of the Romanian migrant and the Romanian migration. There migrate highly qualified specialists from the following fields: health, education, technical, IT, migration being thought as a long term project, tending to get a permanent character. These aspects are reflected in the percentage increase of Romanian migrant concentrations in destination countries such as Great Britain, France, northern countries or, destinations outside UE: Canada, USA. These trends of the Romanian migration are able to produce interesting effects in terms of immigration flows towards Romania for employment purposes. In the future, Romania may replace the lack of national specialists in the above mentioned fields through a policy of attracting and encouragement of the establishment in our country of the highly qualified immigrants from third countries ” (Alexe & Păunescu, 2011).

Along with labour force related challenges Romania faces serious demographic ones.

„In 2008 Romanian women abroad gave birth to almost 14.800 children, and in 2013 their number reached almost 30.000. Romanians birth rate is almost one third more abroad than within their country, because the ones who left are at the age of starting a family. – One of seven Romanians who left the country in the recent years is under 15, this proving that they reunite with their family there [...] There are two possibilities to fill the void left by the external migration: economic development of the country, accompanied by demographic policies of birth encouragement and of Romanian migrants return, and “import” population from abroad, from Republic of Moldavia (the main source of immigration to Romania or even from other states outside European Union)” (Mihai, 2016).

4. Purpose of the Study

4.1. Tolerance for Romanians

In terms of the highlighted trends in the studies and analyses on migration, Romania is on a similar path with other states in the European Union with every assumed commitment at the institutional level.

Even if distant and seemingly hazardous, the odds that Romania becomes an increasingly attractive destination for immigrants once it enters the Schenghen Area - otherwise an assumed objective – require a greater attention on the manner in which both institutions and the population are prepared for the “confrontation” with this phenomenon.

To what extent can we talk about pertinent measurements of Romanians attitude towards the immigrants as long as there is a weak contact with them?

It is obvious that citizens’ opinions reflect more than lived realities and opinions are uttered starting from simple representations about one phenomenon or another.

So, if we place ourselves in the context of the “wave” of immigrants coming from the Middle East, migrating, Romanians share other states rejection attitude towards them, a possible cause being the common concern of terrorist attacks.

The truth about Romania” barometer, dated March 2016, conducted by INSCOP, an ordered study by “The truth”, shows that:

- 84,6% from the respondents state they disagree that refugees / immigrants settle in Romania, an increased percentage compared to November (80,2%) and September (65,3%) 2015, respectively. Only 11% of those interviewed agree to such a perspective (compared to 16,1% in November and 26,5% in September, 2015). The percentage of those who do not know or do not answer is 4,3%.
- Furthermore, 88,3% of the respondents stated in March that they disagree that refugees/immigrants be housed in their locality. This opinion was shared by 81,9% in November, 2015 and by 67,1% in September, 2015 respectively.
- IRES assessed Romanians’ perception towards this phenomenon in September 2015 – in the international turmoil regarding the refugees’ exodus to Europe – revealing roughly the same attitudes:
- More than one of two Romanians – 58% - believes that the refugees should have the right to decide the country in which to start a new life. Instead, Romanians are undecided when it

comes to expressing their opinion regarding refugees' reception in Romania. 65% from the respondents totally or partially agree that Romania, as a UE member state, should receive a certain number of immigrants. However, when they are asked about the possibility that the refugees move right into their locality, the percentage of those agreeing to such a matter drops to 46%, and 42 % totally disagree with this hypothesis.

At the same time, transnational surveys at the European level (Survey conducted by Pew Research Center, in the spring of 2016 as well, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/07/12/europe-rejects-multi-cultural-society-says-survey>) show that:

- Over 70% of the respondents from 10 European countries (Greece, Italy, Hungary, Poland, Holland, Germany, UK, Sweden, France and Spain) state that diversity make from their country a "worse" place for living or it does not make any difference.
- After a year from the terrorist attacks in Brussels and Paris, in eight from ten participant countries in the survey, more that 50% of the respondents stated that immigrants wave increased terrorism probability in their country. Terrorism is not, yet, the only concern of the Europeans related to the refugees. Many fear that these would be a economic burden. Half or more from the respondents in five of the countries – Hungary, Poland, Greece, Italy and France – believe the refugees will take their jobs and social benefits. The negative attitude towards the refugees is more widespread among the respondents ideologically situated on the right of the political spectrum. Likewise, supporters of the far-right parties have more negative attitude towards the refugees and Muslims and are more skeptical about the benefits of a diverse society (Foster, 2016). However, ideology is not the only dividing line in European attitudes. Education level and age are variables which influence the attitude towards the immigrants – elderly and less educated people express more negative opinions related to the refugees and minorities.

Outside the migration "wave" phenomenon, it is interesting to analyze which are the relevant characteristics of the Romanian society regarding migration issue and attitude towards immigrants, in particular.

On one hand, we can speak about a value profile of the Romanian society, about some specific orientations with variables which influence the attitude towards the immigrants.

On the other hand, the harmonization process of the Romanian society values with those at the European level is strongly influenced by social context and disseminated messages in the public space.

Message construction defines social and political issues and provides solutions to these problems. For instance, if immigration is defined in terms of problems caused by the influx of immigrants, policies will be focused on its deceleration; if immigration is defined in terms of immigrants rights and integration, then the debate will be centered on these concepts and the actions will be integration oriented" (Arikan & Bloom, 2012).

Moreover, according to Deutsch's "waterfall model" of the public opinion formation (Sartori, 1999), we can speak about the major importance of the transmitted messages by an elite/public space thought leader, an important source influencing the attitudes towards the migrants. The role of values is a crucial one here.

„Values influence European debates on migration and highlight the public opinion role in immigration policies. Moreover, the construction of the message, of the frames of political interpretation is influenced by the shared social values, being an important influencing source since it structures social realities in a symbolic and significant way” (Arikan & Bloom, 2012).

An important role, as we have seen, when we speak about the attitude towards the immigrants is played by social and demographic variables, but especially social and economic ones: age, sex, residence environment, status and professional category, income, identification with the national community (differentiation of national representations in terms of ethnic-cultural or civic – republicans), ideological and political orientation, etc. Therefore, the caution level while interpreting the surveys must be high and must take into account these variables.

Therefore, the social values approach may give a general perspective.

Which are, hence, the strongest values in Romanian society?

According to 2005 World Values Survey, applying Schwartz items package (a theoretical inventory of the main value constructs to which all individuals in all societies have a specific orientation: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, traditionalism, conformity, security – grouped on two polar axes which have at the two ends “high-order value orientation - conservatism/openness to changes and self-achievement/concern for the others, respectively), the strongest values for Romania proved to be traditionalism, orientation to security, conservatism and universalism (orientation to tolerance, understanding and harmony with other members of the society and with nature). Romanians, on average, prove to be among the most traditionalist and conformist Europeans, along with Moldavians, Poles, Bulgarians and Russians from who they are not significantly different from this perspective (Vlăsceanu, 2011).

Shalom Schwartz universal values theory is relevant inclusively for the studies on the attitudes towards immigrants. Both high-order types of values, self-achievement and conservatism, are strong indicators of the attitude towards immigrants.

Based on the data of the first wave of European Social Surveys on 18 European countries, the study “The influence of societal values on attitudes towards immigration” (Arikan & Bloom, 2012) test the hypotheses according to which conservative values are associated to immigrants negative assessment, low immigration acceptance and agreement on strict conditions for the immigrants, while self-achievement is associated with immigrants acceptance in the country, less restrictions for the immigrants, as well as a positive attitude towards immigrants.

Another study, this time focused on Romanian society, based on the data of European Values Study (2008-2009), reveals a Romanian society relatively tolerant to the immigrants, compared to other European countries (Voicu et al., 2012).

Thus: 51% of the Romanians believe immigrants take the jobs from the natives, 41% - immigrants undermine culture, 46% - immigrants increase criminality, 46% - immigrants put pressure on social support system and 44% agree with the statement “ in the future, the proportion of immigrants will become a threat to society”. All these scores are, however, below European average, except for the first item which places Romania at about the European average.

This enters somehow in contradiction with Romanian society definition as traditional.

On the other hand, taking into consideration the low exposure degree of Romania to the immigration phenomenon and, therefore, the lack of prominence of the matter on the public agenda, it was considered the possibility that the attitude towards the immigrants be prone to acquiescence (or ARS - Acquiescence Response Style – the tendency to answer positively to the statements in the questionnaire). For Romania, it was highlighted that the acquiescence has a strong effect on measuring attitudes towards immigrants. The standardized size of the effect is comparable to the most important determinants of the attitude towards immigrants: social solidarity, life satisfaction and education. The wording manner of the items in the EVS questionnaire makes, however, that acquiescence effect does not lead to overestimation of the attitude towards immigrants, but rather to favourable and milder opinions.

Conclusions of the study: the relatively optimistic attitude towards immigrants should ground on other determinants, among which: low exposure to immigration, high rate of emigration and the dependence on the remittances from abroad. Also, the lack of exposure to the immigration phenomenon is compensated by a very good knowledge of the emigration – probability of the residents to be related to family members, acquaintances, older colleagues living abroad is high. Thus, this created a background of basic knowledge of the immigrants' problems.

Still in the value space of tolerance, a survey conducted by Gallup at Public Police Institute request, from September 2003, describes a less pleasant situation: Generally, Romanians are perceived as still far away from the European model of tolerance and dialogue. Romanians' opinions indicate they still are strongly driven to authoritarianism. 84% of the respondents agree that Romania still needs a strong leader to make order in the country. Romanians tend to have attitudes of rejection especially of the sexual minorities, but also against some religious cults such as Islamism and Jehovah's Witnesses. About 1 of 10 Romanians expresses racial attitudes, stating that the African Americans, Chinese and especially Romanies must not live in Romania.

In an IRSOP study from June 2005, it is observed the maintenance of intolerant attitudes of the Romanians:

- 64% state there are too many expats prospering in Romania while Romanians live poorly;
- 61% claim that Arabs, Turks, Chinese are dishonest;
- 62% believe that ethnic minorities should learn Romanian;
- 42% say that Romanians and Romanies will never get along ones with the others;
- 49% from the respondents consider that the tolerance is not a respected value in Romania.

Correlating all the data shown, it can be said that Romanians, like other states citizens, often prove an attitude instability resulted from a tension between the values in which they believe or tend to believe at individual level and the cleavage between their own values and social ones, promoted by the society. According to the theory, individuals tend to consistency and stability in their structure of beliefs and tend to reduce this attitude ambivalence, thus letting themselves influenced by context (Arikan & Bloom, 2012).

And context, as we saw, is largely structured based on the messages conveyed in public.

An exploratory study from August 2003 designed to discover the extent to which intolerance and discrimination issues appear on the agenda and in the policy intentions of the parties in Romania, reveals that interviewed politicians stated that intolerance and discrimination phenomena occur also/especially in the political class. The majority of the parties' representatives suggested to the study makers to apply the

survey related to intolerance, discrimination and authoritarianism specifically, to the political class only, their suggestion being that the answers will generally reflect intolerant and discriminatory attitudes. While accusing other parties' members of intolerance and discriminatory attitudes, some of the respondents uttered explicitly intolerant opinions.

Moreover, a short analysis of the political programmes and parties' statuses in the country indicates a paradoxical picture: the majority of the parties refer to the tolerance principle as an assumed value, while making references to inflexible and intolerant attitudes" (2005, Septembrie 16).

The conclusions of a more recent report, from 2014, are at least equally disturbing:

„Within the European space, denigrating and hateful messages are mostly transmitted by extremist parties and groups (especially far-right ones) and by their supporters. An alarming fact is that this kind of messages are frequently transmitted by public figures and politicians with significant public visibility and who do not belong, nonetheless, to extremist parties. Mass-media is an important channel through which hate discourse (D.I.U) is disseminated, but the on line environment (the on line component of the publications and social media) is the platform which records the most virulent increase of DIU incidence.

Thus, the target categories of people of this kind of discourse may be diverse and there may occur important changes during time. In Romania, at the beginning of the nineties, mass media releases of situations where Magyars were negatively portrayed were more frequent than now. In the same time, anti-Romanies discourse seems to have gradually increased in intensity. When Romania will have a visible increase of immigration it is possible to increase the frequency of public utterances against immigrants.

As well, the assessment of DIU impact must take into account the emitters types of the discourse. Thus, for instance, public interferences of some central institutions representatives (e.g. presidency, government) are expected to have a greater impact than those of the local counselors or mayors of small localities. The efficiency of fighting against DIU may be increased through a clear presence of penalty mechanisms related to DIU from the state authorities' side. Thus, it is waived the equalizing gravity of discriminatory gestures made by state representatives and those made by unrepresentative extremist organizations in a society" (Angi & Bădescu, 2014).

Trying a summary of those reported, we cannot ignore the aspects related to the significance of the tolerance concept placed in the centre of our discourse.

It is obvious that the attitudes towards migrants and widely speaking, the degree of tolerance of Romanians is structured on a deeply traditionalist values background, influenced by context.

From this perspective, the premises of the opening towards alterity, foreigners' acceptance and integration do not seem to be encouraging. Even if "in the perception of the public institution and non-governmental organizations representatives, the general opinion of the population of our country is favourable to the immigrants, foreign citizens being considered by Romanians as hardworking, earnest people who are not an issue for Romanian society", equally, some representatives of these institutions underlined "the lack of interest of the majority of the Romanians regarding the immigrants and their problems. The general population does not know and is not interested in either the reasons these citizens come to our country, or what they do here, nor which are their problems, and it does not make the difference between various categories of foreigners existing on the territory of Romania" (Alexe & Păunescu, 2011).

Oscillations on the conceptual axis described in the present analysis where parochial benevolence is the starting point and the terminus point is represented by the democratic values defined at the European level, may be caused by the defining manner of tolerance.

Thus, Romanians attitude towards the immigrants of outdistancing themselves from those and their problems seems to enlist in the key of the deformed meaning of tolerance, the consequences being dialogue suspension and (kindly) ignoring a different opinion (Pleșu, 2005). A crisis of the tolerance concept is taken into discussion, its significant change of sense: "It no longer describes the acceptance of "different", of the other opinion, but simply ignoring (kindly) of the different opinion, the suspension of difference as difference. It follows that: 1. I do not need to understand you in order to accept you and 2. I do not need to talk to you in order to agree with you. In other words, I agree with what I do not understand and, as a principle, I agree with what I disagree. Reciprocal tolerance ends in an universal smiling and peaceful quietness, a silence for which dialogue is an undesirable interference. Under these circumstances, the effects of tolerance are more than questionable: it removes the passion for knowledge, the real understanding of otherness and it dynamites the necessity of debate (...) Even if occasionally, external events narrowed dramatically its specter of utterance, tolerance remained the minimal condition of coexistence, of interior hygiene within a groups" (Pleșu, 2005). To which sense of tolerance should refer Romanian political and social elite discourse, so that the desired path be followed towards the integration of the European democratic values? UNESCO member states reunited in Paris from October 25th to November 16th, 1995, on the occasion of the 28th session of the General Conference proclaimed and signed The Statement of the Tolerance Principles. From the content of article 1, which circumscribes the significance of the concept, roughly defined as the respect, acceptance and appreciation of the abundance and diversity of the cultures in our world, of our ways of expression and manners of utterance of our quality as human beings), we note the emphasis on defining tolerance as political and juridical necessity, not only as ethical obligation, especially being a "active attitude generated by acknowledgment of the universal rights of the humans. Tolerance is not a concession, a condescension or indulgence" (ONU, 1995).

5. Research Methods

The theoretical approach of this paper assumes thus the sociology perspective of values and argumentation relies, from the intuition point of view, on the empirical findings of the relevantly considered transnational and national studies. References to studies about the values that characterize Romanian society (following Schwartz range of values), to those about tolerance or those about inflammatory hate rhetoric are justified by the operational definition of the social values (Vlăsceanu, 2011). We cannot talk about the attitude towards migrants without relying on higher generic value aspects such as tolerance and we cannot talk about tolerance but in a larger social context. The rhetoric is carried on two main coordinates: first – draws a value profile of the current Romanian society and its relating manner to the migration and immigrants matter and the second – which is placed in the dynamics of the value space. In the latter, the ground assumption is that the Romanian society is a transition society on the level of values as well, a transition generated by the cleavage between the social and political realities before and after 1989 (Lipset and Rokkan constructivist approach notes the need for divisions, as a

mandatory precondition in the change of values). Romania has undergone profound institutional changes, generated by European Union accession commitment. Adjustments to the attitude and behavior level are less synchronized with the formal frameworks because the transformation of values is an insidious process.

6. Findings

From the mentioned studies perspective, we can draw the following Romanian society profile features in relation to the migrants' issue:

First, Romanians' attitude towards migrants is not significantly different from that of other European Union citizens when we refer to the acceptance or, rather say, the non-acceptance of the Middle East immigrants, terrorism being the main cause underlying the rejection of the idea of immigrants settling into the states under consideration. Similarity in this context is somehow natural, although Romanians, unlike other European Union citizens, did not take direct contact with the "wave" of immigrants and their opinions formed mainly on the representations and messages spread in the public space.

Other studies, conducted before Middle East migration phenomenon extended, reveal that Romanians are a little more tolerant compared to other European states citizens. Again, one of the most plausible explanations is the weak interaction with the immigrants, Romania being mainly a country of emigration. Without making any further steps into speculations, we can say that the benevolence towards the immigrants is, to some extent, an attitude Romanians expect from the countries adopting their fellow emigrants.

Secondly, the attitude towards the migrants is rooted in the depths of the value space defining Romanian society. Along with independent variables influencing it (especially referring to its factual features), the attitude towards migrants is built in a societal context, where widely shared values play a key role. Thus, there are highlighted Romanian society tendencies towards traditionalism, conformism, even authoritarianism, somehow inconsistent with the tolerance towards the immigrants. If we bring into question historical arguments of a good conviviality over time with other ethnic groups established in the country we peg between seemingly contradictory trends. Among the values defining Romanian society, good prerequisites for tolerance are certainly to be found. However, we should not overlook the process of re-harmonizing of those values to the new realities generated by the transition from a totalitarian regime to a democratic one. A key role in this process is played by opinion makers, especially by those with high visibility as political leaders, who are, according to the studies, the issuers of denigrating and hateful messages widely spread through media. Meeting the premises for tolerance with this kind of messages may cause an attitudinal inconsistency of Romanians towards the migration matter. Social context, under these circumstances, may play a decisive role, in choosing a certain attitude over the other.

Thirdly, the problem of migrants is handled in a clearly defined institutional framework, its management influencing and being influenced by the attitudes and behaviours of the citizens. If we are to believe mid and long term forecasts highlighting trends of balance between the emigration phenomenon in Romania with the immigration one, then the attention and responsibility for the migrants issue must be equally divided between institutions, initiators of public policies and opinion makers.

7. Conclusion

Romanian society has prominent traditionalist features, oriented from the values perspective towards tolerance, understanding and harmony with other society members and nature (universalism values). As far as the attitude towards migrants is concerned we can talk about a dynamic process, which, in the European context may acquire new inflections. A more tolerant attitude of the Romanians towards immigrants, compared to other European Union citizens (except the expressed opinions regarding the immigration wave from the Middle East) may be interpreted considering the weak interaction with them. On the other hand, there are unignorable signals within Romanian society which emphasize the tendency to propagate from top to bottom some messages against European values of tolerance and dialogue.

The construction of the public message regarding the immigrants is an important lever to go beyond the parochial benevolence transmitted by primary socialization by relevant institutions in a traditional type society – family, community, church, etc. – to internalization of some values which are closer to the normative sense of the democratic horizon, the origin of the relating manner to the migration phenomenon remaining, finally, an institutional one.

References

- Alexe, I. & Păunescu, B. (2011). *Studiu asupra fenomenului imigrației în România. Integrarea străinilor în societatea românească*, Ediție electronică, [Study on immigration phenomenon in Romania. The integration of the foreigners in the Romanian society]. Retrieved from: http://arps.ro/documente/studiu_privind_fenomenul_imigratiei.pdf.
- Angi, D. & Bădescu, G. (coord.), (2014). *Discursul instigator la ură în România*, [Hate discourse in Romania]. Fundația pentru Dezvoltarea Societății Civile. Retrieved from: http://www.fdsc.ro/library/files/studiul_diu_integral.pdf.
- Arikan, G. & Bloom, P. B-N. (2012). The influence of societal values on attitudes towards immigration. *International Political Science Review*, 34(2), 210-226.
- Foster, P. (2016). *Anti-Muslim sentiment on rise in Europe due to migration and Isil as continent rejects multi-cultural society*. Retrieved from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/07/12/europe-rejects-multi-cultural-society-says-survey/>.
- Mihai, A. (2016). Drama României. Cele mai îngrijorătoare statistici: Numărul de copii români născuți în străinătate s-a dublat. Rata natalității este mai mare peste hotare, [Tragedy of Romania. Most concerning statistics: The number of Romanian babies born abroad has doubled. The birth rate is higher abroad]. Retrieved from: <http://www.zf.ro/eveniment/drama-romaniei-cele-mai-ingrijoratoare-statistici-numarul-de-copii-romani-nascuti-in-strainatate-s-a-dublat-rata-natalitatii-este-mai-mare-pest-hotare-14960853>.
- ONU (1995). *Declarația Principiilor Toleranței*. Proclamată și semnată la 16 noiembrie 1995, [The Statement of the Tolerance Principles]. Retrieved from: <http://www4.pmb.ro/wwwt/pactivi/Documente%20europene/Declaratia%20Principiilor%20Tolerantei.pdf>.
- Pleșu, A. (2005). *Toleranța și intolerabilul, Criza unui concept*, [Tolerance and the intolerable, The crisis of a concept]. București, România: Editura LiterNet.
- Sartori, G. (1999). *Teoria democrației reinterpretată*, [A Theory of Democracy Revisited]. Iași, România: Editura Polirom.
- Toleranța – valoare europeană*, [Tolerance – the European value] (2005, Septembrie 16). Retrieved from: <http://infopolitic.ro/studii/toleranta-valoare-europeana.html>.
- Vlăsceanu, L. (coord.), (2011). *Sociologie*, [Sociology]. Iași, România: Editura Polirom
- Voicu, B., Șerban, M., Tudor, E. & Deliu, A. (2012). Acquiescence effect in measuring attitudes towards immigrants: The case of Romania. *Calitatea Vieții*, 3, 311-340.