'WE' AND 'OTHERS':
STEREOTYPE ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS IN SERBIA*

J.S. Petrović[1], U.V. Šuvaković[2]

[1]Department of Sociology
University in Nis
Ćirila and Metodija 2, Nis, 18000, Serbia

[2]Department of Sociology
University in Pristina with temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica
Filipa Višnjića бб, Kosovska Mitrovica, 38220, Serbia

The paper analyzes the data obtained in the course of two empirical studies of Serbian students' attitudes. The first research of auto- and hetero-stereotypes was conducted in 2012 on the quota sample of 363 students of Pristina University with temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica. The results regarding the ethnic stereotypes of Russians were analyzed and compared with the data from the research conducted in the same year on the sample of 603 students of the state universities of the Republic of Serbia. The results indicated that extremely positive auto-stereotypes dominated among the students as well as extremely positive stereotypes of Russians — not only among the students that study in Kosovo and Metohija, but also in other high-school institutions in Serbia. Moreover, moderately negative stereotypes of Montenegrins were revealed, as well as those of Germans and Americans, with significant differences in the disposition of attributes' frequencies that, however, do not form the core of the stereotypes.

Key words: Serbian students, ethnic stereotypes, empirical research of 2012, Kosovo and Metohija (K&M), Serbia.

Stereotypes, as generally accepted, simplify the image of certain ethnic or other social groups, they are often mentioned and (mis)used in public and daily discourses and entered the scientific discourse at the turn of the 20th century, primarily the psychological and sociological sciences due to W. Lippman [1]. Although other definitions of the notion were introduced after the author of the neologism developed it, they did not endure intensive transformations for a long time since their introduction for nothing changed regarding the understanding of the functions they perform and the social context that influenced their appearance and performance. For example, the proponents of the

---

social identity theory, unlike the traditional cognitive theory, point out the fact that stereotypes are not the consequence of the limited abilities of individuals for processing information about their social world. The social function of the stereotypes lies in explaining the social world, while their most important role is to legitimize the past and current group actions [2. P. 209]. The proponents of the social identity theory also claim that stereotypes are not 'frozen' pictures of some social groups' world view, but to a great extent they reflect the social historical context, as well as 'hot' social circumstances in which they appeared, therefore their content also depends on structural relations between the groups regarding their status and competition [2. P. 209—210]. However, even today a significant part of professionals believe that stereotypes imply joint attitudes of the group regarding its own characteristics and features of some other groups usually based on unreasonable generalizations. Thereby, it is completely indisputable that the psychological substratum of stereotypes is located in the extremely important group identification necessarily derived from the social stratification system. An individual obtains the basic sense of the social context by an unambiguous classification of people into different social groups, using the cognitive process of simplifying the real content. Group classifications by ethnic stereotypes are always a simplified, rigid, schematic and dogmatic comprehension of characteristics of the nation under consideration [3. P. 392; 4. P. 358; 5. P. 67]. At the same time, stereotypes are often understood as "concise narrations by which opinions on collectives are verbalized" [6. P. 37] and interpreted as very wide presentations of the 'unlikeness' of social groups and nations and even whole regions, civilizations and cultures [7. P. 8—9; 8. P. 6]. Stereotypes comprehended in this manner have become a part of the terminology of all social sciences and humanities, and recently there have been frequent attempts to explain the mechanism of appearance and maintenance of certain stereotypes in the interdisciplinary context within a wide theoretical and methodological perspective.

To comprehend the stereotypes of certain nations it is important to consider constructions like the 'civilized West', the 'barbarian East', 'Orient' and 'Balkanism' that is interpreted as a synonym of everything contrary to the civilized world. Regarding the stereotypes of the Balkan nations the following statement of M. Todorova is certainly noteworthy — she interprets such opinions, among other things, as the natural superstructure of the continual constructions of 'unlikeness', even 'internal' characteristics, as in the case of the Balkans. Because "geographically inseparable from Europe, the Balkans used to absorb the cluster of externalized political, ideological and cultural frustrations originating from tensions and contradictions intrinsic for regions and societies outside the Balkans... Just as in the case of the Orient, the Balkans have served as the stock for negative characteristics to construct the positive and egotistic image of the 'European' and the 'West' [8. P. 323—324]. Therefore, many scientists stress that stereotype narrations function as a new 'symbolic geography' and recognize them as extremely important research fields alongside with the stereotypes of the smaller, usually marginal social groups.

Although based on a certain generalized cognitive content, ethnic stereotypes, just like other types of social attitudes, imply certain affective and conative dimensions as well. In that sense, collective ideas about other nations also possess elements of (non)inclination towards members of other ethnic groups, as well as the tendency to take certain actions depending on the grade of sympathy/antipathy. That very close connection

of the cognitive content with the tendency to exhibit certain emotions and/or actions towards members of other nations is the thing that gives meaning to the occasional studies of stereotypes, especially among those ethnic groups that share the same social area. In such situations, stereotypes are a substantial indicator of inter-ethnic relations. Likewise, it should be remembered that stereotype ideas, although being simplified schemes and often unjustified generalizations, are based on certain real contexts, although that does not necessarily imply their correctness [9. P. 35, 47]. Some scientists even claim that ethnic stereotypes are just the first step towards an open animosity that starts as an exhibition of prejudice towards other nations [10. P. 8] manifested in the tendency to create negative narratives about others. Then comes a social distance in the form of avoiding any contacts followed by limiting or depriving others of various rights, physical attack and finally genocidal intentions. R. Supek writes the same not only about ethnic stereotypes, but also about marking differences between ethnic and other kinds of social prejudices: the difference is "just in the easy regression of the group's aggressive behavior, i.e., the group identification with the aim of mobilizing against some outside enemy" [11. P. 81].

Actually, as social psychologists point out, a relatively permanent idea of 'collective unlikeness' contributes to easier organization of experience related to one class of objects (social contacts with other nations) and to easier orientation in the social world, but at the same time it is a potential trigger for negative stereotypes to grow into prejudices with a high emotional charge that can be easily (mis)used in various contexts. Simplified constructions of unlikeness may contribute not only to media manipulations with unjustified generalizations about certain nations and cause disagreements and attritions, but also to the deepening of ethnic conflicts within certain communities with human sufferings as their epilogue. Here we deal already with the collective stigmatization as the process of excluding the Other from the community, various forms of discrimination due to the religious, ethnic, racial and other characteristics. A simplified and idealized image of one's own group (like the belief in the being part of the 'chosen' nation) may have equally destructive consequences. Throughout the 20th century, there were numerous examples of the political misuse of ethnic auto- and hetero-stereotypes. For instance, the idea of German superiority over the other nations or the recent breakup of Yugoslavia. The clear engagement of stereotype ideas in the latter case is evident in the political use of general stereotypes of the nations of the former Yugoslavia during the war and in the specific media and political propaganda by which the stereotypes of the Balkan people were created in the world public opinion. Stereotype fights between groups defending different ideologies within one state are no less destructive, for example, forming stereotypes of pro-western and pro-national forces. However, other geographical areas were not immune to the production and maintenance of stereotypes: we can see a similar situation with ethnic stereotypes after the well known European wars (French-German or German-Polish) which resulted in their numerous studies [7. P. 9]. In addition to ethnic stereotypes, the contemporary social sciences often study stereotype ideas of different social groups and minority communities within states (for instance, the stereotypes of religious minorities, disabled people, etc.).

Understanding ethnic stereotypes and the distance among students is especially important because they are the most educated members of their nations, from whom, as

a rule, the social and political elites are recruited [12. P. 292—293]. We need not point out to what extent the social and political elites may influence both the modus of inter-ethnic relations in the state and the construction of social, economic and political relations of cooperation or conflict in the international arena. Intellectual elites may be responsible for the misuse of stereotypes, as they are often the ones to articulate them (with incorrect use of historical facts) and purposely activate them at a certain moment of intensified tensions [5. P. 69]. Our research shows that the Serbian students possess an enviable level of knowledge about Russia, especially regarding its culture, science, sports and politics, as well as a positive perception of many others, not only European, countries [13. P. 91—92].

Below we will present the results of the surveys [14. P. 493—521; 15] implemented on the two-stage quota sample. The first study was conducted on the sample of 363 students in the University in Kosovska Mitrovica. The quotas for each faculty were first established, then proportions were formed according to gender and the academic year. The sample consisted of 58% female and 42% male students with the average age of 22,8. The sample of the second survey consisted of 603 students from four biggest state universities (Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis and Kosovska Mitrovica): the faculties within each university were grouped in four scientifically homogeneous groups (technical-technological, social-humanities, medical and mathematical), within each group quotas were defined. Female students made up 59% and male students — 41% with the average age of 21 [13. P. 82]. A questionnaire was designed to identify stereotypes in terms of one's ethnic group and all ethnic groups that used to live in the former Yugoslavia, as well as to Russians, Americans, Gypsies and Germans. Although it was interesting to reveal the ideas about other European nations, the amount of work did not allow to include a greater number of options (the respondents had to evaluate each of the offered 55 attributes describing a typical representative of every mentioned nation, i.e., 550 items). As in the first survey we found unusually strong positive hetero-stereotypes of Russians, we repeated the analysis on the sample of four biggest universities in Serbia to check the results and compare the collective ethnic stereotypes.

The identified stereotypes were studied with the help of a list of 55 characteristics (see the Tables bellow): the respondents had to choose an unlimited number of features that could be assigned to typical representatives of certain nations. The list included characteristics that had been previously used in other researches in Serbia and other Balkan countries [4; 9; 16; 17]. Considering that one of the attributes of stereotypes is their diffusion, the features assigned to certain nations by at least one third of students were considered to be stereotypes: "it seems that almost nothing can change images that 40% of the population have in most of the countries, even during the period of one or two decades" [9. P. 50]. We will take a look at the auto-stereotypes as well as hetero-stereotypes of Russians, Americans and Germans, whose countries had a very important influence on the position of Serbia in the international arena and on certain political events that determined the fate of Serbs and their country. The idea of the Montenegrins as an ethnic group that is quite familiar to the Serbs is based on the common culture, language, habits and social and political history (until recently the idea that Serbs and Montenegrins are one nation has been widely accepted in Serbia).

Auto-stereotypes are usually understood as a certain idealization of a typical representative of one's own nation (a complex of socially desirable characteristics). Both the representatives of modern theories, for example, the theory of social identity [2; 18], and the proponents of the traditional cognitive theory claim that the establishment and maintenance of auto-stereotypes help to preserve a positive self-image and increase self-respect. As a rule, the stereotypes contain an extremely unbalanced perception of one's nation as the bearer of only positive characteristics with a tendency to usually a negative perception of other ethnic groups. At the same time, it is not clear if the low level of self-respect implies a biased estimation of one's group, or, conversely, if the bias leads to the rise of self-respect [2. P. 214].

The results of the students' survey (95% identified themselves as Serbs) in the only Serbian University in Kosovo and Metohija revealed auto-stereotypes similar to those found by other researchers, regardless of the type of the sample, applied markers for ethnic stereotypes and the questionnaire used, saturated with positive attributes (18 characteristics). Therefore, the typical Serbs are considered to be brave (72%), convivial (56%), cheerful (55%), capable (53%), patriotic (53%) and clever (52%), i.e., these features were chosen by more than half of the students, thus they form the 'hard core' of the auto-stereotypes. The list includes another twelve positive stereotypes (chosen by one third to almost one half of the sample — see Table 1), with the exception of religiosity which might be both a positive and negative stereotype if the respondent is religious, agnostic or an atheist. However, considering the religious self-identification of the students (96% named themselves religious, among which 94% belong to the Orthodox Church) the referred attribute might be considered positive, although most scientists interpret it as a neutral characteristic often connected with a series of markers that indicate the traditionalism of the ethnic group.

Table 1

Auto-stereotypes of students in Kosovska Mitrovica

Characteristics of Serbs	%	Characteristics of Serbs	%
Brave	**72,2**	Nationalists	21,2
Convivial	**55,9**	Adaptable	15,7
Cheerful	**55**	Contumacious	14
Capable	**53,4**	Lazy	13,5
Patriotic	**53,2**	Cunning	12,9
Clever	**52,1**	Aggressive	11,1
Open-hearted	**47,8**	Primitive	11
Proud	**45,5**	Niggard	10,7
Communicative	**43**	Insincere	10,5
Cultural	**41,9**	Dull	10,2
Hardworking	**40,8**	Retrograde	10,2
Witted	**40,2**	Dishonest	9,9
Religious	**39,1**	Greedy	9,6
Emotional	**36,9**	Cold	9,4
Diligent	**35,3**	Presumptuous	9,1
Distinguished	**34,2**	Rude	8,5
Good lovers	**33,6**	Violent	8,5
Clean	**33,1**	Hypocritical	8,5
Militant	32,5	Cruel	7,7
Progressive	31,5	Filthy	7,2
Temperamental	31,1	Communists	6,6
Sociable	30,6	Villainous	6,6

Characteristics of Serbs	%	Characteristics of Serbs	%
Disciplinal	29,2	Brigandage	5,8
Pedantic	27,8	Fascists	5,8
Boastful	25,9	Ruthless	5
Businesslike	24,2	Rapists	4,7
Garrulous	22,9	Robbers	3,3
Rich	21,2	—	—

In the light of the so-called two-factor theory of ethnic stereotypes or the analytical model based on the content of stereotypes developed by a group of researchers from Harvard University that has become widely accepted and states that the empirical data about stereotypes gains an additional importance within a comparative or so-called cross-cultural analysis of different types of communities [16; 19; 20], we can notice that stereotypes of one's own ethnic group are double positive. They always comprise positive attributes in the dimension of competence-incompetence (ability-inability) both at the personal level (e.g., brave, capable, clever, hardworking, diligent) and while evaluating the group's social competence and prestige (e.g., patriotic, proud, cultural, distinguished). The second dimension of predisposition-indisposition is also full of positive components expressed in benevolence, warmth, morality (e.g., convivial, cheerful, emotional, open-hearted). The two-component stereotype theory is worth mentioning, as the recent researches have shown that there is a tendency to clearly divide ethnic stereotypes along the mentioned dimensions when evaluating certain nations, and that there are four types of stereotype patterns established by combining them (respect and predisposition, respect and indisposition, disrespect and predisposition, disrespect and indisposition) that determine different attitudes and grounds for discrimination practices. "These two different dimensions of stereotype evaluation seem to have completely different correlates. Evaluation of the capability dimension is connected with the group's status... or technological improvement... while the evaluation of the benevolence dimension is connected with the level of conflict or competitive fear from the given group" [16. P. 17]. The theory partly explains Allport's thesis that ethnic stereotypes are just the first step towards the radicalization of hostile attitudes and actions towards the members of other ethnic groups and suggests that such a possibility arises primarily when negative evaluations overlap in both components of the stereotype. As we can see in Table 1, the characteristics with the most negative connotations are accepted by a small proportion of the sample (below 10%).

It should be noted that in the research we did not use attributes (neither with auto-stereotypes nor with hetero-stereotypes) that are not common for describing typical representatives of the ethnic groups under study regardless their prevailing evaluation (positive or negative). Thus, the respondents chose both negative and positive attributes for one's own and other ethnic groups, which proves that the students are well aware of the injustice of 'black and white' generalizations of any ethnic groups.

The stereotypes of Montenegrins as the closest nation to Serbs with whom they never had open conflicts were generally confirmed, but at the same time we obtained some surprising findings contrary to the expected. Although Montenegrins were not cha-

racterized by the most negative attributes (only one such characteristic appeared at the core of the hetero-stereotypes — 47% of Serbian students consider Montenegrins lazy) we can say that their prevailing image is not positive (see Table 2). There is an ambivalent attitude to Montenegrins — the stereotype of low personal competitiveness dominates (reflected not only in the common belief that they are lazy, but also in the widespread attributes of boastfulness and garrulity); at the same time the Serbian students consider them a nation with socially desirable characteristics (patriotic, proud, convivial). In other words, Montenegrins figure in the outlook of the students as "mostly incompetent and prevailingly warm".

Table 2

Stereotypes of students in Kosovska Mitrovica of Montenegrins

Characteristics of Montenegrins	%	Characteristics of Montenegrins	%
Lazy	**47,2**	Pedantic	13,3
Boastful	**32,6**	Niggard	13,3
Garrulous	29,6	Hardworking	13
Patriotic	27,9	Emotional	12,2
Proud	26,2	Sociable	11,9
Convivial	23,2	Nationalists	11,6
Rich	21,5	Rude	11,3
Brave	19,1	Contumacious	10,8
Dull	19,1	Religious	10,2
Cultural	18,2	Militant	9,1
Cheerful	18	Greedy	8,8
Communicative	17,7	Disciplined	8,6
Witty	17,4	Retrograde	8,6
Insincere	17,1	Violent	8
Cold	16,9	Diligent	7,7
Clever	16,6	Dishonest	7,7
Cunning	16,3	Good lovers	7,5
Capable	15,8	Villainous	7,2
Distinguished	15,7	Communists	6,4
Progressive	14,7	Primitive	6,4
Adaptable	14,7	Aggressive	6,1
Clean	14,6	Rapists	5,5
Cruel	14,6	Filthy	5,3
Open-hearted	14,4	Ruthless	4,7
Temperamental	14,4	Brigandage	4,1
Businesslike	13,8	Robbers	4,1
Presumptuous	13,8	Fascists	3,6
Hypocritical	13,5	—	—

These findings do correspond to the social distance identified in the researches of 2010 and 2012, which showed that students preferred to live and socialize rather with Russians (2012) or Greeks (2010) than with historically and culturally closer Montenegrins — this situation is quite different from the results of the polls in the past decades. At the same time, Montenegrins are much more acceptable in social relations than other, equally close to the Serbs ethnic groups with whom they used to live in the same country. In other words, it is obvious that the relations between the Serbs and the Montenegrins have undergone certain changes — this is determined and confirmed by the fact that very important political events, such as the withdrawal of Montenegro from the state alliance

with Serbia, the official position of Montenegro on the recognition of the so-called independent Kosovo, arguements about the authenticity of the Montenegrin language, etc., reduced mutual alienation, cooperation and reliance of the Serbs and Montenegrins.

The hetero-stereotypes of Serbian students of Russians are different and quite unexpected, since they are very similar to the ethnic auto-stereotypes (all thirteen markers are positive with the exception of the attribute 'rich' that can be considered neutral). More than half of the students at the University in Kosovska Mitrovica believe that typical Russians are rich (60%), while half of them think that they are capable (50%), brave (49%), clever (46%), progressive (46%), patriotic (42%), cultural (42%), distinguished (38%), hardworking (38%), convivial (36%), cheerful (35%) and proud (34%) (see Table 3).

Table 3

Stereotypes of students of Universities in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis (Serbia) and Kosovska Mitrovica (K&M) of Russians

Characteristics of Russians	Serbia	K&M	Characteristics of Russians	Serbia	K&M
Patriotic	**57,5**	**41,7**	Contumacious	11,8	8,3
Capable	**46,8**	**50**	Good lovers	11,4	12,2
Brave	**43,4**	**49,4**	Presumptuous	10,8	6,4
Religious	**43,1**	27,9	Cunning	10,6	11,3
Rich	**40,1**	**60,2**	Cruel	10,4	7,2
Proud	**40**	**34**	Adaptable	9,8	12,7
Cheerful	**39**	**35,1**	Pedantic	9	22,7
Convivial	**37,1**	**35,9**	Garrulous	8,1	10,8
Clever	**35,3**	**46,1**	Ruthless	8,1	5,5
Hardworking	**33,3**	**37,8**	Aggressive	7,6	5,5
Progressive	32,2	**45,6**	Dull	7,1	9,4
Cultural	29,9	**41,7**	Filthy	6,8	6,1
Open-hearted	29,2	30,7	Rude	6	6,4
Temperamental	25,5	23,8	Niggard	5,8	8,9
Distinguished	24,9	**37,8**	Rapists	4,8	5,2
Disciplined	23,9	30,7	Dishonest	4,8	3,3
Militant	23,9	19,6	Primitive	4,6	5,2
Sociable	22,1	21,3	Violent	4,5	5,8
Nationalists	20,7	12,4	Insincere	4,3	6,9
Diligent	20,6	30,7	Lazy	4,1	4,7
Communicative	20,2	25,2	Hypocritical	4,1	5,2
Businesslike	18,1	27,3	Retrograde	4	6,4
Witty	17,6	23,5	Brigandage	4	4,4
Communists	16,4	8,3	Greedy	3,8	5
Cold	15,9	8	Villainous	3,3	4,4
Emotional	13,8	26,9	Robbers	2,8	6,6
Clean	11,9	28,5	Fascists	2,5	6,1
Boastful	11,8	9,4	—	—	—

The dominant image of Russians might be categorized as 'competent and warm' since it is saturated with positive attributes that indicate personal and social competence, but also with markers of benevolence (cheerful, convivial). In other words, according to the typology derived from the two-factor theory of ethnic stereotypes, students from Mitrovica respect and love Russians. These findings correspond to the results obtained with the social distance scale — Russians are accepted almost as members of one's own ethnic group (recorded score on the scale of ethnic distance was only 1,37 in 2012 — the scores could vary from 0 to 7).

Considering the specificity of the social environment that could influence the students' stereotypes in the southern Serbian province, an identical instrument was used to find out to what extent this extraordinary positive image of Russians is similar or different in other student samples — the data show that almost identical stereotypes of dominant characteristics of the typical Russian are present all over Serbia (Table 3). Although the number of accepted characteristics in the dark frames (more than $^1/_3$ of the sample) is a little lower (10 versus 13 in K&M) and their sequence is a bit different regarding the proportions of the respondents accepting them, we can see that the core of the stereotype is almost identical. Students from four state universities, just like their colleagues in K&M, perceive Russians as competent and warm. The most prevalent attitude is that the typical Russians are patriotic (58%), capable (47%), brave (43%), religious (43%), rich (40%), proud (40%), cheerful (39%), convivial (37%), clever (35%) and hardworking (33%). Then comes a list of frequently named characteristics that certainly support the described positive image, although they do not fulfill the criterion to be considered a stereotype (accepted by less than one third of the sample). An exception is the attribute 'militant': it is associated with aggressive behavior, but, considering the image as a whole and the position of this characteristic in the list of auto-stereotypes we conclude that it does not represent a negative value.

Extremely positive stereotypes of Russians may be interpreted not only as the result of the rich cultural, economic and scientific cooperation, but also as a consequence of the historical and political relations between the Serbs and the Russians as Slav people. Though there were periods when it was hard to speak about cooperation and mutual support, the roots of the closeness should be found in the compatibility of the important social and political goals. For instance, the joint fight in World War II is an important and well known fact to the wide, not only professional public. Protective actions of Russia to solve complex political problems during the late Ottoman rule in the Balkans often resulting in sufferings of the Orthodox citizens are less known, but also contribute to the positive image of Russians: Russia managed to force a more powerful reaction of the Ottoman authorities to the Albanian pressure on Serbian citizens and provide their safety, to provide direct support to the Orthodox citizens of Kosovo and Metohija [21. P. 175]. Contemporary studentd could be also impressed by the official and unofficial position of Moscow — the explicit support of the Serbs in the denouement of the Kosovo crisis. Likewise, the same population had the chance to become more familiar with the Russian culture through the classical literature that was an important part of the educational program in Serbia. We are all witnessing the strengthening of economic cooperation during the past years. Such an interpretation completely corresponds to the two-component stereotype theory, as well as to the theory of social identity, which takes into consideration the social context in the formation of stereotypes.

Unlike the image of Russians, the image of the typical American contains negative attributes and emotional connotations: the core of the stereotype is formed by three characteristics, two of which are negative and one is neutral (refers to the material status) — the students consider Americans to be rich (49%), cruel (49%) and cold (35%) (see Table 4).

Table 4

Stereotypes of students in Kosovska Mitrovica of Americans

Characteristics of Americans	%	Characteristics of Americans	%
Rich	**49,4**	Presumptuous	13,5
Cruel	**48,9**	Rude	13,5
Cold	**34,5**	Niggard	13,5
Aggressive	31,8	Distinguished	13,3
Progressive	31,5	Diligent	13,3
Insincere	28,2	Cultural	12,4
Robbers	24,9	Good lovers	12,2
Villainous	24,4	Adaptable	11,9
Ruthless	23,8	Fascists	11,9
Violent	23,8	Clean	11,6
Militant	22,2	Patriotic	11
Businesslike	21,9	Communists	10,8
Brigandage	19,6	Retrograde	10,5
Garrulous	19,1	Cheerful	10,2
Clever	18,9	Filthy	10,2
Capable	18,8	Proud	9,9
Hypocritical	18,5	Open-hearted	9,7
Dull	18,2	Communicative	9,7
Dishonest	18	Lazy	9,4
Contumacious	17,4	Pedantic	8,3
Rapists	17,2	Temperamental	8
Hardworking	16,6	Sociable	6,9
Cunning	16,6	Primitive	6,9
Brave	16,3	Convivial	6,6
Disciplined	15,7	Emotional	6,4
Boastful	14,9	Witty	6,1
Greedy	14,6	Religious	5,8
Nationalists	14,4	—	—

The list of the prevailing attributes complements the impression: aggressive, progressive, insincere, robbers, villainous, cruel, violent; there is no single characteristic, not even within the less frequent choices, that would indicate benevolence, warmth and morality. The negative coloring of the stereotype is partially mitigated by a neutral feature (rich), as well as by other relatively frequent characteristics — progressive and businesslike, which indicate that some students admit certain competences of the Americans. In other words, according to the two-component stereotype theory, the image of the Americans among Serbian students is as follows: 'moderate competence and pronounced malevolence and coldness'.

The Russians are one of the nations, to which the Serbian youth expresses the least ethnic distance after the Serbs and Yugoslavs [22], that contributed to the creation of such negative stereotypes of the Americans due to the USA inconsistent foreign policy — the intervention in the war conflicts in the former SFRY, especially Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H), and the recognition of the so-called independent Kosovo. The majority of students in the University of Pristina with temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica were born in this southern Serbian province and during their relatively short life experienced the enormous consequences of the NATO aggression in 1999, when most of them were between seven and ten years old, that is why the identified stereotypes

of Americans are not surprising. The processes of globalization also contributed to the formation of such an image of Americans being additionally strengthened by the media pictures. The increase of the ethnic distance to the Americans discovered in the surveys of 2009 and 2012 proves that situational circumstances can strengthen negative stereotypes, regardless the fact that they have a relatively permanent and rigid structure and change slowly.

An almost identical stereotype core was revealed for Germans — they are considered rich (41%), cruel (40%) and cold (37%) (see Table 5), but there are significant differences compared to the Americans — not only in frequencies of the prevailing attributes, but also in a series of frequently used positive characteristics that follow. About 30% of the Serbian students believe that Germans are progressive; almost a quarter of the students think they are hardworking, businesslike and capable. It is interesting that the attribute 'fascists', although relatively frequently allotted (21%), does not form the stereotype core in Kosovska Mitrovica as it was in many previously conducted researches in the region, even the most recent one [4]. Thus, we can see three dominant characteristics in the image of Germans: malevolence, lack of students' predisposition and competence, therefore, the typical German is 'mostly competent and malevolent, i.e., respected but not loved.

Table 5

Stereotypes of students in Kosovska Mitrovica of Germans

Characteristics of Germans	%	Characteristics of Germans	%
Rich	**40,6**	Dull	12,2
Cruel	**39,5**	Villainous	12,2
Cold	**37**	Communists	11,9
Progressive	31,5	Brave	11,3
Hardworking	24,3	Contumacious	11,3
Businesslike	24,3	Pedantic	10,8
Capable	23,2	Communicative	10,2
Insincere	21,8	Dishonest	9,9
Garrulous	21,5	Primitive	9,4
Fascists	21,1	Patriotic	9,2
Disciplined	19,9	Brigandage	9,1
Aggressive	18,8	Rude	8,8
Robbers	18,8	Convivial	8,6
Clever	18,2	Temperamental	8,6
Cultural	18,2	Retrograde	8,6
Violent	17,7	Greedy	8,6
Diligent	17,4	Distinguished	8,3
Ruthless	15,5	Religious	8
Militant	15,2	Filthy	8
Presumptuous	14,9	Cheerful	7,7
Proud	14,6	Open-hearted	6,9
Nationalists	13,8	Good lovers	6,6
Cunning	13,8	Adaptable	6,6
Niggard	13,8	Lazy	6,6
Hypocritical	13,3	Sociable	6,1
Boastful	13	Emotional	5,2
Rapists	13	Witty	4,7
Clean	12,2	—	—

The historical roots of the negative perception of Germans are not only in the collective memory of Serbs due to the sufferings during World War II, such as systematic extermination of ethnic groups in Nazi camps and mass executions of civilians for murdered German soldiers during the occupation of Yugoslavia. A step further in the past leads to the recollection of sufferings from the German army in World War I. The more recent historical reasons are connected with the role of Germany in the disintegration of Yugoslavia and its open support of the independence of some former Yugoslav republics. Additional reasons for the formation of the negative stereotype are provided by the leading position of Germany in the European Union — often the country plays a crucial role in deciding the 'destinies' of the candidates for entering the EU. Participation of Germany in the NATO when bombing Serbia and open recognition of the independent status of Kosovo surely influenced the negative perception of Germans by Serbian students. However, cooperation of the two countries, manifested among other things in the foreign trade exchange, popularity of the German technologies and working migration of Serbs to Germany contribute to shortening the distance to Germans. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that many other surveys in Serbia show negative stereotypes and a low level of confidence namely in Americans and Germans [23. P. 206—297].

Thus, our studies indicate that the Serbian students possess different images of other nations and an extremely positive image of one's own nation saturated with the attributes of personal and social competence, characteristics of Serbs as benevolent and warm people. The students consider Russians as the closest 'other' nation due to the almost exclusively positive attributes allotted to this nation and to the structure of the stereotype core that is very similar to the perception of one's own ethnic group (other positive characteristics that do not belong to the stereotype core are also similar in frequencies and sequence). Generally, the Russians are believed to be competent, respected and warm, i.e. loved. The identified negative and rather ambivalent stereotypes of Montenegrins are somewhat surprising for the nation that is closest to the Serbs — Montenegrins are considered lazy and boasting. Such an image is mitigated by frequently chosen positive and neutral characteristics for describing a typical Montenegrin, although they do not form the stereotype core. The perception of Germans and especially Americans is extremely negative. The core of stereotypes of these nations comprises three characteristics — rich, cruel and cold, although their prevalence in the images of the two nations is not identical (they are more 'American'). Besides, the sequence and frequency of other characteristics used for describing Germans indicate a more positive perception of them compared to Americans.

It should be surely recognized that we describe stereotypes of nations with which the Serbian students had no experience of direct contact, except for the Montenegrins. In other words, there is an important question about how the stereotypes were formed, and to answer this question we should conduct an additional analysis of their creation mechanisms, primarily in the domain of symbolic contacts. Generally, when studying ethnic stereotypes, one should observe their connection and every-day use, as well as public and scientific discourse, as "as long as stereotypes stay in the kingdom of collective imagination, they are not very dangerous, they might be also amusing, even useful. But in the moments when they become the driving force of political decisions, when their alluring image outshines reality, they become the most ominous creations of the human mind, witnessed by the history several times" [7. P. 31].

REFERENCES

[1] *Lippman W.* Public Opinion. — N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich, 1922.

[2] *Hornsey M.J.* Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review // Social and Personality Psychology Compass. — 2008. — № 2/1. — P. 204—222.

[3] *Rot N.* Osnovi socijalne psihologije. — Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1987.

[4] *Turjačanin V.* Etnički stereotipi mladih bošnjačke i srpske nacionalnosti u Bosni i Hercegovini // Psihologija. — 2004. — Vol. 37 — № 3. — P. 357—374.

[5] *Milosavljević O.* Nacionalni stereotipi u istorijskoj perspektivi // Nova srpska politička misao. Special edition — Etnički stereotipi. — 2002. — P. 65—86.

[6] *Derić G.* Pr(a)vo lice množine. Kolektivno samopoimanje i predstavljanje: mitovi, karakteri, mentalne mape i stereotipi — Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, IP Filip Višnjić, 2005.

[7] *Marković P.* 'Civilizacija' protiv 'varvarstva' — prilog teoriji zajedničkog porekla etničkih stereotipa // Nova srpska politička misao. Special edition — Etnički stereotipi. — 2002. — P. 5—32.

[8] *Todorova M.* Imaginarni Balkan. — Beograd: XX vek, 1999.

[9] *Popadić D., Biro M.* Autostereotipi i heterostereotipi Srba u Srbiji // Nova srpska politička misao. Special edition — Etnički stereotipi. — 2002. — P. 33—56.

[10] *Allport G.W.* The Nature of Prejudice. — N.Y., L., Amsterdam, Sydney: Reading MA Ltd, Addison-Wesley, 1954.

[11] *Supek R.* Društvene predrasude. — Beograd: Radnička štampa, 1973.

[12] *Suvakovic U., Petrovic, J.* Etnička udaljenost studenata Univerziteta u Beogradu i Univerziteta u Prištini sa privremenim sedištem u Kosovskoj Mitrovici // Sociološki godišnjak. — 2010. — № 5. — P. 213—228.

[13] *Suvakovic U, Petrovic J.* Russia in the eyes of Serbian students // Вестник РУДН. Серия «Социология». — 2012. — № 4. — P. 81—94.

[14] *Milosavljević S., Radosavljević I.* Osnovi metodologije političkih nauka. — Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2000.

[15] *Supek R.* Ispitivanje javnog mnijenja. — Zagreb: Naprijed, 1968.

[16] *Petrović N.B.* Međusobni stereotipi Hrvata, Bošnjaka i Srba u svetlu dvofaktorske teorije predrasuda // Sociologija. — 2003. — Vol. 45. — № 1. — P. 15—32.

[17] *Mihailović S.M.* Etnički autostereotipi i heterostereotipi na Kosovu // Sociologija. — 1998. — Vol. 40. — № 3. — P. 411—426.

[18] *Tajfel H., Turner J.* The social identity theory of intergroup behavior // Psychology of Intergroup Relations. — Chicago: Nelson, 1986.

[19] *Fiske S., Xu J., Cuddy A., Glick P.* (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth // Journal of Social Issues. — 1999. — № 55. — P. 473—491.

[20] *Cuddy A.J. C. et. al.* Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences // British Journal of Social Psychology. — 2009. — № 48. — P. 1—33.

[21] *Samardžić R., Ćirković S., Zirojević O. i dr.* Kosovo i Metohija u srpskoj istoriji. — Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga, 1989.

[22] *Pantić, D.* Nacionalna svest mladih u SR Srbiji bez SAP. — Beograd: Izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1987.

[23] *Vasović M.* Osnovne karakteristike grupnih identifikacija u populaciji // Društveni karakter i društvene promene u svetlu nacionalnih sukoba / B. Kuzmanović, M. Vasović (ed.). — Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, IP Filip Višnjić, 2005. — P. 171—224.

«МЫ» И «ОНИ»:
СТЕРЕОТИПЫ СЕРБСКОЙ СТУДЕНЧЕСКОЙ МОЛОДЕЖИ

Я.С. Петрович[1], У.В. Шувакович[2]

[1]Кафедра социологии
Университет Ниша
ул. Кирила и Мефодия, 2, Ниш, 18000, Сербия

[2]Кафедра социологии
Философский факультет
Университет Приштины
ул. Филипа Виньича, бб, Косовска Митровица, 38220, Сербия

В статье обобщены результаты двух эмпирических исследований, посвященных ценностным ориентациям сербского студенчества. Первый опрос, обозначивший базовые авто- и гетеростереотипы молодежи, был проведен в 2012 г. на квотной выборке в 363 студента Университета Приштины, временно расположенного в Косовска Митровица. Авторы проанализировали стереотипы студенчества в отношении россиян и сравнили данные с результатами, полученными на выборке в 603 респондента, репрезентирующей студенчество основных государственных университетов Сербии: оказалось, что у молодежи доминируют предельно позитивные автостереотипы и образ россиян, и не только в Косово и Метохии, но и в других регионах Сербии. Кроме того, были выявлены умеренно негативные стереотипы по отношению к черногорцам, немцам и американцам, причем значительные частотные различия в атрибутах этих групп не затрагивают ядра их устойчивых коллективных образов.

Ключевые слова: сербские студенты, этнические стереотипы, эмпирическое исследование 2012 г., Косово и Метохия, Сербия.