BABEŞ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY CLUJ NAPOCA

FACULTY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK

PhD Thesis Summary

The construction of reality through media discourse

The construction of ethnic identity through the media discourse

- The case of Roma from Romania -

Supervisor:

Prof. Univ. Dr. Traian Rotariu

PhD Candidate:

Daniela Tarnovschi

2014

Cluj Napoca

Content:

I. Introduction

Assumptions, objective and hypothesis

The object of the research – Mass media discourse

The Other /Alter

II. Us and Them – Social identity / Ethnic identity / Ethnic identity of a minority group

From individual identity to social identity

The relation between identity – individuality and society

Social identity theory

The conditions for group formation

Minority group

Ethnic identity, a form of social identity

Ethnic identity definitions – short history

The relation between ethnicity and nationalism

The relation between ethnicity and race

Different approaches of ethnic identity

Primordialism

Instrumentalism

Constructivism

Postmodernism

Social constructivism

Ethnic ideology

Ethnic identity of minority group, a special form of ethnic identity

Toward a definition of ethnic identity

III. Roma ethnic identity – past and present

Present situation of Roma minority

The new Roma identity

Identity management

Conclusions

IV. Mass media influence on ethnic identity

Mass media influence

General considerations

Different approaches

The approach

Mass media and Critical Discourse Analysis

Proprieties of mass communication or mass media

The economy of mass media

The politics of mass media

The practices of producing and consuming the text/mass media discourse

Socio-cultural context

The theories about mass media and nationalism

Mass media and minority groups

Short history of mass media research – ethnocentrism, nationalism and racism

Mass media consumption in Romania

V. Discourse analysis – the role and the place of discourse in identity construction

Short history of discourse analysis

Three different approaches of discourse analysis

a). The theory of discourse - Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe

b). Discoursive pshychology - Edwards, Potter, Wetherell, etc

c). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) - Fairclough, van Dijk, Wodak, etc

Remarcs

VI. The analysis of mass media discourse about Roma ethnic identity

The analytic tool

Roma ethnic identity in discourse – Mass media analysis

VII. Conclusions

Annexes

Glossary of terms

Example of monitoring made by MEDIAFAX

References

ABSTRACT. My research project aims to respond to the question: how does mass media build a minority ethnic identity (Roma ethnic identity)? Guided by the premises and tools developed within the Critical Discourse Analysis, I have attempted to capture the action dimension of media discourse – what discourse does. Lately, as result of efforts made in time, mass media (but also politicians) in Romania, has been careful to use politically correct language when it comes to presenting/ reflecting minority individuals/ groups. At the same time, in a more or less informed manner, we witness a process of building a new ethnic identity (Roma ethnic identity) in a context in which well-known ethnic identities are undergoing a continuous reconstruction process. Mass media is an important actor because it disseminates and promotes/ reproduces meanings and power relations in society through messages transmitted in a certain language about different topics/ individuals/ issues. Within the present research, I have attempted to identify the manner in which mass media builds/ presents a (strongly negatively discriminated) minority ethnic group, to identify new strategies used for reproducing power relations, and also to highlight the effect these images about an ethnic group may have on audiences of mass media messages. I have thus identified three identity typologies used in mass media to represent the Roma (the normative, the marginal/poor and the normal ethnic identity) and I have coupled them with the effects they may have at the level of receivers (exclusion, acceptance, inclusion). The conclusion is that despite the politically correct language used, mass media manages to transmit and promote the power relations and implicitly the negative stereotypes, thus acting as a barrier in the social inclusion process of Romanian citizens of Roma ethnicity.

KEY TERMS: identity, social identity, ethnic identity, construction of ethnic identity, elements of ethnic identity, Roma ethnic group, discourse analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis.

Summary of the doctoral thesis

My research project aims to respond to the question: how does mass media build a minority ethnic identity (Roma ethnic identity). Guided by the premises and tools developed within the Critical Discourse Analysis, I have attempted to capture the action dimension of media discourse – what discourse does. Lately, as result of efforts made in time, mass media (but also politicians) in Romania, has been careful to use politically correct language when it comes to presenting/ reflecting minority individuals/ groups. At the same time, in a more or less informed manner, we witness a process of building a new ethnic identity (Roma ethnic identity) in a context in which well-known ethnic identities are undergoing a continuous reconstruction process.

Mass media may provide information about the social meanings and stereotypes reflected through language and communication, as well as about the reflection and influence upon the emergence and expression in culture, politics and social life. Mass media spreads stereotypes and ideas, assigns meaning, builds and represents individuals, groups and masses. The elements of ethnic identity and the context (internal, group specific and/or external) in which ethnic identity is produced and reproduced are revealed, among others, in discourse and language. Ethnic identity is the product of a continuous negotiation/ construction/ deconstruction process, which is partly discursive precisely because social interactions are enacted through discourse. Mass media steps in to "decide" whether to propagate a certain discourse about a specific ethnic identity so that certain "images" about a group get disseminated and covered in the media, with higher chances to reach out widely and then become interiorized by audiences.

In the present research I relied on three premises: ethnic identity is socially constructed within a continuous negotiation and renegotiation process between an ethnic group and the external world; language is a social practice which, through manners of action, representations and embodiment, contributes to the representation and construction of social identities, because to represent another individual is a social practice; mass media discourse is not a mirror reflection of reality, but rather it represents/ constructs reality (and also ethnic identities) as it depends on the conditions that define production, dissemination and reception.

The general objective of my thesis is to identity the ways in which mass media builds Roma ethnic identity, with a view to develop and test an analysis instrument.

I started off from two major hypotheses:

If mass media uses a politically correct language when it designates a minority group (an ethnic group in this case), then there are few chances that the message will transmit a negative stereotype of said group.

If a minority group (ethnic group in this case) is negatively presented by mass media, then the effects of this manner of presentations are the exclusion/rejection of said group from society.

I worded a few working questions: is the image transmitted by mass media stereotyped and racist even when it is constructed in a politically correct language? Is otherness (Roma) presented/ represented by mass media through the prism of stereotypes that the majority has about it? How is the personage belonging to a discriminated minority constructed in mass media discourse? What effects does this construction have on the represented group? Does mass media construct a "normal" or "exotic" Roma ethnic identity?

I. We and They – Social identity / ethnic identity / ethnic identity of a minority group

The first chapter includes the analysis of the relationship between individual identity, social identity and ethnic identity. It is not easy to define identity, to provide a conceptualization and a shared understanding of the notion, as many researchers offer different approaches to the same phenomenon. Philosophy, psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, history, political sciences, linguistics, and legal studies have shown interest for this concept precisely due to its increasingly frequent use, both in everyday life and in mass communication. To further complicate things, the concept of identity is related to many other important concepts (in our existence): personal identity, social identity, individual identity, group identity, collective identity, cultural identity, ethnic identity, national identity, corporate identity, gender identity, etc.

In psychology, the debate on individual-society has been placed in the framework of social psychology. Sociology has approached the relation individual-society from two standpoints: social determinism and social change, both related to the issue of the existence of society independent of the individuals that make it up. This latter because, in general, sociology is interested in the social influence upon individual life through culture, social institutions, power structures which stratify society, etc. However, identity is a central concept in social psychology.

There has been a long history of studies about self-concept and identity, as well as the oppositions/ relation between the individual and the social, individual identity and social identity.

Starting from social psychology, more specifically from psychological sociology (if I may say so), the theory of social identity emerged in an attempt to explicitly address the relationship between the individual and society. The major theoretical premise is that individual identity and social identity are situated at opposite ends of a spectrum, belonging to the same unifying identity (H. Tajfel). Turner (1982: 18) finds social identity as the sum total of social identifications used by a person to define herself, which may, under certain circumstances, go as far as the exclusion of personal identity, the dominating self-image relaying exclusively or mainly on group membership.

This perspective is often used to explain ethnocentrism within the minimal group paradigm. In addition, its two promoters Turner and Tajfel discuss multiple social identities as individual self-concepts derived from the perception of adhesion to certain social groups. Moreover, the need for positive distinctivity is "blamed" for the appearance of a "we". In the theory of social identity, concepts such as identification, categorization and comparison were (sociologically) launched to facilitate better understanding of stereotypes and the need of group belonging. Tajfel is among the first to theorize the connection between individual identity and social identity as items on a spectrum, in which personal identity is at one end of the axis and social identity at the other one, accounting for continuous interindividual-intergroup behavior. Other researchers, however, present this relationship in other forms, opening up the discussion about group formation circumstances and the feeling of belonging. The same Tajfel and then Turner, followed by others, launched the debate about minority group identity.

Ethnic identity is a form of social identity. In time, numerous definitions have been used, each attempting to best capture particularities. The relationships between ethnicity and nationalism, and then race have all been considered. Many academic discourses have tried to explain the origins and the power of ethnic identity, the source and degree of commitment to a certain ethnic group: primordialism, instrumentalism, constructivism, postmodernism, and social constructivism. I decided to pursue social constructivism which posits that identity is a key element of subjective reality and, like any subjective reality, it is in a dialectic relationship with society. Identity is shaped through social processes (Berger and Luckmann 1999: 200).

"Ethnicity and race are not mere labels pinned on people, but identities that people accept, resist, choose, specify, invent, redefine, reject, defend and so on" (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998: 77).

After having analyzed several theories, I decided to consider identity as the result of interaction between the individual and her social and physical environment, an outcome of the convergence between internal and external factors, between subjectivity and objectivity. An individual's identity is not fixed, nor set or homogenous, but constructed and reconstructed in time, depending on the situation the individual encounters and the forces that act upon her. The definition I adopted states that ethnic identity is social, collective, socially constructed as an outcome of continuous interaction between attribution-categorization and affirmation-identification, through the articulation-construction-identification of dimensions upon which one can lay down pretended cultural similarities and differences to compare oneself with those in one's group and those outside of it, and to build boundaries – symbolically loaded social-ethnic barriers of separation.

I have looked into the processes involved in ethnic identity construction – self-identification and external categorization, as well as the series of social interactions that produce and reproduce identity: primary socialization, routine public interaction, sexual relations, community social relations, membership in informal groups, marriage and family, business relations, employment, administrative allocation, organization policies, official classification. I have taken into account elements involved in the ethnogenesis of a group divided by Cornell and Hartman (1998) in two broad categories: external factors (circumstantial: social conditions, legislation, local and international public policies, etc.) and internal ones (group-specific, chosen identities, accepted identities, invented identities, rejected identities, actively defended identities, etc.). Also the major links that keep together group members: self-awareness of belonging to a certain ethnic/racial group, shared interest, shared institutions, shared culture.

II. Roma ethnic identity – past and present

In this quite short chapter I have tried to focus especially on the project of constructing a new Roma ethnic identity. I have reviewed the beginnings and the trends and stopped to consider the stakeholders involved in the process and in the identity management that is being implemented. There are not too many publications or research papers dedicated to this issue; the analysis of Roma ethnic identity construction is an infrequent topic in the public space.

III. Mass media influence on ethnic identity

In chapter three I approached the leading stakeholder being analyzed: mass media, and its influence on receivers/audiences. I reviewed major research papers on the influence of mass media, then I looked into the concept of mass media as promoted in the Critical Discourse Analysis, a trend in discourse analysis I have adopted.

I focused on the concept and perspectives discussed: from the characteristics of mass communication to mass media economy, media policies, followed by practices in the production and consumption of text/media discourse, ending with the socio-cultural context.

I could not overlook in this chapter the theories on mass media and nationalism: I focused on theoreticians that I considered as major voices in the field. Then I looked into the relationship between mass media and minority groups. The studies that explore this issue are rather numerous, so I tried to concentrate on those that may prove useful for my efforts. In order to narrow down the area, I briefly highlighted the history of research into the relations between mass media, ethno-centrism, nationalism and racism, carried out within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis. Then, using data about mass media consumption in Romania and about the level of trust in mass media, I further narrowed down my field of research. Making use of survey data, I attempted to illustrate the manner in which the Roma in Romania are perceived.

IV. Discourse Analysis – the place and role of discourse in identity building

In chapter four I presented a short history of discourse analysis, and then I introduced and discussed three different approaches: discourse theory (Laclau and Mouffe); discursive psychology (Edwards, Potter, Wetherell); and Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, van Dijk, Wodak).

Phillips & Jorgensen (2002) articulate very well the shared aspects of the three approaches: 1. Language is not a reflection of pre-existing reality; 2. Language is structured in models and discourses; there is no one system of meanings but there are series of systems or discourses, and meaning changes from one discourse to the other; 3. Discursive models are maintained and transformed in discursive practices; and 4. Model preservation and transformation must be explored through the analysis of certain contexts in which language is enacted.

For each of the three approaches, I shortly presented the concept about discourse and the concept about social and identity. Critical Discourse Analysis is the approach presented in the last part, but to this I dedicated the broadest space as I found that this can provide the most adequate theoretical and analytical framework for my approach.

I focused on the three elements that combine in social identity: categorization, identification and comparison. I considered that discourse is important in shaping social self-identity but also in shaping the image – the social identity of the other (used for comparison), the two images being in a continuous relationship conditioning one another, non-existent without the Other[1].

V. Mass media discourse analysis about Roma ethnic identity

In this chapter, dedicated to introducing the mass media discourse analysis instrument, and also its application, I attempted to respond to the challenge: how is an ethnic identity presented in the press, how is an ethnic group or its ethnic identity presented/ constructed in mass media discourse? I kept, however, the line of critical discourse analysis and I pursued the identification of effects that mass media discourse has on the construction/presentation of a certain ethnic group.

Along a constructivist line, I conceptualized identity as the outcome of interaction between the individual and the (social and physical) environment, a result of the convergence between internal and external factors, between subjectivity and objectivity. An individual's identity is not fixed, nor set or homogenous, but constructed and reconstructed in time, depending on the situation the individual encounters and on the forces that act upon him.

Ethnic identity is a form of collective identity, a social identity, one of the multiple identities of an individual, which can vary depending on the situation as well as in absolute terms. It is a collective identity that is socially built at the crossroads between attribution-categorization, comparison and affirmation-identification, through the articulation/ construction/ identification of (objective and subjective) dimensions/elements/features upon which pretended similarities and differences can emerge, invested with ethnic significance used for comparison with those in one's own group and those outside it and the continuous construction/reconstruction of boundaries – symbolically marked social-ethnic barriers of

---

[1] The Other is capitalized to designate the other group, an absolute *Alter* which at the same time is also relative.

separation between groups, which are socially produced and reproduced. The ethnic category is historically defined but the ethnic group is internally defined (Jenkins 1994, 1998:20), which does not mean that the Other does not matter in the continuous definition/construction of an ethnic group, as ethnicity is a matter of contrast (Cornell and Hartman, 1998).

The ethnic group (as defined by Jenkins 1998) is a collectivity that states the existence of dimensions/elements/features of distinct similarity and difference marked with ethnic meaning, a group that becomes an "imaginary community", developing a certain ethnic group ideology, a consortium which thus constructs its distinctiveness and demarcation lines from other groups.

In discourse analysis, I took into account the fact that text/discourse not only reflects the world, but it also constructs it (J. L. Austin, How to do things with words, Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP. 1962), has an impact on it, it builds reality and – more importantly – it confers meanings. Language is that through which the author (here the journalist) structures and at the same time builds her own world, which is presented to the audiences.

As shown above in the chapters discussing ethnic identity and minority group ethnic identity, it is true that a group defines itself (defines its group identity) by comparison with other groups through exacerbating differences between Us and Alter, but also through negativizing (rarely do we encounter pozitivizing[2]) the Other.

My approach focuses not on the grammatical details of discourse, but rather on the lexical ones – how the Roma are presented, what words are used in discourse to present the Roma. However I have not ignored a very important aspect: context – who says so (because in an article the journalist is not the only one who speaks), what authority the speaker has and what he or she does, what are his or her actions within the discourse, and what actions effect the Roma. I will not discuss in detail the importance of a certain manner of presentation of the Roma in mass media, especially given the discrimination which members of this ethnic group encounter on a daily basis, and the fact that we witness a process of identity awakening, of identity

---

[2] Pozitivizing (≠ negativizing) in the present context is the process by which the positive features (positive stereotypes) are used. It is the case of Germans in Romania who are considered by Romanians (according to the Barometer of Ethnic Relations, Ethno Cultural Diversity Resource Center, November 2001) to be civilized, hardworking, intelligent and entrepreneurial. These are positive stereotypes that have persisted and will persist in the collective imaginary.

reconstruction which, in my view, should be supported because in time it will yield positive effects for the social inclusion of this ethnic minority.

I have to admit that in my analysis and in the development of the instrument, I did not want to exceed the level of microanalysis – analysing sentence structure (words, syntax) – for reasons articulated above. To these elements of analysis I added others, inspired by content analysis: assessment of the presentation of a personage in an article; the evaluation a journalist makes when presenting a personage in his/her article[3]; framing the presentation of an ethnic group (the general topic of the article and the issue connected to the Roma).

The methods of construction I identified rely on the definition of ethnic identity: a collective identity constructed socially at the crossroads between attribution-categorization, comparison and affirmation-identification through the articulation/construction/identification of (objective and subjective) dimensions/elements/features from which pretended similarities and differences emerge (cultural differences are only relevant through interaction, as the ratio between ethnicity and culture is not 1:1, cultural features being changeable in time), invested with ethnic meaning used for comparison with those in one's own group and those outside it and the continuous construction/reconstruction of boundaries-social ethnic barriers of separation between symbolically marked groups, which are socially produced and reproduced.

I have attempted to identify the manner in which similarities are constructed, what kind of similarities these are, what features, what significance they are endowed with, what differences are pointed out and what significance is attributed to these differences. I have considered the following: standard of living, normative (norms and values), cultural (which also includes historic differences), political (affirmation of the new ethnic identity accompanied by a political dimension). These will be elaborated on and explained in the framework of the analysis.

In the course of the analysis I took into account the following elements:

- The journalistic genre;
- The general topic of the article;
- The topic in the article in which the Roma ethnicity is mentioned:
- The interest for Roma ethnicity (the article is exclusively dedicated to the Roma, the article touches upon the Roma, Roma ethnicity is mentioned in the article):

---

[3] While in opinion journalism the journalist does an evaluation and commits to the idea, in other journalistic genres which require objectivity from the people of the press, judgment should not be passed.

- The general evaluation of ethnicity in the article;
- The evaluation of Roma ethnicity done by the journalist; the ethnonyms "Roma" and "Gypsy" and their significance in the article;
- Whether the ethnonym "Roma" is used as a synonym for the ethnonym "Gypsy";
- Irrelevant reference to ethnicity;
- The evaluation of activities done by the Roma;
- Voice (quote or paraphrase) and authority of the Roma ethnic personages in the article;
- Voice (quote or paraphrase) and authority of the Other in the article; who categorizes the Roma protagonist (who places her in an ethnic category);
- Normative differences, differences in standards of living, culture, affirmation of ethnic political identity;
- How the Other acts upon the Roma ethnic protagonist;
- How the journalist evaluates his actions; evaluation of the relationship between the Other and the Roma ethnic protagonist; identity type.

I used the MEDIAFAX monitoring base and studied only the national dailies and periodicals, using the following root words: Roma, Romanes, Rroma, etc.; and Gypsy. The sample was relatively small: 105 articles published in the central press from 1 January 2013 to 31 March 2013.

VI. Conclusions

The instrument I developed was inspired by several authors (Norman Fairclough, Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter, Teun van Dijk, Ruth Wodak), but the objective I pursued consistently was inspired by J. L. Austin's well-known lecture, "How to do things with words" – what words/ speeches do when they present something/ someone. In all of my readings, I tried to discover something that would allow me to identify the borders which separate the "imaginary communities" as Benedict Anderson so eloquently called them.

After years of research and trials, I succeeded in identifying a definition of the ethnic group, which could help me do the discourse analysis subsequent to reading extensively in this field. Having studied publications on the topic of discourse analysis, I arrived at the conclusion that Critical Discourse Analysis is the perspective that I can use to achieve my objective. The various approaches and analyses that I studied inspired me in developing the analysis instrument.

As I have mentioned in the presentation of the instrument of analysis, I did not scrupulously use all the instruments developed by Teun van Dijk, or Norman Fairclough, or Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter, or Ruth Wodak. There was some overlapping, but at the same time, there was an empty space which did not allow me to do the analysis of several discourses in the manner which I desired, and furthermore, to be able to identify the ways of building an ethnic identity of a minority group.

The instrument comprises the analysis of several items and of the relationships between them: the journalistic genre; the general topic of an article; the topic in the article which makes reference to the Roma ethnic group; interest for the Roma (the article is dedicated exclusively to the Roma; the article covers several themes, one of which is the Roma; the Roma are mentioned in the article); the general evaluation of ethnicity in the article; the evaluation of the Roma by the journalist; "Roma" and "Gypsy" ethnonyms and their significance in the article; whether the "Roma" ethnonym in the article becomes synonymous with the „Gypsy" ethnonym; irrelevant reference to ethnicity; evaluation of the activities carried out by Roma people; Voice (quote or paraphrase) and authority of Roma personages in the article; Voice (quote or paraphrase) and authority of Other in the article; who categorizes (places the individual in an ethnic category) the Roma protagonist; normative differences, differences in living standard, cultural aspects and affirmation of political ethnic identity; does the Other act upon the Roma protagonist; how does the journalist evaluate the action; the evaluation of the relationship between the Other and the Roma; identity type.

Starting from the definition of ethnic identity (presented in chapter I), I managed to outline an identity typology which answers the question that was at the basis of the discourse analysis: what is being achieved through the discourse; „What does the journalist do through the image she presents/reflects?" I succeeded in identifying three main identity types: normative identity, marginal identity and normal ethnic identity.

Normative ethnic identity is the identity presented/construed through a discourse that emphasizes the differences between Alter's norms and values and Our norms and values, highlighting the fact that Alter's norms and values are very different and they mismatch the norms and values of democratic society. In this large identity category, I took into consideration the cultural differences between We and Alter (I noticed that it appears more frequently), but the cultural specificity of Alter is taken to the extreme, exoticized and thus withdrawn from the

socially accepted norm. Through this construct/representation of identity, the journalist conveys the message that this ethnic group can in no way be integrated/accepted by society, and consequently the desirable solution is exclusion and rejection (on the grounds that they are a threat to society).

The marginal ethnic identity emerges by insisting on/presenting the differences related to living standards and the associated problems (discrimination, marginalization, poverty). The journalist does not make reference to normative differences (cultural differences are seldom mentioned, but this may be due to the little number of articles analysed), the group is presented as poor, discriminated, marginalized, passive and disempowered, but social integration is possible through the effort of the whole society.

Normal ethnic identity is presented in a discourse that highlights normal cultural differences (considered normal by a society which promotes multiculturalism as a value), but also political identity (as is the case with UDMR – the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania). Similarly to the previous identity category, no reference is made to normative differences between the majority and minority groups. Moreover, the members of the minority group are Voice 1 and have authority (frequently), the protagonists of the minority group are not presented by uniformization, but by differentiation (which is a sign of normality and does not encourage negative stereotyping). Moreover, the members of the minority group are involved (more frequently) in categorization – self-identification with the ethnic group they belong to. In this case, the presentation of the minority group is typical to a society which promotes multiculturalism.

The analysis disproves the second hypothesis (If a minority group - ethnic, in this case - is portrayed in negative terms by mass-media, the effects of this presentation are of exclusion/rejection of the group by society.) The answer to the question that refers to the effects of this identity construct upon the group presented is shown graphically by identifying the three positions of the majority society as a result of the three main identity constructs: exclusion, acceptance and integration.

Normative Identity **EXCLUSION**	→	Marginal/ Underprivileged Identity **ACCEPTANCE**	→	Normal Ethnic Identity **INCLUSION**

The instrument that I developed and tested demonstrates that it is no longer sufficient to signal the ethnonyms/denominations used, associated words, actions in which the protagonists are presented, subjects that present the minority in question in order to identify discriminatory/racist articles. Such analysis fails to capture the effects that a particular identity discourse may have on the group presented.

The Alter's negative and unfavourable image is reached only by using external categorization (hetero-attribution of the category), by presenting a single protagonist – the group as protagonist with no inner diversity; by presenting a group as compact, all abiding by the same values and norms which are opposed to society in general; without a voice and authority (therefore without the possibility of presenting their side of the event); carrying out negative deeds; and being very different from a cultural point of view (up to exotization).

The analysis leads to the conclusion that the first hypothesis (If mass media uses politically correct language in reference to a minority (ethnic, in this case) group there is little chance that the message conveys a negative stereotypical image of the group in question) is also false because negative presentation of a minority group does not automatically imply suggesting that the group is excluded from society if the approach does not touch upon the important elements of group identity. A minority group may be presented as performing/being involved in negative actions by use of derogatory language, but as long as emphasis is not laid on the normative differences and those pertaining to values that separate the minority group from society (assuming that it is a democratic, inclusive, multicultural society in which human rights and diversity are respected), or cultural differences (pushed to the extreme), the discourse in question does not exclude the minority group from society.

The mere counting of the times certain names are used (ethnonyms in this case) is not sufficient to identify the cases of discrimination/racism that appear in the media. Exclusion –

presentation of a group as incompatible with society, and, consequently requiring exclusion - is worse than discrimination, which may have unpleasant consequences to the group in question. This is a covert way of transmitting an extremist ideology. Moreover, a certain ethnonym having derogatory significance ("Gypsy") may be used for self-identification by the very members of the group, some of whom are in authority positions (representative of the minority group in Parliament).

Despite efforts made by governmental and non-governmental organizations, mass media discourse still has a tendency to convey negative stereotypes and hints at excluding the Roma from society. The problem is that these actions are not as visible as they were in the 90's because the control mechanisms of a society that presents itself as democratic, multicultural and inclusive for its citizens are eluded.

References:

Abrams D. (1992). Processes of Social Identification. In G. M. Breakwell (ed.), Social psychology of identity and the self-concept (pp. 9-33). Academic Press: London.

Agger G. (1999). Intertextuality Revisited: Dialogues and Negotiations in Media Studies. Canadian Journal of Aesthetics, 4, 1999.

Anderson B. (1996). Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Verso / New Left Books.

Austin J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Harvard UP: Cambridge (MA).

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. University of Texas Press.

Bañón H. A. (1996). Racismo, discurso periodístico y didáctica de la lengua. Almería: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.

Banton M. (2001). Instrumentalist Theories of Nationalis. In Encyclopedia of Nationalism, 2001. Academic Press.

Barany Z. (2002). The East European Gypsies. Regime Change, Marginality and Ethnopolitics, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Barometrul de Opinie Publică (2003-2006). Fundația pentru o societate deschisă: http://www.fundatia.ro/barometrul-de-opinie-public%C4%83

Barth F. (ed.) (1969). Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Difference. Little, Brown and Company: Boston.

Berger P. L. & Lumann T. (1999). Construirea socială a realității, Editura Univers: București.

Billig M. (1991). Ideology and Opinions. Sage Publications: London.

Billig M. (1996). Arguing and Thinking. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boscoboinik A. (2009). Le jeu des identites rom: dynamism et rigidite. Boscoboinik A. et Ruegg F. (ed.) Nouvelles identites rom en Europe central et orientale. (Vol XLVIII.2) Universite de Geneve, Switzerland.

Boscoboinik A. and Giordano C. (2003). Roma's Identity and the Political Arena. In Memedova A., Plaut S., Boscoboinik A., Giordano C. Roma's Identities in Southeast Europe: Macedonia. Ethnobarometer: Roma.

Brown G., Yule G. (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturală (2001). Barometrului Relațiilor Etnice: http://www.edrc.ro/projects.jsp?project_id=19.

Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturală (2002). Barometrului Relațiilor Etnice: www.edrc.ro.

Chouliaraki L. and Fairclough N. (1999). Discourse in Late Modernity – Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.

Clark C. (1998). Counting backwards: the Roma "numbers game" in Central and Eastern Europe. Radical Statistics, vol. 69, pp. 35–46.

Coman Mihai (coord.) (2009). Manual de Jurnalism. Polirom: Iași

Cornell E. C. and Hartman D. (1998). Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changhing World. Sage Publications.

Couthard M. (1977). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Longman: London.

Coyle, A. (*1992*). 'My own special creation'? The construction of gay *identity*. In Breakwell, G. M. (ed.) *The social psychology of identity and the self concept (pp. 147-186)*. Academic Press (Surrey University Press): London.

Cuilenburg J. J. Van, *Scholten O.*, *Noomen* G.W. (1998). Știința comunicării. Ed. Humanitas: București.

Dâncu V. (2013). Tele-Vremea Țiganilor. http://www.ires.com.ro/articol/241/tele-vremea-tiganilor--perceptii-si-atitudini-fata-de-mediatizarea-decesului-%E2%80%9Cregelui%E2%80%9D-florin-cioaba- accesat la 15.12.2013

Deaux, K. (1992). Personalizing identity and socializing self. In G. M. Breakwell (ed.), Social psychology of identity and the self-concept (pp. 9-33). Academic Press: London.

Deschamps J. C. (1982). Social identity and relations of power between groups. In H. Tajfel (ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations (pp. 85-98). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Deschamps J. C., & Devos T. (1998). Regarding the relationship between social identity and personal identity. In S. Worchel, J.F. Morales, D. Paez, & J.C. Deschamps (Eds.), Social identity: International perspectives (pp. 1-12). Sage Publications: London.

Deutsch K. W. (1953). Nationalism and Social Communication. An Inquiry Into the Foundations of Nationality. The MIT Press

Devitt M., Sterelny K. (2000). Limbaj și realitate. Polirom: București.

Doise W. (1986). Levels of explanation in social psychology. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Edwards, D. et al. (1995). Death and furniture: The rhetoric, politics and theology of bottom line arguments against relativism, History of the Human Sciences, 8, 25-49.

Edwards, D. (1997). Discourse and Cognition. Sage: London.

Edwards, D., Potter, J. (1992). Discursive Psychology. Sage: London.

Eide A. (2001). Cultural Rights as Individual Human Rights. In Eide A., Krause C., Rosas A. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: A Textbook. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers

Eriksen T. H. (1991). The cultural contexts of ethnic differences. Man, vol. 26, no. 1 (1991).

Eriksen T. H. (2002). Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology. Pluto Press: London, Sterling, Virginia.

Erikson E. H. (1959). Identity and the Life Cycle. International Universities Press: New York.

Erjavec K. (2001). Media Representation of the Discrimination against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia. *Discourse Society* November 2001 vol. 12 no. 6 699-727.

Fairclough N. (2000) b. Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of wealfare reform. In Journal of Sociolinguistics, May 2000, vol. 4.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. Longman: London.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and Social Change. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Fairclough, N. (2000) a. New Labour, New Language? Routledge: London.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and Power (2nd edition). Longman: London.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. Routledge: London.

Fairclough N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman: London.

Fairclough N. 1(995). Critical Discourse Analysis. Longman: London.

Fairclough, N.; Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk (ed.) Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2. s. 258-84. Sage: London.

Feys, C (1997): Towards a New Paradigm of the Nation: The Case of the Roma: http://www.geocities.com/~patrin/paradigm.htm.

Forbes J. and Kelly M. (1995). French Cultural Studies: An Introduction. Oxford Univeristy Press: Oxford.

Foucault M. (1971). L'ordre du discours. Gallimard: Paris:.

Ganea L. şi Ulmanu A. B. (2007). Stimularea gândirii critice a jurnaliştilor. Bucureşti: Centrul pentru Jurnalism Independent.

Gellner E. (1983). Nations and Nationalism. Cornell University Press.

Georgakopoulou A., Goustsos D. (1997). Discourse analysis: an introduction. Edinburgh University Press.

Gheorghe N. (1991). Roma-Gypsy ethnicity in Eastern Europe, Social Research, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 829–35

Gheorghe N. (1997). The social construction of Romani identity, in Thomas Acton (ed.), Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity. pp. 153–63University of Hertfordshire Press: Hertfordshire.

Gheorghe N. & Acton T. (1995). Dealing with Multiculturality: Minority, Ethnic, National and Human Rights. In OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, BULLETIN, Spring 1995, Vol. 3 No. 2, Warsaw.

Habermas J. (1989) .The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a category of Bourgeois Society. Polity: Cambridge.

Habermas J. (2005). Teoria Transformării Structurale a Sferei Publice. Ed. Comunicare.ro.

Hall S. (1996). Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies. Routledge: London.

Hansen A., Cottle S., Negrine R., Newbold C. (1998). Mass Communication Research Methods. Palgrave Macmillan

Hobsbawm E. and Ranger T. (ed.) (1983). The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Hogg M. A. and Abrams D. (1988). Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes. Routledge: London.

Horvath I (20012). Etnonimul de rom ca instrument al politicii identitare. În Horvath I. & Nastasă L. (ed.) Rom sau Ţigan. Dilemele unui etnonim în spaţiul românesc. Ed. Institutul pentru Studierea Problematicii Minorităţilor Naţionale: Cluj.

Hutnik N. (1991). Ehnic Minority Identity. A Social Psychological Perspective. Clarendon Press and New Delhi OUP: Oxford.

Jenkins R. (1998). Rethinking ethnicity. Argument and Explorations. Sage Publications Ltd.

Jerman H. (2004) Russians as presented in Finnish TV documentaries, The Global Review of Ethnopolitics 3(2): 79-88.

Jorgensen M. and Plillips L. (2002). Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. Sage Publications: London, Thousand Paks, New Delhi.

Levine D. (ed.) (1971). On Individual and Social Forms: Selected Writings of George Simmel. University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London.

Liebkind K. (1992). Ethnic Identity - Challenging the Boundaries of Social Psychology. In Breakwell, G. M. (ed.) *The social psychology of identity and the self concept (pp. 147-186)*. Academic Press (Surrey University Press): London:.

Martín Rojo, L. (1994). The jargon of delinquents and the study of conversational dynamics, Journal of Pragmatics 21(3): 243-289.

Matouschek, B., Wodak, R., and Januschek, F. (1995). Necessary measures against foreigners?: genesis and forms of racist discourses of difference. Passagen Verlag: Wien:.

Mead G. H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society. University of Chicago Press.

Memedova A., Plaut S., Boscoboinik A., Gordano C. (2005). Roma's Identitites in Southeast Europe: Macedonia. Ethnobarometer: Rome.

Motyl A. J. (ed.) (2001). Encyclopedia of Nationalism. Academic Press.

Nash M. (1989). The Cauldrum of Ethnicity in the Modern World. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

Okely, J. (1997) Some political consequences of theories of Gypsy identity. In Allison James et al. (eds.) After Writing Culture: Epistemology and Praxis in Contemporary Anthropology, pp. 224-243.

Pêcheux M. (1982). Language, semantics and ideology. St. Martin's Press: New York.

Potter, J. (1996) a. Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: Theoretical background. In Richardson, J.E., (Ed), Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences. British Psychological Society: Leicester.

Potter, J. (1996) b. Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction. Sage: London.

Potter, J., Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour, Sage: London.

Potter, J., Wetherell, M. (1988). Accomplishing attitudes: Fact and evaluation in racial discourse. Text - Interdiciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 8(1-2) pp. 51–68.

Puxon G. (2000). The Romani movement: rebirth and the first World Romani Congress in retrospect, in Thomas Acton (ed.), Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle. Commitment in Romani Studies, Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, pp. 94–113.

Reisigl M. and Wodak R. (2001). Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism. Routledge: London and New York.

Renan E. (1997). Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? Mille Et Une Nuits: Paris.

Richardson J. E. (2007). Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis. Palgrave Macmillian.

Riggins S. H. (1997). The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Rochardson J. E. (2007). Analysing Newspapers. An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis. Palgrave Macmillan.

Romani Criss (2007). Imaginea minorității rome în presa națională şi locală. Bucureşti.

Roosens E. E. (1989). Creating Ethnicity. The Process of Ethnogenesis. Frontiers of Anthropology, Volume 5. SAGE Publications.

Smith A. D. (2001). Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Stewart, M. (1997). Time of the Gypsies (Boulder and Oxford: Westview)

Stewart, M. (1998). Brothers and Orphans: Two egalitarian models of community among Hungarian Rom. In Stewart, M., Day, S., Papataxiarchis, E. (Eds.). Lillies of the Field: Marginal People who live for the moment (pp.27-44). Boulder Westview.

Stubbs M. (1983). Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human Groups and Social Categories. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Instrumentality, identity and social comparisions. In H. Tajfel (ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations (pp. 483-508). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Tajfel, H. (ed.). (1978). Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. Academic Press: London.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Brooks-Cole: Monterey, CA.

Ter Wal (2004). Report: European Day of Media Monitoring. A quantitative analysis of daily press and TV contents in the 15 EU Member States. Online/More Colour in the Media (project financed by the European Commission Community Action Program to Combat Discrimination).

Ter Wal J. (1997). The reproduction of ethnic prejudice and racism through policy and news discourse : the Italian case (1988-1992): http://hdl.handle.net/1814/5426

The Hutchinson dictionary of ideas. (1994). Helicon: Oxford.

Tuchman G. (2002). Qualitative methods in the study of news. In Jensen K. B and Jankowski W. (ed.) A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research. Routledge: London and New York.

Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations (pp. 15-40). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D. & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Blackwell: Oxford.

van Dijk T. (ed.) (1985). Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Academic Press: London.

van Dijk T. A. (1984). Prejudice in discourse. Benjamins: Amsterdam.

van Dijk T. A. (1987). Communicating Racism. Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk. Sage: Newbury Park, CA.

van Dijk T. A. (1988). News as Discourse. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ.

van Dijk, T.A. (1990). Discourse & Society: a new journal for a new research focus, Discourse & Society, 1, pp.5-16.

van Dijk, T.A. (1991). Racism and the Press. Routledge: London:.

van Dijk, T.A. (1992). Discourse and the denial of racism. Discourse & Society, 3 (1992), 87-118.

van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. SAGE: Newbury Park, CA:.

van Dijk, T.A. (1996). Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction (2 Volumes). Sage: London.

van Dijk, T.A. (1997). Political discourse and racism, Describing Others in Western Parliaments. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), The Language and Politics of Exclusion. Others in Discourse. (pp. 31-64). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

van Dijk, T.A. (1998). Ideology. Sage: London.

van Dijk, T.A. (2000). New(s) Racism: A discourse analytical approach. In Simon Cottle (Ed.) Ethnic Minorities and the Media. (pp. 33-49). Open University Press, 2000: Milton Keynes, UK.

van Dijk, T.A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), The semiotics of racism. Approaches to critical discourse analysis. (pp. 85-103). Passagen Verlag, 2000: Vienna.

van Dijk, T.A. (2003). Elite discourse and racism. SAGE: Newbury Park, CA.

Voicu M. (2007). Toleranță și discriminare percepută. În Bădescu G., Grigoraș V., Rughiniş C., Voicu M., Voicu O. Barometrul Incluziunii Romilor. Fundația pentru o societate deschisă: București.

Walker R. (2001) Encyclopedia of Nationalsim (pp. 621). Academic Press.

Wetherell M. (1982). Cross-cultural studies of minimal groups: Implications for the social identity of theory of intergroup. In H. Tajfel (ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations (pp. 207-240). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Wetherell M. (1996) a. Constructing identities: the individual/social binary in Henri Tajfel's social psychology. In Robinson, Peter W. ed. Social Groups and Identities: Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel. Social Psychology Series. pp. 269–284.Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford, U.K.

Wetherell M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. Discourse and Society, 9(3) pp. 387–412.

Wetherell M. (ed.) (1996) b. Identities, Groups and Social Issues. Sage Publications Ltd: London, U.K..

Wetherell M. & Potter J. (1992). Mapping the Language of Racism. Columbia University Press.

Widdicombe S. and Wooffitt, R., 1995, The Language of Youth Subculture, Harvester: Brighton.

Wilson C. C., Gutierrez F. (1985). Minorities and Media: diversity and the end of mass communication. Sage Publications.

Wodak R. (1997). Gender and Doscourse. Sage: London.

Wodak R., de Cillia R., Reisigl M., Liebhart K. (2009). The Discursive Construction of National Identity. Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak R., Meyer M. (2001). Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Wodak, R. and Kirsch, F.P. (eds). 1995. Totalitäre Sprache — Langue de bois — Language of Dictatorship. Vienna, Passagen.

Worchel, S., Morales J.F., Páez D., Dechamps, J.C. (Eds.) (1998). Social Identity. International Perspectives. SAGE Publications Ltd: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi

Zamfir C. și Preda M (coord.) (2002). Romii în România Ed. Expert: București.

Zamfir E. și Zamfir C. (coord.) (1993). Țiganii: Între ignorare și îngrijorare. Editura Alternative: București.