

Success Stories of Emplacement: Viennese Croats' Identities In-Between  
Political Discourses and Narrative Biographies

By

Matea Korda

Submitted to

Central European University

Nationalism Studies Program

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Dr. Ana Mijić

Second reader: Dr. Mate Nikola Tokić

Vienna, Austria

2023.

## Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the processes of displacement and emplacement in the context of Viennese Croats, and these processes' significance in the discursive construction and negotiation of their identities. This research is undertaken through a comparative study of Croatian nation-state representatives' political speeches and Viennese Croats' narrative biographies. This is an examination of whether, how, and why political speeches of Croatian nation-state representatives reflect themselves in the everyday lives and experiences of Viennese Croats. This thesis is guided by the approaches of grounded theory, ethnography, and critical discourse analysis. It employs theoretical frameworks of migration studies, transnationalism, and identity studies, and it is informed by the historical background of the 1960s-1980s Yugoslav labour migration, 1990s forced migrations, and 2000s-present migrations. The thesis concludes there are weak indirect ties within the transnational social field in the context of institutional and everyday discourses on identification. The narratives of Viennese Croats and their lived experiences tell 'success stories of emplacement' which are focused on Vienna as a space of emplacement, while the political speeches aim at the construction of a unity between the imagined national and transnational community, focusing on Croatia as a space of displacement. Hence, the discursive actualisation of identification in the bottom-up level of analysis does not follow the one from the top-down. The contribution of this thesis to the existing body of knowledge is in its comparative character and theoretical and methodological triangulation.

## Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been what it has become without the insights and support of my supervisors Ana and Mate and this thesis' biographers – Petra, Helena, Jakov, Karla, Jana, Antea, Marko, and Lana. You are the makers of this text as much as I am, and its key readers and critics. Thank you for sharing your lives and knowledge with me.

My family and friends in Zagreb and Vienna accompanied me with love and care during this two-year process. Thank you all, especially my sister Iva, for all she has done for me and for the person she is growing up into. To Moritz, for very special secret reasons shared among occupiers of the East German kitchen in Vienna's 5th district, a very special (and public) thank you.

In the end, I would like to thank myself for not giving up, I learned to remember only happy days. Mama i tata, puno vas voli vaša Matea.

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	5
2	Theoretical and Methodological Framework.....	8
2.1	Migration Studies.....	8
2.1.1.	Transnationalism.....	12
2.2	Identity Studies .....	15
2.3	Grounded Theory .....	17
2.4	Ethnographic Method.....	18
2.4.1.	Life Stories and Life Histories.....	19
2.4.2.	Narrative Biography.....	20
2.5	Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) .....	20
2.6	Synthesis of Thesis Focus .....	21
2.7	Top-Down Analysis Data.....	22
2.8	Bottom-Up Analysis Data .....	24
3	Historical Background.....	27
3.1	Yugoslav-Austrian Labour Migration.....	28
3.2	Forced Migration in the 1990s Yugoslav Wars.....	31
3.3	Contemporary Migrations (2000s-2020s) .....	33
4	“Unity of Emigrated and Homeland Croatia”: Analysis of Political Speech .....	36
4.1	Development of the Concept of Unity in Political Speech .....	37
4.2	Unity in Displacement: Remittances and Return.....	39
4.3	Unity in Emplacement: Identity Preservation .....	41
5	Narrating Success Stories: Analysis of Narrative Biographies.....	44
5.1	The City of Vienna.....	45
5.1.1.	The Multiple ‘Us’ .....	46
5.1.2.	Networking among ‘Us’ .....	49
5.1.3.	‘The Viennese’ .....	53
5.2	Emplacement: Earning Acceptance .....	55
5.2.1.	German and Croatian language acquisition.....	59
5.2.2.	School environment .....	63
5.2.3.	“Teufelkreis”: Work and Work Permits.....	68
6	Concluding remarks, limitations of the study, and ways forward.....	73

7	Appendices.....	76
7.1	Transcript (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021).....	76
7.2	Transcript (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019).....	78
7.3	Information sheet (ENG, BCS, GER).....	84
7.4	Consent letter (ENG, BCS, GER).....	91
7.5	Questionnaire (ENG, BCS, GER).....	94
8	Data.....	95
9	Sources.....	95
10	Bibliography .....	96

## Table of Figures

**Table 1** Data overview for top-down analysis of political speeches ..... 23

**Table 2** Information about informants and conducted interviews for bottom-up analysis..... 26

# 1 Introduction

Moving from Zagreb to Vienna in September 2021 was a new and partly unexpected experience. First city subway rides reminded me that people from ex-Yugoslavia were to be found in every corner of the city. Talking on the phone while commuting made me realise quite quickly that people who glimpsed in my direction were usually the people that did not judge but understood me and the language I spoke. Feelings of stigma and prejudice, reflecting on it almost two years later, were influenced by underlying knowledge of ex-Yugoslav and Balkan stereotypes in Western countries, and by lived experience. This, along with frequent migration from one home to the other and being a ‘familiar stranger’ to the Viennese and the Viennese ex-Yugoslavs changed my self-perception and prompted me to reflect on these experiences. After the fact of moving to a new, friendly yet hostile, Viennese environment, I changed unexpectedly in thinking and doing, in identification. Besides being a cultural insider of Zagreb and Croatia, I was becoming an insider of a particular migration experience in Vienna. This was decisive in choosing the thesis topic – to try to understand, explain, and interpret others’ experiences of migration and to thus understand myself better.

Daphne Winland (2005, 76–77) estimated the size of the Croatian population living outside of Croatia to be 4.5 million people. Particularly significant destinations were North and South America, Australia, Germany, Austria, and the former Yugoslav Republics. Academic literature on migrations from the (post-)Yugoslav space explores, for instance, guestwork, forced migration, contemporary social and symbolic boundaries among ex-Yugoslavs, and other topics, e.g., diaspora terrorism. Jasna Čapo (2019) provided an ethnography stemming from a 15-year-long fieldwork that deals with the transnational character of Croatian guest workers’ experiences in Germany. Mate Nikola Tokić (2020) focused on discourses and practices of radicalisation which prompted terrorism as a form of political expression for parts

of the anti-Yugoslav Croatian diaspora. Sanja Lončar (2013) investigated the importance of developing and spreading transnational social networks for women workers in Munich to operate in the informal labour market. Others researched ex-Yugoslavian post-war identities and ethnic boundaries (regarding Bosnian diaspora see Halilovich 2012; Valenta and Ramet 2011; regarding Bosnians in Bosnia and Herzegovina see Mijić 2021). An ethnography of the experiences of ex-Yugoslavs in Austria was written by Ivanović (2012), noting one of the few comprehensive works on the Austrian context of ex-Yugoslav migrant experiences. Barbara Franz (2003a) explored the implications of legal and political changes in refugee law on Bosnian refugees in Austria and the US, by comparing asylum, residence, and socio-economic issues. The findings of the paper emphasised a much stronger impact of individual initiatives of refugees than state policy, especially due to their similar adaptations in both contexts. In another paper, Franz (2003b) argued for quicker adaptation of Bosnian refugee women to the new environments than men in Vienna and New York. In addition, Ana Mijić (Mijić 2020) explored symbolic belonging and boundaries of Viennese Ex-Yugoslav communities.

However, not much scholarship has studied comparatively the institutional and everyday discourses of migration experiences in the context of (post-)Yugoslav and Croatian space. This is where I found my research gap. The purpose of this thesis was to examine the processes of displacement and emplacement in the context of Viennese Croats, and these processes' significance in the discursive construction and negotiation of their identities. This research was undertaken through a comparative study of Croatian nation-state representatives' political speeches and Viennese Croats' narrative biographies.

The thesis is guided by the approaches of grounded theory, ethnography, and critical discourse analysis (CDA). It employs theoretical frameworks of migration studies, transnationalism, and identity studies, and is informed by the historical background of the 1960s-1980s Yugoslav labour migration, 1990s forced migrations, and 2000s-present migrations. This is an



examination of *whether, how, and why political speeches of Croatian nation-state representatives reflect themselves in the everyday lives and experiences of Viennese Croats*. In this way, it aims to answer the following main research questions: (1) *how a normative national identity of ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ is constituted top-down through political speeches of the Croatian nation-state representatives* (top-down part of research), and (2) *how heterogeneous and polyvocal identities are negotiated bottom-up through life stories and everyday life experiences of Viennese Croats* (bottom-up part of research).

In the analysis, I argue weak indirect ties within the transnational social field in the context of institutional and everyday discourses on identification. The narratives of Viennese Croats and their lived experiences told ‘success stories of emplacement’ which were focused on Vienna as a space of emplacement, while the political speeches aimed at the construction of a unity between the imagined national and transnational community, focusing on Croatia as a space of displacement. The contribution of this thesis to the existing body of knowledge is in its comparative character and theoretical and methodological triangulation, defined as “...the use of multiple datasets, entirely different types of data, multiple investigators, theories or models as well as multiple categorization schemes or analytical methods” (Rheindorf 2019, 4).

The thesis consists of six chapters. In Chapter 2, I address the theoretical and methodological background of the study and synthesized my approach to the specific thesis focus. Chapter 3 historically situates the study in the 1960s-1980s Yugoslav labour migration, 1990s forced migrations, and 2000s-present migrations. Chapters 4 and 5 provide analyses of political speech and narrative biographies, respectively. Chapter 6 summarises the main findings and discusses the limitations and ways forward in addressing this and similar research topics.

## 2 Theoretical and Methodological Framework

Grounded theory, critical discourse analysis, and ethnographic method were the pillars of this research conduct. Analytically framing research in transnational social fields approach emphasises the significance of power, and the dynamic between agency and governmentality. Combining this approach with that of symbolic and social boundaries allowed the thesis to view identity and identification as a fluid, processual, and ‘negotiable’ concept.

While the research was initially based on the frames of state, nationality, and ethnicity employed in political speeches, and was trying to find their reflections in everyday life identifications, the flexible and reflexive research approach allowed the bottom-up part of the analysis to take an analytical turn towards the concepts of displacement and emplacement. They acknowledge both the historicity and contemporaneity of research subjects, and their agency, without disregarding experiences of cross-border movement.

This thesis was informed by migration studies, studies on transnationalism, and identity studies, from which the theoretical framework of the research, elaborated in sections 2.1–2.2, derived. The theoretical and methodological conduct of the research was based on a partial implementation of grounded theory, the ethnographic method and critical discourse analysis. In addition, concepts of narrative biographies, life stories and life histories, elaborated in sections 2.3 – 2.5, were employed for the bottom-up part of the research.

### 2.1 Migration Studies

Contemporary migration studies operate under a notion of the experience of migrant movement as a multidirectional process, a nuanced phenomenon that requires reflexivity when researched. Any work in migration studies needs to critically situate itself towards the knowledge it produces, the concepts and categories it uses, as well as the power imbalances, and social and

political exclusion it might constitute. Dahinden (2016, 2207) argued that migration studies and integration research originate “in a historically institutionalized nation-state migration apparatus and [are] thus entangled with a particular normalization discourse”. Čapo emphasised how: “with their scientific legitimacy, scientific paradigms supported political and public discourse while they were simultaneously imbued with national ideology just like political and media discourses” (Čapo 2019, 65; translated by author). This is a tendency of migration studies to view research topics and the social world through the lens of methodological nationalism, which is “understood as the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world” (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002, 301).

Exploring migrant experiences is difficult without acknowledging nation-states and their borders. This is due to the determinant impact they could and do have on migrants’ everyday lives (e.g., with migration policies). However, methodological nationalism, “the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world” (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002, 302), became one of the primary issues in research due to the power imbalance it introduced to the phenomenon of migration. Thus, Dahinden et al. (2021, 539) emphasised the risks of migration studies reproducing hegemonic power relations, social and political exclusion, and in some cases racist and neo-colonial reasonings.

Furthermore, research should avoid conceptualising its subject through an ethnic lens, “a prioritisation of ethnic and/or national categories in analysis”, obscuring “multiple sources and dynamics of migrant agencies, sociabilities and belongings, as well as the divisions based on class, religion or politics among members of those identified as being from the ‘same’ group” (Çağlar 2016, 2). However, I argue that such an approach would not be entirely suitable in the context of this research. The focus of this thesis is precisely on the intersection of lived experiences of Viennese Croats with the political discourses which aim to frame their identities,

thus attempting an institutionalisation of an a priori assumption on ethnicity and nationality. Such an analysis could not have been adequately conducted if one completely disregarded the ethnic lens. Hence, to explain these issues, one should not prioritise, but at the same time cannot neglect, disregard, or deny ethnicity and nationality as potent concepts.

One could argue that such knowledge production would mirror nation-state policies, and vice-versa. However, in this thesis, I try to counter this by showing that the discourses employed in political speeches aimed at the construction of a unity between the imagined national and transnational community, while the narratives of Viennese Croats and their lived experiences told ‘success stories of emplacement’ which were focused on Vienna as a space of emplacement rather than on Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) as spaces of displacement. In this way, the top-down and bottom-up discourses exhibit different foci in identity construction and do not refer to one another particularly.

The aforementioned concepts of emplacement and displacement (Glick Schiller 2023; Çağlar 2016; Miraftab 2014) emerged in the course of analysis and proved to be especially important for this thesis’ analytical framework. Emplacement captures the relationship between city power networks and its dwellers’ efforts to *emplace themselves* “within the constraints and opportunities of a specific locality at a particular time” (Çağlar 2016, 10). While this thesis did not look into the city of Vienna in such detail in the context of capital and urban restructuring as Çağlar (2016), it showed informants’ life stories still narrated the process of emplacement in Vienna and often addressed the city as the space where their stories of success took place.

In addition, I used emplacement and displacement to avoid post-migrant and (transnational) migrant generation perspectives. Ayşe Çağlar argued that the concept of post-migrant, defined as “the descendants of migrants who have not experienced the actual spatial mobility themselves but whose actions and lives bear the traces of migration” (Çağlar 2016, 3), has a

limited analytical value due to its confining spatial and temporal framework. Drawing on the concept of post-socialism, Çağlar (2016, 6–7) stated how migration as an experience of cross-border movement is inscribed in the concept, thus a priori differentiating (post-)migrants from others. There is a designated space and time framing post-migrant subjectivities, thus “perpetuat[ing] the language of transition” (2016, 7).

There is a similar issue in spatial and temporal framing of the concept of generation when used in migration studies. This concept was first developed by Karl Mannheim, meaning “a way of understanding differences between age groups” and “a means of locating individuals and groups within historical time” (Pilcher 1994, 481). In migration studies, this concept connotes specific intra-group connections and inter-group differences, a sense of unity within a generation, all connected to a specific (degree of) experience of cross-border movement. Distinguishing between 1st, 1.5, 2nd, etc. generation of migrants implies common traits depending on if one experienced cross-border movement as an adult (1st), as a child (1.5), or if one was born as a descendant of one of the previous generations (1st generation’s children are the 2nd, their children are the 3rd, etc.). This was already problematised in the transnationalism paradigm and thought to have been sorted by dividing only migrants and transnational generation (cf. Čapo 2019). However, much as with the post-migrant concept, transnational generation distinguishes a group with indirect experiences of cross-border movement, thus designating it a specific spatial and temporal framework. In addition, it perpetuates the issue of presuming unity in a generation’s migration experience. In this way, both concepts deny historicity and contemporaneity to migration experiences, simultaneously anchoring them in a space and time which is not here and now, but in a vague there and then.

In this notion, the historical background of this thesis is divided into periods, and informants’ histories are acknowledged, but so is their existence in the here and now. All informants were born in a span of 20 years (1979–1997), some experienced cross-border movement as 1990s

children refugees, others were born in Vienna in the 1970s–90s, some moved as adults in the 2010s, and all lived in Vienna in the time of this research (for detailed information see Table 2). While experiences involving cross-border movement cannot be and are not denied in this thesis, so cannot be denied the significance of historicity and contemporaneity. Concepts of emplacement and displacement take all this into account. They do not “[anchor] migrants’ frames and references of action elsewhere and to *other times* different from the ‘natives’/‘non-migrants’” (Çağlar 2016, 8; emphasis in original). Analysis showed there were far more significant analytical similarities than differences in informants’ narratives, reinforcing the argument that there is significance in being a part of a similar historical time when experiencing any degree of cross-border movement.

### 2.1.1. Transnationalism

Transnationalism as a research paradigm and perspective emerged in the 1990s, and it is the leading paradigm in migration studies (Ivanović 2012, 17; Halilovich 2012, 167). Transnational migration denotes a process of (re)constituting “simultaneous multi-stranded social relations that link together [one’s] societies of origin and settlement” (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc 1995, 48). Its actors, ‘transmigrants’, uphold their everyday lives according to their multidirectional interconnections across borders (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc 1995, 48). Transnationalism as a perspective aims at the reformulation of the concept of society, trying to untie it from the nation-state and national boundaries, and thus from the analytical pitfalls of methodological nationalism (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002).

Before further discussion on the specific approach within the transnationalism perspective used in the thesis, it is important to address reasons for not using the concept of diaspora as a category of analysis, but only critically assessing it as a category of practice in top-down

analysis (Brubaker 2005). Firstly, this term was not used by informants at all, but was extensively used in political speeches alongside the term ‘emigration’. Being further institutionalised through its usage in Croatian legislation (particularly in the *Law on relations of the Republic of Croatia with Croats outside the Republic of Croatia*; Law on relations 2011), this is a highly politicised term (see analysis below). Secondly, the analytical category of diaspora presupposes a sense of groupness, a collective identity interlocked within a national framework. The issue of groupism is encountered here, as well as that of methodological nationalism (Brubaker 2002; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). Thirdly, and in line with the former argument, there are issues in defining the term and its scope within the scholarship. Some scholars essentialised the concept by connecting it strictly to the Jewish diasporic experience, where diaspora involved specific memories of dispersal, a strong relationship with the diaspora’s homeland, and a desire to return, while others expanded the concept to an extent it became almost useless as an analytical category (Brubaker 2005; Clifford 1994). Finally, similarly to the concepts of generations and post-migrancy discussed above, it could be argued that the concept of diaspora, while accounting for historicity, does not necessarily account for the contemporaneity of those it is supposed to refer to. Instead, the concept puts its subjects in a specific spatial and temporal framework. Due to the presented issues, I argue that transnationalism as a perspective complemented the research plan and framework better than the diaspora studies framework.

An approach by Levitt and Glick Schiller proposed looking into transnational migration through the concept of transnational social fields – “a set of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices, and resources are unequally exchanged, organized, and transformed” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1009). Transnational social fields question the division between local, national, transnational, and global, by emphasising that all networks are local in the sense of penetrating individuals’ daily lives, living in a certain locale,

and “connect[ing] them to others in a nation-state, across the borders of a nation-state, or globally, without ever having migrated” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1010). This approach moves the focus away from assuming, and towards empirically analysing the “strength and impact of direct and indirect transnational relations” by operationalising “the parameters of the field (...) and the scope of the networks embedded within it” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1009).

In the transnational social fields approach, Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) view society and social membership by analytically distinguishing between *ways of being* and *ways of belonging*, while emphasising their interconnectedness and dynamics in different contexts. Ways of being denote a potential to act in a way that might signify a specific identification according to one’s embeddedness in a social field. In this way, one might live within a social field without necessarily identifying with the politics associated with it. Ways of belonging denote concrete actions combined with the awareness of the identifications such actions might signify (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1010). Embeddedness in social fields, either by ways of being or belonging, necessitates being involved with, shaped by, and acting upon power structures in multiple loci and layers (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1013–14). This is where the subjects’ agency and governmentality, and their dynamic step in.

On the one hand, individuals are shaped by power structures, there is a logic of governmentality, of “conduct of conduct” (Madsen 2014, 814). This is a “form of thinking that strives to be relatively clear, systematic, and explicit about (...) how things are and how they ought to be” (Dean 2009, 18–19).<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, individuals act upon these power

---

<sup>1</sup> There are important differences between the Foucauldian poststructuralist governmentality and the interpretative adaptation of the concept. According to Carol Bacchi (2015), the Foucauldian poststructuralist perspective questions and problematizes governmental policies and practices while the interpretative adaptation focuses on the policy makers’ process of developing problematisations. She argues that the Foucauldian notion provides a more substantive ground for policy critique – that is the perspective of this thesis as well.



structures, upon governmentality – they are agents. Since agency has been often misused, reified, and poorly defined according to Ahearn (2001, 112), she provided a broad definition of the concept as one referring to “the socioculturally mediated capacity to act,” and emphasized the importance of looking into language and linguistic forms and actualisations when studying agency.<sup>2</sup> This thesis looked at political speech as a form of governmentality and identity politics (elaborated below) and contrasted that to narrative biographies of Viennese Croats and the agency that was narrated throughout their life stories. Ways of being and belonging were explored in the bottom-up analysis along with symbolic and social boundaries, elaborated in the following section.

## 2.2 Identity Studies

Identity or identification is a process of assigning one’s position toward oneself and others through similarity and difference. Individual and collective, social identities are constructed as facets of one another, and both go through processes of individual and group identification and categorization (cf. Jenkins 2006; 2014). Top-down analysis showed how political speech constructed such social identities and thus imagined transnational communities<sup>3</sup> for those it recognised as cross-border members, through the processes of identity politics and nation-building. In this way, a form of national identity was constructed for the imagined community.

This was an attempt at “the construction of difference/distinctiveness and uniqueness” (de

---

<sup>2</sup> Karp (1986, 137 in Ahearn 2001, 113) distinguished actors and agents: “an actor refers to a person whose action is rule-governed or rule-oriented, whereas an agent refers to a person engaged in the exercise of power in the sense of the ability to bring about effects and to (re)constitute the world”.

<sup>3</sup> In this thesis, the concept of national community is conceptualised as *imagined and transnational*. Benedict Anderson (2016) conceptualises the national community as an imagined community in the sense that a nation has a meaning for all those it encompasses, but those meanings differ. While most members of this imagined political community do not know each other, a sense of belonging exists due to their acceptance of the idea of a common history, beliefs, traits, etc. According to Anderson “nations are to be understood as mental constructs, as ‘*imagined political communities*’” (1988, 15 in de Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 1999, 15; emphasis in original). In this research, such a notion of imagined communities will be used and translated to transnational, cross-border imagined communities. Here the concept of transnational community is assessed critically, as being a state project relying on a construction of national identity.

Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 1999, 153). Here, we can talk about identity politics and nation-building. Identity politics are supposed to represent a designated group, a community and their interests, they are “always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference” (Benhabib 1996, 3 ff. in de Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 1999, 154) based on “essential” categories such as ethnicity or religion (Ashmore, Jussim, and Wilder 2001, 42). Nation-building is a process through which states “forge political ties between citizens and the state (...) and integrate ethnic majorities and minorities into an inclusive arrangement” (Wimmer 2018, 1), a top-down, official, state project which manipulates identity construction and seeks to foster hegemony via discursive strategies (Tse 2014).

While there was an assumption of a certain relation between institutional and everyday discourses at the beginning of this research, the bottom-up part of the analysis showed, in line with the de Cillia et al. argument, that:

“...there is *no such thing as the one and only national identity* in an essentializing sense, but rather that different identities are discursively constructed according to context, that is according to the social field, the situational setting of the discursive act and the topic being discussed. In other words, national identities are (...) to be understood as dynamic, fragile, ‘vulnerable’ and often incoherent” (de Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak 1999, 154; emphasis in original).

Other important concepts in analysing national identity, identification, and its construction and negotiation for this thesis were Lamont’s symbolic and social boundaries. These concepts brought the analytical frame closer to the processual notion of identification and its fluidity.

In the book *Money, Morals & Manners*, Lamont (1994) analysed the concept of symbolic boundaries, and in another article together with Molnár (2002) further conceptualised social boundaries. The former are conceptual distinctions, categories which social actors use to define

their realities, their social relations, groups, and membership, while the latter represent objectified forms of such social differentiations, manifesting themselves in “unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources (material and nonmaterial) and social opportunities” (Lamont and Molnár 2002, 168). To draw on Berger and Luckmann’s theory of social reality (1966) – the former are constructed categories, and the latter the reality of their consequences.

I argue it was essential to combine Lamont’s approach to boundary work with Levitt and Glick Schiller’s (2004) approach to transnational social fields in this thesis. While Lamont (1994) approached the study of identity from the standpoint of field boundaries, Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) initiated the analysis from the multidirectional interaction across multiple fields. I argue that this adds analytical clarity and a stronger basis for the operationalisation of concepts of analysis. Hence, this thesis combined the theoretical framework of symbolic and social boundaries with Levitt and Glick Schiller’s (2004) *ways of being* and *ways of belonging* elaborated in section 2.1.1. above. Ways of being could be provisionally seen as acts of establishing symbolic boundaries, and ways of belonging as acts of establishing social boundaries. Such an approach may add an emphasis on individuals’ agency and conceptualizing multiple, interacting boundaries, as well as help to analytically grasp connections between symbolic and social boundaries – a challenge very much persistent in the boundary scholarship (cf. Lamont, Pendergrass, and Pachucki 2015).

## 2.3 Grounded Theory

Grounded theory, as devised by Kathy Charmaz (2014) emphasises entering the field of interest without previously constructing a firm perspective on the researched issue, i.e., letting the field guide the researcher and ‘ground their own theory’. In the fieldwork for this research, literature had not been assessed in detail beforehand, as to avoid developing firm preliminary hypotheses. However, a preliminary overview of previous work and desk research had been done as a way

of starting the process of ‘preparing for’, or ‘going into’, the field to be informed on the interview topics that might be discussed. The narratives captured through interviews were coded and abstracted to categories and concepts with field notes as an analysis backdrop. The emphasis was on self-reflection throughout fieldwork and analysis, and adjusting one’s own theoretical and methodological lenses as research was being done. It was exactly through this process that the main concepts of this thesis, emplacement and displacement, emerged.

Due to the scope of one master thesis, the grounded theory approach was partially implemented. The notions on how to enter the field, and how to analyse data through codes, categories, and concepts with flexibility and reflexivity were employed. However, there was no rigorous attention to the coding canon which the grounded theory approach prescribes – working from codes, categories, and concepts, toward a new theory (cf. Charmaz 2014). While it was not expected this thesis would produce a distinctively new theory, a contribution to the existing knowledge and filling in the research gap was.

## 2.4 Ethnographic Method

Grounded theory complements the ethnographic method very well in its flexible and reflexive notion of fieldwork and research. The ethnographic method was the main approach to the bottom-up level of research. This is an approach and methodology that emphasises fieldwork, participant observation, and in-depth interviews. In general, this approach allows the researcher to grasp the in-depth meaning of the issues they are dealing with in the field. Specifically, Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004, 1013) argue that ethnography is particularly suitable for the study of transnational social fields:

“Participant observation and ethnographic interviewing allow researchers to document how persons simultaneously maintain and shed cultural repertoires and identities, interact within a location and across its boundaries, and act in ways that are in concert

with or contradict their values over time. The effects of strong and weak indirect ties within a transnational social field can be observed, and those connections, whether they take the form of institutional or individual actors, can be studied”.

Both participant observation and interviews were conducted for this thesis. In-depth interviews were conceptualised through life stories and life histories (Svensson 1995) and methodologically operationalised through narrative biographies (Rosenthal 1993).

#### 2.4.1. Life Stories and Life Histories

Identity constitution and negotiation is a conscious reflexive process. The individual undergoes this process in specific contexts dependent on others and institutions legitimising self-identification. Hence, “to be able to say anything about people's different identity formations one must,” according to Birgitta Svensson (1995, 25), “distinguish between the concepts of life history and life story”. Life stories are ways in which people constitute themselves socially and culturally, “the subjective versions of life” (Svensson 1995, 42). To understand them one should extend their research focus to life histories, “the life that is lived during a certain time and in a certain context” (Svensson 1995, 42). Svensson identified this as often lacking in ethnographic research, yet essential to capture power relations in everyday life (1995, 42). Svensson (1995, 1) argued that “it is a matter of combining these two accounts into a unity which can be called a biography”. Hence, a biography is a way an individual becomes part of a shared narrative – constituting what one is like, how they perceive themselves in relation to their past, present, and future, and how their life corresponds to life history (Svensson 1995, 28). This was the analysis’ aim – a comparison of life stories (narrative biographies) with life histories (political speech) to see whether, how, and why identity construction and negotiation correspond on individual and institutional levels.

### 2.4.2. Narrative Biography

The operationalisation of biography is elaborated according to Gabriele Rosenthal's notion of narrative biographies (1993). This approach offers a semi-structured but still open methodological framework for interview conduct. In narrative biographical interviews, the informant or biographer<sup>4</sup> gives a "full extempore narration (...) of events and experiences from their own lives," (Rosenthal 1993, 1) allowing research to be focused on a broad, yet specific topic, and simultaneously flexible. This allows shifting and/or expanding in directions that are relevant for the research topic, and which might not have been considered otherwise. This was one of the main reasons for using narrative biographies as a methodological tool in this thesis, along with the presented importance of exploring life stories and life histories to capture biographies and the dynamics between people's lived experiences and the contexts in which these experiences were made.

## 2.5 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The top-down research frame was guided by critical discourse analysis (CDA). As a problem-oriented research program, CDA focuses on discourse as "structured by dominance; (...) historically produced and interpreted, (...) situated in time and space; and that dominance structures are legitimated by ideologies of powerful groups" (Wodak and Meyer 2001, 3), as well as power *within* and *over* discourse. It offers an indispensable means of deconstruction and understanding of these phenomena with its flexible approach to methodology and research conduct. Focusing on political speech as text, as power dynamics of those *addressed* and those *addressing*, I was looking into language and discourse actualisations of identity politics and governmentality in Croatia's current prime minister's and first president's speeches.

---

<sup>4</sup> Rosenthal argued for the term biographer instead of autobiographer because "the latter does not account for the social constitution of the subject and the social construction of his or her life history" (Rosenthal 1993, 1).

## 2.6 Synthesis of Thesis Focus

Having introduced the thesis' scholarly background, I finalise preparations for the analysis by synthesising my comparative research approach. As a whole, the thesis partially implements the approach of grounded theory and consists of a twofold analysis. On the one hand, the thesis focused on a top-down framework and processes of national identity construction through political speech. In the analysis of this data, conceptualised as forms of governmentality, identity politics, and nation-building, I employed critical discourse analysis. On the other hand, the thesis focused on bottom-up processes of heterogeneous and polyvocal identification and their negotiations through life stories and everyday life experiences. This was done through the ethnographic method and the analysis of narrative biographies of eight Viennese Croats.

With a backdrop of Yugoslav-Austrian state framing of the 1960s-1980s labour migration, the 1990s forced migration, and the 2000s-present migration, this thesis is an examination of *whether, how, and why political speeches of Croatian nation-state representatives reflect themselves in the everyday lives and experiences of Viennese Croats*. The aim is to answer the following main research questions: (1) *how a normative national identity of 'Croatian emigration/diaspora' is constituted top-down through political speeches of the Croatian nation-state representatives* (top-down part of research), and (2) *how heterogeneous and polyvocal identities are negotiated bottom-up through life stories and everyday life experiences of Viennese Croats* (bottom-up part of research).

Finally, in the analysis, I argue weak indirect ties within the transnational social field in the context of institutional and everyday discourses on identification. The top-down analysis showed how political speech discourses aimed at the construction of a unity between the imagined national and transnational community, focused on Croatia as a space of displacement, 'a homeland'. Conversely, the narratives of Viennese Croats and their lived experiences told

‘success stories of emplacement’ which were focused on Vienna as a space of emplacement. Hence, the analysis showed that the foci of identity construction took different starting points, and developed differently, not referring to one another particularly. The thesis’ contribution to the existing body of knowledge is in its comparative character and theoretical and methodological triangulation.

## 2.7 Top-Down Analysis Data

Data for top-down analysis consisted of nine political speeches by Croatia’s first president Franjo Tuđman,<sup>5</sup> and two by current prime minister Andrej Plenković. Tuđman’s speeches which were assessed in the analysis are available in transcript online (Košutić et al. n.d.). Of the 14 available speeches, 10 interviews, two reports and one public lecture given by Tuđman, nine texts were chosen, three interviews and six speeches, based on dealing with and narrativizing the imagined transnational community of ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’<sup>6</sup> (Tuđman 1989; 1990a; 1990b; 1990c; 1995; 1997a; 1997b; 1997c; 1998). The two political speeches by Plenković selected for discourse analysis were the only ones available online and originated from the Council for Croats outside the Republic of Croatia<sup>7</sup> meetings in 2019 and 2021 with an intermission in 2020 because of the pandemic (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019; 2021). The 2019 speech lasted for approx. 30 minutes, was held in person and transmitted live on national television, and later published on the government’s official YouTube channel

---

<sup>5</sup> Often named ‘father of the homeland’ in public discourse, Franjo Tuđman was the founder and first president of the Croatian Democratic Union (Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica; HDZ). This political party was the founding party of the Croatian state in the 1990s and is still quite prevalent in Croatian political life.

<sup>6</sup> According to legislation, there are three legally divided categories of “Croats outside of the Republic of Croatia” – “Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatian minorities”, and “Croatian emigration/diaspora” – in the Law on relations of the Republic of Croatia with Croats outside the Republic of Croatia (Law on relations 2011).

<sup>7</sup> Savjet Vlade Republike Hrvatske za Hrvate izvan Republike Hrvatske; addressed as the Council in the text. The Council and its meetings were constituted through the enforcement of the Law on relations of the Republic of Croatia with Croats outside the Republic of Croatia (2011). The last version of the Law on relations was published in 2011 and prescribes relations between the nation-state and its differently categorized members (Law on relations 2011; Winland 2002).



(Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019). The speech prime minister Plenković gave in 2021 was recorded in a 10-minute video, transmitted through a Zoom meeting of the Council, and later published on the governmental Youtube channel (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021). Although the audience of the Council meetings was mostly its members,<sup>8</sup> the distribution of the speeches on television and in cyberspace made it highly available, and arguably widely viewed.

Plenković's speeches were transcribed verbatim, and the transcripts are available in Appendices. The language of all speeches was Croatian – this was the language in which the analysis was conducted, while translations to English were provided for those parts which were used as examples in the text of the analysis. Table 1 shows all the units of top-down analysis.

Unit of analysis	Year
Tuđman interview by Dolores Meić for Malmö Radio, Sweden	1989
Tuđman interview for Youth Radio	1990
Tuđman speech at the Constituent Session of the Croatian Parliament	1990
Tuđman speech on the Occasion of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia	1990
Tuđman's Freedom Train Speech Held in Split	1995
Tuđman's Presentation on the Occasion of the Seventh Anniversary of the First Assembly of the HDZ	1997
Oath Letter of the President of the Republic of Croatia Dr. Franjo Tuđman	1997
Tuđman's Vukovar Train Speech Held in Zagreb	1997
Tuđman interview for the 'WE' newspaper by Lucija Ljubić, Stanko Gačić, and Vladimir Lončarević	1998
Plenković speech at the annual meeting of the Government's Council for Croats living outside of the Republic of Croatia	2019
Plenković speech at the annual meeting of the Government's Council for Croats living outside of the Republic of Croatia	2021

**Table 1** Data overview for top-down analysis of political speeches

<sup>8</sup> Representatives of "Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatian minorities", and "Croatian emigration/diaspora" are the members of the Council's annual meeting along with members according to position – governmental, ministry, and institutional representatives (Articles 18 – 22 in Law on relations 2011). According to the "number and significance" of Croats in respective communities, there are 9 representatives for Croats from Bosnia and Herzegovina, among which one is a representative from the Catholic Church from Bosnia and Herzegovina; there are 17 representatives for minorities and 29 for "Croatian emigration/diaspora". Members according to their position in the Croatian government – ministers, members of parliament, representatives of scientific institutions, Catholic Church, NGOs, etc. – have no voting rights (Law on relations 2011).

## 2.8 Bottom-Up Analysis Data

For purposes of the bottom-up part of the analysis, I conducted eight semi-structured, in-depth interviews and a small-scale participant observation. I attended a sports event organised by a Viennese Croatian organisation holding cultural and sports events such as theatre plays, concerts, and sports tournaments. In addition, I talked to the president of the organisation during the fieldwork which was ongoing in February 2023. Being aware that this kind of fieldwork is not a substantive one, I still argue that it provided me with an insight into a middle-out level which I would not have otherwise been able to capture, a level in-between the state representatives' political speech and the life stories of Viennese Croats.

As for the interview conduct, two of my acquaintances in Vienna were entry points in the interview snowballing method, which then branched out as informants put me in contact with other people.

The interview plan devised for this research consisted of an opening question: "Please tell me your life story, with an emphasis on life in Vienna? / Please tell me your life story, how did you get to where you are now?". The main narrative encouraged by this question was not interrupted but further encouraged by "nonverbal and paralinguistic expressions of interest and attention" – nodding, "mhm", etc. (Rosenthal 1993, 1). Notes were taken during this narration to be able to come back to some topics in the second part of the interview, where further narration on specific, already-mentioned topics and events was initiated. These questions were devised by using informants' own words – they were asked to elaborate in detail on a mentioned event, experience, or period of life.

Interviews were conducted between November 2022 and February 2023, lasting between 0.5 and 1.5 hours on average.<sup>9</sup> Seven of the interviews were conducted in informant's homes and public spaces such as cafés, and one was conducted online through the Zoom platform. The language of the interviews was Croatian<sup>10</sup> – this was the language in which the analysis was conducted as well. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, while translations to English were provided for those parts which were used in the text of the analysis. The ethical conduct of research was upheld. Research has been approved by the supervisor and department before interviews and participant observation were conducted. Information sheet, informed consent, and a questionnaire<sup>11</sup> were devised and adhered to during research. All interviews were recorded after permission was given by informants, and their anonymisation was adhered to. Upon finishing research, all audio recordings were destroyed, leaving transcripts as only existing raw data, available only to the researcher and thesis supervisors. Table 2 shows the information on the thesis' informants and the conducted interviews.

---

<sup>9</sup> One interview was shorter, lasting 16 minutes. However, substantive findings have been noted in this conversation and are presented in the analysis.

<sup>10</sup> While on some occasions informants mentioned BCS (Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian) and Serbo-Croatian, the language they identified as their language of communication was mostly Croatian.

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed overview of interview conduct, informed consent and information sheet forms, see Appendices.

<b>Informant</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Time and place of migration<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>Interview details</b>
<b>Petra</b>	41	Female	1993 to Austria, in Vienna for the last 12 years	Nov 2022., the lobby of a school, Croatian, 30min 49sek
<b>Helena</b>	37	Female	1969 parents moved to Vienna	Nov 2022., Helena and Jakov's home, Croatian, 1h 15min 15sek
<b>Jakov</b>	39	Male	1991 moved to Vienna	Nov 2022., Helena and Jakov's home, Croatian, 36min 16sek
<b>Karla</b>	44	Female	1991 moved to Vienna	Jan 2023., a café in Vienna, Croatian, 1h 26min 35sek
<b>Jana</b>	32	Female	1992 to Germany, 1998 to Croatia, 2010 to Vienna	Feb 2023., Jana's home, Croatian, 1h 26min 47sek
<b>Antea</b>	33	Female	2015 moved to Vienna	Feb 2023., Antea's home, Croatian, 1h 22min 57sek
<b>Marko</b>	33	Male	2012 moved to Vienna	Feb 2023., Marko's home, Croatian, 16min 08sek
<b>Lana</b>	26	Female	1992 parents moved to Vienna	Feb 2023., Zoom platform, Croatian, 22min 03sek

**Table 2** Information about informants and conducted interviews for bottom-up analysis

---

<sup>12</sup> This information is noted for matters of historical contextualisation of each informant's life story, but as already noted in the body of text, I do not use the concepts of 1st, 1.5, 2nd, 3rd generation of migrants, transnational generations, or the concept of post-migrant in my analysis.

### 3 Historical Background

In this chapter, I am assessing spaces and temporalities of the Yugoslav, later Croatian, and Austrian sides of the migration policies coin. Providing a historical background which focuses on migration and migration policies was important, as to acknowledge the historicity of the researched issue and its subjects, and to adequately account for “the life that is lived during a certain time and in a certain context” (Svensson 1995, 42). While this thesis was not a particular endeavour in the anthropology of policy, a field which focuses on “reveal[ing] larger processes of governance, power and social change that are shaping the world today” (Shore and Wright 2011, 1), migration policies needed to be accounted for as to frame this kind of research adequately. Life stories are simply not the same in spaces of different policy regimes:

“...policies [are] windows onto political processes in which actors, agents, concepts and technologies interact in different sites, creating or consolidating new rationalities of governance and regimes of knowledge and power” (Shore and Wright 2011, 2).

The mass phenomenon of migration in the Yugoslav and Croatian context is conceptualized to have started in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century and divided into different phases. Jadranka Grbić (2006; 2014) points to three: (1) *old emigration* from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the First World War, counting approx. 0.5 million transcontinental migrants; (2) *new emigration* dating to the interwar period and counting approx. 150 000 transcontinental and European emigrants; and (3) the phase in the aftermath of WWII until approx. the 1980s, counting up to 800 000 political (anti-communist) and economic, transcontinental and European emigrants. Daphne Winland (2009) differentiates the third migration phase into post-Bleiburg (1949-1961) and

Socialist Yugoslavia (late 60s – early 70s) migration waves.<sup>13</sup> In the Yugoslav-Austrian context, the Socialist Yugoslavia migration wave could be dated to the 1960s-1980s migrations pertaining to primarily labour migration. This is further discussed in subsections of this chapter alongside forced migration of the 1990s Yugoslav wars and post-war, 2000s-present migrations, possible 4th and 5th phases of migration in such a division as presented above.

### 3.1 Yugoslav-Austrian Labour Migration

At the beginning of the 1960s, Austria faced shortages of the labour force due to a high number of Austrian labour migrants leaving for Switzerland and Germany. Yugoslavia, on the other hand, entered the 1960s as a country undergoing rapid change. Barriers to state-organised recruitment abroad were overcome through political and economic reforms, by opening borders, liberalising migration policies, and opening to the international economic market (Bakondy 2017, 113; Čapo 2019, 32). In 1965 Yugoslavia and Austria signed the Agreement on temporary employment, thus legalising labour migration, which was a widespread, although irregular, phenomenon since the late 1950s (Bakondy 2017, 116; Bernard 2019, 470). Regulating the recruitment procedure, travel organisation, and the responsibilities of contractual partners, this agreement was a way to formalise and stricken recruitment of migrant labour on both sides (Bakondy 2017).

Authors disagree on the proportions of Yugoslav labour migrants in Austria. Lorber (2017, 169) claims that most came from Serbia (17.3%), Bosnia and Herzegovina (16.8%), and Vojvodina (13.3%). Bernard (2019; 2012), however, argues that most labour migrants came

---

<sup>13</sup> Post-Bleiburg migrants fled abroad fearing prosecution due to connections with the Independent State of Croatia, while Socialist Yugoslavia migrants were a combination of political and economic migrants (cf. Winland 2009, 126).

from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, citing the exact numbers from the census, and giving proportions for the most affected republics:

“According to the population census held in 1971, of a total Yugoslav population of 20,505,000, the number of Yugoslav workers employed abroad was estimated as between 700,000 and 900,000, accompanied by about 300,000 family members (Baučić, 1973, p. 204). The different regions of Yugoslavia were unevenly affected by labour emigration: of the 671,908 Yugoslavs registered as ‘temporarily employed abroad’ in 1971, the majority came from the northern republics of Croatia (33.4 percent) and from Bosnia–Herzegovina (20.4 percent)” (Bernard 2019, 470).

Bernard (2019, 470) notes that the registration of labour migrants was problematic and underestimated the real dimensions of labour migrations. This was due to imprecise measurement, informal recruitment practices, and changing institutional classifications.

The number of guestworkers in Austria peaked in 1973, most having been from Yugoslavia. The authors again disagree on proportions. According to Peintinger (2012) the percentage of Yugoslav labour migrants amounted to 87.5%. However, according to both Bakondy (2017) and Lorber (2017) this percentage was near to 80%. Lorber (2017, 168–69) further stated that half of the Yugoslav labour migrants were situated in Vienna and around 95% were employed as unskilled workers in the leather, textile, construction industry, and tourism sector. Ivanović (2012, 11) stated that Yugoslav labour migrants made up almost 90% of the foreign labour force.

Austrian 1975 Foreign Nationals Employment Law (*Ausländerbeschäftigungsgesetz*) officially halted the recruitment of labour migrants outside of the European Economic Community (EEC)

due to the aftermath of the oil crisis of 1973,<sup>14</sup> and Austria's subsequent economic crisis (Bakondy 2017, 136–37; Peintinger 2012, 4; Čapo 2019, 24). The Yugoslav leadership's fear of uncontrolled migration, exacerbated by the aforementioned 1971 Yugoslav census, resulted in an attempt to restrict labour migration (Bernard 2012, 15). Laws of 1973 and 1974<sup>15</sup> were passed, extending to labour migrants services similar to those provided to domestic workers,<sup>16</sup> as well as encouraging return and reintegration (Ragazzi 2017, 45). Yugoslav labour migrants were reconceptualised as the “seventh republic”, treating the workers abroad as an integral part of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav working class (Zimmerman 1987 in Ragazzi 2017, 45).

Both states' migration policies' fundamental premises were the rotation and eventual return of labour migrants (cf. Čapo 2019; Ivanović 2012). Looking at discursive actualisations of these premises, in Austria, they were first called ‘foreign workers’ (*Fremdearbeiter*). This was changed to ‘guestworkers’ (*Gastarbeiter*) in the 1970s due to the close connection of the term *Fremdearbeit* with the WWII term ‘forced labour’ (*Zwangsarbeit*) (Kolakušić 2022; Ivanović 2012). Yugoslav classification was ‘workers temporarily employed abroad’ (*radnici na privremenom radu*). Austria later changed this to ‘people with migrant background’ (*Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund*), and Yugoslavia, i.e., states emerging from its 1990s dissolution, changed the term to ‘diaspora’ and ‘emigration’ (Kolakušić 2022; Ivanović 2012).

---

<sup>14</sup> Due to the Yom Kippur War, members of OPEC halted oil shipments to all countries supporting Israel in the conflict. This led to drastically high prices of oil and recession in most countries of Western Europe (Ivanović 2012, 11).

<sup>15</sup> The Act on the Basic Conditions for Temporary Employment and Protection of Yugoslav Citizens Employed Abroad (1973) and Social Agreement on the Temporary Employment of Yugoslav Citizens Abroad and Return of Yugoslav Citizens from Employment Abroad (1974) (Ragazzi 2017, 53).

<sup>16</sup> “Through consulates and cultural centres in countries where substantial numbers of Yugoslavs worked (Baskin 1986: 74) they were offered education in all Yugoslav languages, media content including newspapers, radio, and TV, social welfare programs, workers' assistance, and leisure activities” (Ragazzi 2017, 45).



### 3.2 Forced Migration in the 1990s Yugoslav Wars

The Yugoslav wars of the 1990s reproduced multidirectional pathways of forced migration. People mostly from the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and Croatia sought refuge outside of their places of residence – in the territories of Croatia, BiH, and Serbia, and across Yugoslav borders – sometimes legally categorised as refugees, other times as internally displaced persons (IDPs), or remaining undocumented. For purposes of the thesis, I focus on forced migration across Yugoslav borders and, where possible, on forced migrations and migration policies in Austria.

In line with UNHCR data (Bagić and Mesić 2011), Drago Župarić-Iljić (2016) estimated that approximately 5% of Croatia's population was displaced by the end of 1991 – 550,000 internally displaced, and 150,000 people who forcibly migrated to West-European and other countries. In 1992 the largest migration flow was that of 400,000 refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in 1995 there were over 250,000 Serbian refugees from Croatia. However, Bališa (2019) emphasised that the statistical data were not systematised and that we should therefore speak in terms of estimations. Mesić (1995, 661) stated that in 1992 UNHCR estimated approximately 45,000 Croatian refugees registered in Hungary, 15,000 in Austria, 5,000 in Germany, 2,117 in Czechoslovakia, and 1,500 in Italy. According to Valenta (2011 in Hageboutros 2016, 50), by the end of the Yugoslav wars, from the estimated total of 1.2 million Bosnian refugees, an estimated 650,000 people acquired 'temporary protection' in the European Union and states preparing to enter the EU. Of all European countries, Germany and Austria accepted most refugees – the former admitted 320,000, and the latter 86,500 refugees. In addition, Burić (2018) gave an estimation of 130,000 people who forcibly migrated from Croatia to, mostly Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, and Austria, but emphasised how more detailed statistical estimations are problematic due to (1) the absence of the obligation to deregister residence in Croatia and (2) due to most people having been registered as Yugoslavs,

or citizens of (former) Yugoslavia upon their arrival (e.g., in Germany the term Yugoslav was exchanged for the new national classifications in 1994).

The 1990s marked a turn towards ‘managed migration’ (*geregelte Zuwanderung*) for Austria (Kraler and Hollomey 2010, 42). Until 1992 admission and residence in Austria was granted under the 1965 Austrian-Yugoslav Agreement on Visa Policies, permitting a 3-month stay without a visa, often prolonged to six months. However, in 1992 entry to Austria was progressively limited by the Austrian Federal Asylum Office’s legal interpretation of the 1951 Geneva Convention, strictly focusing on state-supported persecution and denying asylum in case of “fleeing general violence perpetrated by private groups” (Hageboutros 2016, 52).

In this way, people were treated as *de facto* refugees and were given Temporary Protection Status. This status denied financial and social services otherwise available under the 1951 Geneva Convention, yet offered basic temporary protection and residence rights for refugees, thus “satisf[ying] public opinion and international criticism concerned about human rights” (Hageboutros 2016, 53). Adhering to the 1993 Residence Act, the temporary residence was granted under the conditions of having valid travel documents, sufficient financial needs, and a visa. These were difficult to obtain (Franz 2003a, 8).

The criteria for asylum prohibited the vast majority from obtaining this status as well: “According to the statistics of the Ministry for the Interior, between May 1992 and April 1998 a total of 4,477 Bosnians applied for asylum in Austria, of whom 1,277 were recognised as Convention refugees” (Franz 2003a, 9). Although the 1992 Asylum Law used the 1951 Convention definition of a refugee, making the Austrian refugee status criteria technically identical to international law, more than two-thirds of asylum applications were rejected on grounds of “not arriv[ing] directly from the country of persecution, [not being able to] demonstrate their fear of individual persecution, or if the applicants could prove persecution,

that their persecutors were private groups rather than state-related institutions” (Franz 2003a, 8–9).

Unlike Germany where massive repatriation happened at the UNHCR-announced end of temporary protection of Bosnians in 1997, in Austria this was dealt with as “an official acceptance of permanent residency status of refugees who were initially offered ‘temporary protection’” (Hageboutros 2016, 53–54). The 1998 ‘Bosnians Law’ (*Bosniergesetz*) ‘upgraded’ *de facto* refugees’ statuses by providing them with permanent residence and a possibility to acquire citizenship after 8 years of residence. However, the Austrian state still had the opportunity to select those who would be subsumed under this new legislation, which would not have been possible, had Bosnians acquired refugee status under the 1951 Convention in Austria (Hageboutros 2016, 55–56).

### 3.3 Contemporary Migrations (2000s-2020s)

Following forced migrations of the 1990s, Drago Župarić-Iljić (Župarić-Iljić 2016, 16–17) determined an increase in migration from Croatia at the onset of the global economic crisis of 2009, for it only to further rise with Croatia’s accession to the European Union in 2013. Data on migrations from Bosnia and Herzegovina show an increase in migrations toward Austria in the 2010s as well, while emphasising these are only estimations according to residence deregistration (23.28% of total deregistration in 2017 is tied to Austria; Trifković et al. 2019, 37–38). A similar issue was encountered in Croatian statistics. There was no obligation of residence deregistration until 2012 in Croatia. The 2012 legislation prescribed an obligatory cancellation of residence in case of permanent or temporary leave from the country which exceeded one year. However, there was uncertainty that new legislation was followed in full since 2012 (Župarić-Iljić 2016, 18). According to the 2013 census in BiH, there were 544,780 people of Croatian nationality in BiH (15.4% of total population; Agency for Statistics of

Bosnia and Herzegovina n.d.). The movement of a part of this census-recorded population, provided they hold Croatian citizenship,<sup>17</sup> would have been made as easy or difficult as that of Croatian citizens from Croatia at this time.

In the early years of Croatia's EU accession, there were temporary restrictions in place for workers from Croatia as a new EU Member State. Austrian labour market restriction policy prescribed Croatian citizens with an 'in-between' access to the labour market. While they held preference over 'third-country nationals', they held an inferior status to Austrian workers. Furthermore, highly qualified workers, workers in shortage occupations, health care workers, and seasonal workers in agriculture and tourism "enjoy[ed] easier access" (migration.gv.at n.d.). The prerequisites to get employment in Austria during this period were: "Austrian wage and working conditions, no equally qualified registered workers available, no hiring-out of workers" (migration.gv.at n.d.). Those who were already in Austria at the time would have been issued confirmations of freedom of movement under conditions prescribing the longevity of living and working in Austria.<sup>18</sup> Finally, when such a confirmation would have been obtained by an individual, the same would be given to their partners and children, provided they live in the same household (migration.gv.at n.d.).

These restrictions in labour market access were not unified across Member States and could be adopted for up to seven years. While Župarić-Iljić (Župarić-Iljić 2016, 17) mentioned how Austria applied these measures the longest, until the end of 2020, the statistics show Austria to still have been at the top of choices of migration in 2014 and 2015 behind Germany and Serbia.

---

<sup>17</sup> The exact number of people holding Croatian citizenship status was not obtainable.

<sup>18</sup> "Upon application, the Public Employment Service will issue a confirmation of freedom of movement (Freizügigkeitsbestätigung), provided that you: (1) already had free labour market access on the day of Croatia's accession to the EU (such as holders of a "Long-term Resident-EC/EU" or a Red-White-Red-Card plus) or (2) have been legally working in Austria for at least 12 months, (3) meet the requirements for a Red-White-Red-Card plus according to § 15 AuslBG or (4) have been settled in Austria for at least five consecutive years and have a regular income from lawful occupation (e.g. self-employed occupation) or (5) prove ten months of continued employment with a valid employment permit under the Red-White-Red-Card system" (migration.gv.at n.d.).

Of the total of 20,000 people in 2014, and almost 30,000 people in 2015 migrating from Croatia, 9.6% and 10.91% respectively, were registered to have moved to Austria. Furthermore, not only were these driven by economic and educational reasons, but also by reasons of family reunion and an increase in higher education mobility (Župarić-Iljić 2016, 18).

Having set the stage with the theoretical and methodological framework, and the historical background, I turn to analysis. In chapter 4, I explore the discursive actualisation of identity politics, governmentality, and nation-building in the Croatian state-representatives' political speeches, a construction of an identity based on "unity of emigrated and homeland Croatia". In Chapter 5, I examine ways of being and belonging, and boundary work of Viennese Croats, and how they narrated 'success stories of emplacement' through narrative biographies. The analysis concluded that the processes of identification took different courses and that the two levels of analysis did not refer to one another particularly.

## 4 “Unity of Emigrated and Homeland Croatia”: Analysis of Political Speech

In this part of the thesis, I analyse how governmentality, identity politics, and nation-building were discursively employed through political speeches. This is an examination of ways of addressing ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ and its perceived nationally determined identity. Employing critical discourse analysis, I analysed Croatia’s first president Franjo Tuđman’s 1989-1998 speeches and current prime minister Andrej Plenković’s 2019 and 2021 speeches. Although the number of analysed Tuđman speeches exceeded those of Plenković due to availability issues, the importance of questions of unity on the level of shared identity, as well as differences in discourses were still visible in both political actors’ speeches.

Before going into analysis, it is important to explain how the concepts of migration and mobility were constructed in the first president’s and current prime minister’s discourses. Tuđman narrated the history of ‘Croatian emigration’ starting from the Austro-Hungarian Empire across the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and Socialist Yugoslavia, emphasising that political emigration was present in all periods, and that, especially in the period of the nazi/fascist Independent State of Croatia, this was mostly “distraught and defeatist” emigration “which gave up on the idea of a sovereign Croatia” (Tuđman 1998). This was “an emigration with no personality, no programme which would consolidate the Croatianness<sup>19</sup> in emigration and give a possibility of a statehood idea”, until the emergence of HDZ and Tuđman’s visits abroad in 1987 (Tuđman 1998). Plenković differentiated between historical (beginning of the 20th century until the 1960s) and contemporary migrations. He emphasised that contemporary migrations were the exercise of one of the four fundamental freedoms – the freedom of movement. Forced migrations in the 1990s during the Yugoslav wars were mentioned as a rare

---

<sup>19</sup> *hrv.* “hrvatstvo”

and circumstantial occasion (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 39–45). These people have, thus, not moved permanently to a different territory and country, but were in a constant conceptual movement that made the connection to ‘homeland’ and a possible return more tangible.

According to the Law on relations, “Croats outside the Republic of Croatia” were “an equal part of one and inseparable Croatian people” (Law on relations 2011).<sup>20</sup> This analysis showed how political discourse started with Tuđman’s desire for this unity, urging for remittances and return, and ended with Plenković proclaiming unity as a state of facts, calling for identity preservation and reassuring Croatian nation-state’s involvement in these efforts politically and through nation-state funded projects.

#### 4.1 Development of the Concept of Unity in Political Speech

In the 1989 interview with Radio Malmö just before the first multi-party elections in 1990, Franjo Tuđman stated how “historical hardships made one-third of the Croatian people displaced (...) all around the world” (Tuđman 1989). This displacement made cultural and economic networks, and human connections harder to maintain between “the emigration and the homeland” (Tuđman 1989).<sup>21</sup> In a speech held in Split in 1995, Tuđman (1995) said that a sovereign and democratic nation-state was possible only with the “unity of all lands, all classes, and the unity of ‘homeland- and emigrated Croatia’” (Tuđman 1995). Although it is not strictly a part of the analysis, it should be mentioned how throughout the speeches, Tuđman addresses persistently post-Bleiburg, often politically exiled and fascist ‘Croatian emigration’ as the subject of this unification. This should be said along with stating how the Serbian, Bosniak, and Roma minorities are seldomly, if ever mentioned in these speeches. Mesić and Bagić

---

<sup>20</sup> One could translate ‘narod’ as ‘folk’ as well, but since this term has different and heavy connotations, and I could not argue this was for certain meant by the Law, I opted for a more neutral form of translation.

<sup>21</sup> From a fairly vast scholarship which would contradict this statement, here I would especially recommend recently published literature on labour migration in the 1960s-1980s, which elaborates on ways in which transnational fields and networks persisted through these times, up until today (cf. Čapo 2019; Ivanović 2012).

(2011, 29) argue that “Tuđman’s government adopted legislation and other regulations during and after the war, which were aimed at preventing and deterring the return of Serb (and also Bosniak, and Roma) refugees to Croatia”. This further highlights among which imagined communities unity is discursively constructed – only among those ethnically and nationally Croatian. Furthermore, when Tuđman discussed the results of HDZ’s political actions in the speech for the seventh anniversary of the first HDZ assembly, he emphasised that:

“all the results were accomplished by the Croatian people, homeland- and emigrated Croatia, with their own strength and sacrifice, only with the help of God, by choosing in large majority the programme aims of HDZ” (Tuđman 1997a).

This was furthered in Plenković’s 2019 speech, where he addressed “the fact that we [Croats] can be found in all parts of the world” but that “contributions many make to their homeland with their heart, soul, business, cultural, artistic, sport, and any other activities” were what represented (at the moment, and in action and not only desire) “*the great unity of Croatian people and the community of emigrated and homeland Croatia*” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 14–17; my emphasis). Moreover, Plenković explicated how both the Croatian Democratic Union and the nation-state were led according to “the most important elements of [Tuđman’s] doctrine” and that this was a reason why the unity of “emigrated and homeland Croatia” was a priority to the government (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 17–20).

This imagined transnational community was discursively constructed as tightly connected to its space of displacement, cooperating, and developing Croatia together (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021), creating a unified body politic of ‘homeland- and emigrated Croatia’. Prime minister Plenković framed Croatia as “a serious country... which aims to move forward by the politics of unity of homeland and emigrated Croatia” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 228).



The analysis further shows how the success of nation-state development was to be accomplished by discursively framing it through the “unity of emigrated and homeland Croatia” (1) in space of displacement (through encouraging return and remittances; Tuđman), and (2) in space of emplacement (through encouraging ‘identity preservation’; Plenković). Both perspectives saw Croatia (displacement) as focal to the relationship of ‘emigrated and homeland Croatia’.

## 4.2 Unity in Displacement: Remittances and Return

As for the matter of unity in spaces of displacement, Tuđman stated how the Croatian Democratic Union made it a part of their programme to “create one spiritual, political, and moral climate in which every man abroad can return to their homeland (...) no matter their previous or current political and ideological alignments” (Tuđman 1989).<sup>22</sup> This was proclaimed to have been successfully done just after the elections in a 1990 interview held at the Youth Radio in Zagreb. Tuđman stated that Croatian Democratic Union “has changed the spiritual and political climate,” and that “one-third of the Croatian people in emigration no longer calls upon their relatives to join them abroad but strives to return and stay on their native soil” (Tuđman 1990a). Furthermore, in the 1997 speech held for the seventh anniversary of the first HDZ assembly, this programme of return was ‘discursively enhanced’, and rebranded into a “reconciliation programme for the quarrelled, divided, and distraught Croatianness,<sup>23</sup> especially that of homeland and emigrated Croatia” (Tuđman 1997a). Tuđman continued by

---

<sup>22</sup> In addition to this discursive neglect of migrants’ political inclinations which were, e.g., largely nazi and fascist in the post-WWII migrations and therefore reasons for migration in the first place, ‘Croatian emigration’ is narrated as to have been forcefully separated from “their own [people]” due to historical contexts rather than personal wrongdoings and responsibilities (Tuđman 1989).

<sup>23</sup> *hrv.* “hrvatstvo”

saying that this reconciliation was a crucial postulate for the “completion of the *spiritual integration of the Croatian national being*” (Tuđman 1997a; my emphasis).<sup>24</sup>

To connect this to the issue of return and remittances, Tuđman stated that the wealth of ‘emigration’, their readiness, and abilities to economically invest in the ‘homeland’ was something which was presupposed and implied, but on the conditions that:

“this Croatian man<sup>25</sup> can return to his homeland, that he gains trust in the Croatian government, and that based on that, and not only patriotism,<sup>26</sup> but on economic interest, he invests either by returning or by investing in projects of his own choosing” (Tuđman 1990a).

This connection between “economy and patriotism” as Tuđman (1990a) put it, i.e., remittances and national belonging and identity, was something he argued as follows:

“Never has a man gone to the world forgetting their native soil, and I had the chance to meet people who told me they would, even under conditions of smaller profit and personal gain, want to keep their work going in their homeland” (Tuđman 1990a).

Continuing this discourse, Plenković stated how “we [government and nation-state] have to take care of Croats wherever they live” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 35–36). The support from the nation-state and its government towards ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ was in “ensuring better conditions in homeland... to create encouraging conditions for return... for those who wish to return and give their contribution to the homeland” (Vlada Republike

---

<sup>24</sup> In another 1997 speech, Tuđman added to the nominalisation of the programme by calling it that of “national revival” (Tuđman 1997b). This is closely resembling the name of the Croatian national, cultural and political movement from the mid-19th century, which was a part of the European-wide 19. century national movements and nation-state formations.

<sup>25</sup> *hrv.* “taj hrvatski čovjek” (Tuđman 1990a).

<sup>26</sup> *hrv.* “rodoljublje”; a term which is similar to patriotism but could also be literally translated as “love towards one’s own people”.

Hrvatske 2019, 38–39, 46–47). Plenković’s view on migration as freedom of movement (presented at the chapter’s beginning) made return a tangible option and migration an indefinite process – the unity of the imagined community therefore also remained intact. The return of ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ was indirectly portrayed as a step towards bettering their homeland.

### 4.3 Unity in Emplacement: Identity Preservation

As already stated, prime minister Plenković presented “tak[ing] care of Croats wherever they live” as a government and state obligation (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 35–36). Apart from providing conditions for return, nation-state and government support towards ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ was also in “financing projects which connect [emigrated and homeland Croatia],” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021, 36). According to Plenković, Croatia helped the efforts of identity preservation politically, and by supporting and financing projects, as a means to oppose “all politics leading to assimilation or fragmentation of the Croatian people” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021, 32).<sup>27</sup> For example, Plenković singled out the changes made for easier acquisition of Croatian citizenship – this was a way:

“to include younger generations [of especially overseas migrants] in the corpus of Croatian citizens, [a way] for them to contribute the development of their homeland, and [a way] for them to have a connection with contemporary Croatia” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021, 13–16).

Plenković emphasised preserving a Croatian identity in “emigration/diaspora” as “a key issue” and that “the best guardians” of those identities are themselves (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 130–32). Preservation of identity was, hence, an obligation conducted successfully and

---

<sup>27</sup> This was specifically addressed towards minorities in neighbouring countries in the speech, but then exemplified with issues pertaining to ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ as presented in the text.

with enthusiasm: “a thrill of cherishing the Croatian language, culture, and identity, even in difficult conditions” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 29–30). All this Plenković framed as a mark of “how strong the Croatian lineage and the devotion to the homeland is” (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 30).

Finally, Plenković described “emigrated Croatia” as developers, entrepreneurs whose steps the Croatian state was trying to follow (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019, 190–92). This went hand in hand with Tuđman’s idea of ‘emigration’ as people with expertise and opportunities acquired abroad in realms of finance, technology, and science (Tuđman 1989).

In this analysis, I showed how an ideological and political unification of the body politic was discursively constructed in Franjo Tuđman’s and Andrej Plenković’s political speeches. Apart from similarities in the first president’s and current prime minister’s discourses, some differences were noticed.

On the one hand, Tuđman narrated ideological distraught of the ‘Croatian emigration’ before the emergence of HDZ and him as its leader, consolidation of ‘homeland and emigrated Croatia’ resulting in the ‘victory of Homeland war’, and further needed efforts in the political inclusion of the transnational part of Croatia’s body politic. There was constant emphasis on political and ideological unification, reconciliation, inclusion, and return of ‘Croatian emigration’, in order to help in the developmental efforts of the nation-state. This was a process of nation-building, trying to construct a national community transcending nation-state border as a basis for development in the post-war period. The Radio Malmö interview, where Tuđman directly addressed ‘Croatian emigration’, captured his perspective on this imagined transnational community. He focused on the contribution of ‘diaspora’ to its ‘homeland’, urging for remittances and return:

“[May you, Croats in Sweden,] be upright people, upright Croats and [may they] with their knowledge and opportunities try to help their fellow men, their home and the whole homeland” (Tuđman 1989).

On the other hand, Plenković’s ‘Croatian emigration/diaspora’ were represented as strong individuals and communities that (were supposed to) preserve their identities and thus contribute to their homeland. For these imagined transnational communities, the unity with their ‘homeland’ was already a fact. They were not rooted in their host communities, but simply performing their fundamental freedoms and hence in a constant conceptual movement. Relying on Tuđman’s discourse, the ‘homeland’ and ‘emigration/diaspora’ were again represented as a unified entity. A statement in which Plenković directly addressed ‘emigrated Croatia’ framed them in close connection to ‘homeland Croatia’, advocating identity preservation as a means of ‘emigration’s’ contribution to ‘homeland’:

„...partners, co-workers, and what is most important, fellow countrymen (*hrv. zemljaci*), friends, people that love Croatia, and pass on Croatian culture, and the love toward homeland to your younger generations wherever you might live in the world and guard our Croatian and Christian identity“ (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021, 62–64).

Much like Yugoslavia’s ‘seventh republic’, as were called labour migrants in the course of the 1960s-1980s labour migrations (cf. Čapo 2019), Tuđman and Plenković were both discursively trying to (re)connect the border-bounded nation-state with its cross-border subjects. In this way, an identity of ‘emigration’ in close, unifying connection with ‘homeland’ was constructed, and a nation willing to transcend its borders to encompass its cross-border subjects.

## 5 Narrating Success Stories: Analysis of Narrative Biographies

In this part of the thesis, I analyse bottom-up processes of heterogeneous and polyvocal identification and their negotiations through life stories and everyday life experiences. Through the ethnographic method, I analysed narrative biographies of eight Viennese Croats. The analysis shows how their narratives and lived experiences told ‘success stories of emplacement’ which were focused on Vienna as a space of emplacement and the subjects’ agency. Hence, the discursive actualisation of identification did not follow the ones from the top-down level of analysis. Discourse constructed on ‘Croatian emigration’ by Tuđman and Plenković did not reflect itself in the narratives of Viennese Croats. Instead, these two set their foci of identity construction and negotiation in different spaces and did not particularly reflect in each other. While state representatives talked from a focus on space of displacement, informants focused on emplacement. To supplement analysis where possible, I present fieldwork from February 2023 which was done through participant observation in Vienna. While this was not substantive fieldwork, it provided insights into a middle-out level which I would not have otherwise been able to capture – a level in-between the state representatives’ political speech and the life stories of Viennese Croats.

Before proceeding with the analysis, I briefly introduce the informants of this thesis. Petra came to Austria as a refugee in the 1990s and moved to Vienna 12 years ago. Helena was born in Vienna, where her parents moved in the late 1960s as Yugoslav labour migrants. Jakov came to Vienna with his family in the 1990s as a refugee. Karla became a *de facto* refugee when she came to Vienna with her mother and siblings for a vacation in the 1990s. Jana spent her early childhood with her family in Germany as a refugee. After Germany decreed refugees’ repatriation in the late 1990s, her family settled in a town in Croatia, where they live today. She moved to Vienna in 2010 for educational purposes. Antea and Marko both moved to

Vienna to study – Antea arrived through an Erasmus exchange programme with a Croatian university and stayed on after enrolling on her current studies, and Marko moved after getting accepted to his studies in Vienna. Lana was the first of her siblings to be born in Vienna after her parents came here as refugees in the 1990s. Five informants have children – Petra, Karla, and Lana, and Helena and Jakov who are spouses as well. All informants work in Vienna.

The analysis explores the space of Vienna as narrated by informants, proceeds to show who are seen as its people and in what manner, who are the ‘we’ and ‘they’, and finishes with a detailed overview of the most important tropes of success stories of emplacement – language acquisition, school and work experiences, all emphasising agency.

## 5.1 The City of Vienna

Vienna was regarded as a space of opportunity by informants. This was a city described as international and open, a city of high culture, and rich in content (events, happenings, etc.). Jana stated that “life in Vienna is good, of good quality, and eventful. You can’t be bored because there is always something”. Not only was Vienna seen as full of opportunities in the sense of available content, but in a sense of employment – as Antea said, “if you can find a job anywhere, then that is in Vienna”.

Karla narrated how she decided to live in Vienna due to its open-minded character and available opportunities. When she was a child, she was missing her community from Zagreb and her friends, and had a strong wish to return. However, when she was about 18 years old, Karla began to see the many opportunities Vienna had, and how she could “be anonymous” and “exactly who she is” in Vienna – the city “held a better future” for her. This was a process in which Austria “became [her] homeland”. Petra grew up in another Austrian city and decided to go to a “more international” Vienna, a city “with more opportunities”, as a step toward other

destinations, such as cities in Germany and Switzerland. However, she eventually decided to stay because she “simply fell in love with Vienna and find[s] the city amazing”.

Often spaces of emplacement, Vienna and Austria, were compared to towns and states of displacement, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. For Petra, Austrians and Croatians were similar in their impoliteness, but what she saw as a new, positive, and surprising feature of Croatia, and what others usually prescribed to Vienna, was the openness of younger generations. Helena and Karla, both mothers, mentioned how Vienna had more to offer from happenings and events for them and their children. Marko said to have decided to study in Vienna because “there are far more opportunities to grow here”, thinking not only about professional but personal growth. He stated the most difficult part of arriving in Vienna was “assimilating”:

“It’s a little bit different environment. It was okay because I had some acquaintances, a few colleagues from Split, so I had a crowd to hang out with. But somehow you feel like you are not here, like you came to visit. (...) This was a feeling that everything was new and different. And it was interesting in the context of discovering all which we don’t have. It was, of course, emotional to separate and leave everything down there, whole 22 years of life, and to move here. (...) When I compare this with now, ten years later, I feel at home here, and as a visitor there” (Marko 2023).

#### 5.1.1. The Multiple ‘Us’

In some narratives Vienna was a space of home, as it was with Marko, but also a home which often lacked a certain culturally specific mentality informants found characteristic of their places of displacement in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Helena narrated the in-betweenness of her identity. She identified as both “always feeling to have been Croatian in [her] heart” and Vienna being the home she did not wish to leave, yet “never having her own



[space]”. She recognised Austria as a “good state” and Vienna as a city where she felt safe and supported but lacking the cultural specifics of what she saw as “our”, “Croatian” culture, especially the feeling of community this culture harbours. Karla, who identified as Croatian, and even more as Zagrebian with a Viennese home, compared Zagreb and Vienna in the same manner as Helena, emphasising Vienna’s shortcomings in the feeling of community, a “different mentality”. Helena described this as follows:

“Music, for example. Austrian music cannot bring me such joy as our music can. (...) And our weddings simply have more heart in them. Or when someone says, that is not your cousin – of course they are. (...) It’s the big family. (...) Or when someone says, how do you talk every day? I talk to my mom at least through text every day. (...) I cannot imagine that some people, often they are alone here in Austria. I see that here, and there is no such thing with us. We are more together, as a family” (Helena 2022).

However, when Helena found herself in Croatia, “down below” or “down there”, as informants often addressed this space, she found herself in-between symbolic boundaries of the two spaces she recognised as her own:

“When I come to Croatia then people often say, what have you got to do with Croatia, you have never lived here, you weren’t born here. Yet again, here are my roots. My uncles were in Operation Storm for example. And I always say how, when I am older, I could imagine living in Croatia. (...) But every time we come down there, always [people think or say], here come the Austrians” (Helena 2022).

For Karla, these boundaries collided, yet differently, in Zagreb, where her Zagrebian identity was contested against a Janjevan<sup>28</sup> identity:

“I am not, how one might say, (laughter) clean, in essence. Although I have always seen myself as Croatian, and I am, but my parents are from Janjevo. (...) I always felt Zagrebian, but I was always told [by others] that my parents are Janjevci (...) They even teased me inside my family, how can you be [Zagrebian] when your parents are Janjevci? Well, they are, but I am Zagrebian. (laughter) I have simply always felt like that. And even now, I would say that I am not a Croat but a Zagrebian” (Karla 2023).

To address these symbolic boundaries, Helena proceeded to explain how their lives differ in Austria, referring to gender roles. In this way, a distancing was made in how one “lives their identity in their everyday life”. Although they were between two worlds, Helena was narrating how they acquired the best of both worlds:

“Our lives are a little different. For example, we know, we have a certain order of things, so my children go to bed [on time] and so on. When I see our family, the ones who live down below in Bosnia and so, the way they live. Husbands don’t commit to their children. This is completely different. It is completely normal for a husband to change the baby’s diaper, and there are some down there [who ask], what are you doing? They used to say [to Jakov], why would you, I have never done that. And I think to myself, *you are doing that for yourself*, so that you are with your child. And so, we are somehow in-between those two worlds. Somehow, we took all that is good from both” (Helena 2022).

---

<sup>28</sup> Janjevci are a Croatian minority group descending from a village called Janjevo, near Priština, Kosovo. In Zagreb, such a contestation of a Zagrebian identity of people connected with Janjevo is not unusual. Prejudice and discrimination are present in this context, and stereotypes of cultural differences between Janjevci and other Croatian and Zagrebian people.

None of the informants expressed strong connections to Croatia in a political or nationalistic way. Petra explicated she did not feel like “a big Croat”. In this way, she explicated her way of being in a negation of being ‘overly Croatian’ – as a form of a symbolic boundary:

“I somehow don’t have this strong feeling, as if I am a big Croat or anything like that. (Why not?) Because there are many people who are total patriots, but it’s not like that with me at all” (Petra 2022).

Others did not explicate their identification in such a manner, but affirmed their ways of being. Thus, they were drawing a symbolic boundary between themselves and Austrians, emphasising their emotional connectedness with Croatia – its culture, mentality, sense of community, etc., as it was shown above.

#### 5.1.2. Networking among ‘Us’

Informants narrated ways of connecting with others in Vienna on both informal, and partially formal levels – the former referring to family and friends’ networks, and the latter to Viennese Croatian organisations. Most of the informal connections were established within “international”, “foreign” networks and relations. While Helena stated she had mostly Austrian friends until she was around 16 years old, then she started going out, to listen to “our, Balkan, one can’t say Croatian only [music]”, she found her company and community there: “We had a company of really all nations and regions” (Helena 2022). Another thing that she emphasised was the importance of family. Talking about her family and her brother- and sister-in-law, and their children, Helena said:

“We love them very much and take care of each other, always try to see each other once every weekend. (...) And our children love each other. We also have a lot of godchildren, so we try to see and hear from each other too. (...) We have [family] in

Germany, Canada, Africa, Australia, everywhere, scattered around the world” (Helena 2022).

Karla told a story of how she tried to keep contact with her friends in Croatia after leaving in the 1990s. She used the phrase “Aus den Augen, aus dem Sinn,”<sup>29</sup> to explain how none of these friendship contacts persisted until today. However, networks were established with her mother’s sisters in Vienna. Aunts helped Karla and her siblings with learning German, studying, and one aunt’s partner (who was Austrian) guaranteed for Karla’s family in an application for a family visa, for them to be able to stay in Vienna.<sup>30</sup>

Petra was the only one who mentioned a lack of informal networking in her narrative. While she did mention how moving to Austria during the 1990s was made possible through her family networks, she said that she had not found a way to connect with other Croatians, especially women, in Vienna. Instead, she was connecting with other ‘non-Austrian networks’ such as a platform for Italian women in Vienna.

Besides the opportunity to develop informal networks, several organisations were an option. I address views informants held on a Croatian Catholic Mission organisation, one Burgenland Croat<sup>31</sup> organisation, and I bring my own findings from a short fieldwork with a Viennese Croatian organisation holding cultural and sports events such as theatre plays, concerts, and sports tournaments. I viewed these organisations as part of a middle-out level of analysis, a level in-between the state representatives’ political speech and the life stories of Viennese

---

<sup>29</sup> *de*. “Out of sight, out of mind.”

<sup>30</sup> If they had gotten refugee visas, there was a chance of them having to leave after Austria would establish that their places of origin were safe. Such a story is presented in Jana’s story of growing up in Germany elsewhere in the analysis.

<sup>31</sup> While Burgenland Croats are not considered migrants *per se*, but as an Austrian minority group, some of the informants mentioned them in comparison with ‘us’. The analysis showed that the position of Burgenland Croats seemed to be an interesting stance in-between ‘us Croats’ and ‘them Austrians’ as if being a ‘better version of ‘us’’. This would be of importance to explore in further research.

Croats. While it would be important to discuss in which way this middle-out level of Viennese Croatian organisations operated in a dynamic between top-down and bottom-up levels, due to the scope of fieldwork this was not possible to the full extent. However, fieldwork and informants' insights into the organisations and communities they were supposed to gather are discussed.

As part of participant observation, I attended a sports tournament and met with this Viennese Croatian organisation's president. This was an annual tournament, and it was well-visited. This was an event that gathered clubs from both Vienna and various places in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There was also one Viennese Albanian team who won the tournament in the end. The venue, which was, to my surprise, not 'banal-nationally decorated' at all, was filled with a crowd in which it seemed as if everyone knew each other. A Viennese ex-Yugoslav television crew and one Croatian newspaper covered the story of the tournament.

In our conversation later on, the organisation's president spoke of a decaying cultural scene in Vienna, and how it was getting more and more difficult to reach out to a Croatian community this organisation was supposed to gather. He mentioned how Serbian organisations had a tight-knit and bigger community – they had more folklore performers and higher visitor numbers at their theatre plays. He implored how something was supposed to be done about this “shame and downfall of culture”.

In addition, the organisation's president told of rivalries between communities in Vienna. He gave an example of two separately organised 'Croatian Balls' (*Kroatenball*). Antea reflected on the dynamics between different organisations in her narrative as well. While she described the church as a “centre for connecting”, she was critical of them as an organisation in the same vein as towards Viennese Croatian organisations in general – “they are all some sort of rivals,

one is funded by this, others by that”. Marko described his restraint towards the community adjacent to the Croatian Catholic Mission due to its closed character:

“I don’t like when people are put in boxes. I am not susceptible to parties or anything, I am quite open, and I like to follow something that suits me, as one develops as an artist and liberal. That community became too closed for me. I have nothing against them, it was just restraining me, so I distanced myself from them. (...) This is just my life philosophy at the moment, but they say that religion is a fish in an aquarium, and that spirituality is a fish in the ocean. (...) I am very spiritual, not religious. Although I was raised Catholic, I like to explore, explore myself. Some things I simply cannot do in church, so it didn’t resonate well with me anymore. Of course, it serves a purpose to someone else, but not to me. And it feels stupid to listen then, this negative, always victims, always lamenting, always the same. For a young person, you need a little motivation. So that was the reason” (Marko 2023).

Close to this notion, Helena described the church as “too strict”. She recollected how there was a brief conflict between the priest and herself and Jakov when they wanted their new flat to be blessed. The priest first adamantly rejected their proposition because the couple was not married at the time, but after another conversation decided to comply and bless their new living space. While Helena mentioned how she preferred the Christmas service in the Croatian church to any other, she stated how an Austrian church, where her children attended religious teaching, offered more for children. Parents taught some of these classes, so Helena did as well. She talked very fondly of this, because “the children opened up to me. Until this day we have a special connection”.

Another community was mentioned in informants’ narratives and fieldwork participant observation – Burgenland Croats and their adjacent organisation Croatian Centre. The

Viennese Croatian organisation's president emphasised how Burgenland Croats and their community cherished a Croatian culture strongly, mentioning holding tight connections with them.

Both Antea and Marko saw the Croatian Centre and Burgenland Croats as an antithesis to the negative traits of the Croatian Catholic Mission. Antea stated the Centre and its community were “wow!”, “the closest to what a minority should represent”, that their “culture is on the level – they cherish their language, (...) tradition”. Marko compared Burgenland Croats in the Croatian Centre to the Croatian Catholic Mission community at the Am Hof church:

“Burgenland Croats are very, very different. (...) They are far more professional, better organised, they are Croatian Austrians. The Croats at Am Hof, they are all sloppy, at least considering the organisation of the community. It's all sloppy, everyone wants to screw over someone else, and that kind of non-cooperation. While Burgenland Croats are organised. Everything functions in business the way you fixed it” (Marko 2023).

This view of Burgenland Croats as “Croatian Austrians”, gives an opening to turn to a detailed exploration of who ‘Austrians’ and ‘Viennese’ are in informants’ narrative biographies.

### 5.1.3. ‘The Viennese’

Jana told a story about how she learned a lot about Austrians in one work and travel opportunity. She mentioned her friends were mostly working colleagues, “foreigners”, explaining how these were “Turkish, Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian, Afghan, and German friends”, and expressed a regret that she did not socialise more with Austrians before. She explained how in this work and travel opportunity most of her colleagues were Austrians, and that a common cause – travelling to an unknown environment – connected them. This was a time when she said to have socialised with Austrians the most and stayed in contact after returning to Vienna. She explained why there was an assumption that staying in contact with

Austrians was difficult through her perspective on “Austrian culture”, and their “mentality”, slowly narrowing her perspective towards who she perceived as the “Viennese”:

“Many say it’s difficult to stay in contact with Austrians and I partially agree, but partially it is the case that Austrians watch the way one behaves. If they like it [your behaviour], they have nothing against staying in contact, but if they don’t, they will politely say, ciao, see you some other time. And by behaviour, I mean manners. The way someone acts in company, in a restaurant, towards salespeople, waiters, various sorts of people. And then they probably assess you by that. Are you with or without manners. Probably it’s this famous Viennese school everyone talks about, but for me, the Viennese, because I can’t say for other cities, these are simply people with manners. They know the exact rules of behaviour. Even when they are small. I see this with children (...) of Austrian men and women. It is as if they were born with manners, but it’s just, they are raised in such a way, and I find that wonderful” (Jana 2023).

While Jana told of the “Viennese” as people with manners, cultured individuals, Antea stated “Austrians take care of themselves”, comparing them to the orderliness of the Austrian public transport and the healthcare system. However, some, according to Antea, hid true, not-so-presentable selves. She told how she earned parts of her income in the cleaning services upon arrival to Vienna, and expressed surprise and disgust over the conditions in which she found some homes, saying “on the outside [they] looked like they took very good care of themselves”. Antea had another view on what it meant to be “typically Viennese” which tangentially touched upon Jana’s perspective. For Antea, “the Viennese” were opportunistic, resourceful, looking out and sticking up for themselves, self-confident, and assertive:

“A typical Viennese looks out for themselves, for their own benefit, where they can make more money – to have more and work less. I am not saying they are bad people,



but I got an impression that people know how to find their way around Vienna quite well, that they determine some minimum they need, that it is simply a different life. It's not like in Croatia, where people work very much and get paid very little, that they don't have time for anything, for themselves, their family, children, friends. Of course, they are frustrated [in Croatia]. And here, I remember in the first or second year after I arrived in Vienna, I went for a walk at Schönbrunn and I watched people – they held hands, they were happy. I couldn't believe it. That people were so truly happy and relaxed. I didn't notice that with us. Another thing I noticed; from my Croatian perspective it looked like they complain all the time. But I realised they are only demanding their rights. (...) Also, on every other house, it says 'Beethoven lived here' – maybe he spent 5 days there. But they know how to use marketing. (...) They are all very easygoing. Sometimes I wonder, don't they see this or if they never learned this...? (...) Maybe they are like that because they are in their own country, and they don't have to try as hard as I, as a foreigner, have to" (Antea 2022).

Further analysis shows how these same traits of resourcefulness, confidence, and assertiveness were paired with fighting for one's position, proving and earning acceptance in informants' narratives about themselves. In this way, what some informants saw as 'being Viennese', others narrated as who they were, and how their life stories took place.

## 5.2 Emplacement: Earning Acceptance

Success stories of emplacement despite more or less unwelcoming or unfavourable circumstances ran like an unbroken thread through informants' life stories. Emplacement was a matter of agency. Analysis showed how emplacement happened when one 'fought for' or 'earned' acceptance into a wider (Austrian, Viennese) society. Not every one of the informants narrated stories of discrimination, but all, explicitly or implicitly, narrated ways in which they

‘proved themselves’. Karla and Jakov both stated how they felt discriminated against only once or never in their lives,<sup>32</sup> but both acknowledge this was a very pervasive issue. Karla stated that the reason why she did not have more such experiences, might be:

“because of my complexion, because I don’t look like other foreigners. I believe that foreigners who are a little bit darker have many more, not to say issues, but that they come up against such things every day” (Karla 2023).

Jakov shared how he sensed a need to prove himself, that he could be trusted. He connected the ease with which he emplaced himself at his working place with the open-mindedness of his profession, which he witnessed in the context of himself and other colleagues:

“I am not sure, but I do have a feeling (exhales) that sometimes we have to prove ourselves. So that someone notices – okay, I can trust him. But I think once this trust is established, (...) I think they don’t mind what my name is. (...) [To prove oneself means] to be proactive in things (...) I was looking to act differently [than others in my work], to be proactive, to help them if some mistake was made. And I think they grew fond of me in this way, and that my character suits them. (...) I think it is different here [in my profession]. I think that we are very open and accepting. (...) We had one colleague who transitioned, and she was accepted, that’s why I think our profession, that people are more open here, than, might be stupid to say, but at a construction site. If a man came [to work] a week later as a woman, I don’t think this would be easy for them. Or in the police or wherever. (...) That’s why I think that my profession is open for such things, and different cultures, and so on” (Jakov 2022).

---

<sup>32</sup> While Jakov shared how he never experienced discrimination, Karla recollected how she felt discriminated against only once when she was a child, in a public transport scene where she and her sibling were driving without tickets, discussing in Croatian how to escape ticket control, and a person yelled insults at them when they heard them speak Croatian.

While narrations of being welcome to a new community were pervasive in most informants' narratives, difficult times, less welcoming, and discriminatory environments were addressed as well. An instance of discrimination Helena described was in her neighbourhood, when she was living further away from the Viennese centre, in a district where she and Jakov say, many people were working-class, poorly educated, a district with a lot of "social issues" and where there was a high number of voters for the right-wing Freedom Party of Austria, FPÖ.<sup>33</sup> Helena mentioned how this was one of the incentives to move away from the city's periphery to the centre. She narrated experiences from the period of living in this periphery, especially the story of one neighbour. This neighbour never wanted to say hello when passing Helena in the neighbourhood until one day when they encountered each other in the building. The woman started asking questions about how Helena and her family would be able to take care of their children, considering that Helena was pregnant. Helena's neighbour assumed that Helena's whole extended family "lived in one apartment (...) as it is with foreigners". Helena told this person off, saying this was not the case only with foreigners, but with Austrians as well, and that this was "none of her business" in any case. Helena mentioned how after her child's birth they played with other children in the building, and how eventually "[the neighbours] accepted us because we were different foreigners. We were the foreigners whom they liked" (Helena 2022). This was a story that showed quite vividly the path of proving oneself as 'better than expected' and earning acceptance.

Another similar story was of Helena's family's 'chosen Viennese family' – the three grandmas who lived in the same building where her parents rented a flat when they moved to Vienna. This was a story of how a building that never admitted foreigners before, started to do differently, and the role Helena's parents played in this turn of events:

---

<sup>33</sup> The Freedom Party of Austria, Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs.

“We lived in a building where there were three grannies. One of them was my godmother, she helped a lot to my mom and dad when they came in the 70s. They learned a lot of German with her, and whatever they needed, they always went to her. When she found out my mom was pregnant, she wanted to be and eventually became my godmother. (...) I learned with them a lot, they help me with German where mom and dad couldn’t. (...) Mom and dad were the first foreigners in the building. The manager of the building was together with my godmother, and he didn’t want foreigners in the building, but he was looking for a building caretaker. (...) So, he took them temporarily, but wouldn’t even say hi to them because they were foreigners. Mom and dad said that the building was a mess, and they were fixing it. One day my godmother, she was very open-minded, she asked my dad if he could fix something in their apartment. So, he [the manager] was really very much against foreigners (...) but he shook my dad’s hand then and said thank you. And since then, he accepted them, and started admitting other foreigners to the building” (Helena 2022).

As could be seen in Helena’s two narrations, stories of discrimination were accompanied by narrations of succeeding in overcoming prejudice and stereotypes. These narratives, as well as narratives of strife and difficulties in life, included almost as a rule tropes of being welcomed and taken into a community well, i.e., the trope of acceptance. Spaces of emplacement were described and compared by their welcoming characteristics. Sometimes being poorly accepted in a space was justified by age – usually in cases of school bullying by classmates who hit puberty. Other times, the unwelcoming environment was addressed by the informants themselves – they ‘proved their worth’ and ‘earned acceptance’. Here we talk of symbolic and social boundaries, that is, of a process of crossing, or trying to cross symbolic and social boundaries and being welcomed ‘inside the borders’. The following sections show how emplacement operated in different environments: in language acquisition, at school, and work.

### 5.2.1. German and Croatian language acquisition

Language acquisition could be considered a way of belonging that was among the most important to the informants – both in the context of spaces of displacement and emplacement. When informants talked about themselves, learning German was talked about the most. Petra and Karla both mentioned how they first used English to communicate, but soon switched to German. Being immersed in a German-speaking environment and with the help of engaged teachers and schoolmates, an engaged community, they all acquired skills in speaking German very quickly, in a period of a couple of months. Karla’s mother insisted her children be enrolled in continuing classes, and not with younger generations, despite their lack of German skills, saying that this was “out of the question, they should continue where they left off (...) and in case they failed, they would fail class but at least wouldn’t repeat [from the start]”:

“And so it was. But thank God, all of us were great. In the first semester, we weren’t graded but in the second we already had grades. We went through it all very well and learned German quickly. (...) [At first, one of our aunts] translated all the books for us. (...) I have to say they took me in very well [at school]. German teacher told me, it’s no problem, write it in English. (laughter) It was so funny – I was writing German in English. (laughter) And I have to say they took me in well, I never felt that I was a foreigner, that I was unwanted. They were very interested in me. And after three months approximately, I started speaking German. Everyone [classmates] looked at me, hey Karla, you are speaking German! (...) Of course, I made a lot of mistakes, but I just started talking, I didn’t care. And I asked them [classmates] to correct me if I make a mistake, so that I wouldn’t learn wrong. This one friend, she was always by my side, she taught me a lot. And I taught her a little bit of Croatian as well” (Karla 2023).

While Karla taught her classmates Croatian, Lana and Jana both narrated how they themselves simultaneously learned German and Croatian – the former in the public sphere of education, and the latter in the private sphere of the family home. Lana mentioned how they did not speak German at home, but that she picked up a lot of the language through television and animated movies, and that later on there were no issues in school with her language skills.

Helena said how her mother, who spoke German better than Helena's father, taught her German from an early age, and so well that "many even today say that they cannot believe I have anything to do with Croatia when I speak. They always think I am Austrian" (Helena 2022). To further develop this division between public and private language use, Helena said how she was taught by her mother to always speak German when in public or essentially anywhere but home, especially if there was an Austrian person present, out of respect, and that it was "simply repulsive" to do any differently.

Antea learned German partly in language schools and partly being immersed in everyday situations with colleagues who didn't speak English. Talking of Viennese Croatian organisations in general, Antea narrated a fear of forgetting the Croatian language, touching upon classism, class difference and whom language knowledge loss might be expected of:

"It gives me the creeps, it was actually my biggest nightmare, and it still is – I believe I forgot a good part of Croatian. Really, I mean, I have books here and I force myself, I need to read. But when I hear how people speak, you know, educated people, I am not talking of cleaning ladies here, from them you would expect so. But people in some position, that is really (makes a sound of disapproval). (...) I mean, okay, not a big deal, but then don't work in a cultural institution" (Antea 2023).

Teaching their children Croatian seemed to have been especially important for informants. Both Petra and Helena said how they struggled in teaching their children Croatian. While

Helena's two older children spoke Croatian, her youngest child, like Petra's, understood but usually answered in German. Both mothers mentioned how insisting on Croatian was difficult because children were surrounded by German language from kindergarten onwards in the public sphere of their lives. Petra further narrated how her efforts to teach her child Croatian sometimes produced conflict with the child's father:

"I have a child and I am trying to teach them Croatian. Although this is quite hard for the child, because their father is Austrian, and everything is in German except this Croatian school.<sup>34</sup> At home I try, but they respond to me in German. (...) With their father, the child speaks only German. And it even bothers him when I speak to the child, and he doesn't understand. It is not so simple then. We aren't together that often, but when we are it is always a little uncomfortable. (...) Because he doesn't understand, and then he doesn't want us to [talk in Croatian]. But I don't talk with the child because I want to say something he should not know, but simply for the child to hear Croatian. But it bothers him. Every person is different, and this is him, yes. I mean, it doesn't bother me, but it is uncomfortable because it bothers him" (Petra 2022).

Petra expressed persistence in her efforts for the child's Croatian language education and shared how she already planned, although nothing was yet set in stone, to spend more time in Croatia with the child, either through organised youth events or by investing in real estate, so that language acquisition would go easier:

"I should go [to Croatia] more often because of my child. I am even thinking of buying an apartment somewhere on the coast, but I can't decide between Trieste and Rijeka (laughter) On the one hand, maybe Rijeka because then my child would hear Croatian

---

<sup>34</sup> Here Petra referred to a Croatian language school which her child was attending. The interview with Petra was done in the lobby of this school due to her availability to meet only at that time for the interview.

more often, but my soul is more for Trieste because it all seems more easy-going there, in Italy. (...) That is some kind of a goal [to visit Croatia more often because of the child]. I even thought of enrolling them on a camp, a sports camp or anything, anywhere... I am a little helpless there and not sure where to find something like that, where they would simply be with Croatian children (...), it doesn't matter, just so that they hear Croatian. And to maybe find some friends also" (Petra 2022).

Here, we can see how language use could turn symbolic into social boundaries – the dynamic in raising a child as bilingual could produce conflict, despite it being done to expand the child's friendship networks. Karla told how she and her husband managed to get both of their children to talk in Croatian at home. She mentioned a drawing where her child drew their family, and how the father was depicted with a speech bubble saying, "Speak Croatian!". Karla added how her children had friends in Croatia where they spend their summers, and how this might have been an incentive to learn the language as well.

She emphasised how teaching their children Croatian, "their mother language", was very important to her and her husband: "Although, what is a mother language? They are born in Vienna. But the older child says, I am a Croat". In a short story about their friends whose children understand, but don't speak Serbian, she explained the importance of learning the language – the importance lay in the ability to communicate with family members who did not speak German well, grandparents for example.

Jana, who spent her early childhood in Germany and then moved with her family to the Croatian coast, told a story about the Croatian language and symbolic and social boundaries that first emerged in the school environment. Emphasising a very welcoming atmosphere in Germany and the town on the Croatian coast where they settled temporarily, she spoke of the town where her family settled permanently as "a little different". This was a place she spoke



of as “home” but mentioned they had “a rough start”. Upon moving from Germany to Croatia, Jana and her sibling spoke Croatian differently than others, which prompted bullying in school. She told how they both shook this prejudice off, inviting their classmates to get to know them better before judging them for their speech.

Helena talked of negative experiences connected to Croatian language acquisition at work in Vienna, connected to her supervisor and clients. Her supervisor asserted a policy where Helena was not allowed to speak Croatian to clients. During the interview, Helena rhetorically asked, what would be the difference between German, English, and Croatian, if the goal was to help a client. As for clients, she shared a story of one who inquired if Helena knew German at all, considering her last name. In addressing such issues, Helena said to have changed over the years:

“I have to say that when I got children, I changed and looked after myself more, so that I am well, and not that others necessarily like me. (...) And they [work colleagues, Austrians] always ask me (...) and now, since the beginning [of working at a new post], I say that my husband’s and my roots are from Croatia. So now they [acknowledge, respect] me more. Just today, one colleague asked, where is Osijek, our Croat will explain. (...) And they always tease me about who I will cheer for [in football]. So, I tell them, of course, for Croatia, my heart always beats there in football. (laughter)” (Helena 2022).

### 5.2.2. School environment

Helena argued that having bad education and “an -ić last name”<sup>35</sup> left an “imprint” on a person:

---

<sup>35</sup> This would be a way to presume one was of ex-Yugoslav descent since many have the distinct -ić suffix.

“I say, an -ić last name and on top of that bad school. It is impossible to achieve what you want. But if you always fight for better education and so on... [there is a chance]”<sup>36</sup> (Helena 2022).

A story Helena and Jakov told in a dialogue showed how discrimination and establishing networks were connected. Jakov said that he “always had more friends from the Balkans than Austrians”, reasoning this with his environment. He went to a Hauptschule type of high school and went out more in “our [meaning ex-Yugoslav] places”. Helena and Jakov explained in a dialogue how schooling was segregated when they were children, and how their parents might not have had this information at their disposal:

“There was Hauptschule, Mittelschule, and Gymnasium. Švabos<sup>37</sup> went to Gymnasiums, in Mittelschule it was mixed, and in Hauptschule it was all foreigners and Švabos who really knew nothing. (...) If you had top grades, you were for Gymnasium, a few average grades, then Mittelschule, and all below – Hauptschule. And so, the children were concentrated, those from foreigners who didn’t know German well or didn’t know how to help their children, or some Austrians who didn’t take an interest in their children. (...) Later on, they [the state] said no, and now there are only Mittelschule and Gymnasium. And they are discussing merging them, which I am definitely for” (Helena 2022).

---

<sup>36</sup> While Jakov mentioned in this dialogue that he never experienced such a thing, Helena tells him that is because he is a man: “Men always have it easier than women” (Helena 2022). He agrees this might be a possible reason and continues to say how although he has not experienced outright discrimination as she did, he did have a feeling he needed to prove himself often. This is elaborated on elsewhere in this analysis.

<sup>37</sup> This is one of the very few occasions in which Helena uses the word ‘Švabo’, a derogatory term meaning a German-speaking person in an ex-Yugoslav context. Its ‘pair’ would be ‘Yugo’, used for ex-Yugoslavs in Germany and Austria, and ‘Tschusch’ and ‘Tschuxl’ which could have a wider use than for ex-Yugoslavs. Because the terms Švabo-Yugo were not used on more than a few occasions in total, and not in all 8 interviews, I did not include this as a significant part of the discussion.

“But I think my parents didn’t know of the difference. (...) They might have put me to school there because it was close to the apartment, maybe they heard it was a good school from someone. And so, I ended up in a Hauptschule. But my grades were great. That was the reason why I planned to go to university, but it all turned out differently in the end” (Jakov 2022).

Lana expressed her surprise by a similar situation in her schooling experience – “wherever I went to school, there was not one Austrian, we were all somehow either us [meaning ex-Yugoslavs] or [people] from Turkey, Romania... no one was (laughter) Austrian”. Helena shared how in the gymnasium she attended, her classmates were children of wealthy, upper-class families. These were children of politicians, musicians, and she and her cousin were “the only foreigners” in class. Besides one professor who showed interest in her and in learning Croatian, a professor she remembered fondly, with others “you could feel that we were foreigners”. Professors would tell both Helena and her mother that “nothing would ever come of me [Helena], that it would be better to stop schooling”. Her mother was demanding Helena finish her schooling, so Helena finished high school, enrolled a college afterwards, and found employment in her profession. Karla told a similar story about her younger child’s school experiences. As in Helena’s story, the teacher, their statements, and behaviour were key issues:

“This teacher is a disaster. (...) I am not sure if she has an issue, but I wouldn’t say it is something connected to foreigners. It’s just that in her class there are many foreigners, many low-achieving pupils, not speaking German well. And the teacher is very strict, everything has to be perfect for her. (...) She used to say awful things to the class. She would tell them how they were the worst class she ever had, I mean, *this is fourth grade of primary school*. These children are 9 years old, and she is telling them such stuff. (...) I have a feeling this teacher is dissatisfied with herself rather than having something against foreigners. But we had a conversation with her because our younger

child already started crying. (...) The teacher told them that she is very disappointed and asked how the child even considers going to the gymnasium, that they had to know everything by now. (...) I told the teacher, *but you are their idol!* It is difficult to hear such a thing from you. (...) She just said, I am like that, and I won't change. (pause) But she also said she means well (...) But I'm thinking to myself, *then tell them differently.* (...) The child is afraid of her; all children are afraid of her. (...) But we are hoping all will be well" (Karla 2023).

Petra told another story from school, how she was differently accepted in different schools and towns – in an Austrian village and city. She reasoned this difference in how she was welcomed as a matter of urban and rural settings, and children reaching puberty:

"The city was a catastrophe at first because I didn't have any friends. As much as it was difficult in the village because I came there not knowing the language, but children accepted us. We were never a problem for them, and in the city this was different. At least for me, in my class, no one wanted to have anything to do with me. I was almost always alone, and it was like that for three years. When I changed school, it was better, but in those three years I was a complete outsider, I was new, I had different opinions. I enjoyed talking to professors more than to children because I found what they were talking about nonsensical and boring. And I wasn't suiting them because, I don't know, I wasn't likeable to them. So, it was more difficult because of that. But school as such was never an issue because I was always top of the class. (And why do you think that children were different in those two places?) Because this was a small village, and we were something new to them. They were open-minded and wanted to help us. And this is a bigger city and maybe it was just bad luck that I came to that specific class. (...) We were running, and I had the best time, so I was supposed to get into the team. I just arrived; I was new. For them it was the second, and for me first year. And then they

were angry. So, I gave them my place on purpose, or ran slower because it wasn't important for me. There was just so much more jealousy, as there wasn't in the village. The same as in Croatia, I have never felt jealousy from anyone. But maybe it's also different age (...) such jealousy starting with teenagers. I came to the city when I was 13 years old, so just in time when all this begins" (Petra 2022).

The last story in this section bridges those on school and work – a story of Jana's student visa issues and how she overcame them. Jana explained that to enrol into studies in Vienna she first had to pass exams in German, English, and "general knowledge" at a Croatian university accredited in Vienna, translate her diplomas and other documents, and present financial capabilities to sustain herself in Vienna. She sent all her documents to her prospective university, but her documents got lost:

"I wrote to them [the university] on many occasions, did my documents arrive, I applied, and so on. I think I have those emails to this day. And simply, one day after three months of waiting they told me, we don't have your papers at all. They have never arrived, let alone been processed. So, I packed my bags, came to the university, and put my papers directly in the mailbox. And that's essentially how I moved to Vienna. Because waiting in Croatia, not knowing what's happening... It took a long time to get answers, so I spoke to my parents and told them, it will all be easier if I am there, I can go and ask. This way, it's a long journey. And slowly but surely, I enrolled at the university. I got my Bescheid. (with excitement) There it is! I got a confirmation of enrolment (laughter) to the university. I came to submit my papers and see the city a little bit and then soon after (...) I officially moved to Vienna" (Jana 2023).

### 5.2.3. “Teufelkreis”: Work and Work Permits

Some informants narrated their success stories as success in finding themselves in their professions. Both Jakov and Antea told such stories through seeing themselves as excellent workers, very much cherished in their positions:

“I finished school until 8th grade, and I was a good student. I didn’t find it difficult, and I had great grades. I wanted to go study further, maybe even to university, but a big international company was looking for students when I was in 8th grade. (...) It was a whole new profession, and they accepted me. There were 10 of us [who got accepted], and 800 applied. (...) I had the luck to enter the company, that was somehow – wow! to me (...) I finished [the education] and stayed on, working for them until recently (...) They were very pleased with me (...) I transferred to another company where I am still working. (...) This suits me now and they are pleased with me as well” (Jakov 2022).

“(asking rhetorically) Am I doing what I love, am I appreciated at work? No matter the better pay [at my previous position], I was so unhappy and frustrated because my qualities weren’t appreciated. While, for example, I come to work today – they simply adore me! They bought me this wonderful orchid and a Christmas card. And everyone wrote something nice about me. Not just ‘Alles gute’<sup>38</sup> or ‘Merry Christmas’ but things like, ‘you are our harmony’, ‘we are lucky to have you, you cheer up our weeks’. I cried while I was reading that. Screw the money and expensive gifts when someone writes such a thing. Wow! So, I realised that this is what matters in life, that you are in a place where what you have is appreciated” (Antea 2022).

---

<sup>38</sup> *eng.* “All the best”.

Success in professional life was made more difficult for those with non-Austrian, Croatian citizenships, due to visa requirements before Croatia's accession to the EU.<sup>39</sup> Lana briefly told how she got issued a work permit, which was necessary to finish her practice-requiring education, and then told a story of her parents' work permits, and how these marked her perspective on their lives and what they provided for their children. Her father was a medical worker who got his work permit quite soon because his profession was needed in the labour market. However, Lana focused on the story of her mother, who struggled to get her work permit for a longer time. Her mother was working in a cleaning service and this lack of a working permit was decisive for her mother's lack of workers' rights, such as parental leave. This was a struggle which Lana deeply respected:

“She wasn't allowed to stay at home with me [after birth] because she didn't have her documents [work permit], so her boss said, it's not a problem, but come 2-3 months after birth and bring your child with you. (laughter) (...) So, I was with her at her work all the time. She was hurrying to work and to help me whenever I needed anything. And after a while, I was working together with her (laughter) – I got my little broom, so I cleaned with her. And we got through it somehow. (...) I still have the broom! I don't remember most of it because I was so young, but mom tells me often about it. And I like to hear it because I see how brave and strong she was. That she was able to provide all – to be with me and at work, everything” (Lana 2023).

Jana told how acquiring a visa was a tiresome, difficult, and long-lasting process she wished never to have to go through again. She told how she realised “things can be different” when she was seeking a visa for a job as an acquaintance's work assistant, and how this acquaintance showed her that standing up for oneself was the way to go about:

---

<sup>39</sup> All informants had either Croatian or Austrian citizenship, while the majority had the former.

“This person and this job, they gave me momentum, wind in my back, that things don’t have to go by the rules always. Because one who waits for rules, who waits for luck or justice to happen, they won’t see it. (laughter) For example, in 2010, I was waiting for my visa. Every time I would wait for approx. 10 hours at the magistrate. 7 to 10 hours, never less. And something was always missing, missing, missing. And then one day he came with me. Because he was in fact waiting for my papers so that I could work with him. So, he came with me one day. He didn’t wait to take a number, he just knocked on a door and entered. With an offensive guard he said, (emphasising each word) what – else – do – you – want? The woman stopped; I don’t understand. So, he said, what else do you want from this girl? She brought everything you were looking for. What is missing today? Let me hear before she waits for another 10 hours here for nothing. And she looked at him, (speaking fast) well, I don’t know how much she pays rent. So, he said, she doesn’t pay rent, she lives with me, and he signed. I saw, okay, it can be different. Those that work at the counter and in their offices, they are not gods and can’t determine someone’s fate. You have to put a little effort, raise your voice when necessary” (Petra 2023).

Talking of work permits, Karla touched upon the stereotype that “foreigners don’t want to work”, connecting this prejudice to the process of work permit acquisition – the “Teufelkreis”, a “devil’s circle”, which prompted Karla to acquire Austrian citizenship:

“At the time you could not work without an Arbeitserlaubnis, a work permit. This doesn’t exist anymore because Croatia is in the EU, now you can go wherever, but then you could not. Student jobs, that was mostly moonlighting (...) and if I really wanted a job, I couldn’t have it. It was a big issue. That was the point where I said, okay, I will take Austrian citizenship. Because what? I won’t be returning, I want to stay here, I will take the citizenship. Everything is better. We used to have to go to the magistrate,



submit a request for a visa, and that was getting more and more difficult. (...) A lot of foreigners that wanted to work, couldn't. That was like a Teufelskreis [devil's circle]. As a foreigner, as if you don't want, you know many say, they don't want to work, this and that. *But they couldn't have, you didn't have an opportunity to work*, because you weren't given one. It's a little different now but yes" (Karla 2023).

Unlike Karla, Jakov said he did not want to change his Croatian citizenship to an Austrian "because now there is no use, because Croatia is in the EU. (...) It was more difficult before, but when they entered the EU, then I thought, why would I pay for Austrian citizenship". In this conversation, Helena reflected on the process of acquiring Austrian citizenship – having to pay fees, take a language course, and an exam "about Austrian history, things even some Austrians don't know". She continued to retell a discussion with a neighbour about the parliamentary and presidential voting system injustice and its connection to citizenship. Namely, a person with a non-Austrian citizenship, irrespective of their birthplace and years of permanent Austrian residence, cannot vote in these elections, which Helena considered unjust. In this way, one could view citizenship as a particular symbolic belonging which produces a symbolic boundary, which is then translated into a social boundary when one has no right to vote – in a sense, this is a restriction in one's ways of belonging. Thus, Helena asserted a claim over a way of belonging in Vienna and Austria and a right of crossing symbolic and social boundaries. This claim and right pertained to acquiring equal voting rights despite one's non-Austrian citizenship:

"I just spoke the other day to an Austrian neighbour, and she said, well, if someone was born here, for example, our brother- and sister-in-law, they both have Croatian citizenship, their children as well. And they don't have a right to vote. They were born here as well. Why can't they? And others who grew up here, went to school. If you are here for some years – why don't you have the same right? Without citizenship. (...) For

example, there was an election a year ago or so. In the 15th district, I think they said, something big, like 80% of people cannot vote, because there are so many foreigners. This is complete chaos for me. Our generation is not represented, and the generation after us. (...) For them all [the extended family], the two of us [me and my mother] vote. The two of us vote” (Helena 2022).

Stories of work, work permits, visas, and citizenship bring us to the conclusion of this analysis which showed how agency through success stories of emplacement was at the centre of informants’ narrative biographies. The process of emplacement into the city of Vienna operated in different environments, language acquisition, school, and work, and happened when one ‘fought for’ or ‘earned’ acceptance. While this might be and seemed to be an issue deeply embedded in the capital and urban restructuring of Vienna, an endeavour in exploring these processes and issues is left for future studies.

## 6 Concluding remarks, limitations of the study, and ways forward

Employing theoretical frameworks of migration studies, transnationalism, and identity studies, this thesis examined the dynamic between top-down and bottom-up identity construction and negotiation, i.e., the processes of displacement and emplacement. Through an analysis informed by the historical background of Yugoslav labour migration, the dissolution of Yugoslavia, and post-war migrations, this thesis answered its research questions. This was an examination of identity construction and negotiation – *whether, how, and why political speeches of Croatian nation-state representatives reflected themselves in the everyday lives and experiences of Viennese Croats*. This comparative study analysed and found weak indirect ties within the transnational social field in the context of institutional and everyday discourses on identification, i.e., a mismatch between lived experiences of Viennese Croats and political discourses on their identities concerning the focus one's life story took against the life histories that envelop them. Particularly, what was shown in this thesis was that identity construction took different starting points in their construction and negotiation, and that the two levels of analysis did not refer to one another particularly.

The unity of a national and transnational imagined community with its focus on Croatia as a space of displacement was of key importance for Tuđman's and Plenković's political discourse. Top-down analysis showed that in their political discourses, both Tuđman and Plenković were discursively trying to (re)connect the border-bounded nation-state with its cross-border subjects. Here, an identity of 'diaspora/emigration' in close, unifying connection with 'homeland' was constructed, and a nation and national identity which transcended nation-state borders in order to include their cross-border subjects. A connection between spaces of emplacement and displacement was thus constructed with the emphasis on Croatia as 'homeland', as the space of displacement.

While the eight narrative biographies of Viennese Croats did show a connection between spaces of displacement and emplacement, the point of focus was narrating success stories of emplacement within Vienna. Narrating overcoming struggles in German and Croatian language acquisition, issues in schooling and working environments, informants told of multiple and fluid ways of being and belonging, and of versatile boundary work that was employed in their everyday lives. Informants emphasised their agency in constructing and directing their life stories alongside life histories throughout their narrative biographies. Because of the importance of narrating success stories within the space of emplacement, I would surmise that emplacement might be empirically shown to be a part of the capitalistic and neoliberal logic of urban city environments not exclusive to migrants if one were to focus future research on capital and urban restructuring of cities. This would touch upon the objective Çağlar (2016, 9) saw as crucial for contemporary migration scholarship – “bringing migrants and non-migrants into a common analytical lens as coeval to each other”.

While it could be argued that the two parts of analysis could stand apart, I argue that (1) strict predictions prior to actual analysis were not the framework chosen for this thesis in the first place (i.e., it was exactly through grounded theory approach that the main concepts of this thesis and its findings emerged during analysis), and more importantly (2) putting these two levels of analysis in a comparison allowed arguing a mismatch in the foci of discourses on identity, emphasizing subjects’ agency over governmentality, which was not analysed or compared in a theoretical, methodological, and analytical framework as this one before. Hence, I would consider this as a valid contribution to the existing body of knowledge.

This study had various limitations, and there are multiple ways forward in addressing this and similar research topics. Future research should especially expand on ex-Yugoslavs and ‘people with migrant background’ as its research subjects. This would be of great importance, considering the intertwined character of these groups – their experiences, stories and histories.

While the contribution of this study is in its comparative character, a more thorough comparison could be made in future research – including a comprehensive analysis of legislation, an analysis of the political speeches of Austrian state officials, etc. A study which would further include a more detailed overview of the middle-out level of analysis, i.e., cultural organisations, would be important as well.

This thesis did not aim at a completely particular yet cannot claim a universal argument. However, it should be noted that emplacement as a concept should be possible to translate to different urban contexts. Therefore, this thesis is a comment on the possibility and an encouragement to translate and compare success stories and emplacement in different cities in further research. Finally, I would argue that whatever direction in the expansion of research focus one would take, the final objective should be further exploration of cities' 'overall populations' through the concept of emplacement. This remains an important endeavour in migration studies – theoretically, methodologically, and empirically.

## 7 Appendices

### 7.1 Transcript (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2021)

Poštovani i dragi prijatelji, članice i članovi Savjeta za Hrvate izvan Republike Hrvatske, veliko mi je zadovoljstvo pozdraviti vas i danas na vašem godišnjem sastanku, sastanku na kojem smo se ovaj puta okupili u formi video konferencije, no pandemija kovida 19 primorala nas je da mnoge naše obaveze i naše susrete proteklih 15 – 16 mjeseci organiziramo na ovaj način. Zahvaljujem i državnom tajniku, čelniku našeg Središnjeg Ureda za Hrvate izvan Hrvatske, Zvonku Milasu na organizaciji, ministru Grliću Radmanu također na stalnoj komunikaciji s vama i svim drugim članicama i članovima Vlade koji su u proteklom razdoblju iz svojih nadležnosti promovirali suradnju sa Hrvatima izvan Hrvatske bilo da se radi o onim državama u kojima su Hrvati nacionalna manjina ili su pak konstitutivni narod kao u Bosni i Hercegovini ili je riječ o hrvatskom iseljeništvu. Meni je posebno drago da smo ustanovili ovaj dijalog kao redovitu praksu, prigodu da jednom godišnje rezimiramo sve ono što smo učinili boljim nego što je bilo do sada, da oslušujemo sve što nam vi želite sugerirati da Vlada i sve njene institucije budu još učinkovitije na području razvijanja i jačanja suradnje s Hrvatima izvan Hrvatske. Jako mi je drago da smo jednu od vaših glavnih preporuka, a to je izmjena Zakona o državljanstvu, uvažili, da je taj zakon promijenjen i da s te strane mnogi naši sunarodnjaci mogu lakše stjecati hrvatsko državljanstvo. To je važna poruka povezivanja, osobito Hrvata iz prekooceanskih zemalja gdje je hrvatsko iseljenišтво godinama i desetljećima nastajalo kako bi se mlađe generacije uključile u korpus hrvatskih državljana i na taj način dali svoj doprinos i razvoju domovinu, a i njihovu poveznicu s današnjom Hrvatskom. S druge strane, jako sam zadovoljan i sretan što smo uspostavili mnoge međudržavne komisije ili povjerenstva za pitanja manjina u onim zemljama u kojima su Hrvati nacionalna manjina i gdje nastojimo ojačati programe konkretnog financiranja različitih projekata koji njeguju hrvatski identitet, hrvatski jezik, hrvatsku kulturu, hrvatsku povijest i hrvatsku baštinu. I s te strane posebno zahvaljujem svima vama koji na osobit način dajete doprinos jačanju položaja hrvatske nacionalne manjine u nizu država u našem okruženju. Konačno, Hrvati u Bosni i Hercegovini koji su i konstitutivan narod, koji su i najbrojnija hrvatska zajednica u nekoj od drugih država osim naše domovine Hrvatske su posebno važni i za našu Vladu i za cijeli hrvatski narod i mi tu privrženost potpori Hrvatima u Bosni i Hercegovini kontinuirano i ponavljamo, i dokazujemo, ne samo svesrdnom političkom podrškom koja je temeljno pitanje naše aktivnosti prema Bosni i Hercegovini već isto tako i brojnim projektima koji se provode između Hrvatske i Bosne i Hercegovine, osobito programima suradnje prema Hrvatima u Bosni i Hercegovini, različitim projektima koji su na dnevnom redu. Spomenut ću naša ulaganja u mostarsku bolnicu, ulaganja u Sveučilište u Mostaru, u potporu Hrvatskom Narodnom Kazalištu u Mostaru, ali i brojnim drugim projektima diljem Bosne i Hercegovine, bilo da se radi o teritoriju Federacije Bosne i Hercegovine ili pak o Hrvatima koji su u drugim dijelovima zemlje. Također kada dođe do nekih otvorenih pitanja poput ovoga kojeg smo imali u gradskom vijeću Subotice gdje je bunjevački jezik uvršten kao jedan od službenih jezika, hrvatska država je snažno reagirala – protiv smo svih politika koje vode bilo asimilaciji ili fragmentaciji hrvatskoga naroda u Srbiji, a osobito u Vojvodini i zbog toga ste vidjeli i reakcije i ministra, i svih nadležnih institucija, i tako će biti i u budućnosti. Ono što me posebno veseli, a tu zahvaljujem još jednom državnom tajniku Milasu i njegovim suradnicima, da smo kroz godine koje su iza nas kontinuirano povećavali proračunska sredstva za Središnji Državni Ured, a to znači i za financiranje projekata koji povezuju

Iseljenu Hrvatsku sa Domovinskom Hrvatskom. Nalazimo se u vremenu u kojem su veliki izazovi pred Hrvatskom. Za vas je bitno da vodite računa o onome što će se događati sljedeće 4 godine, a što će ostati svojevrsna ostavština rada naše druge Vlade. Prije svega želim istaknuti dovršetak Pelješkog mosta. Pelješki most omogućit će fizičku povezanost juga Hrvatske sa ostatkom zemlje. Očekuje se, prema najavama izvođača da taj most bude fizički spojen već krajem ljeta ove godine. U ovo doba dogodine ćemo ga i svečano otvoriti zajedno sa svim prilaznim cestama. Također u idućoj godini očekujemo i odluku o ulasku Hrvatske u šengenski prostor, dakle u prvoj polovici 2022. godine, a članstvo Hrvatske u Euro području, Eurozoni očekujemo od 2023. godine. I konačno, jedna odluka koju je naša Vlada donijela protekloga tjedna, a to je odabir o kupnji višenamjenskih borbenih aviona, odabrali smo francuski Rafal. Ti avioni bi trebali doći u Hrvatsku početkom 2024. Dakle, ako pogledamo te četiri točke, imat ćemo riješeno pitanje monetarne stabilnosti, financijske stabilnosti, ekonomske snage kroz članstvo u Euro području, imat ćemo otvoren put u unutar šengenskoga prostora o slobodi kretanja i čuvanju vanjskih granica i Hrvatske i Europske Unije, imat ćemo sigurnost i obranu na razini kakvu nikada prije nismo imali od 2024., a fizičko povezivanje teritorija juga Hrvatske i ostatka zemlje Pelješkim mostom samo po sebi govori o dimenzijama ovog strateškog projekta. Ujedno Vlada je u proteklom razdoblju stala iza hrvatskih radnika, iza hrvatskih poslodavaca, osigurali smo skoro 11 milijardi kuna za plaće skoro 700 000 ljudi, za premoštavanje ove situacije za oko 120 000 poslodavaca, pritom smo zadržali investicijski kreditni rejting, dokazali našu reputaciju na financijskim tržištima, prema agencijama za kreditni rejting, prema međunarodnim organizacijama, a istodobno osigurali iz europskog proračuna sve skupa 25 milijardi eura za idućih 10 godina. To će biti vrijeme razvoja, vrijeme ulaganja i ono što je najvažnije vrijeme obnove, obnove glavnog hrvatskog grada Zagreba nakon teškog potresa koji nas je pogodio u ožujku prošle godine i obnove Banovine nakon potresa koji se dogodio krajem prosinca prošle godine. Ja vam želim ovaj puta svima zahvaliti koji ste dali doprinos za obnovu, bilo da je to financijski ili konkretnim materijalnim sredstvima. Velika solidarnost Hrvata izvan Hrvatske pokazala se još jednom. Mi to izrazito cijenimo i učinit ćemo zajedničke napore da obnovimo i Banovinu i Zagreb. To su najvažnije zadaće pred našom Vladom, Vladom koja je usvojila nacionalnu razvojnu strategiju, Vladom koja je pripremila nacionalni plan oporavka i otpornosti i Vladom koja će napraviti i plan suradnje sa hrvatskim iseljeništvom za razdoblje 2021-2027. Želimo da nam u tom procesu budete i dalje i partneri, i suradnici, a ono što je najvažnije zemljaci, prijatelji, ljudi koji vole Hrvatsku i koji svojim mladim naraštajima gdje god živjeli diljem svijeta prenosite hrvatsku kulturu, ljubav prema domovini, i čuvate nas hrvatski i kršćanski identitet. Stoga vas, i ovoga puta, srdačno pozdravljam, želim vama, vašim prijateljima, vašim obiteljima, svako dobro i očekujem da iduće godine sastanak ponovno bude ovdje u Hrvatskoj, ali fizički gdje ćemo se zajednički okupiti. Hvala, Zvonko, i lijepi pozdrav svima.

## 7.2 Transcript (Vlada Republike Hrvatske 2019)

1 Hvala vam lijepa, gospodine Grbešić, poštovani državni tajnici Milas, poštovani predsjedniče saborskog  
2 odbora, izaslaniče predsjednika Hrvatskog Sabora, gospodine Ljubić, poštovani potpredsjedniče Vlade,  
3 gospodine Božinović, poštovani gradonačelnice Čehok, dragi saborski zastupnici, europska zastupnice, državni  
4 dužnosnici, tajnici, čelnici institucija, predstavnici Hrvata iz Bosne i Hercegovine, iz nama susjednih zemalja  
5 gdje su Hrvati nacionalne manjine, i svih vas članova Savjeta iz drugih zemalja svijeta. Sve vas srdačno  
6 pozdravljam, i drago mi je da smo danas zajedno ovdje u Varaždinu na četvrtom Savjetu koji se odvija u  
7 mandatu ove Vlade. Treći formalno, ali onaj prvi, nulti u Vukovaru, možemo ga tako nazvati, ja ga doživljam  
8 kao da je bio također Savjet zbog toga što ja, nažalost, prošle godine u Šibenik nisam mogao doći, ali došla je  
9 naša Marija Pejčinović, potpredsjednica Vlade tada, u međuvremenu nam je ona postala glavna tajnica Vijeća  
10 Europe, pa evo vidite da radimo na povećanju broja naših ljudi u međunarodnim institucijama. Dopustite da  
11 nevezano od govora koji je jako cjelovit i sadržajan, i prigoda čak evo da i javnost putem medija vidi što sve  
12 radimo za Hrvate izvan Hrvatske, samo kratko se referiram na ovo pitanje gospodina Grbešića o tome dali se  
13 Hrvatska srami svoje dijasporu. Pa ja mislim da je to krivo postavljeno pitanje. Hrvatska je *ponosna* na svoju  
14 dijasporu, *ponosna* na Hrvate u Bosni i Hercegovini, Hrvate u svim državama oko Hrvatske, na Hrvate diljem  
15 svijeta. Činjenica da nas ima zaista u svim krajevima i da mnogi od vas daju doprinos domovini srcem, dušom,  
16 poslovnim aktivnostima, kulturnim, umjetničkim, sportskim, bilo kojim drugim, u biti, predstavlja jedno veliko  
17 jedinstvo hrvatskoga naroda i zajedništva Iseljene i Domovinske Hrvatske. Ako postoji jedna od ključnih poruka  
18 prvog predsjednika Tuđmana, onda je upravo to *ta* poruka. A budući da mi vodimo, evo, i vladajuću stranku, a i  
19 državu u mnogim aspektima na najvažnijim elementima njegove doktrine, onda ta vrsta zajedništva  
20 međusobnog uvažavanja, respekta, je visoko na listi prioriteta ove Vlade. I činjenica da, evo, i Božinović i ja  
21 smo bili 2010. u Ministarstvu vanjskih poslova tada kad se kretalo uopće u promišljanje da se iz jednoga  
22 segmenta uprave tada, ili odjela čak, na razini MVP-a, stvori ovaj ured, da se stvori ovaj Savjet, dakle taj  
23 zakonodavni okvir. Ljudi koji danas vode Hrvatsku na najodgovornijim dužnostima su vam *svi* bili apsolutno za  
24 to da se *emancipira* odnos Hrvatske i Hrvata izvan Hrvatske, a to vidimo i ovim multiresornim pristupom svih  
25 koji su ovdje danas i koji će, siguran sam, u raspravama sa vama o tome dati dodatan doprinos. Tako da je to  
26 važno da svi znamo na početku, a svi mi koji smo često i na putovanjima, uglavnom jako kratkim, u brojnim  
27 zemljama, praktički *nikada* ne propuštamo bilo koji od tih trenutaka da ne odvojimo jedno vrijeme za susret sa  
28 našim ljudima gdje god bili. Evo, zadnji je bio Prag, prije pet dana, čini mi se, gdje smo razgovarali sa našim  
29 Hrvatima u Češkoj, Moravskim Hrvatima koji su tamo više od 500 godina, i oduševljenje s kojim oni baštine i  
30 njeguju i hrvatski jezik, i kulturu, i identitet, a i u teškim uvjetima, osobito nakon '45., i kako su se očuvali,  
31 pokazuje koliko je *snažna* ta hrvatska *loza* i, i privrženost domovini. No, da se vratim na ono što je po nama  
32 izrazito važno, a to je važnost ovoga Savjeta. Dakle, Savjet u svojim godišnjim susretima je za nas platforma  
33 gdje moramo dobro oslušnuti vaše preporuke, konstatirati ono što radimo dobro, vidjeti što možemo raditi bolje,  
34 definirati neke teme na kojima vi ispravno očekujete veću susretljivost, brzinu i učinkovitost institucija. Nama  
35 je, evo, i u krajnjoj liniji moj šef kabineta Zvonko Frka Petešić je jedan od Hrvata izvan Hrvatske koji se rodio u  
36 Parizu, i koji meni svaki dan, ako hoćete, rasvjetljava činjenicu da moramo vodit računa o svim Hrvatima gdje  
37 god živjeli. I ta činjenica da takvih ljudi ima dosta i po hrvatskih institucijama, a spomenuli ste i neke koji su u  
38 biznisu ili u sportu koji su se javili, nama je uvijek onaj ključni element uvažavanja hrvatskog iseljeničtva,



zaštite prava, nastojanja da se, teško je reći zaustaviti, ali da se ipak stvore bolji uvjeti u domovini, pa da ta  
 sloboda kretanja, jer ja nju tako zovem, ovo što danas doživljavamo nije iseljavanje kao što su vaši preci  
 odlazili, bilo početkom 20. stoljeća nakon Prvog svjetskog rata, nakon Drugog 60-ih, neki eventualno početkom  
 90ih, ovo što danas imamo je jedan proces korištenja četiri slobode, odnosno one prve i najvažnije, to je sloboda  
 kretanja ljudi i radnika u Europskoj Uniji, koja je jednostavno omogućila da više nema kvota, nema radnih  
 dozvola, s našim kvalifikacijama vi ste jednakopravni na tržištu rada bilo koje članice Europske Unije, čak i  
 Austrije za koji mjesec, koja je jedina zadržala još određene limitacije. Tako da, ovaj proces kojeg smo, kojem  
 smo svjedoci zadnjih par godina se ne može usporediti sa onim valovima klasičnog iseljavanja u prošlosti. No,  
*naš je cilj* da mi sa svojim aktivnostima stvorimo i poticajne uvjete i za *povratak* dijela naših iseljenika, onih  
 koji žele se vratiti u Hrvatsku i dati svoj doprinos ovdje domovini. Želim prije svega zahvaliti državnom tajniku  
 Milasu. Tu ću još izdvojiti i našu Zdravku Bušić koja je bila jedna od prvih suradnica predsjednika Tuđmana,  
 koja je državna tajnica u Ministarstvu vanjskih i europskih poslova, na svemu što rade, posebno na aktivnostima  
 koje se odnose za potporu Hrvatima u Bosni i Hercegovini. Ja nijedan put, ja mislim, nisam bio u Bosni i  
 Hercegovini, a bio sam skoro petnaestak puta u mandatu, što je dosta više nego što je bila dosadašnja praksa,  
 evo, Borjana zna. Zdravka i Zvonko su bili praktički sa mnom na svim tim putovanjima. Mi smo povećali  
 podršku projektima Hrvata u Bosni i Hercegovini u našem mandatu za više od 50 posto. Mi smo udvostručili  
 potporu hrvatskim nacionalnim manjinama u susjednim zemljama u odnosu na ranije. Proširili smo pristup  
 financijskoj podršci hrvatskom iseljeništvu osobito u Sjevernoj Americi, Australiji, Europi i drugim  
 prekomorskim zemljama. Protekle tri godine financirali smo 1537 projekata diljem svijeta u vrijednosti 115  
 milijuna kuna. Poboľjšali smo komunikaciju i ovaj strukturirani pristup je izrazito važan, i stoga je i  
 predsjednica bila jučer ovdje, i stoga sam ja danas ovdje, i dolazit ćemo i u budućnosti jer smatramo da je  
 ključno čuti poruke Savjeta i izaći u susret koliko god možemo. Kad je riječ o Bosni i Hercegovini, tu želim  
 istaknuti nekoliko temeljnih postavki naše politike. Prvo, Bosna i Hercegovina je za nas *glavna* susjedna država  
 ne samo zbog povijesnih veza, geografskog položaja, nego i zbog činjenice da su Hrvati konstitutivan, i trebaju  
 biti u potpunosti ravnopravan narod u Bosni i Hercegovini, i nadam se da ovo što čitam u današnjim medijima  
 ide u dobrom smjeru u pogledu razgovora između političkih stranaka u Bosni i Hercegovini, prije svega HDZ-a  
 Bosne i Hercegovina i SDA, a odnosi se na promjene izbornoga zakona, da se riješe ove anomalije i da se ne  
 događaju situacije u kojim se preglašavaju Hrvati prigodom izbora u ključna predstavnička tijela Bosne i  
 Hercegovine, jer to nije dobro, to ne dovodi do harmoničnih odnosa među narodima, *niti* do dobrog  
 funkcioniranja institucija. Drugo, mi dajemo zaista bezrezervnu podršku Bosni i Hercegovini na europskom  
 putu, bilo da je riječ o političkoj potpori, bilo da je riječ o stručnoj potpori. Ako postoji jedna zemlja koja je  
 odvjetnik Bosne i Hercegovine u tijelima, primjerice, Europske Unije onda je to Hrvatska. Nitko temu Bosne i  
 Hercegovine ne otvara tako detaljno, uz toliko znanja, uz toliko želje da se pomogne niti toliko često. Da je mi  
 ne otvaramo toliko, drugi je ne bi otvorili. Dakle, to svi skupa morate bit svjesni. To su činjenice. I to ćemo  
 raditi i u budućnosti. Drugo, mi smo, naravno, i supotpisnik Daytonškoga, Daytonsko-pariškoga mirovnoga  
 sporazuma, imamo obveze i po tom dokumentu, i pratimo što se radi u okviru upravljačkog vijeća za provedbu  
 mira koja će se sastati, koliko znam, u prosincu ove godine u Sarajevu, i važno je i da sa drugim akterima u  
 međunarodnoj zajednici pratimo sve teme koje se odnose i na stabilnost, i na sigurnost, i na funkcioniranje  
 Bosne i Hercegovine. Također, imali smo i zajedničku sjednicu Vlada 2017. Stavili na stol sve teme, teme  
 apsolutno svih resora, tu je samo dio resora danas, i te se stvari provode. Gradimo mostove na Savi, Svilaj,

79 Gradiška, nešto što prije nije postojalo – jačanje koridora 5C, povezivanje ovoga prostora posavskoga sa  
 80 Republikom Hrvatskom. Činjenica da smo inzistirali da u Europski Parlament uđe i Željana Zovko kao  
 81 predstavnica Hrvata iz Bosne i Hercegovine je možda najbitnija i najsnažnija poruka jer danas realno gledajući  
 82 najviše rangirana u bilo kojem međunarodnoj instituciji da predstavlja interes Hrvata u Bosni i Hercegovini je  
 83 Željana. Ja ne znam ima li tko drugi da će na angažiraniji način staviti teme koje su relevantne za Hrvate u  
 84 Bosni i Hercegovini na raspravu u međunarodnim organizacijama, u ovom konkretnom slučaju Europskoga  
 85 Parlamenta, i tu poruku je važno da shvatite i razumijete svi, to nije samo poruka Hrvatima u „BiH“ nego uopće.  
 86 Što se tiče projekata koje smo dosada realizirali, zaista ih ima puno. One su i u dogovoru sa predstavnicima  
 87 lokalnih vlasti, predstavnicima katoličke crkve u Bosni i Hercegovini, grade se škole, domovi zdravlja, ceste,  
 88 kulturni centri, studentski domovi, domovi za starije, obnavlja se kulturna i spomenička baština, podržavamo  
 89 mlade, djecu s poteškoćama u razvoju, stipendije. Hrvatska je otvorila u našem mandatu konzulate u Vitezu i  
 90 Livnu, otvorili smo predstavništva Hrvatske Gospodarske Komore u Sarajevu i Mostaru nakon 15 godina,  
 91 otvorili zrakoplovnu liniju Mostar – Zagreb, ponovo su otvorena dopisništva Hrvatske Radio Televizije  
 92 Sarajevo i Mostar, podupiremo sustavno i Sveučilište u Mostaru i Hrvatsko Narodno Kazalište u Mostaru, te  
 93 dvije točke su na sjednici Vlade idući tjedan. Posebno važno, katkada i uz kritike na unutarnjem planu, i  
 94 Sveučilišnu Kliničku Bolnicu Mostar. Smatramo da je to ključno. Dakle, te tri teme—obrazovanje, kultura,  
 95 zdravlje—gotovo identitetska, *korijenska* pitanja o kojima ćemo uvijek voditi računa. Obnavljaju se kuće Hrvata  
 96 povratnika u Bosni i Hercegovini. Posebno mi je drago da smo nedavno pronašli dodatna sredstva i za Katolički  
 97 Školski Centar u Bihaću uz financiranje ovoga Centra u Banja Luci. Dakle, vodimo računa i o onim dijelovima  
 98 Bosne i Hercegovine gdje je Hrvata *malo* u odnosu na druge ali *šaljemo poruku*. Bez obzira što je, recimo, u  
 99 Bihaću više od 80 posto djece su Bošnjaci koji idu u tu školu, u suradnji sa biskupom Komadicom inzistirali  
 100 smo i na tom projektu. To vam govorim samo kao jedan primjer. Ne treba zaboraviti ni otvaranje šestoga bloka  
 101 Hrvatske Bolnice fra Mato Nikolić u Novoj Biljoj. To je simbol hrvatskoga zajedništva. Zdravka je tamo bila i u  
 102 puno težim vremenima kada je ta bolnica značila opstanak Hrvata u središnjoj Bosni i Hercegovini. Dali smo  
 103 poseban prostor da se i u audiovizualnom sektoru bolje čuje i hrvatski jezik i hrvatski glas u Bosni i  
 104 Hercegovini, mislim da je to jako važno. Riješili smo kroz Zakon o hrvatskim braniteljima i određene, što  
 105 praznine, što nepravde prema pripadnicima Hrvatskog Vijeća Obrane koji su branili Hrvatsku, budimo sasvim  
 106 jasni, u vrijeme Domovinskog rata. Mislim da su to poruke koje govore o postignućima. Sigurno možemo još  
 107 toga puno napraviti, ali već ovo što smo učinili u ove tri godine i koji dan mandata je važno. Kad je riječ o  
 108 hrvatskim nacionalnim manjinama u susjednim zemljama, mi smo u tri godine, dakle, udvostručili financijska  
 109 sredstva za programe i pripadnike hrvatske nacionalne manjine, reaktivirali smo mješovite međuvladine odbore  
 110 sa svim zemljama, održane su prošle godine sjednice s Mađarskom, Srbijom, Sjevernom Makedonijom, Crnom  
 111 Gorom. Ove godine su održane sjednice, dodatne, i sa Makedonijom, i sa Srbijom, i sa Mađarskom što je  
 112 također posebno važno. Pokrenuta je inicijativa međuvladinog Odbora za hrvatsko-češke odnose, slična je  
 113 inicijativa sa Slovačkom. I mi se vodimo onim najbitnijim načelom, načelom uzajamnosti, mislim da je ono  
 114 izrazito važno. Vi sami znate da je Hrvatska jedna od zemalja koja u smislu zastupljenosti nacionalnih manjina  
 115 u najvišem predstavničkom tijelu, a to je Hrvatski Sabor ima izrazito visoke standarde, standarde koje smo  
 116 definirali još davno, Ustavnim Zakonom, i ta činjenica da imamo čak *osam* predstavnika nacionalnih manjina u  
 117 Hrvatskom Saboru, jedan standard koji nam daje za pravo da načelo uzajamnosti bude jedno od temeljnih načela  
 118 kada govorimo o zemljama u našem susjedstvu, osobito onima gdje ima Hrvata i hrvatske nacionalne manjine.

119 Također, posebno na tom tragu, želimo raditi na pitanju statusa Hrvata u Sloveniji, njih je u Sloveniji oko 50  
 120 000 i tu bismo željeli napraviti iskorake. O tome smo i razgovarali sa predstavnikom hrvatske manjine u  
 121 Sloveniji. Mi podržavamo i medije, tjednike hrvatske nacionalne manjine: Hrvatski Tjednik u Mađarskoj,  
 122 Hrvatske Novine u Austriji, Hrvatsku Riječ u Srbiji, Radio Dux u Crnoj Gori. Sve ćemo to nastaviti raditi. Što  
 123 se tiče Hrvata u Srbiji, vodimo stalni dijalog, vrlo često su kod mene i gospodin Žigmanov i gospoda Vojnić.  
 124 Mislim da je to tema o kojoj moramo *posebno voditi računa, sa posebnim obzirom*. Sve što se događa u  
 125 Hrvatskoj, pa i u pogledu srpske manjine u Hrvatskoj, ima *trenutne* refleksije na položaj Hrvata u Srbiji. *Onaj*  
 126 *tko to ne razumije, puno ne razumije*. Dakle, to je jako važno da razumijete našu politiku i njene refleksije  
 127 prema položaju hrvatske manjine koja, evo, od negdje početka 70-ih kad je tamo bilo oko 200 000 Hrvata,  
 128 mislim da smo sada na 57, ako se ja dobro sjećam, i to znači da moramo pažljivo voditi računa o Hrvatima u  
 129 Srbiji, govoriti i o tome kako da se hrvatski jezik uči u sveučilištima, u Novom Sadu se osniva lektorat  
 130 hrvatskoga jezika, tiskanje udžbenika na hrvatskome jeziku, obnova kuće bana Jelačića Petrovaradin,  
 131 podupiranje strateških projekata, dakle, rekao sam već, novinsko-izdavačke ustanove Novinska Riječ u Subotici,  
 132 krenuli smo u projekt izgradnje Hrvatske Kuće u Subotici, dakle, cijeli financijski plan je dogovoren sa  
 133 Ministarstvom financija – možda ne toliko sa vašom upravom, gospodine Kutleša, ali vode računa Zdravko i  
 134 Ivana što se tiče proračuna. Kad je riječ o hrvatskom iseljeništvu, tu je ključno pitanje očuvanja identiteta.  
 135 Dakle, najbolji čuvar identiteta ste vi sami. Da vi to nemate u sebi, sve ove institucionalni naponi bi bili tanani.  
 136 Veliku nam podršku daju naše katoličke misije, veliku nam podršku znači i *dosta razgranata mreža*  
 137 diplomatskih misija i konzularnih ureda. Slažem se, nismo pokrili cijeli svijet, ali ja vas molim da tu malo imate,  
 138 a vi ste si ljudi koji se probijaju u okolnostima gdje se treba znat probit, univerzalnu prisutnost svih zemalja  
 139 svijeta danas si može dopustiti 3-4 velike globalne sile. Budimo realni. Tu morate bit realni. Mi nismo ni  
 140 Sjedinjene Američke Države, niti Francuska, niti Ujedinjena Kraljevina, niti Rusija, niti Njemačka. Samo oni  
 141 imaju dovoljno snage da imaju neposredno svoju informaciju iz svih krajeva svijeta. Svi mi ostali, a naročito  
 142 zemlja poput nas koja ima 4 miliona ljudi, mora se realno dimenzionirati, i mogu vam reć, ja mislim kad bi se  
 143 napravila dobra komparativna analiza, Davore mi imamo negdje, ja mislim, koliko Zdravka, 80-ak što  
 144 veleposlanstava, generalnih konzulata, multilateralnih misija, *to nije malo*. Dakle, vodite računa, *to nije malo*.  
 145 Slažem se, ako ste vi bili u Peruu, sigurno da nisu zadovoljni, ali nije baš uvijek toliko lako pokriti sve zemlje  
 146 svijeta. Vodite računa da je naša diplomatska mreža, tu znam malo više o tome jer sam proveo dosta godina u  
 147 Ministarstvu [vanjskih poslova], jedna od *temeljnih načela* otvaranja naših diplomatskih misija *upravo bio*  
 148 *kriterij gdje ima Hrvata*. To je bila jedna od najbitnijih, najbitnijih kriterija. Naravno jedan određeni kritični  
 149 broj. *To je važno*. Ostalo je možda još par zemalja gdje bi bilo dobro da nešto radimo, mislim da tu postoji  
 150 negdje i počasni konzulati koji su neke premosnice, ali realno kad se to sagleda uz sve uvažavanje, nije to, nije  
 151 to loše. Dapače, ja mislim da je, da je dosta dobro. Što se tiče aktivnosti koje mi se čine važnima za ovaj  
 152 element, tu želim pohvaliti ovu manifestaciju koja se odnosi na Hrvatske Svjetske Igre. Mislim da je to *jako*  
 153 lijepa manifestacija, sudjelovali smo na, ja sam barem bio na ovoj koja je bila u Zagrebu, kad je bilo, prije 2  
 154 godine—(Točno, 2017.)—prije dvije godine, koja je bila sjajna. Preko 30 naših mladih ljudi odnosno puno naših  
 155 ljudi iz preko 30 zemalja svijeta, i to vam je jedan od sjajnih osjećaja gdje vidite zaista motiv generacija koje su  
 156 možda i četvrta i peta već danas, i to je jedan od najentuzijastičnijih trenutaka koje sam ja vidio u cijelom  
 157 mandatu ove Vlade, moram priznat, i to je predivno da će biti još jedna takva iduće godine. Ova ljetna škola  
 158 Domovina, mene je Zvonko zvao par put ovoga ljeta, on je bio još oduševljeniji nego ja dok se sve to odvijalo

159 jer je bio s našim ljudima ovoga ljeta, bilo bi dobro da brojevi tih mladih koji kroz to će proći bude što veći. Što  
 160 veći, jer ovaj jedan njihov krug koji je bio je dobar, ali moramo napraviti mehanizme, programe, koji će  
 161 omogućiti financijski da što više ljudi to prođe. Dobro je da Vlada naša sudjeluje i u projektu podizanja  
 162 spomenika žrtvama komunizma u Kanadi. Imali smo tu odluku na Vladi. To također govori malo, evo, i u ovoj  
 163 debati koju imamo oko blagdana, što se tiče naših stavova o totalitarnim sustavima, dakle oni su jasni, čvrsti,  
 164 konzistentni, od samoga osnivanja slobodne i demokratske Hrvatske, i tu nema nikakvih dilema. Ja vas molim  
 165 da tu pažljivo slušate ono što je stvarna istina jer uz sve ovo dobro što rade i Hrvatski Svjetski Kongres i naša  
 166 Matica Iseljenika, vi ste nerijetko pod informacijama koje vam nisu baš Bog zna kako provjerene i točne. I to  
 167 apeliram na sve vas da dobro filtrirate ono što čitate na internetu. Nije vam svaki izvor točan, živimo u vremenu  
 168 fejk njuza, laži, dezinformacija, a veliki dio toga usmjeren baš na vas, ne bi li vi imali osjećaj da ovdje nešto baš  
 169 nije dobro ili, ne daj Bože, da ova Hrvatska Vlada, država ili vlast ne vodi računa o dijaspori. To kad pročitate  
 170 negdje, ja vam kažem da 95 % možete računat da je to *nečija namjerna politička manipulacija*. To vam govorim  
 171 sasvim jasno i otvoreno. Imajte velike rezerve prema tome i provjeravajte izvore i autore koji vam to govore,  
 172 kao i one koji hodočaste po raznim skupovima i prikazuju Hrvatskom kakva nije. To je važno da čujete direktno  
 173 od mene. Što se tiče drugih projekata, spomenut ću i naše lektorate koji se osnivaju na brojnim sveučilištima:  
 174 imamo lektore sada u Temišvaru, u Punta Arenasu, u Čileu, u Željeznom u Austriji. Sve su to dobri i veliki  
 175 potezi za učenje hrvatskoga jezika, ne samo od strane Hrvata, nego i državljana tih država gdje su oni osnovani.  
 176 Mi u ovom trenutku imamo nastavu hrvatskog jezika i kulture u 20 država diljem svijeta. Dvadeset je solidno,  
 177 ali može to biti i više, siguran sam da interesa ima i više. Imamo i nove odluke o učiteljima, koordinatorima u  
 178 Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama i Kanadi, a oni već postoje u Australiji. Bez njih nije jednostavno obrazovni  
 179 element, Sanja je tu, Sanja tu si, ti ćeš sigurno nešto govoriti o tom aspektu, a to je dio onoga za što je nadležno  
 180 Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja. Dobar je i projekt Korijeni u kojem sudjeluje 24 škole iz Hrvatske i Bosne i  
 181 Hercegovine, i država u kojima su Hrvati nacionalna manjina. Mislim da i o tome trebamo kazati koju riječ, kao  
 182 i oni koji su iseljenici diljem svijeta, tu će se udvostručiti sredstva, vjerujem, i broj mladih koji će kroz to  
 183 također proći. Ljetna škola Hrvatskog Identiteta u Vukovaru – jako je važno da se naši ljudi u iseljeništvu dobro  
 184 informiraju, naročito nove generacije, o ključnim i najbitnijim trenucima hrvatske recentne povijesti, osobito  
 185 vrijednosti Domovinskoga rata. Spomenuli smo već Zakon o hrvatskom državljanstvu, mislim da je ovaj zakon  
 186 koji je usvojen, prvo, sadržajno u cijelosti odgovorio na ono što smo čuli od vas prije 3 godine. Zahvaljujem  
 187 ministru Božinoviću, njegovim suradnicima, našim kolegama u Saborskom Odboru, koji su imali određene ideje  
 188 gdje smo popravili i još proširili, ja bih rekao, opseg u tom zakonu i, ono što je najbitnije, *olakšali* postupak  
 189 stjecanja državljanstva. Također, Ministarstvo vanjskih i europskih poslova, ono što je najbitnije je da smo  
 190 ubrzali i različite konzularne postupke u pojedinim konzulatima gdje smo utvrdili internim revizijama da je bilo  
 191 i nekih *uskih grla*. *To isto moramo reć*. Dakle, tu zahvaljujem, evo, Zdravki i ministru Grliću koji danas, apropo  
 192 u Berlinu, jer je 30 godina pada Berlinskoga Zida. Dakle, Hrvatska pažljivo prati ove bitne povijesne trenutke i  
 193 tamo smo s našim prijateljima danas gdje i trebamo biti. Tako da će ovaj zakon bitno poboljšati situaciju. Što se  
 194 tiče gospodarstva i općenito aktivnosti, ja sad nemam vremena da vam ponovim što sam Saboru rekao prije  
 195 otprilike mjesec dana. Al ono što je najbitnije, da razumijete kako radimo. Dakle, cilj naše politike je bio da  
 196 budemo otprilike kao i vi u vašim poslovima. Da budemo jedan dobar gospodar. Da trošiš koliko imaš, a da ne  
 197 trošiš na kredit budućih generacija. To je najosnovnije načelo koje je jako važno da ga razumijete. Dakle imamo  
 198 jedan zdravi rast, rast koji nije temeljen na novim zaduženjima, dapače, temeljen je na smanjenju dugova, na

199 poreznom rasterećenju, na administrativnom rasterećenju, na izlasku iz procedure prekomjernog proračunskog  
 200 manjka, nepostojanju makroekonomskih neravnoteža, investicijskom kreditnom rejtingu. Evo, jučer je  
 201 Ministarstvo financija refinanciralo jednu Euro obveznicu koja je bila uzeta prije 10 godina – samo da shvatite  
 202 *Hrvatska prije 10 godina i danas*. Tadašnja je kamata bila preko 6 i nešto posto, jučerašnja je bila 1,2. *Me*  
 203 *razumijete?* Znači, nešto što smo se mogli zadužiti prije 10 godina, morali smo plaćati po više od 6 posto kamate,  
 204 danas mi plaćamo samo malo iznad jedan posto. To vam govori o financijskom kredibilitetu. A tu je vrlo jasna  
 205 poruka da oni koji tu apotekarskom vagonu gledaju kakav je smjer zemlje, što radite, da vide da stvari idu dobro.  
 206 Da stvari idu dobro. Naravno da mogu biti bolje, međutim naš gospodarski rast, koji je u prvih 6 mjeseci bio 3,1  
 207 posto, možda nije rast od 5 posto, ali je puno bolji ovaj od 3,1 bez zaduženja. *On je zdrav*. Ako svi zadužujete,  
 208 imate visok rast, onda na kraju vam to uvijek dođe na naplatu. Tu je ta ključna razlika, tu je ta ključna razlika,  
 209 da ne govorim o europskim fondovima, infrastrukturnim projektima, o povećanju minimalne plaće, mirovina,  
 210 prosječne plaće, svega onoga što smo ostvarili u ove protekle tri godine. Što se tiče međunarodnih postignuća,  
 211 ona su, pa možemo slobodno reći skromno, malo bolja nego ikada do sada. Hrvatska će predsjedati Europskom  
 212 Unijom za doslovno 7 tjedana. Dakle, to je bez ikakve dileme međunarodni i europski izazov bez presedana.  
 213 Inače, u ovom mandatu smo već predsjedali Odborom ministara Vijeća Europe, Srednjoeuropskom Inicijativom,  
 214 Dunavskom Komisijom, imali predsjedanje sa suradnjom Kina plus 16, pa zajedno s Grčkom u Dubrovniku  
 215 prije par mjeseci Kina plus 17, sad predsjedamo strategijom Europske Unije za dunavsku regiju. Rekao sam već,  
 216 Marija je u Vijeću Europe, Dubravka Šujica je potpredsjednica Europske Komisije, vodite računa ona je samo  
 217 druga hrvatska povjerenica u povijesti – ima članica 28, potpredsjednika ima 8, ona je jedna od njih. *Ona je*  
 218 *jedna od njih*. Mogli smo ne imati potpredsjednicu, ali imamo. Dakle, to vam govorim da je naš utjecaj na  
 219 zbivanja na europskoj razini takav, da ono što mi govorimo naročito o temama kojima imamo posebnu  
 220 ekspertizu, evo, ja sam jučer bio u Ženevi na jednom strateškom dijalogu Svjetskoga Gospodarskoga Foruma  
 221 koji u pogledu nevladinih, recimo to tako, međunarodnih organizacija, koja spaja privatni i javni koncept,  
 222 najutjecajnija bez ikakve dileme, bit će 50. Davos u siječnju, dogovorili smo da u Zagreb, kada ćemo svjesno i  
 223 namjerno organizirati sastanak članica Europske Unije na najvišoj razini sa čelnicima država jugoistoka Europe,  
 224 uz ovaj politički samit imamo jednu veliku konferenciju koju će baš zajedno s nama organizirati Svjetski  
 225 Gospodarski Forum i dovesti, ne samo političke lidere, nego i ključne ljude iz poslovnoga svijeta. Sve to vam  
 226 govori da se *ne događa* slučajno. Dakle, to vam nitko od njih ne dolazi zato što nema što raditi ili otići negdje  
 227 drugdje, nego dolazi zato što vidi ideju, vidi smisao, vidi partnere, vidi koncept i razumije što želimo postići.  
 228 Zato je dosta bitno da i vi taj element razumijete. Naš međunarodni položaj danas nije onaj u smislu da, evo  
 229 želimo da postoji država, i da sada onaj sjaj u očima koji ima moj Zvonko, a vi ga svi imate, jer to je jedan  
 230 posebni sjaj ljudi koji žive izvan Hrvatske, i to uvijek vam daje dodatni motiv. Današnja Hrvatska, sa 30 godina  
 231 samostalnosti, neovisnosti, suizgradnje institucija, demokracije, napretka gospodarskog, razvojnog, i  
 232 infrastrukturnog, međunarodnog pozicioniranja, je ozbiljna država koja zna gdje ide, zna gdje pripada, zna koji  
 233 su njeni korijeni, koje su njene vrijednosti i sa, kažem još jednom, politikom jedinstva Domovinske i Iseljenje  
 234 Hrvatske želi raditi korake *naprije-d*. I to uz vašu participaciju, vaš doprinos, vašu pomoć, i stoga smo mi  
 235 ponosni na sve Hrvate koji žive u bilo kojem dijelu svijeta, i vrata su im, što se tiče državnih institucija i svih  
 236 ostalih, uvjeren sam, itekako otvorena. Je li tako gospodine Marić? (Tako je.) Evo vidiš kako se on slaže sa  
 237 mnom. Hvala vam lijepa.

## 7.3 Information sheet (ENG, BCS, GER)

### RESEARCH FOR MA THESIS INFORMATION SHEET

Approved at Central European University (CEU) by:

- (1) Thesis supervisor dr. Ana Mijić, MA
- (2) Nationalism Studies Program

#### 1. What is the aim of his research?

The research focuses on the everyday life of Croats in Vienna and the influence that Austria and Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have had on this everyday life. I would like to hear your personal stories (or your family members'), how you decided to come to Austria, and how has your life in Austria been since moving to the present day. The goal is to understand your everyday life and experiences. The research is carried out as part of the MA thesis in the second year of graduate studies at the Central European University (CEU) under the mentorship of Professor Ana Mijić, MA.

#### 2. Why am I invited to take part in the research?

You are invited to participate because you or your family members moved to Austria, and I believe that you can provide me with a better insight into the topic of my research.

#### 3. Do I have to take part?

No. You can ask questions about the research before deciding whether you want to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw at any time, and thereby withdraw all the information you have provided, without explanation and without consequences, by informing me of this decision. All the information you have provided will be excluded from the research.

#### 4. How will the conversation go?

I'll start by asking you a question and I'll ask you to tell me anything you can think of. You can take as much time as you like. I won't interrupt you; I'll just take notes to ask a question or two after you've told the story. Of course, if you don't want to answer some of the questions, that's perfectly fine. If it gets too much for you, you are completely free to stop the interview at any time or to take a break. If you agree, I will record the conversation. These recordings are then transcribed so I can continue working with them. The data will of course be treated confidentially and made anonymous (so that no conclusions can be drawn about your identity).

**5. Do I have any benefits from this research?**

There is no direct benefit but sharing your experiences and stories with those who know little or almost nothing about the topic, can be considered one, thus helping to better understand this topic.

**6. What is going to happen with the information and data I provide?**

Research data and all sensitive and personal information will be stored confidentially using secure electronic devices. Only those directly involved in the project will have access to sensitive and/or personal information. These persons are subject to a strict duty of confidentiality. The audio recordings of our conversation will be anonymized in the course of the transcription. Any assignment of your identity is then no longer possible. Individual passages from the conversations may be quoted in my master's thesis and subsequent publications. (I will ask your permission beforehand though). But here, too, it is ensured that anonymity is guaranteed. The master's thesis will remain in the repository of theses at the Central European University. Access to the anonymized research-related data is granted to those individuals who come to the presentation of the thesis, and individuals who have access to the repository of theses at CEU.

**7. Will this research be published?**

It is possible that the research will be published in a student or scientific journal.

**8. Who is organising and financing this research?**

The research is organized and financed by the Central European University (CEU).

**9. Who do I contact if I have concerns about the research or if I want to make a complaint?**

If you are concerned about any part of research, please contact me ([korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu), phone +43 681 8184 1327; +385 98 184 8082) or my supervisor Dr. Ana Mijić, MA ([mijica@ceu.edu](mailto:mijica@ceu.edu)). We will try our best to answer your queries.

**10. Further information and contact details**

If you would like to discuss something before or after the interview, please contact me:

Matea Korda

Nationalism Studies Program

Central European University

Quellenstraße 51, 1100 Vienna

E-mail: [korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu)

tel.: +43 681 8184 1327; +385 98 184 8082

## **ISTRAŽIVANJE U SKLOPU DIPLOMSKOG RADA**

### **INFORMACIJSKI LETAK**

Odobreno na Srednje Europskom Sveučilištu (Central European University, CEU) od strane:

- (1) Mentorice diplomskog rada dr. Ane Mijić, MA
- (2) Programa za studije nacionalizma (Nationalism Studies Program)

#### **1. Koji je cilj ovog istraživanja?**

Istraživanje se fokusira na svakodnevni život Hrvata u Beču te utjecaj koji su Austrija i Hrvatska, odnosno Bosna i Hercegovina imale na njihovu svakodnevicu. Želja mi je čuti Vaše osobne priče, ili osobne priče Vaše obitelji, kako ste odlučili doći u Austriju, kakav je Vaš život od preseljenja do danas. Cilj je razumjeti vašu svakodnevicu i iskustva. Istraživanje se odvija u sklopu diplomskog rada na drugoj godini diplomskog studija na Srednje Europskom Sveučilištu (Central European University, CEU) pod mentorstvom profesorice dr. Ane Mijić, MA.

#### **2. Zašto sam pozvan/a sudjelovati?**

Pozvani ste sudjelovati jer ste se Vi ili Vaši članovi obitelji preselili u Austriju i smatram da mi možete pružiti bolji uvid u temu istraživanja.

#### **3. Moram li sudjelovati?**

Ne. Možete postavljati pitanja o istraživanju prije nego što se odlučite želite li sudjelovati ili ne. Ako pristanete na sudjelovanje, u bilo kojem trenutku se možete povući, a samim time povući i sve informacije koje ste pružili, bez obrazloženja i bez posljedica, tako što ćete me o toj odluci obavijestiti. Sve informacije koje ste dotad pružili bit će u potpunosti isključene iz istraživanja.

#### **4. Kako će se odvijati razgovor?**

Počet ćemo tako što ću Vam postaviti pitanje i zamoliti vas da mi ispričate sve čega se možete sjetiti. Možete uzeti vremena koliko želite. Neću vas prekidati, vodit ću bilješke kako bih Vam mogla postaviti pitanje ili dva nakon što ispričate priču. Naravno, ako ne želite odgovoriti na neka od pitanja, to je sasvim u redu. Ako vam postane previše, potpuno ste slobodni prekinuti intervju u bilo kojem trenutku ili uzeti pauzu. Ako se složite, snimit ću razgovor. Te se snimke zatim transkribiraju kako bih mogla nastaviti raditi s njima. Podaci će se naravno tretirati povjerljivo i bit će anonimizirani (tako da se ne mogu donositi zaključci o vašem identitetu).

#### **5. Imam li kakve koristi od sudjelovanja?**



Direktne koristi nema, ali kao korist može se smatrati dijeljenje svojih iskustava i priča s onima koji o tome znaju malo ili gotovo ništa te tako pomažete u boljem razumijevanju ove teme.

**6. Što se događa s pruženim informacijama?**

Podatci vezani uz istraživanje te sve osjetljive i osobne informacije bit će pohranjeni povjerljivo koristeći se zaštićenim elektroničkim uređajima. Pristup osjetljivim i/ili osobnim podacima imat će samo oni koji su izravno uključeni u istraživanje. Ove osobe podliježu strogoj obvezi povjerljivosti. Audio zapisi našeg razgovora bit će anonimizirani tijekom transkripcije. Tada Vas više nije moguće identificirati. Pojedini odlomci iz razgovora mogu se citirati u diplomskom radu i kasnijim objavama. Za to ću tražiti vaše dopuštenje unaprijed te je i ovdje anonimnost zajamčena. Diplomski rad ostaje u repozitoriju diplomskih radova u CEU. Pristup anonimiziranim istraživačkim podacima imaju osobe koje dođu na prezentaciju diplomskog rada te osobe koje imaju pristup repozitoriju.

**7. Hoće li istraživanje biti objavljeno?**

Moguće je da će istraživanje biti objavljeno u studentskom ili znanstvenom časopisu.

**8. Tko organizira i financira istraživanje?**

Istraživanje organizira i financira Srednje Europsko Sveučilište (Central European University).

**9. Koga da kontaktiram ako sam zabrinut/a u vezi istraživanja ili ako se želim požaliti?**

Ako ste zabrinuti u vezi nekog dijela istraživanja, molim Vas da se obratite meni ([korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu), tel. +43 681 8184 1327; +385 98 184 8082) ili mentorici istraživanja dr. Ani Mijić, MA ([mijica@ceu.edu](mailto:mijica@ceu.edu)) koji će učiniti sve u svojoj moći da odgovore na Vaše upite.

**10. Daljnje informacije i detalji kontakata**

Ako želite razgovarati o nečemu prije ili nakon intervjuja, molim Vas da me kontaktirate:

Matea Korda

Nationalism Studies Program

Central European University

Quellenstraße 51,

1100 Beč

E-mail: [korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu)

Telefonski broj: [+43 681 8184 1327](tel:+4368181841327); [+385 98 184 8082](tel:+385981848082)

# **FORSCHUNG IM RAHMEN DER GRADUATIONSARBEIT**

## **INFORMATIONSBLETT**

Anerkannt an der Zentraleuropäischen Universität (Central European University, CEU) von:

- (1) der Betreuerin der Masterarbeit Dr. Ana Mijić, MA
- (2) dem Nationalism Studies Program

### **1. Was ist das Ziel dieser Forschung?**

Im Zentrum der Forschung stehen der Alltag der Kroaten in Wien und der Einfluss, den Österreich sowie Kroatien und Bosnien-Herzegowina auf diesen Alltag haben. Ich würde gerne Ihre persönliche Geschichte hören, wie Sie (oder ihre Familie) sich entschieden haben nach Österreich zu kommen, wie Sie ihr Leben in Österreich bis heute erleben. Ziel meiner Forschung ist es Ihren Alltag und Ihre Erfahrungen zu verstehen. Die Forschung wird als Teil der Abschlussarbeit im zweiten Jahr des Graduiertenstudiums an der Central European University (CEU) unter der Leitung von Professorin Ana Mijić, MA, durchgeführt.

### **2. Warum werde ich zur Teilnahme eingeladen?**

Sie sind zur Teilnahme eingeladen, weil Sie oder Ihre Familienangehörigen nach Österreich gezogen sind und ich glaube, dass Sie mir einen besseren Einblick in das Thema meiner Forschung geben können.

### **3. Muss ich teilnehmen?**

Nein. Sie können Fragen zur Forschung stellen, bevor Sie entscheiden, ob Sie teilnehmen möchten oder nicht. Wenn Sie einer Teilnahme zustimmen, können Sie jederzeit und ohne Angabe von Gründen und ohne Konsequenzen alle von Ihnen gemachten Angaben widerrufen, indem Sie mich über diese Entscheidung informieren. Alle bisher von Ihnen gemachten Angaben werden vollständig von der Forschung ausgeschlossen.

### **4. Wie läuft das Gespräch ab?**

Ich stelle Ihnen am Beginn eine Frage und werde Sie bitten, alles zu erzählen, was Ihnen einfällt. Sie können sich so viel Zeit nehmen, wie Sie möchten. Ich werde Sie nicht unterbrechen, sondern mir nur Notizen machen, um im Anschluss an Ihre Erzählung noch die eine oder andere Sache nachzufragen. Wenn Sie auf manche Fragen dann nicht eingehen möchten, ist das selbstverständlich vollkommen in Ordnung. Wenn es Ihnen zu viel wird, steht es Ihnen vollkommen frei das Interview jederzeit abubrechen oder eine Pause einzulegen.

Das Gespräch werde ich – sofern Sie einverstanden sind – aufzeichnen. Diese Aufzeichnungen werden dann transkribiert, damit ich weiter damit arbeiten kann. Die Daten werden selbstverständlich alle vertraulich behandelt und anonymisiert (so dass keinerlei Rückschlüsse auf Deine Person möglich sind).

**5. Hat die Teilnahme irgendwelche Vorteile?**

Es gibt keinen direkten Nutzen aus der Teilnahme an dieser Forschung, aber das Teilen Ihrer Erfahrungen und Geschichten mit denen, die wenig oder fast nichts darüber wissen, kann als Vorteil angesehen werden und so dazu beitragen, sich diesem Thema zu nähern und es besser zu verstehen.

**6. Was passiert mit den bereitgestellten Informationen?**

Forschungsdaten und alle sensiblen und persönlichen Informationen werden vertraulich unter Verwendung sicherer elektronischer Geräte gespeichert. Nur jene, die direkt am Projekt beteiligt sind haben Zugang zu sensiblen und/oder persönlichen Informationen. Diese Personen unterliegen einer strengen Verschwiegenheitspflicht. Die Audioaufzeichnungen unseres Gespräches werden im Zuge der Verschriftlichung anonymisiert. Eine Zuordnung zu ihrer Person ist danach nicht mehr möglich. Einzelne Passagen aus den Gesprächen werden möglicherweise in meiner Masterarbeit und in daran anschließenden Publikationen zitiert. (Ich werde Sie davor allerdings um Erlaubnis bitten). Doch auch hier wird sichergestellt, dass die Anonymität gewährleistet bleibt. Die Masterarbeit wird im Repositorium der Abschlussarbeiten an der Zentraleuropäischen Universität gespeichert bleiben. Der Zugang zu den anonymisierten forschungsbezogenen Daten wird jenen Personen gewährt, die zur Präsentation der Abschlussarbeit kommen, sowie Einzelpersonen, die Zugang zum Repositorium der Abschlussarbeiten an der Central European University (Central European University, CEU) haben.

**7. Wird die Forschung veröffentlicht?**

Es ist möglich, dass die Forschungsarbeit in einer studentischen oder wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift veröffentlicht wird.

**8. Wer organisiert und finanziert die Forschung?**

Die Forschung wird von der Central European University organisiert und finanziert.

**9. An wen wende ich mich, wenn ich Bedenken bezüglich eines Teils der Forschung habe oder eine Beschwerde einreichen möchte?**

Wenn Sie Bedenken hinsichtlich eines Teils der Forschung haben, wenden Sie sich bitte an die Forscherin Matea Korda ([korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu), Telefon +43 681 8184 1327; +385

98 184 8082) oder die Betreuerin Dr. Ana Mijić, MA ([mijica@ceu.edu](mailto:mijica@ceu.edu)). at), die alles in ihrer Macht Stehende tun werden, um Ihre Fragen zu beantworten.

#### **10. Weitere Informationen und Kontaktdaten**

Wenn Sie die Forschung vorher mit jemandem besprechen möchten oder wenn Sie danach Fragen haben, wenden Sie sich bitte an die Forscherin:

Matea Korda

Studienprogramm zum Nationalismus

Zentraleuropäischen Universität

Quellenstraße 51, 1100 Beč

E-mail: [korda\\_matea@student.ceu.edu](mailto:korda_matea@student.ceu.edu)

Telefon: +43 681 8184 1327; +385 98 184 8082

## 7.4 Consent letter (ENG, BCS, GER)

### RESEARCH FOR MA THESIS

#### CONSENT LETTER

Aim of research:

*Please write YES/NO*

- |    |  |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|
| 1  | I confirm that I have read and that I understand the information sheet for this research. I had the opportunity to ask questions to which I was given satisfactory answers.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2  | I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary and that I can back down in any moment and without any explanation or consequences.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3  | I understand that some individuals from Central European University (CEU) will, when needed, have insight in the data and information gathered during this research. I allow these individuals to access the data and information I have provided. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4  | I understand that this research has been reviewed and has gotten an ethical approval from the research supervisor.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5  | I understand who has access to the personal data I have provided, how data will be stored and what will happen with the data at the end of the research.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6  | I understand in which way this research will be written and published.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7  | I understand how to show I have worries about parts of this research and how to file a complaint.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8  | I agree the conversation to be recorded with a voice recorder.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9  | I understand in which way the voice recordings will be used in this research.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10 | I understand that I will be completely anonymous in this research so that I could not be identified.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11 | I give permission to be quoted in this research using pseudonyms, or anonymously.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12 | I agree that my personal data be kept in a safe database in order I might be contacted in future to be a part of possible further research.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13 | I agree to participate in this research.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of researcher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

## ISTRAŽIVANJE U SKLOPU DIPLOMSKOG RADA

### PISMO SUGLASNOSTI

Cilj istraživanja:

*Molim Vas upišite DA/NE*

- |    |   |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|
| 1  | Potvrđujem da sam pročitao/la i da razumijem informacijski letak ovog istraživanja. Imao/la sam priliku postaviti pitanja na koja su mi dani zadovoljavajući odgovori.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2  | Razumijem da je moje sudjelovanje dobrovoljno i da se mogu povući u bilo kojem trenutku bez obrazloženja i bez ikakvih posljedica.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3  | Razumijem da će određeni pojedinci sa Srednje Europskog Sveučilišta (Central European University, CEU) imati uvid u podatke prikupljene za vrijeme istraživanja gdje će biti potrebno. Dopuštam ovim pojedincima da pristupe podacima koje sam pružio/la. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4  | Razumijem da je ovo istraživanje recenzirano i dobilo etičko odobrenje od mentora istraživanja.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5  | Razumijem tko ima pristup pruženim osobnim podacima, kako će se podatci pohranjivati i što će se s podacima dogoditi na kraju istraživanja.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6  | Razumijem na koji će način ovo istraživanje biti napisano i objavljeno.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7  | Razumijem kako pokazati svoju zabrinutost oko nekog dijela istraživanja i kako podići žalbu.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8  | Pristajem na snimanje razgovora diktafonom.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9  | Razumijem na koji će se način snimke razgovora koristiti u istraživanju.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10 | Razumijem da ću u ovom istraživanju biti u potpunosti anonimna kako me se ne bi moglo identificirati.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11 | Dajem dopuštenje da me se citira u istraživanju koristeći se pseudonimom ili anonimno.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12 | Slažem se da moji osobni podatci budu čuvani u sigurnoj bazi podataka u svrhu kontaktiranja u sklopu mogućih daljnjih istraživanja.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13 | Pristajem sudjelovati u istraživanju.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ime sudionika istraživanja

\_\_\_\_\_  
Datum

\_\_\_\_\_  
Potpis

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ime istraživača

\_\_\_\_\_  
Datum

\_\_\_\_\_  
Potpis

## FORSCHUNG RAHMEN DER GRADUATIONSARBEIT

### EINVERSTÄNDNISERKLÄRUNG

Ziel der Forschung:

*Bitte schreiben Sie JA/NEIN*

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1  | Ich bestätige, dass ich das Informationsblatt zu dieser Studie gelesen und verstanden habe. Ich hatte Gelegenheit, Fragen zu stellen, auf die ich zufriedenstellende Antworten erhielt.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 2  | Ich habe verstanden, dass meine Teilnahme an dieser Studie freiwillig ist und dass ich jederzeit und ohne Erklärung oder Konsequenzen zurücktreten kann.   | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 3  | Ich habe verstanden, dass einige Personen der Central European University (CEU) bei Bedarf Einblick in die Daten und Informationen haben werden, die während dieser Forschung gesammelt wurden. Ich gestatte diesen Personen den Zugriff auf die von mir bereitgestellten Daten und Informationen. | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 4  | Mir ist bekannt, dass diese Forschung in ethischer Hinsicht überprüft und vom Forschungsleiter genehmigt wurde.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 5  | Mir ist bekannt, wer Zugriff auf die von mir angegebenen personenbezogenen Daten hat, wie Daten gespeichert werden und was mit den Daten am Ende der Forschung passiert.   | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 6  | Ich habe verstanden, auf welche Weise diese Forschungsarbeit geschrieben und veröffentlicht wird.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 7  | Ich habe verstanden, dass und wie ich Bedenken bezüglich Teile dieser Forschung äußern kann, und wie ich eine Beschwerde einreichen kann.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 8  | Ich bin damit einverstanden, dass das Gespräch mit einem Diktiergerät aufgezeichnet wird.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 9  | Ich habe verstanden, auf welche Weise die Sprachaufzeichnungen in dieser Forschung verwendet werden.   | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 10 | Mir ist bewusst, dass ich bei dieser Untersuchung vollkommen anonym bleiben werde, sodass ich nicht identifiziert werden kann.   | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 11 | Ich erteile die Erlaubnis, in dieser Studie unter Verwendung eines Pseudonyms oder anonym zitiert zu werden.   | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 12 | Ich stimme zu, dass meine persönlichen Daten in einer sicheren Datenbank gespeichert werden, damit ich in Zukunft kontaktiert werden könnte, um an möglichen weiteren Forschungen teilzunehmen.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 2px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 13 | Ich bin damit einverstanden, an dieser Studie teilzunehmen.  | <input style="width: 60px; height: 25px; border: 2px solid black;" type="text"/> |

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name des Teilnehmers

\_\_\_\_\_  
Datum

\_\_\_\_\_  
Unterschrift

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name des Forschers

\_\_\_\_\_  
Datum

\_\_\_\_\_  
Unterschrift

## 7.5 Questionnaire (ENG, BCS, GER)

Questions and topics part of the biographical interviews that I conducted for the purpose of research for the graduate MA thesis:

- 1 Please tell me your life story, with an emphasis on life in Vienna?
- 2 Please tell me your life story, how did you get to where you are now?  
(Sub-questions depending on the topics that the interlocutor narrates)
- 3 Can you clarify what you meant when you said [topic]?
- 4 Can you tell me more about [topic]?

Pitanja i teme za razgovor u sklopu biografskih intervjuja koje sam provela u svrhu istraživanja za diplomski rad:

- 1 Molim Vas da mi ispričate svoju životnu priču, s naglaskom na život u Beču?
- 2 Molim Vas da mi ispričate svoju životnu priču, kako ste došli do toga gdje ste sada?  
(Potpitanja ovisno o temama koje sugovornik/sugovornica narativizira)
- 3 Možete li pojasniti što ste mislili kad ste govorili o [tema]?
- 4 Možete li mi ispričati više o [tema]?

Fragen und Gesprächsthemen im Rahmen der biografischen Interviews, die ich zum Zweck der Forschung für die Diplomarbeit geführt habe:

- 1 Bitte erzählen Sie mir Ihre Lebensgeschichte, mit Schwerpunkt auf dem Leben in Wien?
- 2 Bitte erzählen Sie mir Ihre Lebensgeschichte, wie sind Sie dahin gekommen, wo Sie jetzt sind?  
(Unterfragen, abhängig von den Themen, die der Gesprächspartner erzählt)
- 3 Können Sie erklären, was Sie meinten, als Sie [Thema] sagten?
- 4 Können Sie mir mehr über [Thema] erzählen?



## 8 Data

- Tuđman, Franjo. 1989. Interview in Malmö, Sweden Interview by Dolores Meić. <https://www.tudjman.hr/intervju-franje-tudjmana-dat-dolores-meic-u-malmeu-u-svedskoj>.
- . 1990a. Interview for Youth Radio. <https://www.tudjman.hr/intervju-omladinskom-radiju-1990-godine>.
- . 1990b. *Speech at the Constituent Session of the Croatian Parliament*. <https://www.tudjman.hr/govori/konstituirajuca-sjednica-hrvatskoga-sabora>.
- . 1990c. *Speech on the Occasion of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia*. <https://www.tudjman.hr/govori/proglasenje-ustava-republike-hrvatske>.
- . 1995. *The Freedom Train - Speech Held in Split*. <https://www.tudjman.hr/govori/vlak-slobode-govor-u-splitu>.
- . 1997a. ‘Presentation on the Occasion of the Seventh Anniversary of the First Assembly of the HDZ’. February 23. <https://www.tudjman.hr/izlaganje-prilikom-sedme-obljetnice-prvog-sabora-hdz-a-1997>.
- . 1997b. ‘Oath Letter of the President of the Republic of Croatia Dr. Franjo Tuđman’, 8 May 1997. <https://www.tudjman.hr/govori/prisezna-poslanica-1997>.
- . 1997c. *The Vukovar Train - Speech Held in Zagreb*. <https://www.tudjman.hr/vlak-mira-govor-u-zagrebu>.
- . 1998. Interview for the ‘WE’ newspaper Interview by Lucija Ljubić, Stanko Gačić, and Vladimir Lončarević. <https://www.tudjman.hr/intervju-za-list-mi-1998-godine>.
- Vlada Republike Hrvatske, dir. 2019. *Govor predsjednika Vlade na sjednici Savjeta za Hrvate izvan RH u Varaždinu*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9be7Oi9VU14&t=357s&ab\\_channel=VladaRepublikeHrvatske](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9be7Oi9VU14&t=357s&ab_channel=VladaRepublikeHrvatske).
- , dir. 2021. *Privrženi smo jačanju veza Domovinske i Iseljene Hrvatske*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xsoN1R6HmvY&t=337s&ab\\_channel=VladaRepublikeHrvatske](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xsoN1R6HmvY&t=337s&ab_channel=VladaRepublikeHrvatske).

## 9 Sources

- Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina. n.d. ‘Popis 2013 u BiH (2013 Census in BiH)’. Accessed 28 May 2023. <http://www.statistika.ba/>.
- Košutić, Dejan, Siniša Košutić, Nina Tuđman Vuković, Ivana Tuđman, Ana-Marija Tuđman, and Nera Tuđman. n.d. ‘Dr. Franjo Tuđman – Službene Stranice’. Dr. Franjo Tuđman. Accessed 13 April 2023. <https://www.tudjman.hr>.
- migration.gv.at. n.d. ‘Transitional Regulations for Workers from Croatia’. Migrationsplattform der österreichischen Bundesregierung. Accessed 17 May 2023.

[https://www.migration.gv.at/fileadmin/downloads/infoblaetter/Transistional\\_Regulations\\_for\\_Workers\\_from\\_Croatia.pdf](https://www.migration.gv.at/fileadmin/downloads/infoblaetter/Transistional_Regulations_for_Workers_from_Croatia.pdf).

*Zakon o odnosima Republike Hrvatske s Hrvatima izvan Republike Hrvatske (Law on relations of the Republic of Croatia with Croats outside the Republic of Croatia).*

2011. <https://www.zakon.hr/z/507/Zakon-o-odnosima-Republike-Hrvatske-s-Hrvatima-izvan-Republike-Hrvatske>.

## 10 Bibliography

Ahearn, Laura M. 2001. 'Language and Agency'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (1): 109–37. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109>.

Anderson, Benedict. 2016. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London New York: Verso.

Ashmore, Richard D., Lee J. Jussim, and David Wilder, eds. 2001. *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*. Rutgers Series on Self and Social Identity, v. 3. Oxford [England] New York, N.Y. [USA]: Oxford University Press.

Bacchi, Carol. 2015. 'The Turn to Problematization: Political Implications of Contrasting Interpretive and Poststructural Adaptations'. *Open Journal of Political Science* 5 (1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2015.51001>.

Bagić, Dragan, and Milan Mesić. 2011. *Minority Return to Croatia - Study of an Open Process*. Zagreb: UNHCR. [https://www.academia.edu/4013702/Manjinski\\_povratak\\_u\\_Hrvatsku\\_Studija\\_otvore\\_nog\\_procesa](https://www.academia.edu/4013702/Manjinski_povratak_u_Hrvatsku_Studija_otvore_nog_procesa).

Bakondy, Vida. 2017. 'Austria Attractive for Guest Workers?' Recruitment of Immigrant Labor in Austria in the 1960s and 1970s'. In *Migration in Austria*, edited by Dirk Rupnow and Günter Bischof, 113–38. Contemporary Austrian Studies, volume 26. New Orleans, LA : [Innsbruck]: University of New Orleans Press ; Innsbruck University Press.

Balijs, Monika. 2019. 'Iseljavanje iz Hrvatske – razvojno i/ili sigurnosno pitanje? (Emigration – Question of Development and/or Safety?)'. *Podravina : časopis za geografska i povijesna multidisciplinarna istraživanja* 18 (35): 105–21.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality. a Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books.

Bernard, Sara. 2012. 'Developing the Yugoslav Gastarbeiter Reintegration Policy. Political and Economic Aspects (1969-1974)'. Centre for Southeast European Studies and Universität Graz.

———. 2019. 'Oil Shocks, Migration and European Integration: A (Trans)National Perspective on the Yugoslav Crises of the 1980s'. *National Identities* 21 (5): 463–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2018.1498471>.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2002. 'Ethnicity without Groups'. *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie / Europäisches Archiv Für Soziologie* 43 (2): 163–89.

- . 2005. 'The "Diaspora" Diaspora'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000289997>.
- Burić, Mia. 2018. 'Republika Hrvatska kao ishodište migranata i demografski aspekti nacionalne sigurnosti (Republic of Croatia as Source of Migrants and Demographic Aspect of National Security)'. Info:eu-repo/semantics/masterThesis, University of Zagreb. The Faculty of Political Science. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:114:156557>.
- Çağlar, Ayşe. 2016. 'Still "Migrants" after All Those Years: Foundational Mobilities, Temporal Frames and Emplacement of Migrants'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (6): 952–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126085>.
- Čapo, Jasna. 2019. *Dva Doma: Hrvatska Radna Migracija u Njemačku Kao Transnacionalni Fenomen (Two Homes: Croatian Work Migration to Germany as a Transnational Phenomenon)*. Zagreb: Durieux.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2014. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Second edition. Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Cillia, Rudolf de, Martin Reisigl, and Ruth Wodak. 1999. 'The Discursive Construction of National Identities'. *Discourse & Society* 10 (2): 149–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002002>.
- Clifford, James. 1994. 'Diasporas'. *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (3): 302–38. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1994.9.3.02a00040>.
- Dahinden, Janine. 2016. 'A Plea for the 'de-Migranticization' of Research on Migration and Integration'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (13): 2207–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1124129>.
- Dahinden, Janine, Carolin Fischer, and Joanna Menet. 2021. 'Knowledge Production, Reflexivity, and the Use of Categories in Migration Studies: Tackling Challenges in the Field'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 44 (4): 535–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1752926>.
- Dean, Mitchell M. 2009. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. Second edition. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Franz, Barbara. 2003a. 'Bosnian Refugees and Socio-Economic Realities: Changes in Refugee and Settlement Policies in Austria and the United States'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (1): 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183032000076696>.
- . 2003b. 'Bosnian Refugee Women in (Re)Settlement: Gender Relations and Social Mobility'. *Feminist Review* 73 (1): 86–103. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400077>.
- Glick Schiller, Nina. 2023. 'The Twilight of Transnational Migration Studies in a Conjuncture of Dispossession: An Epistemological Approach'. In *Routledge International Handbook of Transnational Studies*, edited by Margit Fauser and Xóchitl Bada. Routledge, forthcoming.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. 1995. 'From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 68 (1): 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3317464>.
- Grbić, Jadranka. 2006. 'Hrvatska dijaspora i iseljništvo (Croatian diaspora and emigration)'. *Narodne nošnje Hrvata u svijetu: (Tradicijsko odijevanje Hrvata izvan Republike Hrvatske) : Gradski muzej Subotica*, 28. 07. - 20. 08. 2006., 1.

- 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.
- Hageboutros, Joelle. 2016. 'The Bosnian Refugee Crisis: A Comparative Study of German and Austrian Reactions and Responses'. *Swarthmore International Relations Journal*, no. 1: 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.24968/2574-0113.1.12>.
- Halilovich, Hariz. 2012. 'Trans-Local Communities in the Age of Transnationalism: Bosnians in Diaspora: Trans-Local Communities: Bosnians in Diaspora'. *International Migration* 50 (1): 162–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2011.00721.x>.
- Ivanović, Vladimir. 2012. *Geburtstag pišeš normalno: jugoslovenski gastarbajteri u SR Nemačkoj i Austriji 1965-1973 (You write Geburtstag normally: Yugoslav guestworkers in FR Germany and Austria 1965-1973)*. Biblioteka Studije i monografije. Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju.
- Jenkins, Richard. 2006. 'When Politics and Social Theory Converge: Group Identification and Group Rights in Northern Ireland'. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 12 (3–4): 389–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110600882619>.
- . 2014. 'Time to Move beyond Boundary Making?' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (5): 809–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.871308>.
- Kolakušić, Luka. 2022. 'Jugoslavenska iseljenička politika od 1956. do 1970. godine (Yugoslav emigration politics 1956-1970)'. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- Kraler, Albert, and Christina Hollomey. 2010. 'Austria: Irregular Migration – A Phenomenon in Transition'. In *Irregular Migration in Europe. Myths and Realities*, edited by Anna Triandfyllidou, 41–70. Farnham, Surrey, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Lamont, Michèle. 1994. *Money, Morals, and Manners: The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Morality and Society Series. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3645663.html>.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Virág Molnár. 2002. 'The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167–95.
- Lamont, Michèle, Sabrina Pendergrass, and Mark Pachucki. 2015. 'Symbolic Boundaries'. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 850–55. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10416-7>.
- Levitt, Peggy, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. 'Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society'. *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1002–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00227.x>.
- Lončar, Sanja. 2013. 'Etnografije Hrvatskih Radnih Migrantica u Münchenu: Važnost Razvijanja Društvenih Mreža, Novih Osobnih Znanja i Vještina (Ethnographies of Croatian Women Worker Migrants to Munich: The Importance of Developing Social Networks, New Knowledge, and Skills)'. In *Hrvatska Svakodnevnica: Etnografije Vremena i Prostora*, edited by Jasna Čapo and Valentina Gulin Zrnić, 243–62. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku.
- Lorber, Verena. 2017. 'To Come into Focus: Female "Guest Workers" from Former Yugoslavia in Austria (1960-1980)'. In *Migration in Austria*, edited by Dirk Rupnow

- and Günter Bischof, 161–86. *Contemporary Austrian Studies*, volume 26. New Orleans, LA : [Innsbruck]: University of New Orleans Press ; Innsbruck University Press.
- Madsen, Ole Jacob. 2014. 'Governmentality'. In *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology*, edited by Thomas Teo, 814–16. New York, NY: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7\\_126](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7_126).
- Mesić, Milan. 1995. 'Types of Refugees: Croatian and Bosnian-Herzegovinian Experiences'. *Društvena Istraživanja : Časopis Za Opća Društvena Pitanja* 4 (4-5 (18-19)): 657–75.
- Mijić, Ana. 2020. 'Together Divided–Divided Together: Intersections of Symbolic Boundaries in the Context of Ex-Yugoslavian Immigrant Communities in Vienna'. *Ethnicities* 20 (6): 1071–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819878202>.
- . 2021. 'Identity, Ethnic Boundaries, and Collective Victimhood: Analysing Strategies of Self-Victimisation in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina'. *Identities* 28 (4): 472–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2020.1748348>.
- Miraftab, Faranak. 2014. 'Displacement: Framing the Global Relationally'. In *Framing the Global: Entry Points for the Search*, edited by Hilary Kahn, 37–50. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Peintinger, Teresa. 2012. 'Demographics of Immigration: Austria'. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1990224>.
- Pilcher, Jane. 1994. 'Mannheim's Sociology of Generations: An Undervalued Legacy'. *The British Journal of Sociology* 45 (3): 481–95. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591659>.
- Ragazzi, Francesco. 2017. *Governing Diasporas in International Relations: The Transnational Politics of Croatia and Former Yugoslavia*. 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315177137>.
- Rheindorf, Markus. 2019. *Revisiting the Toolbox of Discourse Studies: New Trajectories in Methodology, Open Data and Visualization*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17405904.2021.1939079>.
- Rosenthal, Gabriele. 1993. 'Reconstruction of Life Stories: Principles of Selection in Generating Stories for Narrative Biographical Interviews'. *The Narrative Study of Lives* 1 (1): 59–91.
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 2011. 'Conceptualising Policy: Technologies of Governance and the Politics of Visibility'. In *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, edited by Cris Shore, Susan Wright, and Davide Peró, 1–26. New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Svensson, Birgitta. 1995. 'Lifetimes - Life History and Life Story. Biographies of Modern Swedish Intellectuals'. *Ethnologia Scandinavica* 25: 25–42.
- Tokić, Mate Nikola. 2020. *Croatian Radical Separatism and Diaspora Terrorism During the Cold War*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.
- Trifković, Miloš, Meliha Husić-Mehmedović, Adnan Efendić, Lejla Turulja, and Mirza Emirhafizović. 2019. *Emigration Study. Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Edited by Muris Čičić. Sarajevo: Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia and Herzegovina. <https://doi.org/10.5644/PI2019.182.00>.

- Tse, Thomas Kwan-choi. 2014. 'Constructing Chinese Identity in Post-Colonial Hong Kong: A Discursive Analysis of the Official Nation-Building Project'. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 14 (1): 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12073>.
- Valenta, Marko, and Sabrina P. Ramet. 2011. *The Bosnian Diaspora: Integration in Transnational Communities*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Wimmer, Andreas. 2018. *Nation Building: Why Some Countries Come Together While Others Fall Apart*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc77kjj>.
- Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. 'Methodological Nationalism and beyond: Nation–State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences'. *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00043>.
- Winland, Daphne. 2002. 'The Politics of Desire and Disdain: Croatian Identity between "Home" and "Homeland"'. *American Ethnologist* 29 (3): 693–718. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2002.29.3.693>.
- . 2005. 'Croatian Diaspora'. In *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World*, edited by Melvin Ember, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, 76–84. Boston, MA: Springer US. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-29904-4\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-29904-4_8).
- . 2009. 'Between Two Wars: Generational Responses of Toronto Croats to Homeland Independence', 22.
- Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer, eds. 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. Introducing Qualitative Methods*. London ; Thousand Oaks [Calif.]: SAGE.
- Župarić-Iljić, Drago. 2016. *Emigration from the Republic of Croatia after the Accession to the European Union*. Zagreb: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.