

Police Perceptions of Discrimination in Serbia¹

Radomir Zekavica,² Darko Simović³

One of the key requirements of a democratic society is the absence of police discrimination. Discriminatory treatment by the police is a challenge in many societies, and every society that wishes to be truly democratic, should aim to keep police discrimination to an absolute minimum and continuously work on its elimination. One step toward this is studying the perceptions and understanding that police have toward discrimination to enable the most effective preventive measures to any discriminatory behaviour they may exhibit. This paper presents the results of a study conducted on the attitudes of police officers toward discrimination in the Republic of Serbia. This research focused on the recognition of the meaning of discrimination and awareness of the presence of discrimination in Serbian society by police officers, the level of police social and ethnic distance toward different groups, police perceptions as to the influence and responsibility that public and social institutions can have in provoking discrimination, as well as the existence and acceptance of prejudice among police officers in Serbia.

Keywords: discrimination, police perceptions, research, social and ethnic distances, prejudice, Serbia

UDC: 351.741:316.647.82(497.16)

1 Introduction

A democratic society postulates democratic policing. This means that in a democracy, the roles of the police should be in harmony with democratic principles and values such as equality, delivery of service, responsiveness, distribution of powers, information, redress, and participation (Jones, Newburn, & Smith, 1996). Policing in democratic societies requires accountability of police to the law, protection of human rights, accountability, operational priority to serving the needs of individual citizens and private groups, transparency, legitimacy, concern for equality of service, guided by law (Bayley, 2001, 2006; Goldstein, 1977; Liang, 1992; Manning, 2016; Pino & Wiatrowski, 2006; Sklansky, 2008). The concept of democratic policing has changed in recent decades due to various police reforms, social changes and security threats and challenges, but the underlying premise that a police officer serves as an agent of the community and his/her

responsibility is to serve and protect community members remained (Nalla, 2009: 521).

Serbia has progressed significantly in combating discrimination within its police forces, particularly in the past decade. The active role of the state in this area has been particularly noteworthy with the creation of an adequate legal and institutional framework for the protection against discrimination. Serbia has accepted and ratified the most important international and regional treaties in the field of fundamental human rights, as well as discrimination. All ratified conventions are part of the Serbian legal system, and they are directly answerable to the Serbian courts. Serbia has created a significant national legal framework for protection from discrimination starting with the Constitution itself. The *Constitution of Serbia* (Ustav Republike Srbije, 2006) contains a broad spectrum of human rights, proclaiming equality and prohibits discrimination. A fundamental anti-discrimination legal act, *The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination* (Zakon o zabrani diskriminacije, 2009), was adopted in 2009. It prohibits discrimination but also provides a foundation for the new independent body, *The Commissioner for Protection of Equality* and tools for every person, group or state to deal with discriminatory behaviour. Additionally, numerous other laws indirectly protect citizens from discrimination in certain spheres of social life.⁴

¹ The paper is the result of the research on the following projects: "Crime in Serbia and Instruments of State Reactions", which is financed by the Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies; the scientific research project entitled "Development of Institutional Capacities, Standards, and Procedures for Fighting Organised Crime and Terrorism in Climate of International Integrations", which is financed by Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia (No 179045).

² Radomir Zekavica, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Serbia. Email: radomir.zekavica@kpa.edu.rs

³ Darko Simović, Ph.D., Full Professor, Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Serbia. Email: darko.simovic@kpa.edu.rs

⁴ The Law on the Protection of the Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities (2002), The Law on the Prevention of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities (2006), The Law on the Professional Rehabilitation and Employment of Persons with Disabilities (2009), The Gender Equality Act (2009), etc.

Furthermore, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) of the Republic of Serbia has made considerable efforts to date to eliminate discrimination, protect human rights and freedoms through education of the police. A project aimed to improve relations between the police, minority and socially vulnerable groups was introduced in 2006. The project was implemented in collaboration with the Law Enforcement Department of the OSCE Mission in Serbia, British Council and the MIA. From that moment until today, the MIA carries out regular, yearly training of police officers. Within the “IPA project 2011” called “Implementation of Anti-discrimination Policies in Serbia” several activities, training and workshops were undertaken, aimed at the elimination of stereotypes, prevention of discrimination in the treatment of vulnerable groups by police, and familiarization with the objectives and tasks of the *Strategy for prevention and protection from discrimination* (Strategija prevencije i zaštite protiv diskriminacije, 2013; Zekavica, 2014).

Efforts which government and social actors implemented to combat discrimination were not sufficient to eliminate it, as no society in the world is immune to discrimination. The key contributing factors to potential discrimination lie in the adopted social prejudices which were developed during the process of socialisation of individuals. These prejudices were transposed from the social to the individual level, became intrinsic and are generally difficult to eliminate. Therefore, one of the first and key steps in the fight against discrimination should be to determine the propensity toward it, especially of the police in this case. The primary objective of this paper is to determine police perceptions of discrimination in Serbia and their propensity towards discrimination. Initially, we would like to examine the most important scientific studies on basic issues regarding the phenomenon of police discrimination.

2 A Review of the Current Knowledge on Meanings, Roots, Types and Scope of Police Discrimination

For a better understanding of the concept of police discrimination, it is important to understand the general meaning of discrimination. The *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (United Nations, 1969) was the first international document providing a general definition of discrimination. Article 1 of this Convention describes discrimination as: “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, ancestors, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose to violate or threaten the recognition, enjoyment or performance, on an equal conditions of human rights in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life”. Similarly,

The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination of the Republic of Serbia (Zakon o zabrani diskriminacije, 2009: Article 2) defines discrimination as “any and all unjustified difference in treatment or non-equality (inclusion, limitation or giving advantage) with respect to persons or groups of persons, their families or other related persons, based on race, skin colour, ascendants, citizenship, nationality, ethnicity, language, religious or political belief, gender, sexual orientation, financial capacity, birth, genetic predisposition, health condition, invalidity, marital status, history of conviction, appearance, membership in political, labour union or other organizations, as well as any other personal predispositions”. In the context of these definitions, we would like to offer a definition that would be, by our opinion, any unjustified profiling or unequal treatment by police officers exercising their official authority over individuals or groups, based on their individual characteristics and resulting in an unfavourable social status.

Before the notion of police discrimination is considered further, it is important to clarify the terms often employed or referenced in relation to discrimination. The most important is the categorization by Reiner (Reiner, 2000: 125), who distinguished between *prejudice* – a preconceived opinion that is transmitted to conflicts with individuals; *bias* – the idea that certain types of people should have a better or worse treatment because of the law that is related to them, regardless of merits or a certain behaviour; *differentiation* – a form of use of police powers over certain social categories that varies from their representation in the population; and *discrimination* – a form of use of police powers over certain social categories that are overrepresented as targets of police action.

The closest link among the terms provided by Reiner (2000) is undoubtedly that between *prejudice* and *discrimination*. The relationship between them is mostly interpreted as one of cause and effect, and while *prejudice* usually entails reactions or behaviour due to preconceived beliefs or opinions, *discrimination* refers to behaviour based on prejudice. Kappeler, Sluder and Alpert (1998: 151) believe that these two terms should be differentiated for at least two reasons: 1) even if a person has a certain prejudice he/she does not have to act in accordance with it, and 2) a person can possess both positive and negative prejudices. An example of a positive prejudice is a belief that teenagers from wealthy families are less prone to delinquent acts, whereas young people from poor families are capable of committing even serious crimes routinely (negative prejudice).

Police discrimination is a particular form of discrimination, the most likely reason being that any discriminatory conduct is carried out by the police in their official capacities. Discriminatory behaviour by police does not only occur

when a police officer uses his/her power in an illegal manner, such as excessive force toward someone of racial, ethnic or other distinctions. It can also occur during regular police duties which are not in themselves illegal. For example, in cases of routine traffic control when members of particular social or ethnic groups are deliberately targeted (Crank, 2004; Waddington, 1999).

Despite differences between discrimination carried out by police and discrimination in a more general sense, the two notions also share similarities. For example, the motives and reasons for discriminatory actions by police are almost identical to any other form of discrimination. This means that the primary motive of such actions is usually associated with prejudices toward a person because of his or her personal characteristics. It should be noted that, as Reiner explained (Reiner, 2000: 125), when police discriminate by applying different treatments toward different people without legal justification, their discriminatory actions do not have to be a product of prejudices, biases or unilateral decision-making, but of situational, interactional or institutional processes that result in discriminatory behaviour, even when there is no intention or desire to do it.

Therefore, to understand police discrimination, it is necessary to understand the ethology of such behaviours. Incidentally, it is important to emphasize that the increased use of force by the police aimed at certain members of the population can be explained by objective and subjective factors. The objective refers to the violation of laws, and citizens' behaviour toward a police officer during an intervention, while the subjective refers to prejudice which can be based on a variety of personal elements, such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, social class, sexual orientation.

The question is whether these prejudices were created within the police environment or adopted from society generally? It is usually assumed that police prejudice is often likened to prejudices of other social and professional groups, and they are a reflection of the society in which police officers live. If the occurrence of prejudice in police practice is viewed primarily as a social phenomenon and as a direct result of existing prejudice in society, then the responsibility for its elimination must be considered the responsibility of the entire society, not just the police. This view can be found in the theory of "reflection of society", which stems from the premise that racial prejudices and discrimination in the criminal justice system reflect beliefs and behaviours that are the most prevalent in a society (Bowling, Phillips, Campbell, & Docking, 2004: 8). If such beliefs are burdened by racial or any other prejudices, even the police will not be immune to them. A basic assumption then would be that wherever institutions

of power are under the influence of racial, ethnic, religious or other social imbalances, the police will be under that influence as well. We could assume that the prevalence of prejudice and its intensity in police culture in everyday work is largely determined by the level and the degree of its presence in the broader society.

Although this may be true, it is important to note that social prejudices are often additionally emphasised by the work and values of the police subculture (occupational risk, the ethos of masculinity, conservatism, suspicion, isolation, etc.). They have adapted to the nature of this profession, and in the process, have acquired some very different connotations. Numerous scientific studies of police subcultures strongly support this view (Bowling, et al., 2004; Chan, 1996; Crank, 2004; Reiner, 2000; Skolnick, 1966; Waddington, 1999). Reiner (2000: 98) believes that racial prejudice is the most important by-product of police conservatism. Walker (1992: 225) states that racial inequality in American society is also present in the criminal justice system, and although black people make up only 12% of the population, they represent 30% of all persons arrested, and 49% of all persons currently in prison. They are shot and killed by police three times more often than white people. Similar evidence arises from multitude of studies on racial prejudice among British police officers (Reiner, 2000: 99).

Consequently, the literature that derives from Anglo-Saxon scholars introduced the term "racial profiling" to describe situations where police react with suspicion toward an affected party/victim based on his or her racial characteristics (Kennedy, 1997: 11). The phenomenon of racial profiling is particularly common in the US and the UK, as the challenges of racial divisiveness have been prevalent for decades in these two countries. In addition, numerous studies supported the investigation of this occurrence in different areas of work with the police (Batton & Kadleck, 2004; Harris, 1997; Meehan & Ponder, 2002; Miller, et al., 2008; Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, & Simons, 2009).

In the literature devoted to police discrimination, there are different classifications of this phenomenon. One of the key criteria for this differentiation is the way in which this discrimination is expressed. Accordingly, all discriminatory behaviours by the police are divided into active and passive. Kappeler and colleagues (1998: 151) explained that police officers are involved in active discrimination when the department's laws or policies are applied differently to different people (e.g., a deliberate halt and control of black people to prevent them from going through certain parts of town, etc.). In contrast, they argued that passive discrimination occurred when a police officer chose to withhold the benefits of the law

(e.g. a refusal to investigate attacks on homosexuals, with a justification that they “got what they deserved”).

Michael Banton (in Reiner, 2000: 134), who made one of the first typologies of police discrimination, proposes a distinction between two types: a “*categorical discrimination*” and “*statistical discrimination*”. The former is reflected in the police officers’ unequal treatment of individuals solely due to their association with certain social groups and not their actual behaviour in a given situation. The latter comprises a distinctive behaviour toward members of a group based on a belief that the group is more prone to delinquent behaviour, whereby this conclusion has been drawn purely from personal beliefs that stem from stereotypes created by society over the years. For example, when police tend to stop young men with long hair to a greater extent or black boys because of the belief that they are more prone to commit some offenses.

These stereotypes are certainly not legally acceptable, and are explicitly rejected in police regulations. Despite that, the selective approach often represents a tacit encouragement for intervention and investigation, and usually arises from an interest to effectively perform police duties. Numerous studies conducted internationally (primarily in the USA and the UK), have confirmed that the use of physical force and the number of stops, searches and arrests against those of ethnic minorities and lower classes are disproportionate considering the number of these groups in the wider population (Batton & Kadleck, 2004; Cha-Jua, 2006; Kennedy, 1997; Meehan & Ponder, 2002; Meeks, 2000; Rowe, 2004).

Rainer (2000: 133–134) adds three further types of police discrimination: 1) “*transmitted discrimination*”, which occurs when a police officer acts as a passive transferor of prejudices present in society (e.g., cases where a white citizen is a victim of a crime and identifies the attacker as a black person due to preconceived racial prejudices), 2) “*interactional discrimination*” – the process of interaction between police and citizens that results in an intervention by police without any legal justification, and 3) “*institutionalized discrimination*” which occurs when the consequences of universally formed organizational policies and procedures are developed in practice as discriminatory because of the structural biases of an unequal society, or because of inherent, but insignificant differences between the groups.

Numerous studies have led to a better understanding of “interactional discrimination”, and emphasised that an individual’s behaviour during an interaction with the police may cause increased police control and even actions that exceed the limits of acceptable control (Grant & Terry, 2005; Holmes & Smith, 2008; Roberg, Crank, & Kuykendall, 2000; Worden,

1996). For example, aggressive behaviour of a suspect significantly increases the likelihood of the use of force or detainment more than cooperative behaviour.

Significant efforts have been made to date in the studies of public perceptions of discrimination by police. This especially refers to the consideration of variables regarding personal particulars, such as age, race, previous encounters with the police, and contact with those living in the neighbourhood that may influence citizens’ perceptions of whether behaviour of the police in certain situations is discriminatory or not (Brown & Benedict, 2002). Peck (2015) provides the most comprehensive literature review published to date, which consists of 92 empirical research studies on the perceptions of minorities regarding law enforcement. There is also a considerable number of studies dedicated to police perceptions of community policing issues (Kääriäinen & Sirén, 2012; Lewis, Rosenberg & Sigler, 1999; Moon & Zager, 2007; Nalla, 2009; Nalla, Modic, & Meško, 2014; Pagon & Lobnikar, 2001; Lobnikar, Prprović, Nemeč, Banutai, Prislán, & Cajner-Mraović, 2016; Zekavica, Kešetović, & Kesić, 2011). However, despite these initiatives, there is no research that examines police perceptions of discrimination. In this paper, we examine the understanding and perceptions of discrimination by Serbian police officers, and if successful, this study will be the first to provide insights into the tendencies of Serbian police toward discrimination.

3 Data and Analytic Strategy

Surveys of the perceptions of the police on discrimination were conducted in two research cycles. The first was in February 2014, the second in December 2015, and included 734 police officers from all three operational segments of the Serbian police – crime investigation (CIP) in the first cycle 2014, and public order (POP) and traffic police (TP) in the second cycle in 2015. Seven out of 27 regional police departments on the territory of Serbia were included in the surveys, while Kosovo and Metohia were excluded:

- The Police Department in Belgrade, the capital city;
- The Police Department in Novi Sad, in the far north of Serbia;
- The Police Department in Subotica, in the northern part of Serbia;
- The Police Department in Novi Pazar, in the far south of Serbia;
- The Police Department in Vranje, in the southern part of Serbia;
- The Police Department in Kragujevac, in central Serbia, and
- The Police Department in Zajecar, in eastern Serbia.

The sample was prepared in such a way that it represented a basic composition of each given institution according to the principle of regional distribution of employees in the police departments. Respondents were selected by the Heads of the departments, that is, the officers actively employed. The survey technique applied was the Paper and Pen Interview (PAPI) using a questionnaire created by CeSID⁵ UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the Commissioner for Protection of Equality.⁶

In this paper, we will focus on the key findings of the recognition of the meaning of discrimination and its presence in Serbian society, the levels of social and ethnic distances of the police, police perceptions of influence and responsibility of public and social institutions in the occurrence of discrimination, and the existence and acceptance of prejudice among police officers in Serbia.

4 Results

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

The structure of the sample can be viewed through five basic socio-demographic characteristics: region, age, gender, education level and years of work experience (table 1).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of Police officers – CIP, POP and TP*

Variable	Index of comparison Value	CIP (N/%)	POP (N/%)	TP (N/%)
		(N = 258)	(N = 302)	(N = 174)
	A	B	C	
Region				
Belgrade	(143,55.4[B,C])	(96,31.8)	(73,42[B])	
Novi Pazar	(20,7.8)	(40,13.2[A])	(0,0)	
Novi Sad	(56,21.7)	(60,19.9)	(34,19.5)	

⁵ The Centre for Free Elections and Democracy is a non-governmental, non-political and non-profit organisation. The Centre was established with a primary goal to organise impartial monitoring of the elections in Serbia, including media, voting process and parallel counting of votes.

⁶ The same questionnaire was used several times in CeSID surveys of citizens' attitudes towards discrimination that has been conducted to date. At the request of the Commissioner for the Protection of Equality, and with the support and assistance of the UN Development Programme, CeSID had implemented such public opinion surveys in 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2013 (CeSID, 2013)

	Subotica	(17,6.6)	(32,10.6)	(11,6.3)
	Vranje	(22,8.5)	(19,6.3)	(28,16.1[A,B])
	Kragujevac	(0,0)	(43,14.2[B])	(13,7.5)
	Zajecar	(0,0)	(12,4)	(15,8.6[A])
Age				
	20 to 29 yrs.	(55,21.3)	(85,28.1)	(45,25.9)
	30 to 39 yrs.	(105,40.7)	(122,40.4)	(74,42.5)
	40 to 50 yrs.	(82,31.8)	(75,24.8)	(47,27)
	Over 50 yrs.	(16,6.2)	(20,6.6)	(8,4.6)
Gender				
	Male	(206,79.8[B])	(210,69.5)	(139,79.9[B])
	Female	(52,20.2)	(92,30.5[A,C])	(35,20.1)
Education				
	High School	(64,24.8)	(158,52.3[A])	(112,64.4[A,B])
	College	(84,32.6[B,C])	(46,15.2)	(17,9.8)
	University			
	Master	(110,42.6[B,C])	(98,32.5)	(45,25.9)
	Postgraduate			
Years of service				
	Under 5 yrs	(41,15.9)	(60,19.9)	(36,20.7)
	5 to 15 yrs	(114,44.2)	(140,46.4)	(75,43.1)
	16 to 25 yrs	(75,29.1)	(72,23.8)	(42,24.1)
	More than 25 yrs	(28,10.9)	(30,9.9)	(21,12.1)

*Column proportion Z-test. Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level .05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.

Among all three departments in the sample, the Belgrade Police Department is the most represented, especially for CIP and TP. There are no significant differences regarding age of respondents in the three departments, the average age for CIP and TP police officers is 34 years, while the average age for POP is 33 years. Similarly, while CIP and TP police officers on average have 14 years of service, the average for POP officers is 13 years. Regarding gender differences, there are more female officers in POP in comparison with the other two departments, and as expected, police officers from CIP have higher education levels than officers from POP and TP.

4.2 Recognition of the Meaning of Discrimination and Its Presence in Serbian Society

Respondents were asked to define the term *discrimination* in their own words. Their first associations with the term were: endangerment/denial of rights, inequality, belittlement and endangerment due to differences, etc. The most remarkable finding from the study was that 49% of the respondents were unable to define discrimination.

This proportion is the average of the results obtained from the surveys of members of all three operational segments of the police – the crime investigation police unit (47%), public order and peace police (49%) and traffic police (50%). These data clearly indicate that the general knowledge of discrimination of the Serbian police is inadequate. This is particularly worrisome if we consider that failure to recognise discriminatory behaviour prevents an appropriate response to it, which is unacceptable for police in a democratic society and the rule of law. A closer examination of the results of the survey revealed that the respondents considered that discrimination

was present in Serbian society to a certain extent. Overall and by individual departments, respondents are significantly** aware that discrimination is present in Serbia (table 2).

One should be aware that among POP (F-value: 18.3 *) and TP (F-value: 6.8 *) it was predominantly the female officers who noticed the presence of discrimination. In addition, there are significant differences in awareness concerning gender, age, education and years of service in relation to POP (table 3).

Table 2: Police officers' perceptions of discrimination (department's difference)

Variable	CIP (N = 258)		POP (N = 302)		TP (N = 174)	
	SP/P	\bar{X}/σ_x	SP/P	\bar{X}/σ_x	SP/P	\bar{X}/σ_x
	(N/%)		(N/%)		(N/%)	
Awareness of discrimination by officers in all police departments.	131/60	2.7/0.83	142/54	2.6/0.87	80/56	2.6/0.84

Table 3: Police officers' perceptions of discrimination (department's difference) – continued

ANOVA		\bar{X}	\bar{X}	\bar{X}	F-values
Region					
	Belgrade	2.7	2.6	2.8	0.66
	Novi Pazar	2.9	2.8	0.0	0.16
	Novi Sad	2.8	2.8	2.7	0.32
	Subotica	2.6	2.5	2.4	0.01
	Vranje	2.4	2.7	2.6	0.26
	Kragujevac	0.0	2.5	2.3	0.64
	Zajecar	0.0	2.5	2.5	0.01
F-value		1.2	0.9	1.0	
Age					
	20 to 29 yrs.	2.7	2.6	2.7	0.32
	30 to 39 yrs.	2.7	2.8	2.7	0.13
	40 to 50 yrs.	2.6	2.4	2.5	2.02
	Over 50 yrs.	3.1	2.8	2.1	2.92
F-value		0.9	3.4 *	1.8	
Gender					
	Male	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.18
	Female	2.8	3.0	3.0	0.63
F-value		1.3	18.3 *	6.8 *	

Education					
	High School	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.48
	College	2.7	2.8	2.5	0.96
	University, Master, Postgraduate	2.7	2.8	2.7	0.39
<i>F</i> -value		0.7	4.0 *	0.3	
Years of service					
	Under 5 yrs.	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.47
	5 to 15 yrs.	2.8	2.8	2.7	0.24
	16 to 25 yrs.	2.6	2.6	2.3	1.08
	More than 25 yrs.	2.7	2.6	2.7	0.31
<i>F</i> -value		0.3	4.1 *	1.7	

1 Response categories range from 1 (not present) [SD] to 5 (strongly present) [SA]. SP/P represent strongly present and strongly present.

2 Mean on a 4-point scale and standard deviation; Single response; * $p \leq .05$; *

3 Q11. According to your opinion, to what extent discrimination exists in our country?

4 ** For total and departments means one-sample *t*-test is performed (test value: 2.5). *p* values for CIP (0.00) and POP (0.013) are less than 0.05 and for TP (0.07) is less than 0.1

4.3 Analysis of the Presence and Level of Socio-Ethnic Distances

The investigation of the presence and levels of social and ethnic distances of the police officers was vital in establishing the index of police discrimination. It was measured using a version of the Bogardus scale (Bogardus, 1926) which is comprised of eight different types of social relationships of various degrees of social interaction – from the most generic, such as the ones with fellow citizens, through the more specific, such as: those among neighbours, co-workers, teachers, friends, superiors in a work place, politicians, spouses or spouses of children. The questionnaire addressed 11 ethnic and social groups. The ethnic groups included: Roma, Bosnians, Hungarians, Croats, Albanians, Serbs, and the social groups consisted of: LGBT, religious minorities, refugees, asylum seekers, and HIV-positive people.

Respondents were asked to provide binary responses, affirmatively or negatively answering the question of whether they ‘*would mind if a member of the stated groups...*’ was in any of the above-stated relationships with them. This provided a clear picture of the presence and level of social and ethnic distances, and the willingness or unwillingness to interact with members of the stated groups socially.

Images of Social and Ethnic Groups were found in two sets of questions (the index of discrimination is based on Q13 to Q29) (table 4). Another set of questions was introduced to get a full picture of discrimination propensity within the police. Those were questions Q30 to Q46, and they depict the recognition by the police of the existence of a vulnerable

group’s position in society (table 4). The universal finding present throughout all the results was a strong aversion toward Albanians, LGBT (except CIP [49%] where this index was higher than in other departments), people with HIV, and migrants.

Table 4: Test of difference for Index of discrimination***

Index for comparison	Departments		
	CIP (N = 258)	POP (N = 302)	TP (N = 174)
	\bar{X}	\bar{X}	\bar{X}
Overall Index of Discrimination	A	B	C
	25	25	28
Roma	28	26	26
Bosnians/Muslims	22	25	29
Hungarians	19	23	25
Croatians	28	29	28
LGBT	49 B C	38	41
Religious minorities	18	23	25 A
Albanians	34	36	37
Serbs	13	17	21 A
Refugees	16	17	23 A
The migrants/asylum seekers	34	37	40
Strangers	22	23	25
HIV/AIDS	39	36	39

Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances with significance level .05. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears under the category with larger mean.

*** Questions Q13 to Q29; multiple response; dichotomous variable.

Table 5 indicates that age, years of service, and gender play important roles in the view of the position of Albanians in Serbia, insofar as older men with more work and life experience have greater aversion toward Albanians (see ‘Albanians’ in Table 5. Alpha risk for *F*-values is less than 0.05).

ANOVA shows a significant difference between regions (Novi Sad) for CIP and TP in relation to LGBT persons. This difference is present only for CIP in relation to migrants and people with HIV (Belgrade, Novi Sad and Vranje) (table 54).

Table 5: One way ANOVA (summary) by Social and Ethnic Groups**

Variable	Departments					
	CIP* (N = 258)		POP* (N = 302)		TP* (N = 174)	
	T2B (N/%)	\bar{X}/σ_x	T2B (N/%)	\bar{X}/σ_x	T2B (N/%)	\bar{X}/σ_x
Roma	73/33 (R, G)*	3.3/1.42	79/34 (R, A, E, Y)*	3.1/1.34	38/28 (A)*	3.3/1.38
Bosnians/Muslims	157/75	4.2/1.14	147/68 (A, Y)*	4/1.21	88/71 (A, G)*	4.1/1.16
Hungarians	169/83	4.4/0.96	175/81	4.3/1.04	87/74 (R, A, Y)*	4.2/1.12
Croatians	161/81 (R)	4.3/1.04	167/79 (R, A, Y)*	4.3/1.14	84/70 (A, G, Y)*	4.1/1.27
Albanians	133/67	3.9/1.31	122/60 (A, G, E, Y)*	3.7/1.38	77/63 (R, A, G, Y)*	3.8/1.42
Serbs	112/54	3.6/1.5	140/66	3.9/1.38	68/55 (R)*	3.5/1.6
LGBT	113/55 (R)*	3.5/1.44	86/42	3.1/1.48	51/41 (R)*	3/1.49
Religious minorities	148/74	4.1/1.12	119/56	3.7/1.2	76/61 (R, A, Y)*	3.8/1.31
Refugees	120/61	3.8/1.21	129/62 (E)*	3.8/1.23	78/60	3.7/1.22
The migrants/ asylum seekers	101/53 (R)*	3.5/1.28	120/61 (Y)*	3.7/1.28	56/47	3.5/1.37
People with HIV/ AIDS	81/44 (R)*	3.2/1.35	77/39 (G)*	3.1/1.4	42/37	3/1.48

* $p \leq .05$ (all alpha risk for F -values are less than 0.05), legend (A - Age, E - Education, G - Gender, R - Region, Y - Years of Service);

** Questions Q30 to Q46; single response, 5-point Likert scale;

Based on the results of Pearson Correlations which measures strength and links between the index of discrimination and other variables in the questionnaire (table 6), level of education (-.078*) and regional variable (Belgrade, -.090*) have an influence on the degree of aversion towards vulnerable groups. Also, officers see the media, political parties and people in general as the main instigators of discrimination and, at the same time, as elements with the most potential to drive opinions toward a more tolerant society.

Table 6: Drivers of Discrimination measured by Pearson correlation

Variable	Total		CIP		POP		TP	
	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Index of discrimination								
Age	0.03	0.46	0.04	0.49	-0.03	0.58	0.11	0.15
Gander	0.03	0.47	-0.01	0.90	0.09	0.10	-0.03	0.65
Education	-.08*	0.03	-0.07	0.29	-0.06	0.28	-0.09	0.22
Belgrade ***	-.09*	0.02	-.145*	0.02	-0.09	0.10	-0.03	0.73
Novi Pazar ***	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.20	0.06	0.31	.a	
Novi Sad ***	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.15	0.05	0.42	0.06	0.44
Subotica ***	-0.01	0.88	0.00	0.99	-0.03	0.58	0.03	0.70
Vranje ***	0.00	0.94	0.05	0.45	0.02	0.71	-0.04	0.62
Kragujevac ***	-0.01	0.82	.a		-0.02	0.76	0.00	0.95
Zajecar ***	0.02	0.60	.a		0.08	0.15	-0.02	0.83
Year or service	0.03	0.42	0.04	0.47	-0.03	0.65	0.09	0.22
Government (responsible)	0.04	0.34	0.06	0.44	0.05	0.49	0.04	0.72
Parliament (responsible)	0.05	0.31	0.05	0.47	0.05	0.52	0.05	0.58
Political parties (responsible)	0.00	0.96	0.06	0.39	-0.04	0.62	0.01	0.92
Serbian Orthodox Church (responsible)	-0.09	0.06	-.20**	0.01	-0.05	0.49	0.00	0.99
NGO's (responsible)	.11*	0.02	.20**	0.01	0.08	0.26	0.07	0.49
Media (responsible)	0.00	0.92	0.03	0.73	0.00	1.00	0.02	0.84
Citizens (responsible)	-.09*	0.05	-.17*	0.02	-0.06	0.40	-0.04	0.67
Judiciary (responsible)	-0.03	0.54	-0.09	0.22	-0.01	0.87	0.01	0.92
Vulnerable groups (responsible)	0.09	0.06	-0.08	0.32	0.10	0.16	.25*	0.01
Military (responsible)	-0.03	0.57	-.17*	0.03	0.07	0.31	-0.01	0.89
Police (responsible)	-0.04	0.38	-.18*	0.02	0.05	0.48	0.00	0.96
School (responsible)	-0.04	0.39	-0.13	0.09	0.01	0.84	0.03	0.74
Family (responsible)	-0.05	0.28	-.12**	0.01	0.01	0.92	0.12	0.22
Protector of citizens (responsible)	.10*	0.03	-0.08	0.32	.16*	0.03	.26**	0.01
Commissioner for Equality (responsible)	.12**	0.01	-0.04	0.62	.22**	0.00	.22*	0.03
Government (influence)	-0.08	0.09	-0.01	0.89	-.16*	0.02	-0.02	0.81
Parliament (influence)	-0.09	0.06	-0.07	0.36	-.15*	0.03	0.00	0.97
Political parties (influence)	-.13**	0.00	-.17*	0.03	-.16*	0.02	-0.03	0.74
Serbian Orthodox Church (influence)	-0.09	0.07	-.17*	0.03	-0.09	0.21	0.03	0.74
NGO's (influence)	-0.08	0.11	-0.11	0.16	-0.06	0.41	-0.05	0.64
Media (influence)	-.12**	0.01	-.27**	0.00	-0.10	0.17	0.01	0.94
Citizens (influence)	-.11*	0.01	-.16*	0.04	-0.14	0.06	-0.05	0.64
Judiciary (influence)	-0.08	0.09	-0.14	0.06	-0.12	0.10	0.05	0.61
Vulnerable groups (influence)	-0.01	0.88	-0.12	0.13	0.02	0.83	0.08	0.47
Military (influence)	-0.08	0.09	-0.14	0.08	-0.11	0.12	0.01	0.92
Police (influence)	-.11*	0.03	-0.12	0.11	-.21**	0.00	0.06	0.57
School (influence)	-0.06	0.17	-0.12	0.13	-0.11	0.12	0.07	0.48
Family (influence)	-.09*	0.04	-.17*	0.03	-0.09	0.19	-0.01	0.88
Protector of citizens (influence)	-0.06	0.17	-.16*	0.04	-0.07	0.34	0.05	0.60

Commissioner for Equality (influence)	-0.05	0.28	-.18*	0.02	-0.08	0.25	0.15	0.13
Need to be priority issue in society	.12**	0.00	.18**	0.00	.12*	0.03	0.02	0.81
Awareness of institutions that secure citizen rights	0.06	0.11	.12*	0.05	0.04	0.54	0.02	0.84
Protector of citizens is institution that defend rights of citizen	.14**	0.00	.13*	0.03	.13*	0.03	.18*	0.02
Personal exposure to discrimination	-0.01	0.86	-0.05	0.47	0.04	0.52	-0.01	0.94

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*** In order to introduce meaningful correlation categorical variable (region) in transformed into dichotomous (binary, 1 – Yes, 2 – No).

a. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

4.4 Perceptions of Influence and Responsibility of Public and Social Institutions in the Occurrence of Discrimination

The analysis of respondents' views on the link between the power of institutions and discrimination focused on two questions – *which institution is the most responsible for spreading discrimination?* and *which of the mentioned institutions could influence the reduction of discrimination?* The questionnaire included a list of institutions and offered a five-point scale for responses to each question (1 – not at all, 5 much, 0 – I don't know).

The findings presented in table 6 demonstrate the increased need for participation of the entire society in the elimination of discrimination. This conclusion refers especially to the media which the respondents frequently regarded as having the most influence on the extent to which discrimination is spread (4.26, 3.91). It was followed by the government (4.08), political parties (4.07) and Parliament (4.03). An important fact is that police officers do not see the police as an institution essentially more responsible or influential in the occurrence of discrimination (2.04, 3.27). The only institution that police officers perceive as less responsible and influential than the police itself is the military (1.95, 3.11).

Table 7: Test of difference regarding responsibility and influence of Institutions in Serbia

Variables	Department							
	Total		CIP (\bar{X})		POP (\bar{X})		TP (\bar{X})	
	Responsible	Influence	Responsible	Influence	Responsible	Influence	Responsible	Influence
<i>Index for comparison</i>	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Government	3.18	4.08 A	3.18	4.08 A	3.19	4.16 A	3.25	4.06 A
Parliament	3.15	4.03 A	3.15	4.03 A	3.15	4.14 A	3.25	3.97 A
Political parties	3.69	4.07 A	3.69	4.07 A	3.8	4.18	3.83	3.97 A
Serbian Orthodox Church	2.33	3.8 A	2.33	3.8 A	2.2	3.9 A	2.6	3.74 A
NGO's	3.61	3.98 A	3.61	3.98	3.77	4.07 A	3.54	3.91 A
Media	3.91	4.26 A	3.91	4.26 A	4.05	4.38 A	3.89	4.17 A
Citizens	3.3	3.98 A	3.3	3.98 A	3.23	3.91 A	3.43	3.95 A
Judiciary	3.03	3.8 A	3.03	3.8 A	2.92	3.74 A	3.13	3.8 A
Vulnerable groups	3.27	3.79 A	3.27	3.79 A	3.3	3.84 A	3.29	3.65 A
Military	1.95	3.11 A	1.95	3.11 A	1.86	3 A	2.13	3.13 A
Police	2.04	3.27 A	2.04	3.27 A	1.97	3.2 A	2.26	3.32 A
School	2.55	3.92 A	2.55	3.92 A	2.63	3.9 A	2.66	3.93 A
Family	3.05	4.04 A	3.05	4.04 A	3.19	4.05 A	3.28	4.01 A
Protector of citizens	2.62	3.82 A	2.62	3.82 A	2.67	3.82 A	2.7	3.86 A
Commissioner for Equality	2.66	3.83 A	2.66	3.83 A	2.77	3.83 A	2.7	3.87 A

* Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances with significance level .05. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears under the category with larger mean.

One issue was very interesting regarding *Protector of citizens* (Ombudsman) and *Commissioner for Equality*. Namely, while POP shows that gender and education play important roles in the way these two institutions are perceived, in the

case of CIP, it is the difference in the years of service that proved significant ($p = 0.05$ and $p = 0.049$ for F -test), and rises sharply in the first 5 years of service, then stabilizes in later periods of service (table 8).

Table 8: One way ANOVA (summary), regarding responsibility of institution.

Variable	CIP* (N = 258)		POP* (N = 302)		TP* (N = 174)	
	T2B		T2B		T2B	
	(N/%)	$\bar{X}/\sigma_{\bar{x}}$	(N/%)	$\bar{X}/\sigma_{\bar{x}}$	(N/%)	$\bar{X}/\sigma_{\bar{x}}$
Government	78/45	3.2/1.59	86/45	3.3/1.55	46/44	3/1.7
Parliament	79/45	3.2/1.6	85/45	3.2/1.5	44/41	3/1.65
	Gender: $p = 0.018$, Years of service: $p = 0.01$		Age: $p = 0.024$			
Political parties	109/60	3.8/1.35	117/61	3.8/1.36	55/49	3.3/1.6
Serbian Orthodox Church	Years of service: $p = 0.029$					
	44/25	2.2/1.55	56/31	2.6/1.54	21/19	2.1/1.46
NGO's	Education: $p = 0.016$				Gender: $p = 0.025$	
	108/61	3.8/1.5	101/54	3.5/1.51	58/53	3.5/1.56
Media	129/71	4/1.33	131/65	3.9/1.33	70/61	3.7/1.5
			Region: $p = 0.048$		Region: $p = 0.005$, Age: $p = 0.007$, Years of service: $p = 0.019$	
Citizens	84/46	3.2/1.52	95/50	3.4/1.37	50/45	3.2/1.49
					Gender: $p = 0.033$	
Judiciary	65/37	2.9/1.61	78/43	3.1/1.46	44/40	3.1/1.61
	Gender: $p = 0.014$, Years of service: $p = 0.002$				Region: $p = 0.046$	
Vulnerable groups	71/44	3.3/1.45	89/48	3.3/1.48	48/46	3.2/1.64
	Years of service: $p = 0.015$					
Military	20/12	1.9/1.33	39/21	2.1/1.41	13/12	1.8/1.25
	Age: $p = 0.01$		Gender: $p = 0.011$		Age: $p = 0.022$	
Police	25/14	2/1.38	47/25	2.3/1.45	13/12	1.8/1.26
					Age: $p = 0.029$	
School	52/30	2.6/1.59	62/32	2.7/1.54	22/20	2.2/1.48
					Gender: $p = 0.001$	
Family	80/45	3.2/1.61	93/48	3.3/1.51	28/25	2.5/1.55
			Gender: $p = 0.022$			
Protector of citizens	49/30	2.7/1.6	59/32	2.7/1.49	28/26	2.4/1.61
	Years of service: $p = 0.049$		Gender: $p = 0.005$			
Commissioner for Equality	56/35	2.8/1.61	57/31	2.7/1.49	29/28	2.4/1.63
	Years of service: $p = 0.005$		Education: $p = 0.03$			

* $p \leq .05$ (alpha risk for F -values);

4.5 Existence and Acceptance of Prejudice among Police Officers in Serbia

The analysis of the responses to the statements designed to elicit tendencies of Serbian society toward discrimination is presented here. It was found that the degree of agreement or disagreement with these statements would be a good indicator of these tendencies. The statements were constructed so that agreement with indicated a negative, discriminatory view. The questionnaire contained 25 statements (table 9), with responses ranging from SA/A – Strongly Agree/Agree, N – Neutral and SD/D – Strongly Disagree/Disagree. Members of the public order police demonstrated the lowest level of agreement with most of the statements, as opposed to the crime investigation police. The responses indicated that the LGBT population is most prone to being subjected to discrimination. In most statements, there is a noticeably higher

proportion of disagreement than consent, and the only statements for which this does not hold true are those from members of sexual minorities. Thus, almost every second police officer considers that: ‘homosexuality is a disease that should be treated’, while a clear majority of crime investigation police agree with the statement: ‘I have nothing against homosexuals, but they should do that at home’. This suggests that most police officers see nothing wrong with that statement per se, and do not see that such views affirm the social invisibility of members of sexual minorities.

Finally, as for the link between levels of discrimination (Q13-Q29) and the correlation coefficient (Q82-Q106), results suggest that it would be less challenging to handle perceived ‘barriers’ with ethnic groups (Albanians and migrants) than with social groups such as LGBT and HIV/AIDS patients.

Table 9: Test of difference between departments regarding stereotypical claims

Variable	Total	Department						
		CIP (X̄)	POP (X̄)	TP (X̄)	CIP (SD/D,N,SA/A)***	POP (SD/D,N,SA/A)***	TP (SD/D,N,SA/A)***	
Index for comparison		A****	B****	C****	A*	B*	C*	
Q82. It is easy to support the Roma when they are not one's neighbours	2.8	3 B	2.7	2.8	44, 19, 37 B	48, 23, 29	48, 23, 29	
Q83. I have nothing against the Roma, but they, still, like to steal	3.0	3.1 B	2.9	2.9	36, 22, 42 B C	44, 23, 33	39, 29, 32	
Q84. Homosexuality is a disease that should be treated	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	27, 16, 56	25, 24 A, 51	28, 23, 49	
Q85. I have nothing against homosexuals but they should do that at home	3.8	4 B C	3.7	3.6	16, 10, 74 B C	20, 15, 65	23, 19 A, 59	
Q86. One should be cautious of other nations even when they appear friendly	N**	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.3 B	37, 21, 42	42 C, 23, 34	32, 19, 49 B
Q87. Serbia should be the state of Serbian people only, as this is the majority people	N**	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.6	62, 17, 22	59, 21, 20	53, 21, 26
Q88. A normal person recognises only traditional religions (Orthodox, Catholic, Islam)	T**	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.9 A	53 C, 21, 25	46, 24, 30	43, 26, 31
Q89. Small religious communities ‘steal’ people’s souls	T**	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.6	54, 29, 18	46, 36, 18	48, 31, 21
Q90. There is some truth in book that explains existence of Jewish conspiracy	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.7	44, 41, 15	36, 50 A, 13	39, 45, 17	
Q91. Jews tend to benefit based on their suffering	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	46, 35, 19	40, 45 A, 15	41, 39, 20	
Q92. Children with developmental difficulties should not be mixed with other children	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	59, 23, 18	57, 28, 15	59, 24, 16	
Q93. There are few disabled people in our nation	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	48, 40, 12	47, 44, 9	50, 39, 11	
Q94. Healthcare institutions should refuse to treat those suffering from HIV/AIDS	1.9	1.7	2 A	1.9 A	86 B C, 8, 6	71, 20 A, 9	75, 20 A, 6	
Q95. HIV/AIDS patients should blame themselves for their illness	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5	53, 21, 26	47, 32 A, 21	51, 28, 21	
Q96. Leadership positions in the business world should be in the hands of men	T**	2.1	2.2	2.1	2	60, 23, 17 B	67, 23, 9	68, 17, 16

Q97. The most important virtue of every woman is to be a good housewife	T**	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.4	53, 20, 27 B	58, 24, 18	56, 23, 21
Q98. I do not like to argue with someone about something if we have a different opinion	K**	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6	54, 22, 23	50, 27, 23	47, 26, 27
Q99. I try to be not too different from other people in my environment	K**	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	42, 25, 33 B	43, 32, 26	38, 27, 35 B
Q100. I do not like to express my opinion if I know that it is different from other	K**	2.2	2	2.2	2.3 A	69 C, 18, 13	64, 26 A, 10	56, 25, 19 B
Q101. This country needs a strong leader who people will be followed without question	A**	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.1 A	49 C, 19, 32	42, 32 A, 26	34, 27, 39 B
Q102. Respect for authority is the greatest virtue that people need to foster	A**	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.1 B	42 C, 29, 30	39, 37 A, 24	30, 32, 38 B
Q103. Due to the mixing of different cultures, we are threatened the danger of losing our identity	EU**	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	49 C, 24, 27	42, 34 A, 24	37, 33 A, 30
Q104. Entering the EU we risk to lose national identity and culture	EU**	2.7	2.6	2.7	3 A	51 C, 26, 24	43 C, 32, 24	33, 33, 34 A B
Q105. Democracy may have flaws, but it is better than any other form of government	D**	2.9	3	2.9	2.9	30, 33, 37 B	37, 39, 24	33, 40, 28
Q106. Democracies are not good at maintaining order	D**	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.9	41 C, 32, 26	39, 41 A, 21	31, 43 A, 25

* Results are based on two-sided tests with significance level .05. For each significant pair, the key of the category with the smaller column proportion appears under the category with the larger column proportion.

** Claims that has strictly stereotypical meaning regarding: N – Nationalism, C – Conformity, A – Authority, EU – European Union and D – Democracy.

*** SA/A – Strongly Agree/Agree, N – Neutral and SD/D – Strongly Disagree/Disagree; single response.

**** Results are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances with significance level .05. For each significant pair, the key of the smaller category appears under the category with larger mean.

5 Discussion and Concluding Remarks

As we have seen, the findings of these surveys produced a complex picture of police perceptions of discrimination in Serbian society. The general conclusion is that there is a need to continue to increase the level of awareness of discrimination on theoretical, practical and 'legal' levels. Current awareness is inadequate and is reflected in the results that demonstrate failure to address the cases of discrimination adequately. Police officers in Serbia exhibit considerable levels of awareness of the existence of discrimination in Serbian society. It is also crucial that they know precisely the meaning and consequences of discriminatory behaviour insofar as their daily contact with people may lead them to inadvertently apply discriminatory treatment but mistake it as a legal requirement.

As for discriminatory tendencies, the findings in this paper confirmed that they are prevalent in regards to ethnic and social groups toward which Serbian people already feel a degree of animosity. This outcome was expected, as discriminatory tendencies usually arise from existing social divisions. The social divisions stemming from ethnic and religious conflicts throughout history have evolved intensely over the last two decades in Serbian society. Consequently, it is of no surprise that Albanians and Croats constitute ethnic groups to which the respondents show the greatest ethnic distance.

With respect to social groups such as LGBT, it is difficult to expect full acceptance of persons of homosexual orientations in a traditionally heterosexual society such as is observed in Serbia. In addition, Serbian society has also had a considerable religious influence since the fall of Communism in the late 80s and early 90s, which further contributed to disapproval and condemnation of homosexuality. If we compare the results from this study with the results of the CeSID survey on the views of Serbian citizens (CeSID, 2013), we can conclude that the police show somewhat greater intolerance than the public in general toward most of the groups included in the survey.

This raises questions as to what the main reasons of greater social and ethnic distances of the police are in relation to certain social and ethnic groups, and presents an interesting topic for future research. From these results, one gets the impression that the key elements of discrimination, as perceived by the police, are political power and the media. In other words, it is the creators of policies, programmes and strategies to reduce or even eradicate discrimination that seem to be the largest contributors to it. The fact that the police do not see themselves as an institution more responsible or influential in the occurrence of discrimination is a concern. This presents a myriad of challenges as the police are in a daily contact with people, and as such have opportunities to enforce laws, and

possibly discriminate against citizens on unlawful grounds. A positive point is that members of the public order police demonstrate the lowest level of agreement with most of the stereotypical claims. That, however, is not the case with the criminal investigation police.

The data from the surveys conducted, and other data relevant to this study, emphasise the main goals of future efforts to eliminate discrimination and bring the Serbian police closer to the essential values of a democratic society. Of course, quantitative surveys of the perceptions of discrimination cannot indicate the actual level of discrimination in a society. Their key role is to provide a clear insight into discriminatory tendencies, crucial in the efforts to eliminate discrimination. These surveys make it possible to design various educational programmes, the outcome of which should be an increased level of awareness of the role of the law in instances of discriminatory behaviour, and the elimination of the main causes of discrimination which stem from ignorance and accepted prejudices. The generalizability of the sample is limited, giving that participants come from only seven out of a total of 27 police departments in the country. The limitations of the study are also reflected in the fact that the research is primarily focused on the Serbian police, as well as on the topic of discrimination. The results of the research can be applied exclusively to the Serbian society.

References

- Batton, C., & Kadleck, C. (2004). Theoretical and methodological issues in racial profiling research. *Police Quarterly*, 7(1), 30–65.
- Bayley, D. (2001). *Democratizing the police abroad: What to do and how to do it*. Washington: Institute of Justice.
- Bayley, D. (2006). *Changing the guard: Developing democratic police abroad*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1926). Social distance in the city. *Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 20, 40–46.
- Bowling, B., Phillips, C., Campbell, A., & Docking, M. (2004). *Policing and human rights – eliminating discrimination, xenophobia, intolerance and the abuse of power from police work*. Paper Number 4. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25(3), 543–580.
- CeSID. (2013). *Izveštaj o istraživanju javnog mnjenja „Odnos građana prema diskriminaciji u Srbiji”* [Report on the survey of public opinion “Attitudes of citizens towards discrimination in Serbia”]. Beograd. Retrieved from <http://ravnopravnost.gov.rs/rs/izvestaj-o-istrazivanju-javnog-mnjenja-odnos-gradana-prema-diskriminaciji-u-srbiji/>
- Cha-Jua, S. K. (2006). Racism is a factor in police violence. In S. Fitzgerald (Ed.), *Police brutality* (pp. 55–62). Michigan: Greenhaven Press.
- Chan, J. (1996). Changing police culture. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(1), 109–134.
- Crank, J. P. (2004). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati: Anderson Pub.
- Grant, H., & Terry, J. (2005). *Law enforcement in the 21st. century*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- Goldstein, H. (1977). *Policing a free society*. Cambridge: Ballinger Pub. Co.
- Harris, A. D. (1997). Driving while black and all other traffic offenses: The Supreme court and pretextual traffic stops. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 87(2), 544–582.
- Holmes, M., & Smith, B. (2008). *Race and police brutality: Roots of an urban dilemma*. New York: Sunny Press.
- Jones, T., Newburn, T., & Smith, D. J. (1996). Policing and the idea of democracy. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36(2), 182–198.
- Kääriäinen, J., & Sirén, R. (2012). Do the police trust in citizens? European comparisons. *European Journal of Criminology*, 9(3), 276–289.
- Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, D. R., & Alpert, P. G. (1998). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing*. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Kennedy, R. (1997). *Race, crime and the law*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lewis, S., Rosenberg, H., & Sigler, R. T. (1999). Acceptance of community policing among police officers and police administrators. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22(4), 567–588.
- Liang, H. H. (1992). *The Rise of modern police and the European state system from Metternich to the Second World War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lobnikar, B., Prprović, B., Nemec, N., Banutai, E., Prisljan, K., & Cajner-Mraović, I. (2016). Comparative analysis of the quality of policing in local Slovenian and Croatian multicultural communities. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 67(4), 275–288.
- Manning, P. K. (2016). *Democratic policing in a changing world*. New York: Routledge.
- Meehan, A., & Ponder, M. (2002). Race and place: The ecology of racial profiling African-American motorists. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(3), 399–430.
- Meeks, K. (2000). *Driving while black – What to do if you are a victim of racial profiling*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Miller, J., Gounev, P., Pap, A. L., Wagman, D., Bologi, A., Bezlov, T., Simonovits, B., & Varga, L. (2008). Racism and police stops: Adapting US and British debates to continental Europe. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(2), 161–191.
- Moon, B., & Zager, L. J. (2007). Police officers’ attitudes toward citizen support: Focus on individual, organizational and neighbourhood characteristic factors. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 30(3), 484–497.
- Nalla, M. K. (2009). Democratic policing: A comparison of police officers’ perceptions of their role and functions in transitional societies. *Varstvoslovje*, 11(4), 520–535.
- Nalla, M. K., Modic, M., & Meško, G. (2014). Community policing reforms and organizational changes: An assessment of officers’ perceptions of community-police relations in Slovenia. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 65(4), 272–286.
- Pagon, M., & Lobnikar, B. (2001). *V skupnost usmerjeno policijsko delo v mestu Ljubljana: ugotavljanje potreb za ustanovitev mestne policije ali redefiniranje dela državne policije: končno poročilo s popravki* [Community-oriented policing in the city of Ljubljana: Assessment of needs for establishment of the city police or re-

- definition of work of state police: Final report]. Ljubljana: Visoka policijsko-varnostna šola.
30. Peck, H. J. (2015). Minority perceptions of the police: A state-of-the-art review. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38(1), 173–203.
 31. Pino, N. W., & Wiatrowski, M. D. (2006). The principles of democratic policing. In N. W. Pino, & M. D. Wiatrowski (Eds.), *Democratic policing in transitional and developing countries* (pp. 43–97). Hampshire: Ashgate.
 32. Reiner, R. (2000). *The politics of the police*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 33. Roberg, R., Crank, J., & Kuykendall, J. (2004). *Policija i društvo* [Police and Society]. Sarajevo: Embassy of the United States of America – Office of public affairs.
 34. Rowe, M. (2004). *Policing, race and racism*. London: Willian Publishing.
 35. Sklansky, D. A. (2008). *Democracy and the police*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
 36. Skolnick, J. (1966). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
 37. Stewart, E. A., Baumer, E. P., Brunson, R. K., & Simons, R. L. (2009). Neighborhood racial context and perceptions of police-based racial discrimination among Black youth. *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 47(3), 847–887.
 38. Strategija prevencije i zaštite od diskriminacije [Strategy for prevention and protection from discrimination]. (2013). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (60/13).
 39. Ustav Republike Srbije [The Constitution of Republic Serbia]. (2006). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (98/06).
 40. United Nations. (1969). *International convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx>
 41. Waddington, P. A. J. (1999). *Policing citizens: authority and rights*. London: UCL Press.
 42. Walker, S. (1992). *The police in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
 43. Worden, R. (1996). The causes of police brutality: Theory and evidence on police use of force. In W. A. Geller, & H. Toch (Eds.), *Police violence: Understanding and controlling police abuse of force* (pp. 23–51). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
 44. Zakon o profesionalnoj rehabilitaciji i zapošljavanju osoba sa invaliditetom [The Law on the Professional Rehabilitation and Employment of Persons with Disabilities]. (2009). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (36/09).
 45. Zakon o ravnopravnosti polova [The Gender Equality Act]. (2009). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (104/09).
 46. Zakon o sprečavanju diskriminacije osoba sa invaliditetom [The Law on the Prevention of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities]. (2006). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (33/06).
 47. Zakon o zabrani diskriminacije [The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination]. (2009). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (22/09).
 48. Zakon o zaštiti prava i sloboda nacionalnih manjina [The Law on the Protection of the Rights and Freedoms of National Minorities]. (2002). *Službeni glasnik RS*, (11/02).
 49. Zekavica, R. (2014). *Suzbijanje diskriminacije u Republici Srbiji s posebnim osvrtom na ulogu i doprinos Ministarstva unutrašnjih poslova*. [Combating discrimination in the Republic of Serbia with a special emphasis on the role and contribution of the Ministry of Internal Affairs]. Beograd: Kancelarija za ljudska i manjinska prava Vlade RS.
 50. Zekavica, R., Kešetović, Ž., & Kesić, T. (2011). Democratic policing in Serbia – attitudes towards law, human rights and police effectiveness in Belgrade police department. *Varstvoslovje*, 13(2), 169–187.

Policijsko zaznavanje diskriminacije v Srbiji

Dr. Radomir Zekavica, izredni profesor, Akademija za kriminalistiko in policijske študije, Srbija.
E-pošta: radomir.zekavica@kpa.edu.rs

Dr. Darko Simović, redni profesor, Akademija za kriminalistiko in policijske študije, Srbija.
E-pošta: darko.simovic@kpa.edu.rs

Ena od ključnih zahtev demokratične družbe je odsotnost policijske diskriminacije. Diskriminatorno obravnavanje policije je izziv v mnogih družbah in vsaka družba, ki resnično želi biti demokratična, si mora prizadevati za absolutno minimiziranje policijske diskriminacije in njeno odpravo. En korak k temu je raziskovanje, kako policisti zaznavajo in razumejo diskriminacijo, z namenom omogočiti najučinkovitejše preventivne ukrepe za vsakršno odkrito diskriminatorno vedenje. V pričujočem prispevku so predstavljeni rezultati raziskave o odnosu policistov do diskriminacije v Republici Srbiji. Raziskava se je osredotočila na prepoznavanje pomena diskriminacije in ozaveščenosti o prisotnosti diskriminacije v srbski družbi, ravni policijske družbene in etnične distance do različnih družbenih skupin, policijsko zaznavanje vplivov in odgovornosti, ki jih imajo javni in socialni zavodi pri spodbujanju diskriminacije ter obstoj in sprejem predsodkov med policisti v Srbiji. V študiji je sodelovalo 734 policistov.

Ključne besede: diskriminacija, policijsko zaznavanje, raziskave, družbena in etnična razhajanja, predsodki, Srbija

UDK: 351.741:316.647.82(497.16)