**Research Project: New and Ambiguous Nation-Building Processes
in South-Eastern Europe**

Working Paper Series

PROBLEMS OF IDENTITY OF SECOND AND THIRD GENERATION OF MONTENEGRIN IMMIGRANTS IN SERBIA

Saša Nedeljković

Problems of Identity of Second and Third Generation of Montenegrin Immigrants in Serbia

Saša Nedeljković

Theoretical-methodological doubts

By finishing my previous paper on Montenegrins, the dilemma from the beginning remained. This dilemma concerns scientific legitimacy of observing Montenegrins in Serbia through discourse of ethnic (minority) identity, and more precisely, it is about desire and necessity of observing all Montenegrins through one (and the same) discourse being founded. I am not sure that this paper will solve this dilemma, primarily because it discusses second and third generation of immigrants. My initial hypothesis is that this population is even more heterogeneous from the first generation, and that it is going to, as well as the first, show little or no characteristics of a "community". This is the reason for this research to be focused on "hidden system of meaning" and indirect expression of identity on individual and interpersonal level.

Doing research on Montenegrins in Serbia through minority identities, as the previous paper showed, does not bring a lot of new or unknown material, nor it opens new theoretical problems. This research, however, questions universality of applying many established schemes and theories, or in other words, creates theoretical doubts. In that sense, as a first case of that kind, I have tried to explore the relation between formal ethnic status and social mobility. The question of comparing Montenegrins in Serbia with middleman minorities in Europe and USA necessary emerges. There is a difference in a way of functioning of Montenegrin minority and middleman minorities, and also in level of their inner cohesion, but similarity lies in ability of reaching high level of social power which appears, not in spite of, but as a result of affiliation to minority group (about Middleman Minorities see Sanderson 1991). In previous paper I have pointed to the problem of simultaneous affiliation with minority

group, which is at times perceived as ethnic and occasionally as regional group[1], and membership in social, precisely, national elite. For that reason it would be very useful to see if that tendency, noticed with the first generation of immigrants, continues in the second generation. The second case, where problem of Montenegrin's identity presents a challenge for accustomed theoretical approaches, is the relation between cultural and structural dimension of acculturation (about these dimensions see Gordon 1966). Applying Milton Gordon's classical model to Montenegrin case enables us to explore its endurance and flexibility, since the case of Montenegrins is atypical. We have seen that Montenegrins in structural dimension want to integrate completely into Serbian society, but with at the same time preserving their, although not many and inadequately expressed, cultural particularities on interpersonal level; these cultural particularities are, again, often the source of their distinct social status. Paradoxically, the grater the stigma is, their status is also better. The third case can be added to past two, and it is related to a kind and level of instrumentalization of ones identity, or more precise, situational usage of identity. It is known that having multilayered ethnic and national identities create a potential, which makes balancing between different communities and benefiting in different situations possible. It is theoretically possible to include all mentioned theoretical doubts with discourse of social roles, in fact through strategic setting represented by opposition self-understanding/self-representation.

While in my first paper I have been considering problems of causes and factors of migrations, problem of contact and accommodation of first generation of immigrants from Montenegro through narratives, in this paper I have focused on problems of identity of second and third generation of immigrants. I believed that this research is specific and that it is necessary to be conducted separately from the first research (research of first generation), for several reasons. Only after researching the population that has not been born in Montenegro, and which have no immediate memories of living in home country, it can be concluded in which degree and in what way Montenegrin "community" is preserving its "traditional" identity, that is, in which degree members of that community differ from "native people". Besides, I was interested in what is that, that is inherited from generation to generation, that is, how a

---

[1] Middleman minorities are understood as regional, but also as ethnic, and professional groups. It is not the case with Montenegrins; they have different occupations. What is common for them is occupying high social positions.

"tradition" is built and from what. That had to be explored on the level of ideas, opinions and subjective experience of one's position (one's roles) in the society, being impossible to observe such a large and inhomogeneous urban group, and noting that there are no manifestations on institutional level.

In research of this problem I have decided, for the reason of easier initial orientation, to approach this problem using a general discourse of acculturation. There are many reasons that can be stated against this kind of approach, but there are also many which sees this approach as only meaningful. For that, I have relied on somewhat outdated sociological model of acculturation studies (see Davidović 1989). This model separates the process of acculturation on several different sub-processes or phases: first, according to this model we have forced socialization, second, de-socialization and in the end, re-socialization. The attempt to force young migrants, with different cultural means, to stay within traditional pattern, the one that was brought from the motherland, is characteristic for the first phase. In the second phase comes to the abandonment of some elements characteristic for the traditional culture, and accepting new patterns from the culture of host society. In the third phase comes to complete incorporation into the new society and acceptance of a new culture. In this examined case this model is not fully applicable, although it gives a good basic foundation for the analysis. Besides, this model is, and I am not the first to notice that, too unilinear and pretentious, as it prejudices the direction of development of acculturation process: assimilation is only one of the possible results of acculturation. This model relies on theory of social relations harmonization in multicultural society, precisely, it views the problem through opposition "continuity-discontinuity". According to that understanding, every cultural conflict is discontinuity that must be resolved by reestablishing the harmony in the relation between crucial social subjects, which means, it will end by reestablishing continuity. Theories that emerge from such approach are, basically, theories of assimilation and amalgamation, which, although presuming different results, still suppose that the same type of acculturation relation and process will happen: until merging of the entities and restoration of non-conflictive phase. Opposite to this, theories of pluralism (plain and modified pluralism) and multivariate assimilation, are trying to point to relativity and inconstancy of constant relations in the society, and in other words, they are leading to viewing conflict as a constant (and not just a side effect) in social relations and

interethnic interaction. This second approach presumes that processes are never finally concluded, that they are never conclusive, and that many things that seem to be obsolete, persist on subconscious or latent level as a potential (more about this see in Driedger 1980: 354-388). This subconscious constant is preserved on institutional level through folklore or folklorism, through secondary, and seemingly unimportant cultural mechanisms that convey "traditional" systems of value, which can always be activated as basis for revitalization of "traditional" identity formulae.

I have focused my attention to several different directions, in order to be able to learn how those mechanisms and strategies function, and whether different strategies mutually correspond, and if yes, in what way. That presumed for me to explore relationship between what is said and what is being done, to establish corpus of symbols and to explore specific mechanism for conveying cultural messages between generations.

During the period from October 2007 until March 2008 I have conducted research among members of second and third generation of immigrants from Montenegro to Serbia. Total of 182 informants were questioned (93 members of second and 89 members of third generation of immigrants); women and men distribution was 52: 130 (29%:71%). Method of random sample is used, and the only condition was that the informant's father (grandfather) is born in Montenegro. I have introduced this additional condition in view of the fact that the construct that we call "Montenegrin culture" is patriarchal in its character, actually, that among Montenegrins male line of inheritance (heritage) is more dominant, and that this line will display significantly greater influence on informant's identity than female line[2]. Informants are from different age groups (from 20 to 70 years of age), their places of origin can be found throughout Montenegro, and they live in different areas of Serbia. All the data I have gathered in this way, I have also examined and compared to knowledge I acquired through long-lasting friendship with four Montenegrin men from second generation of immigrants.

One of the basic goals of this paper was to, based on very extensive questionnaire, reveal what does "traditional Montenegrin culture" represents for informants, in what degree and in what way are informants able to understand,

---

[2] I have found confirmation for this in informants' responses. One 33 year-old informant said: "…Since I am by nationality Montenegrin, I think that in such families some kind of patriarchal upbringing is preserved, I am proud of it, and I will try to bring my son in the same spirit."

preserve and apply it today in Serbia, in other words, how it is combined with other segments of their identity. I attempted to explore this through considerable number of direct and indirect questions, so biography method and controlled interview were combined. Since I wanted to interview as many people as possible, I recruited assistants (students) to help. Help from inexperienced researchers has proven to be problematic (inefficient) in view of revealing subtle feelings of the informants, and therefore I am not completely satisfied with the material; still it was sufficient to enable examination of my presumptions.

Description and contextualization of a research situation

According to my expectations, every analysis I have attempted, in classical anthropological key, to apply in the beginning has proven to be insufficiently appropriate and insufficiently indicative. Comparison of the opinions of informants' groups that differ in regional origin, whether they are born in mixed or one national marriage, by age group, form of religiousness and by level of education, showed to be nonfunctional, since no regularity or rule in any sense can be noticed. The answers were too heterogeneous or too uniform, and boundaries between classified (constructed) groups of informants were fluent; often there were too many models of behavior in order to be operational.[3] This fact discouraged me in the beginning, since it threatened to reduce whole analysis to description of individual particularities.

Recent political processes (departing of Montenegro from the union with Serbia) left mark on all of the participants, therefore the research of national identity of second and third generation of immigrants from Montenegro is more difficult than ever to conduct. Namely, political identity of the whole process contributed to a start of paying attention to things that were not particularly important until now, or more precisely, to the things that until now mainly had only folkloric or personal (intimate) meaning, now is being added political, precisely ethnic or national meaning. Certain atmosphere of distrust and caution had appeared, and although it is not of great proportions or intensity, it has a negative influence on research like this one. Many informants were for that reason withholding, distrustful, their responses were limited, and informants themselves felt a little uncomfortable. They were, often for them

---

[3] During the course of research it became apparent that informants themselves were not clear whether it is about two different cultures coming to contact, most of them think of Serbs and Montenegrins as one people with certain, and not especially important differences.

unexpected and unpleasant, characterized as "other", although they were not ready for that. They, nor as individuals nor as a group, still have not developed strategy for acting in that kind of situations, so they felt vulnerable and threatened. Similar can be said about researchers: they were reserved, hesitant and uninventive. They had a feeling that they are researching something nonexistent, so often would happen to researcher and informant together came to an implicit conclusion that this research doesn't have much sense, precisely, that there's nothing that could be examined. At the same time, among some researchers, a sort of embarrassment was noticeable, because they were in some way "aggressive", forcing people to think and to affiliate with something, that was not important for many of them until then. It seems that this kind of situation in some cases created a sense that a greater level of individual emancipation and anationality than it was the case in reality, was achieved with informants: it would seem that they are uninterested in their national identity, and in problems of national identity in general, precisely, in some cases they exhibited complete unfamiliarity with that aspect of social reality. Many informants gave philosophical responses concerning general problems of national identification, and not specific examples from their lives. They couldn't (or wouldn't) look deeper in themselves, and to find something of what we were looking for. On the other hand, responses of many are in the boundaries of already known clichés, so from them any personal opinion cannot be derived. For that reason many of the interviews are unusable for studying some deeper identification layers. However, large number of informants demonstrated great willingness to cooperate, which gave very interesting, although anticipated answers.

It was shown that informants have very vague representations about what is ethnic and what is national identity, and also that they are quite confused on the question of operationalization of their identities[4]. They sometimes perceive their Montenegrin descent as a regional category and sometimes as national. This

---

[4] Rather interesting phenomena is their relation towards their descent. Namely, large number of them referred to their Montenegrinhood as "descent", and not as real cultural and political fact; that practically is not an identity, but sentiment. Also, many have stressed that, of course, they will tell their children that their ancestors are from Montenegro, but only for them to be aware of that, and in order for them to be able to use it as a means of self-apprehension and individual maturity. Very few of them consider it as something that is vital and has contemporary and utilizable national value.

confusion became apparent during expression of national identity.[5] Some informants were using digital ("everybody else are the same"), and some analogous principle ("some of the others are closer and more similar to us") during classification of their and other nations. Among most of them, however, more or less explicitly, model of identification that was offered by Petar II Petrović Njegoš can be noticed: they are in ethnical sense Serbs, and in national Montenegrins. That is the reason why most of them are either confused, or even revolted when the question is emphasized in the sense that Montenegrins are a distinct nation. For the separation of Montenegro from Serbia they blame current government of Montenegro, who put "political interests before national". In accordance with abovementioned, informants expressed coherency in view of choosing historical events that they consider to be important for understanding identity of Montenegrins in Belgrade. They are proudest for the battle at Mojkovac *(Mojkovačka bitka)*, in which during World War I Montenegrins enabled the retreat of Serbian army, and are most ashamed by recent separation of Montenegro from Serbia. First event symbolizes solidarity of Montenegro with Serbia, devotion, unity and common interests. The other event symbolizes escalation of particular interests, putting economic interests before national, the unnaturalness and degradation of historical conscience. Very few of them consider their ethnic descent being something too important for representing themselves, precisely, they rarely (or almost never) mention it without direct question about it.[6] Only several informants, and mostly those from second generation from ethnically homogenous marriages (both parents from Montenegro), express certain "objective" parameters of ethnic identity (language, certain customs).

Bilocality and/or alocality: The role of "accepted" and "rejected"

Very few informants lived in both surroundings during their life, but some interesting processes can be noticed through their life stories. Ethnic descent of those informants is Montenegrin, they were born and raised in Serbia, but in the course of

---

[5] "I consider myself to be Serbian of Montenegrin descent. That means, if anyone asks about my nationality, I say Montenegrin, but literally I am a Serb. Serb of Montenegrin descent… But, you know, that changes from generation to generation…"

[6] The answers as this are rare: "I am pure Montenegrin, married to a Montenegrin, I do not emphasize that, but I am deeply aware of that." Or like this: "I always felt special about who I am, what I am, but I never expressed it too much, in order not to offend members or other nations. And I have something to be proud of, like all Montenegrins."

their lives, for different reasons, they had to live in Montenegro. Among them it was possible to follow the differences in manifesting of dual identities in Montenegro and Serbia, that is, to explore kind of processes of stigmatization of these dual identities in Montenegro, and in Serbia. Although most of informants were not aware of their dual identities, in fact, they feel it partly, but they are not accepting it nor manifest it, it potentially exists and has tendencies towards development and materialization. Among informants who lived in both surroundings, intensification in this duality and greater need for deciding on a side can be noticed. They were faced with the fact that one environment determines them more as "foreigners", and other more as "natives". Their internal impression corresponds with external experiences; sometimes it precedes and causes it, and sometimes, internal feeling follows what can be objectively perceived. In many cases, however, we find that they are considered foreign or "other" in both environments.[7]

Because there are not many informants like this, it was not possible to identify rules, and also it was not possible to analyze with more depth all the factors in that process. Some of these informants have adapted very well in the new environment, while other went through very difficult and painful process during which they were perceived as someone "other". An example of one girl who has formed as a person in Serbia, but then her parents took her with them, and she spent one part of life in Montenegro, is especially indicative. She went through a traumatic experience, because cases like that are not that frequent: migration from Montenegro to Serbia happens very often, but moving from Serbia to Montenegro happens very rarely, and mostly is temporary. In such cases there is no adaptation, nor from the side of "immigrants", nor the host society. Ethnic stigmatization is made banal and simplified; it is based on only one objective parameter of identity, in this case, the language; personal feeling and wish for belonging are disregarded. Since these cases are rare, stigmatized person is unable to use experiences of other or older; there is almost no one who is in similar situation, who would sympathize with her and fully understand and support her. Informant in question was stigmatized in school as different (as a Serb), and she was exposed to a certain form of discrimination and

---

[7] "Usually, when I go there (in Montenegro), I am usually Serb for everyone, and here I am a Montenegrin"

abuse: the others would mimic her and ridiculed her speech.[8] It is interesting that now, several years later, she puts this events in political context, and gives them meaning, which in its basis they probably did not have; now she, in these events, "recognizes" the basis for growing distance of Montenegrins toward Serbs, and a wish for separation. Namely, Serbs know relatively little about Montenegrin society; knowledge is limited to a relatively small number of movies in which Montenegrins are depicted rather stereotypically. This is the reason why mentioned cases represent valuable pseudo-anthropological notes. Informants who were stigmatized as Montenegrins in Serbia, on the other side, never experienced it as something bad, neither it endangered them; everybody imagined that, as we will see later, they can take same advantage from their uniqueness.

The second case of an attempt of integrating into Montenegrin society concerns an informant from the second generation of immigrants, who did not take the process of incorporation so drastically; but he also did not, after futile attempts of accommodation, ever blended completely in new (Montenegrin) environment.[9] Today, he does not interpret this in national, but in social discourse. According to him, reason for not accepting him lies in character of local community where he resided; that was small community which was not ready to absorb him. The third example concerns an informant who has spent one part of life in Kotor: he considers himself a Montenegrin today, and does not make a difference between people who live there and himself. Moreover, he has original Kotor accent in Belgrade, which means that his environment recognizes him as a Montenegrin, and he is proud of that. He goes to Kotor three times a year.

From these short examples we can see that there are many personal and supplemental factors that influence experiences and success of accommodation.

---

[8] "The difference in manner of speaking was especially noticeable. When I was little I would spend every summer brake at my relatives in Montenegro and the their manner of speaking was interesting for me. I have tried to speak like they do, but I have never managed to. One part of high school I have studied in Montenegro and than the difference was most intense, which turned into conflict, obvious disapproval from their side. In school my Serbian manner of speaking was subjected to ridicule, even from the professors who imitated me. Even then, the division was clear, which later developed into political conflict, which was very sad."

[9] "When I moved there, I had lot of trouble fitting in, more precisely, I have never fitted in, but it was not because they are Montenegrins, but rather because of the mentality of a small town, that is, people from Bar who do not except any outsiders. They are difficult people, their mentality is somehow strange, completely closed. That is why I isolated myself from them, and eventually I didn't care. Yes (I did try to point to a fact that I am Montenegrin), but since I have lived for so long in Serbia I have already had accent from Jagodina, so I was always just some man from Serbia"

Migration from a big and in greater extent multicultural environment, like Belgrade, to a small, relatively closed environment in Montenegrin province, and the acculturation that accompanies that kind of migration, is not possible to reduce to a level of interethnic interaction. That level, however, in attempt to understand the problem, cannot be avoided.

Tourists and/or pseudoanthropologists: Meeting the homeland and bilingualism

Situations in which Montenegrin immigrants of second and third generation meet with their traditional culture, in other words, with their motherland, are not only linked with unexpected, permanent and reluctant contacts, as it was the case previously. Everywhere in the world where constant migrations can be found, there is a cult of visiting homeland. That cult was very strong and spread in former Yugoslavia, and further the homeland was from the place of new residence, that was the cult stronger and more obligatory. Visiting homeland was considered to be something understandable, and everyone planned to spend at least one part of his or her vacation in "homeland village": that sojourns were not in function of rest, but rather in purpose of helping the old parents, renovating and cleaning the house, completing some important and necessary field work, etc. Understandable, this visit was more of a ritual and mandatory character if the people were from countryside. Those who originate from urban areas were not so eager to visit their native countryside, and they didn't have to. There weren't any necessary work to be done over the summer, so their visits to parents in cities could be shorter and did not depend on time of year. In households in which head of the family was from Montenegro, these kind of practice was usual. Parents took their children to the "homeland" every year, where they could, through more or less optional and spontaneous, but also ritualized contacts with their close and distant relatives, get a certain notion of "who they are and where they are from". That ritualized part consisted obligatory meeting of closer relatives and neighbors immediately after arrival of "ours from Belgrade"; it was considered that they could always say something new, since they were closer to the source of important information, and often they would bring presents. At the same time that was a chance to recall memories from their youth, immigrants could feel more successful, important and happier than they were in a new environment, but also for those who stayed not to feel

forgot and insignificant. Immigrant's children used that ritual to indirectly absorb language and ethos of Montenegrin society and local community, adopting them in different ways and in a different degree. Since being "ones from Belgrade", they represented temporary stars of that small community, it was considered that they have the life that members of homeland villages could only wish for, "emigrants" acquired idyllic impression about that environment; they were more pleased and given extra attention. Very soon they would accept local dialect, and their parents would start to speak as the natives as soon as they arrived. From that environment they would usually bring home, to Serbia, beautiful memories and in that way strengthen emotional connect with their homeland.

Not all of the informants had the same (positive) feeling about place of birth of their parents, but almost everyone felt as that experience was a useful cultural change.[10] Most of them consider it exotic and showed some kind of interest for certain parts of that culture which they could use in their own place of residence (in Serbia), like helpful mean of personal identification.[11] It was particularly related to using of *ijekavica* and special dialect, that served as a special psychological valve, or in other words, medium through which could be said with less words some "culturally intimate" thing. Montenegrin dialect is, as informants applied, more picturesque and/or more concise, and using these dialect had its own deeper cultural and psychological meaning. After going back to the "new environment", dialect was used for making jokes, mostly in circle of family or friends, and its usage had a purpose of strengthening special kind of feelings and creating conditions of internal cultural understanding, which was supposed to stay unclear for outsiders, or at least, inaccessible. Outsiders could not be equally involved in deciphering of complex and subtle messages.[12]

---

[10] "I feel better there than here..."

[11] "When I travel, I go visit Bar and my father's relatives, I adapt very fast and soon enough I feel accepted, because I am one of them."

[12] After being asked, if and when they use words from montenegrin language, *ijekavica* or just montenegrin accent, informant who belongs to second generation of immigrants responded: "Well, not as much. When our grandparents were alive we used some of their examples and words. When we were younger, they would sound funny, so we used them for jokes and laughs. But, since they are not with us anymore even father and his part of the family started loosing *ijekavica* accent and some of the words they were using before...and if I may say so, some of the things in that dialect even bothered me." The other informant was a little bit more precise: "Well, I use it mostly when it is in purpose of some funny jokes, when we imitate Montenegrins. You know: 'Bjezi avetinjo'! And that sort of things."

Tourist visits or performing certain private work in Montenegro brought some interesting encounters with the "countrymen"; those meetings were starting and ending with stories about their descent. Discovering ("unveiling") one's own Montenegrin descent (on purpose or not), brought change of status in that temporary group, that is, it resulted in accepting by the society as "their own".[13] That brought certain benefits to those "native tourists" (much better service in hotel, warmer relationship, protection from bullies, etc.)

Usage of two different dialects, which only conditionally we can call bilingualism, contributes to even more complex situation of Montenegrins identity in Belgrade. Pointing out that Montenegrins are Serbs, and that they are the part of the same nation, and in the same time using the language that, as they stress, Serbs from Serbia cannot understand, they are supporting the thesis about cultural uniqueness of Montenegrins. Pointing out specific Montenegrin characteristics they emphasize certain type of difference in mentality, and with keeping special elements of Montenegro material culture they point the uniqueness in symbolic sense. That kind of symbolism is not familiar to Serbs in Serbia (about bilingualism see more in Ferguson 1990: 232-251).

This separable affiliation has a situational use and is noticeable as useful long-term strategy. Affiliation to Serbian nation brings one kind of advantage, and affiliation to Montenegrin nation another. Serbia is much bigger and wealthier environment, with better cultural and artistic offer, and also with better chance for profit gain. Montenegro is for the moment much more pro-Europe focused, and political status of Montenegrin is better in foreign countries.[14]

With death of parents, who are born in Montenegro, contacts with relatives in "homeland" usually become less frequent and weaker, therefore many of my

---

[13] "When I was in tourist visit, they thought that because I'm from Serbia, I must be Serb. They didn't expect that I have roots from Montenegro, and if I would mention it in conversation, everyone would be cheery. Some even bought me some drinks, when I would say where my grandparents were from."
"In Montenegro I use *ijekavica*, but not here. I use their accent, when I'm there, all the phrases and words they use, that nobody knows over here. And sometimes I used them because they make me closer to people and they can understand me better."

[14] When asked to decide on a nation (Serbian or Montenegrin), if obligated to choose, one of the informants replied: "definitely Montenegrin... There they got schengen visa, I would see were it is more useful... I feel as a Serb and not Montenegrin, but if I could pass the border easier as a Montenegrin, then why not.". Second informant stated: "Well, I would probably take dual citizenship, only because that would give me some benefits. Maybe one of the countries will be more advanced, since hat are current political circumstances, so you never know with which passport I could go further in the world and who will not ask me or visa, because I am a citizen of Serbia or Montenegro."

informants don't go back anymore. It can be said that many members of the third generation never visited the place from where their grandfather descent. Many of them do not even know if they have any relatives, and they are not sure what is the exact place from which their grandfather came from. Apparently there is a tendency of reducing of visits to Montenegrin seaside, since vacations were connected with visiting relatives, and then continuing to seaside. Very small number of informants has real estates in Montenegro, and those who do, don't have a clear idea what to do with it, considering that they are mostly settled in mountain or passive parts of the country.

Recognizing and adoption of elements of "traditional" culture

The fact that majority of informants does not experience themselves as something distinct, that is, that they cannot notice no important differences between themselves and "pure" Serbs. That is why I tried to indirectly find something of the tangible ethnographic material for research.

One of the things that I was interested in, was whether the informants think that they inherited something from "traditional" Montenegrin culture, in other words, what by, and how, do they differ from the average member of the "host" country. I have tried to get that information through several independent questions: one was directly and specifically asked informants to state whether they inherited something from Montenegrin culture, and what. Other questions are in different manner, more or less directly, asked informants to state if anyone ever could guess that they are of Montenegrin descent, that is, if they have ever, in any way, manifested their complex ethnic/national identity. Many were a bit surprised and angry because I am describing their identity as "dual", they would generally comment on that question by saying: "I don't have a dual identity. I am Serbian".

There are different representations about what they have inherited from Montenegrin descent.[15] Through these representations that were more in the domain

---

[15] One informant replied: "I assume that the need for standing out in a company is a heritage of Montenegrin mentality. I consider that to be my bad characteristic, and I am trying to cultivate it. Also, I tend to retell events too pompously, not using lies, off course, but I really feel some things very intensely." The other thinks that he inherited following things: "I think that I've inherited something I am not proud of, and what is bothering me from Montenegrin culture and mentality; there are some self-confidence with no reason, and elements of arrogance, which are characteristic for Montenegrin mentality". Among the most articulate informants, one informant stands out, and she gave following answer: "First of all, I have a strong resistance towards injustice, and I think it originates from that.

of vague impressions, than in the domain of rational conclusions (judgments), what represents "traditional" Montenegrin culture for my informants, or what is understood as "Montenegrin mentality" can be inferred. Representations can be divided to positive and negative by value, and all are regarding mentality or character; customs or some other tangible cultural values are never mentioned. Informants are ashamed of some inherited things, and they would like to liberate of them. They are essentially related to signs of mentality, such as difficult character, stubbornness, boasting, unfounded pride. Informants are proud on other "inheritances" and they wish to preserve them: these are related to spirit of "freedom", sense of justice and truth etc. It is interesting that a certain number of informants have established representations about the inherited elements, and also a mindful and direct relationship, while others experience it indirectly, consequently. These other have relatively vague impressions, that is, they are trying to indirectly extract, from their experience, through reactions of people who used to know them, what is that "Montenegrin" that they carry in them. "That" does not have a distinct outline, and it is neutral in value.

Informants were, in different ways, experiencing ethnic, that is, cultural stigmatization from their environment, and their reactions were different as well.[16] That stigmatization has five forms or sources. As first and most often, they are recognized by society by name and surname[17]; many Montenegrins have particular surnames that not exist in Serbia, and that is rather certain criteria for determining ethnic and/or regional descent. This criterion is used by non-Montenegrins as well as

And I would never hurt or deceive on purpose. It wasn't important for me to watch out for not being deceived. More important it is not to deceive someone unintentionally. And from the mentality, I think that we tend to be fair and humane, not to be cowards, but again in some boundaries, not at all costs. And maybe a little stubborn and opinionated (laughs). In principle ambitious too, although I don't think of my self as someone who would pursue achievements, but in principle, I thing Montenegrins are more ambitious then many other".

[16] "On one occasion, at the practice, my teammate, Hungarian, cursed my Montenegrin mother, and I did, in a flash, hit him in the nose with my fist. That was a horrible event, which basically burns me, because Montenegrins cannot tolerate such curses, that is the greatest, most awful insult if someone says something about our mother, but I would like to see him, and apologize for that". Situation in which informants are not clear of the mechanisms by which "majority people" recognizes them is most usual: "Well, based on my manner of speech, no one could (recognize), because I didn't accept that way of speaking, maybe only based on my behavior, reactions to some subjects…I can't single out one case, I can't remember now, I just think that some people when they find out that I'm of Montenegrin descent say 'oh, we thought so'…so they assume that based on my behavior, and now I couldn't say which things reminded them of my descent… and how do I react. I say, I don't mind…" "No, but it is possible that maybe by appearance… but, some older people thought so because of my dark hair, eyes, asked do I have some roots in Montenegro, some of them reacted so that they started to slander my family and started rumors about that, but I reacted indifferently."

[17] "My manner of speaking and last name 'gives me away'..."

by Montenegrins; owing to the surname, through connections, many enrolled, or graduated from school easier, got a place in a student hall, or a good job. Secondly, informants often stated that they are recognized by character and mentality. Although such informant's notion appears very often, it can be said, with certainty, that this is rationalization. They have, for instance, often gave examples in which members of their household or their friends, called them "Montenegrins" because of their laziness.[18] However, such usage of stereotypes generally has social, and not ethnic meaning, and is not related exclusively to informants of Montenegrin descent; for instance, my mother, when she wanted to criticize my laziness, addressed me as Montenegrin, although I do not have blood, nor cultural connections to Montenegro. Thirdly, many are recognized by the manner of speaking; one part of the informants, mostly from the second generation, still has recognizable accent and are using *ijekavica* (a dialect of Serbian language characteristic for Montenegro and also Bosnia and Hercegovina – translator's note). I couldn't determine the reason why this "atavism" manifests itself among certain members of the second generation, and not among the majority. I assume that a set of several different factors is the case here: parental influence, frequent visits to Montenegro, personal need to express individuality, etc. I have a lot of friends and acquaintances from the second generation of immigrants, some of them are from ethnically homogenous marriages, and none of them uses Montenegrin accent and *ijekavica*, not even in their homes. Fourthly, some "gave away" through their opinions, especially lately, when political conflicts between Serbia and Montenegro appeared. Their comments and great interest for abovementioned conflict often indicated that they are from "down there"[19]. And fifthly, many experienced being "labeled" based on body constitution; Montenegrins are among highest people in Europe and are usually prominent in their environment. Stigmatization is facilitated if more of these "objective" parameters are found on one person. First generation more often possesses more parameters than later generations, which is understandable.

Character and the meaning of stigma could be positive, negative or neutral: sometimes it didn't have any particular meaning (or had multiple meanings), sometimes it had more or less hidden negative connotation, and often it was positive

---

[18] "How lazy you are, you are a real Montenegrin", "Must yours always to be the last, it is clear that you are a Montenegrin".
[19] "Sometimes, maybe based on some opinions, when I criticize Serbian-Montenegrin disputes..."

and well-meant. Most commonly, however, it had multiple meanings, with very subtle nuances of meaning. Aftereffects of stigmatization are noticeable on individual, interpersonal, as well as on institutional level. On individual level consequences were never negative; they mostly created positive results for the stigmatized, more precisely, they were never ashamed because of their "difference".[20] On interpersonal level, in specific relations between people, informants sometimes encountered distance and intolerance based on an Serbs' impression that Montenegrins are privileged in Serbian country, that they adapt better and that more is allowed for them, then to Serbs. Crucial is, however, how stigmatized themselves experience their stigma, and whether that influences general notion of the society towards them. Often happened that by revealing their descent they gained special status in society, something they were different by. Most of informants were proud of that, while a smaller number was, supposedly, indifferent (towards that). It is interesting that this pride surfaced only when they became aware that the surrounding perceives them as different, and that this does not create any negative consequence for them. They were called "Montenegrins", but that only supported greater confidence and intensified the feeling of personal specialness, although they did not have to sacrifice anything for it, nor had merits concerning that. High stereotypization of Montenegrins in Serbia, which does not always have a single meaning (tall, brave, strong, sharp, mutually connected, successful, plain), made possible certain psychological benefits, and relation towards them was never discriminative. However, some of the informants suspect that stigmatization is occurring more often, as a result of political events.[21]

It is particularly interesting to interpret social roles that Montenegrins ascribe to themselves, and which are given to them, (and which they get, and play in everyday life), that is, to explore evaluation and accepting of that roles by majority in accordance with interpretative models offered by Goffman. What is especially indicative here is a view of an individual who represents himself, which I attempted to indirectly acquire from my informants. The problem of control over the behavior of others by stigmatized person particularly emerges, that is, influence on "definition of a situation that others will accept" (Goffman 2000: 18). Provoking of a situation and

---

[20] "It was usually somehow pejorative, when they want to insult me somehow. I never reacted especially to that, because that way they couldn't really insult me."
[21] "I can say that lately it has been frequent, it happens more often than before, after this madness that happened to us"

imposition of appropriate discourse, that is, imposing of other to act according to one's plans, is a quite good description of what associates with Montenegrins in Serbian society. My informants weren't always aware of, to use Goffman's terminology, "revealing expressions", so they had to assume from the development of a situation; it is interesting that, contrary to popular beliefs, Montenegrins of second and third generation of immigrants weren't especially skillful in producing expressions, at least not as much as their parents or further ancestors. Many informants are aware of that, and in that sense idealize people from homeland.[22] Because of distancing from ideal-typical representation of Montenegrins, these descendants of immigrants do not enable the spectators to know in advance what can be expected from them.

Affective relation towards objects of material culture and their symbolism

Interior design represents a very interesting subject matter, because through this activity entire identity of an individual and a family who lives in that space can be depicted. Size, structure and furnishing of the space is pointing to families' aspirations, long-term orientations, what systems of value they adhere to. Although it is not always possible to explicitly discover someone's national identity formula only based on material objects he/she uses and meanings that are given to this objects, that still represents very good corrective method which can help in filling up the holes in knowledge, gathered through narratives and behaviors (about problem of material culture studies see Miller 1994).

Concerning material objects, I was interested is there a system in symbolization of material world, and if there is, are the informants aware of it, and also, what are the characteristics of that system. Since I easily predicted in the questionnaire what objects will be most prominent, it could be said that a certain system exists, and that is wide known, but it is difficult to define its character and place in informants' view of the world. Informants have a complex relationship towards national question, hence, the symbolism of the objects that bear at least several levels of meaning is tangled. One can say (it could be said) that material objects can be contextualized in different ways. First level of meaning seams to

---

[22] "But the way I present it is not even similar to how they are doing that, with such skill and artfulness. They are a different people by that from the Serbs..."

position Montenegrins in relation to Serbs: main objects that informants possessed, and which were associated with homeland, were a picture (bust) of Njegoš and his books, picture of Ostrog monastery and *gusle* (traditional one stringed instrument – translator's note). Njegoš is, in a certain way, although that can be discussed today, a symbol of Serbhood in Montenegro; at the same time, he is a father of a modern age Montenegro, and a representation of its great intellectual and spiritual potential. Ostrog monastery is a symbol of Serbian Orthodox Church in Montenegro, symbol of inextricability of Montenegrin spirituality and Serbian religious institutionalization; on the other hand, Ostrog is a spiritual place which significance transcends area of Montenegro and Orthodoxy. *Gusle* are the symbol of epic folk poetry, and as it seams, they are more popular in areas where pro-Serbian population resides; I am not sure, but it seams that the project of contemporary Montenegrin culture is based on distancing from the symbolism of *gusle*. Aforementioned objects are icons and symbols, which hardly can support the independent Montenegrin identity, so, ethnicity, although implicit, is their important feature. However, this tense construction related to meaning and usage of objects is far from the awareness of their consumers. Njegoš is, for instance, intellectual whom all southern Slovenes are adopting, and respect for him does not have to have any ethnic implications.[23]

It become apparent that my informants' relationship towards material culture is not always directly and single-meaningfully related with other segments of identity. Namely, majority of informants does not have a defined relation towards material culture of motherland; material objects they own in their homes, and which point to their descent, are generally inherited from their parents. Relation toward these objects is not developed, it remains on level of general representations and only a few subtle sentiments. All mentioned objects, with addition of Montenegrin cap, often just collect dust and are standing in the house without someone noticing them, and appear to be without symbolical value. They figure mostly as clan omen, something inherited from a direct ancestor (grandfather or father)[24], or as a religious object (icons and little crosses from Ostrog monastery), and rarely with awareness and recognized as national relic or symbol. Not all informants knew what specifically every object in

---

[23] "Njegoš fascinates me as a personality, but I don't think that this has anything to do with my descent, but simply he fascinates me same as some other people, who are of different nationalities. So, he fascinates me as a historical figure."

[24] "...I have feeling of admiration and devotion toward these things because they are a memory of my father..."

their house represents, and many didn't know which of these objects they own. Some expressed regret for not paying enough attention to that, but most of them stated that they do not have any feeling towards these objects.[25]

Learning of the "traditional" culture: Forced socialization

One of the directions I wanted to take is determining a manner of transmission and the reception of ethnic/national sentiments, that is, of cultural patterns of motherland. I attempted to explore this directly, asking questions concerning whether, how often, and in what way, the members of the previous generation have narrated to their descendants about life in the homeland, that is, about life in their place of origin. I also asked about whether, what, and in what way, they would convey that culture to their children. I assumed that this transmission occurs in several ways, and that oral transmission is the main and essential way. There the personal genealogy converge with the local and regional, on one side, and ethnic and national sentiment on the other, so it is not always clear if the effect should be interpreted exclusively in ethnic/national discourse. The reception of information and transfer of cultural values and cultural codes happened mostly through parents' stories and literature.[26] In that sense, a great number of informants had ambivalent relationship towards "traditional" culture. On one side, some elements were funny and distant to the informants, since they are urban population that considers itself Serbian, in national and ethnic sense.

---

[25] "I had *gusle*, but when I was little, I broke them..."

[26] "My father can be hard so his lectures about Montenegro often created counter effect and rejection towards culture and tradition. Still, later I started to develop interests on my own, so I made him to tell me everything again, and there was a lot of literature in the house, so it wasn't difficult to fill up with those information." "Yes, he was telling to me, in the house we often spoke of the customs and I liked it because there was never passion, exclusiveness, but always with a certain measure, and that was something that shaped me as a person in a positive sense". "He, for instance, knew many songs, and usually after dinner mother and us, children would gather around fireplace and listening to father recite those songs". "Much more success doing that had my grandfather who in a nice and unobtrusive way passed on many things from Montenegrin culture and tradition, so mellow and acceptable for me in my youth; father did that much more direct, and later stopped insisting because that manner of communication I didn't want to accept". "Well, yes, off course, when we were children, my father recited songs to my brother and me, sang to us, taught us... although those songs they sang were funny to us. Their poetry, epic songs... it is no some art, but... Mother reacted normally, there never been some repulsion or something like that. It was interesting for us to listen to his songs and stories. He is quite gifted to talk and he passed on to us stories he heard from his grandfather, although it is a different milieu they descent from. But, still, it helped me to form a picture in my head how it looked like when they lived there, through songs, stories... reading books. Since we were exposed to that in early childhood, we accepted it normally. And now, too... I don't have a repulsive attitude toward that. I accepted it as a part of our family and national tradition, with respect and with interest. It wasn't imposed, and father knew how to present it in an interesting way" One informant, when asked whether his grandfather ever spoke of his origin, said: "I mean, that are 'fish stories'."

On the other side, those contents were interesting and represented cultural potential, which helped them to feel different, mostly in positive sense. Stubbornness and determination that are characteristic for the manner in which the first, and sometimes the second generation conveyed Montenegrin folklore and history to their children, most often provoked two kinds of reactions: repulsiveness, indifference and mockery, on one side, and interest and some kind of pride, on the other. This transfer of culture has to be interpreted through oppositions: rural-urban, ethnic-civic, past-present, emotional-rational, etc. Therefore we can say that according to informants' responses, in second and third generation of immigrants, prevails rather strong resistance towards forced socialization and imposition of "traditional" patterns. Great majority of informants considers themselves Serbs and does not make the distinction between Montenegrinhood and Serbhood. Aggressive and anachronous teaching methods and "traditionalization" following them often did not awoke any national sentiment, moreover, it was more clear about what "they are not". As the method of transmission was more tolerant and practical, it caused more sympathies, attention and came to a greater degree of acceptance.

Not in one response I could find, not even an indirect hint of an attempt of transferring some kind of direction towards special social roles or positions, except certain cultural elements and mentalities. I haven't noticed that in long-term observation of my friends of Montenegrin descent, either. However, that does not mean that this transference did not happen, that some standards haven't been imposed, or that some orientations were not given. And an indirect transference of an obligation to reach high level of education or success in the society is, however, hardly characteristic only for Montenegrins. In socialist Yugoslavia highest ideal was to "finish school", because that brought good social positions, and the possibility of liberation from hard work, in fact, from work in general. All of my friends of Montenegrin descent have graduated from faculties or are still studying, and all of them have good jobs. It is hard to say what is the role of, probably equally inheritable, personal motivation for success, and in which degree it is an effect of subtle pressure mechanisms.

It seams that a certain rule is noticeable, concerning relation between age group and acceptance of "traditional" pattern, and it has been long known in science, but here I have to describe it as an impression, and not a conclusion. Receptiveness

21

for "traditional" impulses occurred in the childhood of my informants, through games and stories "of old", when in "warmth of a home" whole family gathered and listened "how it was in the past". Period of youth is marked with greater need for building of one's own identity, and a rebellion against traditional restraints. A decrease of interest for "fish stories" can be noticed there. In adult and late years of life this need to turn back to one's roots intensifies again, and this time as internally understood responsibility for ancestors and descendants.

As far as their conveying of "traditional" cultural pattern to children is concerned, that is, their role of message carrier, their impressions usually bring to the point where they will introduce their children to the fact where their ancestors are from. That role is deprived of any ideological connotation; it does not have any ethnic or national value or importance for the majority of them. That is something that is exclusively a matter of personal and family identity, matter of need of knowing personal history.[27]

Closing Arguments: Lack of Material and indirect data as a basis for evaluation of theoretical notions

What become apparent in the course of this research is a fact that Montenegrin community does not exist in Serbia today, at least not in a classical anthropological sense; existence of this community is in a sphere of relatively vague and undefined impressions and informal contacts, but also rather articulated social roles and positions which indirectly define a place of Montenegrins in Serbian society. Crucial problem which imposed here, is recognition and stigmatization of Montenegrins, that is, their awareness related to the fact that they are explicitly or implicitly stigmatized, and that stigmatization will be further intensified. This underground of meanings, hidden and apparent, false and overemphasized identities creates a very complex communicational situation, which was until now, perceived as a rather simplified one.

We cannot say that a community of Montenegrins lives in Serbia, but rather individuals of Montenegrin descent, who are approaching a problem of identity in different ways. Lots of factors influence a way they will opt for. Social and political circumstances today are like that, and they are forcing those individuals to decide in

---

[27] "I couldn't quite say that I will point to their Montenegrin descent, but I will certainly tell them who their grandfather is, who their great-grandfather was, where they were born and lived. I hope that they will, as I was, spend a lot of time down there, and that they will like it, as I liked it."

the context of ethnic/national relations: motherland is, explicitly or implicitly, encouraging them to declare as Montenegrins and to take Montenegrin citizenship, and the host country expects from them to incorporate into mass majority. Many of them find sense in those requirements, and are aligning with one of the two options. Many, however, cannot find themselves in such classification, they do not feel the need to categorize themselves in ethnic and national sense, and are preserving some kind of dual identity. This polarization within the population of Montenegrin descent tells us that this population is maybe in a phase of redefining, that is, to use the terminology of Henry Teifel, in a phase of "rising awareness" of their minority identity and status (see Teifel 1981: 311). This rising awareness is, however, in case of Montenegrins in Serbia, rather unusual; still it is not followed by any recognizable social and political movements, it is not supported by generally accepted and understandable symbols, and it does not gain interest of a great number of people. Inner cohesion of this group does not increase in time, nor recognizable characteristics of mimicry develops, that is, syndrome of "hidden minorities". Although Montenegrins in Serbia were always subjected to stigmatization, today it is developing a different form, meaning and value, but this change in perception of this problem is not happening fast, nor articulated and dramatically.

In my research I focused on subjective dimension of identity, which I explored in two ways. Firstly, it was explored through informants' relation towards rudimentary residues of objective parameters of identity: language, customs, mentality etc. Secondly, since many informants weren't able to review and define reflections of their own behavior, I was forced to motivate them to analyze their own identity using secondary sources; primarily here I think of impressions and reactions informants' noticed among those, they came in contact with. I asked them to interpret reactions of the audience who observed their "role playing".

It was shown that much could be derived from the way of self-determination or ascription, that is, from the differences between ascriptive and descriptive model. Informants perceive themselves in one way, but they come to a complete representation of themselves by also noticing reactions of others to their behavior and to signs of their identity. That mechanism of catching their own reflection in the reactions of others represents a rich field of research, that is often not simple to exploit. When I realized inability of informants to find and define national in them, I

asked them to tell me, in as many details, what is that what others see in them. The other segment is condensation and materialization of identity. Since there is not enough tangible and measurable difference between Montenegrins and Serbs, and thus no specific material culture of Montenegrins, it was necessary to explore the relation towards objects which on personal level have exclusively sentimental function, while on institutional level they have a function of national symbols: souvenirs.

The case of Montenegrins in Serbia seriously brings to question credibility of division on structural and cultural dimension of assimilation, that is, their mutual influence and significance. Scientific problem of "Montenegrins in Serbia" thus continues to problematize long ago formulated science problems. In Montenegrin case structural aspect of assimilation is not a question; it is developing normally and effortless from the beginning, from the immigration. There are no obstructions for Montenegrins in entering institutions, engaging in leading positions etc. Cultural aspect, on the other hand, does not exhibit usual line of development, concerning nor development direction, nor existence of all usual elements. They were always stigmatized, but never discriminated. Montenegrins weren't resisting assimilation, but it is not impossible that, at least some of them, would start to resist it in second or third generation, since only during lifetime of that generation, certain, until then unimportant, cultural differences are becoming noticeable, that is, they would start to gain certain significance and usage.

Literature

1. Davidović, D., 1989, Metodološki aspekti izučavanja kulturnog identiteta mladih jugoslovenskih migranata, u D.Drljača (ur.), Prilozi proučavanju etničkog identiteta, Zbornik radova EI SANU, knjiga 20, Beograd, 89-95.

2. Driedger, L., 1980, Etnic and Minority Relations, in R. Hagedorn (ed.), Sociology, Toronto.

3. Ferguson, C.A, 1990, Diglossia, in P.P.Giglioli (ed.), Language and Social Context, London, Penguin Books, 232-251.

4. Gofman, E., 2000, Kako se predstavljamo u svakodnevnom životu, Beograd, Geopoetika.

5. Gordon, M.M, 1966, Assimilation in American life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins, Oxford University Press.

6. Miller, D., 1994, Artefacts and the Meaning of Things, in T. Ingold, Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology, Routledge, 396-419).

7. Sanderson, S.K, 1991, Macrosociology: An Introduction to Human Societies, New York, HarperCollins Publishers.

8. Tajfel, H., 1981, Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology, Cambridge University Press.