

# Use of Migration Terms in Public Discourse

## Example of Serbia in the Last Hundred Years

DOI 10.17234/9789531756525.3

Miroslava Lukić Krstanović

Institute of Ethnography SASA (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts)

Knez Mihailova 36, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

miroslava.lukic@ei.sanu.ac.rs

Migration-related terms were created, multiplied, supplemented, and amended, establishing specific realities of reading, interpretation, and use. In terms of terminology and typology, the migration-related nomenclature has changed through history under the influence of global and specific social, economic, and political events. This paper analyses the shaping and representation of migration-related terms in public discourse of the state, media and academic policies during the last hundred years on the example of Republic of Serbia. The analysis is based on contextual observation of formal and symbolic constructs, which have been changing their linguistic and semantic positioning. This involves the most frequently denoted and denoting terms which were and which are used in Serbia, partly compared with those in Croatia.

Keywords: migration terms, public discourse, former Yugoslavia, Republic of Serbia

### Conceptual frame

The ever-changing and multiplied migration phenomena are constructed into certain terminological and typological systems and orders, in accordance with (inter)national, academic and media policies, and the administrative management. The shaping and use of technical terms establishes a specific communication with a large number of participants – those who produce, supervise, implement, apply, analyse, inform, and those who identify with those terms. This is how the field of explicative power is created. As subjects of scientific observation, instruments of political use and control, interpretative phenomena and news/events, migrations represent derived realities and formal rationalities. The terminological processing and use of migrations is therefore dependant on language, criteria, interests, situations, systems of values, social and cultural identifications. A field is created in which the normative and affective, the empirical and theoretical, the public and private are confronted. Clearly, the naming and distribution of phenomena into notions, types and categories inaugurates appropriate distinctions, distances and relations, i.e., an entire range of relationships and roles (migrants, *non*-migrants, us – them). The terms that denote migration are also sensory images, symbolic projections and attributes

that create special correlations between the senders and the recipients of messages. Dictionary entries, press headlines, TV images, visa applications, statistics, and protocols are subject to particular norms suggested by those in authority. Migration-related terms were created, multiplied, supplemented, and amended, establishing specific realities of reading, interpretation, and use. Terminological stratification and positioning have largely complicated migrations and made them complex, further complicating and escalating the issue of human mobility. Diversification and changes in the migration processes shape the notional nomenclature, which is internationalised and centralised, but also localised in sets of autonomous political instruments. The conceptual model which I generated can serve as a guideline for further analysis, bearing in mind the diachronic and synchronic dimension.<sup>1</sup> The vertical column contains the bearers and authorities on shaping terminologies in public discourse: political and administrative institutions, science and media. The horizontal column has three categories: norms as legal regulators, paradigms as exemplary forms, and symbols as association codes. In this manner, migration phenomena can be traced both through historical prism, and through current processes.

Migration-related terms in process of production

	Norm	Paradigm	Symbol
Political and administrative institutions	managing migration flows: state and national terminology, international conventions	state and national utilitarian; internationally networked	public discourse: power of authority, hierarchy, supremacy and subordination, securitisation and protection
Scientific discourse	academic and scientific institutionalisation – discipline, education, institutes, projects, subjects	theories (methodological nationalism, transnational theory, etc.) and academic authorities (especially in ethnology and anthropology), interdisciplinarity, transdisciplinarity, comparativity	symbolisation of identity structures, contextual factor in interpretation
Media	electronic and printed media: exclusivity and events – news comments	media nationalism, media internationalism	glorification, satanising, victimisation, discrimination, dehumanisation

<sup>1</sup> This conceptual frame is based on research material: archival materials, state and social protocols, statistics, press, public rhetoric, scientific literature and interviews.

In this paper,<sup>2</sup> migration-related terminology is analysed through the shaping of terms in a historical context, from the institutionalisation of migration policies in the former Yugoslavia<sup>3</sup> to the present day, with a special focus on terminological transformations in the Republic of Serbia.<sup>4</sup> My objective is to demonstrate the way in which terms were constructed under the influence of social, economic, and political circumstances, the way in which terms were stereotyped in public discourse and everyday communication, establishing certain protocols, interests, systems of values, and stereotypes in creating conceptions on migrants. The sources used – administrative protocols, archive materials, media (especially press), scientific literature, not only represent factual tools for analysis, but also a text of its own kind which stratifies meanings. Although historically marked, the principal migration processes (such as: internal migrations, deruralisation, political emigration), the stress will be placed on external migrations and their terminological markers, which have seen the largest terminological transformations in public discourse over the past seventy years. This necessitates a comparison of similarities and differences in lexical, semantic, and functional shaping on the level of state policies and public discourse, especially in the example of Serbia, and then in comparison with Croatia,<sup>5</sup> which derives from the period of cohabitation in the former states of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1929) and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1963)<sup>6</sup>, all the way to the breakup of the mutual state in the 1990s (Republic of Croatia – Independence 1991), and finally to the establishment of separate state entity (Republic of Serbia 2006).<sup>7</sup>

### Normative production of terms and categories

The word/term *migration* is of Latin origin (*migratio -onis, migrans, migrare*). These words have acquired international use and spread across the Anglo-Saxon and

---

<sup>2</sup> This paper is the result of the work on the project “Multiethnicity, Multiculturalism, Migration – Contemporary Processes” (17702) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

<sup>3</sup> The construction of migration-related terms can be traced even earlier, from the period before World War II (the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) when the state institutions for monitoring internal and external migrations were consolidated.

<sup>4</sup> My research of migration, especially of emigration processes has been ongoing since 1984. Based on the field work and documentation activities, I was able to monitor the transformations of migration-related terminologies in the domain of administration, science, and media.

<sup>5</sup> Croatia and Serbia were the principal institutional bearers of migration policies from the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century to the breakup of Yugoslavia. Therefore, this paper will mark the principal institutions which represent the starting points of the terminological roads.

<sup>6</sup> Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia (1945).

<sup>7</sup> State Union of Serbia and Montenegro (2003–2006).

Francophone language realms over to other languages. The term *mobility* (UNDP 2010: 8) is superordinate to the term *migration* today, taking into account the different forms of migrations and the different forms of mobility such as, for example, daily migrations – commuters, tourism, virtual – internet mobility, and other. This is why not only spatial mobility, but also social mobility is taken into account. On the other hand, a number of phenomena have obtained notional definitions and specific categorisations – colonisation, emigration, immigration, evacuation, exile, asylum, repatriation, expatriation, irregular migrations, readmission, brain drain, as well as the key terms that accompany these processes (integration, acculturation, accommodation). Since the establishment of the United Nations<sup>8</sup> and international organisations for migrations, such as the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), European Migration Network (EMN), and others, the set of terminological instruments has been permanently redefined and refined. International glossaries of terms set guidelines for the purpose of harmonisation and comparison; this especially refers to EU members within the scope of their multi-sector activities.

In the Serbian and Croatian languages, the word migration (*migracija*) has been used for a long time; however, much older words: *selidba*, *seljenje* and *seobe* (moving, moving place, moves) also appear as complementary terms. The history of the Balkans and South-East Europe is built on movements of people, and it is only logical that these terms have long been in use. With the institutionalisation and internationalisation of the state policy of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in the 1920s, the problem of emigration – until then haphazardly and only partially regulated, became a matter of state policy and regulations. The foundations of emigration policy were laid with the establishment of particular state bodies in the ministries, which drafted and then adopted provisions, decrees, and laws on emigrants.<sup>9</sup> The term *returnees* also came into use in the administrative discourse of those years, in the sense of regulation and influx of foreign currency into state coffers.<sup>10</sup> At the same time, with intensified international and diplomatic communication the word *immigration* was transferred into the local official language. Among

<sup>8</sup> The key markers for defining the standards and protection of migrants have been determined in universal documents, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948); the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951); the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966); the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees (1967); ILO (International Labour Organisation) Convention No. 97 Migration for Employment Convention (1980); the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (2003), etc.

<sup>9</sup> In the 1920s, the emigration affairs were conducted by the Emigration Commissioner's Office in Zagreb, and the services of emigration supervisors and envoys were also introduced (Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministry of the Interior, 14, 37, Archive Unit 104, document signature 140-201, d. 141). The term *emigration* appears in the title of *Draft of the Emigration Decree* of 1921.

<sup>10</sup> *Report on Returnees and Refugees and Methods of their Admission*, MUP, State Security Department, Archives of Yugoslavia, F 37/116.

other, the following sentence was recorded in the emigrant news of 1923: “With regard to emigration to Canada, the need for increased immigration is generally emphasised” (Archives of Yugoslavia, document 120, MUP 34/104).

The migration-related terminology is associated with migration currents, which are a result of social and political circumstances. After World War II, socialist Yugoslavia saw a particular increase in internal migrations – from villages to cities and from less developed to more developed agricultural areas (the Agrarian Reform of 1945–1946 contributed to such trends, as well as relocations from the Mt Dinara region to Vojvodina – Serbia, from Lika to Slavonia – Croatia; also known as the *Colonisation*; Bjeljac and Radovanović 2016: 502–503). The terms which denote the processes – urbanisation, industrialisation, and deagrarianisation occur most often in the literature of that time. Workers – migrants became a key category of the demographic policy. Daily, seasonal, and permanent migrations towards city areas, lifestyle changes, as well as the attitudes towards the newcomers, created population entities that shared the same norms and values: the return of repatriates to their native areas, relocation of military personnel and other professionals throughout the former Yugoslavia, education and arrival of young people to cities. The rural – urban migration trend continued in the 1970s with more prominent regional migrations, which either represented a *circular flow* of people’s migrations or permanent relocations. In the 1981 population census, workers and students were asked for the first time about the frequency of returning to their places of permanent residence and about the duration of work outside their places of permanent residence (Oliveira-Roca 1984: 5).

Economic emigration processes in the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century were usually initiated by pauperisation, stagnation of economic reforms, unemployment, “super-concentration” of people in urban areas, and depopulation of rural areas, while the reasons for political emigration processes were marked with refusals to recognise the existing political regime and the imposing of repressive measures by the state. These standard reasons, denoted as push-pull factors, determined the emigration to other states (Bobić and Babović 2013: 214–215). Since migrations are always supervised by the state, the official politics and authorities strived to determine appropriate constructs for their regulation. This is how terms were constructed and redefined to be used as signifier and signified. Since the end of the 1960s, the following terms were used in political, academic, and public media discourse: *iseljeničtvo* (emigration), external migrations, political emigration, *radnici (lica) na privremenom radu u inostranstvu* (workers (persons) temporarily working abroad), and as of the 1980s: *odliv mozgova* (brain drain).

In Serbian and in Croatian, the terms *iseljeničtvo* (emigration) and *iseljenici* (emigrants) are terms that have been in use for a long time (Lukić Krstanović and Pavlović 2016: 9). However, regardless of their persistence, these phenomena/terms

have produced different and variable linguistic and terminological codes within the frame of communicational and situational configurations.<sup>11</sup>

*Emigration/Emigrants* are defined as flows and stocks of long-term or permanent residence out of the domicile country, usually for economic reasons. According to some definitions, the Latin expression *animus non revertendi* (with no intention to return) can be ascribed to the notion of the emigrant (Čizmić and Mikačić 1974: 1).<sup>12</sup> In contrast with the term *iseljenici* (emigrants), which continued to be used domestically in its original form, in the socialist period, the construct *emigranti* (emigrees) denoted persons who moved out of the country for political reasons (in some cases, the term *emigrant* (émigré) was determined by the adjective *political*; *Pravna enciklopedija* 1979: 298, 437). Such a polarisation created an opportunity for the further heightening of differences. Unlike *emigrants* (*iseljenici*) who were legitimately accepted by the state as Yugoslav compatriots and loyal nationals of the “Homeland country”, *political émigrés* (*politički emigranti*) had a negative connotation in the administrative vocabulary – those with a hostile attitude towards the then socialist regime. In some encyclopaedic entries and studies from that time, political émigrés became a category unto itself, separate from the other categories (economic migrants, Yugoslav emigrants, persons temporarily working abroad).<sup>13</sup> As of 1945 and up to the breakup of SFRY, the terms *political emigration* and *enemy emigration* (see Spasić 1982: 192) were used in political and state discourse and in official language register, categories which denoted all the emigrants who were or who were labelled as enemies of the Yugoslavia.

Until the 1960s, Yugoslavia had a restrictive policy toward moving out of the country. The change of the course of Yugoslav state policy, which occurred after the break-up with the Eastern Bloc and the opening toward the West, created a new climate around the issue of emigration. At the same time, the Western countries experienced an increased workforce demand, which additionally intensified the spatial mobility. The Amnesty Law and a set of measures regarding the possibility of employment abroad were passed in those years. The regulations were formalized in 1964, as part of the Law on Yugoslav Citizenship. Year after year, the number

<sup>11</sup> Here, I primarily refer to the political events (Wars for Yugoslav Succession) on the territory of the former Yugoslavia, i.e. the breakup of the state and the establishment of separate states within which different migration processes were unfolding and different migration policies were created as of the beginning of the 1990s. These states are: Republic of Serbia, Republic of Croatia, Republic of Slovenia, Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Republic of Macedonia. In 2008, Kosovo declared independence, which was not recognised by Serbia and some other countries.

<sup>12</sup> Čizmić and Mikačić (1974: 1) indicate four types of emigrants: conqueror, colonist, entrepreneur, and industrial worker.

<sup>13</sup> See: *Sociološki leksikon* 1982: 365.

of those going abroad increased. At the end of the 1960s, another technical term entered the administrative and political vocabulary: *workers (persons) temporarily working abroad*. The newly-coined expression in the Serbian and Croatian languages was obviously a modified version of a term taken from the German language: *Gastarbeiter* – in English literally: *guest-worker* (Giordano 2010: 12). This category is based on two referent units: work and temporariness. The insistence on this phrase derives from the political interests of the state of emigration – in this case the former Yugoslavia, and the states of immigration. The term *workers* pertained to non-qualified and qualified workers, while the term *temporary* was used as a guarantee that the workers would return to their domicile country after a certain while. For the country of immigration, the term *guest* was a guarantee that the workers-migrants would not become permanent citizens, securing in this manner the stability and tolerance of the rest of population towards the newcomers (Vuksanović 1996: 296). Although the 1970s saw relative stagnation in the demand for foreign labour, due to the “oil crisis” (1972–1978), modernisation of technology and automation, people continued to leave Yugoslavia.<sup>14</sup> The term “persons temporarily working abroad” first appeared in the Yugoslav census of 1971 (Bobić and Babović 2013: 215). In the following, 1981 census, the category of workers-emigrants was extended to include their household members. As of the 1991 census, the word “temporarily” was removed and the term “persons working/residing abroad” was introduced.<sup>15</sup> In Serbia, the persons studying abroad have also been added to this category as of 2011 (Stanković 2014: 11). With regard to administrative regulations, the status of workers-emigrants was regulated by special international and national regulations. The export of skilled workers from Yugoslavia was supervised by state bodies and methods of administration called workers’ self-management (self-managing interest communities for employment). A specific form of employment entailed sending workers employed by Yugoslav companies abroad, based on investment contracts and contracts of business and technical cooperation, in accordance with the bilateral agreements of 1988 (Pavlica 2005: 130). On the other hand, there were institutions/authorities which regulated the contractual status of emigrants in the domain of state emigration and immigration policies, while on the other hand, personal decisions on whether to stay or to return created flexible positioning into a “permanent temporality” (Čapo Žmegač 2005: 255–273), bearing in mind the

<sup>14</sup> Emigration is a set of very complex individual and social circumstances, relying on micro- and macro- immigration/emigration policies on the labour market. Another important factor in the 1970s was making personal decisions to stay abroad temporarily for the purpose of fulfilling the motives for improvement of quality of life and living standards.

<sup>15</sup> It has to be emphasised that this was the last census conducted in the then SFRY. It turned out already then, that the republican statistics institutes stopped collaborating with each other, and that demographic and statistical data became the responsibility of the newly-established administrative state entities, including also identification and terminology markers.

several generations that had already been living abroad.<sup>16</sup> Hence, it is not surprising that, after a certain while, the expression denoting the *temporary character of working abroad* found itself in a blind alley. The past decades have proved that this migrant category has exceeded the “temporary stay” and entered the phase of (long-)lasting, taking into account that this indicated period has come to include their offspring, as well. The terminological fluidity arises from the cumulative process of naming those who are arriving and those who already live there, blending-in or merging with the category of “guests” in diaspora (Krstić 2011: 307). According to some authors, the attribute “temporary” was a euphemism of the contemporary communist nomenclature the aim of which was to conceal the organised and massive “export” of workforce (Stanković 2014: 10). Regardless of the state emigration or immigration policy, the term of “temporariness” represented a limiting variable that served the purposes of political control. The Law on Conditions for the Temporary Assignment of Employees to Work Abroad and Their Protection (*Official Gazette of RS* [Republic of Serbia] no. 91/15) demonstrates that the tendency toward the terminological use of “temporariness” has continued, this time in the form of control over the residence abroad by the time limitation set by the employer.<sup>17</sup>

Another technical term that has been in use since the 1980s is *brain drain*.<sup>18</sup> This term could be determined as a subcategory of emigrants, i.e. migration of highly-qualified people. The use of the term, especially in professional publications, coincides with the period when professionals (predominantly engineers and doctors) left the former Yugoslavia for the countries of Western Europe, USA, and Canada. Originating from the academic vocabulary, this term very soon assumed global use and entered the administrative and political rhetoric. The development of means of communication, internationalisation of production, trade, and financial flows resulted in increased mobility and the circulation of professionals within the developed world (Mesić 2002: 15). These were highly educated professionals who predominantly migrated from bigger cities. This term has also been increasingly used for students and postgraduates abroad. Brain drain is the term used in the countries of emigration to denote the depletion of human capital, while brain gain is interpreted as a benefit and contribution of human capital. Therefore, brain drain and brain gain correspond to the rotational formula of loss and profit (Lukić Krstanović and Pavlović 2016: 220).

<sup>16</sup> The terms *detaširani* (detached) and *izaslani* (dispatched) workers refers to a worker that “remains employed in his company, but is sent on work at the facilities of this company located abroad” (Heršak 1998: 34–35).

<sup>17</sup> The term *labour migrant* is used more often nowadays in official documents. See: International Organization for Migration, *Key Migration Terms*, <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms> (last access 25 January 2017).

<sup>18</sup> With the introduction of the term *globalisation*, the term *brain gain* has become increasingly frequent, too; it refers to the circulation and “migration of talent” (Mesić 2002: 16).



In the example of Serbia, the use of the word diaspora appeared in the political context with the dissolution of the state of Yugoslavia and the national constitution of Serbia. Having come into terminological use in Serbia in the 1990s, the term diaspora is indicative of the nationalization of emigration and has taken over the role of the term *iseljenišvo* (emigration).<sup>19</sup> However, unlike the term *emigration*, the term diaspora has an internationally recognised status, which automatically makes it a valid category. How did the exploitation of this term begin? Everything revolved around emigration policy and nation-building.<sup>20</sup> The degree of institutionalisation of the term *diaspora* in the example of Serbia demonstrates that it is a new/old construct. The Ministry for Serbs outside Serbia was established in 1992; in 2004, the Ministry of Diaspora was created and it was later renamed to the Ministry of Religions and Diaspora. Until the present day, the institutionalisation of the category of diaspora has been restructured from Ministry to Office at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia. In 2009, the Law on Diaspora and Serbs in the Region was passed. This Law pertains to the citizens of the Republic of Serbia who live abroad, and Serbian nationals – expatriates from the territory of the Republic of Serbia and from the region, as well as their offspring. The term “Serbs in the region” denotes Serbian nationals who live in the Republic of Slovenia, Republic of Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Republic of Albania, and Republic of Hungary (Art. 2). Most of the protocols use the term “Serbian diaspora”. The institutionalisation of diaspora is thus directed towards creating a constituting unit and national entity of the expatriate community. The presented terminological policies are made evident through administrative instruments which are used primarily in formulating the national diaspora as an essence. The process of “diasporisation” today is a matter of political records, strategy of governmentality (establishment of ministries and boards for the diaspora), and the activity of diaspora bodies – such as assemblies and congresses, so as to create a unifying image of the nation in diaspora.

In addition to its institutional affirmation, the term/notion of *diaspora* is a suitable instrument for symbolic identification. I have constructed the following formulations of diaspora which indicate particular meanings and messages at the symbolical level: 1. Homogenisation of emigrants into an entity; 2. Harmonisation – interconnecting; 3. Collective memories and collective experiences; 4. Common narratives; 5. Feeling of empathy and solidarity; 6. Uniqueness and differentiation

<sup>19</sup> While the term *iseljenišvo* (emigration) is used increasingly less in the public discourse of Serbia, in Croatia the terms *iseljenišvo* and *dijaspora* are associated with different types of mobility. The term *iseljenišvo* in Croatia rather denotes transcontinental emigration, while diaspora refers to those who live in the dispersive area of European countries (Grbić Jakopović 2014: 16).

<sup>20</sup> Vertovec (1997: 277–299) accentuates three meanings of diaspora: diaspora as social form; diaspora as type of consciousness; and diaspora as mode of cultural production. Once these three meanings are brought together under a national umbrella, diaspora becomes a political concept.

from “others”. It is only enough to have a look at the internet communication (official internet sites of state institutions and state network) as various forms of propaganda, cultural events in which diaspora is promoted in its unity of life and past.<sup>21</sup> In this manner, emigrants are observed and presented in the form of a matrix and national essence. It is not difficult to conclude that such a matrix could be easily manipulated to project an ideal standard model of diaspora with an established history, economy and culture. The more stable a construct the diaspora is, the stronger is its power to further solidify into a monolithic matter and *fictitious Us*. According to those terminology managers, the citizens of Serbia and those who originate from Serbia but belong to other ethnicities, do not always fit into the formula of diaspora. Therefore, a terminological question is posed – how do the members of diaspora call and see themselves; or even further – how do the members of the second and the third generations of emigrants see themselves? The diaspora is based on “allopatricity” (Mežnarić 2003: 335) and stratifications, which is difficult to classify as a produced or artificial entity from the point of view of the members of diaspora.

The migration terminology is multiplying increasingly, since human mobility is also becoming more complex. The migration-related terms are especially problematized through the following categories: refugees, asylees, irregular migrants and migrants. Over time, the dilemmas regarding the use of these terms have grown into issues of inconsistency between the general universal declarations on protection of human rights, movement of people and changes in their status, in accordance with the current geostrategic and national policies. Marta Stojić Mitrović points out to the shifting of policies in migration categorisations. In the SFRY period, the “asylee” and “refugee” were clearly divided categories. The “asylee” category belonged to the domain of state strategy of responsibility and propaganda towards “foreigners”, while “refugees” were more in the domain of international humanitarian responsibility (Stojić Mitrović 2014: 1117).<sup>22</sup> Up until the year of 1996, the experience in Serbia with the refugees from the former Yugoslavia and from other countries demonstrated that political interest was becoming increasingly primary in determining the status of refugees (Pavlica 2005: 145). Since the breakup of Yugoslavia, the “refugee” status in Serbia has acquired the label of expelled and dislocated

<sup>21</sup> Concurrently with official programmes, social networks and internet sites which create specific virtual communities and communications – *Nova srpska dijaspora* (New Serbian Diaspora) internet magazine, of Serbian Diaspora Café and many other contacts via Facebook, Twitter and similar networks, are thriving.

<sup>22</sup> Certain events that initiated regulation of the asylum issue can be highlighted, such as when Hungarian citizens sought asylum in Yugoslavia after the Soviet intervention of 1956/57. Most of the arrivals from socialist countries to Yugoslavia were under the jurisdiction of police and were treated as confidential data. As of 1974, the right to asylum was regulated by the Constitution, Article 202, which was based on the International Convention.

persons based on national criteria which all fitted well into the turbulent political and warmongering rhetoric and which became the subject of the Hague trials. The repeated activation of the asylee and refugee issue comes as a consequence of the international migration events of 2010.<sup>23</sup> This time, terminology becomes the key player in political strategies. International and national supervisors of categorisation have assumed the key role now. UNHCR presented an important standpoint that there was a difference between migrants and refugees while nowadays all migration categories are being converted to migrants. While the international protocols on protection are valid for refugees, migrants exclusively fall under the jurisdiction of the countries of immigration. Distorting these two terms only shifts the attention from the specific forms of legal protection that the refugees need (see Edwards 2016).

Analytical studies and reports state that the migration terminology in the Republic of Serbia has not been sufficiently harmonised with the current terminological trends.<sup>24</sup> Until now, a few laws – such as the Law on Foreigners, the Law on Asylum, and the Law on State Border Protection, have tackled the issue in their introductory sections, by defining the meaning of certain terms important for the domain of migration management (*Osnovi upravljanja migracijama u Republici Srbiji* 2012: 15–17).

### Terms in the sphere of scientific paradigms and media symbols

Technical terms shape paradigms, denoting systems and rules, which are established and stable designations and denominators. However, terminological paradigms in different contextualisations and interpretations become fertile ground for the production of symbolic constructs in zones of perception. Politics and science have institutionalised migration-related terms, and the media have shifted them to the field of symbolism. The overlapping of paradigmatic and symbolical contexts has occurred in a number of situations.

In the second half of the twentieth century, emigration processes were activated thematically and institutionally, both as part of international scientific trends and as instruments of current policies and ideologies. As Mežnarić pointed out, “con-

---

<sup>23</sup> These are events related to the massive arrival of refugees from Asia (especially Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan) and from African countries to the countries of the European Union. The reasons for emigration are war events and poverty.

<sup>24</sup> The Migration Profile, published on a regular basis by the Government of the Republic of Serbia since 2010, contains the following migration categories: foreign citizens (temporary stay and permanent residence), asylum seekers, illegal migrants, victims of human trafficking, returnees based on readmission agreement, refugees and displaced persons (SEEMIG projekat 2013: 3).

ceptually, personnel-wise and cognitively”, the humanities have not dealt with the phenomenon of external migrations, which were then taken over and dealt with by economics, social geography and demography (1985: 78). Discursive gaps also came as a logical consequence of migration flows. Social sciences and humanities have commenced their scientific journey within the agendas of institutes and research projects: in Serbia, Institute of Social Sciences (the projects conducted by Živan Tanić and the studies of Milena Primorac), Institute of International Politics (Vladimir Grečić). In accordance with the adopted proposal of Slobodan Zečević and Dušan Drljača, the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts commenced a long-term project of the Institute of Ethnography entitled “Ethnological Study of Emigrants and Ethnic Minorities from Serbia”, in 1981. In Croatia, continuous research of external migrations can be traced back to 1965, within the Agency for Migration and Nationalities and to 1967, within the Institute of Geography of the Zagreb University. The Centre for Migration Study was established in 1984, and it was renamed to the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies in 1987. This was the first institution that entirely consolidated the research of migrations and ethnic groups and minorities. Upon the initiative of Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SAZU) and the history department of the Slovenian Emigration Institute, the *Študijski center za zgodovino slovenskega izseljenstva* (Study Centre of Slovenian Emigration History) was founded in Slovenia in 1963. In 1982, the Centre was renamed to the *Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU* (ZRC SAZU Institute of Slovenian Emigration). Concurrently with the scientific research activities, as of 1951, social and political institutions named *Matice iseljenika* (Emigrant Centres) were established in all the republics of Yugoslavia with the task of establishing contacts with the newly-formed Yugoslav clubs in the countries of immigration. They worked on “positively directed” cultural cooperation which was harmonised with the politics of the socialist Yugoslavia. Obviously, such a form of social engagement carried strong political residues of the promotion and selection of emigrants who were positively oriented towards socialist Yugoslavia, in contrast to emigrants and organisations that were stigmatised as negative anti-communist “elements”. As opposed to the diffused and insufficiently transparent academic research, the Emigrant Centres enjoyed strong support of the authorities, since the work that they carried out was in the interest of the state politics. The alliance between science and politics can also be followed in the undertakings that put the problem of emigration processes into the focus of interest in the 1980s. An academic gathering on the study of emigration (Conference Proceedings: *Iseljenišvo naroda i narodnosti Jugoslavije* [Emigration of Peoples and Ethnic Minorities of Yugoslavia], from 1978) assembled a number of experts and authorities at the end of the 1970s. The Conference Proceedings became the main platform for the ensuing projects, programmes, and initiatives under the auspices of the Yugoslav paradigm, yet at the same time, with an explicit orientation towards the national academic course of

research of the country's *own* national emigrants (Croatian, Serbian, and Slovenian emigrants).<sup>25</sup>

What is noticeable in the launching of these activities? Firstly, that the migration problems were scientifically institutionalised, i.e. theoretically and methodologically promoted, and then that they set off on their research paths and established their scientific paradigms. Scientific activities, and accordingly the set of terminological instruments have traced the path in two directions: one was the direction of methodological nationalism<sup>26</sup> (studying emigrants, refugees, and later diaspora) while the other direction consisted of problematising the phenomenon of ethnicity and monitoring ethnic identity in a symbolic context. Whereas sociologists were predominantly focused on socio-economic problems and neo-classical migration theories, ethnologists and anthropologists in Serbia and Croatia were engaged in studying ethnicity, ethnos, and identity over the 1970s and the 1980s, which created a platform for research activities in emigration processes (Lukić Krstanović 2014: 24–25; Grbić Jakopović 2014: 53).<sup>27</sup> When migrations became a part of ethnicity studies, especially in anthropological research, ethnic identities and migration processes were problematized. The other direction was focused on socio-cultural studies in the context of following the dynamics and processes of population movement, especially of economic migrations. Economic migrants, in the form of *Gastarbeiters* were contextually clarified from the perspective of sociological and ethnological research. In the 1970s and the 1980s, the international word – *Gastarbeiter*, assumes a pejorative meaning in the local vernacular, with emphasis on the status symbols and identity patterns of those who worked abroad, as a form of “symbolic flaunting” (Bratić and Malešević 1982; Antonijević 2013). Finally, the migration-related scientific terminology of recent years has been articulated in accordance with the global problems, such as stigmatisation of foreigners, dehumanisation of irregular migrants and deeply altered identity contexts in border zones of identifications. The terms/notions of asylees, refugees, irregular migrants, and transmigrants are becoming regular scientific and methodological practices, which are not competing for the positions of paradigm and form any more, but for a flexible monitoring and clarification of the problem. Therefrom science poses the question of whether terminological classifications for migrations are necessary at all, taking into account the fact that they are produced and changed globally every day, as suits the current situation and supervisors.

<sup>25</sup> At the same time, the studying of emigration was intensified in Croatia, concurrently with papers in sociology which dealt with internal migrations. For example, Ivan Čizmić and Vesna Mikačić (1974) analysed the phenomenon of emigration (definitions and typologies) with a special focus on the emigration from Croatia. For an analysis of Serbian emigration see Jončić 1982: 357–364.

<sup>26</sup> See Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2003: 576–610; Kovačević Bielicki 2016: 527.

<sup>27</sup> For example, the papers of Dušan Bandić, Olga Supek, Dunja Rihtman Auguštin, Jadranka Grbić Jakopović, Jasna Čapo Žmegač, Miroslava Lukić Krstanović, Mirjana Pavlović, and others.

The media (press, television, internet) are important and powerful instruments for the shaping and transmitting of information on migrations/migrants, i.e. they are the verifiers and propagators of terminological differentiation. And while the migration terminology was moulded within the frame of state and international rules, imperative norms, and scientific paradigms, the media managed to establish a much wider and arbitrary field of terminological negotiability in the domain of associations. The past decades have demonstrated that the media have left their mark on the production of representations of emigration and, in a way, left their imprint in attributive terminology. Media also have a narrative mission which models migration-related terms from information to sensation.<sup>28</sup> In the 1950s and the 1960s, little was written on migration processes, and even less on emigration, and there was no continuity in the monitoring and interpretation of migration movements. As of the 1970s, the greater presence of migration-related topics has been observed in the media. It was only logical, taking into account that migrations were written about from two standpoints: long-term emigration, and the workers temporarily working abroad – popularly called *Gastarbeiters*. As regards the transoceanic emigration, media topics were concentrated around famous emigrants, positive events among emigrants, especially favouring loyalty towards Yugoslavia, incidents and “dangerous events” as anti-Yugoslav provocations. Taking primarily into account articles published in the press, the headlines and content of those articles created stereotypes based on symbolic constructions: “Our People Worldwide”, “Our Famous Inventor in America”, “Patriot from the Pacific Coast”, “Our Dollar Millionaire”, “One of Our Kind”, “Our Man from the West”, “Honest Patriot”.<sup>29</sup> Based on these standard headlines, we can identify symbolic parameters, which are used to express the following types of perception: remoteness and distance (*over the ocean, foreign country*), belonging and identity (possessive pronoun *our/s* becomes a super-mark of collectivity, native region, state and nation), distinctions and opposites (contained in descriptive adjectives *good* and *dangerous*), power and glorification (being well-known, famous, successful). The manufacturers of these and similar attributes were not only the media but also the official politics, by means of large quantities of information and propaganda materials, the mission of which

<sup>28</sup> As part of my research of press articles on emigration, I have especially analysed the symbolic context of various media narratives. The conglomeration of messages – news – narratives can be traced in a historical context which points to a certain continuity or discontinuity of knowledge about emigrants. Based on a selective review of the press, certain characteristics are noticed from news to narratives, irrespective of whether the newspapers from the beginning or from the end of the twentieth century are concerned (Lukić Krstanić and Pavlović 2016: 317).

<sup>29</sup> I have collected the press documentation in: Archives of the *Politika* (daily and periodic issues in the period between 1970 and 1990 – *Politika*, *Večernje novosti*, *Ilustrovana politika*, *Vjesnik* and other); Archives of Yugoslavia (funds after 1945); emigration press in the USA and Canada (personal archives).

was to prompt moral judgements on emigrants. For many years, the phenomenon of *political emigrees*, their lives, affiliations, social status from a distance and under control, were shaped in the zones of “strictly confidential” and censored documents but it also became an attractive topic of media news – sensations.<sup>30</sup> One can easily reach the conclusion that such a label and construct became fertile ground for all kinds of imaginations, prejudices, and manipulations.

Up until the breakup of Yugoslavia, the polarisation into “friendly emigrants”<sup>31</sup> and “enemy émigrés” in the official rhetoric, especially that of the establishment and media, left a formal imprint of ideological/political appropriateness and loyalty of the (*e*)migrants, i.e. their terminological determining. This historical context in media discourse demonstrates to what extent the (*e*)migration terms are subject to constructions, especially in identification policies. A decade later, the migration terminology, especially in Serbian press, attuned itself to current political and social events. The dramatic 1990s, with the breakup of Yugoslavia, consolidation of states, with nationalist tensions and refugee plights, created new media agendas for interpretation of migrations. The terms refugees and displaced persons occupied the media space in Serbia, though predominantly as part of national conflicts and warmongering discourse which ranged from victimisation to discrimination. The European policy towards transmigrants and the Balkan route became topical problems and hot media topics/news in 2015 and 2016. As the inquiries conducted by UNHCR and CeSID showed and the media (*Vreme*) reported, it turned out that the poor level of information or the lack of information had an influence on the lack of interest in transmigrants among the population up until 2014. The cumulative-ness of news and a lack of analysis leave neither enough space nor enough time for investigative journalism and adequate analyses of current migration processes. TV programmes and press where analytical texts (serials and comments) are published – such as *Vreme* and *Danas*, as well as *NI TV*, are independent media the interpretative and analytical discourse of which has a characteristic autonomy of a critical view of daily politics in the country and abroad, providing for a wider range of reception and developing attitudes. On the other hand, some newspapers – especially tabloids, compete in inflating both human suffering and discrimination.

The symbolisation of the current international migrations in the media, especially regarding the refugee crisis, establishes a tripartite symbolic code of victimisation, discrimination, and dehumanisation. Numerous headlines, articles, news, and

<sup>30</sup> Unpublished material (confidential material), Spasić 1982.

<sup>31</sup> During the era of Yugoslav socialism, the term *iseljenik* (expatriate) was used in the media. The media were writing about “our” *iseljenici*, “Yugoslav *iseljenici*”, “prominent expatriates”, or simply “our people in the world”, with the aim of creating a positive image of those who were leaving to other countries out of economic reasons and who were sympathisers of socialist Yugoslavia or who became famous and successful abroad.

reports intent on generating sensationalism and shock value create special fields of perception which produce migration narratives. Both international and national media are competing in transforming refugees and asylees into numbers, quotas, percentages, masses, strategies, or victims, which spurs further tensions, distancing, threats or empathy. Migration terms are now becoming an instrument, not only for normativisation of migrant protection and (inter)national security, but also for causing complete commotion among the public, i.e., creating stimuli with affective value in the process of categorising people. This is how public discourse is projected from formal to symbolic communication systems, especially taking into account the clear distinctions between *us* and *them* on the level of securitisation and victimisation between the resident and the migrant participants. Further systematic analyses of migration terms in a public discourse will reveal whether usage belongs to the level of instrumentalization or level of symbolization.

### Further terminological dilemmas

The objective of the treatment of migration terms was to analyse the key markers of their shaping through history in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, especially in Serbia. Taking into account the course and phases of migrations, presented in this paper, it can be observed that the terms and typologies have served daily political interests<sup>32</sup> and changed in accordance with the interests, rather than facilitating appropriate academic articulation and demographic monitoring of the process. Notwithstanding numerous topics, contextualisations, and problematisations of migration phenomena, scientific research mobility has not sufficiently challenged the terminological dilemmas, which often form the basis for projecting migration potential: regulations, statuses, subjective and moral identifications.<sup>33</sup> I have demonstrated that diversification and changes in the migration processes shape the notional nomenclature, which is internationalised and centralised, but also localised in sets of autonomous political instruments. Terminological situations in the domain of migrations have a dual function: expansive<sup>34</sup> and restrictive.<sup>35</sup> The

<sup>32</sup> In line with the Regulation of European Parliament and Commission No 862/2007, regular updating of migrant categories in Serbia was commenced in 2011 and is used as an instrument in the planning of migration policies (*Migracioni profil Republike Srbije za 2014. godinu* 2014: 6).

<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, I would like to point out two anthropological academic gatherings which raised many issues including the issues of terminology – Round Table “Scientific Research of Migrations in Serbia, Problems and Initiatives” SASA Institute of Ethnography, 2014; and “Contemporary Migration Trends and Flows on the Territory of Southeast Europe”, Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb and Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Zagreb, 2016.

<sup>34</sup> The Importance of migration terminology course on International Migration Law jointly organized by UNITAR, IOM, UNFPA (2012).

<sup>35</sup> In general, the classification of linguistic functions as expansive and restrictive was given by Louis-Jean Calvet (Kalve 1995: 87).



expansiveness of migration-related terms moved in the direction of standardisation and extended use, to the effect of diffusion and permanence. Internationalisation of words such as: migration, emigration, or immigration, certainly cover the largest part of the public. The restrictiveness of migration-related terminology pertains to the limited terminological use of words/notions which are recognisable as a part of particular linguistic and political constructs, i.e. *iseljenici* (emigrants) and *radnici na privremenom radu u inostranstvu* (workers temporarily working abroad). It is interesting to note that migration phenomena and terms intensified and amassed in certain situations. The dormancy which prevailed in Serbia until recently – except for the specialised institutions for monitoring migrations, has turned into a scorching and turbulent reality of global migrations and migration-related topics. The instability of the terminological set of instruments has been caused by the cumulateness and asymmetry of migration-related events and processes. When migration-related processes are stable, the terminology stabilises to the level of norms and paradigms.

Throughout history, migrations were managed and they were always designated with particular markers, i.e., terms and categories of classification, so as to achieve the most transparent control possible, either by authorities, administration, science, or the media. The ambivalent terminological position was a result of the diachronic continuity of existence of long-lasting categories, and of the historic irreversibility of events that altered meanings and practices. Migration policies and migration practices were confronted, often creating distance between the experiences and the system. Migration-related terms were usually modelled and presented from the point of view of legislators, science, and media. In this sense, they had a single trajectory into which the people who were named were incorporated. The naming was done from the top (according to the principle of hierarchy) and laterally in accordance with the principle of diffusion and distribution of customary names/expressions that appeared in everyday language and in public opinion. In both cases, those who were or are called emigrants/immigrants/migrants did not (do not) participate in it. It has been shown that migration-related terms/terminology are not merely instruments of categorisation, but also identity signs. In that sense, they are part of the migration politics and migration policies (of authority and law). The synchronisation and compatibility of use and presentation of migration terminological and typological apparatus in the relations between bureaucracy, science and media is not sufficient. In Serbia, academic competency is seldom used for the purposes of explaining migration problems in the domain of media and bureaucracy.

Nowadays, there is increasingly more talk about spatial mobility, human mobility, and migrations in general, which often negate problems. Due to the stockpiling of terms and categorisations, which are obviously convenient for terminology

hegemony, the identificational classification of people has found itself in a blind alley. Migrant identities and statuses are in collision with migration policies, since they entail normative and value categories on the one hand, and social and affective relationships on the other. The stability and variability of migration-related terminologies represent delicate identification fields which are adapted to different situations and cases. The general components of migrations are known, yet it is important to consider this phenomenon from a broader aspect which includes cases, comparisons and experiences, and as Mežnarić (2003: 339) pointed out – “new intuitions”. Therefore, the production and use of terms is not only a matter of controlling people as migration capital, but also a matter of protection in the domain of choices and experiences, which are supposed to offer a greater degree of security to this world. Finally, the entire terminology should focus more on the category of citizen as “an institution on the move” than that of the national affiliation of migrants. All these and similar dilemmas are indicative of terminological mobility which entails permanent updating and analysis, which may not be able to resolve the burning issues, but can persistently keep mobilising them and pointing at them.

## REFERENCES

- Antonijević, Dragana. 2013. *Stranac ovde, stranac tamo. Antropološko istraživanje kulturnog identiteta gastarbajtera* [Stranger Here, Stranger There. Anthropological Research of Cultural Identity of Guest Workers]. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar, Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Archives of Yugoslavia, Ministry of the Interior (MUP), 14.f. 34/104, 38/125, 39/141.
- Bjeljac, Željko and Milan Radovanović. 2016. "Multidisciplinarno proučavanje značajnih migracija na primeru teritorije Vojvodine (Srbija) u 20. veku" [A Multidisciplinary Study of Significant Migrations on the Territory of Vojvodina (Serbia) in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century]. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* 64/3: 493–507.
- Bobić, Mirjana and Marija Babović. 2013. "Međunarodne migracije u Srbiji. Stanje i politike" [International Migration in Serbia. Facts and Policies]. *Sociologija* 55/2: 209–228.
- Bratić, Dobrila and Miroslava Malešević. 1982. "Kuća kao statusni simbol" [House as a Status Symbol]. *Etnološke sveske* 4: 144–152.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna. 2005. "Trajna privremenost u Njemačkoj i povratak hrvatskih ekonomskih migranata" [Permanent Temporariness in Germany and Return of the Croatian Economic Migrants]. In *Stanovništvo Hrvatske. Dosadašnji razvoj i perspektive*. Dražen Živić, Nenad Pokos and Anka Mišetić, eds. Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, 255–273.
- Čizmić, Ivan and Vesna Mikačić. 1974. "Neki suvremeni problemi iseljništva iz SR Hrvatske" [Some Contemporary Problems of Emigration from SR Croatia]. *Teme o iseljništvu*, 1. Zagreb: Centar za istraživanja migracija Instituta za geografiju Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Edwards, Adrian. 2016. "UNHCR Viewpoint. 'Refugee' or 'Migrant' – Which is Right?". <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/7/55df0e556/unhcr-viewpoint-refugee-migrant-right.html> (last access 6 November 2017).
- Giordano, Christian. 2010. "Paradigms of Migration. From Integration to Transnationalism". *Kultūra ir visuomenė. Socialinių tyrimų žurnalas* 1/2: 11–27.
- Grbić Jakopović, Jadranka. 2014. *Multipliciranje zavičaja i domovina. Hrvatska dijaspora: kronologija, destinacije i identitet* [Multiplication of Homelands. Croatian Diaspora: Chronology, Destinations, Identity]. Zagreb: FF-press.
- Heršak, Emil, ed. 1998. *Leksikon migracijskoga i etničkoga nazivlja* [Lexicon of Migration and Ethnic Terminology]. Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Školska knjiga.
- International Organization for Migration. *Key Migration Terms*. <https://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms> (last access 25 January 2017).
- Jončić, Koča. 1982. "Izučavanje srpskog iseljništva u SAD i Kanadi i njegovih veza sa starim zavičajem" [The Study of Serbian Emigrants in the United States and Canada and Their Links to the Old Homeland]. *Međunarodni problemi* 3–4: 357–364.
- Kalve, Luj Žan. 1995. *Rat među jezicima* [War among the Languages]. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

- Kovačević Bielicki, Dragana. 2016. "Methodological Nationalism and Groupism in Research on Migrants from Former Yugoslavia". *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* 64/3: 527–540.
- Krstić, Marija. 2011. "Dijaspora i radnici na privremenom radu u inostranstvu. Osnovni pojmovi" [The Diaspora and Temporary Migrant Workers. Basic Concepts]. *Etnoantropološki problemi* 6/2: 295–318.
- Lukić Krstanović, Miroslava. 2014. "Migration Studies. Ethnology and Policy of the Institute of Ethnography SASA (1947–2014)". *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* 62/2: 15–34.
- Lukić Krstanović, Miroslava and Mirjana Pavlović. 2016. *Ethnic Symbols and Migrations. Serbian Communities in USA and Canada*. Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU.
- Mesić, Milan. 2002. "Globalizacija migracija" [The Globalisation of Migration]. *Migracijske i etničke teme* 18/1: 7–22.
- Mežnarić, Silva. 1985. "Jugoslovenska sociologija (vanjskih) migracija. Pokušaj sistematizacije" [Yugoslav Sociology of (External) Migration. An Attempt at Systematisation]. *Migracijske teme* 1: 77–96.
- Mežnarić, Silva. 2003. "Migracijske aktualnosti. Stanje, problemi, perspektive paradigmi istraživanja" [Migration. The Present State, Problems and Perspectives of Research Paradigms]. *Migracijske i etničke teme* 19/4: 323–341.
- Migracioni profil Republike Srbije za 2014. godinu* [Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia for 2014]. 2014. <http://www.kirs.gov.rs/docs/migracije/migracioni%20profil%202014.pdf> (last access 6 November 2017).
- Oliveria-Roca, Maria. 1984. "Tipovi migracije radnika u Jugoslaviji" [Types of Labour Commuting in Yugoslavia]. *Sociologija sela* 22: 3–16.
- Osnovi upravljanja migracijama u Republici Srbiji* [The Fundamentals of Migration Management in the Republic of Serbia]. 2012. Beograd: Međunarodna organizacija za migracije – Misija u Srbiji.
- Pavlica, Branko. 2005. "Migracije iz Jugoslavije u Nemačku. Migranti, emigranti, izbeglice, azilanti" [Migrations from Yugoslavia to Germany. Migrants, Emigrants, Refugees and Asylum-Seekers]. *Međunarodni problemi* 57/1–2: 121–158.
- Pravna enciklopedija* [Legal Encyclopedia]. 1979. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Report on Returnees and Refugees and Methods of their Admission*. Ministry of the Interior (MUP), State Security Department, Archives of Yugoslavia, F 37/116.
- Romelić, Živka and Marko Stojanović. 1989. "Neki elementi kulture gastarbajtera đerdapskih naselja" [Some Elements of the Gastarbeiter Culture of the Iron Gate Settlements]. *Etnološke sveske* 10: 197–202.
- SEEMIG projekat. 2013. "Upravljanje migracijama i posledice migracija u Jugoistočnoj Evropi" [Migration Management and the Effects of Migration in Southeast Europe]. *Demografski pregled* 50.
- Sociološki leksikon* [Sociological Lexicon]. 1982. Beograd: Savremena administracija.

- Spasić, Aleksandar. 1982. *Informativno-propagandna delatnost SFRJ u mirnodopskim i ratnim uslovima* [Information and Propaganda Activity of the SFRY in Peaceful and War Conditions]. Unpublished material. Beograd: Jugoslovenski institut za novinarstvo.
- Stanković, Vladimir. 2014. *Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova 2011 u Republici Srbiji, Srbija u procesu spoljnih migracija* [2011 Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Serbia, Serbia in the Process of External Migration]. Beograd: Republički zavod za statistiku.
- Stojić Mitrović, Marta. 2014. "Serbian Migration Policy Concerning Irregular Migration and Asylum in the Context of the EU Integration Process". *Etnoantropološki problemi* 9/4: 1106–1120.
- UNDP – United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Office. 2010. *Mobility and Migration. A Guidance Note for Human Development Report Teams*. [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/nhdr\\_migration\\_gn.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/nhdr_migration_gn.pdf) (last access 6 November 2017).
- Vertovec, Steven. 1997. "Three Meanings of 'Diaspora', Exemplified among South Asian Religions". *Diaspora. A Journal of Transnational Studies* 6/3: 277–299.
- Vuksanović, Gordana. 1996. "Stanovništvo Srbije na radu u inostranstvu tokom XX veka" [Population of Serbia Working Abroad in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century]. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 24: 295–307.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick-Schiller. 2003. "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences and the Study of Migration. An Essay in Historical Epistemology". *International Migration Review* 37/3: 567–610.