

Croatian Occupational Terminology: the 2000s' Escape from "a Man's World"

Milinović Hrga, Anđela

Source / Izvornik: **Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics**, 2018, 54, 377 - 406

Journal article, Accepted version

Rad u časopisu, Završna verzija rukopisa prihvaćena za objavljivanje (postprint)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2018-0015>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:172:164069>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom](#).

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-02**

Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of Faculty of humanities and social sciences](#)



UNIVERSITY OF SPLIT

The logo for 'dabar', featuring a stylized red and black graphic above the word 'dabar' in a lowercase, sans-serif font.

DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

Anđela Milinović Hrga
University of Split
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Split, Croatia

Croatian Occupational Terminology: the 2000s' Escape from "a Man's World"

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the forms of expression of occupational terms in contemporary Croatian institutional practice, typical of the changes in language policy and public language usage. Predominant in Croatian language was the androcentric practice of using masculine occupational terms as unmarked, gender-neutral. However, due to various reasons, it has changed in past years. The 2008 Amendments to the Croatian National Classification of Occupations marked the turning point in gender equality in terms of providing for gender-specific occupational nouns. For the first time, an official document codified both masculine and feminine occupational titles and stipulated their usage as a national classification standard, thus acknowledging a significant language change. However, the 2008 and 2010 Classifications both displayed certain asymmetries as well. The paper pinpoints these asymmetries, documents elements of linguistic sexism still remaining, as well as successful "escapes" from it, and tries to determine whether imbalances and barriers within the binary masculine-feminine concept are brought about by intralinguistic (lexical) or extralinguistic factors.

Keywords: *gender-specific occupational terms; language policy interventions; language planning; feminine/female forms; Croatian National Classification of Occupations.*

1. Introduction

If language is perceived as a creation and reflection of a society and its members, representing their particular reality, social hierarchy, etc., then, taking the perspective of linguistic determinism (Mills 1995), it is also possible and necessary to intervene in language, to plan it and change it if the sociolinguistic challenges require such actions.

This brings to mind the presidential oath taken by Croatia's first female president Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović in February 2015, which can be seen as illustrative of a rather strong "people=male" bias (Silveira 1980), still dominant in the society, particularly in the legislative discourse. When Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović was sworn in as President of Croatia at an inaugural ceremony, she took the oath using the masculine gender nouns with the overall masculine agreement: *dužnost predsjednika* 'duty of the President' and *hrvatski državni*

poglavar 'Croatian Head of State'. It was required by the ceremony in order not to challenge the legality of the procedure. From the linguistic perspective, this was unnecessary in the given context, since the presidential oath with feminine noun and the overall feminine agreement – *hrvatska državna poglavarica* – sworn by a female referent would have changed neither the content nor the meaning of the oath; on the contrary, this was a situation where a referentially motivated gender-aware language should have been used. Quite different is the situation with the phrase *dužnost predsjednika*; in the (con)text of the oath, it expresses the function, therefore, a referential feminine form would be incorrect.

Although Croatian language has the linguistic tools for distinguishing genders, they have been applied to occupational terminology within official regulations since only recently. The significant language policy interventions towards gender awareness in Croatian institutional practice in the 2000s, which are the focus of this paper, have been triggered by changes in the society and by significant efforts to correct gender inequality in many terminological fields. Gender sensitivity as to the masculine and feminine occupational terms within public language usage has thus become more prominent. Gender-specific occupational terms can be generated easily in Croatian using several productive suffixes. By adopting a language planning perspective in the 2000s, the Croatian occupational terminology has been prescribed as national classification standard. These language interventions have thus had significant effects in terms of “legalising” occupational terminology. The use of language in terms of gender awareness within Croatian occupational titles may be perceived as a reflection of the language policy supported by institutional mechanisms.

1.1 Theoretical framework and methodology

Although a number of studies have dealt with the motion and motal word formation¹ in general in Croatian language (e. g. Barić 1987; Barić 1988; Barić 1989; Babić 2006; Silić 2004 etc.), the topic has never been approached by analysing the “legalised” gender-sensitive document regulating occupational terminology from the feminist perspective, with the focus on the asymmetrical representation of women and men in the document structure.

Previous research suggested there was a lack of terminologisation of occupational nouns, especially in view of insecurity and hesitation with alternative occupational forms within certain professional fields (cf. Barić 1987; Mihaljević and Štebih Golub 2010; Motschenbacher and Weikert 2015). Comparing gender expression in Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian, Hentschel states: “Even for Croatian, where new linguistic norms have been

¹ The terms ‘motion’ *mocija* and ‘motal word formation’ *mocijska tvorba* in Croatian refer to pair nouns of opposing biological sexes, usually derived from common stems.

developed quite successfully in domains like orthography or lexicon, the gender-related questions have not been taken into consideration.“ (2003: 306) After the publication of her research, the matter of how to form correct feminines in Croatian has been resolved by prescribing the national occupational classification and there should be no more uncertainty about which form to use in a given situation. Similar actions by feminist linguists in Serbia have recently caused nationalist counter-reactions, wondering if Serbian language is turning into Croatian (Rajilić 2017).²

Study has proved that feminine occupational terms are far more frequently used in Croatian than in Serbian (Mihaljević and Štebih Golub 2010). For comparison purposes, in Russian, masculine/male terms for female reference with nouns denoting occupation are evaluated positively even by women (Bukarica 1999; Doleschal and Schmid 2001: 260) – this is not the case in Croatian.

The goal of this study is to investigate systematically the linguistic representation of women and men in the language structure of the Croatian occupational classifications, evaluate the results of the terminological changes implemented in the corpus, document asymmetries and offer proposals to eliminate some of the identified terminological and word-forming problems in terms of sexist practices. Its scope is limited to an analysis of these features at the word level within the provided occupation lists, through the panoptic of the second wave feminism issues of the overt language sexism as defined by Mills (2008), evident in the generic masculine forms. Androcentric generics and asymmetrical gender-marking are core elements in linguistic sexism (Hellinger and Pauwels 2007). According to Mills (2008: 159), the exposure of linguistic sexism is necessary in order to change sexist structures in the society.

However, some studies have reminded of the limitations of the feminist language planning, pointing out that the grammatical and referential genders are not readily reconcilable and that “‘feminification’ in every (con)text (...) leads to semantic chaos and grammatical incorrectness” (Martinović 2015). This is contrary to the feminist’s theories of language sexism, but in line with the post-structuralist theories that grammatical gender is not inherently discriminating, it merely opens a possibility to be used in such manner (Hornscheidt 2006: 77-83).

² In 2003, describing the expression of gender in Serbian, Hentschel stressed that the question of which of the three possibilities (generic masculines, an analytical structure with masculine nouns and ‘female’ modifiers, derived feminines) was to be preferred in occupational titles for women had indeed remained unresolved as it had been fifty years before.

Since the examples of the generic masculine as the expressions of overt sexism are easy to identify in the 1998 National Classification, and the 2008 and 2010 classifications have challenged the overt sexism in occupational framework by providing feminine nouns in almost every instance, second wave feminist approach is more applicable to the occupational terms analysis presented in this paper.

1.2 Language planning measures to increase female linguistic visibility

In Croatian (and not only in Croatian), the masculine gender functions as unmarked and covers both sexes – male and female – while the feminine form covers female sex exclusively. The generic masculine forms have therefore become the prevailing type in the nomenclature, in all laws and regulations.³ The generic masculine form in the legislation has its origins in the tradition of the Roman Law, very rooted in Croatian language, which influenced the gender choice. It is largely known that in Roman Civil Law masculine form covered both sexes. This was transferred to Croatian legislative discourse (Glovacki-Bernardi cites from the *Corpus Iuris Civilis: Pronuntiatio sermonis in sexu masculino ad utrum sexum plerumque porrigatur* (2008: 86)).

The second wave feminism in the 1970s and 1980s closely studied and challenged linguistic sexism, defining it as a gender-biased use of a language in a manner discriminatory towards women. The use of generic masculines as supposedly gender-neutral results in women being invisible in a language.

Although overt sexism has been exposed and challenged by feminists since the 1960s, in Croatia, an extensive institutional campaign against gender asymmetry when it comes to occupational terms has been in place since the early 2000s. Social norms often dictate that men occupy higher positions, while women tend to be at a lower occupational level, and these gender stereotypes are linguistically reflected in the non-existence of parallel masculine and feminine occupational terms for every profession. The social issues and effects are therefore implicit in the language representation of women and men and confirm the social role theory put forward by Alice H. Eagly (1987); according to her, gender is enacted through the roles

³ Article 43 of the Gender Equality Act states: "Words and terms that are gender-specific shall refer equally to the masculine and feminine gender regardless of whether they are used in the masculine or feminine gender in laws and other regulations" (Official Gazette, No 82/08). This formulation is generally used in the introductory parts of Croatian legislation as a compromise of a sort. Its intention is not to saturate the text with additional gender specific formulations, which could affect the clarity of the layout, comprehension and cohesion. Needless to say, in Croatian, gender awareness is not expressed only by using feminine form nouns, since the overall agreement (pronouns, adjectives, numbers, participles) has to be changed as well. However, it will be the masculine forms that will be chosen as generative, and this is a typical feminist linguistic issue. On the other hand, this is a familiar procedure with highly flexional languages, described usually as a necessity to avoid stylistic cumbersomeness (cf. Hellinger and Bussmann 2001: 20).

people play. The relatively late occurrence of such challenging of linguistic sexism in Croatia has to do – partly, at least – with the socio-historical situation. At least two reasons should be highlighted here: first, the Homeland War Croatia was caught up in in the early 1990s left no time to deal with linguistic choices; second, the women's movement gained more strength in Croatia in the late 1990s/early 2000s, thus shedding light on linguistic issues as well.

A significant change in Croatian gender equality legislation has been prompted in the early 2000s. The process of raising consciousness of gender sensitivity within occupational terms was instigated by Croatian institutions' commitment to implement European gender equality legislation.

The public response instigated the change as well – the Office for Gender Equality insisted on the use of a gender-neutral language in the governmental bodies. Furthermore, in 2004, an alliance of female non-governmental organizations *Women's Network Croatia* observed gender discrimination against women in the 1998 Croatian National Classification of Occupations and demanded that the document's compliance with the Constitution be revised.⁴ This simultaneously happened in other spheres as well.

In accordance with the social changes, the Act on Gender Equality was enacted in Croatia in 2008. It marked the beginning of equal treatment of sexes in Croatian legislation. Its Article 14 determines the following: "All education institutions, as well as all other institutions shall, in their degrees, certificates, licences and diplomas, use the linguistic standards pursuant to this Act, indicating professional qualifications, professions and occupations in the feminine or masculine gender, depending on the sex of the recipient" (<http://www.mvep.hr/zakoni/pdf/476.pdf>). Furthermore, the Gender Equality Act stipulates that public bodies, local and regional self-government units, legal persons with public authorities, education and scientific institutions and legal persons majority-owned by the state shall apply gender-specific terminology and promote gender equality. Sanctions in the form of fines are also stipulated for violating the Gender Equality Act.

The gender perspective was then integrated into the 2008 Amendments to the National Classification of Occupations. The goal of the measures was to provide feminine terms to the predominantly masculine nouns within the existing official occupational classification and to make the use of parallel feminine and masculine terms obligatory in the public sphere. It was a prerequisite for effective language policy measures promoting gender equality in occupational terms. This classification stipulates the gender-specific terminology usage as the

⁴ http://www.zenska-mreza.hr/Aktivnosti/klasifikacija_zanimanja.htm

national classification standard. It has been coordinated with Croatia's Ministry of Economy, Entrepreneurship and Crafts and Croatian Employment Service and it is also recommended by the European Commission to be used in censuses.

In line with Pauwels' definition of feminist language reforms as a type of language planning (1998), since the Croatian occupational terminology has been published in the official gazette, thus codifying the occupational gender onomastics, the occupational classification may be perceived as the instrument of language planning, making women "visible" in occupational terminology.

2. Deriving feminine (occupational) forms in Croatian

The Croatian language has such an elaborate morphological structure that makes it easy to express and recognise genders, which is typical of the highly inflected Slavic languages. It distinguishes three genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. They are distinguished by the nominative singular form (morpheme). Nouns that denote animate beings are in many cases logically assigned to gender based on natural sex. However, this is only partially valid; gender assignment can be influenced by other factors –usually by the morphology of nouns, by the type of their declension and their meaning (semantic), or by agreement (see Babić et al. 2007; Corbett 1991, 2006; Motschenbacher and Weikert 2015). Croatian language has at its disposal the devices required for identifying feminine/female nouns, using the morphologically gender-specific nouns. Most nouns indicating a person typically form pair nouns of opposing biological sexes. If they are derived from common stems, these are generative motion pairs (for example, *učitelj/učiteljica* 'male/female teacher') (Barić 1987: 10).⁵

Nouns designating females are derived by adding the suffixes *-a*, *-ica*, *-inja*, *-ka*, *-kinja* (cf. Babić 2006: 82–83; Barić et al. 1997: 310–312; Silić and Pranjković 2007: 171–173).⁶

The suffix *-ica* is the most productive in standard Croatian. It is followed by *-ka*, *-inja*, *-kinja* and finally, *-a* as the least productive one (Barić 1987: 12). The distribution of these suffixes depends primarily on the sociolinguistic factor, standardization history etc.

⁵ When pairs of opposing biological sexes are expressed with two different stems, two suppletive forms (for example, *otac/majka* 'father/mother'), in Croatian linguistic literature this is sometimes referred to as lexical or suppletive motion (cf. Silić and Pranjković 2007: 173; Barić 1987: 10).

⁶ The definitions of motion pairs in contemporary Croatian grammars and normative handbooks predominantly specify the derivational direction from masculine to feminine forms. From the feminist perspective, the only gender-fair definition of motion pairs is provided for in the Croatian grammar by Silić and Pranjković (2007: 171–173, cf. Pišković 2011: 102–113). They define the common stems and various morphemes denoting male and female referents, without specifying that masculine forms are the basis or the prerequisite from which feminine forms are derived.

The suffix *-ica* is distributed on the nouns ending with *-ač*, *-aš*, *-ar*, *-er*, *-or*, *-telj*. Semantically, it denotes both the female occupation/function and the matrimonial status.⁷ For example, historically *profesorica* did not denote ‘female professor’ at all nor *mlinarica* conveyed the meaning of a ‘woman miller’. Following the same sociolinguistic pattern, these forms were titles for the ‘wife of the male referent’. The suffix *-ica* is also homonymous with the diminutive suffix *-ica* (e.g. *mamica* ‘mummy’) and an identical suffix is used to derive nouns denoting tools (*sijačica* – both ‘sower’ as tool and female occupation, cf. Babić 1991: 155). This may cause potential difficulties in terms of possible semantic confusion when deriving feminine occupational forms and this issue has been a concern of Croatian feminist linguists (cf. Bertoša 2001).

The suffix *-ka* is distributed to the masculine nouns ending with the consonants *-j*, *-l*, *-lj*, *-m*, *-n*, *-r*, *-v*; or the suffixes *-in*, *-(a)k* and *-(a)c*, which are then reduced. Croatian linguists have somewhat different opinions as regards the problem of the reduction of these suffixes. Barić stresses the fact that these feminines are not directly derived from masculines in this case, although, semantically, they are of opposing biological sexes. Nonetheless, there is no direct word-forming connection between them; that is, the common stem is the adjective, verb or noun, and suffixes are added to coin both masculines and feminines. For example, *tkalac* and *tkalja* ‘male/female weaver’ are both motivated by the same verb *tkati* ‘to weave’. Babić takes that view into consideration, acknowledging the fact that it could be explained differently, but he interprets it as feminines derived from masculine stems after reducing suffixes *-in*, *-ak*, *-ac*. He is supporting his argument with the need to be practical for the sake of systematics and uniformity within motal word-formation (Babić 1991: 257). Of course, from the feminist perspective, this sort of argumentation is unacceptable.

The suffix *-inja* is usually added to the masculine nouns with a stem ending with *-k*, *-g*, *-h* (Babić 1991: 268).

The suffix *-kinja* is distributed to nouns with stems ending with *-t*, *-d* and *-f* (Babić 1991: 269).

The suffix *-a* is not very productive in motal word formation, but within the occupational field, it is used to derive feminine academic title *magistra* ‘master’, which has a high frequency of occurrence in Croatian higher education system after implementing the Bologna Process reforms.

⁷ The function of expressing (matrimonial) “belonging“ using such a suffix is found, for example, in German as well (cf. Posch 2014: 108).

2.1 The historical development of occupational nouns in Croatian language

The historical development of occupational nouns in Croatian language has been influenced by social factors, the most important among them being the changes in the labour market and (equal) participation of women in the work sector.

Although it is possible to equally use masculine and feminine occupational titles as needed, initially there were only masculine forms for most professions (mostly due to the fact that these professions were performed predominantly by men). The stereotypically female professions usually related to household (e.g. *prelja*, 'spinner', *kućanica*, 'housewife'), and only took feminine gender. However, along with the females entering the labour market, more feminine forms appeared in language practice as well. A study has indicated that the first feminine occupational terms were recorded quite early, although the masculine forms of occupational terms are more frequent and predominant in Croatian dictionaries (Matas Ivanković 2006). The saturation of lexicographic definitions with masculine forms could be explained as a tendency of dictionaries to reproduce and reflect sociolinguistic context, thus adopting the existing social bias or sexist language views. Cf. Mihaljević 2013.

The first feminine occupational term *odvjetnica* 'female lawyer' was noted in the 15th century. In 1649, Jakov Mikalja lists *odvjetnica* along with the terms *učenica* 'female pupil' and *učiteljica* 'female teacher' in his dictionary *Blago jezika slovinskoga*. What is more, the term *učiteljica* 'female teacher' was introduced by Bartol Kašić in his 1641 work.

Recent studies have confirmed that there used to be a regular practice of forming a name for a female doer of an action in Croatian language. Such forms were included in the 17th- and 18th-century Croatian kajkavian dictionaries (Stolac and Soldo 2015). Furthermore, feminine occupational terms were frequently coined in the kajkavian standard language (from the late 16th century to the appearance of the štokavian standard language in the mid-19th century (Štebih Golub 2008).

This substantiates the fact that word formation of feminine occupational terms was a well-established and frequent language practice even in the older Croatian. Evidence for this claim can be found in dictionaries.

2.2 The development of occupational terms in the 20th century

Significant changes in the labour market were most obvious in the period between the two World Wars, when women started occupying many hitherto exclusively male professions. The unequal distribution of men and women between occupations was eradicated to a large extent. Illustrative of the shift in the interwar period is the article by Croatia's first

professional female journalist Marija Jurić Zagorka, who founded the magazine *Hrvatica* (*Croatian Woman*) in 1939. In the first issue she addressed her future readers, mentioning all the roles and jobs they occupied at the time, using many feminine nouns denoting females in all walks of life, prestigious and non-prestigious ones: *novinarka* ‘female journalist’, *spisateljica* ‘female writer’, *voditeljica trgovine* ‘female shop manager’, *poslovočkinja* ‘female manager’, *prokuristica* ‘female assistant manager’, *odgojiteljica* ‘female pre-school educator’, *učiteljica* ‘female teacher’, *profesorica* ‘female professor’, *liječnica* ‘female doctor’, *odvjetnica* ‘female lawyer’, *činovnica* ‘female clerk’, *pekarica* ‘female baker’, *obrtnica* ‘craftswoman’, *slastičarka* ‘female confectioner’, *švelja* ‘seamstress’, *kitničarka* ‘female milliner’, *vlasuljarka* ‘female wigmaker’, *domaćica* ‘housewife’. It is worth pointing out that she refers to herself in two ways: using a derivative *novinarka* as well as the analytical form *ženski novinar*, with a masculine noun and an adjectival modifier meaning ‘female’.⁸

Along with the changes in the labour sector, the first linguistic discussions on the subject began. The discussions on feminine forms in Croatian legal texts appeared at the beginning of the 20th century (e. g. Grubor 1911).⁹ They were followed by a discussion on special forms of gender conversion in Croatian language, published in a 1934 issue of *Naš jezik* (*Our Language*), a linguistic periodical recommended for use in the school system by the Ministry of Education (in the historical period during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Croatia being its integral part). Its author (Janjanin 1934) substantiates his viewpoint that masculine and feminine forms for occupational terms should be differentiated and used properly and consistently. Many articles have since been written on the subject of linguistic gender inequality (to mention but a few, Barić 1987; Barić 1988; Barić 1989; Silić 2004, etc.).

The feminine forms quite often denoted the meaning of the female spouse of a male performing some occupation, particularly before the changes in the labour market. When women entered the labour market spheres, most of the existing forms simply underwent a semantic transformation, eventually denoting the feminine occupational title. In relation to word formation, a twofold practice was put in place to provide two different suffixes – one for the feminine occupational term and the other for a female spouse (cf. e. g. Janjanin 1934; Vince 1955; Babić 1991: 155, 167).

⁸ The journal *Hrvatica* is available in digitalised form: <http://dnc.nsk.hr/journals/LibraryTitle.aspx?id=23ec3af4-8916-49fe-839c-8eca24fa4432#>

⁹ Mamić (1981: 188) states there are no records of feminine nouns indicating the subject or the doer of an action in Croatian constitutional legislation from the second half of the 19th century. The reason is the fact that women were neither subjects nor objects in legislative texts – their linguistic invisibility mirrored the sociolinguistic situation.

Croatian linguist Stjepan Babić points out that the particular type of word formation, conveying the meaning of a female married to a male holding a certain position, occupation, title (regardless of her own possible occupation), is limited semantically (to approximately 30 nouns in Croatian) and chronologically (since most of these nouns were coined prior to 1960). Many of them are archaic or of a regional character, more a language possibility than the actual language usage (Babić 1991: 155, 167). They are also found throughout literary works.¹⁰ Nonetheless, these nouns did not disappear entirely as the language developed; they are found even in contemporary Croatian. Contemporary dictionaries of Croatian language still record some of them with both suffixes, occupational and marital, although with somewhat different normative descriptions. For example, *ministrovica* is defined as ‘minister’s wife’ (Anić 1998: 536, exclusively pertaining to the speech level/jargon); whilst *ministrica* is the feminine equivalent of the masculine occupational title. Another example is *šefovica*, conveying the meaning of ‘wife of a boss’ (Anić 1998: 1148, without any labels specifying the speech level), while *šefica* denotes ‘female boss’. Finally, *majstorica* is defined twofold; firstly, as the feminine equivalent for the masculine occupational title ‘craftsman’ and, secondly, as ‘wife of a craftsman’.¹¹

No linguistic ‘two-way street’ has ever been observed in this respect as to the derivation of masculine nouns describing matrimonial position in relation to a female occupying a certain position and title; therefore, dictionary entries and usage in general lack such derivations.

3. Corpus analysis and discussion

The analysis is concerned with three versions of the Croatian National Classification of Occupations, a document regulating occupational terms, covering the period between 1998 and 2010. It focuses on the gender perspective within the (binary) stratification used in these classifications, pinpointing asymmetries in the structure of occupational terms and trying to

¹⁰ Here are several examples: in the literary works from the 19th century, the noun *sudinja* denotes ‘wife of a judge’ (Vulić and Laco 2015: 210); in the famous early-20th-century Croatian children’s novel *Čudnovate zgrade šegrta Hlapića* (*The Marvellous Adventures of Hlapić the Apprentice*) one of the main antagonists is a *majstor* ‘shoemaker’, and his wife is referred to as a *majstorica*, although she herself is not a craftswoman.

¹¹ The print edition of the Anić dictionary does not have the entry *majstorica*, but it is listed in its online version, see http://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e11uURc%3D.

When compared to the Anić dictionary, the other contemporary Croatian dictionary – *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* edited by Jure Šonje – records only *majstorica* (2000: 565) out of the highlighted nouns and defines its meaning in the reversed order: firstly, the matrimonial meaning; secondly, the feminine form for the masculine occupational term ‘craftsman’.

determine whether the reasons for the underrepresentation of women are primarily intralinguistic or extralinguistic.

The Croatian National Classification of Occupations is a means for the systematic collection, processing and presentation of occupational data. It provides a uniform instrument suitable for use in the employment service, education system, professional orientation, national statistics, other statistical surveys, science etc. As a national (classification) standard intended to be mandatory, it was created in accordance with and based on the European version of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88 COM). It is divided into four levels, classifying occupations into 10 major groups and further subdividing them into sub-major groups, minor groups and unit groups, based on their similarity in terms of the skill level and skill specialization required for jobs. The last, fifth level includes single occupations within these groups. The purpose of the structure is to provide internationally comparable occupational data and facilitate their exchange. It is mandatory in national statistics and the European Commission recommends it for use in censuses. Its development has been coordinated with the Ministry of Economy, Entrepreneurship and Crafts and Croatian Employment Service.

Three versions of the Classification have been published so far. The first Croatian National Classification of Occupations entered into force in 1998. It consistently uses generic masculine expressions. In 2008, the Amendments to the National Classification of Occupations were passed, codifying for the first time the binary, masculine and feminine forms for all professions. Two years later, in 2010, a new binary version of the Croatian National Classification of Occupations was accepted in line with the recent changes in international standards, also upgrading certain terminological issues.

3.1 The 1998 Croatian National Classification of Occupations

The 1998 Croatian National Classification of Occupations systematically provides only generic masculine forms for occupational titles on all levels. Nonetheless, it displays discrepancies within both unit groups and single occupations.

3.1.1 Unit groups

The exclusive visibility of feminine terms is evident in the following unit groups: *medicinske sestre* ‘female nurses’; *primalje* ‘midwives’; *tajnice* ‘female secretaries’; *zrakoplovne domačice* ‘female travel attendants’;¹² *domačice i srodna zanimanja* ‘female

¹² Within the group *zrakoplovne domačice i brodski poslužitelji* ‘female travel attendants and travel stewards’.

domestic housekeepers and related professions'; *vezilje* 'female embroiderers';¹³ *kućne pomoćnice* 'female domestic helpers'; *čistačice i posluga* 'cleaning ladies and domestic staff'; *pralje i glačarice* 'hand-laundresses and female pressers'.

3.1.2 Single occupations

Furthermore, a list of single occupations has also been provided with a number of feminine terms without their corresponding masculines. Some of the professions listed within the unit groups are repeated here as well, while others are presented in several versions conveying the same meaning: *primalja* 'midwife'; *tajnica* 'female secretary'; *sekretarica* 'female secretary'; *sekretarica režije* 'female script supervisor'; *domaćica zrakoplova* 'female flight attendant'; *voditeljica u kabini zrakoplova* 'lead flight attendant'; *zemaljska domaćica* 'ground hostess'; *brodska sobarica* 'ship maid'; *stjuardesa* 'stewardess'; *starija zrakoplovna domaćica* 'senior female flight attendant'; *hotelska sobarica* 'hotel maid'; *paziteljica djece* 'childminder'; *dadilja* 'childminder'; *hostesa* 'hostess'; *gatara* 'female fortune teller'; *seljakinja* 'peasant woman'; *domaćica seoskog turizma* 'rural tourism female domestic housekeeper'; *vezilja* 'female embroiderer'; *kućna pomoćnica* 'female domestic helper'; *čistačica* 'cleaning lady'; *spremačica* 'female cleaner'; *pralja* 'laundress'; *glačarica* 'female presser'; *striptizeta* 'female stripper'.

The instances of linguistic sexism in the 1998 Croatian National Classification of Occupations are documented in the forms of androcentric generics and asymmetrical feminines with no masculine counterparts for many typically female-dominated lower-ranking occupations. It could be argued that, due to extralinguistic factors, seemingly, there was no need for providing their masculine pairs at the time.

When examining the reasons behind these facts, there are no intralinguistic, word-forming limitations that could be identified as the cause for offering no occupational motion pairs in the Classification. On the contrary, both masculine and feminine forms for those occupations do appear in the subsequent versions of the Classification (see sections 3.2 and 3.3). Moreover, several authors have emphasised that some of the masculine forms not included in the 1998 Classification actually appeared quite early in Croatian, not later than in the early 20th century, but it is clear that they have 'disappeared' during further development of the language. Illustrative of the fact is the dictionary *Kroatisch-Deutsch und Deutsch-*

¹³ Within the group *šivači, vezilje i srodna zanimanja* 'seamsters, female embroiderers and related workers'.

Kroatisch (the 1920s¹⁴) by Ivan Scherzer, which was intended for schools. It includes entries for masculine and feminine titles for the following occupational titles: *gatar/gatara* ‘male/female fortune teller’; *primalj/primalja* ‘male/female midwife’ (Scherzer 192-; cf. Glovacki-Bernardi 2008: 81). The reasons for their “disappearance” from the language are probably of social, extralinguistic nature – it was predominantly women who occupied these sectors in the labour market.

These feminine-only occupational titles also reflect the social bias that women cannot occupy leading positions in the labour market. As a result, no occupational terms for the leading positions existed at the time.

Croatian linguists Zlatko Vince (1955: 114) and Stjepan Babić (1991: 80) highlight the interesting semantic data on the masculine form *prelac* ‘male spinner’, also included in the 1998 Classification. It was registered in the language, but it did not denote the male equivalent for the female spinner in terms of lexis. On the contrary, its meanings covered other semantic fields: ‘weak male, avoiding what are considered male tasks and jobs’, as well as ‘type of beans’, ‘butterfly species’ etc. In the 1998 Classification, it obviously conveys the meaning that stands for the masculine equivalent representing the unmarked form of the occupation ‘spinner’. It attests to the fact that the noun *prelac* ‘spinner’ has undergone a certain semantic transformation during the language development processes.

3.2 The 2008 Amendments to the National Classification of Occupations

After adopting the measures of the National Policy for the Promotion of Gender Equality 2006 - 2010, a specific measure was introduced in order to record all the occupational classifications indicating feminine and masculine forms, as underlined in the introductory part. In 2008, Croatian Bureau of Statistics, the body responsible for the execution of the measure, published the Amendments to the National Classification of Occupations.

Although a novelty approach was implemented, it was obvious that the order implemented was opposite to the one stated earlier – first masculines, then feminines. The practice of persistently ordering masculine terms before feminine terms may be interpreted as the instance of overt linguistic sexism. The primary position of the masculine forms also reflects the derivational direction criticised by feminist linguists that the feminine forms are derived from the masculine forms.

¹⁴ No specific year of publishing can be found on the pages of Scherzer's dictionary. The imprint of the edition referred to in this paper specifies only that it is the 12th edition, printed in Osijek.

Despite significant progress in the occupational stratification model providing both masculine and feminine occupational titles, the 2008 Amendments also display certain gender asymmetries. They are evident in minor groups, unit groups and are the most widespread on the list of single occupations.

3.2.1 Minor groups

In minor groups, the following professions are listed with feminines exclusively: *medicinske sestre i primalje* ‘female nurses and midwives’; *kućne pomoćnice, čistačice, peračice i srodna zanimanja* ‘female domestic helpers, cleaning ladies, laundresses and related professions’. Compared to the 1998 Classification, it is evident that there are fewer feminine-only titles in the minor groups; therefore, from the linguistic sexism perspective, it could be argued that some noticeable progress has been made. The reason for not listing their masculine pairs is again to be found in the social factors. These jobs had traditionally been performed mostly by women, and the latter minor group is a typical example of the fact that women usually occupied lower-ranking jobs. Again, there are no intralinguistic constraints to form masculine nouns, which will be shown in the 2010 Classification analysis (section 3.3), where almost all of those nouns have both equivalents.

In minor groups, the masculine form only is provided for the profession *modeli* ‘models’.¹⁵ The Croatian noun *model* (nominative singular form) can be classified as the epicene with masculine grammatical gender (a-class declension type¹⁶) and both male and female referents.

3.2.2 Unit groups

Several occupations without masculine forms, found in the minor groups, can also be found in the unit groups, together with some new examples: *medicinske sestre* ‘female nurses’; *primalje* ‘midwives’; *tajnice* ‘female secretaries’; *zrakoplovne domaćice* ‘female travel attendants’;¹⁷ *domaćice i srodna zanimanja* ‘female domestic housekeepers and related professions’; *vezilje* ‘female embroiderers’;¹⁸ *kućne pomoćnice* ‘female domestic helpers’; *čistačice i posluga* ‘cleaning ladies and domestic staff’; *pralje i glačarice* ‘hand-laundresses and female pressers’.

¹⁵ Within the minor group *manekeni/manekenke i modeli* ‘male/female fashion and other models’.

¹⁶ In contemporary Croatian grammars, declension types for nouns are determined according to the genitive case morpheme of the noun; a-class declension type, e-class declension type, i-class declension type.

¹⁷ Within the group *zrakoplovne domaćice i brodski poslužitelji/brodске poslužiteljice* ‘female travel attendants and travel stewards/ travel stewardesses’.

¹⁸ Within the group *šivači/šivačice, vezilje i srodna zanimanja* ‘seamsters/seamstresses, female embroiderers and related professions’.

When compared to the 1998 unit groups, it is evident from the examples that the 2008 Amendments unit groups are supplemented with two new feminines for the masculine forms – along with the male ship attendants, there is also the newly added feminine equivalent *brodske poslužiteljice*; male seamsters are accompanied with the feminine noun *šivačice* ‘seamstresses’.

Nonetheless, other titles listed only with feminine forms still lack their masculine pairs.

Certain titles in the 2008 unit groups, without feminine pairs and with specific grammatical determinants, are to be explained separately. These nouns end in -a in the nominative singular; therefore, according to their morphological structure, they belong to the e-class declension type, typical of most Croatian feminine gender nouns. On the other hand, their gender as regards declension type does not correspond to what they denote as they are lexically male nouns. They are often referred to as ‘masculine a-stems’ (see Motschenbacher and Weikert 2015: 71–74) or ‘hybrid nouns’ (e. g. Pišković 2011; Marković 2013). However, it should be stressed here that their grammatical description in terms of gender, sex and noun class is inconsistently and ambiguously presented throughout Croatian linguistic literature and dictionaries since identical examples of the nouns in question are often described and classified differently by various authors.

In these unit groups, there are two e-class declension type nouns of grammatically masculine gender: *knjigoveže i srodna zanimanja* ‘print finishing and binding workers and related professions’; *pazikuće i srodna zanimanja* ‘building caretakers and related professions’. It is necessary to underline the fact that although both *knjigoveža* and *pazikuća* usually denote males, they can denote both males and females (see Babić et al. 2007: 375, cf. Pišković 2011: 136–159).¹⁹ According to these features, they can be classified as common gender nouns, double-gender nouns (in Croatian, the term is *dvorodne imenice*, *dvorodnice*). In order to avoid the double gender and double reference for the same noun form, it is possible in Croatian to coin feminine nouns that differ from masculine nouns by using somewhat different stem and adding suffixes. For the professions in question, the possible binary pair could be *kućepazitelj/kućepaziteljica* – it actually appeared in the 2010 Classification (see 3.3.2).

¹⁹ Some of these nouns – *pazikuća* – may denote males exclusively in which case they are classified as hybrid nouns. They may also denote both males and females, in which case they are classified as common gender nouns.

The epicene noun *modeli* ‘models’ from the minor group appears again within the unit groups.

3.2.3 Single occupations

The list of single occupations shows imbalances in various titles – some occupations lack masculine pairs, others lack feminine pairs.

The following are the titles without any masculine forms for denoting males in terms of lexis: *servirka* ‘female food server’; *hostesa hotelske ponude* ‘hotel offer hostess’; *balerina* ‘ballerina’; *stomatološka sestra* ‘stomatological female nurse’; *striptizeta* ‘female stripper’; *domaćica zrakoplova* ‘female flight attendant’; *stjuardesa* ‘stewardess’; *voditeljica u kabini zrakoplova* ‘lead female flight attendant’; *starija zrakoplovna domaćica* ‘senior female flight attendant’; *zemaljska domaćica* ‘ground hostess’; *brodska sobarica* ‘ship maid’; *pomoćna hotelska domaćica* ‘female assistant hotel housekeeper’; *nadzornica čistoće* ‘female cleanliness supervisor’; *hotelska domaćica* ‘female hotel housekeeper’; *nadzornica soba* ‘female room supervisor’; *domaćica kuhinje* ‘kitchen hostess’; *hotelska sobarica* ‘hotel maid’; *dadilja* ‘childminder’; *paziteljica djece* ‘childminder’; *babica* ‘midwife’; *hostesa* ‘hostess’; *gatara* ‘female fortune teller’; *kućna pomoćnica* ‘female domestic helper’; *spremačica* ‘female cleaner’; *čistačica* ‘cleaning lady’; *sobarica* ‘chambermaid’; *pralja* ‘laundress’; *glačarica* ‘female presser’.

It is evident from the list that feminine-only titles mostly refer to non-prestigious jobs. The title *stjuardesa* ‘stewardess’ is not given its masculine form; paradoxically, for the profession ‘travel steward/travel stewardess’, both titles are entered: *brodski stjuard/brodska stjuardesa*.

Titles without any feminine equivalents are the following: *ataše* ‘attaché’; *krupje* ‘croupier’; *konferansje* ‘master of ceremonies’; *impresario* ‘impresario’; *diskodžokej* ‘disc jockey’; *dramski pisac* ‘drama writer’; *pisac* ‘writer’; *tehnički pisac* ‘technical writer’; *pisac reklamnih poruka* ‘copywriter’; *pisac tekstova za pjesme* ‘lyricist’; *tekstopisac* ‘text writer’; *pristav* ‘court clerk’; *hotelski teklić* ‘hotel errand-boy’. The nouns *ataše*, *krupje*, *konferansje*, *impresario* and *diskodžokej* are all of foreign origin in Croatian and can be categorised as the epicenes, with stable grammatical masculine gender, but referring to both males and females. Nevertheless, there have been attempts to fit some of them better into Croatian norms and to form motion pairs, thus eliminating the epicenes. One of the examples of such practice can be found in the Croatian-English Dictionary by Željko Bujas, published before the 2008 Amendments. It offers a feminine equivalent for croupier: *krupjerka* ‘woman croupier’ (2001:

595). However, it obviously had no effect on the “legalization” of occupational titles. The occupational title *konferansje* ‘master of ceremonies’ is a similar case. The Croatian language dictionary contains entries for masculine and feminine pairs, although the masculine noun is different than the form in the Amendments: *konferansijer/konferansijerka* (Šonje 2000: 476); Bujas’ Dictionary contains the entry *konferansje/konferansjerka* (2001: 556), but none of the two feminine forms recorded in contemporary dictionaries entered the 2008 Amendments.

The occupation *pisac* ‘writer’ has been recorded in various versions on the 2008 Amendments single occupations list. Most of the nouns ending with -(a)c have no feminine pairs in Croatian due to the word formation constraints (see Barić et al. 1997: 304). The binary pair *spisatelj/spisateljica*, denoting the same meaning as *pisac*, is also frequently used in the contemporary language practice, as well as listed in the contemporary Croatian language dictionary (Anić 1998: 1090). It was also included in Scherzer’s early 20th-century dictionary. These nouns are derived by using a slightly different stem in order to easily derive the feminine noun from the masculine one, but the language practice was obviously not incorporated in the 2008 Amendments.

The masculine noun *pristav* ‘court clerk’ has been present in Croatian legal terminology since the Middle Ages (Margetić 2005), but no feminine form has existed. As stressed earlier, no feminine forms were included in Croatian constitutional legislation even in the 2nd half of 19th century (Mamić 1981). Legal language is usually characterised by high degree of linguistic conservatism, therefore, it could be the reason why no feminine has been derived, although there are no intralinguistic constraints to do so. What’s more, extralinguistic situation suggests there are more women performing this occupation. Since the noun ends in consonant /v/, the feminine form could be *pristavka*.

The masculine form *hotelski teklić* ‘hotel errand-boy’ could be provided with the feminine noun *tekličica*, by analogy with the occupational term *vodič* ‘guide’, with the same suffix, and its feminine form *vodičica*.

Among the single-list entries without any feminine nouns there is a distinctive group of titles with particular sociological, traditional and religious characteristics. These are Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Islamic and Jewish religious titles. Since these religions do not allow women to wear the titles in question, there has been no need to derive the nouns that lexically refer to females: *biskup* ‘bishop’; *cardinal* ‘cardinal’; *nadbiskup* ‘archbishop’; *pomoćni biskup* ‘titular/auxiliary bishop’; *eparh* ‘eparch’; *patrijarh* ‘patriarch’; *mitropolit* ‘metropolitan’; *arhijerej* ‘archpriest’; *arhiepiškop* ‘archbishop in Eastern Orthodox Church’;

episkop ‘bishop in Eastern Orthodox Church’; *imam* ‘imam’; *glavni imam* ‘grand imam’; *muftija* ‘mufti’; *generalni vikar* ‘vicar general’; *kapelan* ‘chaplain’; *redovnik* ‘monk’; *brat laik* ‘lay brother’; *župnik* ‘parish priest’; *pastor* ‘pastor’; *rabin* ‘rabbi’; *kantor* ‘cantor’; *đakon* ‘deacon’; *arhiđakon* ‘archdeacon’; *ipođakon* ‘subdeacon/hypodeacon’; *jerodđakon* ‘hierodeacon’; *protođakon* ‘protodeacon’; *protojerej* ‘archpriest’; *protonamjesnik* ‘deputy protopriest’; *jerej* ‘priest’; *jeromonah* ‘hieromonk’; *arhimandrit* ‘archimandrite’; *iguman* ‘igumen’; *protosinđel* ‘protosyncellus’; *sinđel* ‘syncellus’; *mualim* ‘muallim’; *mujezin* ‘muezzin’.

The title *redovnik* ‘monk’, listed as masculine-only, can be occupied by women and its feminine form *redovnica* is standard in the Croatian language practice, but it has not been incorporated into the single-occupation list.

In certain branches of Judaism, women can be ordained as rabbis, but this has not happened in Croatia so far. That is probably the extralinguistic reason why we still do not have the feminine form for the title *rabin*. On the other hand, the noun *rabin* can be classified as an epicene with the masculine grammatical gender (the a-class declension type) and with both male and female referential gender (see Pišković 2011: 161).

The only form listed among those religious titles in feminine gender and referring to females exclusively is *časna sestra* ‘nun’. It has no masculine form due to the same extralinguistic – social and religious – constraints (cf. Pišković 2011: 166–167).

The following occupations are illustrative of the clash between declension type (e-class declension type) and referential gender: *listonoša* ‘mail carrier’; *pismonoša* ‘mail carrier’; *drvosječa* ‘lumberman’; *diplomirani kateheta* ‘instructor in catechism’.

Common gender nouns are also listed: *pazikuća* ‘building caretaker’; *vođa snimanja* ‘filming producer’; *vođa posade marine* ‘marine crew captain’; *vođa plovećega radnog stroja* ‘marine engine captain’; *vođa plovećeg jaružala* ‘dredger captain’; *vođa velikog tehničkog broda* ‘large vessel captain’; *vođa palube* ‘boatswain’; *vođa palube unutarne plovidbe* ‘inland navigation boatswain’; *vođa malog broda* ‘coxswain’; *vođa stroja* ‘donkeyman’.

As illustrated in section 3.2.2 for the noun *pazikuća*, some Croatian linguists have also noticed that the noun *vođa* ‘chief/head’ does not have a feminine form, but in contemporary Croatian it could denote both sexes (e. g. Bošnjak-Botica and Gulešić-Machata 2007), although normative handbooks have not prescribed it so far (cf. Babić et al. 2007: 301; Silić and Pranjeković 2007: 108). The same could apply to nouns *pismonoša* and *listonoša* (see Anić 1998: 490, 759, 1311).

From the feminist language planning perspective, many of those occupational nouns could be transformed by implementing other word-formation processes, thus obtaining occupational nouns that easily produce masculine and feminine forms, such as the masculine/feminine noun *voditelj/voditeljica* instead of *voda*.

The examples of epicenes in cases of single occupations are the following: *fotomodel* ‘photo model’ and *umjetnički model* ‘artist’s model’.

3.3 The 2010 Croatian National Classification of Occupations

Following the changes in the labour market, a new International Standard Classification of Occupations ISCO-08 was adopted by the European Commission in 2009. That was an incentive for the Croatian Bureau of Statistics to create the new Croatian National Classification of Occupations, harmonized with the recent international standard. The project was divided in two phases. Its first part was published in 2010, using the four-level classification: major, sub-major, minor and unit groups. The second phase – the creation of the list of single occupations within these groups – was to be completed by the end of 2013. However, as it has not been published at the time of writing of this paper, it was impossible to include it into the analysis.

Changes have been noticed in the minor and unit groups; the feminisation strategy of explicit naming of both sexes has resulted in non-sexist, masculine/male and feminine/female pairs almost in every single case. We can single out here the asymmetries still remaining in the 2010 version of the Classification.

3.3.1 Minor groups

The minor group *kućne pomoćnice, čistačice, peračice i srodna zanimanja* ‘female domestic helpers, cleaning ladies, laundresses and related professions’ was changed to fit the binary model, and in 2010 it was listed as *čistači/čistačice, perači/peračice, kućne pomoćnice i srodna zanimanja* ‘cleaners/cleaning ladies, launderers/laundresses, female domestic helpers and related professions’. The profession *kućne pomoćnice* still lacks its masculine form, although there are no intralinguistic constraints for forming it. The masculine form could be *kućni pomoćnik*.

The 2008 Amendments group *medicinske sestre i primalje* ‘female nurses and midwives’ was divided in two separate minor groups in 2010: *medicinske sestre/medicinski tehničari* ‘female/male nurses’ and *stručnjaci/stručnjakinje za zdravstvenu njegu i primaljstvo* ‘male/female experts for health care and midwifery’.

The group *medicinske sestre/medicinski tehničari* ‘female/male nurses’ is the only one in the whole Classification with a reversed order – first feminine and then masculine title. It thus perpetuates the imagery of nursing as a predominantly female occupation, although the assumption only became correct in the 19th century, in the period strongly influenced by Florence Nightingale and her vision of the nursing profession development (e. g. Licul 2014). The socio-historical stereotype is also visible in the female firstness Classification order. Another fact to point out is the asymmetry of the occupational form itself. Instead of reaching for the antonym *brat* ‘brother’, the masculine occupational term is formed by using the noun *tehničar* (literally ‘technician’). The applying of this strategy to coin a masculine form could be seen as an example of hidden, indirect sexism. The “semantic derogation” (Schulz 1975) of feminine form is also evident: the stereotypical patriarchal family label, domestic marks and connotations are linked with *sestra*; and technical expertise imagery is evoked with *tehničar*, representing the higher category.

3.3.2 Unit groups

Among the unit groups from 2010 occupational titles represented only with feminine forms can still be found: *vezilje* ‘female embroiderers’;²⁰ *pralje i glačarice* ‘hand-laundresses and female pressers’. The Croatian-English Dictionary by Željko Bujas offered *glačalac* ‘launderer/presser/laundry-press operator’ as a masculine equivalent (2001: 336), but it obviously had no impact on the 2010 Classification. This again attests to the fact that the limitations for forming both pairs are only of the socio-cultural nature, not the intralinguistic one.

In 2010, the unit group *kućne pomoćnice* ‘female domestic helpers’ was merged with the unit group *čistačice i posluga* ‘cleaning ladies and domestic staff’ to form a new group: *čistači/čistačice i kućne pomoćnice i srodna zanimanja* ‘cleaners/cleaning ladies, female domestic helpers and related professions’. It is obvious that the term *kućne pomoćnice* still has no masculine form in this group.

The unit groups *glavne primalje* ‘head midwives’ and *medicinske sestre-primalje* ‘female midwifery associate professionals’, listed with no masculine pairs, are presented separately. It recalls the case of the first male person in Croatia’s modern history to achieve a degree in midwifery. Although the minor group term was reformulated to encompass both male and female experts for midwifery, the existing Classification has no masculine pair for

²⁰ Within the group *šivači/šivačice, vezilje i srodna zanimanja* ‘seamsters/seamstresses, female embroiderers and related professions’.

the unit group level (the single occupation list has not been published yet). When trying to obtain his licence from the Croatian Chamber of Midwives in 2014, the person in question encountered problems and his case received media coverage. The Chamber had no legal mechanisms to issue his licence with the occupational title in referential masculine gender next to his name. After the ombudswoman for gender equality had raised the issue with the Chamber in 2016, the regulation was changed and a new title for a male was coined: *primaljski asistent* ‘midwifery assistant’. The Croatian midwifery handbook from 1875 includes a glossary of midwifery terms. It explains *primalj* with its Italian and German synonyms *ostetrico* and *Geburtshelfer*, respectively (Kuzmanić 1875: 286).²¹ Scherzer’s dictionary also had the entry *primalj*. However, during the period of more than a century between the publishing of the handbook and dictionary and 2016, the masculine form *primalj* obviously “disappeared” from the language development processes, probably due to its infrequent usage in real-life situations. Therefore, paradoxically, we had to reach for a new solution in 2016, instead of possibly re-using the one that had existed since the late 19th century.

Some of the occupational titles have been reformulated in order to facilitate the forming of the feminine pair in the binary model – the former group *zrakoplovne domačice i brodski poslužitelji/brodске poslužiteljice* ‘female travel attendants and travel stewards/travel stewardesses’ has been changed to *članovi/članice kabinske posade* ‘male/female travel attendants and travel stewards/stewardesses. Something similar happened with the terms *knjigoveža* ‘print finishing and binding worker’ and *pazikuća* ‘building caretaker’, which are morphologically typical of most feminine gender nouns, but which can denote both males and females, and their gender according to the agreement is masculine. These occupational terms have been changed in their unit groups in such a way to facilitate the forming of feminine nouns according to generative models, using the same stem and different suffixes: *kućepazitelji/kućepaziteljice* ‘male/female building caretakers’; *rukovatelji/rukovateljice tiskarskim, knjigoveškim i sličnim strojevima* ‘male/female print finishing and binding workers’.

Several occupations have also changed their suffixes compared to the 2008 Amendments forms. The feminine title *slagarice* ‘female pre-press technicians’ has been changed to *slagarke*. However, the feminine term *slagarica* can be found in a contemporary Croatian dictionary (Šonje 2000: 1139), and the newly changed *slagarka* is not confirmed in

²¹ The handbook’s first chapter describes the term *primalja* and explicitly stresses that *ženske glave* ‘female heads’ exclusively help with natural births (Kuzmanić 1875: 1).

contemporary dictionaries. Moreover, adding the suffix *-ka* to foreign bases ending with *-ar*, *-er*, etc. is a standard, but *slagar* is not a foreign base. Motschenbacher and Weikert also point to the fact that the suffix *-ka* is much more used in Serbian than in Croatian (2015: 62, 64). The reason for the suffix change may be the fact that, apart from denoting the female person, *slagarica* could denote a type of a puzzle game. This semantic ambiguity may thus be evaded by using the form *slagarka* to denote a female person.

The masculine title *kušatelj namirnica* ‘male food and beverage tasters’ was changed to *kušači namirnica* in 2010. The reason for this probably lies in the more frequent usage of the latter term and its better adaptation to the word-formation models. Furthermore, *kušač* is confirmed in contemporary Croatian dictionaries (see Šonje 2000: 522, Bujas 2001: 607).

The last point to be noticed in the analysis is the masculine single occupation listed in the 2008 Amendments: *ronitelj spužvi i koralja* ‘the sponge and coral underwater diver’. The 2010 Classification unit group now has the plural term *ronioci* ‘underwater divers’ and its nominative singular form is *ronilac*. The term *ronitelj* is more productive because its feminine form is more easily derived by only adding the suffix to the masculine form – *roniteljica*. In the case of the form *ronilac*, the noun *ronilica* exists, but semantically it denotes ‘type of underwater vessel’ and one has to reach for the noun *roniteljica* as a feminine form. Regardless, the strong and frequently used language practice and the standard Croatian contemporary dictionaries have verified only *ronilac* as the normative form (see Šonje 2000: 1086; Anić 1998: 1015; cf. Frančić et al. 2006: 175). The 2010 Classification obviously adhered to the norm and confirmed the status of the noun *ronilac* by listing it into its groups.

4. Conclusion

After analysing a large corpus of occupational terms in three different versions of the Croatian National Classification of Occupations published between 1998 and 2010, the results suggest that a significant language change in the form of implementation of the gender-differentiated occupational terms has been taking place and that this change has been successful to an extent. A study in 2012 showed that the percentage of gender-equal job advertisements in Croatian daily newspapers is increasing year after year (Glovacki-Bernardi 2012: 150).²² A more recent studies assessing the use of feminine forms in Croatian language

²² A degree of resistance to feminist reforms in this respect may be illustrated by two anecdotes. The first one involves a company owner, whose secretary informed him on the gender equality ombudswoman’s warning that their company’s job advertisements have to include a clear indication that persons of both sexes may apply for the job in question. He reacted with disbelief, discarding it as an unimportant issue. He posted such a note on a social network, but he later deleted it. Another company’s job advertisement was an example of indirect sexism.

practice, in everyday spoken language as well as different discourses, have confirmed that feminine forms for occupations are used frequently (Martinović 2015; Medved 2017).

The three versions of the Classification reflect the language changes and splits. The newer versions of the National Classification of Occupations exhibit more diversity in terms of the linguistic representation of women – gradually evolving from the dominant androcentric principle in the 1998 Classification, then introducing the dichotomous, grammatical masculine-feminine model in the 2008 Amendments and then developing female linguistic visibility further in the 2010 Classification. It confirms that the reasons for the asymmetries concerning the motion pairs that specify professions are predominantly caused by extralinguistic, not morphological factors.

The forming of feminine occupational terms constitutes the tradition in Croatian language development. As a result of language developments, more and more feminine forms have been coined and frequently used in the spoken language. The native speakers of Croatian got used to them and started using them in everyday situations. It can be stated that equality in respect of the occupational terms was first achieved in the language practice, and then slowly codified in legislative documents. Although gender-correct occupational forms have been spontaneously used in the daily language practice (cf. Glovacki-Bernardi 2012), the attempts to adopt and spread non-sexist language changes by codifying the gender-aware terms continued at a slower pace, sometimes even ignoring the solutions already incorporated in contemporary dictionaries or in older ones, as well as in the everyday usage of the language. The analysis of the occupational nouns confirms the fact that the change in Croatian is underway; perhaps progressing slowly, but nevertheless incorporating sociolinguistic and cultural changes, habits and the current reality of its language community into its terminology.

Although significant efforts have been made to ensure that the feminine occupational terms are listed on an equal footing with masculine ones, it is important to note that the binary model still displays certain asymmetries and constraints. It is still implicitly androcentric: feminine forms occupy the secondary position in the binary structure and are mostly derived from masculine nouns, which are still inherently perceived as the norm/basis to start from. Although there are no intralinguistic limitations among the examples analysed, they are evident socially and historically. Groups of nouns with feminine forms only exemplify the male bias against certain professions. It is also evident that many of the exclusively feminine

Although there was a clear indication that persons of both sexes may apply, the videos were stereotypically implying that cashiers and cleaners are women, and warehouse workers men. They were also warned by the Gender Equality Office.

nouns are associated with non-prestigious occupations. On the other hand, the exclusively masculine nouns are not associated with such occupations. The only noun where female bias is shown is the nursing profession. Finally, some of the occupational terms in the classifications, which denoted male referents, but with a typically feminine declension type, were reluctantly replaced with other nouns, although the new entries were more productive in when it comes to word formation. Furthermore, the intralinguistic (lexical) factors such as word formation restrictions for certain professions (for example *pisac*), which can cause imbalances, can be overcome by offering other solutions that facilitate the forming of the male/female pairs. The justifiability of using epicenes, such as *pazikuća*, is also questionable in this context, especially in the light of other occupational titles conveying the same meaning and with both masculine and feminine equivalents.

Nevertheless, the everyday language practice confirms that the gender-specific usage has become widespread in the modern Croatian language, but there are challenges in the lexical aspect of “codified” occupational terminology, since it still reflects numerous social stereotypes. It remains to be seen whether both masculine and feminine occupational terms will be used with similar frequency in the future, thus acknowledging the language history and tradition on the one hand, and social and cultural characteristics on the other.

Sources

Amendments to the National Classification of Occupations. 2008. *Official Gazette* 124/08. Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2008_10_124_3556.html

Croatian National Classification of Occupations. 1998. *Official Gazette* 111/98. Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1998_08_111_1506.html

Croatian National Classification of Occupations. 2010. *Official Gazette* 147/2010 and 14/2011. Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2010_12_147_3736.html

References

Act on Gender Equality. 2008. *Official Gazette* 82/08. Retrieved on 18 March 2018 from [www.prs.hr/attachments/article/126/Act%20on%20Gender%20Equality%20\(Official%20Gazette%2082_08\).pdf](http://www.prs.hr/attachments/article/126/Act%20on%20Gender%20Equality%20(Official%20Gazette%2082_08).pdf)

Anić, V. 1998. *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika (The Croatian Language Dictionary)*. Zagreb: Novi Liber.

Babić, S. 1991. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskom književnom jeziku: nacrt za gramatiku (Word Formation in Croatian)*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

Babić, S. 2006. "Hrvatski jezik, zakonodavstvo i ravnopravnost spolova" ("Croatian Language, Legislation and Equality of Sexes"). *Jezik, časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 53 (3). 81–120.

Babić, S., D. Brozović, I. Škarić and S. Težak. 2007. *Glasovi i oblici hrvatskoga književnog jezika (Croatian Phonology and Morphology)*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Barić, E. 1987. "Mocijski parnjaci i njihova upotreba (Motal Pairs and Their Usage)". *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik* 13 (1). 9–18.

Barić, E. 1988. "Tvorbeni status ženskog mocijskog parnjaka (The Formation Status of the Feminine Motal Pair)". *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik* 14 (1). 43–49.

Barić, E. 1989. "Ženski mocijski parnjak kao funkcionalna komunikacijska kategorija (Feminine Motal Pair as Functional Communication Category)". *Jezik, časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 37 (1). 12–21.

Barić, E., M. Lončarić, D. Malić, S. Pavešić, M. Peti, V. Zečević and M. Znika. 1997. *Hrvatska gramatika (The Croatian Grammar)*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Bertoša, M. 2001. "Jezične promjene i feministička kritika jezika (Linguistic changes and the feminist critique of language)". *Revija za sociologiju* 32 (1-2). 63-75.

Bošnjak-Botica, T. and M. Gulešić-Machata. 2007. „Rod imenica na -a za osobe muškoga spola (Gender of Nouns with the Grammatical Morpheme -a for Male Persons)“. *Lahor: časopis za hrvatski kao materinski, drugi i strani jezik* 2 (4). 170–189.

Bujas, Ž. 2001. *Croatian-English Dictionary*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Bukarica, M. 1999. „Rod imenica koje znače profesiju u ruskom i hrvatskom jeziku (Gender of nouns denoting occupation in the Russian and Croatian language)“. *Suvremena lingvistika* 47-48 (1). 3-28.

Corbett, G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doleschal, U. and S. Schmid. 2001. Doing gender in Russian. In: Hellinger, M. and H. Motschenbacher (eds.), *Gender Across Languages* 1. 253-282. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eagly, A. 1987. *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Frančić, A., L. Hudeček and M. Mihaljević. 2006. *Normativnost i višefunkcionalnost u hrvatskome standardnom jeziku (Normativism and Polyfunctionality in Croatian Standard Language)*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.

Glovacki-Bernardi, Z. 2008. *Kad student zatrudni... rasprava o rodnoj perspektivi u jeziku (When a Student Gets Pregnant... a Discussion on Gender Perspective in Language)*. Zagreb: Alfa.

Glovacki-Bernardi, Z. 2012. Job Advertisements in Croatian Newspapers – Gender Perspective. In: Kersten-Pejanić, R., S. Rajilić, C. Voss (eds.), *Doing Gender – Doing the Balkans, Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe*, 20. 147-161. München, Berlin, Washington D.C.: Otto Sagner.

Grubor, M. 1911. "Hrvatski pravni jezik (Croatian Legal Language)". *Mjesečnik Pravnčkoga društva u Zagrebu* 37/1. 47–58, 151–162, 241–251, 322–328, 438–442, 629–636, 716–728.

Hellinger, M. and A. Pauwels. 2007. Language and sexism. In: Hellinger, M. and A. Pauwels (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, Germany. 651-684.

Hentschel, E. 2003. The expression of gender in Serbian. In: Hellinger, M. and H. Motschenbacher (eds.), *Gender Across Languages* 3. 287–309. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hornscheidt, L. 2006. *Die sprachliche Benennung von Personen aus konstruktivistischer Sicht. Genderspezifizierung und ihre diskursive Verhandlung im heutigen Schwedisch*. Berlin/N.Y.: de Gruyter (Linguistik – Impulse und Tendenzen 15).

Janjanin, M. 1934. “Gospođa profesor! (Madam Professor!)” *Naš jezik* 2 (1). 202–204.

Kuzmanić, A. 1875. *Šestdeset učenjah iz primaljstva za primalje (Sixty Midwifery Lessons)*. Zadar: Špiro Artale.

Licul, R. 2014. “Sestrinstvo – ženska profesija? (Nursing – a Female Profession?)” *JADR – European Journal of Bioethics* 5 (9). 183–192.

Mamić, M. 1981. “Hrvatski ustavnopravni jezik u 2. polovici 19. stoljeća (Croatian constitutional language in the 2nd half of 19th ct.)”. *Rasprave* 6-7. 163-226.

Margetić, L. 2005. „O srednjovjekovnom pristavu (About the Medieval Court Clerk (Pristav))“. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu* 2. 271-324.

Marković, I. 2013. *Uvod u jezičnu morfologiju (An Introduction to Language Morphology)*. Zagreb: Disput.

Martinović, B. 2015. „Od jezičnoga "pomuškarčivanja" do jezičnoga "poženčivanja" (From "masculification" to "feminification" in language)“. *Tabula* 13/1. 91-110.

Matas Ivanković, I. 2006. “Kada su prvi put u hrvatskim rječnicima zabilježene imenice za ženska zanimanja? (When Were Nouns for Women's Occupations/Professions Recorded for the First Time in Croatian Dictionaries?)“ *Jezik, časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 53 (1). 33–35.

Medved, A. 2017. “Mocijska tvorba u hrvatskome standardnom jeziku (Motal word formation in standard Croatian language).” Diploma thesis. Pula: Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Faculty of Humanities. Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:137:093259>.

- Mihaljević, M. 2013. "Mocijska tvorba kao leksikografski problem (Motal Word-Formation as a Lexicographical Problem)." In: Matasović, R. (ed.), *Od indoeuropeistike do kroatistike*. 361–373. Zagreb: HAZU.
- Mills, S. 1995. *Feminist Stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, S. 2008. *Language and sexism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Motschenbacher, H. and M. Weikert. 2015. Structural gender trouble in Croatian. In: Hellinger, M. and H. Motschenbacher (eds.), *Gender Across Languages* 4. 49–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- National Policy for the Promotion of Gender Equality 2006 - 2010. 2006. *Official Gazette* 114/06. Retrieved on 2 March 2018 from <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/74614/92967/F383663118/HRV74614.pdf>
- Pauwels, A. 1998. *Women changing Language*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Pišković, T. 2011. *Gramatika roda (The Grammar of Gender)*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Posch, C. 2014. *Feminist language forms in German: A corpus-assisted study of personal appellation with non-human referents*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing.
- Rajilić, S. 2017. "Is Serbian becoming Croatian? Nationalist counter-reactions to feminist linguistics in Serbia." *Gender and Language* 11(2). 204-226.
- Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)17 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on gender equality standards and mechanisms. Retrieved on 10 March 2018 from https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805d4aa3
- Scherzer, I. 192–. *Hrvatski-njemački i njemački-hrvatski: s naznakom izgovora i naglasaka. Kroatisch-Deutsch und Deutsch-Kroatisch*. Osijek: Štamparski zavod Krbavac i Pavlović.
- Schulz, M. 1975. *The Semantic Derogation of Woman*. New York: Thorne and Henley.
- Silić, J. .2004. "Mocijska tvorba u hrvatskome jeziku (The Motal Word Formation in Croatian Language)". *Riječki filološki dani* 5. 481–486.
- Silić, J. and I. Pranjković. 2007. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Silveira, J. 1980. "Generic masculine words and thinking". *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 3 (2–3). 165–178.

Šonje, J. (ed.) 2000. *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika (The Croatian Language Dictionary)*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Školska knjiga.

Štebih Golub, B. 2008. "Pravi tvorbeni mocijski parnjaci u kajkavskome književnom jeziku (Direct motion pairs in kajkavian standard language)". *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 34. 393–412.

Štebih Golub, B. and M. Mihaljević. 2010. "Mocijska tvorba u hrvatskome i srpskome jeziku (Word Formation in Croatian and Serbian)". In: Tošović, B. and A. Wonisch (eds.), *Hrvatski pogledi na odnose između hrvatskoga, srpskoga i bosanskoga /bošnjačkoga jezika*. 191-213. Zagreb: Izvori. Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from https://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/470356.LitVerlag_Format-mmbs_1.pdf.

Stolac, D. and V. Soldo. 2015. „Tvorba naziva za vršitelje radnje u starijoj hrvatskoj kajkavskoj leksikografiji (Forming a name for a doer of an action in the older Croatian Kajkavian lexicography)". *Radovi Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad u Požegi* 4. 71-87.

Vince, Z. 1955. "Drugarica direktor, gospođa profesor ili drugarica direktorica, gospođa profesorica? (Madam Director, Madam Professor or Madam Directress, Female Professor?)" *Jezik, časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika* 3 (4). 113–118.

Vulić, S. and G. Laco. 2015. Jezik hrvatskih književnih djela u 19. stoljeću (The language of Croatian 19th ct. literary works). In: Bičanić, Ante (ed.) *Povijest hrvatskoga jezika, 4. knjiga: 19. stoljeće*. 179-243. Zagreb: Croatica.

Ženska mreža Hrvatske. 2004. Zahtjev za pokretanje ispitivanja ustavnosti i zakonitosti Nacionalne klasifikacije zanimanja (Request to Initiate the Examination of the Constitutionality and Legality of the National Classification of Occupations). Retrieved on 26 March 2018 from http://www.zenska-mreza.hr/Aktivnosti/klasifikacija_zanimanja.htm.