

## LANGUAGE NATIONALISM AND LANGUAGE COSMOPOLITANISM – THE CASE OF THE STUDENT POPULATION IN SERBIA, MACEDONIA AND BULGARIA

**Summary:** On the basis of the relevant sociolinguistic literature, the paper analyses the strength of the link between language identity, on the one hand, and national and individual identity, on the other hand, with the students of the University of Niš, the University of Bitola (Republic of Macedonia) and the University of Veliko Tarnovo (Republic of Bulgaria). More precisely, it aims to investigate which attitude towards the given relation would be identified as predominant in the student population – linguistic nationalism or linguistic cosmopolitanism. In addition, the paper also analyses the possible dependence of these attitudes on a number of demographic variables, such as the participants' education and vocational orientation, sex, ethnicity, their place of birth, and their degree of religiousness, among others. The research instrument used in this study was a designed questionnaire, distributed to the students of the University of Niš during the 2012 spring semester, and a (somewhat shorter) questionnaire given to the students of the University of Bitola and University of Veliko Tarnovo at the end of 2012. A statistical (SPSS) analysis of the obtained data was then carried out, pointing to the impact of particular demographic variables on the attitudes of the participants towards the relationship between language and the given layers of identity. In that sense, the paper especially focuses on substantiating the given influence by empirical data and on the comparison of the given type of attitudes with the students of the three universities (and, in the case of the University of Niš, its various faculties and departments), its main aim thereby being the development of the awareness of the student population about the complexity between language and individual / national identity, and in that way providing a contribution to the promotion of intercultural dialogue and multicultural literacy.

**Key words:** language, nation, identity, language nationalism / language cosmopolitanism, attitudes towards the relation between language and national / individual identity.

### INTRODUCTION

Ever since the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (the time of the French Revolution and of authors such as Herder, Rousseau or Fichte), it has been believed that language identity is not merely one of the layers of (individual and col-

---

<sup>1</sup> vladan.pavlovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

lective) identity that is on a par with other layers of identity, but rather that it occupies the central place among the different layers of identity, that it represents the “mirror of the people’s spirit”, and that it guarantees the identity and the prosperity of the nations that were formed at that time (Bugarski, 1996b: 121–161; 2002: 171–176). Hence the popular belief, that is often undermined by empirical data but, despite that, continues to be present in our society (e.g. in the attitudes of far-right organizations in Serbia, as well as in the general population), that a “Holy Trinity” of language, nation and state exists, i.e. that the three are crucially interrelated and interdependent, most often in the following manner: *one language – one nation – one state*.

In that sense, this paper aims to explore which attitudes the students of the University of Niš, Serbia (henceforward *UNI*), the University of Bitola, FYR of Macedonia (henceforward *UB*), and the University of Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria (henceforward *UVT*), hold with regard to the given issue, i.e. to ascertain whether the given population holds the view that language and individual/national identity are closely intertwined (which could be seen as an expression of *language nationalism*), or that maybe such a close connection between the two does not exist (which could be taken to represent *language cosmopolitanism* of the given population). In addition, another aim was to analyse the possible connection between such attitudes, on the one hand, and various demographic variables, on the other. The student population was chosen as it is expected to be at the intellectual forefront of respective (i.e. Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian) societies in the future. In that sense, an overarching aim of the paper is the development of the awareness especially of the student population about the complexity between language and individual / national identity, and in that way providing a contribution to the promotion of intercultural dialogue and multicultural literacy.

The paper puts forward two hypotheses.

Firstly, it hypothesizes that *the students of the UVT, on account of their being citizens of the EU, unlike the students of the two remaining universities, hold views dominated by language cosmopolitanism, whereas the other students lean towards views that could be taken as indicators of language nationalism*.

And secondly, it hypothesizes that, *when it comes to the UNI only, the students of the English Department, on account of their education which necessarily makes them acquainted with other cultures through a foreign language and the literature written in it, also hold views dominated by language cosmopolitanism, whereas the other students lean towards views that could be taken as indicators of language nationalism*.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

As terms such as *value judgments* referring to the relation between *language identity* and *national identity* (taken *collectively* and *individually*) are of great importance in the given paper, they will be defined here in greater detail.

The term *identity* is here used to refer to a set and continuity of essential characteristics that distinguish one group of people or an individual from another (Bugarski, 2005: 67; Bugarski, 2009: 12). It can be considered as consisting of a series of components, including the following: 1) its *levels*: identity as humanity, collectivity and individuality, 2) its *layers*: ethnic, religious, professional, social, territorial, cultural, political, generational, gender as well as linguistic, national and other layers of identity, and 3) *the degree of its strength*, i.e. strong, medium and weak identity (Bugarski, 2009: 12). The aforementioned first level of identity - *humanity*, is not relevant for this study because it has no otherness – this paper does not compare the human race with other living beings. However, all the other mentioned *levels* (identity shared within a community as well as an individual's unique identity) are closely related, and by intertwining with the aforementioned layers and levels, they constitute an extremely complex structure, whose elements are almost all socially constructed (and not “given by God” or “Nature”), and which are subject to change (Bugarski, 2009: 12). In that sense, we shall consider the linguistic and national identity to be types of layers of identity that may appear at the aforementioned levels of collectivity and individuality (as the levels of interest in this paper), and which may be manifested in the degrees mentioned above. Moreover, the concepts of *people*, *nation*, *ethnic group/ethnicity*, *ethno-national consciousness* and *language* are used in this paper in the same sense that Bugarski uses them (Bugarski, 1996b: 123–125; 2002: 15–27).

Popular (i.e. layman) attitudes to language (and the attitudes indirectly associated with national and language identity) have been analysed by Bugarski (1996a: 164–171). There they are defined as anonymous and widely accepted general attitudes on language and languages that are passed down from generation to generation, usually in the form of common conversational clichés (Bugarski, 1996a: 164). A certain part of this linguistic folklore, according to the author, even when it comes to pure prejudice and superstition, is completely harmless; however, among them there are some that may have serious consequences, and which should not be ignored.

Bugarski classifies language attitudes based on three criteria: a) according to the subject, where the attitudes include an entire range of a language in general, via certain languages and dialects, to idiolects as individual speech; b) according to the type, language attitudes are classified into aesthetic, pragmatic, moral and social ones, and c) according to the direction, language attitudes may relate to one's own or to a foreign language, dialect or idiolect. These divisions are closely related, and the author illustrates this point with numerous examples.

Moreover, Bugarski stresses that in all the listed attitudes there is a general tendency for declaring as normal *everything belonging to us*, whereas *everything belonging to them* is subject to ridicule or even anathemizing. Bugarski (1997b: 75–83; 2009: 11–73) also thoroughly analyses popular beliefs regarding languages and nations, the “native” and “foreign” in a language, the social basis of linguistic conflicts and attitudes referring to language.

The issues of a relation between language and national ethnic con-

consciousness, the issues of the relation between language and a nation in time and space, as well as issues of ethnic characteristics and nationalism in language, stand out in particular as significant ones (Bugarski, 1996b: 121–161; 1997a: 70–79; 2002: 11–94). Attention is especially drawn to the two following important facts. Firstly, no fundamental link should necessarily exist between a language, nation and state, and therefore an ethnicity may be constituted as a nation even if it does not have its own separate, standardized, national language that would be used by all the members of the ethnicity. And secondly, it stresses the attitude that language and ethno-national consciousness do not have to be inextricably linked, i.e. that the ethno-national consciousness may well develop without a national language, which, therefore, does not necessarily have to constitute support for and guarantee its preservation, nor need it constitute “the essential embodiment of the very soul for the ethnicity in question”. This is exemplified by a number of empirical facts, which, for limitations of space, cannot be cited here.

In that sense, an essentially romanticist, mystical and mythological attitude regarding the close connection between language, nation and state, i.e. the idea that overall identity may be reduced to the ethnical background embodied in the mother tongue, as well as the attitude that mankind is naturally divided into nations each having its own particular and unique character, where language is a guarantee for that uniqueness, may be called *linguistic nationalism* (Bugarski, 2002: 60). And vice versa, for an attitude that denies the aforementioned, and that may be regarded as rational, cosmopolitan and future-oriented, this paper uses the term *linguistic cosmopolitanism*<sup>2</sup>.

Authors that also discuss the presented issues, among others, include: Edwards, Fought, Greenberg, Joseph, MacGiola Chríost, and Fishman (detailed bibliographical data regarding their work in the area is provided in the References section at the end of the paper). They discuss issues referring to the relation between language, on the one hand, and national, ethnic and religious identity, on the other, as well as issues referring to the relationship between language, nationalism and ethnic conflict, both on the territory of the former Yugoslavia (e.g. Greenberg), and in other parts of the world (the other listed authors), paying specific attention to their close connection and the consequences of that connection.

In addition, local sources that deal with similar issues include: Kovačević, Đorović, Ignjačević, Vlahović and Kordić (once again, detailed bibliographical data regarding their work in the area is provided in the References section at the end of the paper). These sources explored the attitudes of both students and the general population – speakers of Serbian/Serbo-Croatian – regarding their relation towards foreign languages (e.g. the importance of foreign language learning and its popularity), their relation regarding the varieties of Serbian/Serbo-Croatian (i.e. the literary language/native speech), and similar issues.

<sup>2</sup> Regarding the abovementioned term (*linguistic cosmopolitanism*), we wish to emphasize that the given author never explicitly used this term in its entirety, as opposed to the term *linguistic nationalism*. However, he regularly in all of the specified places confronts the term *nationalism* with the term *cosmopolitanism*, and therefore for the purposes of this paper, the phrase *linguistic cosmopolitanism* was coined.

## 1.2 The Method

As a basic instrument for the research presented in this paper, a questionnaire was developed, which, in addition to questions about demographic details, consisted of statements with offered alternative (*yes / no*) answers.

These statements have been created on the basis of the literature previously listed, as well as on the basis of the attitudes to the relation between language and national identity which could be found on the websites of some of the far-right wing organizations in Serbia, i.e. on the website of the *Otačastveni pokret Obraz* organization ([www.obraz.rs](http://www.obraz.rs)) and the *Srpski narodni pokret 1389* movement ([www.snp1389.rs](http://www.snp1389.rs))<sup>3</sup>. Some of these positions are as follows: *It is natural that each nation should have its national language and national state, In order to live and work successfully, one need not use his / her own mother tongue, The word srpski should be written as srbski (or, even better, Srbski), so as to show belonging to the Serbian nation more prominently, One should accept Europe, its differences and values, as an enlarged cultural, spiritual and language homeland*, and the like.

The given attitudes were formulated in such a way that the respondents who “tend towards” either a “nationalistic” or “cosmopolitan” standpoint constantly have to alternate between *yes* and *no* answers, rather than constantly (automatically) offer only one of the two answers.

The survey was conducted in two almost parallel stages (both carried out during 2012):

1) the stage when a representative<sup>4</sup> sample of students from all the three universities (818 students from UNI, 804 students from UB and 586 students from UVT) were presented with a questionnaire, which apart from the issues dealing with demographic details about the students, addressed primarily various primarily *sociologically* important issues (such as students’ attitudes towards marriages of people belonging to different national, religious and other backgrounds and the like), but also included 6 (six) statements in total regarding issues that can be viewed as *sociolinguistic* ones, especially those related to the relationship between language and individual / national identity, as the main topic of this paper. This part of the research was conducted within the central empirical research carried out within the project this paper has been written in, namely the project entitled *Tradition, Modernization and National Identity in Serbia and in the Balkans in the Process of European Integrations*, carried out by the Centre for Sociological Research at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš;

2) the stage when a sample of students from the University of Niš only were presented with a questionnaire that, apart from the issues dealing with demographic details about the students, included as many as 19 (nineteen), rather than only 6, statements relevant in view of the aims of

<sup>3</sup> These websites were accessed in September 2011.

<sup>4</sup> It was a job of the colleagues specializing in methodology of sociological research from the scientific project previously referred to and to be referred to below, to establish and secure that indeed a representative sample of students from all the three universities has been chosen, and to address all the other relevant methodological issues.

this paper presented above. It was carried by a subset of researchers involved in the given national scientific project who are especially interested in the given sociolinguistic issues, and encompassed 665 students, 146 of whom were students of the Department of English, 96 students from the Department of Sociology and 88 students from the Department of History, all those departments belonging to the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš, 140 students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, 121 students of the Faculty of Law and 74 students of the Faculty of Medicine. The entire questionnaire (translated into English) used in this part of the research is given in the Appendix to this paper, and is also exemplary of the type of the questionnaire given in stage 1 of the research, which was, as stated above, much longer, so that that particular questionnaire could not be incorporated into this paper in its entirety.

This two-stage process in conducting the given research has also affected the way the actual results will be presented here.

In that sense, as far as the stage 1 of the research is concerned, the paper will simply present and compare the results obtained using the SPSS software dealing with how students from the three given universities responded to the 6 relevant statements.

On the other hand, the data obtained within stage 2 of the research will present the main focus of the paper, because the research it involved was specifically designed to address the very issues this paper deals with (rather than various sociologically relevant issues in general, such as the one briefly mentioned above).

All the responses from the questionnaires used in stage 2 of the research were then entered into the SPSS program for statistical analysis. The preliminary analysis of the data revealed an almost general (non)compliance (80% or more) for a total of 7 (out of 19) attitudes, wherefore those attitudes cannot serve as proper indicators of “linguistic nationalism” or “linguistic cosmopolitanism”, which is why they were not taken into account in the quantitative data processing. The responses of the participants to the remaining 12 standpoints were recoded so that a “nationalist” response to the proposed attitude scored 1, and the “cosmopolitan” scored 0. That was the basis for calculating “the index of linguistic nationalism” (hereinafter referred to as ILN), a term that has three related meanings: 1) at the level of every individual participant, it represents the total value of the recoded “nationalistically” directed responses of a participant to the views presented to him / her; 2) at the faculty / department level, it represents an average value that is obtained by adding all the recoded values of the “nationalistically” directed answers of all the participants from a specific faculty / department and by dividing it by the number of participants from the faculty / department; 3) at the level of the entire survey sample, it represents the mean value calculated by dividing the recoded values of the “nationalistically” directed responses of all the participants from the sample by the total number of participants.

Clearly, the value of the ILN in each of the three listed meanings ranged from 0 to 12, where a value closer to zero indicated that the participants tend towards “cosmopolitanism”, and a value closer to 12 indicated “nationalistically” oriented attitudes.

Thus established ILN was then cross-tabulated with the following demographic variables: educational and professional profiles (i.e. the departments / faculties at which the polled students are enrolled, sex, age, nationality, place of birth and residence, parents' place of birth and education level, the religion / confessional affiliation of the participants and their attitude toward religion).

This paper in no way lends support to the thesis that the values obtained by the described methods of calculation represent any "absolute values". On the contrary - they are always taken to simply indicate certain tendencies among the participants belonging to different departments and faculties.

The attitudes which for the purpose of the *quantitative* analysis were previously qualified as not discriminative enough, were, however, taken into account for the *qualitative* analysis of the data.

## 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### 2.1. Analysis Pertaining to the Part 1 of the Research (Involving all the Three Given Universities)

The results obtained in stage 1 of the analysis, as that stage was described above, will be presented first.

The students' answers to some of the statements dealing with the issues related to the interrelationship between language identity, on the one hand, and national and individual identity, on the other hand, were sometimes quite similar across all the three universities from the three countries.

For example, when it comes to whether the students agree that *an official use of different languages within a country is to be treasured and considered a strength of that country*, 54.5% of students from Serbia, 51.1% of students from Macedonia, and 57.5% of students from Bulgaria, expressed their approval of such an attitude. Still, 25.2% of the students from Serbia and practically an equal number of the students from Macedonia, as well as 29% of the students from Bulgaria expressed their disapproval of such an attitude, all of which can be seen from the tables below:

Tables 1-3: The attitudes of the students from UNI, UB and UVT respectively regarding whether an official use of different languages within a country is to be treasured and considered a strength of that country

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	444	54,3	54,5	54,5
Disagree	205	25,1	25,2	79,7
Valid No attitude to it	164	20,0	20,1	99,9
4	1	,1	,1	100,0
Total	814	99,5	100,0	
Missing System	4	,5		
Total	818	100,0		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	411	51,1	51,1	51,1
Disagree	202	25,1	25,1	76,2
Valid No attitude to it	191	23,8	23,8	100,0
Total	804	100,0	100,0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	326	55,6	57,5	57,5
Disagree	170	29,0	30,0	87,5
No attitude to it	70	11,9	12,3	99,8
33	1	,2	,2	100,0
Total	567	96,8	100,0	
Missing System	19	3,2		
Total	586	100,0		

Still, when it comes to the students' answers given in relation to some of the other attitudes regarding the link between language identity, on the one hand, and national and individual identity, on the other hand, they tend to be quite varied, and to display attitudes which are more in line with language nationalism in the case of some countries, or language cosmopolitanism, when it comes to some other countries.

For example, when it comes to the following attitude: *Do you agree that the national minorities should be allowed to carry out the education process in their mother tongue*, 40% of the polled students from Bulgaria, 44,2% of the polled students from Macedonia and 62,1% of the students from Serbia, expressed their agreement with such an attitude, making the students from Serbia most open to such an idea, as can be seen from the tables below.

Tables 4-6: The attitudes of the students from UNI, UB and UVT respectively regarding whether the national minorities should be allowed to carry out the education process in their mother tongue

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	505	61,7	62,1	62,1
Disagree	148	18,1	18,2	80,3
Valid No attitude to it	159	19,4	19,6	99,9
4	1	,1	,1	100,0
Total	813	99,4	100,0	
Missing System	5	,6		
Total	818	100,0		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	355	44,2	44,2	44,2
Disagree	246	30,6	30,6	74,8
Valid No attitude to it	203	25,2	25,2	100,0
Total	804	100,0	100,0	

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	227	38,7	40,0	40,0
Disagree	268	45,7	47,2	87,1
No attitude to it	73	12,5	12,9	100,0
Total	568	96,9	100,0	
Missing System	18	3,1		
Total	586	100,0		

Still, opposite trends could be seen in the students' answers to some of the remaining statements, such as *One should accept Europe, its differences and values, as an enlarged cultural, spiritual and language homeland*, where it is 39.5% of students from Macedonia, 38.8% of students from Bulgaria and only 17.8% of the students from Serbia that agreed with such an attitude (with the disapproval rate towards such an attitude being 31% for Macedonia, 46.6% for Bulgaria, and as much as 53,5% for Serbia, as can also be seen from the tables below.



Tables 7-9: The attitudes of the students from UNI, UB and UVT respectively regarding whether one should accept Europe, its differences and values, as an enlarged cultural, spiritual and language homeland

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	143	17,5	17,8	17,8
Valid Disagree	450	52,6	53,5	71,4
Valid No attitude to it	230	28,1	28,6	100,0
Valid Total	803	98,2	100,0	
Missing System	15	1,8		
Total	818	100,0		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	316	39,3	39,5	39,5
Valid Disagree	248	30,8	31,0	70,4
Valid No attitude to it	237	29,5	29,6	100,0
Valid Total	801	99,6	100,0	
Missing System	3	,4		
Total	804	100,0		

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	210	35,8	38,8	38,8
Valid Disagree	252	43,0	46,6	85,4
Valid No attitude to it	79	13,5	14,6	100,0
Valid Total	541	92,3	100,0	
Missing System	45	7,7		
Total	586	100,0		

All of such answers, generally speaking, testify to the fact that the hypothesis put forward above, namely that that *the students of the UVT, on account of their being citizens of the EU, unlike the students of the two remaining universities, hold views dominated by language cosmopolitanism, whereas the other students lean towards views that could be taken as indicators of language nationalism*, holds only partially, and that additional research should be carried out regarding why the students have provided the given answers (i.e. why the majority of students from Bulgaria disapprove of the practice of allowing national minorities to carry out the education process in their mother tongue. In that sense, one can only hypothesize about that and say that this may be a result of Bulgaria being a slightly more nationally homogenous country than Serbia or Macedonia, that this may point to the disillusionment with some EU integration processes, and the like).

## 2.2. Analysis Pertaining to the Part 2 of the Research (Involving the UNI Only)

ILN mean value of the whole sample is 5.92, which means that the interviewed students hover between the “nationalistic” and “cosmopolitan” pattern in their understanding of the relationship between language and identity. The participants from the English Department scored the lowest ILN mean values, and the participants from the History Department had the highest scores. The standard deviations of the mean values are relatively high. The data are presented in Table 10:

Table 10: The mean values of the ILN for the UNI faculties/departments

Faculty / Department	Mean value ILN	n	Standard deviation	min	max
Mechanical Engineering	6,61	129	2,27	1	11
Law	6,25	117	2,32	1	11
Medicine	6,44	70	2,00	2	11
English	4,43	138	2,46	0	12
Sociology	4,98	87	2,36	0	10
History	7,42	84	2,50	0	12
Total	5,92	625	2,55	0	12

When it comes to cross tabulating the ILN with the socio-demographic variables, the connection of the ILN and the attitudes referring to religion has proved to be most obvious, whereas the connection to the participants' sex, age, place of birth and residence, ethnicity and denominational affiliation, their parents' education and place of birth was less obvious. When comparing the ILN mean value for each faculty in relation to the gender of the participants, the results reveal higher "nationalism" among the male students, except for the Faculty of Philosophy, where the ILN mean value at all three departments is higher among the female students. The most consistent results, with an almost negligible difference, were obtained from the future lawyers, whereas the largest differences were determined between the male and female students of the departments of Sociology and English, which undoubtedly deserves additional analysis which cannot be undertaken here.

Table 11: The mean values of the ILN at UNI faculties/departments in relation to gender

Faculty / Department	Gender	Mean value ILN	n	Standard deviation
Mechanical Engineering	Male	6,70	100	2,15
	Female	6,31	29	2,65
Law	Male	6,21	24	2,13
	Female	6,28	92	2,37
Medicine	Male	6,60	25	2,25
	Female	6,36	45	1,86
English	Male	3,83	30	2,65
	Female	4,59	108	2,39
Sociology	Male	4,08	26	2,33
	Female	5,36	61	2,29
History	Male	7,31	54	2,64
	Female	7,60	30	2,25
Total	Male	6,18	259	2,62
	Female	5,75	365	2,48

When considering the ILN mean value concerning the students' age, only those students between the ages of 20 and 23 were taken into consideration for the analysis.<sup>5</sup> The data reveal different trends at the faculties / departments. While a constant decline in "nationalism" with the students of sociology with an increase in age (at the more advanced levels of study) can be established<sup>6</sup>, the opposite was evident of the law students. The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, the History Department, and, especially, the Faculty of Medicine, display the largest number of variations, and one

5 This makes up 82.10% of the total sample, and 87.36% of those who expressed their agreement/disagreement with the 12 statements on the basis of which the ILN is constructed.

6 However, we cannot speak about a stronger correlation, given the low value of Spearman's correlation coefficient ( $\rho = -0.285$ ).

cannot speak about any clear tendency towards one direction or the other. The ILN mean value remains the most constant with the students of English, which is somewhat surprising, since it was logical to expect that as the studies progress, the level of the (English) students' awareness regarding the relationship between language and nation increases.

Regarding the *ethnicity* of the students, 96.4% of the sample consists of students who declared themselves Serbs, where the ILN has the same value as for the entire sample. The percentage of other national minorities<sup>7</sup> is negligible (each less than 1%).

When analyzing the relation between the *place of birth* and the ILN, no major differences in the average achieved score were determined (with a minimal deviation from the average for an entire sample) for the students born in towns, cities and large towns, which make up 94% of the participants. The percentage of the others is negligible, and no valid conclusions may be drawn regarding the effect of the birth place on the "nationalism" of the respondents.

When it comes to the *place of residence*, it was expected that with the increasing size of the community where the students reside, a decrease in "nationalism" would be found. However, these expectations were not met. Although the students who live in the country scored the highest ILN value (6.06), it is only slightly larger than that of the others, which make up a more significant percentage of the sample (e.g., in the case of a large city it is larger by only 0.14); therefore no regularity can be established here.

The analysis demonstrated that the *place of mother's and father's birth* does not affect the ILN value noticeably, whereas when it comes to *parents' education* a surprising finding is that the average ILN value records a slight increase with an increase in the level of the education of the father, and in the case of the education level of the mother the ILN decreases when one goes from elementary school, over to high school and university, recording a slighter increase in cases when the mother has a university degree. The findings are contrary to the assumption that the level of "nationalism" will record a decline among participants with parents having high education.

Most of the students from the sample (67.8%) cited Orthodox Christian as their *religion* (n = 451), and their average ILN score was 6.26. Orthodox Christians from among the students of English and Sociology have lower scores (4.88, and 5.56 respectively), whereas the Orthodox Christians from other faculties / departments have higher scores.

Christians made up a significant percentage of the sample (n = 87, 13.1%) with an average ILN score of 5.87 and atheists (n = 25, 3.8%), who also had a lower average ILN value of 3.08. The incidence of other religions<sup>8</sup> is negligible (less than 1% each). Students who did not state their religion (n = 67, 10.08%) had an average ILN score of 5.22.

The clearest relation was observed between the ILN and *the atti-*

7 Those include: Bulgarian, Montenegrin, Yugoslav, Roma, Croatian and Greek.

8 There were cases of "Rastafarians", "Deists", "Manicheans", "Maradonists", "Agnostics", and those who cited "patriotism" or "Serbian" as their religion (the last on the list are from the Faculty of Law and the History Department, Faculty of Philosophy).

tude toward religion – the “stronger” the religiousness, the higher the ILN score. However, the standard deviation values are relatively high, and the low value of Spearman’s correlation coefficient ( $\rho = -0.28$ ) indicates that there is no significant dependence between these two variables.

Table 12: The mean ILN values and the attitude regarding religion

Attitude regarding religion	Mean value ILN	n	Standard deviation
I am a firm believer and I accept anything that my religion teaches	6,89	180	2,24
I am religious, but I do not accept everything that my religion teaches	6,16	211	2,22
I think about it, but I am not sure whether I believe or not	5,17	77	2,36
I am indifferent to religion	5,06	31	3,02
I am not religious, but I do not have anything against it	4,33	73	2,77
I am not religious and I am against it	2,91	11	2,63
No data	6,17	42	2,55

We shall also present here a possible qualitative analysis of students’ answers to three specific attitudes (rather than all 19 of them, which would indeed take too much space here). Such an analysis may by itself further contribute to the achievement of the goal that was set at the beginning, and at the same time it provides us with the opportunity to pay attention to the attitudes which in the quantitative analysis did not prove to be discriminatory enough.

The percentage of positive responses to attitude № 1 of the questionnaire (*It is natural that every nation has its own national language and a national state*) at all the included departments / faculties is extremely large, and ranges from 85.4% at the Department of Sociology, to 95.9% at the Faculty of Medicine.

These data may reflect the (average) extreme “linguistic nationalism” of the participants when it comes to this attitude, i.e. the idea of the tight relation among the nation, the language and the country, especially in view of well-known empirical facts (briefly referred to above) that often deny such a strong relation in practice. In addition, if such a strong “nationalistic” attitude could possibly be expected from students belonging to non-philological departments, such an attitude may be considered surprising when it comes to students of English, who study in detail, among other materials, American, Canadian and Australian literature and culture, and are certainly aware of the fact that none of these three nations has its own national language.

The following attitude (*Ijekavian pronunciation (as in the words mljeko, vrijeme, dijete) should be excluded from the Serbian language as it is used by Croats and Bosnians (for example, in the following words odvjetnik, ispovijed)*) was included in the questionnaire under the influence of an actual event when Ijekavian pronunciation became banned in public use in the Republic of Srpska, during the last war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (and shortly after the law was withdrawn because people - native Ijekavian speakers could by no means adjust to the new change). Moreover, as it is well known, the Eastern Herzegovinian Ijekavian dialect together with the Ekavian dialect of Šumadija and Vojvodina, constitute *the basis* of the Serbian literary (standard) language, thus every insistence on its

expulsion from use could be considered paradoxical. In that sense, it could be said that the positive responses regarding the abovementioned attitude, given by more than half of the Faculty of Medicine (66.2%), Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (55.7%) and the Faculty of Law (52.1%) students were quite surprising; at three departments of the Faculty of Philosophy this attitude got only minor support (42% at the History Department, 38% at the Sociology Department and the lowest was for the English Department – 32.3%).

The attitude *The word srpski should be written as srbski (or, even better, Srbski), so as to show belonging to the Serbian nation more prominently*, which is doubtlessly very much in the spirit of language nationalism, was taken directly from the internet portals of one of the far-right organizations in Serbia (listed above). Despite the fact that the majority of the polled students do not support such an attitude, significant differences have been noticed regarding a positive attitude towards such a judgement. Namely, whereas the answer *yes* has been circled by only 3,4% of the students from the Department of English, it is 13,5% of the students at the Department of Sociology, 14,9% of the students at the Faculty of Medicine, 21,5% of the students at the Faculty of Law, 23,9% of the students at the Department of History, and as much as 29,3% of the students at the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, that have expressed their approval of such an attitude, all of which may also testify to the importance of philological education of some of the polled students.

## CONCLUSION

As already stated above, the *first* starting hypothesis has been confirmed only partially. Namely, the standpoint that *the students of the UVT, on account of their being citizens of the EU, unlike the students of the two remaining universities, hold views dominated by language cosmopolitanism, whereas the other students lean towards views that could be taken as indicators of language nationalism*, proved to be true only in some of the answers, and additional research is called for to account for the reasons why the students have provided the given answers (i.e. why the majority of students from Bulgaria disapprove of the practice of allowing national minorities to carry out the education process in their mother tongue).

The *second* starting hypothesis (pertaining to the students of the UNI only) may be considered confirmed: *English Language students, as students of philology, regarding the issues concerning the relation between language and national identity, usually hold a more “cosmopolitan” attitude when compared to their colleagues from other departments and faculties (especially the students of history and mechanical engineering, and somewhat less students of sociology)*.

Female students at all the departments of the Faculty of Philosophy showed greater “linguistic nationalism”, whereas male students from other faculties were more inclined toward “nationalism”. The age of the participants at the faculties/departments where the survey was conducted cor-

relates conversely with the ILN, and it is only with the sociology and law students that one can see a clear trend that over the years they become less or more “nationalistically” oriented. In contrast to what was expected, the students who were born or live in large Serbian cities do not have a significantly lower ILN score compared to those living in smaller towns and villages. As far as the parents’ education is concerned, it was found that the value of the ILN does not decrease among participants whose parents have a higher education.

Obviously lower ILN scores were recorded with non-religious participants, and with the variables concerning the attitudes toward religion, a “regular” link was noted in direct proportion with the ILN, although no significant correlation coefficient was determined.

When it comes to the conclusions related to the above (very briefly) presented qualitative analysis of students’ answers to individual attitudes, it can be said that the participants gave very interesting and sometimes extremely “nationalist”, but “cosmopolitan” responses as well, which, in addition, proved once again that students at the English Department, on average, have slightly more “cosmopolitan” attitudes towards the issues discussed in this paper.

At the end of this analysis, it should be added that it provides opportunities for further research, in terms of performing a similar study which would include older high schools pupils in Niš, as well as other areas of Serbia, including the border ones. Such further research would give more accurate results, which again might be of importance both at the theoretical level – in terms of further development of the theoretical and methodological approach to these issue, and in a more empirical sense, in terms of the possibility of discovery of some statistically more significant differences and correlations on larger sample groups of participants, which have not been revealed in this relatively limited study.

Finally, this type of research might have some practical effects, in terms of, for example, the introduction of relevant teaching materials not only at the primary and secondary education levels, but also at the academic level, so as to develop pupils’ / students’ awareness of the complexity of the relationship between the language identity, on the one hand, and individual and national identity, on the other hand, and in that way provide a contribution to the promotion of the very much needed intercultural dialogue and multicultural literacy.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The author wishes to thank the team led by the Centre for Sociological Research at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš for conducting the research that the above part 1 of the findings is based on. In addition, the author would also like to thank Mihailo Antović (PhD), Dragan Todorović (PhD), Dušan Stamenković (PhD), Miloš Jovanović (M.A.), and Jelena Petković (M.A.), my colleagues from the Faculty of Philosophy, Vuk Milošević (PhD) and Jelena Bašić (PhD), from the Faculty of Medicine in Niš, Natalija Žunić (M.A.) from the Faculty of Law, and Miloš Tasić (M.A.) from the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, who helped me in conducting the research that part 2 of the findings above are based on. I would also like to additionally thank the colleague Miloš Jovanović from the Department of Sociology, University of Niš, for giving me help with various methodological issues. Finally, as the given research has been a joint task of a group of researchers, the author has already presented some of the findings given here with his colleagues, notably with Miloš Jovanović and Miloš Tasić, elsewhere as well.

## REFERENCES

- Bugarški, Ranko. *Lingvistika o čoveku*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa / XX vek, 1996a.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Jezik u društvu*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa / XX vek, 1996b.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Jezici*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1997a.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Jezik u kontekstu*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa / XX vek, 1997b.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Nova lica jezika – sociolingvističke teme*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa / XX vek, 2002.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Jezik i kultura*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa / XX vek, 2005.
- Bugarški, Ranko. *Evropa u jeziku*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, 2009.
- Diarmait Mac Giolla Chríost. *Language, Identity and Conflict – A Comparative Study of Language in Ethnic Conflict in Europe and Eurasia*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Đorović, D. “Odnos studenata humanističkih nauka prema stranim jezicima”. *Nastava i vaspitanje* 53 (4–5) (2004): 448–464.
- Edwards, John. *Language and Identity – An Introduction* Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
- Fishman, Joshua A., ed. *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. New York: Oxford. OUP, 1999.
- Fought, Carmen. *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006.
- Greenberg, Robert D. *Language and Identity in the Balkans*. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
- Ignjačević, Anđelka. *Stavovi o engleskom jeziku u srednjem i visokom obrazovanju u Beogradu* (magistarski rad). Beograd: Filološki fakultet u Beogradu, 1998.
- John E. Joseph. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Kordić, Snježana. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux. 2010.
- Kovačević, B. „Stavovi govornika srpskog jezika prema stranim jezicima”. *Srpski jezik – studije srpske i slovenske* 10, 1–2 (2005): 501–518.
- Kovačević, B. „Stavovi prema varijetetima srpskog jezika”. *Philologia* 2 (2004): 33–38.
- Vlahović, N. „Iz istraživanja stavova o jeziku na srpskohrvatskom jezičkom području”. *Sol: lingvistički časopis* (1990): 43–51.
- Vlahović, N. *Popularni sudovi o jeziku na srpskohrvatskom jezičkom području* (magistarski rad). Beograd: Filološki fakultet u Beogradu, 1989.
- Vlahović, N. „Stavovi o jeziku u okviru opštih izučavanja stavova”. *Kultura: časopis za teoriju i sociologiju kulture i kulturnu politiku* 95 (1997): 61–77.

## APPENDIX

### THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN PART 2 OF THE RESEARCH (TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH)

#### *Researching Attitudes regarding the Relationship between Language and Identity with the Students of the University of Niš*

Dear students, this questionnaire forms the basis for the research entitled *Value Judgements regarding the Relationship between Language and Identity with the Students of the University of Niš*, carried out by a group of researchers from the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš. The questionnaire contains 19 standpoints that you are kindly asked to indicate your agreement with or disapproval of, which should not take you longer than 10 minutes. In addition, we would like to ask you to provide us with the the data regarding your place of birth, your current place of residence, your age, the education level of your parents, and the like. **The questionnaire is anonymous, and the obtained results will be used exclusively for scientific purposes.** So, having in mind that nobody will ever find out which exact answers you yourself have given, please help us by answering all the questions sincerely. **THANK YOU!**

Faculty  Department

Sex _____ Year of Birth _____ Nationality _____ Place of Birth _____ Place of Permanent Residence _____ Mother's Place of Birth _____ Mother's Education Level _____ Father's Place of Birth _____ Father's Education Level _____ Religion _____	What is your attitude towards religion? (please circle a number) 1. I am a firm believer and I accept everything my religion teaches 2. I am religious, but I do not accept everything my religion teaches 3. I think about it, but I am not sure whether I believe or not 4. I am indifferent to religion 5. I am not religious, but I do not have anything against it 6. I am not religious and I am against it
---	---

1.	It is natural that each nation should have its national language and its national state.	yes	no
2.	In order to live and work successfully, one need not use his / her own mother tongue.	yes	no
3.	The mater tongue of each nation contains the whole soul, the whole past and all the spiritual values and creative ideas of that nation.	yes	no
4.	The Serbian language, and the Serbian nation alongside it, should be protected by abolishing the Latin script.	yes	no
5.	The Ijekavian pronunciation (as in <i>mlijeko, vrijeme, dijete</i> ) should be expelled from Serbian because it is also used by Croats and Bosnians (as in <i>odjemetik, izpovijed</i> ).	yes	no
6.	A script (i.e. the Cyrillic, Latin scripts) are not an obligatory and an unchangeable part of national identity.	yes	no
7.	The word <i>srpski</i> should be written as <i>srbski</i> (or, even better, <i>Srbski</i> ), so as to show belonging to the Serbian nation more prominently.	yes	no
8.	A nation without its language and its state is doomed to disappear.	yes	no
9.	It is wrong to think that the people who speak one language should all live in the same country.	yes	no
10.	Language is a strong factor of integration in every country.	yes	no
11.	The mother tongue is acquired by birth once and for all.	yes	no
12.	Multilingualism and multiculturalism are a natural state of most of mankind and represent a source of wealth rather than a threat to national identity.	yes	no
13.	The mother tongue, its purity and wealth, must be protected from every kind of change, decay and the pernicious influence of other languages.	yes	no
14.	As opposed to my mother tongue, all the other languages are coarse and are not fit for expressing deep thoughts.	yes	no
15.	The mother tongue is a supreme and final expression of national identity.	yes	no
16.	It is wrong to think that children should not be taught foreign languages until they have fluently and logically mastered their mother tongue.	yes	no
17.	The cult of the mother tongue should dominate in a family – all the major family occasions and all the conversations within a family should be conducted in it.	yes	no
18.	It is especially important that the waking of self-awareness of children (usually at the age of three or four) should take place in their mother tongue.	yes	no
19.	One should accept Europe, its differences and values, as an enlarged cultural, spiritual and language homeland.	yes	no



**JEZIČKI NACIONALIZAM I JEZIČKI KOSMOPOLITIZAM: PRIMER STUDENTSKE POPULACIJE U SRBIJI, MAKEDONIJI I BUGARSKOJ**

**Rezime:** U radu se, na osnovu odgovarajuće sociolingvističke literature, analizira povezanost između jezičkog, s jedne, i nacionalnog i individualnog identiteta, s druge strane, kod studenata Univerziteta u Nišu, Univerziteta u Bitolju (R. Makedonija) i Univerziteta u Velikom Trnovu (R. Bugarska). Preciznije, razmatra se to da li u datoj populaciji dominiraju stavovi koji se mogu smatrati refleksijom jezičkog nacionalizma, ili oni koji bi predstavljali izraz jezičkog kosmopolitizma. Kao instrument istraživanja korišćena je anketa, izvedena tokom letnjeg semestra akademske 2011/2012. godine (u slučaju Univerziteta u Nišu), kao i (nešto kraća) anketa izvedena krajem 2012. godine (u slučaju Univerziteta u Bitolju i Univerziteta u Velikom Trnovu). U radu je potom izvršena statistička analiza tako dobijenih podataka (uz pomoć SPSS paketa), što je pomoglo da se analizira i zastupljenost pomenutih stavova u odnosu na niz demografskih varijabli: pol, etničku pripadnost, obrazovanje roditelja, veroispovest, tip religioznosti ispitanika i sl. Uz to, pomenuto je pomoglo i da se ukaže na uticaj pojedinih demografskih varijabli na stavove ispitanika o stepenu povezanosti između jezika i navedenih slojeva identiteta. U tom smislu, upoređivanje pomenutog tipa stavova kod date populacije na tri data univerziteta (a u slučaju Univerziteta u Nišu, i njegovim pojedinim fakultetima i departmanima), kao i dokumentovanje opisanog tipa uticaja empirijskim podacima, i čini okosnicu ovog rada, koji za suštinski cilj ima razvoj svesti naročito studentske populacije o složenosti odnosa između jezičkog i nacionalnog/individualnog identiteta i, na taj način, pružanje doprinosa promociji interkulturnog dijaloga i multikulturalne pismenosti.

**Ključne reči:** jezik, nacija, identitet, jezički nacionalizam/jezički kosmopolitizam, stavovi prema odnosu između jezika i nacionalnog/individualnog identiteta.

