

CORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS GENDER ROLES AND AMBIVALENT GENDER PREJUDICES IN SERBIAN STUDENTS^a

Vladimir Mihić*, Ksenia Šimoković, Andrea Kapetan,
Gordana Bojović

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, Serbia

**mihic@ff.uns.ac.rs*

Abstract

The idea of ambivalence in gender prejudice, as one of the modern forms of prejudice, has been in the spotlight of social psychologists for the last two decades, sometimes even more than most of the well-explored, traditional forms of prejudice such as ethnic or race prejudices. The central problem of this paper is the level of ambivalent gender prejudice toward men and women in students, as well as what the relation of attitudes towards gender roles is, as well as some other variables, and the level of gender prejudice. For research purposes, several scales were applied: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), the Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI), and Attitudes towards Gender Roles scale (ATGR). The sample consisted of 715 students of 34 faculties of the Universities in Novi Sad and Belgrade, as well as students of the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies and Military Academy in Belgrade. The results show that gender prejudices (although there are smaller differences with respect to the type of prejudice) are most strongly predicted by the attitudes towards gender roles, the respondents' gender and the type of faculty (almost consistently students of social and human sciences expressed less prejudices). Also, the most prominent were the benevolent prejudices toward women, confirming that in our culture, this kind of behaviour is still not considered as a problematic treatment of the opposite (but also own) gender.

Key words: ambivalent gender prejudice, attitudes towards gender roles, benevolent prejudice, sexism.

^a This paper is a part of the research on the “Effects of existential insecurity on individuals and families in Serbia” project financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

ПОВЕЗАНОСТ СТАВА ПРЕМА РОДНИМ УЛОГАМА И РОДНИХ ПРЕДРАСУДА КОД СТУДЕНАТА У СРБИЈИ

Апстракт

Идеја о амбивалентности уверења код родних предрасуда, као једној од врста модерних форми предрасуда, заокупља пажњу социјалних психолога у последње две деценије, можда и више него већина традиционалних начина испитивања других врста предрасуда попут етничких или расних. Основни проблем овог рада јесте колико су изражене родне предрасуде према мушкарцима и женама код студената, као и каква је повезаност става према родним улогама, али и неких других варијабли, са израженошћу ових предрасуда. За потребе истраживања коришћене су скале за мерење амбивалентног сексизма (ASI) и скала за мерење амбивалентних ставова према мушкарцима (AMI), као и скала ставова према родним улогама (ATGR). Узорак је чинило 715 студената са 34 факултета Новосадског и Београдског универзитета, као и студената Криминалистичко-полицијске академије и Војне академије из Београда. Резултати показују да су за предикцију родних предрасуда (иако постоје неке мање разлике у зависности од врсте предрасуда) најважнији традиционални став према родним улогама, пол испитаника и врста факултета који студент похађа (готово доследно, студенти друштвено-хуманистичких факултета показивали су мање изражене предрасуде). Такође, најизраженије су биле беневољентне предрасуде према женама указујући нам да се оваква врста понашања у нашој култури и даље не види као посебно проблематичан начин опхођења према супротном (али и сопственом) полу.

Кључне речи: родне предрасуде, став према родним улогама, беневољентне предрасуде, сексизам.

INTRODUCTION

Gender roles, as seen in the context of social psychology, are norms of interactions and expectations about the division of labour between men and women. Defined this way, gender roles depend on cultural-historical context they appear in, and one of the simplest definitions of gender roles postulates that gender roles present a set of expectations about men's and women's behaviour (Myers, 2010). A child learns how to behave in accordance with his or her gender role based on direct tutorship by adults, social modelling and social reactions to behaviours that are attributed to a certain gender, and to which an evaluative epithet is given (Bussay, Bandura, 2004). Children anticipate consequences of their own and others' behaviours and further on, based on expectations, internalize rules of behaviours expected according to their gender, and then model their behaviours in accordance with the internalized rules (Kessler, McKenna, 1978). Parents actively enforce gender typed behaviours by offering dolls to, primarily, girls and cars and trucks to boys. Besides that, they talk significantly more about feelings with girls and show negative reactions when boys behave in what is called effeminate way (Maccoby, 1998). On the other hand, as soon as they get into educational system, children have the opportunity to see men at positions of authority and domination over

women. Also, accordant to that view of institutions, the research has shown that female teachers more often encourage independence and assertiveness in boys than in girls (Venus, 2004). A research conducted on a student population in Serbia showed similar results. Namely, it is shown that students still see men within the area of technical sciences, while social sciences and humanities are 'reserved' for women. However, when it comes to teachers, men are literally more numerous than women, no matter the area of studies (Džamonja-Ignjatović, Milanović, Duhaček, 2015).

Research on gender roles has become more popular as the role of women has undergone huge transformations, in the context of general increase in social standard, the level of education, advancement of feminist moves and female figures taking on important positions in society. One of the most important changes is that from the former role of a woman-housewife, that takes care only about family and home, emerged the idea of an employed woman that has to balance her house duties with her job, that is, outside the house (Kamenov, Jelić, Tadinac, & Hromatko, 2007). Because of that, and as a consequence of adopting new gender roles and especially modern views on the role of women in family and society, we make distinctions between traditional and egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles. Traditional attitudes towards gender roles assume expectations about the division of labour in the house and family exclusively based on gender, which is supporting traditional attitudes that the woman is the one that stays at home and takes care of the house and children, while the man works outside the house and finances family needs. On the other hand, egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles assume expectations on the division of labour based on capabilities of men and women, their needs, possibilities, situation and other factors which are not necessarily based on gender. Based on these definitions of attitudes towards gender roles and the process of socialization of gender typed behaviours, it is expected that children growing up in traditional families would develop traditional attitudes towards gender roles, while children growing up in families where gender equality is promoted would develop egalitarian attitudes (Vuksan, 2009). However, there are researches that show that situation is not as simple and linear, showing that even in the most egalitarian societies women do twice as many house chores than men, and egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles are correlated with the sense of injustice about the division of labour at home, although only when there is a low level of appreciation by the partner perceived (Lachance-Grzela, 2012). Also, even when there are egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles in a family, the research has shown that, in professional context, breaking of 'prescribed' norms for women within the traditional gender role, they are most often met with negative evaluation and negative treatment (Heilman, Okimoto, 2007). One research on the student population in Serbia has singled out, as an important outcome, the one that says that women perceive more

discrepancy between their abilities and possibilities for professional success, which directly points to that even if there are equal possibilities for both genders concerning education, equality in professional life remains relatively low (Džamonja-Ignjatović, Milanovic, Duhaček, 2015). Therefore, although egalitarian attitude toward gender roles in both partners is extremely important for development of such attitudes in children, this compliance of attitudes is not guaranteed to transfer egalitarian attitudes on the following generation.

Gender Prejudice

Traditional view of prejudice as hostile attitudes towards another group cannot help in understanding the true nature of gender prejudice, being that they do not include only elements of open hostility (as ethnic or race), but rather more latent forms of prejudice, being more ambivalent than openly hostile. The specificity of gender prejudice originates from overemphasizing gender stereotypes, which include expectations about certain characteristics and behaviours that arise from psychological and biological differences between women and men (Rinc-Urosević, 2006). In this way, a certain picture about how most of group members should look or behave is created, not taking into account their individual differences and specificities.

When talking about prejudice towards the opposite gender, we mainly talk about prejudice toward women, or sexism. Sexism is seen today as an ambivalent phenomenon, given that this type of prejudice is specific because of the existing interdependence of men and women and the lack of antipathy that otherwise leads to manifestations of prejudice, that is exclusion, ignoring or isolation of a social group that is the object of prejudice (Swim & Cambell, 2003; Glick & Fiske, 1996). This state encouraged authors to introduce the concept of 'benevolent prejudice', whose base is justifying one's own behaviours by the wish to help to the weaker, that is, justifying the prejudice by worrying for a group that, namely, cannot take care of itself (Mihić, 2010a). The same principle, as will be explained further, could also be applied to prejudice toward men.

Benevolent and Hostile Prejudice

Gender prejudice (towards both men and women) is considered to be a multidimensional construct that includes two forms of prejudice – benevolent and hostile. Widely speaking, hostile gender prejudice are manifested as open hostility towards the group that is the object of prejudice, while benevolent are more latent, hidden, less clear forms of prejudice.

Hostile prejudice towards the opposite gender could be explained as typical, traditional prejudice, which fit in almost every definition of prejudice. They are open and include antipathy and unchangeable and

rigid generalization onto members of a certain group. They originate in beliefs (when talking about prejudice toward women) that women are less capable in doing most things relative to men, hence they actually strive to dominate men by demanding equality. These hostile prejudices are formed and maintained by the need of men to take and defend the dominant position in society, and they are, most often and strongly, directed toward women defying them, as women with careers and feminists (Mihić, 2010b).

On the other hand, benevolent prejudice toward women is based on beliefs that women are the weaker gender that should be helped by the stronger one – men. At first sight, this form of prejudice could be viewed as ‘chivalry’, gentleman behaviour of a ‘real’ man making sacrifices if it is necessary even by endangering his own health in order to provide financial and physical security for his partner (Mihić, 2010b). The interpretation of benevolent prejudice as positive, protective attitudes toward women, or even as showing love, is aimed at justifying the inferior position of women relative to men (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Glick and her colleagues argue that, as opposed to hostile prejudice which would most probably be disapproved by women, women most often agree to benevolent prejudice (and manifest them), and that way they make those prejudices firmer, which is exactly what makes them more efficient promoters of gender inequality relative to hostile prejudice (Glick et al., 2000). Although in modern times hostile prejudice has been relatively dismissed (or at least are not as openly manifested as earlier), it seems that benevolent prejudice with sexism in its core, but masked with positive tones, make more damage in achieving gender equality.

On the other hand, hostile prejudice toward men are considered a consequence of the same mechanism of hierarchical social order that forms the base of prejudice toward women, that is a consequence of the fight for establishment of equality within social structure (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The interpretation of benevolent prejudice (also prejudice towards the weaker group, only this time men) is rather interesting, men are given the dominant role in society, but are considered lost unless there are women to take care of them, which are caring mothers, wives, daughters. Considering the fact that these two types of prejudice toward men are more strongly correlated than the prejudice toward women, it seems that benevolent prejudice toward men are socially and scientifically better founded phenomenon than benevolent sexism (Mihić, 2010b).

Problematizing the Relation between Attitudes Towards Gender Roles and Gender Prejudice

The very own relation of attitudes towards gender roles and gender prejudice is not easy to define. There is definitively a correlation between the two constructs, and research has shown that it is justifiable to consider the attitudes towards gender roles as a specific base for forming gender

stereotype and prejudice. This relation is best explained by the Social roles theory (Eagly, 1987) which identifies two narrowly correlated key factors for forming gender stereotypes, those being the division of labour between men and women and the hierarchy of roles. Gender stereotypes basically reflect hierarchical differences between female and male traditional gender roles, where women stay at home taking care of children and are not employed, and men have privileged dominant positions, providing financing and working outside the house. If we take into account that adopted traditional gender roles are one of the cornerstones for further upgrade of gender prejudice, and we put the fact that research has shown strong effect of socialization on forming traditional attitudes towards gender roles in girls and boys on the other side (Garst & Bodenhausen, 1997; Ward, Hansbrough, & Walker, 2005; Rivadeneyra & Ward, 2005), the practical value of this study is clear. Beside clarification of this relation which would contribute to theoretical understanding of these constructs, it would, potentially, provide space for working on reducing gender prejudice through tries of systematic providing of adoption of more egalitarian, or at least less traditional, attitudes at relevant age. The research have shown that exactly adolescents and younger adults are most prone to develop these attitudes, considering that attitudes toward opposite gender in childhood usually includes gender segregation and openly hostile attitudes. Later on, during adolescence, especially with increase in interest for intimacy with the opposite gender and, consequently, more need to interact with it, these attitudes change, adapt to the new reality and, most often, stabilize, that way affecting other attitudes about interaction between genders that a person will manifest in adulthood (Rudman, Glick, 2012). That is the key spot where we see the importance of this research that should offer answers to question what some of the basic correlates of gender prejudice in student population in Serbia are.

The main problem of this research is to determine correlation between hostile and benevolent prejudice toward women and men and attitudes towards gender roles. Besides that, the study will try to answer the question of relationship between respondents' gender, place of growing up, material status, type of faculty and parental education level and the strength of gender prejudice.

METHOD

Sample

The sample consisted of 715 students of the Universities of Novi Sad and Belgrade, as well as Military and the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies cadets from Belgrade. Of that number, 37% are students of social sciences and humanities, 27% of technical-technological sciences, 20% Military and the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies cadets,

5.7% of medical faculty, 4.7% college students and 6.1% of other faculties. The sample included 285 men (39.8% of total sample) and 430 women (60.2% of total sample). The average age was 21.43 years. Only 39.2% of the respondents stated that they are in a stable partner relationship.

Measures

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI, Glick & Fiske, 1996). The scale is created to measure hostile and benevolent prejudice toward women. It consists of 22 items with a 6-point Likert type scale. Higher scores indicate higher expression of gender prejudice. The reliability of the hostile prejudice scale on our sample is $\alpha = .76$, and benevolent prejudice scale $\alpha = .63$, but the scale was held in the study since low reliability of the scale is consistent in other studies in our and similar cultures. Nevertheless, caution is advised when using this scale as a predictor of other types of prejudice, which will be explained further in the text.

The Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI, Glick & Fiske, 1996). This scale measures hostile and benevolent prejudice toward men. It consists of 20 items with a 6-point Likert type scale. As with prejudice toward women, we will use, as scale authors advised, two summative scores (hostile and benevolent prejudice). The reliability of both scales is $\alpha = .84$.

Attitude towards Gender Roles scale (ATGR, Kamenov, Jelić, & Jugovic, 2009). ATGR is a scale for measuring attitudes towards gender roles. Higher scores indicate the presence of more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles, while lower scores indicate more traditional attitudes. The reliability coefficient is $\alpha = .88$.

Procedure

The data was gathered during 2014. Instruments were distributed to the students of Novi Sad and Belgrade Universities, as well as to the cadets of the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies and Military Academy, and a smaller number to the students of other faculties in Serbia. The data was gathered by the students of the Department of Psychology of the Faculty of Psychology in Novi Sad. Data gathering was anonymous and done in a group (because of specificities of some faculties, such as the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies) and individually.

RESULTS

Descriptive analysis shows that students in general tend to have more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles relative to general population in Serbia and similar cultures from the region (see for example Mihić, Filipović, 2012; Kamenov, Huić, & Jugović, 2011), which is expected for the population in question. Also, correlations of scores on all four types of

prejudice point to a consistent problem with the benevolent prejudice scale, that is, the correlation of this scale with hostile prejudice toward women is consistently low (although statistically significant) and on this sample it is only .28. For comparison, the correlation between the two types of prejudice toward men is .51.

Detailed descriptive statistics of these scales is provided in Table 1. It should be noted here that there is a column added to the table for pointing the average scores for all four types of prejudice divided with the number of items ($M_{average}$).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the whole sample

Variables	Min	Max	M_{sum}	$M_{average}$	SD
Benevolent prejudice toward women	18	66	42.29	3.84	7.25
Hostile prejudice toward women	16	65	39.20	3.56	8.93
Hostile prejudice toward men	10	60	34.26	3.43	10.03
Benevolent prejudice toward men	10	58	33.95	3.39	10.13
Attitude toward gender roles (higher score-more egalitarian attitude)	12	72	59.31		10.35

Correlations between attitudes towards gender roles and gender prejudice are as expected. Namely, with the exception of benevolent prejudice toward women in which case the correlation is not significant, students who have more egalitarian attitudes towards gender roles have lower level of prejudice (Table 2). This is especially obvious in benevolent prejudice toward men. The inexistence of significant correlation with benevolent prejudice toward women again shows that this behaviour measured by this scale, at least in our culture, is not seen as an expression of prejudice.

Table 2. Correlations of attitudes towards gender roles and ambivalent prejudice

	HP toward men	BP toward men	HP toward women	BP toward women
Attitude toward gender roles	-.15**	-.52**	-.37**	-.07

**p < .001

When it comes to social-demographic variables for which we considered that could be significantly correlated with the level of prejudice in students, multivariate analysis of variance is used with two dependant variables for each gender, which are statistically significantly correlated, hence the analysis of each separate variable is not used (hostile and benevolent prejudice toward men are presented as ambivalent prejudice toward men, with the same logic applied for prejudice toward women). The results show that only gender and the type of faculty make significant

effects on prejudice toward both men and women (Table 3). None of the interactions of independent variables have a significant effect on ambivalent prejudice.

Table 3. The effects of social-demographical characteristics of students on ambivalent prejudice toward men and women

Effect	Prejudice toward men			Prejudice toward women		
	Wilks' Lambda	F(2,596)	p	Wilks' Lambda	F(2,596)	p
Material status	1.00	1.00	.369	1.00	1.08	.341
Place of growing up	1.00	0.13	.881	1.00	0.03	.966
Faculty	0.97	8.04	<.001	0.97	8.20	<.001
Mother education level	1.00	0.01	.986	1.00	0.23	.797
Father education level	1.00	1.00	.368	1.00	0.87	.417
Gender	0.82	64.51	<.001	0.94	19.88	<.001

In the end, we tested the model of prediction of ambivalent prejudice based on variables that were shown as significant in discriminating between the level of prejudice in students, which are gender, the type of faculty and attitudes towards gender roles. For the purposes of this analysis, multivariate analysis of covariance was applied, with gender and the type of faculty as categorical, and attitudes towards gender roles continuous predictors. The criteria were prejudice, benevolent and hostile toward men in one and toward women in the other analysis.

Regarding prejudice toward men, the model explains 17% of the variance of hostile prejudice and 29% of the variance of benevolent prejudice toward men (Table 4).

Table 4. MANCOVA: the significance of the model for prediction of prejudice toward men

Criteria	R	F	p
Hostile prejudice	0.42	23.51	<.001
Benevolent prejudice	0.55	47.47	<.001

When focused on partial contributions of predictors, it is evident that the best predictor of hostile prejudice toward men is the respondents' gender (women show higher level of hostile prejudice), attitude toward gender roles (students with traditional attitudes show more prejudice), and the weakest one is the type of faculty (students of social sciences and humanities express less prejudice relative to the students of other faculties, Table 5). The results regarding prediction of factors of benevolent prejudice toward men provide somewhat different picture. Namely, for this type of prejudice, the most important predictor is the attitude toward gender roles (more traditional students show higher level of prejudice), while somewhat

lower coefficients are for students of social sciences and humanities and students of the Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies and Military Academy (Table 5).

Table 5. Partial contributions of predictors in predicting prejudice toward men

Predictors	Hostile prejudice toward men		Benevolent prejudice toward men	
	β	p	β	p
Gender (M)	-.41	< .001	.03	.43
Faculty (SS-H)	-.20	.005	-.15	.02
Faculty (Police and Military Academy)	-.06	.36	.08	.05
Faculty (TT sciences)	-.13	.06	-.07	.24
Faculty (medical sciences)	-.02	.65	-.04	.29
Colleges	.01	.75	.04	.34
Attitude toward gender roles	-.30	< .001	-.51	< .001

As expected, and in accordance with the still unclear status of benevolent prejudice in our culture, the percent of explained variance for prejudice toward women is far smaller than for prejudice toward men. For hostile prejudice toward women, the percent of explained variance is around 16%, and for benevolent prejudice the percent is extremely low 5% (Table 6).

Table 6. MANCOVA: the significance of the model for prediction of prejudice toward women

Criteria	R	F	p
Hostile prejudice	0.41	22.53	< .01
Benevolent prejudice	0.24	6.58	< .01

When it comes to partial contributions of predictors for hostile prejudice toward women, the situation is similar to hostile prejudice toward men. The highest contribution is of attitudes towards gender roles (students with more traditional attitudes show more prejudice), a lot lower is the contribution of gender (men show more expressed hostile prejudice) and extremely low is the contribution of the type of faculty (students of police and military academies show less hostile prejudice than students of the other faculties, Table 7). When it comes to the prediction of benevolent prejudice, the significant contribution is of the attitude toward gender roles (as expected), gender (women have more benevolent prejudice toward their own gender) and the type of faculty, only this time students of social sciences and humanities have the lowest benevolent prejudice toward women (Table 7).

Table 7. Partial contributions of predictors in predicting prejudice toward men

Predictors	Hostile prejudice toward women		Benevolent prejudice toward women	
	β	<i>p</i>	β	<i>p</i>
Gender (M)	.15	<.001	-.18	<.001
Faculty (SS-H)	-.06	.21	-.19	.01
Faculty (Police and Military Academy)	-.09	.05	-.01	.86
Faculty (TT sciences)	-.05	.52	-.09	.23
Faculty (medical sciences)	-.04	.37	.03	.53
Colleges	.02	.70	.00	.98
Attitude toward gender roles	-.32	<.001	-.12	.01

DISCUSSION

The main problem of this study was the relation between the attitudes towards gender roles and gender prejudice towards one's own and opposite gender as one aspect of the relationship between men and women. As this relation is very important for the youth that enters the world of intimate relationships, in this study we investigated the level of gender prejudice and attitudes towards gender roles of students in Serbia. This segment of the society is, for sure, its most enlightened part, or at least should be, and the very fact that today's students would become society leaders tomorrow, justifies the interest in attitudes and beliefs of this part of Serbian population. What is clearly shown at the beginning of our analyses is that the ambivalence of gender prejudice remains insufficiently both explored and theoretically based phenomenon. More precisely, the fact that benevolent prejudice toward women are still the most questionable type of gender prejudice points to the problem that understanding of this kind of prejudice has in our (and not only our) culture. The main reason for low correlations between the two types of prejudice toward women, not only in our culture, could be searched for in other studies, but also theoretical postulates, which indicate that benevolent prejudice are seen as very functional for a person (regardless of gender), and although they indicate inequality at social level, they correlate with life-satisfaction in both women and men and, which is relevant for this study, in students of both genders (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012). The correlations of these two types of prejudice in other studies are mostly low, and in some even insignificant (Glick et al., 2000) although the authors argue about pretty high correlations in the original research (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Besides that, some earlier studies on student population show that students 'effeminate' women a lot more, that is, they see more sharply differences between desirable characteristics men and women should have, which is in accordance with the ideas of benevolent prejudice

(Džamonja-Ignjatović, Milanovic, Duhaček, 2015). Also, in a study conducted in Croatia, that is, in a culture very similar to ours, female students estimated the profile of benevolent sexist as very desirable and attractive, as opposed to the hostile one, and the desirability of this kind of sexism was higher with the higher scores they had on benevolent sexism scale (Čvek, 2016). However, the very fact that students, as well as Serbian population in general (Mihić, 2010a) have relatively high scores on this type of prejudice, a valid question emerges – could this way of thinking and behaving be called a prejudice? We deeply believe that the answer is unequivocally YES. Instead of a priori considering women weak and in need for help and caring and even feeling sorry for their weakness, our attention should be paid to the individuals that need our help, irrespective of gender, ethnicity or age. The danger of high benevolent prejudice gets bigger if we know that the research have shown that benevolent prejudice are correlated with justifications of sexual assaults (Abrams, Viki, Masser & Bohner, 2003), lower working performance of women (Dardenne, Dumont & Bollier, 2007), while women who tend to have stronger benevolent prejudice have more expectations of their partners feeling threatened, and become violent towards them, if they get promoted at work (Exposito, Herrera, Moya & Glick, 2010).

When it comes to the main question, the results are unequivocal. Students who have more traditional attitudes towards gender roles (although students in general had pretty much egalitarian attitudes, which is in accordance with some earlier studies in Serbia, Džamonja-Ignjatović, Milanovic, Duhaček, 2015), showed more prejudice in three of four cases. The only exception, for the reasons previously explained, is benevolent prejudice toward women. It would be interesting to notice that the strongest correlations between attitudes towards gender roles and gender prejudice are when it comes to benevolent prejudice toward men. This fact is additionally enhanced with the beta coefficient of this variable being the strongest in this type of prejudice. The explanation of this result lies in the fact that benevolent prejudice toward men greatly coincide with traditional attitudes towards gender role of men in both genders and are highly correlated with the idea that men are the ones that take greater risks than women, are more concerned with financial providing of their families and by that they deserve attention from their wives without whom they would not be what they are. This kind of attitude toward men is clearly and strongly correlated with traditional attitudes towards gender roles, therefore a correlation this high is not surprising. Of course, a similar tendency would be expected when it comes to correlation of attitudes towards gender roles and benevolent prejudice in women, but it is argued more than once that this phenomenon in our (and not only our) culture is very problematic. As opposed to benevolent prejudice toward men (as well as both kinds of hostile prejudice), benevolent prejudice toward women are high regardless

of equality (or tradition) in attitudes towards gender roles. This type of prejudice is still not seen as unacceptable in any of the models of equality of gender roles, hence the correlation is very low. In the end, hostile prejudice toward both genders are not so typical for traditional attitudes towards gender roles, therefore their relationship with attitudes towards gender roles is a lot lower than the one benevolent prejudice have.

Further analyses make it clear that the model of prediction which includes gender, type of faculty and attitudes towards gender roles explains prejudice toward men (and, again, benevolent) a lot better than the ones toward women (especially benevolent toward women). In almost all prejudice, the more traditional attitude toward gender roles predicts the best gender prejudice, which is, again, as expected, since the traditional attitudes towards gender roles clearly support status quo in intergroup relations, especially when it comes to gender, hence prejudice toward both men and women are seen as an important aspect of that widespread social status. When it comes to gender, in both cases there is a clear relationship between hostile attitudes toward opposite gender and benevolent prejudice toward own gender. This result is also expected, since it is in accordance with some earlier works that show that in both genders there is regularity in having more hostile prejudice toward opposite and benevolent toward own gender, which is mostly explained by the wish of maintaining (in men) and changing (in women) the existing social order of male and female positions in social hierarchy. Although gender emerged as a very important measure, especially when it comes to hostile prejudice toward men and benevolent toward women, as this is not the main focus of this paper, for further explanation of importance of gender for ambivalent prejudice the reader is addressed to read other papers who have extensively investigated the subject (e.g. Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2001b; Glick, Sakal-Ugurlu, Ferreira, de Souza, 2002; Russel & Trigg, 2004; Mihić, 2010a). In the end, regarding the type of faculty, in almost all cases, students of social sciences and humanities show less gender prejudice (the exception are hostile prejudice toward women, where there is low, but significant negative correlation of police academy students, showing that they have less hostile prejudice toward women than the students of other faculties), which is in accordance with the fact that students of these faculties may have the widest education when it comes to interpersonal and intergroup relations. This fact, as the one that there is disproportionately larger number of female students at these faculties (although it has to be mentioned that the interaction of gender and the type of faculty was not significant), points out that the width of education, and especially of that in the area of human rights, tolerance, discrimination and similar subjects, is one of the most important factors that contributes to reducing and potentially eliminating gender, and many other, prejudice.

REFERENCES

- Abrams D, Viki G.T.N., Masser B, & Bohner G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 111–125.
- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Badinter, E. (1988). *Jedno je drugo*. [The one is the other] Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Bussay, K., & Bandura, A. (2004). Social cognitive theory of gender development and functioning. In: A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp. 92-119). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Connelly, K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Why Is Benevolent Sexism Appealing? Associations With System Justification and Life Satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly December* 36(4), 432-443.
- Čvek, A. (2016). Uloga ambivalentnog seksizma u procjeni privlačnosti muškaraca. [The Role of Ambivalent Sexism in the Perception of Male Attractiveness]. *MA thesis*. Zadar: University of Zadar.
- Dardenne B, Dumont M, & Bollier T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: Consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 764–779.
- Džamonja Ignjatović, T., Žegarac, N., Popović, D. and Duhaček, D. (2009). Istraživanje stavova prema rodnoj ravnopravnosti u sistemu visokoškolskog obrazovanja. [Research of Attitudes toward Gender Equality in the Higher Education System] *Godišnjak Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu*, 3, 696–709.
- Džamonja Ignjatović, T., Milanović, D. M., Duhaček, G. D. (2015). Structure and Underlying Value of Preferable Gender Characteristics among the Students of Belgrade University. *Primenjena psihologija*, 8(4), 395-414.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 46(4), 735.
- Expósito F, Herrera M.C., Moya M., & Glick P. (2010). Don't rock the boat: Women's benevolent sexism predicts fears of marital violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 36–42.
- Garst, J., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (1997). Advertising's effects on men's gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 36, 551–572.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Glick, P. and others (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763-775.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2001a). An Ambivalent Alliance: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism as Complementary Justifications of Gender Inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56, 109–118.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2001b). Ambivalent sexism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 115–188.
- Glick, P., Sakalh-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M.C., de Souza, M.A. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism and Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 292–297.

- Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks? The implied communality deficit. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 81–92.
- Hoffman, C., & Hurst, N. (1990). Gender stereotypes: Perception or rationalization?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(2), 197–208.
- Jugović, I. (2004). *Zadovoljstvo rodnim ulogama* [Satisfaction with Gender Roles]. MA thesis. Zagreb: Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Kamenov, Ž., Huić, A. i Jugović, I. (2011). Uloga iskustva rodno neravnopravnog tretmana u obitelji u percepciji, stavovima i sklonosti rodnoj diskriminaciji [The Role of Gender Inequality in the Family in the Perception, Attitudes and Gender Discrimination]. *Revija za socijalnu politiku, 18*(2), 195–215.
- Kamenov, Ž., Jelić, M., Tadinac, M., & Hromatko, I. (2007). Quality and stability of the relationship as a function of distribution of house work, financial investments and decision making between partners. In: V. Čubela-Adorić (Ed.), *15th Psychology Days in Zadar: Book of Selected Proceedings* (pp. 133-151). Zadar: University of Zadar.
- Kessler, S. J., & McKenna, W. (1978). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Lachance-Grzela, M. (2012). Mattering Moderates the Link between Gender Ideology and Perceived Fairness of the Division of Household Labor. *Interpersona, 6*(2), 163–175.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mihić, V. (2010a). Izraženost i korelati rodnih predrasuda kod stanovnika Vojvodine [Levels and Correlates of Gender Prejudices in Vojvodina]. *Primenjena psihologija, 4*, 307–321.
- Mihić, V. (2010b). *Determinante i korelati etničkih predrasuda, polnih predrasuda i predrasuda prema starima kod stanovnika Vojvodine* [Determinants and Correlates of Ethnic, Gender and Age Prejudices in Vojvodina]. PhD thesis. Novi Sad: Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy.
- Mihić, V. and Filipović, B. (2012). Povezanost podele posla i stava prema rodnim ulogama sa zadovoljstvom brakom zaposlenih supružnika [The Relation between Division of Household Labor and Marriage Satisfaction in Married Spouses]. *Primenjena psihologija, 5*(3), 295–311.
- Myres, D. G. (2010). *Social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rinc-Urošević, A. (2006). Uticaj polnih stereotipa na vaspitanje i obrazovanje [The Effect of Gender Stereotypes on Upbringing and Education]. *Pedagogija, 61*(3), 320–330.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2012). *Social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Russel, B. L. i Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of Sexual Harassment: An Examination of Gender Differences, Ambivalent sexism, Social dominance orientation, and Gender differences. *Sex Roles, 50*(7/8), 565–573.
- Rivadeneira, R., & Ward, L. M. (2005). From Ally McBeal to Sábado Gigante: Contributions of television viewing to the gender role attitudes of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*, 453–475.
- Swim, J. K., & Campbell, B. (2003). Sexism: attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. In: R. Brown and S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Venus, W. A. F. (2004). Gender Dynamics in the Classroom and Clinical Education Settings, Part 1. *Human Kinetics, 9*(4), 38–40.

- Vuksan, G. (2009). *Stavovi adolescenata o rodnim ulogama i percipirani stavovi njihovih roditelja* [Attitudes of Adolescents about Gender Roles and Perceived Attitudes of their Parents]. MA thesis. Zagreb: Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- Ward, L. M., Hansbrough, E., & Walker, E. (2005). Contributions of music video exposure to Black adolescents' gender and sexual schemas. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*, 143–166.

ПОВЕЗАНОСТ СТАВА ПРЕМА РОДНИМ УЛОГАМА И РОДНИХ ПРЕДРАСУДА КОД СТУДЕНАТА У СРБИЈИ

Владимир Михаић, Ксенија Шимоковић, Андреа Капетан, Гордана Бојовић
Универзитет у Новом Саду, Филозофски факултет, Нови Сад, Србија

Резиме

Модерне идеје о истраживању нових врста предрасуда у средиште пажње социјалних психолога ставиле су идеју о амбивалентности родних уверења према женама, а касније и мушкарцима. Сам концепт амбивалентности уверења код родних предрасуда, као једној од врста модерних форми предрасуда, заокупља пажњу социјалних психолога у последње две деценије, можда и више него већина традиционалних начина испитивања других врста предрасуда као што су етничке или расне.

Основни проблем овог рада јесте колико су изражене беневољентне и хостилне родне предрасуде према мушкарцима и према женама код студената универзитета у Србији, као и каква је повезаност става према родним улогама са обе врсте предрасуда. За потребе истраживања коришћене су скале за мерење амбивалентног сексизма (АСИ) и скала за мерење амбивалентних ставова према мушкарцима (АМИ), као и скала ставова према родним улогама (АТГР).

Резултати показују да су за предикцију већине родних предрасуда (иако постоје неке мање разлике у зависности од врсте предрасуда) најважнији традиционални став према родним улогама, пол испитаника (оба пола имају израженије хостилне предрасуде према супротном полу, а беневољентне према свом) и врста факултета који студент похађа (готово доследно, студенти друштвено-хуманистичких факултета показивали су мање изражене предрасуде). Такође, од све четири врсте предрасуда, најизраженије су биле беневољентне предрасуде према женама указујући нам да се оваква врста понашања у нашој култури и даље не види као посебно проблематичан начин опхођења према супротном (али и сопственом) полу.