

Examining Traits of Engagement in Solidarity Actions in Romania: An Analysis of Findings from Social Values Studies with a Comparative Emphasis

Horățiu Rusu^{1*}, Anca Bejenaru¹

¹ Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities,, 2A, Lucian Blaga Street, 550169, Sibiu, Romania

KEYWORDS

Solidarity actions
Attitudes of solidarity
Values studies
Romania

ABSTRACT

Social solidarity is increasingly under scrutiny in the contemporary world. Modern phenomena such as individualization, globalization, and migration have sparked inquiries into the dynamics and transformations of solidarity. Within this context, our study seeks to address one dimension of solidarity: the actions that embody it. We embark on a two-fold mission. On the one hand, we delve into the characteristics of the people engaging in solidarity actions. On the other hand, we compare results regarding acts of solidarity in Romania across different time frames. Our analysis mainly draws from the data collected through the European Values Survey in 2018. Comparisons are made with results from previous analyses and data from the 2012 World Values Survey. To accomplish these ends, we rely on both descriptive and multivariate analyses. Results suggest that approximately two-thirds of Romanians engage in solidarity actions. The likelihood of involving in solidarity actions is mainly influenced by age, religious behaviour, individualization, membership in associations, and recent volunteering behaviour.

* Contact address: horatiu.rusu@ulbsibiu.ro (H. Rusu)

Introduction

Social solidarity plays a crucial role in the development and preservation of societies and therefore faces growing scrutiny in the contemporary world. Various processes, including individualization, migration, and globalization, have prompted questions about its transformations or erosion. The disruptions in global trade, financial tensions, and the economic slowdown caused by the pandemic and the recent war, give rise to concerns regarding the sustainability of solidarity within diverse countries and welfare regimes. Examining solidarity is important for Romania, given that the welfare state was reinvented after the collapse of communism. This process entailed a continuous reconstruction that, unfortunately, was marked by fundamental inconsistencies in principles, which were reflected in public policies related to health, pensions, unemployment, etc. On one hand, given this context, the examination of solidarity aids in comprehending and elucidating the guiding principles influencing people's actions towards others and, from a practical standpoint, how pro-social actions can be promoted. On the other hand, it also provides insights for formulating robust and consistent social policies. Hence, the paper will compare solidarity acts in Romania between 2012 and 2018 and explore the factors correlated with these behaviours in 2018.

Social solidarity: attitudes and behaviours

Solidarity, a concept consecrated in sociology by Emile Durkheim (1984) was originally understood as a moral phenomenon, with the role of maintaining societies together. However, the contemporary conceptualization of solidarity exhibits a wide range of interpretations (see Bayertz 1999; Stjernø 2004; Komter 2005a). While at the societal level, this phenomenon is termed as social cohesion, at the individual level, is referred to as social solidarity (de Beer and Koster 2009). At the individual level, a distinction is made between the attitudinal dimension and the behavioural dimension of solidarity. Discussions about the attitudinal dimension reveal definitions emphasizing

sentiments of sympathy and dedication to others (Janmaat and Brown 2009), a shared selfless concern among community members (Mason 2000, 27), and an empathetic response to conditions affecting the well-being of others, irrespective of their personal or social characteristics (Arnsperger and Varoufakis 2003). Regarding the acts of solidarity, the definitions refer to cooperative behaviours or supportive actions directed toward other individuals or social categories whose well-being is impacted by various existing conditions or risks. They are rooted in a sense of duty, empathy, common interests, or allegiance to specific values. These actions encompass financial contributions (such as taxes) or non-monetary contributions (such as goods, voluntary work, or time devoted to others) typically without expecting any reward (de Beer and Koster 2009; Komter 2005a; Thome 1999).

Concerning the target recipients of acts of solidarity, an ordering is considered based on either social (Abela 2004; Komter 2005b) or spatial (Abela 2004) distances for the categories of people towards whom the solidarity is directed. According to Abela (2004), solidarity may take a local form when directed towards those who are close, known, or possibly known, and a global form when oriented towards those who are distant or even imagined. However, when considering social criteria, solidarity pertains to individuals or social categories perceived to be in need or facing difficulties, such as the unemployed, the sick, the elderly, or sexual and religious minorities.

In this paper acts of solidarity are understood to encompass supportive behaviours directed at three categories of people facing challenges: individuals dealing with illness, those affected by calamities, and a somewhat less specified group of people in need.

Correlates of social solidarity

The literature uncovers various relationships between solidarity (acts or attitudes) and factors that may influence or enhance it. However, only some of these relationships have undergone empirical validation, at least in the context of Romania (see Rusu 2012; Voicu, Rusu and Comşa 2013; Rusu and

Gheorghiuță 2014; Rusu 2015; Rusu 2016). Typically, papers grounded in empirical analyses encompass two broad categories of predictors: individual and contextual or societal. In this study, we exclusively focus on individual-level variables. From this category, we consider individualization (Abela 2004; de Beer and Koster 2009; Voicu, Rusu and Comșa 2013), post-materialism (Janmaat and Brown 2009; Rusu 2015), religious behaviour (Arts, Halman, and Oorschot 2003; Oorschot 2006), national identification (Banting et al. 2011; Rusu 2015), civic participation (Arts and Gellissen 2001; Banting et al. 2011), interpersonal trust (Banting et al. 2011; Voicu, Rusu and Comșa 2013), social class (Arts and Gellissen 2001; Oorschot 2006). From the category of sociodemographic variables age, education and gender are most frequently present in the analyses (Arts and Gellissen 2001; Oorschot 2006; Janmaat and Brown 2009; de Beer and Koster 2009; Voicu, Rusu and Comșa 2013; Rusu 2015).

Individualisation is defined and measured in multiple ways. Among its key aspects autonomy (freedom of choice) and reflexivity play a central role. Individualisation is assumed to be an essential factor in the weakening or fragmentation of relationships between individuals in modern society. However, studies on solidarity fail to confirm or deny this hypothesis. Abela (2004, 76) measures individualization with an index that involves selecting a specific number of items from an eleven-item scale, distinguishing five conventional/traditional value orientations and six post-traditional ones. People are considered to be individualized if they choose at least four items from the following list: independence, determination, responsibility, unselfishness, tolerance and respect, and imagination. He identifies varied and inconsistent connections (positive, negative, or nonsignificant) between individualization and three forms of solidarity attitudes (local, global, and social). Voicu, Rusu, and Comșa (2013), employing a comparable set of items to Abela (2004), but adopting a distinct method to formulate the index, also identify inconclusive associations between the three types of solidaristic attitudes and individualization. The study by de Beer and Koster (2009) also presents contradictory findings. They understand individualization as

detraditionalization and emancipation. de Beer and Koster (2009) discover a significant positive relationship between emancipation (measured at an individual level) and one-sided, voluntary (i.e. willingness to help others and volunteering) solidarity and two-sided, compulsory (i.e. state organized) solidarity, but they identify a negative relationship between detraditionalization (measured at an individual level) and the same forms of solidarity.

People with post-materialistic value orientations are assumed to be more open to newness, change, and others than those with materialistic value orientations. Postmaterialists would also be less concerned with their economic interest and more inclined to support the general welfare (Inglehart 1990, 1997). For these reasons, they would be more willing to show attitudes of solidarity towards their fellow citizens or humanity in general. Janmaat and Brown (2009) conducted empirical analyses to validate the relationship proposed by Inglehart's theory. However, the results are inconclusive, revealing significant yet inconsistent associations between post-materialism and two types of solidarity, particularly in Eastern Europe. They found that in relation to post-materialism, there is a negative association with solidarity as a general principle. Conversely, when examining solidarity as an indicator of compassion for the less fortunate, the relationship is positive. Interestingly, in Western European societies, the relationship between post-materialism and both types of solidarity is consistently positive. Also, Abela (2004) finds a negative relationship between local solidarity and post-materialism, while the relationship between social and global solidarity is the opposite. Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013) find that materialists in Romania are significantly less solidary than those with mixed orientations; however, as far as post-materialism is concerned, the results of the analysis do not allow for confirming or denying any relationship. A similar result is obtained by Rusu (2015).

A positive correlation between religiosity or religious behaviour and solidarity is generally acknowledged. Abela (2004), Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013), and Rusu (2015) provide evidence to support the idea that solidarity

increases with religiosity. De Beer and Koster (2009 171, 185) find the same positive relationship regarding institutionalized religiosity, measured as belongingness to a denomination, and voluntary solidarity (with the elderly, sick and disabled, and immigrants). Arts et al. (2003, 299) show that individuals who attend church more often exhibit more pronounced attitudes of solidarity towards groups in need. A relationship that complements this perspective is also found by van Oorschot (2006): people who attend religious services more frequently are less inclined to condition their expression of solidarity based on the affiliation of those towards whom it is directed to a specific group or category in need.

Arts et al. (2003) find a positive connection between social capital and solidarity, emphasizing their mutual reinforcement irrespective of the specific targets of solidarity. According to Banting et al. (2011), trust, political engagement, and social participation – dimensions of social capital – are strongly linked to solidarity. When examining these relationships in the context of Romania, there is a disparity in the findings related to social capital components. On one hand, Stănuş (2011) discovers no significant associations between social participation and solidarity attitudes. On the other hand, Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013) identify a positive and significant relationship between the latter and generalized trust. Rusu (2015) finds evidence supporting both relationships.

Explored in other studies as well (Rusu 2015) but yielding inconclusive results, the subjective assessment of health status is considered, guided by the notion that empathy is one of the principles underlying solidarity. Viewed in this manner, the subjective health appraisal serves as an indicator of identification with those in similar situations. In essence, solidarity with sick individuals can be notably strengthened by a poor health condition affecting the respondent.

Starting from the idea of the relationship between solidarity and the social transfer mechanisms of the welfare state, the literature points toward relevant indicators such as individuals belonging to social classes and their status on the labour market. These indicators delineate the division into

beneficiaries (such as the unemployed and pensioners) and contributors (such as the employed and entrepreneurs) to the social redistribution system. In this context, Arts and Gellisen (2001) demonstrate that entrepreneurs exhibit significantly less solidarity than non-entrepreneurs. Simultaneously, the unemployed exhibit strong solidarity compared to employees (Arts and Gellisen, 2001; Arts et al., 2003). Considering that the redistributive system is fundamentally rooted in the concept of solidarity, one would anticipate that those benefiting from state transfers would demonstrate higher levels of solidarity. However, this relationship is inconclusive for other classes benefiting from social transfers, including retirees, persons with disabilities, and individuals outside the labour force. For instance, Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013) observe that retirees, housewives, or those not employed are less solidary than their employed counterparts. A similar result is obtained by Rusu (2015) concerning homemakers who have never worked.

Arts et al. al (2003), Abela (2004), de Beer and Koster (2009), and Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013) discover a positive relationship between age and various forms of solidarity. Rusu (2015) finds only partial support for this relation: while donations toward people affected by natural disasters are significantly correlated with age, the same does not apply to solidaristic behaviours directed towards sick people or those in need. The positive relationship is not confirmed in the analysis by Arts and Gellisen (2001), who find no influence of age on solidarity. Janmaat and Brown (2009) also identify no consistent relationship between age and various solidarity measures; although support for solidarity as a general principle increases with age, solidarity with the socially marginalized decreases.

In the realm of education, the literature unveils inconsistent relationships. De Beer and Koster (2009) indicate that both formal and informal solidarity are more prevalent among individuals with higher education, while informal solidarity tends to be lower among those with lower education levels. Janmaat and Brown (2009) find different relationships in terms of direction between education and the two measures of solidarity they employ: as the level of education increases, the support for solidarity as a

general principle decreases, while concurrently, solidarity as a factor denoting compassion for the less fortunate grows. Conversely, Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa (2013), as well as Rusu (2015), identify positive relationships between education and all measured types of solidarity. The divergence in these results can be attributed to the various mechanisms through which education may shape social solidarity. On one hand, the highly educated are inclined to prioritize meritocratic principles (Arts and Gelissen 2001). On the other hand, education fosters openness to change, receptiveness to the new, and greater tolerance (Inglehart 1997).

Studies indicate that women tend to exhibit higher levels of solidarity than men (Arts and Gellisen 2001; de Beer and Koster 2009; Janmaat and Brown 2009). Women show greater favourability towards equality, especially concerning gender issues. In contrast, men demonstrate stronger support for meritocracy as a redistributive principle (Arts and Gelissen 2001). However, these patterns are not evident in the context of Romania (refer to Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa 2013; Rusu 2015).

Methodology and data

This study aims to answer the following research questions: 1) What were the dynamics of solidarity behaviours in Romania between 2012 and 2018? and 2) What factors might increase the chances of engaging in acts of solidarity in Romania in 2018? For this purpose, we carried out quantitative research. In addition to descriptive analyses, we used binomial logistic regression. The analyses are performed on the data provided by the Romanian World Values Survey (WVS - <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org>) and European Values Study (EVS - <https://europeanvaluesstudy.eu>). Data were collected in 2012 respectively in 2018. The samples are representative at a national level.

The acts of solidarity (dependent variables) are operationalised as helping behaviours embodied in the form of money, food or other goods given voluntarily to categories of people in need. The exact wording of the questions is: "For the last two years, have you voluntarily donated money,

food or other goods to: a) ...people in need; b) ...people affected by natural disasters; c) ...sick people". Answers to each of them are measured on a 3-point scale where "1" means "never", "2" means "once" and "3" means "several times". All these variables are transformed into binary variables. For the answers expressing solidaristic behaviour (originally coded "2" and "3"), we assign the value of "1," while for the other responses (originally coded "1"), we assign the value of "0." Using these questions, we built three logistic regression models (Models A, B, and C, Table 2 and 3). Additionally, a fourth logistic regression model measures solidarity behaviours irrespective of the specific category of people in need. In this model, the dependent variable is constructed as an additive index of the dependent variables used in the first three models. The index is further transformed into a binary variable where "0" denotes no solidaristic behaviour, and "1" denotes at least one solidaristic behaviour towards any of the considered categories (Model D, Table 3).

The independent variables are introduced next. Individualization is measured in a different manner than previously discussed. To assess it, we examined a question measuring the extent of autonomy or agency individuals believe they possess. The exact wording of the question is: "Some people feel they have completely free choice and control over their lives, and other people feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please use the scale to indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out?". Answers to this question are measured on a 10-point scale where "1" means "not at all", "10" means "a great deal". In our analysis the answers, we transformed the scale by grouping the consecutive responses in pairs. This adjustment means that the new scale is a 5-point scale where a value of "1" represents "very little or no freedom" while "5" represents "very much or full freedom". The responses categorized as "do not know" or "refusals to answer" were excluded from the analysis.

Postmaterialist, materialist or mixed value orientations are measured using an index proposed by Inglehart (1990, 1997). The question is worded as follows: "If you had to choose which one of the things on this card would you

say is most important? (And which would be the next most important?)". The respondent must choose and rank two of the following four possible answers: maintaining order in the nation, "giving people more say in important government decisions", "fighting rising prices", and "protecting freedom of speech". Based on the six possible combinations of the four items taken in pairs, an index composed of three categories of orientations is constructed: post-materialist (respondents choose the second and fourth answers), materialist (respondents choose the first and third answers) and mixed (respondents choose the other possible combinations). The index is transformed into three dichotomous variables (binary, type 1, 0). Two categories (post-materialist orientations and materialist orientations) are introduced in the analyses, the reference category being mixed value orientations. The responses categorized as "do not know" or "refusals to answer" were excluded from the analysis.

Religious behaviour is measured by an item capturing the frequency of church attendance. The question is worded as follows: "Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, how often do you attend religious services these days?". The respondent must choose one of the following answers: "more than once a week", "once a week", "once a month", "only on specific holy days", "once a year", "less often", "never, practically never". The variable is recorded so that the rating of "never, practically never" corresponds to a value of 1, while "more than once a week" corresponds to a value of 7. The responses categorized as "do not know" or "refusals to answer" were excluded from the analysis.

Social capital is measured through three indicators: generalized trust, membership in voluntary organisations and volunteering. Trust is measured through an index, ranging from 0 to 5. The index is computed as a sum of five binary variables. The variables included target trust in different categories of people: "People in your neighbourhood", "people you know personally", "people you meet for the first time", "people of another religion", "people of another nationality". Each of these variables, originally measured on a 4-point scale, was converted into a binary variable. The value of 1 was assigned for

the answers “trust completely” and “trust somewhat” while the value of 0 was assigned for the rest of the answers. Membership in voluntary organisations is also measured through an index, ranging from 0 to 9. The index is computed as a sum of the following nine binary variables: “Religious or church organisations”, “Education, arts, music or cultural activities”, “Trade unions”, “Conservation, the environment, ecology, animal rights”, “Professional associations”, “Sports or recreation”, “Humanitarian or charitable organization”, “Consumer organization”, “Self-help group, mutual aid group”. Volunteer involvement is assessed through a binary variable, determining whether an individual has engaged in volunteer activities within the past six months.

Subjective health status was assessed with the question: “All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days?”. The responses were initially recorded on a 5-point scale, where “very good” was designated a value of 1, and “very poor” was given a value of 5. Subsequently, in the analysis, it underwent recoding into a binary variable. A value of 1 was assigned to the responses indicating “very poor” and “poor” health, while a value of 0 was assigned to all other answers. This variable is considered only in Model B (when the dependent variable is the category of sick people) and in Model D (when the dependent variable is the index including all categories).

The categorization of respondents based on their status in the labour market was carried out as follows. A category of persons active in the labour market was created first. It comprises full or part-time employed personnel as well as self-employed persons. The second category includes pensioners. The third category encompasses students. The fourth category comprises individuals receiving social transfers such as the unemployed, disabled persons, and those on maternity leave. A fifth category includes homemakers who have never been employed. The last category comprises current homemakers who have had previous experience in the labour market. Control variables are age, education, sex, and size of locality.

Results and discussion

In this section, we begin by presenting the distribution of responses to each of the three questions regarding solidarity actions in 2018, comparing them with the corresponding data from 2012. Following this, we delve into the results of the multivariate analysis of solidarity actions in 2018. To achieve this, logistic regression models were employed.

The data from the World Values Survey (WVS) 2012 and the European Values Study (EVS) 2018 for Romania illustrate the extent of solidarity actions among Romanians towards various categories of people. Table 1 below presents the raw results concerning each target category. Data indicate that there is a higher degree of solidarity towards the relatively loosely defined category “people in need”. This is followed by the categories “sick people” and “people affected by disasters”, as observed in both the 2012 and 2018 data. The differences between the first two categories are not substantial. However, there is a significant difference between the solidarity with these two categories and the third category. Moreover, in 2018, this difference appears to be growing. The percentage of individuals engaging in acts of solidarity with those affected by natural disasters seems to be decreasing, despite Romania experiencing constant extreme weather events over the past 12 years that consistently lead to floods and impact numerous households. A possible explanation is that the responsibility for providing support in such conditions is increasingly perceived as falling on the state. Additionally, fundraising activities for calamities are less common than fundraising actions for sick and disabled people.

When all target categories are grouped, and solidarity behaviours are considered irrespective of the specific target category of people, the results show that roughly one-third of the sample population did not donate money or goods in the two years before the data were collected. Compared with the 2012 data, this result suggests a slight increase (approximately 4%) in the proportion of persons not engaging in solidarity actions.

Table 1. Acts of solidarity in Romania, according to WVS 2012 and EVS 2018 Romania (%)

In the last two years, have you donated (offered without being asked directly or by begging) money, food, or goods to:								
	Never		Yes, once		Yes, several times		DK/NA	
	WVS 2012	EVS 2018	WVS 2012	EVS 2018	WVS 2012	EVS 2018	WVS 2012	EVS 2018
(x41) people in need	31,2%	31,8%	19,5%	19,7%	47,6%	44,3%	1,7%	4,3%
(x43) sick people	36,7%	35,7%	18,8%	19,1%	42,4%	40,5%	2,1%	4,7%
(x42) people affected by natural disasters	47,8%	55,4%	20,2%	15,0%	29,4%	21,4%	2,6%	8,3%

To answer the question about the profile of people who have undertaken acts of solidarity in the two years before data collection we constructed four binomial logistic regression models. The results are summarised in the tables below (Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2. Logistic regression, dependant variable: engaged in solidarity actions toward....in the past two years. (EVS 2018 Romania)

		...people in need (Model A)			...sick people (Model B)		
		B	Wald	Exp(B)	B	Wald	Exp(B)
Constant		-2.676***			-2.694***		
Individualization		.316***	26.557	1.372	.324***	28.133	1.382
Mixt (reference)							
	Materialist	.085	.354	1.089	.238+	2.860	1.269
	Postmaterialist	.112	.241	1.119	.159	.520	1.172
Religious behaviour		.194***	16.340	1.214	.203***	18.400	1.225
Trust		-.040	.885	.961	-.053	1.703	.948
Membership in associations		.374***	19.394	1.453	.388***	23.335	1.474
Volunteered (1=yes)		.771***	13.112	2.162	.603**	9.285	1.828
Poor health (1=yes)					-.499*	3.841	0.607
Employed (reference)							
	Pensioner	-.162	.567	.850	-.291	1.880	.748
	Transfer category	-.544+	2.788	.580	-.246	.567	.782
	Homemaker (previously employed)	-.186	.598	.831	-.128	.292	.880
	Homemaker (never employed)	-.456	2.049	.634	-.631*	4.009	.532
	Student	-.366	1.655	.694	-.492+	3.089	.611
Age		.013*	5.170	1.013	.020***	12.301	1.021
Sex (1=female)		.231+	3.019	1.260	.170	1.717	1.185
Education level		.002**	11.299	1.002	.001	1.874	1.001
Size of locality		-.033	.994	.967	-.084**	6.588	.920
Cox & Snell R Square		0.103			0.110		
Nagelkerke R Square		0.143			0.150		
Omnibus test		$\chi^2=139.5$; df=16; p=0.000			$\chi^2=149.2$; df=17; p=0.000		
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test		$\chi^2=8.942$; df=8; p=0.347			$\chi^2=7.706$; df=8; p=0.463		
Number of cases		1255			1255		

Note: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1

In each of the 4 models, the dependent variable is the act of solidarity declared as performed (respondent donated money, food, or goods). Independent variables were tested for multicollinearity.

Table 3. Logistic regression, dependant variable: engaged in solidarity actions toward....in the past two years. (EVS 2018 Romania)

	...people affected by natural disasters. (Model C)			...all three categories of people taken together (Model D)		
	B	Wald	Exp(B)	B	Wald	Exp(B)
Constant	-2.937***			-2.794***		
Individualization	.204***	11.149	1.226	.341***	28.983	1.406
Mixt (<i>reference</i>)						
Materialist	.037	.076	1.038	.087	.348	1.091
Postmaterialist	-.045	.044	.956	.110	.217	1.116
Religious behaviour	.176***	14.621	1.193	.191***	14.475	1.211
Trust	.052	1.731	1.053	-.028	.418	.972
Membership in associations	.135*	5.566	1.145	.347***	15.572	1.415
Volunteered (1=yes)	.577***	11.013	1.781	1.099***	21.428	3.002
Poor health (1=yes)				-.425 ⁺	2.669	.654
Employed (<i>reference</i>)						
Pensioner	-.335 ⁺	2.721	.715	-.212	.888	.809
Transfer category	-.053	.027	.948	-.531	2.582	.588
Homemaker (previously employed)	-.468*	3.861	.626	-.246	1.005	.782
Homemaker (never employed)	-1.789***	17.611	.167	-.604 ⁺	3.304	.547
Student	-.628*	4.527	.534	-.350	1.431	.705
Age	.013*	5.339	1.013	.020**	10.388	1.020
Sex (1=female)	.167	1.786	1.181	.199	2.078	1.220
Education level	.000	.664	1.000	.001**	9.574	1.001
Size of locality	.006	.041	1.006	-.049	2.039	.952
Cox & Snell R Square	0.086			0.115		
Nagelkerke R Square	0.117			0.162		
Omnibus test	$\chi^2=115.5$; df=16; p=0.000			$\chi^2=156.1$; df=17; p=0.000		
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	$\chi^2=11.74$; df=8; p=0.163			$\chi^2=8.954$; df=8; p=0.346		
Number of cases	1255			1255		

Note: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1

Before presenting the results, it is important to note that the analyses indicate the validity and stability of the indicators used as independent variables across models. The fact that significant independent variables remain consistent across the first three models serves as an argument in favour of using the index of solidarity acts in the fourth model.

An interpretation of the overall picture suggests that the likelihood of engaging in solidarity actions is particularly influenced by age, religious behaviour, individualization, membership in associations, and recent volunteering behaviour. This pattern is broadly in line with the findings from previous studies on solidarity attitudes and actions in Romania (Voicu, Rusu, and Comşa, 2013; Rusu 2015).

Individualization measured by the extent of autonomy or agency individuals believe they possess is positively correlated with solidarity actions. These findings are consistent with the results obtained by de Beer and Koster (2009) who also find a significant positive relationship between emancipation (measured at an individual level) and solidarity.

Except for a borderline exception in Model B, the remaining models do not demonstrate a significant association between materialism or postmaterialism and acts of solidarity.

The correlation between religious behaviour and acts of solidarity is positive and significant. In essence, a higher frequency of church attendance is associated with an increased likelihood of engaging in acts of solidarity. These results align with the expectations derived from the theoretical framework. In the context of this analysis, we interpret this indicator as potentially expressing a connection to a specific type of community. As argued by Arts et al. (2003), this community is grounded in a moral framework of compassion and involves an informal influence or pressure from that community (van Oorschot, 2006) towards engaging in acts of solidarity.

Among the social capital indicators, trust in others does not favour solidarity acts. However, in the case of the other two indicators (membership in associations and voluntary actions), the relationships are both positive and significant across all dependent variables. These results partially confirm the significance of social capital for solidarity, as proposed by Arts et al. (2003) or Banting et al. (2011).

As expected, a poor state of health increases the likelihood of engaging in solidarity with sick people. These results are similar to those obtained by Rusu (2015) in what concerns the direction of the relationship. Advancing age

favours solidarity actions, while the results reveal no significant difference between genders. A higher level of education appears to increase the probability of engaging in acts of solidarity (Models A and D).

In terms of the status in the labour market, most results are not significant, but a consistent negative relationship is suggested across all models: any status other than employment seems to decrease the likelihood of engaging in acts of solidarity. While it was anticipated that being a beneficiary of a solidarity-based system should promote acts of solidarity, the results consistently contradict this expectation. Results are similar to those obtained by Rusu (2015). A significant negative relationship is observed concerning homemakers who have never worked (Models B, C and D). These findings align with those obtained by Rusu (2015), indicating that homemakers in general, but especially those who do not have a record of employment, tend to participate less in acts of solidarity compared to individuals who are employed. One potential explanation could stem from the absence of social connections among these individuals, or a limited understanding of the transfer mechanisms linked to the welfare state.

Social solidarity forms the foundation of sustainable social systems. The principles and mechanisms associated with the welfare state closely align with the concept of solidarity (Ellison 2011). Modern states establish redistribution systems to aid disadvantaged or vulnerable groups, validating these efforts in public discourse based on the concept of solidarity. Understanding what enhances the effectiveness of acts of solidarity is crucial for several reasons. Such studies provide insights into the profile of those more inclined to engage in acts of solidarity, implicitly supporting inclusive and supportive policies. Additionally, they help us comprehend which individuals or categories require more targeted resources and explanations (Voicu, Rusu, and Comsa 2013; Rusu 2015).

Taken together, the results of this study suggest that individuals who feel they have more liberty and control in their lives, are employed and older – likely in the later stages of their careers and financially more stable – people who are involved in their communities (whether religious or

otherwise), and those who are more educated, are more likely to engage in solidarity actions. Compared to the results presented by Rusu (2015), our findings consistently demonstrate that education, religious behaviour, and social capital are reliable predictors of acts of solidarity in Romania. On the other hand, both our study and the one based on WVS 2012 data (Rusu 2015) reveal that certain categories of social transfer beneficiaries consistently exhibit less involvement in acts of solidarity than individuals active in the labour market. The challenges they likely face in their daily lives and the risk of poverty may impede solidarity behaviours in these cases.

References

- Abela, Anthony M. 2004. "Solidarity and Religion in the European Union: A Comparative Sociological Perspective". In *The Value(s) of a Constitution for Europe*, edited by Peter G. Xuereb, 71–101.
- Arnsperger, Christian, and Yanis Varoufakis. 2003. "Toward a Theory of Solidarity". *Erkenntnis* (1975-) 59 (2): 157–88.
- Arts, Wil, and John Gelissen. 2001. "Welfare States, Solidarity and Justice Principles: Does the Type Really Matter?" *Acta Sociologica* 44 (4): 283–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000169930104400401>.
- Arts, Wilhelmus Antonius, Loek Halman, and Wim van Oorschot. 2003. "The Welfare State: Villain or Hero of the Piece?" In *The Cultural Diversity of European Unity*, edited by Wilhelmus Antonius Arts, Jacques Hagenaaars, and Loek Halman, 275–310. Leiden: Brill.
- Banting, Keith, Richard Johnston Johnston, Will Kymlicka, and Stuart Soroka. 2011. "Are Diversity and Solidarity Incompatible? Canada in Comparative Context". *Inroads: The Canadian Journal of Opinion*, no. 28: 36–48.
- Bayertz, Kurt. 1999. "Four Uses of "Solidarity""". In *Solidarity*, edited by Kurt Bayertz, 3–28. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1_1.
- Beer, Paul de, and Ferry Koster. 2009. *Sticking Together or Falling Apart? Solidarity in an Era of Individualization and Globalization*. Solidarity and Identity. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bierhoff, Hans W., and Beate Küpper. 1999. "Social Psychology of Solidarity". In *Solidarity*, edited by Kurt Bayertz, 133–56. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1_7.

- Dickes, Paul, Marie Valentova, and Monique Borsenberger. 2010. "Construct Validation and Application of a Common Measure of Social Cohesion in 33 European Countries". *Social Indicators Research* 98 (3): 451–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9551-5>.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1984. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Londra: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Ellison, Marion. 2011. "Introduction: Social Solidarity in Europe: The Fourth Pillar". In *Reinventing Social Solidarity Across Europe*, edited by Marion Ellison, 1–16. Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781847427274.003.0001>.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Janmaat, Jan Germen, and Robert Braun. 2009. "Diversity and Postmaterialism as Rival Perspectives in Accounting for Social Solidarity: Evidence from International Surveys". *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50 (1): 39–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715208100969>.
- Komter, Aafke E. 2005a. *Social Solidarity and the Gift*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Komter, Aafke E. 2005b. "Solidarity and Sacrifice: An Analysis of Contemporary Solidarity". In *Advances in Sociology Research*, edited by Leopold M. Stoneham, 205–31. New York: Nova Publishers.
- Mason, Andrew. 2000. *Community, Solidarity and Belonging: Levels of Community and Their Normative Significance*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490309>.
- Oorschot, Wim. 2006. "Making the Difference in Social Europe: Deservingness Perceptions among Citizens of European Welfare States". *Journal of European Social Policy* 16 (1): 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928706059829>.
- Oorschot, Wim van. 2008. "Popular Deservingness Perceptions and Conditionality of Solidarity in Europe". In *Culture and Welfare State: Values and Social Policy in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Wim van Oorschot, Michael Opielka, and Birgit Pfau-Effinger, 268–88. London: Edward Elgar.
- Oorschot, Wim van. 2000. "Who Should Get What, and Why? On Deservingness Criteria and the Conditionality of Solidarity among the

- Public". *Policy and Politics: Studies of Local Government and Its Services* 28 (1): 33–48.
- Rusu, Horațiu. 2012. "Measuring social solidarity: some research notes". *Social Change Review*, 10 (1): 71–89.
- Rusu, Horațiu and Andrei Gheorghiuță. 2014. "Transnational Solidarity and Public Support for the EU Enlargement". *Sociologia*, 46 (3): 261–282.
- Rusu, Horațiu. 2015. "Soziale Solidarität in Rumänien–über Solidaritätshandlungen". In *Zivilgesellschaft und Soziale Arbeit: Herausforderungen und Perspektiven an die Arbeit im Gemeinwesen in Rumänien und Deutschland*. Eds. Sagebiel, J., A. Muntean and B. Sagebiel. 61–85, AG SPAK Bücher.
- Rusu, Horațiu. 2016. "Solidaritate". In *Enciclopedia Asistenței Sociale*, edited by George Neamtu, 845–48. Iași: Polirom.
- Stănuș, Cristina. 2011. "Trade Unions, NGOs and Social Solidarity in Romania". In *Reinventing Social Solidarity across Europe*, edited by Marion Ellison, 191–208. Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781847427281.012>.
- Stjernø, Steinar. 2004. *Solidarity in Europe: The History of an Idea*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511490378>.
- Thome, Helmut. 1999. "Solidarity: Theoretical Perspectives for Empirical Research". In *Solidarity*, edited by Kurt Bayertz, 101–31. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1_6.
- Voicu, Bogdan, Horațiu Rusu, and Mircea Comșa. 2013. "Atitudini Față de Solidaritate În România." In *Ocupare și incluziune socială*, edited by Lucian Marina, 17–44. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.