

THE ROLE OF THE LANGUAGE IN MIGRATIONS AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY IN CROATIA

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emina Berbic Kolar¹

Dr. Igor Marko Gligoric¹

¹University of Osijek, Faculty of Education, Croatia

ABSTRACT

In this paper, language is (undoubtedly) a key component of the identity (or at least as one of the key components) of migrations on the territory of the Republic of Croatia at the turn of the century. Migrations are a common occurrence in modern society. They can be defined as a change of location of an individual or a group of people. Without going into more detailed analysis of the reasons and types of migrations, regardless of what is the incentive to relocate, it is more than clear that changing location includes/implies changing society and changing society means changing the language community. This paper contrasts, generally speaking, two migration periods on Croatian territory, including the EU. The first migrations that are analyzed concern the period during the Homeland War in Croatia and the period right after the War. Migrations and inclusion of migrants during that period are analyzed considering language differences between migrants and the language community they are migrating to. Taking into account, that the territory of the Republic of Croatia is linguistically very diverse, there are three very different dialects or (even) languages in Croatia (Shtokavian, Kajkavian and Chakavian), and positive and/or negative perception and position of migrants coming from the war zones are investigated, regarding the differences and/or similarities between linguistic systems they use to communicate. The Migrant situation in the Homeland War is compared with different perspectives in the migrant crisis in Europe during 2015 (2016 and 2017), i.e. migrations that bring people from geographically, linguistically, and culturally distant parts of the World. In drawing conclusions on the status of migrants during the 1990's and during the migrant crisis discourse analysis of the media and narratives was conducted. Finally, it is shown that the differences/similarities between linguistic systems correspond with negative or positive perceptions of migrants and, consequently, their inclusion in society.

Keywords: language, migrations, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics

INTRODUCTION

Language is, if we try to define it in general terms, a phenomenon or property characteristic only for man, which is undoubtedly exact, at least at the level of complexity in which the natural human language functions. Due to the fact that we are talking about a feature of a man, it is necessary in determining language to include the collective dimension. The idea is that the language is a social fact: it rests on a tacit social agreement (primarily because of its initial arbitrariness in linking the terms and contents of the linguistic sign), so it is conventional [11].

The social factor of a language can be recognized as a zero point in its determination irrespective of the linguistic perspective from which the language itself, in this case, the language as a subject of scientific research, as an object of science, tries, to analyze itself and by itself but considering the community that uses it [11]. Thus, the various linguistic perspectives will observe the language primarily as an abstract system of signs and the rules by which these signs are combined [11] - this will characterize the structuralist approach of the language established by F. de Saussure and by the distinguishing form, substance, terms and content, the notion of e.g. metalanguage etc., in addition to his glossary, was suspended by L. Hjelmslev. On the other hand, language can be viewed from the perspective of transforming and generating language messages, recognizing the rules by which messages are transformed and generated, the difference between the depth and surface structure, the distinction between the I-language and the E-language, which is certainly some of the basics of language observation perspective of generative grammar.

For both of these perspectives, it can be stated that they are structural, which of course, does not neglect the differences between the structuralism of Saussure's type and generative grammar founded by N. Chomsky. It is thought that in the above-mentioned linguistic lines the structure of the formal language is the primary focus, whereas the meaning that mediates this structure and the relation of that structure to the extraterrestrial universe remain outside the central interest of structuralism and generativist thinking. The shift towards conceptualization and the perception of, (sometimes) the identic meaning of conceptualization and linguistic formulation are evident in the cognitive linguistic approach to language. Cognitive linguistics begins with the fact that the concept, which is (actually) a linguistic concept, is structured knowledge based on encyclopedia data [15]. Such language understanding, which is at least in part comparable (or equitable) with cognition, was based on American linguistics and anthropology. F. Boas, E. Sapir and B. Whorf, are authors who observed in their contemplation the relationship between language and opinion, language and the world, noting that the language is the factor (or language structure) that shapes the individual's perception of the world around it. In contemporary terminology: language forms conceptualization, which clearly articulates Sapir-Whorf's hypothesis [10], [13]. B. Whorf clearly articulates: Language is not simply a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas, but rather is itself, the shaper of ideas [10], [13]. Moreover, language categorization mirrored conceptualization, the world's perception [7].

The previous is a very brief (but for the purpose of this work is probably sufficient) overview of language determinants, it shows that different approaches have a common starting point for language: it is a mental phenomenon for them and it is social because it involves the possibility of communicating what the individual thinks. Such a generalization, as well as any other generalization, is certainly neglecting the often-important

differences between different approaches, but in itself is not a mistake. Language is a mental fact, it serves as a means of communication, which implies that it is involved in the process of thinking. In the ability to use language as a means of communication, its sociability is contained: members of a community share the same (or very similar) language code - it enables them to convey ideas, to communicate. Taking into account the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and cognitive linguistic preferences about language, it can be concluded that speakers of the same language do not share only the knowledge of the language structures they communicate, but share a similar view of the world conditioned by the specific language (a commonly known example is the name for snow in the language of Eskimos, who have ten words for snow, and in Indo-European languages that have one or only a few).

Linking language, the individual, the society, and (conditionally) views of the world gives a new dimension to the understanding of migration. Without the intent on comprehensiveness and scientific exhaustion, migration can be defined as the spatial movement of the population. In the context of this paper, the reasons (economic, military and other) and types of migration (daily, monthly, etc.) are secondary. Here migrations are viewed as a phenomenon that is common in the modern world, and often involves massive masses, as was the case with the migration crisis in Europe in 2015 (and 2016). Given the above, theoretical and discourse analysis will be attempted, to establish and prove the fact that migration of the population also implies the migration of language systems and all that can be related to language (including identity). In the following sections, we attempt to confirm the assumptions about the impact of inter-ethnic differences on the inclusion of migrants in the communities they are coming from. Keeping this in mind, attention should also be paid to the fact that language / discourse (s) produce identities, to identify certain social groups as positive or negative, i.e. to be experienced through language and with language in mind. In this regard, methods of critical discourse analysis find its application [14], as well as approaches that recognize language as a means of legitimizing and manifesting different power relations [5], [8]. Here the relationship will be seen in migrations as the processes of movement of people: the movement of people can be equalized with the movement of language systems, and the relation of man among other people can be viewed analogously as the relation of one language system among other language systems (that are more or less similar).

LANGUAGE AND MIGRATIONS IN CROATIA

The introduction of the notion of society quite complicates the aforementioned language definitions as it presupposes the existence of a specific relationship between language, the individual and the community. In this way, the language necessarily connects with the identity of the individual and the language community to which it belongs, which often means the nation [12]. In order to better understand the migration (language) in the territory of the Republic of Croatia, it is necessary to briefly present its complexity.

Language(s) in Croatia

The link between the language, the individual, and the society / nations in geographic areas referred to in this paper is extremely complicated due to socio-historical reasons and the various state creations in which the present Republic of Croatia was located during the 20th century and earlier: The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the Independent States of Croatia, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Socialist Republic of Croatia), the Republic of Croatia (later EU Member States). Thus, the area of the Republic of Croatia was socially and legally very dynamic in the 20th century. It should not, therefore, be distant from the mind that the territory in which all the above-mentioned states were born contained language complexity as well. It is an area spoken with languages belonging to a group of South Slavic languages (Bosnian, Bulgarian, Montenegrin, Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian and Serbian) of the Indo-European language family. Bosnian, Montenegrin, Croatian, and Serbian are the standard languages that originated in the Shtokavian Dialectal Basis, which is the reason for the various political currents in the countries in which these languages are official, have used (or still use) in history (and still today) as a reason for unitarianistic persecution. However, these are sovereign states with official (recognized) languages, and we should emphasize Croatian language as one of the official languages of the European Union.

As much as the described language situation in the areas mentioned may seem complicated, in the case of the territory of the Republic of Croatia, it is even more complicated. Namely, there are three Croatian dialects in the Republic of Croatia: Shtokavian, Kajkavian and Chakavian. The specificity of the Croatian language situation is that the individual local speeches of different Croatian dialects differ from each other more often than some Slavic languages (e.g. Russian and Ukrainian, Czech and Slovak, and so on). In many cases, the differences are so much so, that negotiation is disabled. For example, in the Kajkavian area there are examples where two adjacent villages speak so differently that their speakers do not understand each other. There is also a similar situation with the Chakavian speeches, and understanding is undoubtedly completely absent in comparison with some Kajkavian speeches (e.g. Bednja speech) and Chakavian speeches (Vis speech) (the same is true of Shtokavian speeches). Thus, the Republic of Croatia itself is a linguistically diverse and complex region, taking into account the relations between the Croatian standard language and the non-standard variants [9], and the extraordinary reasons (socio-historical, political), these all greatly affect the perception of differences and appreciation of Croatian Shtokavian speeches and (or) of non-Croatian Shtokavian speeches; primarily the Serbian and Bosnian Shtokavian speeches and the Serbian and Bosnian standard languages.

The previous drafts of the language situation in the Republic of Croatia and those between the Republic of Croatia and the neighboring states in which

the official languages are also based on the Shtokavian base will serve to help understand the linguistic situation that migrants come from for various reasons and from different areas. In the following text, two migration situations that occurred at the turn of the century will be analyzed. Firstly, migrations will be considered immediately before, during and after the Homeland War in the 1990s. After that, migrations will be analyzed at the beginning of the 21st century, during 2015 (and 2016) when a migrant wave from the Middle East occurred. In both migrations-linguistic situations, the position and role of language in the perception of migrants and their inclusion in the community they go to, will be observed. All the conclusions to be made were made based on previous research on media discourse analysis and narrative analysis of the respondents from Shtokavian, Kajkavian and Chakavian areas. It should be noted here that the conclusions set out in this paper partly relate to the preliminary research presented in 2017 [3]. Here the research is expanded, and the conclusions are overwhelming and further argued.

Language (s) and migrations during the 1990s

During the 1990s, the Croatian Homeland War occurred in the territory of the Republic of Croatia. Migration and perception of migrants during and after the war can be traced to several types of migration: first, migrations occurring within Croatia; secondly, the population in Croatia coming from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and a somewhat smaller number from Serbia; Thirdly, the population migrating from Croatia to European Union countries (partly North America, somewhat less in Australia).

The first group consists of migrations taking place in the territory of the Republic of Croatia, i.e. in the area where the official language is the Croatian standard language. These migrations took place in the west: the largest number of people are from the eastern part of the country that went to the western parts. (There were migrations to the north and from some parts of Croatia too, but due to the significantly smaller population of these areas, only migrations from the east of the country are considered here.) Such migrations represented the displacement of the population from one area to another, but within the same dialect (Shtokavian) or the displacement of one of the Croatian dialects (Shtokavian) to the area of the other Croatian dialect (Kajkavian and Chakavian). These migrations here will be referred to as A migrations. According to the described description of A migration, they occur in two subtypes: A.1 migration, they are within the same Narrative area, and A.2 migrations are those that imply changing the Narrative area.

The mentioned distinction of the subtypes of A migration has its basis in the perception of the migrants as well. In the analyzed narratives of migration within the Shtokavian area, they are not evaluated as something negative, but are defined as a normal phenomenon, and migrants are generally involved in the community without major problems. Such integration can, at least partly (even theoretically) be associated with relatively small language differences. Namely, the differences between language systems that come into contact with (similar) local speeches of

the same dialect are in fact (especially in the wartime context) not perceived like *outsiders*. On the other hand, migration into non-Shtokavian areas is also recognized in the language. Thus, migrant Shtokavians in non-Shtokavian areas are recognized as drifters (those who drifted somewhere; regionalism, which is synonymous with the verb, is pejorative, in Croatian: *dotepsti se* > *dotepenci*, *došljaci* vs. *naseliti se*) and newcomers (those who came).

Looking at the migrations from the perspective of linguistic similarities, the following are the migrations from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia to Croatia. In both cases, this is migration from Shtokavian areas. However, the difference between Bosnian-Herzegovinian and Serbian Shtokavian speech in comparison to Croatian Shtokavian speech in most cases is noticeable, certainly in the accentuation and phonological features of concrete speech. For these reasons, it is considered that these migrations should be classified as a special type of migration, the type of migration here referred to as the B migration. Thus, B migrations include migrations from the two neighboring states of the Republic of Croatia to the Republic of Croatia. On the other hand, there is an important difference from where the population comes from. Since Serbia committed aggression against the Republic of Croatia, Serbian Shtokavian speech has a negative connotation, while no negative connotations are related to Bosnian-Herzegovinian speech or at least on a much smaller level. Thus, in the narratives it was noted that the speakers of Serbian Shtokavian speeches (more precisely, speakers who are recognized in the territory of Croatia as Serbs because of the spoken intonation, emphasis, phonology, lexicology and syntax) are often equated with ethnic Serbians who were perceived at the time of the Homeland War as extremely negative. It is also interesting, and in fact crucial to note, that migrants from Serbia are by majority mostly ethnic Croats. Still, language functions as a sign of their identity. It is interesting to note that one of the distinct features between Croatian and Serbian language is the reflex of the ancient Slavic voice *ě*. In the Croatian language there are different reflexes (*ije*, *je e*, *i* and sometimes *a*), while in Serbian there is a dominant reflex of *e*. The refugees from Serbia, who were predominantly Croats, changed the reflex of the voice of *ě* in their speech. That would not be surprising if croatisation of reflexion occurred where the etymology for it was justified (for example, Serbian *lepo* > Croatian *lijepo*). However, speakers of Shtokavian speech that have an *e* in place of an *ě* have changed every *e* in their speech to *ije*, accordingly, the *e* which did not come from the ancient Slavic *ě*. Thus, for example, the word *meso* (which comes from the ancient Slavic word *męso*) becomes *mijeso* although there is no linguistic justification for it because the ancient Slavic voice *ę* in both languages give the voice *e*. Additional evidence of the importance that a language has in identity and perception of an individual, there can be considered a similar phenomenon in Shtokavian speeches in Croatia. Namely, it should be noted that the speakers of Croatian Shtokavian speech, which spoke in the territory of the Republic of Croatia during and immediately after the Homeland War, have also changed every *e* to *ije/je* (e.g. *pulover* > *pulovijer*, *omekšivač* > *omjekšivač*). For these reasons it seems necessary to distinguish between two

important groups of B migrations: B.1 migration, migration from Bosnia and Herzegovina to Croatia, and B.2 migration, migration from Serbia to Croatia. In addition to this articulated difference, it is possible, by analogy, to distinguish the subtypes of A migration to establish the distinction between migration with respect to the dialectical destination. This could also be applied to distinguish B.1.1 migrations and B.2.1 migrations that imply migration to the Shtokavian area and B.1.2 migration and B.2.2 migrations coming from neighboring states in the non-Shtokavian Croatian area. The justification for such a subset of subgroups of certain migration subtypes is found in the established differences in the A migration group: if there is a difference in the perception of migrants within Croatia with regard to the fact that it is a Shtokavian or non-Shtokavian destination, it is quite reasonable to assume similar differences in the group B migration.

The description of the B migration and the migrant perceptions are applicable (probably) at the time when migrations occurred and in the context of the entire Croatian territory. However, such a situation in the border areas can at least partly be suspected from a synchronous perspective. In 2017 a study was conducted on the Bosnian language and its sociolinguistic status at the border of the European Union, in Slavonski Brod, on the border between the Republic of Croatia (European Union) and Bosnia and Herzegovina [1]. The area of Slavonski Brod and its surroundings was chosen because of the large number of refugees who came during the Homeland War and wanted to check the status of their organic idioms at the European Union border. The research considered the perception of Bosnian-Herzegovinian speech in the Slavonian-Croatian area from both perspectives: examined was (and valued) the positioning of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian speech from the perspective of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian speakers and from the perspective of the speakers of Shtokavian speeches within Slavonski Brod areas. The results of the research have shown that speakers of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian speaking their speech is positively evaluated, they are not considered less valuable than those from Shtokavian speeches within Slavonski Brod areas or then the Croatian standard language (although in principle they allow partial use limitation of the organic idiom, but any organic idiom) [1]. On the other hand, the Bosnian-Herzegovinian speeches are also positively evaluated by speakers of Shtokavian speeches from the Slavonski Brod region and consider it necessary to preserve them as well as to preserve any non-material cultural heritage; the difference between the two groups of respondents is that speakers of Shtokavian speeches from the Slavonski Brod region give a slightly greater advantage to the Croatian standard language than the speakers of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian speeches [1]. Such a positive perception on both sides should not be surprising because it is a border area that is in all contexts specific, due to its proximity and focus on *the other* and to coexist with them. In this sense, the distinction between the individual subgroups of B migration from a synchronous perspective should be understood conditionally.

A and B migration shape a language frame: they represent two types of migration most often of the Croatian population (as well as respecting the no way

negligible part of the Bosniaks, whom the Republic of Croatia received during and after the war of independence) that are happening either inside of Shtokavian areas or between areas of Shtokavian and Kajkavian, or of Chakavian areas with an important difference of inclusion or non-inclusion of the population of the neighboring States of Shtokavian. The third group of migration that is mentioned so far represent a migration from the Republic of Croatia in the Member States of the European Union (that were members at the time) and the United States, Canada and Australia, but in a much lesser extent. These migrations assume the movement of people from the Slavic language areas into non-Slavic linguistic areas, i.e. areas of primary Germanic (Danish, English, Dutch/Flemish, German, Norwegian, Swedish, etc.) and Romanic languages (French, Italian, etc.). Given that a smaller proportion of the population has moved to Finland, it should also be mentioned the Uralic Ugrophine group of languages.

Bearing in mind the inter-language diversity between the migrants and the community in which they are coming to, the population is expected to feel "*different*" in the new environment. This is apparent from the narratives that form being "*different*" in new environments, often it has to do with language barriers. In the desire to belong to a new community, migrants often neglect the mother tongue, especially when it comes to children born abroad, and thus they themselves influence their perception in their homeland. By integrating into the societies, they came to and avoiding the use of their mother tongue, migrants take over the language of the host countries and then introduce into their speech numerous expressions that are not customized in the Croatian language at any one language level (phonological, morphological or syntactic). In this way, they develop a specific *interlanguage* or *half language* and are given a name in the homeland, a Croatian version of the German term "Gastarbeiter". (*Interlanguage* is a term used in theories of language mastery. Here we do not refer to an intermediate in the mastery of a foreign language, nor to a semi-formal term implying a kind of negligent linguistic use [6]. These two terms are intended to suggest the mix of language codes that is sometimes deliberate (to show that an individual lives abroad), sometimes unintentional (when there is a real separation from the mother tongue).) These few examples point to difficulties in identifying with a new living environment, and the linguistic constituent component and the new communities as well as their own identity problems are at the very least, extremely important to consider. Because of its linguistic specificity, this type of migration described should certainly be distinguished: it is considered a C migration, that is characterized by relocation to an undoubtedly completely different linguistic area from where they left.

In the previous sections, is a breakdown of migrations, characteristic of the time of the Homeland War. Three basic groups of such migrations have been observed with regard to the type of spatial movement. They have attempted to describe, and among them, have tried to identify certain common and specific

features. In the section that follows the migration will be analyzed in the Croatian area during the migrant crisis.

Language (s) and migrations during 2015 (2016, 2017)

The migrations that began intensely in 2015 represent the movement of population, for the most part from the Near East in the direction of the European Union countries. This is the so-called Balkan route. The Balkan route passes, among other countries, through the Republic of Croatia. In addition to migrants from the Middle East, immigrants from the African continent entered the European Union (including sea routes) during the migration crisis. We analyze migrants with regard to their linguistic background, and we notice that most of them are speakers of the African and Turkic language families or speakers of Indo-European languages that are genetically and typologically distant from (for example) Slavic languages (or, specifically, the Croatian language, which this paper is about).

The perception of migrants coming to Europe has changed from 2015. Particularly specific are the changes in the Croatian relations to migrants during 2015 and 2016. It is thought that the identity of migrants in Croatia is almost entirely discourse-constructed [4]. This discourse constructed identity is threefold, bearing in mind that, in principle, every segment of the discrete constructed identity of migrants (every so-called micro-identity) corresponds to a specific time, i.e. with the development of a migrant crisis. Migrants in the Croatian media and in the narratives of the inhabitants who were analyzed were first experienced as victims, which can be related to the Croatian experience of the war, so people were more than congenial to migrant groups [4]. After initial approval and aiding, there were changes in multiple and multilevel migrant identities: migrants are first seen as a potential threat (which is their second micro-identity), and ultimately are undoubtedly seen as a threat that needs to be removed (which is the third micro-identity) [4]. (Given that migrants arriving in the Republic of Croatia, which Croatia is obliged to accept as a member of the European Union, it remains to explore how they are positioned in society and how society responds to the migrant community in view of the inter-ethnic barrier.)

The mentioned changes in the structure of migrant identity are partly influenced by the policy of different interest groups because each identity construction implies different power relations and mirrors different ideologies [5], [8], [14]. On the other hand, these changes are the result of the fact that Croatian society has gained some experience with migrants. Namely, all indicators show that the Republic of Croatia is not an immigrant-interesting state, which means that the population of the Republic of Croatia, in principle, has no immigrant experience, especially not to the extent in which migrants arrived in 2015. Without going into the value judgments, it is concluded that the Croatian attitude toward migrants changes negatively almost exponentially depending on how much experience people have with migrants: the more experienced, the perception of migrants is more negative - this is also apparent from both the media texts and narrative analysis. Given that migrants are a highly heterogeneous group, the only

thing they have in common is being different in relation to the community they come from: different in the linguistic sense over which it is partially constructed and partially observed by the different criteria (culture, customs, faith, system of values, etc.). Because of all these specifics, the migrations described can be classified as D migrations: a special type of population movement from linguistically (cultural, religious, ideological, etc.) highly distinct areas.

Since this paper deals with migrations at the turn of the century on the territory of the Republic of Croatia, one cannot pass on the fact that migrations from the Republic of Croatia to other EU member states, the United States, Canada and Australia occur still today. This migration could be labeled as C migration, which would mean that there is an undeniable linguistic barrier and the identity problem of empathy (from the Croatian perspective) to any community, especially in the context of the next generation, the descendants of emigrants. However, in the narrative analysis of the emigration of people leaving the Republic of Croatia between 2015 and 2018, the C migration features are not observed, at least not to the extent that this applies to the C migration of the 1990s. It is about people whose articulate their dissatisfaction and go (preferably) to European Union countries looking for (better) jobs. In this situation there are young people, often highly educated, who know the language of the country they are going to and integrate into the community, including the language community, at the same time as arrival or with a little delay. In addition, the difference is also due to migration: at the present moment, people migrate because they can or because they want to, not because they have to escape warfare. From their narratives - they learn that they do not feel fully aligned with the members of the community they came to, and as an indicator of this difference, they speak the language because in most cases it is immediately noticeable whether somebody is an original speaker of the language or not. However, they do not feel more of an exclusion from the society they came from and often do not consider returning to Croatia. Moreover, in the language of these migrants, there is no evidence of the emergence of an *interlanguage* or *half language*, which are described in C migrations. With that, there is no change in the B.3.2 migration, which means that according to the characteristics of modern migration from the Republic of Croatia, it is comparable to the B.3.1 migration and perhaps (at least in part) with the A migrations. This fact may seem unusual, because migration happens to areas that are linguistically different from the starting points. However, migrations of this type show that language does not have to be an obstacle if the cause / reason of migration is positive, if there is internal motivation, but at the same time confirms that the difference in language has consequences on the perception of migrants in the society in which they come (because migrants still recognize themselves as others). For this reason, it seems that the described migrations, which for methodological reasons can be called E migrations, represent such a type of migration that may be compared to B migrations.

Language(s) and migrations: differences and similarities

In the previous subsections, various types of migrations that included the territory of the Republic of Croatia at the turn of the 20th to the 21st century were attempted. The migrations analyzed may differ with respect to the category of space, the category of language and can be observed with respect to the perception of migrants. If we take space as a variable, migration can be divided into those within Croatia, migration from Croatia and migration to Croatia. If we decide on language as a criterion, we will distinguish between migrations from Slavic and non-Slavic languages, migration from Shtokavian areas to non-Shtokavian areas, etc. According to the perception of migrants, migration can be defined as generally positive and generally negative with the notion that migration perception is a scalar category to be influenced by various factors.

Except the fact that migrations can be viewed separately from different perspectives, it is possible to try to interpret them with reference to the three fundamental criteria articulated here and establish some kind of relationship between them, which seems reasonable because they do not occur in a vacuum. Taking into account the previous analysis, the table presents the migration classification.

Table 1. Classification of migration

Type of migration	Sub-type	Sub-group	Area	Perception
A	A.1	Within the Shtokavian area within Croatia		1
	A.2	From Shtokavian area to non-Shtokavian areas within Croatia		2
B	B.1	B.1.1	From Bosnia and Herzegovina to Croatia (Shtokavian area)	3
		B.1.2	From Bosnia and Herzegovina to Croatia (Non-Shtokavian area)	3.5
	B.2	B.2.1	From Serbia to Croatia (Shtokavian area)	4
		B.2.2	From Serbia to Croatia (Non-Shtokavian area)	4.5
C	From Croatia to the European Union (1990)			5
D	From the Middle East and from Africa to Croatia			6
E	From Croatia to the European Union			3 – 3.5

It can be seen from the table that there were five different basic types of migration from Croatia at the turn of the century. Each type of migration is described with respect to the area from which the population is moving and the migration number is assigned to each type of migration, which indicates a positive and negative perception of migrants: number 1 indicates that a migrant is involved in society and is not seen as different (or is seen as different in the smallest extent possible), and 6 indicates that the migrant does not engage in society and is likely to be perceived as different (even perceived as a dangerous).

Migrants coming from the same language system feel the least foreign, they are among the least linguistic differences. Thus, the number 1 is assigned to migrations within the Shtokavian region, while the number 2 is assigned to migrations from the Shtokavian to the Kajkavian or Chakavian region. The numbers are given somewhat arbitrarily and from a theoretical perspective, taking into account all criteria (migration type, language, area, etc.) and taking into account the differences between the analyzed narratives. Thus, the distinction between 1 and 2 has been established on the basis of whether the immigrants will or will not usually be called *comers* or *newcomers*, i.e. whether he or she will perceive themselves as others or not (or to what extent).

The second type of migration consists of migrations from neighboring states of Shtokavian countries to Croatia and depending on the population movements in the Shtokavian or Non-Slavic area (analogous to A migrations) subgroups are distinguished. Perception is mathematically equally distributed.

B.1 migration and B.2 migration, aside from the country of migration, differ in terms of language adaptation of immigrants, which is much more important in this context. Thus, B.2 migrants will invest tremendous efforts to change their speech. It should be emphasized again that B.1.1 migrations from a synchronous perspective are perceived as positive, therefore (even) not neutral.

The fact that migration to the area of the second linguistic system is sufficient to separate C migrations as a separate group in which the migrants from Croatia from both perspectives are not perceived unreservedly positive: they are recognized in the emigration as others, they are themselves in an identity gap (inclusion and linguistic) and are in their own homeland at least a recognizable group. According to the destination, E migrations are identical to C migrations, but because of time lag, language knowledge, migration causes, and migrant perceptions do not allow for their equalization.

In D migration are those that result in migrants that are not included in society and are directly related to the initial ignorance of the language, i.e. interpersonal, customary, cultural and other differences. All categories and all the proposed descriptions correspond to the theses of the relation of language and opinion, language and culture, which are characteristic of the linguistic currents derived from the theory of E. Sapir, B. Whorf, G. Lakoff and others.

According to the observed features of a particular migration type, the degree of involvement in society and the similarity or difference between language systems can be noticed. In this sense, it confirms that language plays a very important role in the inclusion of migrants in society [2]. Migrants come from one community to another. It is a community and a linguistic community as well. Given this fact, in order to bridge the differences between the migrants and the community they come across, it is necessary to overcome the linguistic differences. In this way, an individual is fully involved in society, the education system, the labour market, which confirms the place of language in an individual's everyday life: the language is confirmed in this case as a specific human property, a means of communication, thinking, conceptualization, understanding of the world.

CONCLUSION

This paper attempted to consider the influence of language on migration processes and the inclusion of migrants into society. Based on the analysis of media discourse and analysis of individual narratives, migration situations were discussed during and after the Homeland War (1990s) and during the migration crisis in 2015 and 2016. Different migrant groups have been analyzed from different perspectives: given the time of migration, type, geographical area, language etc. The five types of migrations that emerged in the Croatian territory at the turn of the century are described. In the text it is shown that each type of migration differs with respect to the area in which it occurs and with regard to the positive or negative perception of migrants. The analysis has shown that the similarity between migrant and community language systems in which migrants

come positively affects their integration into society, that language differences correspond to a lower degree of involvement in society and a lesser degree of acceptance. It has been noted in the examples that the similarities between the languages or the knowledge of the community language to which it comes positively affects the perception of the immigrant group. Thus, migrants are most likely to be perceived positive within the same dialectal area of the same language on the territory of a state, and the migrants coming from genetic and typological different languages are least positively determined. In this connection, it establishes a link between language, opinion, culture and perception of the world.

REFERENCES

- [1] Berbić Kolar, Emina, Gligorić, Igor Marko. Bosanski jezik na granici Europske unije, *Međunarodni znanstveni simpozij Bosanski jezik u vremenu – knjižica sažetaka*, Croatia, 2017a, pp 7-7.
- [2] Berbić Kolar, Emina, Gligorić, Igor Marko. Jezik u kontekstu inkluzije migranata, *Zbornik sažetaka prve međunarodne konferencije o obrazovanju – MICE 2017*, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2017b, pp 28-29.
- [3] Berbić Kolar, Emina, Gligorić, Igor Marko. Language and migrations: Homeland War vs. Migrant Crisis. *42nd ATEE Conference 2017 – Book of abstracts* (Ed. Sablić, Marija, Škugor, Alma, Đurđević Babić, Ivana, Croatia, 2017c, pp 252-252.
- [4] Berbić Kolar, Emina, Gligorić, Igor Marko. The Discursive Construction of the Migrant Identity in Croatia. *Science and society. Language and linguistics; health policy and services: SGEM Vienna 2017: Social Sciences and Arts*, Bulgaria, 2017d, pp 323-338.
- [5] Dijk, Teun Adrianus van, *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*, United Kingdom, 1998.
- [6] Jelaska, Zrinka, Kusin, Igor, Cvikić, Lidija, Opačić, Nives, Bošnjak, Marija, Novak-Milić, Jasna, Blagus, Vlatka, Hržica, Gordana. *Hrvatski kao drugi i strani jezik*, Croatia, 2005.
- [7] Lakoff, George, *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About our Mind*. United States of America. 1987.
- [8] Leeuwen, Theo van, *Discourse and Practice*, United Kingdom, 2008.
- [9] Mićanović, Krešimir, *Hrvatski s naglaskom: standard i jezični varijeteti*, Croatia, 2008.
- [10] Sapir, Edward, *Language: an Introduction to the Study of Speech*, United States of America. 1921.
- [11] Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Tečaj opće lingvistike*, Croatia, 2000.
- [12] Škiljan, Dubravko, *Govor nacije (jezik, nacija, Hrvati)*, Croatia, 2002.
- [13] Whorf, Benjamin Lee, *Language, Thought and Reality*, United States of America. 1956.
- [14] Wodak, Ruth, Meyer, Michael, Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology, *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, United Kingdom, pp 1-33, 2009.

[15] Žic Fuchs, Milena, Kognitivna lingvistika i jezične strukture: engleski *present perfect*, Croatia, 2009.