



Project
MUSE[®]
Scholarly journals online

Internal and External Ethnic Assessments in Eastern Europe

Patricia Ahmed, *University of Kentucky, Lexington*

Cynthia Feliciano, *University of California, Irvine*

Rebecca Jean Emigh, *University of California, Los Angeles*

Survey data for majority and minority ethnicities in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Russia illustrate how internal ethnic identification and other social characteristics influence external ethnic classification. Logistic regressions show how interviewers use negative social characteristics (poverty, low education) to classify respondents as Roma (Gypsies) who did not self-identify as such. In contrast, for other minorities (Hungarians in Romania, Ukrainians in Russia) and majorities, these characteristics had the opposite or little effect, though self-identification, parents' ethnicity and language were influential. Interviewers' classifications tend to include, not exclude, these ethnicities as majorities. Thus, classifications are external and exclusionary for the racialized ethnicity, Roma, while classifications are optional and inclusive for other ethnicities.

Though it is commonly argued that race and ethnicity are socially constructed, not essential attributes, showing how they are constructed is difficult (cf. Glassner 2000). We investigate two dimensions of the social construction of classification among ethnic majorities and minorities in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Russia: 1.) who makes ethnic assessments (insiders or outsiders) and 2.) what social markers they use.

Internal and External Assessments of Ethnicity

From an essentialist perspective, individuals should agree about race and ethnicity,¹ because they are rooted in innate, biological characteristics (see reviews in Appiah 1990; Calhoun 1997; Gil-White 2001; Haslam et al. 2000; Hirschfeld 1996; Smedley 1993). The United States' "one-drop rule," stipulating that everybody with African ancestry was black, exemplifies institutionalized essentialism (Davis [1991] 2001).

Social constructionism, however, suggests that assessments vary. In particular, insiders identifying themselves can make different assessments than outsiders

The authors contributed equally to this project. Grants from the Ford Foundation (990-0133, 990-0133-1), NSF (SES-9906120), the California Population Research Center and the UCLA Academic Senate funded this work. We thank this project's other major participants: Iván Szelényi, Eva Fodor and János Ladányi for their input; Rachel Cohen for her data analysis; and the CCSA workshop participants, Tinatin Zurabishvili, Vilma Ortiz and the anonymous reviewers of Social Forces for their comments. We presented earlier findings at the "Re-thinking Regions" Conference of the UC World History Group and the 2001 ASA meetings. Direct correspondence to Rebecca Jean Emigh, Department of Sociology, UCLA, 264 Haines Hall, Box 951551, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551. E-mail: emigh@soc.ucla.edu.

classifying others (Calhoun 1997; Guillaumin 1995; Harris and Sim 2002; Telles 2002). Race can be defined as an external classification imposed on others, while ethnicity is an internal, self-identification (Banton 1998; Guillaumin 1995; cf. Cornell and Hartmann 1998). For example, the internal ethnic affiliations of U.S. whites are optional and variable (Waters 1990). In contrast, the historical legacy of the one-drop rule and its wide acceptance by all U.S. racial groups constrains individuals with any African ancestry to identify as only black, regardless of upbringing and appearance (Daniel 2002; Davis [1991] 2001; Waters 1990). The difference between external and internal assessments is consequential substantively and methodologically. Racialization facilitates stigmatization, while ethnic self-identification can be politically empowering (Guillaumin 1995; Telles 2002). The U.S. Census Bureau's (1975) change from external classification to internal, self-identification in 1960 may have increased the Native American population (Nagel 1995; cf. Eschbach et al. 1998).

External classification can conflict with self-identifications in several ways. First, external labeling can homogenize differences that outsiders do not recognize, but that insiders wish to maintain. For example, in the United States, though African-Americans and African and West Indian immigrants may distinguish between ethnicities, ancestries and skin colors, other Americans often ignore such differences because of the primacy of the black/white dichotomy (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Waters 1999).

Second, insiders can homogenize their differences through pan-ethnic labels (e.g., Latino, Asian-American [Espiritu 1992] or Native American/American Indian [Nagel 1996]) to express pride or to promote their collective interests (Espiritu 1992; Nagel 1996; Song 2003). Minority movements deploy these strategies via references to black, brown, red and yellow power (Espiritu 1992; Nagel 1996; Omi and Winant 1986). In contrast, outsiders may use homogenizing terms out of ignorance or scorn – Oriental vs. Asian-American, for example (Espiritu 1992).

Third, outsiders can mark differences that insiders wish to eliminate. The phenomenon of "passing as white" by individuals of mixed ancestry in the United States is a striking example (and stems from the one-drop rule) (Omi and Winant 1986). Such individuals wish to be classified as white, though they usually would be called black if their ancestry were known (Daniel 2002; Davis [1991] 2001; Song 2003). Similarly, some racially mixed groups collectively resist a black label (Daniel 2002; Davis [1991] 2001). Another example is increased identification with mixed racial or ethnic labels, exemplified by the new multiracial census category (cf. Daniel 2002; Song 2003). Such labels proclaim that all Americans have multiple ancestries, although these labels may not be accepted for African-Americans (Song 2003; cf. Davis [1991] 2001).

Finally, external classification can create or exaggerate differences within groups. Though the U.S. black/white dichotomy homogenizes differences among African-Americans, it often creates sharp racial differences among immigrant Puerto Ricans, who were part of a flexible racial continuum (Domínguez 1986; Duany 2002; Rodriguez 1990). Thus, external and internal identities, as well as self-identification and interviewer classification, often differ for Puerto Ricans (Rodriguez 1990).

Social Markers of Ethnic Assessment

The constructionist perspective also suggests that socially relevant markers, such as cultural differences, normative behavior and symbolic representations (Barth 1969; Lamont 1999; Rapaport 1997; Williams 1989), putative shared histories and collective memories (Calhoun 1997; Smith 1986), religion, custom (Geertz 1973) and language (Bailey 2001; Geertz 1973; de Saussure 1985), should influence assessments. Weber (1978) viewed ethnicity as a process of social closure because groups demarcate themselves with these types of social markers out of economic and other interests. Ethnicity, constructed by social actors, also creates and perpetuates boundaries (Barth 1969; Bourdieu 1991). This process sometimes produces highly stigmatized groups, such as the Roma (Gypsies) (Barth 1969; cf. Laitin 1995a).

Some social markers are readily quantifiable. For example, geographical concentration (Eschbach 1995; Harris and Sim 2002; Telles 2002; Xie and Goyette 1997; Yancey et al. 1976) and knowledge of an ethnic language (Portes and MacLeod 1996; Stevens 1985) increase identification. High education increases identification among Asian-Americans (Xie and Goyette 1997), Native Americans (Eschbach et al. 1998) and whites (Liebersohn 1985; Waters 1990). It decreases identification, however, among U.S. Latinos (Portes and MacLeod 1996; Tienda and Ortiz 1986; cf. Song 2003). Similarly, in Brazil, high education has a “whitening” effect, especially in non-white regions (Telles 2002). In Europe, large households often mark Roma ethnicity (Creed 1998; Liégeois 1994).

Toward an Interactive View of Classification

While external and internal assessments can be analytically distinguished, they produce ethnicity dialectically (Jenkins 1997; Nagel 1996). First, external definitions entail internal ones because the act of defining “us” requires “them.” Second, external definitions influence internal ones. Third, individuals use internal definitions to defend against externally imposed ones (Jenkins 1997). Here, we explore a fourth pattern, how internal definitions influence external ones. Because interviewers assessed ethnicity at the end of the survey, we use interviewer classification of ethnicity as the dependent variable to investigate this fourth pattern; namely, how outsiders use insiders’ self-identification of ethnicity and other social markers (ancestry, language, economic status, education, household size and geographical concentration) to impute ethnicity.

Telles (2002) looked at the disagreement between interviewer classification and self-identification using data in which interviewers assessed race before the survey, so they had little information beyond respondents’ appearances. We are not suggesting that our post-survey interviewer classification of ethnicity is better than a pre-survey one or that there is a correct measurement of ethnicity. Telles’ measure well approximates social settings in which participants have few social markers other than appearance (e.g., police stopping a speeding car, bouncers perusing would-be club entrants, job interviews after minimal pre-screening) (cf. Telles 2002). Our measure better approximates contexts in which participants have extensive knowledge of each other (e.g., neighbors, job interviews after

extensive pre-screenings). Furthermore, survey data have advantages and disadvantages. They cannot illuminate how insiders and outsiders negotiate ethnic assessment, as ethnographic data might. However, surveys provide many cases to examine aggregate trends and compare groups across countries, which small-N studies cannot.

Roma, Hungarian and Ukrainian Ethnicity in Eastern Europe

In Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Russia, we examine the classification of majorities; Roma in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania; ethnic Hungarians in Romania; and ethnic Ukrainians in Russia. We use the term, ethnicity, although it is problematic. It is not commonly used in these countries. For example, the distinction between ethnic Hungarian and ethnic Romanian citizens of Romania is often perceived nationally (Fox 2006). "Nationality," however, is less appropriate given our focus on minorities within states. Furthermore, Roma classification has features of racial, not ethnic, classification.

We analyze ethnic assessment during the market transition, the shift from an economy based on socialist redistribution to one based on capitalist markets, when ethnicity has become increasingly salient. Because of this region's historically shifting boundaries, many states are ethnically heterogeneous, some with minorities ethnically affiliated with neighboring states. During socialism, national unity campaigns attempted, sometimes forcibly, to assimilate minorities (Juska 1999; McIntosh et al. 1995); though, ironically, some institutionalized ethnicity (Slezkine 1996). After socialism, ethnicity became increasingly politicized without these policies (Fox 2006; McIntosh 1995; Schöpflin 1995; Todorova 1993). In some places, ethnic affiliations and tensions arose without state boundary change. Elsewhere, boundaries changed, sometimes creating conflict, sometimes alleviating conflict, sometimes creating ethnically mixed states and sometimes creating homogeneous ones. Hungarians in Romania and Ukrainians in Russia live in states bordered by their ethnic homeland states. Majorities may be intolerant of minorities if they perceive their ties with neighboring states as threats (McIntosh et al. 1995).

Hungarians are minorities mostly because of changing boundaries. Transylvania, in northern Romania, became part of that country in 1918; it had been Hungarian. (Verdery 1983). Both Romania and Hungary have claimed sovereignty over the region, and ethnic tensions stem from these political changes (McIntosh et al. 1995; Schöpflin 1995; Verdery 1983). The collapse of socialism heightened ethnic and national awareness, with some Hungarians calling for increased autonomy and some Romanians calling for a stronger, unified nation state (Fox 2006). Romanians and Hungarians have different religions and histories and speak dissimilar languages. Such differences and tensions may heighten ethnic affiliation.

A border change recently re-created Ukrainian minorities in Russia. The Ukraine was independent from 1917 through 1920, then part of the Soviet Union until 1991 (Liber 1992; Service 1997). During the early years of the Soviet Union, Ukrainian language and culture was emphasized, though they were subsequently restricted (Laitin 1995b; Liber 1992; Service 1997). These changes and tensions facilitated a post-socialist "Ukrainization of culture" (Laitin 1995b). Ukrainian

sovereignty creates a borderland situation for Ukrainians in Russia. Though there has been little violence, there have been ethnic tensions and nationalist movements (Laitin 1995b), despite strong similarities between their histories, cultures and languages (Juska 1999; Kolstoe 1995; cf. Shulman 1999). Ukrainian ethnic affiliation may increase, though Russians downplay their ethnic differences (Golovakha et al. 1994; Kolstø 1996).

In contrast, no Roma state exists. Though there are other poor and marginalized groups (e.g., Jews, Bulgarian Turks and Georgian Russians), Roma comprise the largest cross-national group in this region that is concentrated in extreme poverty and has faced widespread discrimination and stigmatization (Barany 1994; Crowe 1991c; Emigh et al. 2001; Liégeois 1994; Stewart 1997; UNDP 2002). Roma were slaves in Romania for about 500 years (Crowe 1991a). The Habsburgs, in the 18th century, attempted to eliminate the Roma through state-imposed assimilation (Crowe 1991b). Mixed marriages were encouraged, and children were forcibly removed from Roma. Strong Roma resistance decreased the success of such policies, but they still erased many markers of Roma identity. Thus, the Roma are more assimilated in regions of the former Habsburg Empire. Many Roma in Hungary speak Hungarian and are settled, while Romanian and Bulgarian Roma more often speak a Roma language and travel (Barany 1994; Stewart 1997). Roma were sent to Nazi death camps (Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; Stewart 1997). Another strong wave of assimilationist policies occurred during socialism (Crowe 1991a, 1991b; Fraser 1992; Stewart 1997). Housing policies eliminated Roma settlements, and education programs were initiated (Crowe 1991b; Fraser 1992). The policies again had mixed effects; though the material conditions of some Roma improved, they still faced discrimination and relative disadvantage (Crowe 1991b). During post-socialism, discrimination and hate crimes against Roma increased (Barany 1994; Stewart 1997). Much discrimination is overt; majorities sometimes use virulently racist terms when discussing Roma publicly.²

There is considerable debate about the Roma. Some Roma, non-Roma and scholars emphasize sharp boundaries between Roma and non-Roma. Roma are said to be distinguished by dark skin, eye color, facial features, dress and social customs (Crowe 1991c; Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; Stewart 1997). Some scholars trace the Roma to India and their language to Hindi (Barany 1994; Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; Salo 1979). Furthermore, for Roma, a primary social distinction is between Roma and non-Roma (Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; Salo 1979; Stewart 1997).

Others argue that Roma neither form a coherent group, nor share biological or ancestral traits. Though some Roma may have emigrated from India centuries ago, they dispersed and intermarried widely (Liégeois 1994; Stewart 1997; cf. Fraser 1992). Stewart (1997) argues that Roma do not have an ethnic identity rooted in past experience or tradition. Ethnic boundaries are fluid, and lifestyle may be their only distinguishing characteristic (Crowe 1991a; Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991). Only outsiders may view Roma as a singular group of "gypsies" (Fraser 1992; Salo 1979; Stewart 1997). Roma are composed of multiple groups (e.g., Lovari, Kalderash or Boyash), with different languages, religions and cultures. The differences among these groups are often larger than between Roma and non-

Roma (Barany 1994; Mitev et al. 2001). Some Roma may identify more strongly with these groups than with the label Roma (Barany 1994). Thus, the Roma are racialized because a perceived social and cultural difference is often viewed in biological or physical terms (cf. Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Mac Laughlin 1999; Omi and Winant 1986).

Not surprisingly, there is considerable debate about “who is Roma,” and estimates of the Roma population vary (Ladányi and Széleányi 1997; Emigh et al. 2001). Inadvertently, social science research compounds the identification problem, because it often selects communities as study sites because they are poor and stigmatized and therefore easily labeled as Roma. But these communities may not represent other Roma. Even a recent UNDP study, one of the few large-scale Roma studies, used convenience sampling to target communities pre-determined to be Roma and employed few comparisons to other populations (UNDP 2002).

In contrast, we problematize the category “Roma” vis-à-vis other ethnic categories. Thus, instead of trying to answer “who is Roma,” we try to answer “why are some individuals called Roma.” Our methodology is advantageous because the survey examines many individuals who might potentially be called Roma, who do not necessarily live in pre-identified Roma communities. Such individuals would be difficult to locate and include in small-N studies.

By examining how and why internal and external assessments differ, it may be easier to understand the seemingly opposite views of Roma (i.e., “they are insular” vis-à-vis “they are poor, but ethnically indistinguishable”). Using our survey, Ladányi and Széleányi (2003) and Csepeli and Simon (2004) argued that Roma ethnicity is more fluid in Hungary and Romania than in Bulgaria. Here, we compare Roma to other East European ethnicities. First, we look for disagreement between interviewers’ and respondents’ reports of ethnicity. Second, we consider how these disagreements vary by ethnicity. Third, we note which respondents’ characteristics influence interviewers’ classifications.

Methods

We fielded individual and household questionnaires in three sub-waves (approximately November 1999, March 2000 and June 2000) to assure that variables with annual variation (such as income) were measured several times (Széleányi and Emigh 1998). Household interviews were conducted with the person most knowledgeable about the household expenses. The survey has three sub-samples, a nationally representative general sample, an oversample of Roma and an oversample of the poor. The target sample size for the general sample was 2,500 household and individual interviews in Russia and 1,000 elsewhere. The final sizes of these samples were 1,078 in Bulgaria, 999 in Hungary, 1,050 in Romania and 2,496 in Russia.³

In Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, the Roma and poor were oversampled. Because the proportion of the Roma in the Russian population is miniscule, they were not explicitly targeted as respondents for this study. Consequently, they were not oversampled there. Because of the high poverty rate and the large sample size in Russia, oversampling was unnecessary. The oversamples were collected

beginning in May 1999 on the basis of screening questions in omnibus surveys. We selected the Roma oversample using interviewer classification of ethnicity to increase heterogeneity, because self-identified Roma are generally the smallest and least diverse category of respondents (Emigh et al. 2001). For consistency, we also selected the poor oversample using interviewer assessments. The oversamples include 523 Roma in Bulgaria, 480 in Hungary and 368 in Romania; 517 poor in Bulgaria, 447 in Hungary and 505 in Romania.

We also examine Hungarians in Romania and Ukrainians in Russia. Based on interviewer classification, there were 129 ethnic Hungarians in Romania and 84 ethnic Ukrainians in Russia. Though the number of cases is small, we obtained consistent and statistically significant results for these ethnicities, which provide valuable group and country comparisons to the Roma that no other datasets provide. Nevertheless, our results should be interpreted cautiously because the self-identification and interviewer classification variables for these ethnicities have a high proportion of cases coded "0."

A unique aspect of our data is its information about interviewers (cf. Telles 2002). Most (97 percent) identified as majorities, and the results did not change when we excluded respondents interviewed by non-majority interviewers.⁴ Compared to the general sample, interviewers were younger, more often female and, most distinctly, more educated. To examine whether interviewers' characteristics influence interviews (Davis 1997), we added interviewers' sex, education, age, fathers' education and ethnicity as independent variables to our final models (see Table 3 below). Their inclusion did not substantially change any of the coefficients, the significance levels of the other variables or our substantive conclusions.⁵ Thus, we use interviewers' assessments to approximate external ethnic classification.

Table 1 gives the weighted⁶ means of our variables. We measured ethnicity in five ways. Ethnicity is a sensitive issue, and the survey was designed to impose as few assumptions on it as possible (given the overall methodological technique). Thus, a self-identification question was included mid-way through the questionnaire – after some questions about occupational status – to downplay its significance. Furthermore, the question was relatively open-ended. Respondents indicated whether they identified with any ethnicity or nationality by choosing from lists of ethnic and national groups living in their country or by specifying another group. They could pick multiple groups. Interviewers also asked all self-identifying Roma whether they belonged to a particular Roma group (e.g., Lovari, Kalderash or Boyash). About 15 percent (121 of 811) did so.⁷

Second, interviewers asked respondents about their parents' ethnicity or nationality. These minority ancestry variables (Roma, Hungarian and Ukrainian) are coded "1" if the respondent's mother or father was a member of that group and "0" otherwise. The majority ancestry variables are 1 if both the respondent's parents were majorities and 0 otherwise. Third, for the minority language variables, respondents are 1 if they spoke that particular language (Roma languages, Hungarian or Ukrainian) as a child and 0 otherwise. For the majority language variables, respondents are 1 if they spoke only the majority language as a child and 0 otherwise. Fourth, respondents are 1 if the interviewer reported that they

Table 1: Weighted Means of Variables Used in the Analysis

Variables	Bulgaria	Hungary	Romania	Russia
Ethnic Markers				
Interviewer Classification as Roma	.078 (2094)	.061 (1792)	.039 (1923)	
Interviewer Classification as Hungarian			.074 (1923)	
Interviewer Classification as Ukrainian				.036 (2359)
Interviewer Classification as Majority	.815 (2094)	.950 (1792)	.893 (1923)	.917 (2359)
Self-Identification as Roma	.062 (2007)	.035 (1791)	.016 (1923)	
Self-Identification as Hungarian			.071 (1923)	
Self-Identification as Ukrainian				.046 (2351)
Self-Identification as Majority	.833 (2005)	.974 (1790)	.907 (1923)	.908 (2356)
At Least One Roma Parent	.070 (1997)	.039 (1770)	.019 (1906)	
At Least One Hungarian Parent			.103 (1905)	
At Least One Ukrainian Parent				.133 (2229)
Both Parents Ethnic Majority	.823 (1985)	.946 (1766)	.893 (1907)	.863 (2261)
Spoke Roma Language as a Child	.055 (2008)	.021 (1791)	.020 (1922)	
Spoke Hungarian as a Child			.108 (1923)	
Spoke Ukrainian as a Child				.060 (2347)
Spoke Majority Language Only as a Child	.814 (2008)	.926 (1791)	.811 (1923)	.845 (2356)
Lives in a Primarily Roma Settlement	.088 (2094)	.055 (1788)	.019 (1923)	
Economic and Demographic Markers				
Poor (below 50% of median per capita income)	.156 (2012)	.158 (1688)	.220 (1888)	.168 (2269)
Number of People in Household	3.374 (2094) std=1.694	3.091 (1792) std=1.551	3.345 (1923) std=1.701	2.813 (2359) std=1.362
Elementary School Education or Less	.382 (2007)	.508 (1792)	.360 (1923)	.273 (2359)

Note: N in parentheses.

lived in a Roma settlement or where the majority of the population was Roma and 0 otherwise. (Unfortunately, we have no analogous variables for Hungarian or Ukrainian neighborhoods.) Finally, after the respondent had completed the survey, interviewers answered the question, “What is your best guess of the ethnic or national origins of the person with whom you just talked?” They could “give more than one response if appropriate.”⁸

We also examine economic and demographic variables that interviewers could use to mark ethnicity. We measure poverty with a dichotomous variable, coded 1 if the respondent’s per capita household income was at least 50 percent below his or her country’s median and 0 otherwise.⁹ The number of people in the household is determined from the household roster. Education is a dichotomous variable, coded 1 if the respondent reported having only an elementary school education or less (according to the Eastern European educational system) and 0 if they reported more education.¹⁰

Results

Internal and External Assessments of Ethnicity

Table 1 indicates that ethnicity is not fixed, since the means of interviewer classifications of ethnicity and self-identifications of ethnicity are not identical. For example, the proportion identified as Roma by interviewers is higher than the proportion self-identifying as such in all countries. As a percentage of the total population, the disagreement in assessment is small, partially because we are examining relatively small minority groups, but from the perspective of the individuals labeled by others as Roma, the discrepancies are large. For example, when interviewer classification is cross-tabulated by self-identification for the Roma oversample, about 62 percent of those who did not identify as Roma are classified as such by the interviewer. More than 16 percent of the self-identified Roma indicated that they had been ethnically misidentified.

Table 2 shows how interviewer classification varies by self-identification for Roma, Hungarians, Ukrainians and majorities using weighted percentages. If ethnicity were immutable, the diagonals of all the tables would be 100 percent. Not surprisingly, self-identification is a strong predictor of interviewer classification, since interviewers heard respondents’ self-identification before giving their own responses. Nevertheless, they do not completely correspond. For Roma classification in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania (the first column of two-by-two tables in Table 2), the most striking finding is that nearly 100 percent of the time, when the respondent self-identifies as Roma, the interviewer accepts that classification. While it might seem that interviewers merely agree with respondents, this is not true for Hungarian, Ukrainian (the second column of two-by-two tables) or majority ethnicities (the last column of two-by-two tables). In Romania, interviewers report that about 6 percent of respondents who claim to be Hungarian are not. Most strikingly, about 56 percent of respondents in Russia who self-identify as Ukrainian are not classified as such by interviewers; the vast majority of them (almost 97 percent) are classified as majorities. In both

Table 2: Interviewer Classification of Ethnicity by Self-Identification of Ethnicity, Weighted Percentages

BULGARIA							
Roma					Majority		
Int. Class.	Self-Ident.				Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	
	No	Yes				No	Yes
No	98.20	1.51			No	96.55	2.60
Yes	1.80	98.49			Yes	3.45	97.40
	100%	100%				100%	100%
N	1527	480			N	700	1305

HUNGARY							
Roma					Majority		
Int. Class.	Self-Ident.				Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	
	No	Yes				No	Yes
No	97.32	.00			No	81.28	2.94
Yes	2.68	100.00			Yes	18.72	97.06
	100%	100%				100%	100%
N	1592	199			N	117	1673

ROMANIA							
Roma			Hungarian		Majority		
Int. Class.	Self-Ident.		Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	
	No	Yes				No	Yes
No	97.65	.00	No	99.18 6.36	No	91.76	2.42
Yes	2.35	100.00	Yes	.82 93.64	Yes	8.24	97.58
	100%	100%		100% 100%		100%	100%
N	1796	127	N	1797 126	N	233	1690

RUSSIA							
			Ukrainian		Majority		
			Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	Int. Class.	Self-Ident.	
						No	Yes
			No	98.35 56.28	No	71.80	1.75
			Yes	1.65 43.72	Yes	28.20	98.25
				100% 100%		100%	100%
			N	2240 111	N	199	2157

Note: Chi-squared tests show all the associations in this table to be significant at the $p < .000$ level.

cases, interviewers are contradicting respondents' self-identity to include them in the majority. This almost never happens in the Roma case, perhaps suggesting that interviewers perceive Roma to be such a socially stigmatized group that no one would claim to be Roma if he or she were not. In all countries except Russia, about 3 percent of the respondents who self-identify as majorities are not classified as such by interviewers. In Bulgaria, in about 80 percent of these cases, interviewers classify these respondents as Roma. The corresponding

figures for Hungary and Romania are 91 percent and 94 percent. These findings further support the idea that outsiders assume some individuals are denying their “true” Roma ancestry by claiming membership in the majority.

Correspondingly, to a greater degree than for other minority ethnicities, interviewers classify respondents as Roma who do not self-identify as such. For example, Table 2 shows that approximately about 2 to 3 percent of respondents who do not self-identify as Roma in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania are classified as such by interviewers. In contrast, less than 1 percent of respondents in Romania are classified as Hungarian if they do not self-identify as such, and only 1.65 percent of Russian respondents who do not self-identify as Ukrainian are classified as such.¹¹ This pattern of interviewer classification without self-identification is even stronger for the majority ethnicities, though it represents the social process of inclusion, instead of exclusion as for Roma ethnicity. In the most striking instance, in Russia, about 28 percent of those who do not self-identify as members of the majority group are nevertheless classified as such by interviewers. The vast majority of these self-identify as Ukrainian. Thus, interviewers diminish boundaries between Ukrainians and majorities.

Thus, the classification of Roma ethnicity differs from other ethnicities. Their stigmatization is such that classifiers seem to assume that no one would claim to be Roma if he or she were not. Thus, if a respondent self-identifies as Roma, an interviewer (almost) never disagrees. In contrast, interviewers often contradict the respondents’ self-identification as minorities to include them as majorities. Interviewers also classify some respondents as Roma even when they do not self-identify as such, perhaps because this ethnicity is so stigmatized that it is assumed that some individuals might deny their heritage. While the same pattern is found for the majority ethnicities (interviewer classification without self-identification), the social process is the opposite: interviewer classification as majority is socially inclusive, not exclusive.

Predictors of Interviewer Classifications of Ethnicity

Table 2 shows that though self-identification is important, it does not always determine interviewer classification. Thus, Table 3 presents logistic regressions with interviewer classification of ethnicity as the dependent variable separately by ethnicity and country. It gives the odds ratios¹² for variables representing self-identification as well as other ethnic, economic and demographic markers that may influence interviewer classifications. Although the models in the different columns are not identical because the independent variables vary by ethnicity, they are analogous, and the significance level of the independent variables in different models can be compared.

Because self-identification as Roma is a near-perfect predictor of interviewer classification (Table 2), it is impossible to estimate models of interviewer classification as Roma with self-identification as an independent variable for Hungary and Romania. This model could be estimated for Bulgaria, but we do not do so because of the small number of cases of self-identified, but not interviewer-classified Roma. However, interviewers classify individuals as Roma

who do not self-identify as such (Table 2). Thus, we examine the factors that lead interviewers to override self-identification in this particular direction by selecting individuals who do not self-identify as Roma for the first three models in Table 3. Thus, the effect of the other independent variables is net of self-identification, as in the other models in Table 3 that include self-identification as an independent variable.

For Roma ethnicity, interviewer classification is significantly affected by ethnic, economic and demographic markers in Bulgaria (Table 3, column 1), Romania (column 2) and Hungary (column 3). Interviewers were more likely to classify respondents as Roma if they had at least one Roma parent, if they spoke a Roma language as a child or if they perceived them to live in Roma neighborhoods. Respondents were also more likely to be classified as Roma if they were poor, if they lived in large households and if they had little education. For interviewer classification as Hungarian in Romania (column 4) and Ukrainian in Russia (column 5), as for Roma ethnicity, self-identification, parents' ethnicities and language use are strong predictors of interviewer classification. However, none of the economic or demographic variables are statistically significant at the .05 level, in contrast to Roma ethnicity.

Columns 6 to 9 show that self-identification, parents' ethnicities and language use strongly influence interviewer classification as majorities, as for the other ethnicities. The economic and demographic variables, however, follow a different pattern. Unlike the non-Roma minorities, and like Roma ethnicity, some of these variables have statistically significant effects for majorities, especially in Romania and Hungary. Where significant, however, these variables have an effect on interviewer classification as majority that is opposite to their effect on interviewer classification as Roma. In Romania and Hungary, respondents who are poor, live in large households and have low education are less likely to be classified as majorities. The directions of the effects are the same in Bulgaria, though only education is significant. Household size may be insignificant because there are many extended households in Bulgaria (see Ahmed and Emigh 2005); consequently, household size may not be viewed as a characteristic of any particular group. These variables are insignificant in Russia, perhaps because there is no single stigmatized racial group that is present in numbers comparable to the Roma and because of a tendency to include respondents as majorities.

The results further support the interpretation that, as a stigmatized racial group, Roma ethnicity is often externally ascribed. Outsiders label individuals as Roma not only because of ethnic markers, but also because of negative social markers, poverty and low education. Such factors are not significant predictors of interviewers' assessments of other minorities.

To examine country differences in the effects of the independent variables on interviewer classification as Roma, we combined columns 1 to 3 of Table 3 and tested the interaction terms (at the .05 level) between country and the independent variables. Living in a Roma settlement has a statistically stronger influence in Romania than in Hungary. Language has a statistically stronger effect in Bulgaria and Hungary than in Romania. Similarly, we combined the data for Bulgaria, Romania, Russia and Hungary (columns 6 to 9) to examine

possible interaction effects for majorities. Self-identification has a statistically stronger effect in Romania than in Russia. Parents' ethnicity has a statistically stronger effect in Bulgaria than in Hungary or Russia. Majority language use has a statistically stronger effect in Bulgaria than in Romania, Russia or Hungary. Finally, smaller households are more strongly associated with interviewer classification as majority in Romania and Hungary than in Russia. All other interactions in both combined models are insignificant.¹³

Discussion

Ethnicity is a dialectical outcome of external and internal assessments (Jenkins 1997; Nagel 1996). We explore one aspect of this relationship: how interviewers use respondents' self-identifications of ethnicity, in combination with other social markers (ancestry, language, geographical concentration, poverty, household size and education), to classify respondents. Outsiders draw heavily, but not entirely, upon insiders' assessments; self-identification is a strong, though not perfect, predictor of interviewer classification. Our interviewers virtually never override respondents' self-identification as Roma, presumably because they assume that no one would claim to be Roma if it were not "true." Interviewers do, however, classify individuals as Roma who do not self-identify as such, on the basis of negative social characteristics (poverty, low education).

Because we are primarily interested in comparing Roma ethnicity to other ethnicities cross-nationally, tables 1 and 2 are weighted to reflect population figures (i.e., that weight down the size of the Roma and poor oversamples to match the population percentages). From the perspective provided by these population statistics, there appears to be widespread agreement about "who is Roma." Because they are a minority, they form a small percentage of these countries' populations, and therefore, the differences between interviewer classification and self-identification are also small (Table 1). In addition, the population figures for the agreement between interviewers and respondents (Table 2) are generally higher for Roma ethnicity than for the other ethnicities. Similarly, Table 3 shows that the direction and level of significance of the independent variables' effects on interviewer classification as Roma is similar in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania (though the interactions suggest that the strength of some effects varies nationally). Thus, the process of Roma classification works similarly in these countries. Most notably, interviewers confirm respondents' self-identification as Roma, creating apparent widespread agreement about Roma identity. Similarly, if social science researchers go to regions pre-selected as having many self-identified Roma, their results will confirm their Roma identity, since interviewers' classifications are unlikely to contradict self-identification.

However, these population figures do not demonstrate how many individuals externally classified as Roma will experience discrepant classifications (cf. Ladányi and Szelényi 2003). Results from the Roma sub-sample suggest that this figure is 62 percent (i.e., respondents who are interviewer-classified as Roma, but who do not self-identify as such). Furthermore, these discrepancies generally arise when an outsider uses a negative social characteristic to classify someone

as Roma who does not self-identify as such. Thus, such classifications may be unwanted or unwarranted. Though Roma organizations are becoming more influential in Europe (Barany 1994; Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; UNDP 2002), there is no strong and widespread “ethnic pride” movement that could make Roma self-identification costless or a political resource (cf. Espiritu 1992; Omi and Winant 1986; Nagel 1996; Song 2003; Waters 1990). These results help explain the debate about “who is Roma.” Apparent widespread agreement among the population about the assessment of Roma ethnicity can coexist alongside a fluid assessment process that creates multiple discrepancies between internal identification and external classification.

In contrast, interviewers’ assessments tend to include – not exclude – other minorities as majorities. For Hungarian and Ukrainian ethnicity, few interviewers identify respondents as minorities if they do not self-identify as such, but interviewers classify them as majorities even when they self-identify as minorities. Correspondingly, interviewers rarely state that respondents are not majorities when they self-identify as such, but interviewers classify respondents as majorities in the absence of self-identification. Ethnic, but not other social markers, are associated with interviewer classification as Hungarian or Ukrainian. While we cannot definitively interpret the results without in-depth interview data, they suggest that Hungarian and Ukrainian ethnicity may be optional identities (cf. Waters 1990). Interviewers’ tendency to reclassify self-identifying Hungarians and Ukrainians may be linked to the presence of the neighboring states of Hungary and Russia. Majorities may perceive large populations of minorities that are ethnically affiliated with neighboring states as threats (McIntosh et al. 1995). Thus, majorities may downplay ethnic affiliations emphasized by minorities.

Our findings vis-à-vis other social markers are consistent with previous research, even though they are not strictly comparable because we include self-identification as an independent variable and do not examine positive characteristics, such as wealth or high education, because we oversampled the poor. Geographic concentration and large household size accentuate interviewer classification as Roma (cf. Creed 1998; Eschbach 1995; Harris and Sim 2002; Liégeois 1994; Telles 2002; Xie and Goyette 1997; Yancey et al. 1976). Linguistic knowledge influences interviewer classification for all ethnicities (cf. Portes and MacLeod 1996; Stevens 1985). The association between negative social characteristics (low education, poverty) and Roma classification is similar to black racial classification in Brazil (Telles 2002) and Latino classification in the United States (Portes and MacLeod 1996; Tienda and Ortiz 1986).

Roma face widespread discrimination and stigmatization (Barany 1994; Emigh et al. 2001; Liégeois 1994; Stewart 1997; UNDP 2002). Roma ethnicity is, in many ways, racialized. Many Roma appear to be assimilated; they speak only the majority language and intermarry with majorities. Nevertheless, majorities often claim that Roma are distinguishable physically. We show how classificatory processes of exclusion are related to this racialization and stigmatization. The difference between Roma and other ethnicities is not, in fact, that self-identification is ignored; it strongly guides all external classifications. The difference concerns the discrepancies between external and internal assessments. External classifiers

tend to exclude the stigmatized and racialized ethnicity from the majority using negative social characteristics (low education, low income), while they tend to include the non-stigmatized ethnicity in the majority or rely primarily on ethnic markers of ancestry and language.

Our cases parallel Water's (1990). Hungarian and Ukrainian ethnicity are analogous to U.S. white ethnicities because identity is self-declared, not externally imposed. Similarly, in the contemporary United States, white ethnicities are not generally stigmatized or racialized. Roma identity assessment is similar to that of U.S. blacks because their ethnic affiliation is often externally imposed. Like Roma, U.S. blacks face widespread prejudice and discrimination. Of course, the histories and characteristics of these groups differ; we point here only to the similar patterns of a stigmatized label corresponding to an externally imposed and racialized identity and a neutral label corresponding to an internally adopted one. Further research among groups elsewhere could explore this pattern's prevalence.

We noted four patterns of interaction between external and internal assessment. Though our findings provided no parallels to the fourth pattern – that external classification exaggerates differences within groups – they illuminated the others. First, external labeling can homogenize differences between groups that outsiders do not recognize, but that insiders wish to maintain. For example, African-descent immigrants to the United States wish to mark differences that many Americans disregard by labeling them black (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Waters 1999). Thus, homogenization combines different minorities into a single racialized one. This pattern applied to the non-Roma minorities, but worked differently. External labeling homogenizes differences between Hungarian minorities and Romanian majorities and between Ukrainian minorities and Russian majorities, which minorities mark. This first pattern is not apparent among the stigmatized group, the Roma. More Roma in our survey identify with the general label, Roma, than with some specific group (e.g., Lovari, Kalderash or Boyash). Of course, for some Roma, these narrower identities are more salient, and much external classification disregards differences among Roma (Barany 1994; Fraser 1992; Salo 1979; Stewart 1997). Because our survey was not designed specifically to examine identification with these particular groups, future research should address this issue.

The second pattern, that insiders homogenize differences among themselves with pan-ethnic labels, is related to the first pattern. Although our findings show that Roma insiders often employ the homogenizing label, "Roma," there is less evidence that it promotes collective interests or ethnic pride (cf. Espiritu 1992; Nagel 1996; Omi and Winant 1986; Song 2003), because Roma organizations have limited impact (Barany 1994; Fraser 1992; Hancock 1991; UNDP 2002).

Third, outsiders can mark differences that insiders wish to eliminate. A striking U.S. example is blacks "passing" as white (Daniel 2002; Davis [1991] 2001; Song 2003). Similarly, individuals self-identifying as majorities are externally classified as Roma. Furthermore, some Roma and African-Americans break ties with their birth families to live as majorities (Daniel 2002; Davis [1991] 2001; Stewart 1997). All ethnicities, however, exhibit some characteristics of passing.

In all countries, some respondents do not self-identify as minorities though interviewers classify them as such, and some respondents self-identified as majorities though interviewers do not classify them as such. Roma ethnicity differs because respondents are more often excluded from, not included in, the majority than other ethnicities and because negative social characteristics influence external classifications. Future research could investigate whether this particular relationship between identification and classification distinguishes passing, with its concomitant social isolation, from other patterns of disagreement between insiders' and outsiders' assessments.

Because our interviewers assessed ethnicity after the interview, we illuminate only one aspect of the relationship between internal and external assessment. Our results may approximate well social settings in which the external adjudicator has extensive knowledge of the individual being classified. Other studies can explore different combinations of outsider and insider assessments and, therefore, expand our knowledge of how ethnicity is a socially constructed outcome of internal identification and external classification.

Notes

1. Race sometimes refers to social actors' cultural distinctions based on presumed biological differences, while ethnicity refers to their cultural distinctions based on presumed social differences (cf. Bailey 2001; Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Van den Berghe 1984).
2. This discrimination differs from "color-blind racism" that avoids racist language (Bonilla-Silva 2001; Winant 2001).
3. The N in the tables below varies because we used listwise deletion for the missing values. Substituting the mean for the missing cases did not affect the results.
4. Results not presented in this paper are available upon request.
5. We estimated the models in Stata in two ways: 1.) with the svy commands, accounting for the sampling weights, strata and psu's and 2.) with robust correction for clustering at the interviewer level, accounting for the sampling weights. Given our sampling design, we cannot adjust for clustering due to the strata, psu's and interviewers simultaneously. The following relationships were statistically significant at the .05 level in both estimations: 1.) Roma Romanian interviewers more often classified respondents as Roma who did not self-identify as such. 2.) Older Hungarian interviewers less often classified respondents as Roma who did not self-identify as such. 3.) Ukrainian Russian and highly educated interviewers more often classified respondents as Ukrainian. (Similarly, majority interviewers less often classified respondents as Ukrainian.) 4.) Bulgarian highly educated interviewers less often classified respondents as majorities. Father's education was insignificant in all the models. Bulgarian female interviewers were significantly (p -value < .05) less likely to classify respondents as Roma (for respondents not self-identifying as Roma) in the svy estimation. This relationship was borderline significant

with the clustering procedure (p -value = .052). Interviewers' effects could be further explored in a multilevel model that accounts for the survey design. Csepeli and Simon (2004) argued that interviewers were less prejudiced against Roma than was the general population, but their models do not include interviewers' characteristics, so it is unclear if interviewers' attitudes affected their results.

6. For analyses using only Russia, we used the base weight (a post-stratification weight calculated for each country to match selected characteristics of their census). For analyses using other individual countries, we calculated, on top of the base weight, a weight to account for the oversamples so that the weighted proportion of Roma and poor in the sample is the same as the proportion in the country's population. The percentage of interviewer-classified Roma and poor in the screening data, weighted by the screener weight, determined the population proportions. For analyses combining countries, we adjusted these weights so that each country has an equal influence.
7. Respondents who did not self-identify as Roma but who spoke a Roma language as children might be the most likely to identify with these specific groups instead of the general label, Roma, because they may maintain these identities through language use and because they are the least assimilated. Of the 648 respondents who spoke Roma, 50 did not self-identify as Roma. However, if these 50 respondents are added to the 121 who indicated that they belonged to a specific group, the number of individuals self-identifying with a specific group (171) would still be smaller than those self-identifying as Roma (811). The conclusions are similar using respondents with Roma parents or with interviewer-classified Roma.

Furthermore, we did not include these specific groups on our lists of ethnicities and nationalities, so we may have discouraged individuals from identifying with them. This is unlikely because no respondent volunteered the name of a specific Roma group in response to the self-identification question. Of course, our study was not designed to examine identification with these specific groups, which would have required oversampling for them. Studies of particular groups might find that more individuals identified with those groups than with the Roma label.

8. Interviewers may have automatically labeled respondents as Roma because they were in the sub-sample or because they had been identified as Roma during the screening. Although interviewers were only told respondents' sub-sample numbers, some may have thought that this was a Roma survey. Furthermore, in the Hungarian poor and Roma oversamples, almost 33 percent of the respondents had the same interviewer for the screener and the survey. In Romania, though, none of the interviewers were the same. (Unfortunately, this information is unavailable for Bulgaria.) However, the data show considerable variability in interviewer classification, suggesting that the sample design does not predetermine the results. About 20 percent of respondents classified as Roma during screening were not re-classified as such by the interviewers in the survey. The large number of interviewers also assured variability (228 in Bulgaria, 234 in Hungary, 334 in Romania and 279 in Russia). Furthermore, we obtain the same substantive results concerning the

effects of poverty, household size and education on interviewer classification as Roma with the screening and the survey data, suggesting that our results are robust. For further analysis of the screening data and comparisons to the survey data, see Csepeli and Simon (2004). Their conclusions are substantively similar to ours but are not strictly comparable because they used different methods and variables and they sub-set the data according to screener responses.

9. Income sums household's wages/earnings, state transfers, sale of agricultural produce, interest, borrowed money, sale of personal things, gifts from relatives/friends, gifts from other people/institutions and other income. Other poverty measures (e.g., interviewer assessment of poverty or respondent's subjective assessment) produced fewer missing cases but identical substantive conclusions.
10. Gender was statistically insignificant.
11. The differences between these proportions are statistically significant at p-values of .05 or less except for the difference between the Roma in Bulgaria and Ukrainians in Russia (1.80 percent and 1.65 percent respectively), which was statistically insignificant, and for the difference between the Roma in Romania and the Ukrainians in Russia (2.35 percent and 1.65 percent respectively), which had a p-value of .055.
12. We used survey logistic regression (Stata 9 svy commands) to account for the survey design by using probability weights to obtain more accurate point estimates and by adjusting for stratification and cluster sampling to produce more robust standard errors.
13. These results should be interpreted cautiously. The large size of some odds ratios, and thus the differences between some of them, stem from the small number of cases on the off-diagonal cell of a two-by-two table of the respective independent and dependent variable. This is partially because the relationships between the independent and dependent variables are so strong and partially because the number of cases for minorities is inherently small. Thus, though some of the differences between the odds ratios across the columns of Table 3 are large, the interactions are not significant because of the small number of cases.

References

- Ahmed, Patricia, and Rebecca Jean Emigh. 2005. "Household Composition in Post-Socialist Eastern Europe." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 25(3):9-41.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1990. "Race." Pp. 274-87. *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, editors. University of Chicago Press.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2001. "Dominican-American Ethnic/Racial Identities and United States Social Categories." *International Migration Review* 35(3):677-708.

- Banton, Michael P. 1998. *Racial Theories, 2nd edition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barany, Zoltan D. 1994. "Living on the Edge: The East European Roma in Postcommunist Politics and Societies." *Slavic Review* 53(2):321-44.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1969. "Introduction." Pp. 9-38. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Fredrik Barth, editor. Little, Brown & Company.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2001. *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Lynne Rienner.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.
- Calhoun, Craig J. 1997. *Nationalism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Douglas Hartmann. 1998. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*. Pine Forge Press.
- Creed, Gerald W. 1998. *Domesticating Revolution: From Socialist Reform to Ambivalent Transition in a Bulgarian Village*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Crowe, David. 1991a. "The Gypsy Historical Experience in Romania." Pp. 61-79. *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*. David Crowe and John Kolsti, editors. M.E. Sharpe.
- _____. 1991b. "The Gypsies in Hungary." Pp. 117-31. *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*. David Crowe and John Kolsti, editors. M.E. Sharpe.
- _____. 1991c. "Conclusion." Pp. 151-57. *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*. David Crowe and John Kolsti, editors. M.E. Sharpe.
- Csepeli, György, and Dávid Simon. 2004. "Construction of Roma Identity in Eastern and Central Europe: Perception and Self-identification." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(1):129-50.
- Daniel, G. Reginald. 2002. *More Than Black? Multiracial Identity and the New Racial Order*. Temple University Press.
- Davis, Darren W. 1997. "Nonrandom Measurement Error and Race of Interviewer Effects Among African Americans." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(1):183-207.
- Davis, F. James. [1991] 2001. *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand. 1985. "The Linguistic Sign." Pp. 28-46. *Semiotics: An Introductory Anthology*. Robert E. Innis, editor. Indiana University Press.

- Domínguez, Virginia R. 1986. *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*. Rutgers University Press.
- Duany, Jorge. 2002. *The Puerto Rican Nation on the Move: Identities on the Island & in the United States*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Emigh, Rebecca Jean, Eva Fodor and Iván Szelényi. 2001. "The Racialization and Feminization of Poverty?" Pp. 1-32. *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe During the Market Transition*. Rebecca Jean Emigh and Iván Szelényi, editors. Praeger.
- Eschbach, Karl. 1995. "The Enduring and Vanishing American Indian: American Indian Population Growth and Intermarriage in 1990." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18(1):89-108.
- Eschbach, Karl, Khalil Supple and C. Matthew Snipp. 1998. "Changes in Racial Identification and the Educational Attainment of American Indians, 1970-1990." *Demography* 35(1):35-43.
- Espiritu, Yen Le. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Temple University Press.
- Fox, Jon E. 2006. "Consuming the Nation: Holidays, Sports, and the Production of Collective Belonging." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(2):217-36.
- Fraser, Angus M. 1992. *The Gypsies*. Blackwell.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books.
- Gil-White, Francisco J. 2001. "Are Ethnic Groups Biological 'Species' to the Human Brain? Essentialism in Our Cognition of Some Social Categories." *Current Anthropology* 42(4):515-54.
- Glassner, Barry. 2000. "Where Meanings Get Constructed." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(4):590-594.
- Golovakha, Evgenii, Natalia Panina and Nikolai Churilov. 1994. "Russians in Ukraine." Pp. 59-71. *The New Russian Diaspora: Russian Minorities in the Former Soviet Republics*. Vladimir Shlapentokh, Munir Sendich and Emil Payin, editors. M.E. Sharpe.
- Guillaumin, Colette. 1995. *Racism, Sexism, Power, and Ideology*. Routledge.
- Hancock, Ian. 1991. "The East European Roots of Romani Nationalism." Pp. 133-50. *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*. David Crowe and John Kolsti, editors. M.E. Sharpe.
- Harris, David R., and Jeremiah Joseph Sim. 2002. "Who Is Multiracial? Assessing the Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):614-27.

- Haslam, Nick, Louis Rothschild and Donald Ernst. 2000. "Essentialist Beliefs About Social Categories." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 39(1):113-27.
- Hirschfeld, Lawrence A. 1996. *Race in the Making: Cognition, Culture, and the Child's Construction of Human Kinds*. MIT Press.
- Jenkins, Richard. 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. Sage Publications.
- Juska, Arunas. 1999. "Ethno-Political Transformation in the States of the Former USSR." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(3):524-53.
- Kolstø, Pål. 1996. "The New Russian Diaspora – An Identity of Its Own? Possible Identity Trajectories for Russians in the Former Soviet Republic." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19(3):609-39.
- Kolstoe, Paul. (Kolstø, Pål.) 1995. *Russians in the Former Soviet Republics*. Hurst & Company.
- Ladányi, János, and Iván Szelényi. 1997. "Ki a cigány?" *Kritika* 12:3-6.
- _____. 2003. "Die 'gesellschaftliche Konstruktion' der Roma-Ethnizität in Bulgarien, Ungarn und Rumänien in der Periode des Übergangs zur Marktwirtschaft." *Zeitgeschichte* 30(2):64-75.
- Laitin, David D. 1995a. "Marginality: A Microperspective." *Rationality and Society* 7(1):31-57.
- _____. 1995b. "National Revivals and Violence." *Archives européennes de sociologie* 36(1):3-43.
- Lamont, Michéle. 1999. "Above 'People Above'? Status and Worth Among White and Black Workers." Pp. 127-50. *The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries*. Michéle Lamont, editor. University of Chicago Press.
- Liber, George O. 1992. *Soviet Nationality Policy, Urban Growth, and Identity Change in the Ukrainian SSR, 1923-1934*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. "Unhyphenated Whites in the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 8(1):159-80.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre. 1994. *Roma, Gypsies, Travellers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Mac Laughlin, Jim. 1999. "Nation-Building, Social Closure and Anti-Traveller Racism in Ireland." *Sociology-The Journal of the British Sociological Association* 33(1):129-51.
- McIntosh, Mary E., Martha Abele Mac Iver, Daniel G. Abele and David B. Nolle. 1995. "Minority Rights and Majority Rule: Ethnic Tolerance in Romania and Bulgaria." *Social Forces* 73(3):939-68.

- Mitev, Petar-Emil, Ilona Tomova and Liubena Konstantinova. 2001. "The Price of Procrastination? The Social Costs of Delayed Market Transition in Bulgaria." Pp. 33-66. *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe During the Market Transition*. Rebecca Jean Emigh and Iván Szelenyi, editors. Praeger.
- Nagel, Joane. 1995. "American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity." *American Sociological Review* 60(6):947-65.
- _____. 1996. *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1980s*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Dag MacLeod. 1996. "What Shall I Call Myself? Hispanic Identity Formation in the Second Generation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19(3):523-47.
- Rapaport, Lynn. 1997. *Jews in Germany after the Holocaust: Memory, Identity, and Jewish-German Relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rodriguez, Clara. 1990. *Racial Classification Among Puerto Rican Men and Women in New York*. Austin, Texas: IUP/SSRC Committee, University of Texas.
- Salo, Matt T. 1979. "Gypsy Ethnicity: Implications of Native Categories and Interaction for Ethnic Classification." *Ethnicity* 6(1):73-96.
- Schöpflin, George. 1995. "Nationalism and Ethnicity in Europe, East and West." Pp. 37-65. *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*. Charles A. Kupchan, editor. Cornell University Press.
- Service, Robert. 1997. *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia*. Harvard University Press.
- Shulman, Stephen. 1999. "The Cultural Foundations of Ukrainian National Identity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(6):1011-36.
- Slezkine, Yuri. 1996. "The USSR as a Communal Apartment or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism." Pp. 203-38. *Becoming National: A Reader*. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, editors. Oxford University Press.
- Smedley, Audrey. 1993. *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*. Westview.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Song, Miri. 2003. *Choosing Ethnic Identity*. Polity.
- Stevens, Gillian. 1985. "Nativity, Inter-marriage, and Mother-Tongue Shift." *American Sociological Review* 50(1):74-83.

- Stewart, Michael. 1997. *The Time of the Gypsies*. Westview.
- Szelényi, Iván, and Rebecca Jean Emigh. 1998. "Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Transitional Societies." Grant Proposal Funded by the Ford Foundation.
- Telles, Edward E. 2002. "Racial Ambiguity Among the Brazilian Population." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(3):415-41.
- Tienda, Marta, and Vilma Ortiz. 1986. "'Hispanicity' and the 1980 Census." *Social Science Quarterly* 67(1):3-20.
- Todorova, M. 1993. "Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Communist Legacy in Eastern-Europe." *East European Politics and Societies* 7(1):135-54.
- UNDP. 2002. "Avoiding the Dependency Trap: The Roma in Central and Eastern Europe." Bratislava: UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States.
- United States Bureau of the Census. 1975. *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre L. 1984. "Race: Perspective Two." Pp. 216-18. *Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations*. E. Ellis Cashmore, editor. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1983. *Transylvanian Villagers: Three Centuries of Political, Economic, and Ethnic Change*. University of California Press.
- Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. University of California Press.
- _____. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Weber, Max. 1978. "The Belief in Common Ethnicity: Its Multiple Social Origins and Theoretical Ambiguities." Pp. 387-93. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, Volume 1*. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, editors. University of California Press.
- Williams, Brackette F. 1989. "A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation across Ethnic Terrain." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:401-44.
- Winant, Howard. 2001. *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since World War II*. Basic Books.
- Xie, Yu, and Kimberley Goyette. 1997. "The Racial Identification of Biracial Children with One Asian Parent: Evidence from the 1990 Census." *Social Forces* 76(2):547-70.

Yancey, William L., Eugene P. Ericksen and Richard N. Juliani. 1976. "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformulation." *American Sociological Review* 41(3):391-403.