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Abstract:
The ethnic map of the Slovak republic (5, 397, 036 citizens according to the 2011 census) consists of 14 ethnic groups with Slovaks (80.7%) constituting the majority. Hungarians (8.5%), Roma (2.0%), Czechs (0.6%), Ruthenians (0.6%) and Ukrainians (0.1) represent – according to Wolff’s classification (2008) – the traditional national minorities. The other 8 ethnic groups (German, Polish, Croatian, Serbian, Russian, Jew, Moravian, Bulgarian) do not each exceed 0.1%. In this article we will concentrate our attention on auto- and hetero-stereotypes of members of five traditional ethnic minorities living in Slovakia: Hungarian, Czech, Roma, Russian, and Ukrainian.

Through intergroup stereotyping we understand standardized and simplified images and beliefs of individual members or groups as a whole. Stereotypes usually correspond to a holder’s beliefs and social objects; in the case of intergroup stereotypes these are typically personality characteristics. Stereotypes have a serious impact not only on the formation of the relation to the target group but also to the formation of in-group atmosphere and appurtenance. The current view on stereotypes is expressed by Stereotype Content Model (SCM) formalized by Fiske, Cuddy & Glick (2007). In the SCM, warmth and competence are two orthogonal dimensions of social judgments, and social targets fall into one of four quadrants created by a combination of these two dimensions. The combination of these dimensions generate distinct emotions: admiration (when warmth and competence are both high); pity (warmth high and competence low); envy (warmth low and competence high); contempt (warmth and competence low) (Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, 2008).

Data was collected in the second half of 2017 in all regions of Slovakia. The total quota sample in our research consists of 972 adult respondents: 165 Hungarians, 160 Roma, 165 Czechs, 160 Ruthenians, 160 Ukrainians, and 162 Slovaks. The mean age of the sample was 45.5 years. Respondents in the PAPI mode of interview were asked to answer more than one hundred questions. In our analyses in accordance with Stereotype Content Model we used 6 bipolar items scaled in a 7-points answer format (with 4 as the neutral point of the scale). Three items represented the Warmth dimension (warm-alof; honest-unfair; sincere-disingenuous) and three item represented the Competence dimension (responsible-irresponsible; assertive-weak; hardworking-indolent). The standardized Cronbach reliability coefficient $C_a$ for Warmth scale was 0.897 and for the Competence scale 0.891.

The obtained results reflect clearly the positive reciprocal effect in the Warmth hetero-stereotypes dimension for the most ethnic group dyads. This is especially visible in the case of Slovaks-Czechs, and Ruthenians-Ukrainians bonds, but also is present in mutual relations between all ethnic groups members except for Roma. They also expressed mainly positive hetero-stereotypes to other groups (with the small exception of Hungarians, where the average 3.91 is slightly below the neutral point 4.00 of the rating scale) but this is not reflected from others in a similar way. Figures in the Competence dimension reproduce the picture described above, but ties between the mentioned closest dyads are slightly weaker and hetero-stereotypes to the Roma moved slightly more to the negative pole.
Data connected with auto-stereotypes of all groups reflect the known fact about their favourableness in comparison with hetero-stereotypes. Hetero-stereotypes of respondents to 5 target groups (4 minority ethnic groups - Hungarians, Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Czechs and for comparison Slovaks representing the majority) expressed to an important extent patterns of similarity, locating all 6 compared groups of respondents (including Roma) into the positive quadrant of the Stereotype Content Model represented by high warmth and high competence. This result supports the picture described in previous analyses (Homišínová, Výrost, 2005; Výrost, 2005) and confirms the stability of mutual perceptions. The situation with hetero-stereotypes to the Roma target ethnic group is visibly different; its location to low-low quadrant in both the dimensions of the Stereotype Content Model is univocal, without no registered statistical difference between groups. These results fill in the picture of social status and conditions of living of the Roma population in general (Europe) and in Slovakia. The Roma community, with an estimate of more than 10 million people, is widely held to be the largest minority in Europe, and experience negative stereotyping and prejudice. Their low educational level, weak economic position, isolated housing conditions with lack of basic facilities, poor health and dependence on social benefits are fundamental factors behind their social exclusion.

Key words:

Intergroup stereotypes in social psychology are understood by standardized and simplified images and beliefs of individual members or groups as a whole. The stereotype term applied in a social context was first used by Walter Lippmann, who defined it as “...an ordered more or less consistent picture of the world, to which our habits, our tastes, our capacities, our comforts and our hopes have adjusted themselves. They may not be a complete picture of the world, but they are a picture of a possible world to which we are adapted” (1997, 63). Stereotypes usually correspond to a holder’s beliefs about attributes of social objects; in the case of intergroup stereotypes, typically personality characteristics could define a group (Yzerbyt, 2016).

Stereotypes have a serious impact not only on formation of relation to the target (out)group but also to the formation of in-group atmosphere and appurtenance. Thomas (2006, 4-5) described six basic functions of intergroup stereotypes/prejudices: 1. Orientation – stereotypes are navigators in complex social reality and strengthen personal capacity for quick reaction; 2. Adjustment – stereotypes accelerate the potential for adjustment to the new social environment and its rules; 3. Resistance – devaluation of out-group as a social comparison tool serves the purpose of creation and maintenance of a positive personal/in-group self-image; 4. Self-expression – communicated images shared by in-group strengthen social support; 5. Identity – stereotypes have a direct impact on collective in-group spirit; 6. Control/justification – stereotypes serves as a control mechanism for required behavior to the target social objects and as a justification of the performed acts.

In seminal classical studies (Katz & Braly, 1933; Allport, 1954) ethnic stereotypes content were viewed as uniform and mostly negative. The current view on stereotypes is expressed by the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) formalized by Fiske, Cuddy & Glick (2007). In the SCM Warmth and Competence are two orthogonal dimensions of social judgments, and social targets fall into one of four quadrants created by a combination of these two dimensions. Despite the empirical evidence that both influences are fundamental, according to the authors warmth judgments are primary: “warmth is judged before competence, and warmth judgments carry more weight in affective and behavioral reactions”. (2007, 77). Warmth can be also understood as valence (positive or negative) of social judgments and competence as their extremity (how positive or negative). So the first dimension of the model expresses activity – active facilitation when
positive (helping) or active harming (attacking) when negative. The second dimension (competence) expresses passive behavior – passive facilitation in a positive case (associations) or passive harm (neglect). A combination of these dimensions generates distinct emotions: admiration (when warmth and competence are both high); pity (warmth high and competence low); envy (warmth low and competence high); contempt (warmth and competence low) (Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, 2008).

The ethnic map of the Slovak republic (from a total of 5,397,036 citizens according to 2011 census\(^1\)) consists of 14\(^2\) ethnic groups: Slovaks (80.7%) constitutes the majority; Hungarians (8.5%), Roma (2.0%), Czechs (0.6%), Ruthenians (0.6%) and Ukrainians (0.1) represent, according to Wolff’s classification (2008), the traditional national minorities. The other 8 ethnic groups (German, Polish, Croatian, Serbian, Russian, Jew, Moravian, Bulgarian) do not each exceed 0.1%.

In our article we will concentrate our attention on auto- and hetero-stereotypes of members of five traditional ethnic minorities living in Slovakia (Hungarian, Czech, Roma, Ruthenian, and Ukrainian).

**Method**

Data was collected in the second half of 2017 in all regions of Slovakia by MEDIAN SK fieldwork agency. The total quota sample in our research consists of 972 adult respondents: 165 Hungarians (57% were female), 160 Roma (50 % F), 165 Czechs (54.5% F), 160 Ruthenians (50.6% F), 160 Ukrainians (53.8% F), and 162 Slovaks (53.1% F). The mean age for the whole sample was 45.5 years (SD=15.9); Hungarian subgroup M=45.8; SD=15.7; Roma M=36.2; SD=14.2; Czech M=46.9; SD=15.1; Ruthen M=42.5; SD=15.5; Ukraine M=46.5; SD=13.9; Slovak M= 42.9; SD=16.6.

Respondents in the PAPI mode of interview were asked to answer more than one hundred questions. In our analyses in accordance with the Stereotype Content Model we used 6 bipolar items scaled in a 7-points answer format (with 4 as the neutral point of the scale). Three items represented the WARMTH factor (warm-alof; honest-unfair; sincere-disingenuous) and three item represented the COMPETENCE factor (responsible-irresponsible; assertive-weak; hardworking-indolent). The standardized Cronbach reliability coefficient \(C_\alpha\) for Warmth scale was 0.897 and the Competence scale 0.891.

**Results**

The obtained results are shown in graphic form, with a focus on the quadrant in which the evaluation is located. The axis X represents Warmth dimension of Stereotype Content Model and axis Y represents Competence. The Point of intersection (PI) of axes is the neutral point of the 7-point response scales, e.g. PI = 4. Groups names are expressed through abbreviations: Sl = Slovak respondents; Hu = Hungarians; Ro = Roma; Cz = Czechs; Ru = Ruthenians; Uk = Ukrainians. Together with groups labels in the graph bubbles, two values are presented; the first is the average

---

2 Nationality of respondents in 2011 census was based on self-declaration principle.
3 Though some estimates suggest that the population could be much higher – they frequently declared themselves as Slovaks and/or Hungarians.
of the group in Warmth dimension, the second is the average of the group in Competence dimension.

**Graph 1: Stereotypes – target group Slovaks**

The values reported by the respondents of all nationalities consistently showed that the in-group auto-stereotype was always perceived as the most positive on both dimensions of Competence and Warmth. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to analyse the differences of values assigned by all of the nationalities in regards to Slovaks, revealing significant differences within both dimensions of Warmth \(F(7, 1317) = 15.003, p = .01\) and Competence \(F(7, 1317) = 6.751, p = .01\). Subsequent post-hoc comparisons (Tukey) identified no significant differences between values assigned to Slovaks by Slovaks themselves and by Ukrainians and Ruthenians, yet the difference was significant between Slovaks and Czechs \(p = .017\) for warmth and \(p = .01\) for competence, but with statistical power at an only negligible 0.03 and 0.05 respectively), then followed by significantly lower values assigned by Hungarians (Czechs and Hungarians at \(p = .01\)), and at the end of the spectrum were perceived stereotypes of Slovaks by Roma respondents \(p = .01\) for both dimensions).
When the respondents were asked to assess Czechs on the chosen dimensions, a similar pattern appeared, with the auto-stereotype for Czechs being the most positively perceived by the Czechs themselves. A one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences between some groups for both dimensions of Warmth ($F(7, 1317) = 13.383, p = .01$) and Competence ($F(7, 1317) = 9.907, p = .01$). Subsequent analysis with post-hoc tests (Tukey) found no significant differences between values ascribed by Slovaks and Czechs, but the difference was significant between Czechs and Ruthenians as well as Ukrainians ($p = .01$ for Warmth dimension, but no difference for Competence), but without differences between Ruthenians and Ukrainians. The lowest values given by the respondents to the Czechs were by Roma and Hungarians, without any statistical significance between these two.

**Graph 2: Stereotypes – target group Czechs**
As in the previous cases, the auto-stereotype was reported to be highest in positive values in both dimensions by Hungarians themselves. A performed one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences between groups for both studied dimensions \( (F(7, 1317) = 22.049, p = .01 \) for Warmth, \( F(7, 1317) = 18.029, p = .01 \) for Competence). Post-hoc comparisons identified differences between Hungarians and Slovaks (in both dimensions \( p = 0.01 \)), clustered without significant difference together with Czechs and Ruthenians, then followed by Ukrainians (difference at the level \( p = .01 \)), and in the end the hetero-stereotype to the Hungarians was valued as least positive by Roma respondents (with statistically significant differences to all other evaluations at \( p = .01 \)). Also their hetero-stereotype to Hungarians on the warmth dimension under the point of the intersection of the axes moves their location into a different quadrant of the SCM model.
Stereotypes concerning Roma ethnic group shows an already expected pattern of auto-stereotypes being the highest positive among Roma respondents, but what is noticeable is the overall lower value of it. A one-way ANOVA has confirmed the differences between values assigned ($F(7, 1317) = 42.049, p = .01$ for Warmth, $F(7, 1317) = 37.417, p = .01$ for Competence). A post-hoc test confirmed statistically significant differences between Roma evaluation and the other groups (at $p = .01$), with no differences between the evaluations of the rest of the nationalities, clustered in the negative poles of both dimensions.
When asked about stereotypes concerning the Ruthenians, the respondents reported an already expected preference for their own in-group; meaning, once again, that the highest scores for positive valence was given to the Ruthenians by Ruthenians themselves. The slight difference between the overall tendencies to give the auto-stereotypes the highest positive values by all nationalities within the research sample was that among all of the nationalities the Ruthenians were giving themselves the highest evaluations in both dimensions, therefore indicating that the in-group preference is the highest from the chosen nationalities. A one-way ANOVA was conducted and found differences between groups ($F(7, 1317) = 40.701, p = .01$ for Warmth dimension, and $F(7, 1317) = 36.241, p = .01$ for Competence). A post-hoc test confirmed significant differences between Ruthenians and Ukrainians ($p = 0.01$), and in descending order with Slovaks, Czechs, Hungarians and Roma.
The final stereotype assessed was the Ukrainian one, with the Ukrainian auto-stereotype being as well perceived as highest at positive ends of both dimensions. A performed one-way ANOVA showed significant differences between groups for both Warmth ($F_{(7, 1317)} = 36.087, p = 0.01$) and Competence ($F_{(7, 1317)} = 33.501, p = .01$). A post-hoc test confirmed differences between values assigned by Ukrainians and Ruthenians, but only in the dimension of Competence ($p = .01$), then for both dimensions between Ruthenians and Czechs ($p = .01$), with Czechs clustered together with Slovaks, without any significant difference between them. At the end of the spectrum, values expressed by Hungarians and Roma were both significantly different from the last values ascribed by Slovaks ($p = .01$ for both dimensions and both nationalities respectively).

In Table 1 we present the overview of the average score in Warmth dimension. Auto-stereotypes are represented by one number in the cells when nationality in the row and column are the same and create a natural diagonal in the table. In the rest of the cells the first average number represents the hetero-stereotype value of members of an ethnic group in the row to the target group in the column; the second number represents the reciprocal hetero-stereotype value of members of ethnic group in the column to the target group in the row.
Table 1: Overview of auto- and mutual hetero-stereotypes of ethnic groups in Warmth dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sl</th>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Hu</th>
<th>Ro</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.30; 5.25</td>
<td>4.89; 4.85</td>
<td>3.24; 4.61</td>
<td>4.72; 5.41</td>
<td>4.74; 5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.52; 4.68</td>
<td>3.06; 4.64</td>
<td>4.65; 5.07</td>
<td>4.49; 4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>2.93; 3.91</td>
<td>4.42; 4.51</td>
<td>4.35; 4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.25; 2.95</td>
<td>4.23; 2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.29; 5.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in the Table 1 reflect clearly the positive reciprocal effect in the Warmth hetero-stereotypes dimension for the ethnic group dyads. This is especially visible in the case of Slovaks — Czechs (5.30; 5.25) and Ruthenians — Ukrainians (5.29; 5.02) bonds, but also is present in mutual relations between all ethnic groups members except Roma. They also expressed mainly positive hetero-stereotypes to other groups (with the exception of Hungarians, where the average 3.91 is slightly below the neutral point 4.00 of the rating scale) but this is not reflected in others in a similar way. Probably because the correlation coefficient between the two sets of reciprocal hetero-stereotypes is positive, but approach only the level of significance (r = 0.401; p < 0.139).

Table 2: Overview of auto- and mutual hetero-stereotypes of ethnic groups in Competence dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sl</th>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Hu</th>
<th>Ro</th>
<th>Ru</th>
<th>Uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sl</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.35; 5.09</td>
<td>4.98; 5.12</td>
<td>3.05; 4.91</td>
<td>4.75; 5.37</td>
<td>4.77; 5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.71; 4.72</td>
<td>2.78; 4.72</td>
<td>4.61; 5.07</td>
<td>5.09; 4.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.68; 4.24</td>
<td>4.45; 4.83</td>
<td>4.31; 4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.29; 2.67</td>
<td>4.28; 2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.19; 5.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in the table 2 of Competence dimension reproduces the picture described above, but ties between the mentioned closest dyads are slightly weaker (Slovaks – Czechs 5.35; 5.09 and Ruthenians – Ukrainians 5.19; 4.53) and hetero-stereotypes to the Roma moved slightly more to the negative pole. These differences are reflected also in the lowered correlation coefficient between the two sets of hetero-stereotypes (r = 0.222; p < 0.427).

Discussion

Data connected with auto-stereotypes of all groups reflects the known fact (e.g. Triandis et al., 1982) about their favourableness in comparison with hetero-stereotypes. Empirical data underlines the interconnection of categorization of a person as a member of social group and self-stereotyping – the mode by which a person reflect themselves through the in-group stereotypes (Cadinu et al., 2013). According to Hunter et al. (2000, 97) “when category members display group serving
attributional biases it is social identity based and not personal self-esteem that is likely to be affected”.

The hetero-stereotypes of respondents to 5 target groups (4 minority ethnic groups - Hungarians, Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Czechs and for comparison Slovaks representing the majority) expressed to a serious extent patterns of similarity, locating all 6 compared groups of respondents hetero-stereotypes evaluations (including Roma) into the positive quadrant of the Stereotype Content Model represented by high warmth and high competence. This result supports the picture described in previous analyses (Homišinová, Výrost, 2005; Výrost, 2005) and confirms a stability of mutual perceptions of these ethnic groups.

The situation with hetero-stereotypes to the Roma target ethnic group is visibly different: its location in the low-low quadrant in the both dimensions of the Stereotype Content Model by Slovakian, Hungarian, Czech, Ruthenian, and Ukrainian respondents is univocal, with no registered statistical difference between the groups. These results fill in the picture of the social status and conditions of living for the Roma population in general (Europe) and in Slovakia. The Roma community, with an estimated more than 10 million people, is undoubtedly the biggest minority in Europe, who experience intense social exclusion and discrimination (the European Comission, 2005; Ringold et al., 2005; Crepaldi et al., 2008). Their low educational level, weak economic position, isolated housing conditions with lack of basic facilities, poor health and dependence on social benefits are fundamental factors in their social exclusion (FRA, 2012). The Roma belong to groups (together with Africans, Muslims, and Jews) suffering the highest level of discrimination in employment and as victims of hate crimes (ENAR, 2013). A Special Eurobarometer 437 results showed that “social circles of Europeans are steadily becoming more diverse” but “the proportion who have Roma friends or acquaintances remained stable” (2015, 7).

In the whole representative sample of 28 EU countries, 63% of respondents answered that they would feel comfortable working with a Roma person, but in the Czech Republic the figure was 29% and in Slovakia 41% (2015, 22).

In conclusion, through our fieldwork experience, we would like to express that stereotypes can be viewed as a sensitive indicator („litmus paper“) of the actual state of interethnic relations. It is instructive to pay systematic attention to this phenomenon. An old truth still stands that „trust takes years to build, seconds to break, and forever to repair“ (Amy Rees Anderson blog, 2014). As far as the Roma community is concerned, it is more and more clear that notwithstanding the responsibility of nation states, the process of their integration will be possible to accelerate only through a common effort and target for all of Europe.

Finally, we would like to add one short methodological remark based on the experience with the Stereotype Content Model application; according to Fiske et al. (2007,79) when people judge individuals, warmth and competence often correlate positively, but when they judge social groups these two dimensions often correlate negatively. In our data all correlations of the scales (6) in all ethnic groups (x6) were positive and statistically significant.
Hetero- and Auto-Stereotypes of Ethnic Minorities in Slovakia

References


**Acknowledgement:**

This work was supported by Slovak Research and Development Agency, grant No. APVV-15-0475 Tendencies of Development of Ethnic Relations in Slovakia (TESS2).