

ISTVÁN MURÁNYI

*Effects of Poverty and Wealth on Identity*¹

In the presentation we are referring to the analysis of a few variables of three national databases (Hungary, Slovakia, Croatia) of a recently completed international survey study (MYPLACE project).² Empirically, MYPLACE employs a combination of survey, interview and ethnographic research instruments to provide new, pan-European data that not only measure levels of participation but capture the meaning young people attach to it.

The process and logic of sampling³

Flyvbjerg (2006) contrasts ‘random selection’ with ‘information oriented selection’ where the former delivers representativeness and generalizability and the latter allows small samples to be theoretically productive through the careful selection of contrasting cases or ‘critical cases’. MYPLACE uses both strategies. Firstly, the purposive selection of two contrasting locations in each country (four in Germany) is undertaken on the basis of a prior analysis of literature and socio-demographic indicators. The single biggest gain in case study sampling is delivered by having two rather than one (Sudman 1976). This strategy allows each team to focus on an area where there are grounds to suspect that young people will be have a greater propensity to be radicalised than elsewhere.

Each country would identified two locations which could be contrasted in terms of economic and social factors. The first location will be economically vibrant and the second will be in economic decline or going through a significant restructuring. The selection of each location within a country aims to maximize the contrast in terms of the conditions within which young people grow up. Regional samples while not representative of each country, are better at highlighting the local context of political issues. National samples (certainly in large countries) would easily

¹ Paper to be presented at ‘Who is Sovereign? Citizenship in Europe and Beyond’ – 18 th International Summer University. ISES (Institute for Social and European Studies) Panel 4.: Citizenship and Sovereignty in Europe. June 23- July 6, 2013. Kőszeg, Hungary

² Projekt web site: <http://www.fp7-myplace.eu/>

³ This summary based on the following paper: Gary Pollock-Hilary Pilkington: The MYPLACE Case Study Approach: A discussion paper. MYPLACE Project Meeting, 27th-29th February 2012, Disley.

dilute hot spots of activity and could potentially underestimate emergent political forms.

The primary consideration when selecting locations is the importance of local factors and the extent to which there are grounds to suspect that particular factors may be associated with young people's receptivity to radicalisation.

Location selection should be systematic at the local level but free from a centrally provided instruction on exactly which criteria to use or the weight that should be given to different criteria. Arising from WP1 the following criteria were suggested as potentially important:

Substantive criteria for selection of locations:

1. Community segregation and perception of minority groups
2. Underlying socio-economic inequalities
3. Civic engagement
4. Political heritage: continuity and discontinuity
5. 'Supply' side: organisation and strategy of radical/populist parties and social movements
6. 'Demand' side: Ideological resonance and local democracy
7. Individual motivations: gender family and community
8. Extent of political engagement/alienation
9. Integration of populist/radical groups with other youth 'subcultures'

Within each geographic area a random sample of young people aged between 16 and 25 would be selected. The target sample size (achieved) for each sample area is 600.

The characteristics of the samples from the three countries⁴

Hungary

For the research location, we suggest two towns, Ózd, with highly disadvantaged economic situation, located in the northeastern industrial area, and Sopron, one of the westernmost locations of Hungary with developed service sector and tourism. If are planning to examine the MYPLACE research problems on two research sub-samples that can be differentiated along the advantageous/disadvantageous dimension, then the proportion of the Roma population is one of the most important criteria for the choice of the two locations for the survey in Hungary. Previous research in sociology,

⁴ The source of the descriptions: Myplace WP3 Field Preparation. Location selection rationales from D3.1 reports.

settlement and economic geography as well as minority sociology have confirmed a close link between the percentage of the Roma population of Hungarian settlements (and regions) and the disadvantaged situation of these settlements according to several indicators (economy, labour market, infrastructure, health care, services). In other words: the larger the proportion of the Roma population is in a settlement (or region), the more disadvantaged the settlement (or region), and vice versa.

A third aspect that was relevant for this selection is that both survey locations lie close to the country's border. Sopron is located near the border between Hungary and Austria, whereas Ózd lies near the border between Hungary and Slovakia. Cross-border economic and touristic activity originating from the highly developed Austria is beneficial for Sopron, whereas that from the less developed Slovakia tends to have an adverse effect on Ózd.

The fourth aspect relevant to this choice is the impact of the fall of socialism. Sopron, which is located in the Western part of the country and relies on traditional and wellness tourism, manufacturing and services has rather benefited from this political change, whereas Ózd, which lies in the industrial region in the Northern part of the country and which is based on large-scale industry and mining, has clearly suffered because of it (due to the total collapse of metallurgic industry and mining).

Additional typical differences between the two towns:

- Sopron is connected to a highway, Ózd is not.
- Sopron has historical and civic traditions. In Ózd, it is missing, Ózd is a typical socialist industrial town.
- in Sopron, there are several secondary schools and university faculties, while in Ózd, there are only two secondary schools.

Slovakia

The selection of localities was based on the fact that the most important factors for the growth of extremism and radicalism is social and economic deprivation of regions and communities on one hand, and the possibility of potential ethnic conflicts on the other hand. The given factors played a crucial role in the selection of relevant localities.

As for both given characteristics, the selected localities differ significantly. On one hand, there is the city Trnava with a homogenous ethnic structure and a relatively low level of social and economic deprivation, and on the other hand, there is the district of Rimavska Sobota, which is characterized by a high ethnic heterogeneity rate as well as, considering Slovak conditions, an above-the-average level of social and economic deprivation.

In order to provide a better description, in the table below you can find some more attributes related to the particular areas (political inclinations in parliamentary

elections, the level of civil participation expressed by the participation in the most recent communal elections).

Additional typical differences between the two locations:

- unemployment rate: city Tranava (7.2%), district of Rimavská Sobota (34.2%)
- average nominal monthly income: city Tranava (934 Eur), district of Rimavská Sobota (539 Eur)
- ethnic structure of the population, rate of Slovak nationality: city Tranava (96.7%), district of Rimavská Sobota (50.8 %, 42.5% of Hungarian nationality, 4.8% of Roma nationality)

Croatia

In selecting the locations the Croatian team were guided by several factors. First, based on the available literature and empirical data on young people's political and social participation in Croatia, as well as the potential and propensity for radical ideas, they concluded that the most important factors that influence young people's receptivity to radical agendas in Croatia are:

Firstly, community segregation/cohesion (especially the degree of contact with immigrants, ethnic and religious minorities) and socio-economic inequalities (including levels of education and unemployment, but also socio-economic issues related to the 1991-1995 Homeland War, war veterans and war refugees).

Second, given the fact that different parts (regions) of the country had very different (recent) historical experiences, where some regions were completely devastated during the Homeland War 1991-1995, and others were left almost "intact" – we were concerned that choosing two locations geographically remote from one another would also raise the issue of their historical past, which in turn could present a problem where it would be difficult to make a meaningful and un-biased comparison.

Third, considering the WP4 field survey, which requires a random sample (and therefore a robust sample frame), we concluded that profiling information would be most easily available for administrative units (e.g. "city districts" or "municipalities").

Based on these criteria, the Croatian team ultimately decided on two locations which are both in Zagreb (the capital of Croatia). Zagreb is a single administrative unit, divided into 17 "city districts", each of which consists of several smaller "local committees". They chose two (out of these 17) city districts for our 2 research locations. These two districts (Podsljeme and Pescenica) are not adjacent; and are very different in socio-economic as well as demographic terms. Data from the latest Census (2011).

Additional typical differences between the two districts:

- social and economic conditions : district of Podsljeme (this city district in Zagreb is located in the north part of the town. This is a rather peaceful, in economic terms prosperous, mostly residential area (we might say “upscale” although it is not the most elite part of the city); district of Pescenica (this city district in Zagreb is located in the south-east part of the town. Could be described as a “troubled” part of the city: it is a poorer city district, mostly (but not exclusively) industrial, ethnically mixed.
- community segregation/cohesion: district of Podsljeme (ethnically homogeneous: 0.4% Bosniacs, other ethnic minorities under 0.2% each; religiously homogeneous: 95.1% Catholic Church, 2.9% atheists/agnostics); district of Pescenica (“multi-ethnic” (86.5% Croats, 3.4% Serbs, 2.3% Bosniacs, 1.3% Roma , 0.7% Albanians, 0.4% Slovenes, other ethnic minorities under 0.2% each; religiously heterogeneous, 81.4% Catholic Church 6.1% Islamic Religious Community, 3.3% Orthodox Church, 0.3% Jehovah’s Witnesses, (all other religions under 0.2% each), 8.1% atheists/agnostics).
- percentage of immigrants: district of Podsljeme 0.7%, district of Pescenica 3.2%.
- underlying socio-economic inequalities: percentage who have only completed primary school or less: 26.6% (district of Podsljeme), 31.3% (district of Pescenica) of inhabitants aged 15 and over; percentage of unemployed : 5.5% (district of Podsljeme), 8.4% (district of Pescenica).

The questionnaire of survey research

During the survey research, the same questionnaire was used at the locations (28 locations in 14 countries) selected on the basis of the reasoning presented briefly above. The development of the finalized questionnaire was preceded by lengthy consultations, for the comparability of results during the operationalization we relied in many cases on questions from surveys of previous researches in Europe (eg. European Social Survey).

The thematic blocks of the common questionnaire are as follows:

1. Political interest, political participation and civic engagement.
2. Social networks, gender relationships and sexuality.
3. Religion.
4. Attitudes towards minority groups.
5. Understanding of democracy, violence and human rights.
6. History and memory.
7. Socio-demographic profile.

The "Habsburg -cluster"

At the time of the start of Myplace project, during the first working meeting (kick-off meeting) the possibility was suggested to analyze (also) the combined research findings of the three countries connected both from historical and geographical perspectives. Based on the apt naming of a researcher in the British team - who happens to be of Russian origin – we established the "Habsburg cluster." The option of joint analysis could be justified lengthily but right now we are stressing just a few important arguments:

1. In historical and cultural terms, countries located east of the River Elbe are classified as Central-Eastern Europe, but they belong to the Western culture - separated from the Orthodox Eastern European and Balkan countries. Beyond the Geographical Central and Eastern Europe, Croatia (and the three Baltic states: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) can be included as well.

2. We can speak about Slovakia as an independent state only from the twentieth century. The Hungarian and Slovak common history is still interpreted by different narratives in the two countries but no doubt in the context of historical Hungary, the life and fate of the Hungarian and the Slovak peoples were closely entwined for a thousand years.

3. Hungary has had a common history with Croatia for more than 800 years: between the years 1102 and 1918 Croatia was in union with the Kingdom of Hungary.

The relevance of civic identity

It could be argued at great length why we are dealing with civic identity during the first analysis of the common database of the three countries (Habsburg-cluster). We believe that the essence is included in two sentences of the abstract of an excellent study and in an answer to a question from the web:

1. "Over the entire existence of the Slovak historical science, the formation of Slovak 'national consciousness' has been always considered a research topic of great importance. It is a quite typical phenomenon in the region of Central Europe, characterized by a complex, delicate, and constantly changing intersection of political, ethnic, national, linguistic, religious, cultural borders, and contexts, producing various competing collective identities." (Hudek, 2011: 257).

2. Question: My grandfather was born in the Ipoly area (now Slovakia) in 1913 and he died in the same place in 1995. He didn't move away anywhere, which countries did he live in? Answer: between 1913 and 1918 in The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, between 1918 and 1920 in Hungary, between 1920 and 1938 in Czechoslovakia, between 1938 and 1946 in Hungary, between 1946 and 1992 in Czechoslovakia and from 1993 in Slovakia.

One of the questions in the questionnaire of the survey research related to the structure of the national identity. Extensive social science literature shows why there is a privileged role of the two ideal types of national identity (cultural nation - state

nation) and of the issue of belonging to a national and civic community in Central and Eastern Europe (Hagendoor et al. 2000 Csepel et al. 2000 Bellamy , 2003; Sekulic, 2004).

Results

The question in the questionnaire examined the assessment of citizens' membership in their community based on four criteria, two of which are better suited to the culture-state (language and origin), while the other two are better suited to the nation-state (birth and right) nation concepts.

Table 1. "Some people say the following things are important for being a citizen of [COUNTRY]. Others say that they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is?" (means of 0-100 scale; 0: not important at all, 100: very important)

	HU sample	SLOV sample	CROA sample
To be able to speak [THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE] *	83	82	78
To respect [COUNTRY] political institutions and laws*	83	77	70
To have at least one [COUNTRY] parent*	74	70	63
To have been born in [COUNTRY] * A három szignifikánsan eltér egymástól a szlováktól, SZlovák, Magyar nem □ gy nemrégén megjelent társadalomtörténeti folyóir	68	71	64

* One-Way ANOVA, $p \leq 0.001$

Based on the preference of criteria, Croats were significantly different from the Hungarian and Slovak results which latter were very similar to each other: Croatian young people find the criteria less important than the Hungarians and Slovaks.

In all the three countries, the averages transformed to a hundred-point scale show that the support of the language criteria is the most significant, followed by the respect for political and legal frameworks. The other two conditions for citizenship - even if not significantly - are considered to be less important in the three countries.

In the thinking of young people supporting differently the culture-state (language, origin) or the nation-state (right of birth) criteria of citizenship, civic identity did not separate to interpretable types. After the "failed" statistical attempts (factor analysis) we formed two index that helped to characterize the two types of civic identity. The Ethnic citizen index was created by merging the variables related to the language and origin criteria, while for the Civil citizen index the variables related to

the legal and birth criteria were used. Both index can range from 0 to 100: with respect to a group, the larger the index value, the more specific is the given civic identity.

Table 2. Types of civic identity - national sub-samples
(means of 0-100 index scale; 0: not important at all, 100: very important)

	Ethnic citizen index*	Civil citizen index *
Hungarian sample	78	83
Slovakian sample	76	79
Croatian sample	70	74

* One-Way ANOVA, $p \leq 0.001$

From the three countries youth in Croatia is the most, youth in Hungary is the least characterized by the openness of civic identity, in other words, the Croats consider the conditions of citizenship the least and Hungarians the most important.

The difference of the three sub-samples obviously depends on several factors. Below we will examine to what extent youth living in different residential environments are characterized by the closeness or openness of civic identity.

The three national samples examined so far consist of residential sub-samples selected by the same logic. For the sake of simplicity, from now on we will call these advantageous and disadvantageous environmental sub-samples.

The average of civic identity index of the sub-samples indicating an advantageous or a disadvantageous socialization environment differ considerably (significantly) in two countries: compared to the advantageous residential sample, the civic identity type related to the ethnic nation concept describes the Hungarian youth living in a disadvantageous environment significantly better. In contrast, a reverse tendency can be observed among the Slovak young people, people living in an advantageous environment are characterized more by ethnic civic identity.

Table 3. Types of civic identity - sub-samples by country
(means of 0-100 index scale; 0: not important at all, 100: very important)

		Ethnic citizen index	Civil citizen index
Hungarian**	advantageous subsample (Sopron)	74	81
	disadvantageous subsample (Ózd)	82	84
Slovakian**	advantageous subsample (Trnava)	82	81
	disadvantageous subsample (Rimavska Sobota)	69	78
Croatian	advantageous subsample (Podsljeme)	72	75
	disadvantageous subsample (Pescenica)	68	73

Independent-Samples T Test, 2 tailed, * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.001$

The national or ethnic group the respondent claims to belong to is likely to play a crucial role from the socio-cultural determinants of ethnic civic identity. In the total sample of the three countries, the proportion of young people who classified themselves as a national or ethnic minority group is 12 percent. The Croatian sample practically consists of respondents of majority only, while the Hungarian sample has a significant proportion of gypsies, and in the Slovak sample there is a significant proportion of Hungarian nationality.⁵

In accordance with the principles of sampling the proportion of minorities is substantial in the disadvantageous residential sub-samples: the ratio of ethnic minorities (Gypsies) in the Hungarian sample and the ratio of national minorities (Hungarians) in the Slovak sample.

Table 4. Proportions of minorities - sub-samples by country
(percentage)

Hungarian	advantageous subsample (Sopron)	4
	disadvantageous subsample (Ózd)	31
Slovakian	advantageous subsample (Trnava)	1
	disadvantageous subsample (Rimavska Sobota)	34
Croatian	advantageous subsample (Podsljeme)	1
	disadvantageous subsample (Pescenica)	2

The ethnic citizen index averages characteristic of the ethnic (Gypsy) and national (Hungarian nationality) minorities and majorities (Hungarian and Slovak) in the Hungarian and Slovak disadvantageous residential sub-samples show interesting trends.

1. For the Hungarian young people claiming their Roma nationality besides the Hungarian, the ethnic Hungarian civic identity is characterized by the same degree (85 points) as the young people belonging to the Hungarian majority (81 points). Among young Gypsies the average of the joint index is slightly higher, but the difference is not significant.

2. Slovak young people claiming to belong to the Hungarian national minority besides their Slovak nationality were characterized significantly less by the Slovak ethnic civic identity (54 points) than the young people of Slovak majority (77 points).

⁵ The ethnic distribution of the national samples: Croatian sample: Croatian (95%), other (3%), lack of response (2%). Hungarian sample: Hungarian (78%), Gypsy (15%), National minority (1%), Jewish (0.1%), lack of response (6%). Slovak sample: Slovak (82%), Hungarian (15%), Gypsy (2%), Czech (0.1%), lack of response: 1 (%).

Table 5. Characteristics of ethnic civic identity - disadvantageous environmental subsamples (means of 0-100 index scale; 0: not important at all, 100: very important)

	Majority sub-sample	Minority sub-sample
disadvantageous Hungarian subsample (Ózd)	81	85
disadvantageous Slovakian subsample (Rimavska Sobota) **	77	54

Independent-Samples T Test, 2 tailed, * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.001$

The Hungarian ethnic civic identity of Hungarian young people claiming to belong to the Gypsy minority and living in a disadvantageous socialization environment doesn't seem to differ from the ethnic civic identity of the Hungarian majority. The ethnic group membership is not (significantly) associated with a different civic identity. In contrast with this, the Hungarian national minority status for a Slovak citizen is associated with a clearly weaker majority (Slovak) ethnic civic identity: compared to the young people of majority (Slovak), for the Slovak Hungarian youth the criteria related to the ethnic nation conception (language, origin) are significantly less important conditions of Slovak citizenship.

How can we explain the differing results? It is important to emphasize that the question in the questionnaire concerned the judgment of the four criteria of civic group membership, ie. by which conditions do the respondents as citizens define citizenship.

For the Gypsies in Hungary the Hungarian language and Hungarian origin is as important (slightly, but not significantly even more important) as for the non-Gypsies. Even two strategies are possible behind the intensive support of the language and origin conditions of the membership in Hungarian citizens' community: 1. the community of Hungarian citizens is separated from the Roma community, where the inclusion of the Roma is logically difficult (Gypsy language and origin are considered a priority before the Hungarian language and origin) or 2. Roma nationality and Hungarian citizenship are not mutually exclusive group memberships, the assimilation has taken place, Hungarian nationality and its condition of language or origin are important for Gypsies.

For the Hungarians in Slovakia, Slovakian language and origin are considerably (significantly) less important criteria of Slovak citizenship than for the Slovaks. One possible explanation for this is that the admitted belonging to the Hungarian nation "overwrites" the importance of Slovak ethnic civic identity: the legal status of Slovak citizenship is a consequence of history (Trianon), thus the voluntary and decisive Hungarian national identity naturally excludes the support of Slovakian language and origin even as the criteria for Slovak citizenship. The other logically possible explanation is - similarly to the Hungarian Gypsies - based on assimilation: due to the dual (Slovakian Hungarian and Slovakian Slovak) identity, the membership of Hungarian nation is compatible with Slovak citizenship. As a result, the Slovakian

language and origin are not really important for the ethnic Slovak civic identity, as the absence of these two criteria would exclude the commitment to Slovak citizenship.

The different explanations possible of the survey results regarding the identity are due to the history of Central Europe. We do not have to wait long for the empirical justification of the relevant explanations on the basis of qualitative interviews, case studies and research findings regarding the local communities of the survey sites in the framework of Myplace project. But that is the topic of a different presentation.

References

- Adam Hudek (2011): *Between Czechs and Hungarians: Constructing the Slovak National Identity from 19th Century to the Present*. *History Compass*, Volume 9. Issue 4, 257-268.p.
- Alex J. Bellamy (2003): *The formation of Croatian national identity. A centuries-old dream?* Manchester University Press. Manchester and New York.
- Csepeli, Gy., Örkény, A., Székelyi, M. (2000): *Grappling with national identity : how nations see each other in Central Europe*. Szalay, É. (transl.) Budapest: Akadémiai.
- Hagendoorn, L., Csepeli, Gy., Dekker, H., Farnen, R., (eds.) (2000): *European Nations and nationalism : theoretical and historical perspectives*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sekulic, Dusko (2004): *Civic and Ethnic Identity: The Case of Croatia*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27. vol. May 3. no. 455–483. p.