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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of social and political change on primary teaching in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The study considers the literature relating to educational developments in post-communist countries in political and economic transition. From the literature key themes were developed as a basis from which the data could be interrogated. The themes relate to how: (i) in times of transition or conflict, schools become arenas for competing forces; (ii) educational reform follows a series of stages and successful implementation requires supporting factors; (iii) micro-level change takes longer to implement than macro-level change; (iv) transition affects teachers’ remuneration and status, and (v) international organisations’ involvement in mediating conflict resolution agreements can have consequences for education.

Analysis of the data illustrates the influence of various ideologies on primary education in Bosnia. In particular, religion and nationalism constantly challenge other forces for control of education. The study suggests that many models of educational reform do not take account of multi-dimensional contexts, where political and economic transition is accompanied by civil war and the transition to a new nation state. The analysis demonstrates that micro-level change in education does not always take time to implement, particularly in highly-centralised systems, and that micro-level change can occur prior to macro-level change. Economic transition is shown to impact on teachers’ remuneration. This has a negative effect on teachers’ status, exacerbated when the political and social context reduces the value accorded teachers. This has consequences for teacher recruitment and quality. The study also suggests that international organisations’ mediation in conflict resolution can impact on education. In Bosnia the evidence indicates that the political structure created has hindered decision-making and contributed to the ethnic division of the country.

This study contributes to knowledge on educational developments in central and eastern Europe by providing an analysis of the Bosnian experience. It also contributes to literature on educational reform and questions existing models. The study also adds to literature on the role of international organisations in the globalisation of educational provision.
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Diagram of the education system in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Chapter 1: Introduction and setting the scene

This study is an investigation into the effects of social and political change on primary teaching in Bosnia\(^1\). I became interested in this topic through working in Bosnia periodically over a number of years and engaging in conversations with people about their educational experiences. In the years following the fall of the communist government and the civil war\(^2\) Bosnia was developing as a new nation state and opening up to the rest of Europe; I was interested in how these political influences would inform educational developments.

**Significance of the research**

Bosnia is described as a country in transition\(^3\) and it is said that there are twenty seven other countries also deemed to be in transition (Slaus, Slaus-Kokotovic and Morovic 2004). I discovered that, whilst much has been written about educational developments in these countries there appeared to be little reference to developments in Bosnia, particularly in the English language. This study therefore contributes to the literature on educational developments in the post-communist countries of central and eastern Europe. The study will also add to the relatively small body of literature currently available in the English language on the historical development of Bosnia’s primary educational provision.

The post-war context is also important to this study. UNESCO has identified that, since

\(^1\) The full name of the country is Bosnia and Herzegovina, but for brevity it will be referred to throughout as Bosnia.

\(^2\) It is acknowledged that the term ‘civil war’ is open to debate and events in Bosnia could be termed ‘conflict’. In this study I describe what occurred in Bosnia during 1992-95 as civil war following the example of Arnhold et.al. (1998).

\(^3\) This phrase is generally taken to refer to countries formerly under communist control and now in political and economic transition, moving towards the establishment of multi-party politics and market-oriented economies.
1990, ‘42 countries have education systems that have been severely affected by conflict’ (www.unesco.org, accessed 21.10.2003). They also note that educational systems often remain unchanged following conflict and that there are lessons to be learned about the role of education in post-conflict reconstruction. UNESCO (www.unesco.org/education accessed 21.10.2003) identified that the study of education in areas of crisis and transition is ‘relatively new’ and it is hoped that this study will contribute to the accumulation of knowledge on experiences in post-war/conflict contexts.

There are, of course, limitations to the study. It is located in a particular time and place and cannot claim to present the complex reality of all those involved in education in Bosnia. Nor can a single case study claim to be generalisable to other contexts; indeed the strength of a case study is that it highlights the events and details particular to that case. However, it is hoped that the analysis of the case exemplifies more general patterns that could be applied elsewhere. This is not a comparative case study but its findings will allow for comparison with developments in other post-communist, post-conflict countries.

The context
Moyles and Hargreaves (1998) claim that primary education in all states is a means of socialising the young into society, although there is debate over whether the school serves as a perpetuator of cultural values and norms or whether it provides ‘hope for a better society through change’ (Tisher and Wideen 1990, p.1). In Bosnia the socio-political context has had implications for education, which has acquired the role of mediator in the acquisition of ethno-national ideology and cultural values. In this role it contributes to the formation of ethnic identity through socialisation of the young as members of a particular

---

4 The term ‘conflict’, rather than civil war, is used where it refers to events that occurred in a range of contexts, some of which could be termed wars and others which could not. Conflict, as defined by Roche (1996) offers a definition that embraces this wider range.

5 Identifying the post-conflict period can be problematic (Miller and Affolter 2002), in this study it refers to the post-1995 period in Bosnia.
ethnic group and perpetuation of the values of the group. Historical developments have impacted on this role as competing ideological forces have challenged those of nationalism, using education as a mechanism for change.

Major developments in the political and social context within Bosnia have often been marked by conflict. For example the ending of the Russo-Turkish war, the First and Second World Wars and the recent civil war all marked political turning points in Bosnia’s history. These periods have, therefore, been used as the defining periods in this study. It is worth noting here that at no point in its history has Bosnia truly been politically autonomous, in each of the periods identified Bosnia was under the governorship of an external authority; first Vienna then Belgrade. Even as an independent nation it is overseen by the UN-appointed Office of the High Commissioner.

The study uses a chronological approach to give context to the development of primary schooling. The first period in the study, 1878 – 1918, covers the governorship of Bosnia by Austro-Hungary. The Austro-Hungarians introduced state provision of education and attempted to minimise the influence of the religious communities on education. During this period teacher education also came under the influence of the state rather than religious clergy.

In the second period, 1918 – 1945, Bosnia was a state within the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, later Yugoslavia. This development saw the introduction of Serbian influences into the education system; although these had minimal impact as the forces of nationalism remained strong.

The third period covers the communist rule of Bosnia, 1945 – 1992, and is the longest period in its history since the departure of the Ottomans. The communist government
expanded educational provision and was able to curb both the religious and nationalist influences but, as was later seen, these were suppressed but not abolished. In the communist tradition the government exercised strict control over education and teachers’ practice.

The final period covers Bosnia’s recent history as an independent nation state, 1992 - 2002. Since 1989 the relationship between eastern European countries and the rest of the world has undergone major change as the eastern European countries embarked on significant ‘triple transition’: from communist dictatorship to pluralistic democracy; from centrally administered to market economies; and from Soviet imperial hegemony to fully independent nation-statehood (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998, p.590). There have been changes in the political systems, economic systems, employment patterns and educational systems of all eastern European countries; many of which are described in the literature.

In Bosnia this triple transition was complicated first by the civil war that occurred soon after the start of the transition process, and second by the peace agreement negotiated by the international community to bring an end to the war. The peace agreement created a complex political structure for Bosnia that has shaped its educational provision and, it is argued, hindered its development. The forces of religion and nationalism emerged strongly after the civil war to reassert their influence on education.

The study is concerned with the effects of each of these major political and social developments on primary teachers and their practice.

In considering the historical developments in educational provision links have been made to the contemporary political and social contexts; this led to the identification of themes that continue to re-appear in Bosnia’s history. The major ideas that emerged from the
study were the influences of ideology on education, the role of the churches, the continuing suppression and re-emergence of nationalist ideology and the role played by education in the development of national identity, and the role of the teacher within different educational contexts. These are discussed in each of the periods identified.

The thesis describes how change in the prevailing ideologies reflected changes in the ruling authorities and how this impacted on education, particularly the ideology of nationalism. It presents data to suggest that existing models of educational reform do not describe the Bosnian experience and that a new model is required. It also suggests that the inter-relationship between macro-level and micro-level reform is dependent on the political context and cannot be assumed to be a linear relationship. The study raises questions over the role played by international organisations in conflict resolution and presents evidence that the post-conflict agreement, drawn up to end the civil war in Bosnia, has hindered its post-war educational developments.

Structure of the thesis

The thesis has a chronological framework. First it describes the background to the data collection and the way in which the work was conducted. The data collected are then reported in four chapters, which correspond to the four periods identified in Bosnia’s history. This data is analysed and discussed and conclusions drawn. Maps are attached to help readers contextualise and understand the information presented.

Chapter two describes the research framework employed and the approach taken. An historical interpretative framework was selected as the most appropriate and, within this, a qualitative case study approach. Data collection methods are also described.
Chapter three discusses existing literature and the themes that emerge from this. The themes relate to the ideological forces that impact on educational provision, the educational reform process and the implementation of reforms, the inter-relationship between macro-level and micro-level reform, the impact of transition on teachers’ remuneration and status and the role played by the international community in conflict resolution and the consequences that this has for education.

Chapters four to seven provide data on the social and political contexts during four periods of Bosnia’s history: under Austro-Hungarian governorship, as a state in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, under communist rule and as an independent nation state.

Chapter eight returns to the themes identified in the literature and considers how the data from the Bosnian experience confirms or contests each theme. Chapter nine concludes the thesis with a discussion of the work and suggested proposals for its further development.
Chapter 2: Methodology: research design and development

In this chapter I describe the way in which the study evolved, starting with a discussion of how I became involved in this area of research as this provides ‘contingent factors’ influencing the research (Silverman, 2005). I go on to describe the research design and the methodological approach taken, including a consideration of my role as researcher. The chapter concludes with a description of the development of the research and the research methods employed.

The context

The study arose from my interest in the development of education in Bosnia; as Stake (1994, p.243) notes, research such as this often has ‘prominent interest before formal study begins’. The start of my interest was serendipitous, through a chance meeting with a charity worker I became involved in a group providing aid to Bosnia. The work involved collecting food and goods in England then delivering and distributing the aid to families in refugee camps. The group also organised summer camps, enabling the children to leave the refugee camps for a short period at the seaside. As a result of this meeting, in 1996, just four months after the signing of the peace agreement that brought an end to the civil war, I was working in Bosnia as a part-time aid-worker and in England as a full-time secondary school teacher. I assisted in the collection and distribution of aid to families, which often meant spending social time with them. Because of my educational experience I became involved in organising the summer camps and working with the children on the camp, which also allowed time for social interaction with them.

My teaching background gave me an interest in educational provision in Bosnia, which I was able to pursue through talking to teachers, parents and pupils. A comment from a teacher also aroused my curiosity, she told me, ‘If you want to know what the state thinks,
what is important, all you have to do is look at the book for the first grade in school, there
you will see what is important.’ She seemed to be saying what I understood many
sociological studies to say, that education is used to transmit values and attitudes which
enable societies to function. My growing interest in this made a formal study more
possible.

Mostar became the focal point, mainly because it was my base for the aid work. This
meant that I had accommodation there, I knew my way around and I already had a number
of contacts in the town. Equally important was that in many ways Mostar represented
Bosnia in microcosm. Prior to the civil war it had been a multi-ethnic town with almost
equal numbers of the population regarding themselves as Muslim, Croatian and Serbian. During the war the majority of Serbs fled and the town became divided between Muslims
and Croats. This remained the situation after the war and mirrors what happened to the
country as a whole.

The research design

By the time the formal research study began I was no longer a school teacher but was
employed as a University-based teacher educator. The research, therefore, was initially
focused on investigating how the social and political changes that had taken place in
Bosnia had influenced primary teacher education provision. However, as I had already
made contact with several teachers working in primary education in Mostar, and had
already spoken to parents and pupils, I decided to widen the study to look at the impact of
the social and political changes on primary education. It soon became apparent that in
order to understand recent events it was necessary for me to understand the complex

As will become apparent in the study, the majority of the population of Bosnia are ‘Bosnian’ given that
they, and their families, were born there. However, national identity is aligned to religious affiliation so that
those of the Catholic faith call themselves Bosnian Croats, those of the Serbian Orthodox faith call
themselves Bosnian Serbs and those of the Muslim faith are Bosnian Muslims or sometimes simply Bosnians
or Muslims.
political and social context within a longer historical framework. In order to reflect this, it was decided to begin the research from the inception of state provision of primary education and the title became: ‘Bosnia and Herzegovina: a study of the effects of social and political change on primary schooling, 1878 – 2002’.

The time frame was selected because 1878 marked the beginning of western European influences on educational developments in Bosnia and the introduction of state education. The end date, 2002, was thought to be sufficiently long after the end of the political transition and civil war for any educational developments to be apparent.

Once the topic of research was agreed consideration was given to methodology. A ‘world systems’ approach was considered but decided unsuitable as I did not want the constraint of approaching the study from a particular, pre-defined, conceptual scheme. I wanted an approach which would allow me to examine events within a specific historical, political, social/cultural framework and within a specific place and time. As the research was mostly historical in nature it was decided that the interpretative historical approach was best suited. This was selected as it is concerned with the ‘integrity, complexity, historical development and social context’ (Kalberg 1994, p.5) of the research case, it allows for the ‘individualizing’ of the case and ‘preserves its historical particularity’ (Tilly, in Kalberg ibid, p.6). Kalberg notes that this approach examines a case against guiding themes and leads to the identification of the ‘unique aspects’ of each case, within its context (1994, p.5).

Interpretive research starts from the view that people’s perceptions form their understanding of their reality, that there is no objective view of reality. This stance accepts that different people may have different views, different understandings of events and that it is the task of the researcher to bring these together to describe and interpret the
phenomena of the study. This approach seemed appropriate to this research as it draws on the views and perceptions of those involved, at various levels, in primary education in Bosnia in order to attempt an explanation of the situation.

As the purpose of the research was to *understand* how the complex political and social development of Bosnia had influenced its primary schooling it was decided that, within the interpretative historical framework, the qualitative approach was the most appropriate. Qualitative methodology is apposite for research ‘that is exploratory or descriptive and that stresses the importance of context, setting and subjects’ frame of reference’ (Marshall and Rossman, 1989 p.46). It was also intended that, as well as taking account of local context, the data would provide ‘a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions’ and ‘preserve chronological flow’ (Miles and Huberman, 1994 p.1) in order to provide an understanding of the situation.

At this stage it was decided to employ an ethnomethodological case study approach. The case study approach has been the subject of discussion and debate (Macdonald and Walker 1977; Adelman et.al. 1980; Kemmis 1980; Walker 1983; Shipman 1985; Yin 1993; Stake 1995) but is increasingly recognised as an appropriate method for educational research. Ragin and Becker (1992) note that case studies ‘need to pay attention to the social and historical context of action, as well as the action itself’ and this was considered an important justification for the case study approach in this study.

Case study has been defined as the ‘study of a bounded system’ (Smith, in Stake 1995, p.2; O’Leary 2004) and as ‘the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances’ (Stake 1995, p.xi). The bounded system which comprised the case in this study was the primary school system in Bosnia during the period 1878 – 2002. This was combined with a narrative approach as, in
the interpretative framework, the participants in the study were asked to ‘describe their world’ (Silverman 2005, p.154). The study cannot, however, be described as a narrative enquiry (Clandinin and Connelly 2000) as it was not a true collaboration between myself and the participants. Whilst the study includes details from a range of participants about their own lives these have not been gathered simply to tell their stories but in order to discover how changes within the political and social context impacted on their lives.

Bassey (2000, p.62) described this kind of case study as a ‘story-telling’ case study as it is a ‘narrative account of the exploration and analysis of the case, with a strong sense of a time line’

Various typologies have been proposed for case studies and this study can be identified within each. Stenhouse (1988) identified the different types as: ethnographic, evaluative, educational and action research. Educational case studies are those concerned with understanding educational action, which was a purpose of this study. Yin (1993, p.5) classified them as exploratory, explanatory and descriptive; this study could be termed ‘descriptive’ as it seeks to give ‘a complete description of a phenomenon within its context’ (op.cit). It would also follow the classification given by Stake (1995) as ‘intrinsic’ because it is concerned with understanding the development of education in Bosnia for its own sake not for other, external concerns; although these may develop later.

The advantages of a case study approach are that it is ‘strong in reality’ (Adelman et.al. 1980, p.59), it allows the researcher to ‘probe deeply’ (Cohen and Manion 1989, p.124) and it acknowledges the complexity of situations. The drawbacks are that it can be difficult to organise (Adelman et.al. 1980, p.59) and that the concepts of validity and reliability may be difficult to ensure because of the singular and particular nature of the case (Bassey 2000). However, qualitative researchers have developed a concept more suited to research of this kind, described variously as ‘trustworthiness’ (Lincoln and Guba,
185), ‘respect for truth’ (Bassey (2000, p.75) and ‘credibility’ (O’Leary (2004). Bassey (op.cit) suggests how ‘respect for truth’ can be looked for at each stage of the research activity: collecting, analysing, interpreting and reporting the data. In this study I attempted to ensure trustworthiness through:

- having prolonged engagement with data sources, thus becoming immersed in the issues;
- observation of emerging issues, looking for ‘salient features’ and clear understanding;
- checking data collected with the originator;
- triangulation of data, by using data from different sources;
- testing of the ‘emerging story’ against the data;
- providing a detailed account of the research.

The role of ‘researcher’

As the role of the researcher is key in any study (see Fink 1999) so it is important to note that the role I played as researcher was that of ‘observer’ of the Bosnian system. My western European, female, teacher-educator perspective will have had some influence on the data collected. However, I have attempted to minimise this through the processes listed above, for example becoming immersed in Bosnian history and culture and checking with interviewees that the transcriptions properly recorded their thoughts. I also discussed my plans for data collection, interview questions and arrangements with colleagues based in Mostar to ensure that they would be clear and meaningful to the participants.

My position as an ‘outsider’ to Bosnian history and culture may also have impacted on the research (see Shah 2004). Vincent and Warren (1998) used the term ‘structure of feeling’ to describe the combination of shared knowledge and understanding of history and place, belonging, beliefs and values, which affect an individual’s attitudes and actions and allow
members of a community to communicate and understand each other. When interviewer and interviewee do not share ‘structure of feeling’ there is a likelihood that this will be reflected in the data collected or in the analysis of data. It has to be acknowledged that, although I spent time in Mostar and read widely about its history and culture, there was no shared ‘structure of feeling’ between me and the participants in this study as I was unable to fully embrace their knowledge and understanding of history and belonging, or their beliefs and values. However, a lack of structure of feeling is not always a disadvantage to research. Mirza (in Vincent and Warren 1998) points out that we each have an identity that is ‘multi-layered’ and complex and that relationships develop between individuals who, on the surface, appear to have nothing in common. Vincent and Warren (1998, p.8) point out that a close match, or symmetry, between researcher and respondent may not necessarily be an advantage as ‘[I]t may mean that one of the pair will assume what is known and understood between them, which may be counter-productive for the researcher’s attempt to understand the respondent’s subjectivity’. The lack of ‘structure of feeling’ was used to advantage in this study as it allowed me to ask participants to explain their situation and experiences in some detail, which provided a richer description than I might otherwise have been able to obtain. In addition, my outsider stance gave me easier access to participants from both ethnic groups, Bosnian Muslims and Croats, which may have been more difficult for an ‘insider’.

My identity helped in a different way when interviewing personnel from the international organisations. Most of the personnel were western European males and we shared not only an interest in the social, political and educational developments in Bosnia but also, through my aid work in the country, experience of working in relatively difficult conditions, for example with intermittent electricity, no running water, cold living conditions in winter and hot ones in summer. This gave sufficient shared experience for them to feel able to
trust me and talk openly, on occasion providing ‘confidential’ information or asking for sources not to be credited.

My role also brought power and social structures into play during the interviewing processes, particularly with the parents and pupils and some of the teachers. Many of these people knew me as an aid worker, or were introduced to me by those with whom I had worked in this way. In this role I had provided the families with food, clothing, money, assisted with finding housing and supported in social and emotional ways. It is possible that, in return, the participants wanted to provide me with ‘good’ information. I was aware of this and tried to avoid it by emphasising that whatever they told me would be useful, and I cross-checked information provided, but I have to take on trust the authenticity of their accounts.

Language was an important issue. I had begun to learn the language before embarking on this research and this enabled me to communicate with the participants on a social level and demonstrated to them my commitment to understanding them and their country. However, my command of the language was insufficient for me to understand the technical language that would arise so I engaged a translator to work with me during the interviews. In order to facilitate openness I used a Bosnian Muslim when working with participants in east Mostar and a Bosnian Croat when working in west Mostar.

There was an added dimension in the context – as a Catholic it could be perceived that I would have a greater shared understanding with the Bosnian Croats, who are of the Catholic faith. However, the majority of my aid work was conducted with Bosnian Muslims, giving me an understanding of their way of life. During the research, whenever possible, I did not reveal my faith and when it was necessary I emphasised that I had
worked with Bosnians who were Muslim and Croat, I had lived in both communities and was non-partisan.

These various dimensions of my role, and how they may have influenced interactions with participants, have to be acknowledged even though it may be difficult to judge how they impacted on the research. It is possible that a different researcher, with a different background, would have focussed on different elements or would have prompted different responses from the participants, but this has to remain unknown.

It is also acknowledged that the data collected, interpreted and presented has been selected and filtered through me and, as Vincent and Warren (1998, p.4) suggest, ‘we remain the arbiter of what we disclose, and what we do not, of how such disclosures are framed and presented for public consumption. In this context, our voice as researchers always remains dominant, even when it is the research respondents who are speaking’. They go on to say that the role of the researcher involves ‘cutting up, ordering and re-ordering the data into a coherent whole’ and that how this is done ‘is influenced by his or her values, priorities, beliefs’ (ibid, p.16). I have attempted throughout this study to remain as objective as possible but recognise that my identity may have some bearing on the final presentation of the work.

**Ethical issues**

Ethical issues were considered during the data collection process and the appropriate guidelines were adhered to (BERA 2004). In this regard, respect for participants was demonstrated through obtaining their voluntary consent. All participants were given full details of the study, ensuring that they understood the process of the research and how and to whom it would be reported. Interviews were recorded in writing or on audiotape and I returned to participants with transcripts of the interviews for them to confirm that they
agreed with what had been transcribed. Each participant was given the opportunity to read the final report. Confidentiality of data was assured and anonymity, as far as possible, was given.

In addition, I was aware of the potentially sensitive nature of some of the research questioning. Participants had recently emerged from a civil war in which many had experienced traumatic events. I was careful when questioning to be sensitive to the emotions of the respondents and to avoid causing upset by stirring up painful memories. Interviews with some participants strayed beyond the research focus, but the data reported omits any references to personal recollections that are outside of the research topic.

**Development of the research**

The research process really began some time before the start of this study. During my period of time as an aid worker I was talking to people about their educational experiences and beginning to try and understand Bosnian society and culture. This helped me to develop some understanding of the context and gave me some initial knowledge of the educational system. This background also helped during the research process as I was able to demonstrate to the participants a long-term interest in their country which made me more acceptable as an outsider.

When the research title had been decided I undertook a more detailed study of Bosnian history along with a review of literature relating to educational reform in countries in transition. This included some texts in Serbo-Croat which were summarised for me by a translator. The literature revealed that little research on the educational system of Bosnia had been conducted and was available in the English language, particularly in recent years. The literature did contain reports of studies of educational developments in other eastern European countries that had experienced political transition and it was from these that the
guiding themes were developed. The themes provided the focus for the research activities by guiding the data collection process and being revisited at the analysis stage.

The study of literature continued throughout the research period as studies of the countries of Eastern Europe continued to be published. I also found that I needed to extend my reading to cover other relevant aspects, such as the literature on educational change and the ideology of communism.

Once the themes had emerged and been considered I began the data collection process. This included site visits to Mostar, reading documentation and conducting informal interviews. During these periods, which spanned from 1998 to 2001, I lived in Mostar, mostly for short periods of two to three weeks but towards the end of the study (June – July 2002) I was there for seven weeks. Wolcott (1995, p.77) asserts that in research activity such as this ‘the brevity of the periods is mollified by the effect of long-term acquaintance’.

Living in the local community provided me with opportunities to become immersed in the culture, developing my understanding and becoming trusted by the participants. I was fortunate that I was able to spend time both in east and west Mostar so became familiar with Bosnian Muslim and Bosnian Croat communities. By working within both communities and listening openly to participants from both sides I was able to overcome any suggestion of being partisan.

**Data sources**

Data were drawn from historical literature, contemporary documents, interviews and observations; these are common methods in the case study approach. The secondary historical sources consisted of a range of literature describing the social and political
context within Bosnia during the earlier periods studied, where it was impossible to obtain primary data. The availability of this data in the English language was limited and as many sources as could be found were consulted in order to reduce the element of author bias. Several books on the history of education in Bosnia were obtained from the library in Mostar, their selection being limited by their availability.

The contemporary documents that were consulted were produced by a number of organisations, including reports published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), UNICEF, UNHCR and The World Bank, government-published reports, reports from the international organisations based in Bosnia and internet news reports such as those at Bosnia Today (www.centraleurope.com/bosniatoday/news). A full list of documents consulted is given in Appendix 2. Some documents were not easy to obtain, and some were impossible; this was due in some cases to the fact that archives were destroyed or lost during the war. The majority of these documents provided factual or statistical data, where possible this was cross-checked with alternative sources but in many cases no alternative source was available. Analysis of the contemporary documents was undertaken with the recognition that they may contain biased information and, where possible, the authenticity and credibility of the author(s) was considered. Documentary evidence was tested out, where possible, through the collection of primary source data, giving an even balance between secondary and primary sources of evidence.

Primary data was collected through interviews and observations. Primary data collection means that the data is not mediated through another person and this allowed me to cross-check data collected through secondary sources.

Interviews were a main source of primary data because they provided ‘a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly’ (Marshall and Rossman 1989, p.82). Mason (1996, p.40)
asserts, also, that interviews reflect the epistemological position in being ‘a legitimate way to generate data … to interact with people, to talk to them, to listen to them, to gain access to their accounts and articulations’. She also believes they reflect the ontological position that ‘people’s knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences and interactions are meaningful properties of the social reality…’ (ibid, p.39). In addition, interviews were thought to be the best way to access information about each respondent’s experience; the time lapse and historical and personal nature of the data meant that they were not available through other sources. However, it is also recognised that interviews asking for personal recollections rely on memory which may not be reliable as ‘it is flawed and reconstructed in the present’ (Potts 1998, p.40) and care was taken to triangulate interview data.

Interviews, it is acknowledged, can be complex and require skill on the part of the researcher. Different interview schedules were drawn up for different respondents (see Appendix 3). The interview questions were carefully planned with ‘comfortable’ questions at the start leading into more difficult questions. The latter drew on the guiding themes and emerging data. The interview schedules were then discussed with a Bosnian colleague to ensure that the questions would be understood by the respondents. Each interview was arranged in advance and preparation undertaken, for example ensuring, where possible, that the location was appropriate, checking audio equipment and briefing the translator.

Interviews were semi-structured, allowing me to work within a framework but to respond to interviewees’ answers and take account of individual experiences and perceptions, an important aspect of case study research. Because of this, during some interviews additional questions emerged which added to, or replaced, existing questions. Interviews of this kind can be perceived as providing accurate accounts of respondents’ experience or
as individual ‘narratives’ (Holstein and Gubrium 1995). Whilst the interview data provides a narrative of a kind this method was not used because it requires the interviewer and interviewee to generate together ‘plausible accounts of the world’ (Silverman 2005, p.154) and I considered that I was not in a position to fully undertake this. Narrative research builds up over time and, although I was engaged in research in Mostar over a period of time, some of the interview respondents were seen only to be interviewed and to report back the interview transcript. For these reasons the narrative approach was not considered appropriate.

Interviews were conducted in June - July 2002 with a range of people concerned with primary education provision, details of these are given in Appendix 4. The list of people to be interviewed was decided by the data required, for example in order to find out about policy I needed to interview government officials whilst in order to find out about classroom practice I needed to interview teachers and pupils. In some cases the sample was selected on the basis of role and there was no choice of who to interview, for example government officials and University staff. In these cases the sample was based on those currently in office or those who had held office in the past. In addition, I had to ensure that I had a balance of representation for east and west Mostar. The international organisations selected were those operating in Mostar at the time of data collection. Each organisation was contacted and visited, the research work was explained and a member of staff involved in educational work agreed to provide data. The numbers of staff available to provide data were small so no further criteria were imposed for the sample selected, and those involved were considered typical. The school Director was selected on the basis of personal recommendation and his long involvement in education in Mostar. It was considered that, particularly under the communist system, the experience of school Directors would be broadly similar and the experiences of this Director would be typical of many. The sample of University staff was selected on the basis of the office held, in the University Dzemal
Bijedic this was the Director of the Pedagogical Institute. In the Sveuciliste, the Director was absent during the period of data collection so the interview was conducted with a Professor of English who had previously been a teacher and was involved in the preparation of teachers.

In selecting the sample of teachers, parents and pupils to interview the choice was greater. The teachers selected were drawn from personal contacts, whilst ensuring that the sample covered the required age range and represented schools in east and west Mostar. The sample of parents and pupils was also drawn from personal contacts in east and west Mostar, which was expanded to ensure a range of ages so that I could obtain first-hand accounts relating to education in the communist era as well as more recent educational experiences. Pupils were further selected on their age, all of those interviewed had been primary school pupils before 1992, during the period 1992-95 and post-1995. Although the number of participants was relatively small, they were considered sufficiently typical of their groups to provide both breadth and depth of data.

Most interviews were carried out through an interpreter. In east Mostar, where the majority population are Bosnian Muslim, the translator was a Bosnian Muslim and in west Mostar, where the majority population are Bosnian Croat, he was a Bosnian Croat. This was important as it helped the interviewees to feel comfortable with the person translating and so speak openly. I also worried that without the appropriate translator I may have been refused an interview or that the responses would not have been as honest and fulsome. Some of the interviewees spoke English at a sufficiently high level for the interview to be conducted in English. However, the translators were also able to act as ‘cultural informants’ (Schweisfurth 1999, p.336), clarifying for me any points which were not clear. This role was also fulfilled by other contacts in Mostar; whilst retaining confidentiality I was able to informally discuss with local colleagues my growing understanding of
educational developments and their viewpoints contributed to the development of my understanding. This ‘cumulation of perspectives’ (op.cit) also contributes to the trustworthiness of the findings.

All the interviews were conducted in a place of the respondent’s choosing; those with officials occurred in their offices whilst those with teachers, pupils and parents took place in their homes or nearby cafes. Most interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and all of those where a translator was used were recorded. On a few occasions, due to high levels of background noise or the informality of the meeting, I took interview notes and typed these up as soon as possible after the interview. The interview records were filed according to the role of the respondent: government official, this category included representatives of the international organisations, University staff, school teacher, parent and pupil. This allowed me to compare the responses of those within a category as well as those from different categories of respondents in order to look for similarities and differences.

Generally, people were positive about becoming involved and were prepared to talk to me, often at length, about their experiences. I was mindful of the fact that their stories would have been influenced by the events of the civil war and that their accounts of pre-war education may not have been wholly accurate but clouded by subsequent experiences. I attempted to overcome this by asking several people the same questions and compared how closely their stories matched. In talking to parents and older people about their education during the communist era I was also aware of how memories change over time and, again, that their representations of education during that period were reflections only of their own remembered experiences. Again, this was dealt with by asking a number of people for their recollections and by reading literature that documented education during that period.
Observations of classroom teaching took place on two occasions in March 2000. These were non-participant and the teacher explained my presence to the pupils. The lessons were of the teaching of English so that I was able to follow the content as well as the pedagogy of the lessons. The observations were unstructured, although focused on what the teacher did and what the pupils did, and I was able to draw on my experience of observing student teachers on school placement. Notes were made and these were discussed with the class teacher after each lesson. These notes provided evidence to help support or refute the data collected via interviews.

Data analysis was both on-going and part of the final stage of the research process. During the data collection process as documents were read and interviews were transcribed these were scrutinised for emerging themes and issues which linked back to the guiding themes identified in the literature. When the data collection process was complete the data were then analysed in relation to the guiding themes. This was done by completing a time ordered matrix (Miles and Huberman 1994) for each of the periods under study and in relation to the political, social and economic context and for the focus of each theme. Miles and Huberman (ibid.) state that the time ordered matrix, giving the chronology of events, shows sequences and helps to develop possible explanations. Here it helped to provide an initial ‘seeing’ of the relationships between the data, but the drawing up of conceptually-clustered matrices (ibid.) gave further insights. The final writing up of the thesis was the last stage.

The next chapter considers existing literature in this field and identifies the guiding themes that emerged from the literature.
Chapter 3: Development of the guiding themes

This research focuses on the influences of political and social changes on primary schooling in Bosnia and intends to build on related literature. Existing literature revealed that research of this kind had been undertaken in other eastern European countries but there was little information in the English language about the situation in Bosnia.

As events in Bosnia are closely related to those in Croatia and Serbia, and as borders have changed over time, it was necessary to gain an understanding both of historical developments in the region and the relationship between Bosnians, Croatians and Serbians in order to understand the political, social and educational developments.

The research on Bosnia’s history identified four major historical periods, which were used in the study as each was associated with political and social change. The periods are:

1878 – 1918 Bosnia under Austro-Hungarian governorship
1918 – 1945 Bosnia as a federal state within independent Yugoslavia
1945 – 1992 Bosnia as a republic in communist Yugoslavia
1992 – 2002 Bosnia as an independent nation state.

During each of these time spans events in Bosnia were interwoven with events elsewhere; political movements in the Balkans, wars in Europe, economic developments in Europe and elsewhere all impacted on developments in Bosnia.

Recent events have focused on the political change from communism to liberal democracy; economic change from a planned economy to a market-oriented economy and social change with the emergence of nation states and the rise in nationalism. Reading around
these areas themes began to emerge from the literature which could be interrogated by data collection, these were that:

- in times of transition, or conflict, school systems can become arenas for competing political and ideological forces, particularly when nationalism is one of the competing forces;
- in countries in transition, the process of educational reform follows a series of stages and its effective implementation relies on the presence of supporting factors;
- where, as a consequence of transition or conflict, there is significant change in the prevailing political and social ideologies this is followed by concomitant changes in education. Macro-level ideological change in education is intended to lead to micro-level change in classroom practice but this usually takes much longer to implement than other aspects of change;
- the initial development of a free market economy appears to detrimentally affect teachers’ remuneration and status, whilst at the same time increasing their responsibilities. In this context, teachers seek to attain status by reverting to traditional approaches to schooling in an attempt to link current practice to a period when status was accorded;
- contemporary resolutions of conflict are mediated by the involvement of international organisations, and resolution agreements have post-conflict consequences for education provision.

Each of the themes is elaborated below and revisited in the analysis of the data.

**Theme 1 -** In times of transition, or conflict, school systems can become arenas for competing political and ideological forces; this is particularly true when nationalism is one of the competing forces.
In most societies the dominant political force will govern according to its own ideological principles. Schools, through their curricula, pedagogy, structures and systems, rules and regulations, represent and transmit the dominant political and social ideology and contribute to the development of future citizens of the state. For this reason schools can be perceived as strategic weapons in the armoury of ideologists, Bernstein (in Popkewitz 1991) wrote that ‘every time a discourse on education reform starts there is space for ideology to play’ and Apple (2004) has referred to education as ‘a site of serious ideological conflict’.

In stable societies schools serve the economic, political and social needs of the dominant ideology of society. In western Europe, for example, one theory for the introduction and development of mass schooling is that the Industrial Revolution and its attendant economic and social changes created a need for a compliant workforce and workers who were literate and numerate (Green 1990, 1997). In the 150 years since then, the school curriculum and structure has continued to develop and change to meet the needs of industry and society, for example with the lengthening of schooling and the introduction of ‘vocational’ education. When the needs of society and the provision of education match school systems receive little attention but when there is a perceived mismatch school reform is usually considered.

_Education and national solidarity_

An important issue in the current Bosnian context is that of national identity. Citizens born in Bosnia never refer to themselves as simply Bosnian, it is always qualified as Bosnian Muslim (or Bosniak), Bosnian Serb or Bosnian Croat. The relationship between education and national solidarity was, therefore, worthy of examination.
Several writers (Durkheim, in Green 1990, Popkewitz 1991, Moyles and Hargreaves 1998) consider one of the main purposes of education to be to develop in citizens a sense of their national identity, through learning the history and culture of their society. Popkewitz (1991, p.13) also considered ‘school reform’ to be one of the mechanisms by which states attempt to achieve ‘cultural transformation, and national solidarity’. National solidarity, or the cohesion of modern society, depends to a large extent on individuals within that society having a ‘common identity’ (see Popkewitz 1991, Moyles and Hargreaves 1998, Taylor 1999). This, in turn, depends on them sharing ‘common values’ and a common ‘historical memory’ (Bokovoy, Irvine and Lilly, 1997; Popkewitz, 1999). Bokovoy et.al., (1997, p.80) referred to common historical memory as a ‘construction of the past’ and an ‘invented tradition’. The sharing of this common historical memory relies to some extent on schooling, where the ‘invented tradition’ is transmitted to each new generation. Moyles and Hargreaves (1998, p.4) found in their survey of primary education across a number of countries, that ‘[M]ass schooling almost everywhere is clearly intended to be the dominant means of the intergenerational transmission of culture’.

Transmission of culture in this way, however, becomes problematic when society is composed of populations with different views, different histories and different traditions and cultures which cannot be reconciled and so cause tension within that society, as appears to be the case in Bosnia. What, then, is to be taught in schools as the common ‘historical memory’? When the differences between populations lead to conflict, there is likely to be an impact on education as the conflict, or its outcomes, create competing political and ideological forces within society. It is in these conditions that schools can become sites of power struggles. Pasutovic (1993, p.409) wrote that where there are conflicting ideological forces within a society the ‘politically dominant’ force will seek to ‘control education in the attempt to preserve the existing power distribution in the society’.
As the countries of central and eastern Europe began their political transition from communist government to liberal democracy the clash between the old ideology of communism and the new ideology of liberal democracy created, for many, competing forces. In a number of the countries, in the process of transition the major political and social changes introduced led to changes in the school system. Cerych (1997, p.77) noted that in eastern Europe, ‘the political and economic changes … are clearly also guiding principles of the key educational changes …’. McLeish (2003, p.163) found that there was a recognition

‘that the successful employment of educational establishments as tools in the dissemination and perpetuation of socialist ideology demanded that the reform of existing educational practices be deemed a priority.’

In Russia, a former Minister of Education described explicitly how education was used to change the dominant ideology:

‘ [we can] use education to help change the mentality of society, to change the system of values away from totalitarianism and to promote democratic decision-making and independence’

(Dneprov in Harber 1997, p.184).

The ideology of communism, which dominated in Bosnia for a long period, includes not only the belief in a ‘planned economy’ but also the control over all aspects of an individual’s life, permeating their values, attitudes and ways of living. It is recognised, though, that in communist governments there is often a difference between what the ruling elites say is happening, what is actually happening and what the mass of people really think; this makes it even more important that the thinking of individuals is controlled as closely as possible. The purpose of education under communism, therefore, is for it to serve the goals of the Party. Shimoniak (1970, p.52) described the aim of communist education as to ‘educate active workers of communism, workers who foresee and
understand the plans of the party and execute these in their lives’. He went on to describe schools as ‘the ideological arm of the revolution’ (op.cit).

It follows from this that communist governments seek to control schools and education and that private schooling, which would be outside of their control, is not allowed. All schools in the former communist countries, therefore, exhibited the same features in their structure and organisation and it is anticipated that these will be found to have been present in schools in Bosnia during the communist era, namely:

- key decisions imposed centrally by education ministries;
- curriculum subjects being defined by government, and obligatory;
- timetables and syllabuses being ‘unified’ and controlling the teaching in all schools;
- a single textbook for each subject, produced by state monopoly;
- teachers limited in their autonomy and creativity, regarding themselves as ‘executors’ of central directives and having their work closely monitored.

(Cerych 1997; Weiler et.al. 1996)

In the communist system, teacher education was also under government control and followed similar patterns. Leclerq (1996, p.80) described teacher training courses in communist countries as being ‘pervaded by the authoritarian and monolithic scientism of Marxism-Leninism’ and ‘largely theoretical’ with a lack of practical training. This was to ensure that the teachers were suitably prepared to teach in the schools as they were then constituted; Rosen (in Lita 2004, p. 19) noted that in the Soviet Union

‘[A]ll teachers, no matter what their subjects are, are obliged to make their contribution to instilling a communist world outlook in the youth. Development of a firm Communist world outlook … is a most important task of teaching staffs …Success depends above all, on the teachers themselves having Communist ideological integrity and profound Communist convictions’.
In non-communist countries schooling serves different purposes, although there are variations in experiences depending on the traditions of the country. In many liberal democracies schooling is intended to promote the development of the individual. Although it aims to prepare individuals to contribute to society and the economy, through preparing them for work, education is also perceived as a means of opening up opportunities for individuals and allowing them choices in their lives. The impact of this on policy and practice is that governments tend to provide a legislative framework within which schools have the autonomy to make decisions about curriculum structure and pedagogy, and teachers have freedom of choice over the resources and materials they use; and in the free market economy there is a wide range of resources from which to choose. In many liberal democracies parents have choice over the school their child will attend, with private schooling being an option in most western countries.

However, these freedoms are not universal in western Europe and it could be argued that some countries are introducing greater central control. In England, for example, a legislative framework was provided in 1988 with the introduction of the National Curriculum. Government policy since then has been to introduce an increasing number of initiatives which have given them more control over educational practices. Initiatives such as the ‘literacy hour’ and ‘numeracy hour’ recommend a curriculum structure and pedagogy and have been supported by publications and guidance from the Training and Development Agency. Inspectors from the government controlled Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) regularly monitor the work of schools. Whilst this is far from the control exercised by communist governments it marks a move away from the more liberal educational tradition previously enjoyed in England. In France and Italy teachers do not have freedom of choice over teaching resources and materials, and may not want it (Beattie 2002). And parental choice of schooling is often limited by geography and the availability
of places. These things, in themselves, however do not fundamentally change the purpose of schooling in these countries.

In the countries of eastern Europe, in transition from communism to liberal democracy, reforms were introduced with the purpose of changing the prevailing ideology. This was attempted through:

- moving decision-making into municipalities and schools, and involving other groups in decision-making, for example education boards that included parents;
- offering diversity and choice in the curriculum;
- reshaping or reforming subjects such as civics, history and languages;
- modernising the curriculum with the introduction of information technology and environmental education;
- removing the state monopoly on educational material;
- allowing private schools to operate.

(Cerych 1997).

These attempts to introduce reform were not unproblematic as they faced resistance from competing forces. Education ministries, schools and classrooms continued to be staffed by personnel educated into the ‘old’ ideology, which informed their values, beliefs and actions. Some of those charged with implementing the reforms found them difficult to understand and accept as they appeared to compete with their existing value systems. Beresford-Hill (1998, p.11) describes administrators in post-communist countries as inadequately prepared and ‘suddenly empowered but lacking clarity when it comes to the role of education in […] a democracy’. The World Bank (2005, p.4) acknowledged that in some countries the ‘pace of decentralization exceeded the capacity of the local management to implement it’.
It is also claimed that many of the central and eastern European countries, despite the rhetoric of reform and the introduction of reforming legislation, have continued to maintain aspects of the ‘old system’ (Cerych, 1997, p.81); for example, in many of them the communist-founded structures and systems of primary education still remained. Primary education continued to be compulsory for eight or nine years, starting at age six to seven years, and post-primary schooling remained optional, although undertaken by many. Only Hungary and Croatia had introduced change to the school system, with a separation of lower primary and upper primary/lower secondary phases of schooling.

One reform that had been instituted in the majority of the transitional countries was the permission for private schools. Whilst these remained a small part of educational provision private schools did represent one arena where the old and new ideologies competed. Under communism, private schools are not allowed but a key principle of liberal democracy is the notion of choice, so private schools became acceptable (Cerych 1995; Svecova 1999). However, their existence raised ideological questions in some quarters; Juceviciene and Taruskiene (1998, p.14) report how, in Lithuania, concern was voiced over the morality of educational resources being in private hands when there were serious needs in state education provision. In contrast, in Latvia, parents welcomed the option of private schools as an alternative to the often poor quality state provision (Kersch 1998, p.37).

The management and administration of education was also an arena for competing forces. Under communism the planning, management and administration of education is centralised and highly controlled, with the Party having the right to appoint personnel, who are known to be loyal to the Party, to education ministries and schools. Shimoniak (1970, p.122) describes how the centralised system of Soviet Russia dictated through its policies
the ‘types of schools, curricula, programs, instructional methods, school requirements etc.’

A key principle of liberal democracy, in contrast, is decentralisation, with the decision-making powers about educational provision being devolved to local or school level.

In practice, this simplistic demarcation between centralisation or decentralisation does not represent the reality of most situations. Whilst the concept and practice of centralisation is usually quite clear, with governments controlling all aspects of education, the concept of decentralisation varies. In liberal democracies in western Europe, even where the system is deemed to be decentralised, the government may retain control of aspects of provision, for example setting legislation governing teachers’ pay and conditions or the school curriculum. Educational systems regarded as decentralised are more complex and are more likely to be a mix, with centralisation of some aspects, such as teachers’ working conditions, and decentralisation of others, such as school structure and teaching methods.

Cerych (1997, p.87) noted how argument about centralisation versus decentralisation competed in central and eastern European countries in transition. In an attempt to remove themselves from the communist ideological centralist approach governments delegated responsibility for education to local municipalities but each municipality operated in a highly-centralised way so for schools there was the appearance of little having changed in their management and administrative systems. Savova (1996, p.10) acknowledged the complexities and difficulties of introducing decentralisation into previously centralised systems. She believed that

‘creating a new balance between centralization and decentralization, redistributing power so that greater responsibility is accorded to lower administrative levels, and ensuring real autonomy for schools and teachers, will be long-term processes’.

The financing of education also represents an ideological stance and has undergone reform in most eastern European countries. Communist governments, with their planned
economies, funded education solely through year-on-year payment to schools, irrespective of the number of pupils. The new governments emulated the funding systems of western European countries and introduced ‘per capita’ funding, which they allowed to be supplemented with money raised through local taxes. For parents and educational staff these new arrangements appeared to lead to inequalities in provision as some areas were able to raise more funds than others, providing more funding for education. These seeming inequalities were more acute when considered against the continuing problem of an overall lack of funding (Beresford-Hill 1998).

The school curriculum and pedagogy are key issues in the transmission of ideology as they help to shape one’s knowledge and understanding of self and others. For this reason they are high on the agenda of competing ideological forces; Moyles and Hargreaves (1998, p.28) describe the school curriculum as ‘a battleground of competing ideologies’.

Communist ideology regards education as crucial and so attempts to control it through the issue of annual ‘programs’, which define in detail the subjects to be taught, and approved textbooks for each subject which the teacher is obliged to use. Such control of curriculum content tended to lead to pedagogy being didactic and teacher-centred as teachers were concerned to ensure that they covered the required information for each subject during the school year. In addition, the central government issued policies governing the ‘instruction methods’ to be used in schools (Shimoniak 1970, p.143). Communist ideology required compliant citizens and classroom pedagogy and discipline were designed ‘not only to enforce discipline in the classroom but also to inculcate respect for Soviet authorities’ (Shimoniak 1970, p.64). Hladnick (2000, p.164) described how communist governments further ensured that their policies were being enacted as teachers’ work was ‘controlled regularly by inspectors who checked if their written preparations and their oral teaching met all the required elements of a school year plan.’
In contrast, in liberal democracies schools and teachers have more choice over the curriculum and pedagogy employed. Governments may set curriculum frameworks, as with the English National Curriculum, but schools have the freedom of compiling their own curricula. Increasingly, across western Europe multi-ethnic populations are influencing the school curriculum as schools attempt to meet their needs through the teaching of different languages and the presentation of various historical perspectives (DfES 2002, 2004, NUT 2002). In addition, teachers make their own pedagogical choices and, although these are usually constrained by social and cultural expectations, choices include a range from didactic through to individualised learning.

The political events of 1989 allowed the ideological forces of liberal democracy to win out over those of communism. This led to changes in school systems as curriculum content was reformed in many countries in central and eastern Europe, with subjects such as civics, history, geography, language and literature being redefined and religion, which was abolished by the communist governments, being reintroduced into schools (Svecova 1999). English became a major foreign language, replacing Russian (Wilde 2002). Schools were encouraged to offer curriculum diversity, giving pupils some choice over subjects studied in their upper primary schooling and offering extra-curricular activities.

Changes in pedagogy were also introduced, but these met with greater resistance from the competing ideology and proved more difficult to establish (Cerych 1997, p.86; Alexander et.al 1999, p.170). And as teacher training institutions were staffed by those trained in the old regime they continued to train teachers in the old methods, making reform in the classroom more difficult to institute (Biatecki 2003; Zindovic-Vukadinovic 2003). These issues are discussed further in theme three. Another possible explanation for teachers’ resistance to changing their pedagogy is that the pedagogic practice associated with
communist teaching put them in the role of expert pedagogue. Teachers may have feared that changing this practice would change the teacher-pupil relationship, and consequently their status. This is discussed in theme four.

**Education and nationalism**

Many of the countries of eastern Europe were comprised a range of nationalist groups and many had ethnically mixed populations. Bosnia is comprised mainly Bosnian Muslims, Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats but also has small populations of Jews and Roma. It is claimed (Latawski 1995, Kohn in Sugar 1997) that nationalism has a long history in the Balkans and tended to be based on ‘myths of the past and dreams of the future … which influenced the nascent nation’s wishful image of itself and its mission’ (Kohn ibid, p.9).

Communist ideology considered loyalty to one’s own ethnic group as less important than loyalty to the Party so, through education, attempted to control the nationalist tendencies of the population in order to curb them. School curricula included only the language of the majority population and their literature, history and culture. Shmoniak (1970, p.61) described how, in Russia, non-Russians were not allowed to learn about their own histories and national cultures and he suggests that it was ‘safer’ for them to ‘forget their own cultures’.

As communism weakened, one of the major competing forces within education was nationalism, particularly in areas where local ethnic populations had been subjugated by the communists. As communist governments fell and the Soviet Republic’s hold on countries was removed many began to emerge, or re-emerge, as nation states\(^8\), and in these

---

\(^7\) Various definitions of ‘nationalism’ have been offered, see Latawski 1995, here it refers to a political ideology which contributes to the development in individuals of a certain state of mind.\(^8\) The term ‘nation-state’ has ‘gained global currency’ (Latawski 1995, p.8), although is open to interpretation. Seton-Watson (1977, p.1) defines a nation as a ‘community of people’ and a state as a ‘legal and political organisation’.
circumstances education assumed an important role. Moyles and Hargreaves (1998, p.4) found that:

‘[I]n many countries an association between the growth of democracy and the development of education provision can be demonstrated … This is because education is one of the key features in the formation of the modern state’.

Beresford-Hill (1998, p.13) described the trend in post-transition countries ‘to restore national heritage and reinvigorate the study of literature and local history’. Nationalists were campaigning and lobbying to ensure that the school curriculum included the study of the national language of the minority ethnic population, as well as their literature, history, art, music. As nationalism is a strong competing force in Bosnia it is anticipated that evidence for this trend will be found in the data.

These nationalist forces competed both with the old communist ideologies and the new liberal democracies. However, Pastuovic (1993, 417) argued that the nationalist ideologies serve to hold back reform as they reflect a ‘particular type of conservatism’ and Beresford-Hill (1998, p.11) described the situation in many eastern European countries as one of ‘radical progressivism on the one hand and historical nostalgia on the other’ causing ‘further fragmentation’ which inhibited reform. In contrast, Kovacs (2000, p.80) described how the post-1989 government in Hungary expected schools to revert to pre-communist (Hungarian) traditions, what Kovacs termed ‘the restoration of the ideology of an earlier era’ but that this did not happen because traditional schooling was considered unable to meet the country’s need for modernisation.

Education systems in the countries in transition in central and eastern Europe have been shown to be an important arena for competing political and ideological forces. Alongside modernisation and reform movements calling for the application of liberal democratic
principles in education, there were many staff holding resolutely to the ‘old’ ideology in which they were trained and experienced. In some countries, including Bosnia, nationalism was also a competing force as previously suppressed power struggles came to the fore. Chapters 4 - 7 describe how education has responded to the various ideologies that have competed for leadership in Bosnia.

**Theme 2 – in countries in transition, the process of educational reform follows a series of stages and its effective implementation relies on the presence of supporting factors.**

The literature suggested that, in all the countries where political and economic transition has occurred, educational reforms followed a more or less similar path in each country. There were also more general models of educational change which suggested the same. However, some writers noted that different orders of change exist; for some education is continually changing, with subjects on the curriculum changing or adapting their content, new pedagogies becoming more or less fashionable and social needs changing the emphasis on different aspects of education. Archer (1979) referred to this type of change as ‘incrementalism’ and posits that it does not substantially change the nature, structure or content of education. Fullan (2001) argued that change can go much deeper, and it becomes reform when it involves ‘…changing the cultures of the classrooms, the schools, the districts, the universities and so on’. Fullan believed there is ‘much more to educational reform than most people realize’ (ibid, p.7).

**A typology of education reforms**

Cerych (1997) identified a typology of educational reforms in post-communist countries: corrective, modernisation, structural and systemic. Corrective reforms are those that correct the ‘most visible characteristics of communist education’ (ibid, p.76).
Modernisation reform involves the introduction of new technologies into education, new textbooks, new curricula and new teaching methods, usually based on western European education. Structural reforms include changes to the length of education, types of educational institutions and types of education. Systemic reform requires a redefining of the role of the government in education, decentralisation of the system, the introduction of market economy principles to education and the introduction of quality measures.

Cerych (ibid) went on to state that he believed that whilst corrective reforms have occurred throughout most of the countries of central and eastern Europe, modernisation and structural reforms have been uneven and inconsistent. Systemic reform, the deepest and most difficult, he claimed has barely begun.

It is difficult to see how modernisation reform is ‘inconsistent’ whilst corrective reform is complete; as in order to remove the ‘most visible characteristics of communist education’ it would be necessary to introduce new curricula, new textbooks and new teaching methods. This claim will be tested out through the data collection in Bosnia. As structural and systemic reforms go deeper it is accepted that these are likely to take longer to institute but the study will also examine whether these reforms are visible in Bosnia’s education system.

A model for the process of educational reform

Several models have been proposed to describe the process of educational reform (Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992; Taylor et.al. 1997; Levin 2001; Fullan 2001) and all seem to indicate that change occurs through a series of stages, beginning with inception and formulation, moving through policy or legislative development to implementation and evaluation. These models, however, focus on change within stable, western European countries. McLeish and Phillips (1998) proposed a model of educational reform based on countries in
transition, shown in Figure 3.1. This model also indicates a staged, developmental, process but within the context of political and social transition.

Figure 3.1 McLeish and Phillips (1998) model of educational reform

In the McLeish and Phillips model, the solid line around the authoritarian system represents the closed system traditionally found under authoritarian rule. Under this system rules and regulations are known and strictly enforced and there is a large degree of certainty. When internal and external forces threaten the closed system, and an anti-
authoritarian climate develops, the system begins to show small cracks. The collapse of
the prevailing ideology opens up the authoritarian system, which is represented by ever-
increasing cracks in the model. As the democratic system replaces the authoritarian one
national and provincial elections, phases II and III, ‘bring a degree of closure to the
political transition process, and in so doing serve to clarify, somewhat, the likely direction
if not outcome, of the educational transition process’ (McLeish 1998, p.17). The relative
importance of the national and local elections depends on the division of power and
responsibility in the new order. Phase IV sees educational changes enshrined in law and
Phase V sees them enshrined in practice, although it was acknowledged that ‘the
translation of policy into practice is exceedingly difficult and complex’ (ibid, p.18).

This model was said to indicate that the transition process was ‘sandwiched between the
stability and certainty which is indicative of authoritarian politics on the one hand, and the
limited, yet manageable, uncertainties which accompany stable democratic regimes on the
other (ibid, p.17). McLeish and her colleagues (1998, p.17) suggested that educational
reform emerges from political and social unrest but that it does not materialise until the
occurrence of governmental elections, which they claim brought certainty about the
decisions and the future direction of education.

There is an assumption in the McLeish and Phillips model that the election of a new
government is unproblematic and that, following this, the way forward for educational
reform is known, but others have suggested that the process is not always so
straightforward. Salter and Tapper (1981) proposed that educational reform at national
level is only successful if it is introduced with a well-developed, supported and accepted
ideology that offers a viable alternative to the established ideology. Kovacs (2000, p.80)
described how the speed of political reform in Hungary meant that the incoming
government had no detailed plans or policies for education. Similarly Tomiak (2000,
p.155), describing educational reform in Russia, suggested that it can only occur if there is ‘…a clear choice of one preferred option, selected and given a solid backing by a clear popular majority, so that action could be taken to put it into operation.’ Where this is not the case educational reform does not occur; Tomiak (ibid) referred to this as being unable to remove the ‘old’ without the ‘new’ being ready to be brought in.

**Factors supporting the process of educational reform**

One of the purposes of educational reform, particularly in countries in transition, was to bring about ‘change in practice’ (Fullan 2001, p.38). Myron Atkin (2003, p.75) believed that this does not happen without changing ‘…the beliefs, skills and general perspective of the individual teacher’. It is generally acknowledged that this change is difficult to achieve (Fullan 2001; Levin 2001; Finnan and Lewin 2003) but the literature on educational change suggested that the presence or absence of certain factors during the process of reform can support or hinder change.

Models of reform (see above) identify the first stages as inception followed by initiation of policy and legislative development. In these stages it is claimed that one of the key supporting factors is for the reform to be ‘championed by one or more ‘messiahs’’ (Healey and De Stefano 1997, p.10). Fullan (2001, p.58) agreed that change ‘rarely occurs without an advocate’ and that the advocate needs to be someone with a degree of authority or power to introduce and implement change. Cerych (1995) cited examples of educational changes championed by Harold Wilson and Jennie Lee, in developing the Open University; Edgar Faure in the reform of the French higher education system and Palme in introducing educational change in Sweden.
Policy and legislative development is followed by the implementation stage, where several supporting factors have been identified. Fullan (2001) described these factors as being concerned with the change itself, with local characteristics and with external factors.

In relation to the change itself, there should be a perceived need for change which is real and significant. Dalin (1978) referred to this as the requirement for ‘problem-identification’ and believed that if this does not occur, if no reason or purpose for change is identified, then any proposed change is likely to fail. Fullan (ibid, p.76) argued, however, that ‘…precise needs are often not clear…’ but that where a need for change has been agreed the proposed change needs to be clear so that it can be understood.

Levin (2001, p.145) also suggested that the proposed change requires understanding and commitment, arguing that even when change is supported unless those charged with implementation understand it and ‘know how to do it’ they cannot implement it. Fullan (2001, p.48) strongly supported this view, stating that:

‘…finding moral and intellectual meaning is not just to make teachers feel better. It is fundamentally related to whether teachers are likely to find the considerable energy required to transform the status quo. Meaning fuels motivation; know-how feeds on itself to produce on-going problem-solving. Their opposites – confusion, overload and a low sense of efficacy – deplete energy at the very time that it is sorely needed.’

Clarity aids understanding and Levin (ibid) suggested that multiple changes increase the complexity of the proposed change, leading to confusion and uncertainty and thereby hindering implementation. Clarity and lack of complexity are, therefore, also key factors in successful educational reform. However, Levin (2001, p.146) further argued that, whilst these aspects are important, the reality is that teachers have demanding workloads and many pressures, leaving them little time or energy to understand or implement change. He
believed, therefore, that a key factor in successful educational reform is the inclusion of time for teachers to be involved.

Supporting factors related to local characteristics of change include the support of those involved. Several researchers (Clark and Peterson 1986, Dillon and Maguire 1998, McCormick 1999, Fullan 2001) acknowledged the important role played by teachers in implementing proposed change. In post-communist countries Pritchard (2002, p.57) believed that educational reforms ‘can be threatened or diluted by teachers reverting to earlier, more authoritarian modes of classroom management and lesson delivery’. The environment in which teachers work is also important, McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) found that teachers who work in a ‘collaborative community of practice’ are more effective in implementing ‘innovating classroom practice’ as they discuss and share practice and see themselves as continuing learners.

The literature also indicated that the leadership provided by the school principal is a key factor in successful implementation of reform. The characteristics of effective principals include having high expectations of staff, the ability to communicate well, create a collegiate working environment and provide staff with support (Leithwood et. al. 1999; Day et.al. 2000; Fullan 2001). Datnow and Stringfield (2000, p.194) found that ‘…clear, strong district support positively impacted reform implementation, and the lack thereof negatively impacted implementation.’ Fullan (2001) described how ‘district leaders’ can provide support through creating a culture and context that supports change, developing appropriate policies and procedures, facilitating the sharing of practice and providing resources.

Parents, as important contributors to children’s learning (for example see Mortimore et.al. 1988), are seen as having a role in the implementation of educational reform. Dalin (1978)
suggested that educational reform requires not only teachers to change but also students and parents. Fullan (2001) believed that parents can press for change, positively support change or can hinder its implementation and Kovacs (2000, p.86) described how educational reform in Hungary met resistance from parents because ‘consumer and market tastes and demands (were) themselves currently under development’.

External factors that influence educational reform include the role of government and other agencies and their ability to provide ‘pressure and support’ (Fullan 2001, p.87). Levin (2001, p.152) described how governments can support change through the use of ‘policy levers’ such as accountability procedures, persuasion and inducements, support structures and capacity building. Fullan (2001, p.232) suggested that the use of accountability measures or incentives would lead only to superficial change and that for more meaningful change governments need to foster capacity building through providing professional development, technical assistance, curriculum materials and resources. A successful example of government-supported educational reform is provided by Aedo-Richmond (2002) who described how the new Chilean government introduced planned changes, provided technical assistance and teacher development programmes and introduced legislation to improve teachers’ pay and working conditions. Levin (ibid, p.154) pointed out, though, that in relation to countries in political transition ‘state bureaucracies that have been primarily concerned with regulation of local systems may be unequipped to move into a new role as builders of local capacity.’ More generally, he believed that governments pay more attention to policy formation and less attention to the implementation stage.

Most of the literature on educational reform and the process of change focused on examples of planned change. In contrast, in many of the countries of central and eastern Europe the current wave of education reforms were not planned but arose from the
changed political circumstances following the fall of communism, a political system under which change was imposed by government and enacted by teachers. Halasz (1993, p.493) described the changes emerging as ‘a reward arising from the achievement of political freedom’ and consequently, he suggested, have not been properly elaborated nor have the appropriate conditions been created for their implementation.

It is suggested here that educational reform occurs through a series of stages and that there are key factors that can support the effective implementation of reform. In chapter 7, the research reports the process of recent educational reform in Bosnia and this will be considered against the process described above and analysed for the presence or absence of supporting factors.

**Theme 3 – where, as a consequence of transition or conflict, there is significant change in the prevailing political and social ideologies this is followed by concomitant changes in education.** Macro-level ideological change in education is intended to lead to micro-level change in classroom practice, but this usually takes much longer to implement than other aspects of change.

With the increasing number of conflicts around the world one theme to emerge from the literature was the impact of conflict on education. However it was suggested that policy and strategy changes occur more easily and quickly than changes in classroom practice.

Schools do not operate outside of their political, social and temporal context; they are exposed to forces beyond their boundaries, some of which may appear to originate at a great distance, for example the influence of the World Bank on education in developing countries (Nielsen 2006). Evidence of the impact of these external forces is that, over a period of time, schooling evolves to reflect or respond to the society in which it is located.
In times and places of conflict, however, the context changes more quickly and educational change, where it occurs, becomes more apparent. The literature revealed that whilst macro-level, legislative, change can occur within a few years implementation at the micro-level, in the classroom, takes several years more.

One consequence of conflict and transition is the disturbance and disruption to society’s normal social patterns, including schooling (Gosden 1976, Lowe 1992). Gosden reported that in Britain the Second World War created social instability and conditions which led to ‘serious educational loss for many individuals’ and there was a ‘decline in standards’ (ibid, p.3). More recently, the conflict in Israel led to the situation where ‘47 government schools [were] unusable’ and ‘Palestinian pupils […] lost nearly three weeks of lessons’ (Times Educational Supplement 2002, p.4). The World Bank (2005, p.16) contended that ‘[S]chools and classrooms are frequently targeted in civil conflict because they are seen to represent the state’. Disruptions of this kind are affecting more and more pupils as the number of conflicts around the world grows; UNESCO (2002, p.1) reported that ‘more than one-third of UNESCO’s Member States and about one-fifth of the world’s countries are either experiencing political instability, armed conflicts, natural disasters, or recovering from them’.

If the conflict or transition process is long-term or brutal the disturbance and disruption created can be so great that, in its aftermath, normal social patterns cannot be re-established and the new political and social conditions call for new social patterns to be established. Where these new conditions include a significant change in the prevailing political and social ideology there is usually accompanying rhetoric about the attendant reforms needed in social and political institutions, including education. The World Bank (2005, p.xvii) believed that this is because education offers a focus for society ‘around which it can coalesce for reform’. Apple (2004) commented that ‘social movements
transform education’ and Cerych (1995, p.423) noted that in central and eastern Europe the political and social transition has led to proposals for educational reforms ‘the breadth, range and depth [of which] is extraordinarily large; they concern almost all levels and sectors of education …’.

**Social, political and educational reform**

Political and social reforms, including educational reform, that follow conflict or occur as part of the transition process usually begin at the macro-level, with legislative and structural reform. Cerych (1997, p.81) reported, for example, that most of the central and eastern European countries in transition have put in place ‘legislative measures which leave room for radical changes in their respective educational systems’.

There are different views, however, on the relationship between political, social and educational reforms. One view is that the reforms occur sequentially, political and social changes occur first and these create conditions for the introduction of educational reforms. Moyle and Hargreaves (1998, p.24) found a ‘close correlation between periods of intense state formation and spells of dynamic educational change. Both often followed profound social and political upheaval …’ (italics added). Birzea (1994, p.35) asked ‘Can educational reform be initiated before the political and economic reforms have stabilised the system as a whole?’ Birzea (ibid) believed not only that educational reform occurs after political and social reform but also that, even at macro-level, it takes much longer to introduce and implement. Batt (1991) also believed that, whilst political reforms occur within a few months and economic and social reforms in a few years, educational reforms can take decades to become evident. On the other hand, Cerych (1995, p.424) called attention to the fact that, in Central and Eastern Europe, ‘the speed of the reform process is … quite exceptional’.
An alternative view is that political, social and educational reforms occur concurrently. 
Pastuovic (1993, p.411) believed that ‘synchronized changes in education, the economy, politics, and culture’ are required and Cerych (1995, p.424) considered ‘the overall transition context is in itself a key factor inducing and facilitating education reforms’.
Weiler et.al. (1996, p.1) cited eastern Germany as an example of concurrent reforms ‘the East German educational system has undergone fundamental changes within the context of a vast restructuring of the economy, the political system, and the institutions of civil society’. They contended that institutional re-structuring, including education, would not have happened without the political and economic changes (Weiler et.al. 1996, p.112).

Educational reform in the classroom

In most instances, educational reform is the result of legislative change. Once instituted, these macro-level reforms are expected to instigate change at the micro-level in teachers’ classroom practices. But legislation is easier to institute than it is to enact and the literature suggested that changes in classroom practice are much more difficult to bring about. In several post-communist countries writers noted disparity between government policy on educational reform and classroom practice; Weiler et.al. (1996, p.4) found in East Germany ‘a profusion’ of policies but ‘a dearth of actual changes’, as did Olek (1998) in Poland and Alexander et.al. (1999) in Russia.

As part of the educational reform process in the countries of central and eastern Europe there was an expectation that schools would become more autonomous and democratic institutions, to reflect the political, ideological reform. It was expected that teachers would become part of the democratic decision-making process and model this in their own teaching through exercising their autonomy over what happened in the classroom. Savova (1996, p.7) wrote that: ‘[T]eachers are expected to be actively involved in these changes, to be critical in their thinking and evaluation, to generate new ideas and to participate actively
in educational management’. Yet, as others have noted (Weiler 1996, Alexander et.al. 1999) this is rarely the case. Pastuovic (1993, p.416) suggested that these expectations are ‘optimistic and unsubstantiated’, expressions of hope for change and a reaction to what previously existed, rather than reflections of reality.

Various reasons have been suggested for teachers’ inability, or tardiness, to institute reform. Vonk (in Biddle, Good and Goodson 1997, p.990) attributed it to ‘the school system – because of its culture and traditions – is more oriented to conservation’. Others attributed it to teachers’ own reluctance to change. Leclerq (1996, p.83) noted that teachers’ ‘… capacity for change is not easy. Rapid and spectacular changes in their attitude and practices are generally rare.’ This appeared to be particularly true in previously-communist countries where teachers had been educated into the ‘old’ ideology both through their own experience as pupils in the communist controlled system and through their teacher-training. Their experiences had formed their values, beliefs and attitudes, their views of education, their understanding of the role of the teacher and their classroom practices and for them to question and change these would be difficult. Olek (1998) found that the culture in post-communist schools continued to militate against individual teachers being critical of previous practices and taking initiatives in introducing change. Cerych (1995, p.426) asserted that in communist countries the ‘heritage’ of the regime had instilled the ‘deeply rooted practice of acting only according to detailed instructions ‘from above’’ which led to teachers’ demonstrating ‘inertia of acquired habits and attitudes’ and ‘lack of experience, knowledge and skills in handling the new situations’. Popkewitz (1999) provided support for this assertion describing how in post-war Russia teachers said that they could now do what they wanted but were waiting for the government tests to come through so that they would know what to teach. Popkewitz described this as ‘decentralisation … of the system but not of the mind’ (1999, personal communication).
Another suggestion for the lack of change is that teachers find change threatening. Weiler et.al. (1996, p.44) found that during transition in eastern Germany teachers were faced with ‘an overload of educational innovations, new policies, new ambiguities, and new cultural phenomena in society, school, and classrooms’ which they found challenged their ‘professional competence’. This challenge caused teachers to maintain their existing practice in order to maintain their feelings of competence. However, Weiler et.al. (1996, p.47) also reported that many teachers believed that they did ‘need to learn new methods’.

Pastuovic (1993, p.417) believed that the wider context also impacts on teachers’ willingness or ability to change. He suggested that the extremely poor economic conditions in the eastern European countries in transition contributed to the difficulty teachers experienced in implementing social and educational reforms. These conditions, he argued, gave rise to ‘misery, social discontent and ethnic conflict’ and that these militated against the introduction and implementation of reforms as they left teachers with little energy or motivation for change. The economic conditions in Bosnia appear to match Pastuovic’s description and his idea will be examined in this research study.

There is some evidence, however, that micro-level reform does not always lag behind macro-level legislative change. Where reform has occurred as a result of populist social movement overthrowing a government or removing a dictator, teachers have shown themselves to be more willing and able to change their practices as they embrace sought-after freedoms. In South Africa, for example, the overthrow of the apartheid regime fuelled a huge desire, in some areas, to improve classroom practice and facilitators of change were welcomed. Similarly in Spain, the end of Franco’s dictatorship was welcomed and modernising political, social and educational reforms were embraced by teachers (O’Donnell et.al. 1991). Persiansis (1998) reported how post-conflict educational
change was welcomed in Cyprus following the invasion by Turkey. He found that the political and social changes brought about by the conflict led teachers to realise the importance of ‘schooling to help improve not only pupils’ cognitive skills but also their morale and faith in the future of Cyprus. It was teachers who realised that ‘[T]he whole climate and ethos of the school had to change, and it did’ (ibid, p.104). This change in teachers’ work led to greater democratisation in the education system and subsequent changes in the structure, curriculum and pedagogy, and in teacher training.

Where change in teachers’ classroom practice is sought it is often initiated through initial and in-service teacher education; Savova (1996, p.37) claimed that ‘[I]f teachers are not offered education and training adequate to the new reality, they will not be able to participate effectively in the changes taking place’. Dahlstrom (1999, p.144) emphasised the importance of teacher training to the reforms in Namibia where, following independence, teacher education ‘came to play a significant role as one of the spearheads in the transformation process.’ In contrast, Schneider (1999) described teacher training as the key problem to educational reform in Israel, he found it ‘old-fashioned’ and not able to ‘address social changes and problems’.

In order to bring about change in teachers’ practice, initial and in-service teacher education has itself to change and this too can be problematic. Several authors noted the conservatism apparent in teacher education and training, Wilkin (1996, p.4) referred to teacher training as a ‘sub-culture’ that is ‘resistant to change … demonstrating continuity over time’. In the countries of central and eastern Europe, following transition, Savova (1996, p.38) found that ‘[C]hanges within the system of teacher education and the innovation processes take place slowly and lag behind changes in other areas of education’ and Leclerq (1996, p.80) described courses as ‘largely theoretical … pervaded by the authoritarian and monolithic scientism’ of Marxism-Leninism.
Several writers acknowledged the difficulty of reforming teacher education. Popkewitz (1987, p.312) described it as problematic because

‘…every plan for teacher education is necessarily bounded by existing or proposed patterns of schooling and with the social, economic and political contexts in which schooling is embedded. Either a program has the consequences of integrating prospective teachers into the logic of the present social order or it serves to promote a situation where future teachers can deal critically with that reality in order to improve it.’

Leclerq (1996, p.77) reported that ‘[I]n all countries, reforms in the initial and in-service training of teacher are slow and seldom far-reaching because they involve very complex factors’. Similarly, Cerych (1997, p.91) found that whilst ‘virtually all countries’ in eastern Europe have acknowledged the importance of in-service training for teachers they were having difficulties in developing and implementing successful programmes. He believed this to be due to their lack of a well-defined policy, the compulsory versus voluntary participation of teachers and the lack of a link with teachers’ remuneration and career development.

These difficulties were overcome in Hungary, where Nagy (1998, p.400) reported there were ‘substantial innovations’ in the content of teacher training with the introduction of child-centred pedagogy, alternative pedagogies, new communication skills, curriculum development and school assessment. Their success in implementing these reforms was attributed to the government policy of encouraging teachers to participate in ‘continuing education’ through establishing a system of rewards based on their participation (ibid).

The literature on educational reform in countries in transition and post-conflict countries was mainly focused on the implementation of legislative, macro-level, change introduced by new governments and highlighted the deficiency in micro-level change resulting from
Successful classroom implementation seemed to occur when reforms were initiated by legitimate and welcomed governments or grounded in the classroom. Ideological change occurred in Bosnia with the fall of the communist government and the rise in nationalism. The new political structure was that instituted by the General Framework Agreement for Peace (the Dayton Agreement) and in chapter 7 the research examines how far the new government has succeeded in introducing legislative reform and whether or not there has been change in teachers’ classroom practice.

Theme 4 – the initial development of a free market economy appears to detrimentally affect teachers’ remuneration and status, whilst at the same time increasing their responsibilities. In this context, teachers seek to attain status by reverting to traditional approaches to schooling in an attempt to link current practice to a period when status was accorded.

In all central and eastern European countries the political transition to liberal democratic government brought with it economic transition, with an attempt to move towards more market-oriented economies. Subsequently each country initially suffered economic decline with high inflation, decreasing incomes and high unemployment. Although individual countries demonstrated different trends, all central and eastern European countries experienced a ‘general collapse’ in their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Savova 1996). In Lithuania, for example, between 1989-1995 GDP fell by more than half (Juceviciene and Taruskiene 1998). It was not until 1994 that countries began to see improvements in their economies as they began to control inflation and unemployment and the effects of economic reform began to be effective. It took until the late 1990s, however, for economic growth to be seen, for example in Hungary GDP in 1992 was 37.3 billion US$ and by 2002 had increased to 65.8 billion US$ (www.uis.unesco.org accessed 21.10.2003). It is likely
that similar effects will be evident in Bosnia, where the economic impact of transition was exacerbated by the civil war.

**Economic decline and its impact on education**

The initial economic decline had an impact on education. All countries allocate a percentage of their GDP to the financing of education and as the economies of the former communist countries declined so did the funding available for education. In 1996, Koucky (1996) reported that, in the central and eastern European countries in transition, ‘the share of public expenditure on education in GDP has undoubtedly gone up since 1989’, that is since the fall of communism countries had allocated more of their GDP to education, this then settled to a figure between 4-6%. However, because GDP itself had fallen dramatically in the years 1989-1994, despite these increases in GDP allocation education budgets still fell in real terms. These budget reductions led to ‘limitations on the prospects for curriculum innovations, enrichment of teaching materials and, thus, on raising the quality of teaching’ (Savova 1996, p.7). This highlighted the paradox where education was stated as a priority by the government and allocated a higher percentage of funding but was perceived by many educationalists as not receiving adequate funding to carry out the reforms identified as priorities, because of the fall in real terms provision (Savova 1996; Beresford-Hill 1998).

In line with their economic transition, governments in the former communist countries introduced changes into the sources of funding for education. Under communism all funding had come from central government but since the early 1990s, education funding was provided by a combination of central and local finances (www.ibe.unesco.org accessed 21.10.2003). Central government funding was also changed from year-on-year allocations to ‘per capita’ allocations, meaning that school budgets began to vary (Halasz 1993, Cerych 1997). Municipal budgets, which were themselves reliant on both central
funding and local taxes, contributed to education funds, as did parents through their payments for textbooks, school meals and other services. In most countries, central government funding covered teachers’ salaries and part of the cost of educational supplies, such as textbooks, whilst local funding covered the maintenance and running of the school buildings and any additional spending (www.ibe.unesco.org accessed 21.10.2003).

**Economic reform and teachers’ salaries**

The economic reforms, and their consequences on educational funding, had an impact on teachers’ salaries which in turn affected their status. Prior to 1989, in the countries of central and eastern Europe, it was found that although teachers’ pay was below average they were generally ‘well trained’ and enjoyed ‘high social prestige’ (Cerych 1997, p.94; Nagy 1998, p.397). Under communism, although teachers’ pay was below average the welfare state assured a minimum subsistence level for all which meant that the job itself brought status and pay was a secondary consideration. With the removal of the welfare state assurance, the level of pay became the only source of income so became more important. The literature also revealed that there are links between levels of income and job status (Cerych 1995, Savova 1996).

In the years immediately following the political and economic changes of 1989, teachers’ salaries fell dramatically. Savova (1996, p.32) reported that in 1990 teachers’ salaries in Hungary were 30-50% below those of other workers and that teachers in Russia were existing at ‘survival level’. Similarly, in Poland, teachers’ salaries ‘decreased by 66.7% compared to 1989’ (Savova, ibid). Koucky (1996) noted that income differentials also increased rapidly, with teachers suffering a decline, and Leclerq (1996. p.76) found that not only were teachers’ salaries well below those of industrial workers they were often not paid on time. These trends continued, an OECD study found that despite accounting for 90% of the education budget, teachers’ salaries in the region remained low (OECD 2002).
Economic restraints on pay were exacerbated in post-conflict countries, where there was a reduction in economic output, a fall in GDP and a high demand for financial resources for reconstruction. In such poor economic circumstances, education budgets and teachers’ salaries were reduced. The World Bank (2005, p.26) acknowledged that conflict, and its legacy, ‘adds a substantial additional burden to the daunting challenges of education development and reform’. Savova (1996, p.33) reported that in the countries affected by conflict in the Balkans ‘… salaries have been replaced by consumer coupons’. Consumer coupons were issued by the governments in lieu of payment as there were insufficient government funds to pay state employees. The coupons could be exchanged in local shops, usually for food, although the value of the coupons was rarely the value of the salary earned by the teacher.

The consequences for education of low teacher salaries

In the post-communist economic climate where salary levels become important, several consequences of low teacher salaries have been identified. One consequence was that teachers considered themselves as having low status, that their role was not valued by society. This was further exacerbated by pay differentials experienced by teachers of primary school pupils, who received lower salaries than those teaching older pupils, and who therefore regarded themselves as having lower status than other teachers (Cerych 1995, Savova 1996).

Other consequences included high absenteeism; unwillingness to give additional time or effort, for example to attend meetings; seeking additional employment such as private tutoring or even manual work; or leaving the profession for alternative employment (Leclerq 1996, p.76). In addition, those who could find employment elsewhere were either leaving the profession or choosing not to enter it in the first place; Savova (1996, p.33)
reported that in the Ukraine ‘10% of teachers have left the education sector due to low salaries’.

Low salaries created other demands on teachers’ time and energy as many found that they needed to work additional hours or take on a second job in order to maintain a reasonable income. These additional demands left insufficient time for the work required for school, such as marking pupils’ work and preparing lessons, and created a downward spiral of poor teaching, leading to lower standards, leading to poor regard for teachers. A further consequence of this demoralised profession was the negative attitude towards teachers that pupils and parents acquired as teaching standards declined. Savova (1996, p.46) reported that, as a result of a perceived decline in the quality of teaching, ‘parents are becoming more critical towards the schools, the teachers and the changes being implemented’.

A more long-term consequence of low teacher salaries and perceived decline in status was that there were fewer applicants for teacher training, and those who did apply were of a lower quality, although this was not true of Russia or the Czech Republic where applications had risen (Savova 1996). Possible reasons for the upturn in these two countries are the steps taken by the governments to increase status through moving teacher education into the university sector and focussing on the professional development of teachers. Where measures such as these were not taken and recruits were of a lower academic standard this contributed to lower quality teaching, thus further lowering the social status and regard with which teachers were held (OECD 2002).

A corollary of poor economic conditions also appeared to be the introduction of some sort of fee-paying from parents. Broadfoot (2001, p.263) argued that the ‘marketisation’ of schooling ‘has weakened the traditional authority of educational institutions and of the teachers who work in them’. She suggested that this is likely to have a negative impact on
Despite low salaries and low status the plethora of educational reforms in countries in transition, and the changed conditions in post-conflict countries, appeared to bring new responsibilities to teachers. There was an expectation that they would accommodate themselves to the new structures and systems that were introduced; they were expected to implement changes in curricula, pedagogy and assessment and become more actively involved in educational decision-making as schools became more autonomous (Savova 1996). In many of these countries education was seen as a powerful tool to improve the economic conditions and contribute to political and social reform, for example the Romanian Ministry of Education stated that teachers are the ‘irreplaceable agents of the desired reforms’ (in Leclerq 1996, p.74).

In addition, in post-conflict countries, the working conditions of teachers were poor. They often worked in damaged buildings with little or no heating and had limited resources; an OECD report (2002) found that only 2-3% of available funding (which was low in any case) was allocated to resource equipment. Savova (1996) reported that these countries also had an increase in the number of pupils with special educational needs, both physical and mental, but teachers had insufficient resources and training to deal with them.

Savova (1996, p.7) found that these complex conditions left many teachers feeling demoralized and placed limitations ‘on raising the quality of teaching’. She reported that studies across eastern Europe since 1990 indicated that teachers felt ‘underestimated, isolated, neglected and rejected.’ which had ‘a negative impact on … teachers.’ Pastuovic (1993) further believed that the extremely poor economic conditions increase the misery
and social discontent felt, causing hindrance to social and educational reconstruction as the discontent gives rise to negative feelings towards the changes.

The economic forecasts for these countries suggested that increases in teachers’ salaries were unlikely. Savova (1996, p.13) suggested that the problem may be partly addressed through the introduction of ‘special legislative activity’ to raise teachers’ social status and empower them. Whilst this may have some effect, attitudes are rarely changed as a result of legislation and Savova offered no argument as to how change in attitudes could be achieved.

Olek (1998) found that in Poland, as a result of low public opinion, teachers became defensive and stressed the consistency of their practice rather than change. It could be postulated, therefore, that teachers were attempting to regain status by reverting to their traditional approaches. If teachers considered themselves to have held status under the previous authoritarian system they may have deemed it necessary only to adopt their previous practice in order to regain that status. This suggestion is supported by Halasz (1993, p.493) who found that ‘[U]ncertainty caused by increased autonomy also makes people feel the desire to go back to well-known patterns of order’.

Bosnia’s political transition to democratic government brought with it economic transition towards a free market economy. However, the interruption to this transition caused by war, and the cost of the war itself, had a further impact on the economy of the country. The research will consider the economic effects of the transition and war and the consequence of these on the remuneration and status of teachers. Chapter 6 considers the communist, pre-war context and Chapter 7 the post-communist, post-war situation.
Theme 5 – contemporary resolutions of conflict are mediated by the involvement of international organisations, and resolution agreements have post-conflict consequences for education provision.

There are many countries around the world experiencing conflict, UNESCO report that ‘At least 73 countries are undergoing an internal crisis or are engaged in post-crisis reconstruction’ (UNESCO 2002, p.13). And developments in communications technology have made us all more aware of the reality of these conflicts for those involved, for example the televising of live events from the war in Iraq. This increased awareness has led to repeated calls from those outside the conflict arena for international organisations to bring about conflict resolution.

Today, conflict resolution is almost always mediated by international organisations, as it was in Bosnia, and requires agreement on a range of issues including the development of political and social organisations, which include education. As Apple (2004) stated, ‘Education is political through and through’.

Education is considered by the international organisations to be an important contributor to the reconstruction and rebuilding process and it is one of the issues on which conflict resolution agreement is sought. UNESCO believed that post-conflict conditions provide ‘an opportunity to rebuild the education system to avoid the weaknesses and faults of the past’ and, when involved in reconstruction and rebuilding programmes, is particularly concerned to ‘avoid replication of education structures that may have contributed to conflict’ (www.unesco.org/education accessed 21.10.2003).
The involvement of international organisations in conflict resolution and post-conflict education development

The First World War led to a period of international institution-building which saw the establishment of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in 1925 and the International Bureau of Education (IBE) in 1929. The purpose of the IBE was to ‘open the way to co-operation among governments in the field of education, hitherto regarded as a preserve of national sovereignty’ (IBE 1979). These organisations had limited impact on education provision but they did lay the foundations for further institution-building after the Second World War which was more strongly linked to political, economic and social agendas. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) were both established during this period, the latter with the purpose of trying to ensure peace through education.

Analysis of the literature indicated that a large number of international organisations have been involved in conflict resolution and post-conflict development work. Table 3.1, on the next page, lists some of the major organisations; these can be categorised as intergovernmental, where personnel are drawn from a number of countries; governmental, where one nation government takes responsibility for projects and non-governmental organisations, these are usually charities.

The organisations listed in Table 3.1 have been involved in a range of post-conflict development work including housing, infrastructure, economy-building and social care work. Those most involved in educational issues are the intergovernmental organisations, particularly The World Bank, the European Union, UNESCO and the OECD.
Table 3.1 – international organisations involved in conflict resolution and post-conflict development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-governmental organisations</th>
<th>Governmental organisations</th>
<th>Non-governmental organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The World Bank Group</td>
<td>• Norwegian government agency</td>
<td>• Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• European Union</td>
<td>• Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>• Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>• Department for International Development (Britain)</td>
<td>• Children in Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• United Nations agencies:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Care International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNHCR</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Open Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Small, independent charities, e.g. Nobody’s Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Health Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The World Bank Group was established in 1944 to provide economic assistance to the poorest nations but further developed its work to include assistance to post-conflict countries such as Colombia and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In 1963 the Bank began lending for education projects and became the largest funder of education programmes across the world (www.worldbank.org accessed 21.10.2003), lending US$2,158 million in 2003. In addition to financial support the Bank has also provided ‘non-lending’ services to education such as personnel and training to assist with policy and strategy formulation, capacity-building and building national consensus, to enable reforms to be carried through.

The humanitarian activities of the European Union (EU) are co-ordinated through The European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO). The EU has supported a number of post-conflict countries including Iraq, the Palestinian Territories, Liberia and Chechnya by
providing funding for, and co-ordination of, education projects. They also work in partnership with other international and non-governmental organisations.

UNESCO, a United Nations agency, has assisted post-conflict countries such as Sierra Leone and Afghanistan, where they ‘are often lacking in the most basic resources, and staff may lack management, education and pedagogic expertise’ (www.unesco.org/education accessed 21.10.2003). They have focused on ‘analyzing the functioning of education systems, identifying their strengths and weaknesses, formulating new educational policy options, defining strategic reform and/or development objectives and drawing up plans, projects or actions plans …’ (ibid). They have provided technical assistance, usually in the areas of education management, curriculum and textbooks, national examinations and teacher training. UNESCO personnel have worked with governments to develop education policy, improve planning and management, monitor pupil achievement, support curriculum development projects and developments in teacher education. They are particularly concerned with introducing skills and values into the curriculum that will help to promote peace, through the teaching materials used and the pedagogic approaches of teachers.

UNESCO has also developed an International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED97), which it called ‘a framework for the compilation and presentation of national and international education statistics and indicators’ (www.unesco.org/uis accessed 21.10.2003). This framework can be used to make comparisons of educational performance across countries, indicating that the organisation sees itself as having a role to play in facilitating comparisons. This then raises the question of what the organisation proposes to do with the data that is gathered, and how this might feed in to extending their educational role.
Other United Nations agencies have also been involved in post-conflict reconstruction and rebuilding education programmes. UNICEF focuses on basic education for children through the provision of supplies and support for teacher training. UNHCR concerns itself with the education of refugee children and UNDP with human development, including access to education to help improve lives.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has worked in post-conflict countries to conduct reviews of education provision and make recommendations on strategy, policy and reform. They are involved in education because of the ‘private and social returns that accrue to investments in education’ and because education is seen as a means ‘for developing individuals’ productive and social capacity’ (www.oecd.org accessed 21.10.2003). They have also developed the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD-CERI.

It is suggested here that the relatively recent and rapid increase of globalisation and the internationalisation of education have led to an even greater role for international organisations in post-conflict development work. Their increasing involvement, it is postulated, derives from new governments in post-conflict countries seeking a place in the global and international community and believing that the involvement of international organisations will help to bring this about. And it is claimed that the organisations themselves benefit from their involvement; Ball (in Fielding 2001, p.49) believed that ‘[I]n part at least the establishment of a global policy paradigm in education and social welfare could be identified with the activities of certain key supranational agencies (World Bank, IMF, OECD)’.
**The appropriateness and effectiveness of international organisation involvement in conflict resolution and post-conflict education development**

The increased involvement of international organisations in areas of conflict resolution and post-conflict education development cannot be regarded as unproblematic; questions can be asked about the appropriateness of their involvement. Jones (1998), for example, believed that the World Bank’s ‘preconditions for education can only be understood as an ideological stance, in promoting an integrated world system along market lines’.

Globalisation is a relatively recent phenomenon, built on the increasing economic links between countries around the world. The balance of power, however, can lead to globalisation being perceived as a means of imposing western ideas and policies on others. Dalin (1978, p.13) questioned the transfer of educational experience from one country to another arguing that changes in education in the western world, such as pupil-centred learning and enquiry-based learning, result from cultural and social changes and that other countries, in different contexts, ‘without these environmental influences … will find it more difficult to implement these practices’. He therefore believed that the imposition of western educational ideas on these countries will flounder.

The involvement of international organisations in education reform in countries in central and eastern Europe has been questioned by several researchers. Birzea (1994, p.8) asked if the transition process means only the ‘transplanting’ of western experience to societies with different social and political experiences. Olek (1998) questioned the ‘appropriateness of western-style educational models’ for post-communist countries in transition. Her research showed that attempts to introduce western-style education in Poland have been ignored or had unintended outcomes, as Dalin (1978, see above) would have forecast. Cerych (1995) noted that some western ideas have been effective in influencing reforms in central and eastern European countries but many have been ignored.
or rejected. UNESCO acknowledged the difficulties, stating that ‘international agencies have not found it easy to bring together these two interrelated strands of education planning and practice,’ (UNESCO 2002, p.13).

A further difficulty is that new governments in post-transition and post-conflict countries are often politically inexperienced (Halasz 1993), which leaves international organisations to ‘set the agenda’. Heyneman (2003, p.315) claimed that in countries receiving financial assistance from the World Bank, ‘[L]ocal policy makers have become passive recipients of the Bank’s agendas’. Newly-established governments, keen to see their countries compete in the ‘modern’ world, follow the agenda which is set but, as Birzea, Dalin and Olek argued, western experience cannot simply be transplanted; appropriate and effective post-conflict developments have to take account of both the global agenda and the local context. The evidence in the literature did not appear to demonstrate that this had been the case.

International organisations were heavily involved in the resolution of the war in Bosnia, its post-war reconstruction efforts and its political and economic transition. The international organisations claim to work with national personnel and take account of the national context, these claims will be investigated within the context of Bosnia. Chapter 7 describes the role of international organisations in Mostar, where post-conflict resolution agreements have proved more elusive, and in particular it questions the appropriateness and effectiveness of the international organisations working in the town.

These themes, which were drawn from the literature, identify the inter-relationship between political, social and economic contexts and education. They indicate the important role that education can play in the transition process when its contribution is acknowledged to be part of the political and social process. Theme five also identifies the increasingly important role played by the international community in both conflict
resolution and post-conflict agreements, which have an impact on educational provision. These themes will be tested out in the context of Bosnia, where political and economic transition was interrupted by a civil war which led to social fragmentation.
Chapter 4 - The merging of east and west:

Bosnia under the Austro-Hungarians 1878-1918

The themes which emerged from the literature, described in the previous chapter, then needed to be tested in the context of Bosnia. The next four chapters present the data using the time periods identified in Chapter 1.

Prior to 1878 Bosnia had been an outpost of the Turkish Ottoman Empire and under its rule for over 400 years. In the period reported in this chapter governorship of Bosnia had just passed to the Austro-Hungarians. This was an important phase because it marked the beginning of the integration of western European influences with eastern European ones, bringing a major change in the dominant ideology and nationalist tensions to the fore. It is also important because it saw the inception of the state provision of primary education. The period of time covered by this chapter means that the data was gathered from historical literature.

Social and political context

During the Middle Ages Bosnia was an independent state ruled by a monarch and with a mainly Catholic population. When it expanded to take in Herzegovina the population grew to include Orthodox Christians. Then, during the fifteenth century the Turks gained control of most of the lands in the region and established Bosnia Herzegovina as a distinct administrative province within the Ottoman Empire (see p.254). The Turks governed Bosnia for four hundred years but by the mid-nineteenth century there was a growing disaffection between the Christian population and the Ottoman Muslims.

In 1878, at a meeting known as the Congress of Berlin, control of Bosnia passed to the Dual Monarchy of the Austro-Hungarians (Habsburgs) as a result of an agreement
negotiated between western European leaders, Russians and leaders of the Ottoman Empire. Western European leaders feared that Russia’s influence and territory was spreading and they were concerned to contain this, as well as containing the influence of the Ottomans and moving their own borders as far east as possible. The agreement meant that in theory Bosnia remained under Ottoman authority but that in practice it was to be occupied and administered by Austro-Hungary (see p.255). The Dual Monarchy already controlled Croatian territory, which had never been part of the Ottoman Empire, and the Croats were known to be ‘contemptuous’ of the Ottomans (McCreight 2002, p.107). It was, therefore, considered that Austro-Hungarian control of Bosnia would extend the ‘western’ presence in the region.

The Congress of Berlin meeting also agreed to grant independence to Serbia and to extend Serbia’s southern and eastern territories into land formerly occupied by the Ottoman Empire. These decisions were to influence later events. As Bosnia lay on Serbia’s western borders its occupation by Austro-Hungary has been referred to as a ‘blow’ to Serbia’s desire to extend westwards and Glenny (1999, p.148) contends that ‘the Serbian state stored its claims to Bosnia for later retrieval…’.

It has been claimed (Malcolm 1994, Sugar 1999) that Austro-Hungary accepted the decision of the Congress of Berlin with reluctance; they did not want the economic burden of administering this region and, being aware of the political and social difficulties within the region, did not want the problems that these would bring. Glenny (1999, p.139), on the other hand, states that the ‘Austrian military establishment were determined to occupy, if not annex, Bosnia-Hercegovina’, and Lovrenovic (2001, p.148) claims that the decision satisfied Austro-Hungary’s ‘long-standing desire for Bosnia-Hercegovina’ for the economic opportunities it offered and to strengthen its position in that part of the world. It
is likely that these contrasting views were both expressed at the time, each with its own supporters.

The Austro-Hungarians rightly anticipated that they would not be welcomed in Bosnia. The Bosnian Muslims organised resistance movements, although the (Muslim) Governor of Bosnia did not fully support their actions as the agreement had been signed by the Ottoman Sultan, theoretically still the ruler of Bosnia. The Muslim resistance continued and gained the support of the Orthodox Christians but they were defeated by the Austro-Hungarian army and by October 1878 the occupation was complete.

The change of sovereignty was momentous. In contrast to the Muslim, eastern European Ottomans the new rulers, the Habsburgs, were Catholics from western Europe and this was to be hugely influential on the development of the country, in particular in relation to the social and political structures that influenced education.

Then, as now, there were three main religious communities in Bosnia: Muslim, Catholic and Orthodox Christian. Each faith group also mainly represented an ethnic group. Although all had been born and raised in Bosnia only the Muslims were known as Bosnian, Catholics regarded themselves as Bosnian Croats and Orthodox Christians regarded themselves as Bosnian Serbs. These affiliations were drawn from history, from a time when the land was inhabited by two Slavic tribes, the Serbs who settled in what is now south-west Serbia, Montenegro and Herzegovina and the Croats who settled in the area of modern Croatia and Bosnia. West (1994, p.7) describes how, during the Middle Ages

… the idea arose that Croatia comprised not only the geographical heartland around Zagreb but all Roman Catholic Slavs who spoke Serbo-Croat. The Catholics in Slavonia, Dalmatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina who had previously thought of themselves simply as Slavs, or took their name from the clan or region, began to identify with the kingdom that ceased to exist in 1102.
West (ibid, p.22) goes on to quote Evans who found that ‘By Serbian nationality is meant rather a difference in political tendencies and religion rather than in blood and language’.

These concepts were understood by the Ottomans, who believed that ‘religion took precedence over culture, language and race in defining one’s identity’ (Glenny 1999, p.71). So Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Serbs, identifying their ethnic affiliation through their religion, identified with lands and political affiliations outside of Bosnia, an idea that has continued through the years.

Bosnian Muslims were mostly former Orthodox and Catholic Christians who converted to Islam during the period of Ottoman occupation, mainly for the social and political benefits that Muslim status brought. Djilas (1991, p.9) describes how Christians in Ottoman Bosnia were second-class citizens, ‘prohibited, for example, from riding horses, carrying weapons, and wearing certain types of clothing, and their choice of occupation and freedom of movement were severely limited’. Conversion to Islam often brought with it ‘social advancement’ (ibid). By the mid-eighteenth century there were sufficient converts in Bosnia for the term ‘Bosniak’ to be in common use both in Bosnia and Istanbul to describe Bosnian Muslims (Glenny 1999, p.78). This term was later reclaimed by the Muslims.

This history led contemporary Serbs and Croats to claim that Bosnian Muslims belonged to their ethnic group and they therefore regarded Bosnian Muslim lands as their own rightful territory. This claim was perpetuated throughout their history, through their educational systems, and was an influential factor in recent events. However, the boundaries of Bosnia have been subject to change so that Serbs and Croats have found themselves living on land labelled as Serbia, Croatia or Bosnia at different times. Ethnic identities in Bosnia today
relate to one’s perceived familial history rather than place of birth; families who have lived for centuries in Bosnia still refer to themselves as (Bosnian) Croats or Serbs.

Initially, Austro-Hungary maintained the administrative arrangements set up by the Ottomans. However, they indicated their presence and control through changing the language, for example regions formerly known as sandzaks were renamed Kreise; districts were changed from kazas to Bezirke. The use of language to signify power is a recurring theme in Bosnia’s history.

The Habsburgs also brought an influx of Austro-Hungarian (Catholic) administrators into the land. Austro-Hungarian officials were posted to every town and village and where previously there had been 120 officials by 1908 there were 9,533 (Glenny 1999). Whilst there may have been a need for additional officials in order to expedite the changes proposed by the Austro-Hungarians, it is difficult to understand why such a large number was thought necessary. It is possible to assume that this was done partly in order to assert their authority and the presence of these foreigners in Bosnia, with their European dress, customs and traditions, brought changes to the traditional ways of life, making many Bosnians feel insecure. The situation was exacerbated by Austro-Hungary appointing Croatians to official posts, a decision taken pragmatically in order to overcome the language problem experienced by the Austro-Hungarian administrators. But the Croats were Catholic and happy to be associated with the Habsburgs and their western European civilisation and culture, so their ‘promotion’ in the political and social order served only to deepen the fears of the Bosnian Muslims.

Catholicism grew rapidly in Bosnia, but the Austro-Hungarian authorities made every attempt to be seen to be even-handed in their dealings with each ethnic/religious group, to the extent that the Catholics felt ‘disappointed’ in their treatment (Miller, quoted in
Malcolm 1994, p.145). The authorities also declared all faiths equal and developed policies aimed at creating the idea of ‘Bosnian nationhood’ to unify the citizens of Bosnia and to separate them from the nationalist factions of neighbouring Serbia and Croatia. The positions of Serbia and Croatia, with their respective Orthodox and Catholic populations, were worrying to the Austro-Hungarians. Serbia, despite its independence, was still under the influence of the Ottomans and it was feared that they had territorial ambitions to annex Bosnia in a Greater Serbia. Croatia was allied to the Austria-Germany-Italy nexus and also feared being subsumed by Serbia; it believed that by extending its territories into Bosnia it would strengthen its defence against Serbia. The Austro-Hungarians sought to alleviate their own fears by attempting to strengthen Bosnia as an independent nation, making it less of an ‘easy target’ for others.

However, the policy of ‘Bosnian nationhood’ was not embraced by the Bosnian population and during this period the tensions between the Catholics and Muslims of Bosnia continued to increase. Many Muslims fled the country, some for religious reasons and some because they feared reprisals for their behaviour towards Christians during the period of Ottoman rule. The Muslims who stayed attempted to retain power where they could, Malcolm (1994, p.146) notes that

An elaborate contest for power went on during the first two decades of Austro-Hungarian rule, with the Muslim elite of Sarajevo acquiring power and influence by cooperating with the government, and the more hard-line Muslim leaders of Travnik and Mostar taking up uncompromising positions in order to discredit their Sarajevan rivals and take over some of their power.

The Sarajevan Muslims co-operated with the Austro-Hungarian authorities in their attempts to introduce Bosnian nationhood, as they saw this as a way of attaining Bosnian autonomy. However, the Bosnian Catholic and Orthodox populations could not be convinced by this policy and their religious/ethnic nationalism grew.
The Austro-Hungarians did, however, have some success in improving the Bosnian economy. They built over 1,000 kilometres of railways and roads, developed forestry and coal-mining, built ironworks, steelworks, chemical plants and carpet factories and introduced modern agricultural methods (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998). This, in turn, led to ‘social diversification’ and the further development of towns and cities (Lovrenovic 2001, p.149).

Just after the turn of the twentieth century, in 1908, Austro-Hungary declared Bosnia a fully-annexed country. In 1909 the Ottoman government signed an agreement with the Austro-Hungarian government, giving them full rights over Bosnia in return for guaranteed freedom of religion for Bosnian Muslims and the payment of 2.5 million Turkish pounds.

With its governorship of Bosnia secured, Austro-Hungary began to grant political concessions. In 1910 they allowed the election of a Bosnian parliament, albeit with no legislative powers. This created opportunities for the nationalist organisations that had begun to emerge - the Muslim National Organisation, the Serbian National Organisation and the Croatian National Society - to evolve further as political parties. Alongside these there were burgeoning socialist political organisations, these were also organised along nationalist lines with Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian groups. These nationalist groups, however, did meet as all-Yugoslav 9 socialists and the idea began to develop that socialists together could create a Yugoslav nation that would unite the working classes and overthrow foreign occupation. Jelavich (1990, p.xii) describes ‘Yugoslavism’ as a significant concept to those who saw their own national history as ‘centuries of subject to foreign domination’. The desire for unity in the new Yugoslavia arose from the idea that the state needed strength and numbers in order to be able to resist foreign takeover and this

---

9 Lampe (1995) notes that the idea of a Yugoslav national identity had kept resurfacing in the region over a two hundred year period, so this would not be a new concept in political thought.
meant that the small, fragmented, states in the Balkans needed to unite as one. Whilst unfruitful in the early twentieth century the idea of a united Yugoslav state was to later re-surface.

The growth of nationalist political parties and socialist groups fed the resentment felt towards the Austro-Hungarians, particularly by Bosnian Serbs and Croats. Then, in 1914, the Austro-Hungarians declared war on Serbia after the shooting of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by a Serbian student demonstrating against the dominance of the Austro-Hungarians. This led to the First World War in which most Bosnians, though not all, fought with Austro-Hungary against Serbia.

This was an important period in Bosnia’s history as the change of governance brought ideological change and major change in the ethnic/religious communities that made up its population, in particular the growth of Catholicism. Events led to the growth both of nationalist movements, Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, and of the idea of a Yugoslav nation. In asserting their authority in the region the Austro-Hungarians also changed some of the language used, demonstrating the importance of language in relation to power and control. Each of these factors – the change in the balance of ethnic groupings; the growth of nationalist and Yugoslav movements; the use of language to assert power – had an influence on the educational provision in Bosnia, and each was to recur through the years.

**Primary education in Bosnia - 1878-1918**

The political and social antagonisms that prevailed in Bosnia during this forty year period had more influence on education than the Ottomans had done in the previous four hundred years. Historical data describe how under Ottoman rule education was obtained through the mosques and churches; this connection of education and religion may have contributed to the perpetuation of ethnic differences in the population as Muslims, Croats and Serbs
were each educated separately within their own confessions. Educational provision was affected both by the changes in the social and political order brought about by the Austro-Hungarian occupation and by their western European views on education, which influenced their decision-making in this sphere.

There are indications from written documents, such as the tablet of Humac and the Charter of Kulin Ban, that there was a form of education in Bosnia as far back as the twelfth century (Dizdar and Kemal 1996). Although, as in many other countries, schooling was limited in its reach and it was mainly the ‘elite’ of the country who were educated. The development of wider educational opportunity occurred through the religious communities; monasteries and mosques were the early educational institutions, priests and hodjas the first teachers. During the Ottoman period mektebe and madrasahs, primary and secondary religious schools, were established in Bosnia for the teaching of Islamic studies, but Pinson (1996) describes these as ‘parochial’ and claims that only 10% of the school age population received schooling and even fewer completed.

Glenny (1999, p.76), in his history of the Balkans, notes that the Christians in Ottoman Bosnia made modest political demands but did seek to ‘establish and run schools’. The first Catholic school in Bosnia opened in 1820, in Livno; this was followed by others in major towns, including Mostar in 1852. The Orthodox Christians were also increasing the number of schools, by 1870 they had between 28 and 57 (Malcolm 1994). By 1878 there were 720 mektebe, 56 Orthodox schools and 54 Catholic schools across Bosnia (Magas 1998).

Schools under church control were independent; they set their own curricula and selected their own textbooks. However, the fact that religious affiliation and national identity were
entwined meant that the textbooks portrayed the ethnic identity of the faith, again a theme that recurs in Bosnian history.

The curriculum generally included study of religious texts and a study of their own language (Croatian, Serbian or other local languages). Serbian also included learning the Cyrillic alphabet, adopted by the Serbs in the ninth century when St. Cyril introduced Christianity to the Slavic Serbs. The Croatians, following the Roman Catholic tradition, used the Latin script. Bosnian Muslims used both. History, geography, mathematics, geometry and French were added to the curriculum later (McCreight 2002). The introduction of French was due to the far-reaching influence of the French revolution; Daskalov (1997, p.4) describes France as ‘a leading civilizing force in Europe of the nineteenth century’ extending as far as ‘the Europeanization of the Ottoman Empire’ (op.cit).

Historical sources suggest, however, that the influence of the churches had begun to wane before the Austro-Hungarians assumed authority. In 1874 Croatia had passed a law which removed control of schools from the church and made them the responsibility of the Croatian Assembly; a minister for education and religion was appointed. One outcome of this was that all schools in Croatia, whether Catholic or Orthodox, were required to use the same textbooks, which would be ‘state-authorized’ to follow the state-set curriculum. This was done, in part, to encourage them to become ‘loyal citizens of Croatia’ (Jelavich 1990, p.43). Due to the large number of Serbs living in Croatia, textbooks were printed in both Latin and Cyrillic script, although in Serbia the Latin script was not taught until 1914 (Jelavich 1990, p.23). However, this did not appease the Serbs who opposed the 1874 law; they regarded it as religious opposition and demanded a Serbian political presence in Croatia. In 1888 the Habsburgs met some of their demands and the law was amended to allow Serbian schools, teaching the Serbian language, to use their own textbooks, although
they still required state approval. This was important to Bosnia because the Bosnian Croats tended to follow the church teaching established in Croatia and would have amended their textbooks and teaching to follow suit. This theme, too, would recur later in Bosnia.

In 1880 Serbia, following Croatia’s lead, reduced the power and control of the church over educational affairs through the appointment of a Chief Educational Council to advise the Minister of Education and Religious Affairs. The Council was responsible for devising and implementing school programmes, approving textbooks and supervising school buildings and furniture. As in Croatia, textbooks were submitted to the Council by authors who were scholars or teachers, these were reviewed by experts appointed by the Council who recommended books for approval. However, Jelavich (1990, p.37) claims that the recommendations of the experts were based as much on the status or prominence of the author as on the ‘scholastic merit’ of the book. The main criterion for selection, it is claimed, was that the book supported Serbian national aims in order ‘to educate loyal, patriotic citizens’ (ibid, p.39).

The language taught in schools during this period further served the nationalist cause. The Serbians, in particular, were strong in the belief that the Serbian dialect of the South Slav language united all Serbs, although many who spoke this dialect lived in Bosnia, Croatia and other regions. Grammar textbooks, whilst teaching the language, used texts describing history, national heroes and folklore to do so, reinforcing the nationalist themes in other textbooks. History and geography textbooks also served the cause. In Serbia the study of history and geography included phrases such as ‘…in the beautiful Serbian lands of Bosnia, Hercegovina, … Croatia, … foreigners rule over the Serbian people’ (Jelavich 1990, p.72). Similarly, Croatian textbooks referred to Novi Sad and Belgrade (in Serbia) as Croatian cities (ibid, p.50). In both states Bosnia-Hercegovina was presented as ‘a
South Slav land with inhabitants who were Serbs or Croats of three religious faiths’ (ibid, p.135); in Serbia they were referred to as ‘Serbs of the Islamic faith’ (op.cit. p.270).

The countries on either side of Bosnia were using the education system to promote the development of nationalism and loyalty to the state. The use of schools to instil patriotism and nationalism was not unusual in the nineteenth century, it was common practice throughout Europe and the United States (Green 1990). The problem in the Balkans was that Serbia and Croatia were each trying to lay claim to being the nation of the region, claiming that all South Slavs were either Serbs or Croats and all the lands were Serbian or Croatian. Each state used its education system to perpetuate these beliefs, sometimes distorting the truth in order to do so. Within Bosnia, the Croatian and Serbian populations were receiving the same education as those residing in Croatia and Serbia, reinforcing for Bosnian Croat and Bosnian Serb pupils the belief that Bosnia belonged to Croatia or Serbia.

In Croatia and Serbia, the removal of control of education from the churches and the introduction of state control brought with it the requirement for state administration. The State Education Commission in Croatia was established to approve the curriculum and textbooks and had responsibility for supervising schools. At regional level, school supervisors were appointed by the state to oversee the local school boards. These were comprised the school principal, a teacher, a priest and several local citizens. Teachers in all regions were employees of the state, although selected by local school boards (Jelavich 1990). Teachers were civil servants and, as such, were required to demonstrate their patriotism and support the nationalist cause. Despite low salaries, the teachers had social prestige and their standing in the local community meant that their views were respected by pupils and parents.
When the Austro-Hungarians took administrative control of Bosnia schools were provided and run by the religious communities. They provided only primary level education, and that only in the basic skills. At that time, the majority of Bosnia’s population was rural and mostly uneducated so the educational provision was considered sufficient. The incomers view, however, was that the quality of educational provision was poor and that Bosnian citizens were uncultured, rude and in need of education.

The Austro-Hungarian view of education, recently developed in their own country, was that education should serve the economic and social needs of society. In Austro-Hungary this view had grown from the ‘dissolution of serfdom’, the increase in social mobility and the growth of industrial developments leading to the need for educated workers (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998, p.329). It has also been proposed (McCreight 2002) that the Austro-Hungarian philosophy of education had developed from that of German educational discourse and combined the philosophies known as Bildung and Disterweg. These are based on the idea that education is to serve the process of self-development and relies on discovering knowledge and nourishing the mind. The approach introduced by the Habsburgs has been described as totally opposed to that in operation in Bosnia at the time (ibid), which consisted of rote learning and memorising of texts and facts.

The Austro-Hungarians sought to introduce centralised state-control of education into Bosnia and in order to do this they needed ‘the subordination of the three education systems then in place’ (McCreight 2002, p.27). Rather than impose government commissions, as had been done in Croatia and Serbia, they achieved their objective through negotiating with the religious leaders of each denomination and gaining the ability to nominate Catholic and Orthodox bishops and to have authority over Muslim imams (religious leaders). McCreight (ibid) claims that ‘inducements’ were traded in order to obtain this influence. This capacity allowed the Austro-Hungarian leaders to appoint
religious leaders sympathetic to their cause and to gain control over the provision of education. In addition they provided 200 primary schools, three high schools, a technical college and a teacher training college (Malcolm 1994). These developments marked the inception of the public education tradition in Bosnia.

McCreight (2002) describes how the state education introduced into Bosnia was based on that operating in Austro-Hungary, which had developed under Empress Maria Theresa a hundred years previously. The Austro-Hungarian system comprised junior and senior primary schools in each parish, with compulsory attendance for six years. In Bosnia they introduced junior primary schools requiring four to five years attendance, which became compulsory in 1909, followed by optional high schools which could be academic, the gymnasias, or vocational, real or technical, schools.

The primary schools provided by the government existed alongside the established religious schools (Dizdar and Kemal 1996). The Catholic nature of the Austro-Hungarian authorities, and their provision of state schools, led the Muslims of Mostar to comment on the increase in cultural centres, schools and churches serving the Catholic and Orthodox communities (Glenny 1999, p.267). These comments are likely to have stemmed from insecurity about their standing and influence in the community and fears that the new rulers were trying not only to instigate modern ideas and new ways of living but also to promote Catholicism.

The Austro-Hungarian authorities were sensitive to the different religious and ethnic communities in Bosnia and one of the ways in which they attempted to placate them was to provide subsidies for their confessional schools. However, one policy served to further alienate the Muslims. Vakufs were Islamic charitable-religious foundations that funded the upkeep of mosques and schools, along with other public buildings such as hamams and
bridges. The special status held by the *vakufs* had led to financial abuse, with wealthy families using them to create tax-free family trusts. In 1883, in an attempt to take away power and influence from the *vakufs*, the government took over the administration of them, introduced a policy for the funding of mosques and schools and drew up ‘proper’ budgets. The Muslims saw this as a further erosion of their rights and the removal of influence from them to the (Catholic) authorities.

Following this, in 1884, the Habsburgs abolished a special tax donation to Serbs’ Orthodox schools, as a result of which many closed (Lampe 2000, p.67). The Serb Orthodox community in Bosnia also felt threatened and organised a ‘movement for freedom of religious education’, which ran from 1893-1903, with the aim of maintaining the powers of the church and developing their political influence (Lovrenovic 2001). The movement did not immediately realise its aims but it did serve to raise the nationalist consciousness of Serbs in Bosnia. By 1905 the Austro-Hungarians gave in and returned to the Serb Orthodox church some control over educational provision, a concession also granted to the Muslims in 1909 (McCreight 2002). The Catholic community had not made the same demands as they were of the same faith as the occupiers and had little conflict with their educational leadership and control.

The *mektebs*, *madrasahs* and church schools had been established mainly to give religious instruction but also provided an education in reading, writing – both Latin and Cyrillic – literature, history, geography, mathematics and French. However, Jelavich (1990) notes that textbooks used in Bosnia-Herzegovina at this time were mostly Croatian and a few Serbian; Bosnia did not appear to have its own state-issued textbooks.
The state schools established by the Austro-Hungarians provided a similar curriculum to the faith schools and included Serbo-Croat\textsuperscript{10}, mathematics, art, music and physical education. In later grades this was expanded to include a foreign language, geography and chemistry (McCreight 2002). In addition, in an attempt to satisfy the religious communities, religious instruction was provided separately for each denomination throughout the four years of primary education by clergy from Catholic, Orthodox and Muslim churches. This policy decision was taken by the Austro-Hungarians in order to deflect accusations of imposing their own, Catholic, western, culture on the population – which would likely have met with hostility and resistance.

In the late nineteenth century, Benjamin Kallay – the Common Minister of Finance, the highest rank in the Austro-Hungarian administration of Bosnia – attempted to introduce ‘Bosnian’ as a national identity for all ethnic groups in Bosnia. In pursuit of this, he attempted to introduce a new series of school texts but the majority of the Bosnian population, including political elites and those commissioned to write the texts, were opposed to the idea of a Bosnian national identity and so the task was never completed (Lampe 2000). The population continued to identify itself as Muslim, Bosnian Croat and Bosnian Serb.

The Austro-Hungarian attempt to introduce western culture and unite the people under a Bosnian identity was not successful. Glenny (1999, p.275) believes that the failures of the Austro-Hungarian governors and the rise in political activity were a result of the ‘social upheaval for which the Austrian regime of occupation was almost wholly responsible’. This social upheaval led to the ‘children of poor peasants’, if they had access to education, being ‘affected by the ideologies of nationalism, Yugoslavism, socialism and anarchism’ which were perpetrated by the schools (op.cit). Glenny (ibid, p.294) goes on to say that the

\textsuperscript{10} The language of the region is known in western Europe as Serbo-Croat but in Croatia it is called Croatian-Serbian. There is little difference between the two forms.
‘gymnasium’ school in Mostar ‘produced more political activists of all denominations’ than any other school in Bosnia.

Teachers in Bosnia were drawn from the priests (Catholics and Orthodox) and hodjas (Muslim clergy). As the number of state schools increased so the demand for teachers grew and the Austro-Hungarian governors opened the first school for teachers in 1886 in Sarajevo, to teach pedagogical methods. Leon (1970) reports that teachers in the state schools were not as highly-qualified as those in the private, church, schools and were considered ‘second-rate’ in comparison. This may have contributed to the low attendance and completion rates for these schools, if what they provided was not valued by the communities.

Lampe (2000, p.67) reports that by 1892 schools were largely staffed by Croat immigrants and, further, that Bosnian Serbs required ‘certificates of political reliability’ in order to teach in state schools. This is supported by McCreight (2002, p.35), who states that the Austro-Hungarian authorities had difficulty in finding good teachers in Bosnia, not only able to teach the curriculum but also able to ‘conduct suitable political propagandizing’ to inculcate the desired values and subdue the rising nationalism. McCreight (ibid) describes how the Austro-Hungarians imposed many rules on teachers in order to enforce their strict control over them.

Teachers were taught to follow the set curriculum, to deliver the body of facts to be learnt, using a teacher-centred approach that stifled pupil participation (McCreight 2002). This opposed the Austro-Hungarian espoused view of education, as a discovery of learning for self-development, but was a pragmatic response to their perceived need to control and influence the young through their education. This model of teaching has persevered
through the communist and post-war years and had a deleterious effect on Bosnia’s ability to develop and modernise.

As educational opportunities increased and students attended universities in other European cities, new educational ideas were brought to Bosnia. The progressive teaching methods of Pestalozzi, Froebel and Herbart, based on child-centred learning, the development of the individual and the wider purposes of education, were growing across western Europe. Many texts were translated and these new ideas became known and practiced in some schools in Bosnia, but the practices never became firmly instituted and waned as their European popularity faded and as the directives of the Austro-Hungarians became established practice.

In keeping with the social and cultural traditions of the time, teachers were respected by parents and pupils and their role brought status and authority. Education was teacher-centred, traditional and authoritarian; the classroom culture was one of strict discipline and pupils were expected to behave well and work hard.

Despite the increase in educational provision many parents – from all the religious/ethnic groups – remained reluctant to send their children to school. Lampe (2000, p.76) reports that by 1900 less than one-sixth of primary age children attended school and Seton-Watson (1946) reported that parents often did not allow their children to attend school as they were needed for work at home and in the fields. Despite some shift in the population the majority of the country was still rural and agricultural and education was seen as having only limited value. As Malcolm (1994, p.143) commented, ‘[P]easants who refused to use iron ploughs were unlikely to rush to send their children to acquire an education which they themselves had never received’.
The authorities first tried persuasive argument to encourage school attendance then in 1909 made it compulsory. By 1913 there were 568 state schools in Bosnia providing free primary education but the aims of the government were still not entirely successful. In 1918, after forty years of Austro-Hungarian rule and attempts to improve education, illiteracy rates for the Bosnian population have been quoted as being over 80% (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998, p.431).

Following the First Balkan War, 1912-1913, relations between Austro-Hungary and Serbia became strained.Caught between the two countries and fearing that war was imminent, the governor of Bosnia increased security measures in the country. He declared a state of emergency, dissolved parliament, closed down many Serbian associations and took control of the administration of all schools in Bosnia (Malcolm 1994). This one measure, taking control of the administration of schools, indicates the importance placed on education by the ruling authorities. It is likely that they assumed control believing that the schools could undermine the influence of the authorities, incite pupils to resistance and threaten the social order. Lampe (2000, p.82) reports that between 1907 and 1914 the national populations were forming political organisations; the number of Serbian Orthodox schools doubled and the Croats and Muslims were calling for separate school networks. Jelavich (1990), in contrast, claims that during this period there was a greater interest in uniting the South Slav nations and that Serbian and Croatian textbooks began to include more references to the writings of each other’s nation, although this was not extended to Bosnia-Herzegovina, which was still regarded as belonging to one or other of these. Any moves towards unity were stalled by the outbreak of the First World War.

The educational provision of this period was that experienced by those who became political leaders in the years after the First World War. Their education had been
dominated by nationalist propaganda and the belief that all peoples and lands of the region were, depending on where they had been educated, Serbian or Croatian.

This chapter, drawing on historical reports of Bosnia during this period, shows how a change of leadership – from eastern, Islamic Turkey to western European Catholic Austro-Hungary – had an influence on primary schooling. Not only did the Austro-Hungarians institute the secular education system and establish teachers as civil servants they also attempted to unite the peoples under one identity of ‘Bosnian nationhood’. Whilst the distinctive characteristics of their education provision remained evident in later years they were less successful in suppressing the ethno-religious influences on education and in bringing unity. The ending of the First World War also brought political and social change, bringing with it a change in the prevailing ideology and leading to further changes in the education system.

NB - During this period Bosnia was administered as an entity, with no differences between its regions, so educational provision in Mostar would have been the same as that described above for the whole of Bosnia. No separate data is available on the educational provision within Mostar at this time.
Chapter 5 – The emergence of Yugoslavia

Bosnia and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes 1918-1945

The ending of the First World War brought Bosnia another change of governorship. As a state aligned with other regional states in the newly-created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes it was able to gain some political control over its own territory, although much of this was later ceded to the Yugoslav government. However, Bosnia remained dominated by external forces, this time the Serbian rulers of the Kingdom. The change in the ruling authority brought change to the educational system. Competing forces sought control of schools and teachers, and again nationalist tensions are evident. This period was an important one as it established Yugoslavia as an entity, which would influence later developments. The data are drawn from a range of historical texts.

Social and political context

During this period nationalism continued to increase, it contributed to social and political tensions in the region which remained unresolved and so influenced later events. The education system was an important focus for those tensions; it operated as an area in which, for some, the tensions could be displayed and heightened to a point short of physical conflict but for others it was an arena where compromise and reconciliation could be attempted.

During the First World War Bosnia continued to be ruled by Austro-Hungary. Several historical accounts (Malcolm 1996, Bideleux and Jeffries 1998, Glenny 1999) describe how the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes saw the war as an opportunity to call for an independent and autonomous Yugoslavia, removed from the influence and control of outside powers. This call for independence notably omitted any reference to Bosnians, who found themselves marginalized by the states surrounding them who, it is possible to
conclude, each hoped that one day they would be able to annex Bosnia for themselves.
The Bosnian Muslims, fearing that an independent Yugoslavia would lead to them being ‘swallowed up’ by either Serbia or Croatia, were prepared to accept continuing Austro-Hungarian rule but also presented a request to the Austrian Emperor for Bosnian autonomy within Austro-Hungary.

By 1918 Austro-Hungary was facing defeat in the war, its authority in the Balkans was becoming weak and there were repeated calls for an independent Yugoslavian state. In October 1918 Croatia set up a ‘National Council’; its parliament (granted by the Austro-Hungarian authorities years earlier) declared that it was separating itself from Austro-Hungary and was now part of a new sovereign state, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Following Croatia’s example, the Bosnian leaders set up a National Council for Bosnia. The Austro-Hungarian authorities finally accepted defeat and on 1st November their governor in Bosnia stepped down. On 3rd November the First National Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina was formed.

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was formally declared on 1st December 1918 and included Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Slovenia, Vojvodina, Serbia and Montenegro (see p.256); the latter two countries both having previously been sovereign kingdoms in their own right. The Kingdom of Serbia saw its inclusion as a victory, anticipating that it would play a large part in ruling the new kingdom. This proved true as the Kingdom was, in effect, ruled by the Serbian bourgeoisie, who it is claimed served only the interests of the Serbs (Jambrek 1975, p.34). Belgrade, in Serbian territory, was declared the capital city of the new Kingdom and Brown (2001, p.20) reports that ‘The Serbs unquestionably had superior status, which was loudly proclaimed by themselves and recognized by the rest of the world – by everyone, in fact, except the Croats’.
Although the new Kingdom included Bosnian territory Bosnian Muslims were omitted from the title, indicating that they were still not perceived as being a national group within the region. (Dalmatia was populated by Croats, Vojvodina by Croats, Serbia by Serbs and Montenegro by Montenegrins.)

The strong position of the Serbs in the new Kingdom was not welcomed by Bosnian Muslims. During the First World War the Bosnian Muslims had supported the Austro-Hungarian government, the enemy of Serbia, and had persecuted many Bosnian Serbs who were considered enemies of the state. Serbs living in Serbia regarded Bosnian Muslims as their enemy, although in Bosnia relations between Bosnian Serbs and Muslims, who had lived closely together for many years, were less hostile. The Bosnian Muslims, as were the Croats, were wary of Serbia’s intentions.

The political groups governing the Kingdom debated for some time on whether the newly-created state should consist of autonomous regions, as favoured by Croatia, or central control, as favoured by Serbia. The people of Croatia and Bosnia were both still fearful that Serbia’s long-term plans included annexation of their lands. The pre-war socialist groups that had begun to develop in each region now united to form the United Socialist Workers’ Party of Yugoslavia (Communists) and at their first meeting, in 1919, decided in favour of the centralist movement. A unified Yugoslavia was considered more favourable to the development of modern industry, which would in turn create a larger working class and the necessary conditions for the revolutionary movement that they foresaw.

Malcolm (1996) reports that, in Bosnia, the initial response to the declaration of the new Kingdom was anarchy; peasants (mostly Christian) ransacked the big estates to demonstrate their antipathy to the Muslim landowners. In response, the government of the new state of Bosnia abolished serfdom and gave serfs legal title to the land they worked.
The landowners, who were mostly Bosnian Muslims, were compensated but the financial compensation was well below the value of the land they had lost, reducing some to poverty and fostering feelings of dissatisfaction with the new order.

The creation of the Kingdom, and the political and social changes that followed, had an impact on many aspects of life in Bosnia, including education. Unification brought with it the need to harmonise the organisation and practice of many institutions, including the education systems of the different states. This led to changes to the curriculum as education was seen as an important contributor to engendering support for a unified Yugoslavia.

In 1920, following elections across the Kingdom, a constituent assembly was formed to agree the form of constitution and governance to be instituted. After much debate a central constitution was accepted with the Kingdom divided into 33 administrative provinces, many of which cut across old borders and created a new ‘map’ of the region. Bosnian representatives, however, had negotiated carefully and the six Bosnian provinces retained the borders agreed by the Austro-Hungarians at the Congress of Berlin (Malcolm, 1994).

Historical accounts report that the Kingdom did not fare well, economically or socially (Lovrenovic 2001). However, there were great differences between the regions as Croatia and Slovenia, the most westerly states of the country, were more developed than others, including Bosnia. Over 80% of the Kingdom’s population lived in villages and only 9% worked in industry (Leon, 1970). As industries closed, and the building of roads and railways begun by the Austro-Hungarians was discontinued, rural communities returned to their traditional ways and the majority of the population became increasingly poorer. This spiral of decline had its effect on social relations, Lovrenovic (2001, p.160) describes it as ‘an antagonism that was basically social, but with a complicating ethno-religious
component’. The failing economy had a negative effect on social relations, a theme that was to re-occur.

During the 1920s political arguments continued among the different national groups within the Kingdom, with Croats and Serbs becoming more and more opposed. This led some Bosnian Muslims to identify themselves as Muslim Croats or Muslim Serbs, mainly for political reasons as this ‘label’ also identified them as supporters of Croatia or Serbia. In 1920 a journal produced by the Yugoslav Muslim Organisation recommended that ‘Muslims should identify with whichever nation offered them the fairest chance of ‘economic development’’ (Banac, quoted in Malcolm 1994, p.166). This indicates the complex relationship that existed in Bosnia between political power, social order and economic performance. It would also appear that the term ‘Muslim’ was becoming more a label of national identity than of religious affiliation particularly, as Malcom (1994) notes, since the fall of the Ottomans in 1878 the Muslims had gradually become more secular. This indicates the precarious nature of the Bosnian Muslim identity; the Bosnian Muslims had been converts to Islam from Catholicism or Orthodoxy when the Ottomans ruled Bosnia, they now appeared to be willing to change their identity again in order to identify with the group which they felt would be more powerful. This equivocation would add strength to the argument of the Croats and Serbs that the Bosnian Muslims, and their lands, essentially belonged to the Croats or the Serbs.

The 1921 constitution of the Kingdom introduced the first changes to the Austro-Hungarian system of government. It introduced new regional and district administrations and the *obcina*, the self-governing local commune. The newly-formed regions and districts created new internal borders that were constituted along ethnic lines and so allowed for the continuing development of nationalist/ethnic identities. It also affected its population; under the constitution the Croats and Serbs were referred to as two different tribes
belonging to the same nation, but Muslims were not accorded this status, adding a further layer to the unresolved national problems.

The ever-increasing hostilities between Serbs and Croats in the unified Yugoslav parliament grew to crisis point and led, in 1929, to King Alexander (then Prince Regent of Serbia) announcing that he was taking power, suspending the constitution and imposing reform. His intention was to try and overcome the nationalist hostilities and create more unity amongst the states. King Alexander renamed the country the ‘Kingdom of Yugoslavia’, meaning the kingdom of South Slavs. This in itself could be considered contentious as South Slavs describes the Serbs and Croats, whilst Muslims were associated with the Ottomans, again reinforcing the idea that the Muslims were essentially of Serbian or Croatian origin.

Alongside the political and social disruption the general economic slump of 1929 had an effect in Yugoslavia. During the early 1930s there was severe economic decline in the country, which further fuelled dissatisfaction and unrest in the population. In the second half of the decade, trade agreements with Germany, Italy and Bulgaria led to some improvement in the country’s economy but social and economic conditions remained poor.

In 1931 King Alexander drew up a new constitution declaring monarchy rule, under which he took control of the government, appointing ministers and making them responsible only to him. He persecuted opponents and suppressed the press. Whilst this was accepted by some as a necessary move, for others it served only to strengthen their support for nationalist autonomy.

Under the new constitution, King Alexander reorganised the internal borders of the Kingdom. The newly-defined regions, banovines, cut across the borders of each of the
previous states and were named, where possible, after rivers. Each *banovine* was governed by a *ban*, an official appointed by the King, and each *ban* appointed local commissioners to replace the previously-elected local government officials. Under this re-organisation Bosnia was not able to retain its old borders and was divided into four areas, each one crossing boundaries into Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro and the Dalmatian coast. This realigning of borders was done in an attempt to erase the old regional ethnic identities and nationalist alliances and create in all citizens identity with, and alliance to, the state of Yugoslavia.

The border changes satisfied no-one and had the opposite effect to that intended. Serbia felt that it had lost some control, whilst the Croatians felt that Serbia had gained. In Bosnia the effects were deeply felt, the new administrative arrangements meant that it lost the autonomy that it had negotiated under the previous arrangement and the Bosnian Muslims were in a minority in each of the Bosnian *banovines*, so were appointed to fewer government places and where they were appointed, given the lowest government positions. Croatians began organizing for independence, mainly through the Ustasa, the Croatian Revolutionary Organisation, an action followed by the Slovenians and the Bosnians.

In 1934 King Alexander was assassinated by political opponents. His son was only eleven years old so the throne was taken by his regent, Prince Paul. Elections in 1935 led to the formation of a new government which, whilst retaining the monarchical powers given by the constitution, was less rigid in its centralist control. Political parties again began to emerge, still demonstrating the nationalist tendencies that King Alexander had tried to quash. The Communist Party also re-emerged, and in 1937 Josip Broz Tito was appointed as general secretary of the Party in Yugoslavia. The Communist Party continued to promote the idea of a unified Yugoslavia and on this basis was able to gain support from those who favoured this approach as a way of alleviating nationalist tensions. The
Communist Party eventually began to call for a united Yugoslavia with autonomous regions (Djilas 1991).

The government headed by Prince Paul, whilst not fully supported by all parties, was able to introduce some measures of reform including reorganizing Yugoslavia into a federal system. This system had been argued for by Croatian politicians for years as it gave some autonomy to the regions. The Croatians, however, were still fearful of the intentions of the Serbs and were demanding their own political control over Croatia.

Following discussions between the government and opposition parties, in 1939 an agreement was made, despite strong opposition from Bosnian politicians, in which areas from the Bosnian banovines were put under Croatian control. Croatia was recognised as a ‘special banovina’ and allowed its own parliament. Serbs controlled most of the rest of Yugoslavia as Bosnia was reduced to just two banovines, in which the majority populations were Serbian. The redrawing of borders and reassignment of power was again a factor in Bosnia’s history.

Elsewhere, the Second World War had begun across Europe. Germany had annexed Austria, and in March 1941 Prince Paul and the Yugoslav leaders signed a pact with Germany. This was unpopular in Yugoslavia and on their return to the country Prince Paul and the government were overthrown by an alliance of the army and Serbian political parties. King Petar II, King Alexander’s son, was declared king though he was still only seventeen. The alliance formed a new government of national unity and attempted to maintain a peaceful, but non-involved, relationship with Germany. However, in April 1941 Germany began attacking Belgrade and invaded Yugoslavia; within days Yugoslavia had been defeated.
As with many other aspects of life in Bosnia, the war was a complex issue. Whilst Yugoslavians were fighting against Germany and Italy, within Yugoslavia Croats were fighting the Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia and Serbian resisters, *Cetniks*, were fighting Yugoslav Communist Partisans. Drawing on contemporary historical accounts, Malcolm (1994, p.174) claims that during the Second World War in Yugoslavia, ‘it is clear that at least one million people died, and it is probable that the majority of them were Yugoslavs killed by Yugoslavs’.

In April 1941 Germany bid for Croatian support by declaring Croatia an independent state, although with German and Italian military occupation. Included in the boundaries of this new Croatian state were territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a Commissioner for Bosnia appointed to oversee these territories. Yet again the boundaries of Bosnia were central to the political wrangling of the time, and these changing boundaries had their influence on the social and cultural context, of which education was a part.

The Croats saw the creation of their independent state as a victory over Serbia, reducing their threat of dominance and leading the Croats to adopt a more conciliatory approach towards the Bosnians. The leader of the newly-formed Croatian state guaranteed the Muslims in Bosnia freedom to continue to practice Islam and even invited politicians from the Yugoslav Muslim Organisation to join the Croatian parliament. However, these guarantees were not honoured and Bosnian Muslims began to complain about their treatment from the Croatians, further fuelling hostilities between the two groups.

The existence of the Croatian state allowed the *Ustasa*, Croat fascists, to continue their war against the Serbs living in Croatia and Bosnia; Serb villages were destroyed and thousands of Serbs were killed. The Serbs retaliated and two resistance movements were formed. *Cetniks*, who wanted violent retaliation against the Germans and their collaborators, and
Partisans, communist party members who saw the war as an opportunity to bring about social revolution within Yugoslavia.

The Communist Party had been in existence for some years in Yugoslavia but with very small membership. Tito, its leader, was a Croatian who had been a corporal in the Austro-Hungarian army. Whilst resisting German occupation the Partisans were also fighting to introduce social revolution and communism into Yugoslavia. In areas that they liberated from Germany they introduced socialist policies and killed many perceived as the ‘bourgeois’. As the war progressed, the divisions between the two Yugoslav resistance movements – the Cetniks and the Partisans – grew, and led to fighting between the two groups. Bosnian Muslims felt caught in the middle of all this and saw autonomy for Bosnia as the best solution.

During 1943-44 the Allied powers gave support to the Partisans, which strengthened their position. In addition, disillusioned Croats and Muslims from other political parties and resistance movements joined the Partisans. Bosnian Muslims were cautious about joining the communist party, aware of its belief in atheism and the suppression of religion, but may have been won over by pamphlets issued by the Partisans claiming that Russians now enjoyed religious freedom and tolerance. The Muslims were also suspicious of improved German-Cetnik (Serb) relations and the breaking of relations between Germany and Turkey. The move by Bosnian Muslims to join the Partisans deepened the feeling among Serbs that Muslims were as much their enemy as the Croats.

In September 1944 the Germans were withdrawing from Yugoslavia, the Soviet army was moving into the country and King Petar II asked Yugoslavians to support Tito. Then, in April 1945, Sarajevo was liberated from German occupation by the Partisans, who went on to take control of all Bosnian territory and to form a People’s Government for Bosnia. The
Partisans, representing the Communist Party, gained support across Yugoslavia and found it easy to establish the Communists as the ruling party. Malcolm (1994, p.191) describes how Bosnians Muslims ‘reconciled’ themselves to communist rule, seeing it as preferable to being taken over by either Croatia or Serbia.

During this volatile period, with many political changes taking place, education in Bosnia continued to be influenced by the political and social context. The unification of the region led to consideration of ways in which to harmonise the education systems; the creation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia led to educational changes to help provide support for the new Kingdom and the desire for its citizens to be Yugoslavs. The political in-fighting for power and control, however, served only to strengthen the cause of the nationalists. The war reasserted their strength and was influential in determining future educational problems.

**Primary education in Bosnia - 1918-1945**

The violent and unstable political backdrop of political events within Bosnia during this period had its impact on education. The changes of government – from Austro-Hungarian sovereignty to federal government then to monarchy and finally to emerging communist rule – meant that the dominant ideology also went through change. The Austro-Hungarians had attempted to create a more ‘westernised’ country and, through the provision of educational programmes and materials, had begun to introduce Bosnia’s young people to the culture, traditions and values of western Europe. The federal government, in contrast, wanted a more autonomous Bosnia and King Alexander introduced educational changes to try and develop a more unified Yugoslav state. At the end of the Second World War, the emerging communist government used education in its goal to develop a communist, socialist and unified state.
Malcolm (1996) reports that one effect of the resignation of the Austro-Hungarian governors in 1918 and the institution of the Bosnian federal government was that ‘the old advantages of economic power from land-owning declined, the upper stratum of Muslim society naturally began to move into the professions, for which a western education was required’ (ibid, p.166). The ‘western education’ referred to was that provided in the state schools established by the Austro-Hungarians as opposed to that provided by the mektebs and madrasahs (mosque schools). This was in accord with the secularisation of Bosnian Muslim society taking place during this period as the Ottoman influence withered away (Malcolm, p.166) and with the modernisation and urbanisation of Bosnian society. So, whilst the church and state schools continued to exist in the main towns there was no further growth in provision, and in rural communities education was still not considered a necessity. Lack of education led to high illiteracy rates of 70%, with even higher numbers of women being illiterate, 84% (Shimoniak 1970).

Whilst formal education provision did not increase during the early years of this period, informal societies that had begun under Austro-Hungarian rule continued to flourish in the towns. There were societies that provided reading rooms and classes in literacy and general education, some also published books. These societies were nationalist; separate societies existed for Croats, Serbs and Bosnian Muslims, but they were open to all; they were not ‘walled round with rigid ethnic or religious barriers’ (Lovrenovic 2001, p.14).

In 1918, Bosnia was still largely rural with three-quarters of its population farmers and peasants. The Austro-Hungarians had increased primary educational provision to some extent but the majority of the rural population still did not consider education to be important. As the period progressed, however, there was increasing modernisation and urbanisation as industries were developed and rural communities began to move into the
towns for work. In these circumstances, education became more important and Jambrek (1975, p.36) describes how education contributed towards the country’s modernisation:

Schools especially were modernising factors par excellence. Education was also a prime condition for mobility out of the village community and thereby provided a realistic alternative to the rural way of life.

Initially, however, the Kingdom was under-developed socially and economically and Leon (1970) claims that this was reflected in educational provision, which was also under-developed compared to Europe. Educational content remained basic and teaching was highly teacher-centred; despite knowledge of Herbart’s child-centred theories these were not much practiced. Even if the town schools had developed their practice the geography of Bosnia, with isolated rural and mountainous villages, meant that there was little communication between the villages and ideas known about in towns did not spread to the village schools. Pedagogical associations began to form between 1924-1936 and these were able to disseminate some of the new theoretical ideas and had some influence on pedagogical development, but knowing about the theoretical ideas did not necessarily lead to them being used in the schools. Leon (ibid, p.85) describes classroom practice of the time as ‘still old-fashioned, traditional and with attributes of the old schools’.

Although harmonisation of institutions had been a policy of the new Kingdom, it was not until 1924-25 that the government in Belgrade really began its policy of unification of schools, causing the provincial government of Bosnia to concede many of its powers to the central government, including its educational department. The education department of the Bosnian provincial government had produced a magazine ‘School Courier’ in which it published the rules and regulations for the organisation of schools. In 1924 this was taken over by the education department in Belgrade and issued from there each month as the official organ of the government. This magazine continued to be published until 1941 (Leon, 1970). In addition to the regulations, in line with its centralisation and unification
policy, the government in Belgrade also published the plans and programmes to be followed by all schools in Yugoslavia.

In 1929, when King Alexander took control of the country, his government attempted to develop and improve education and opened new schools in order to raise educational standards in the belief that this would improve the country’s economic performance. The education system inherited from the Austro-Hungarians was developed during this period. The King introduced a law making primary education compulsory, although this was only partially successful with many children attending school for only four years and acquiring only the most basic education (Shimoniak 1970, p.333). Primary education was also extended in some areas of the country, pupils were able to attend for six or eight years, and post-primary education provision was also extended with a range of academic, vocational and trade schools opened (McCreight 2002).

Just two years later, when the King imposed monarchical rule, he introduced further change into education. Through the constitution he amended the school curricula throughout the Kingdom in order to standardise it. A new regulation was issued stating the need for the schools to provide a better basic education and to prepare pupils for work in trade, industry and agriculture as well as preparing them for secondary education. The new curriculum introduced changes in the programmes for the teaching of history, geography, language and literature; these amended everything that had been taught that was associated with the Austro-Hungarian empire and replaced it with texts, stories and folklore that favoured the Serbian monarchy. The changes included the introduction of new textbooks, ‘glorifying the monarchy and the idea of a single nationality’ (Lampe 2000, p.37). Just as earlier curricula had been used to instil nationalist loyalty and pride so they were now used to instil loyalty and pride in the Kingdom’s (Serbian) monarchy.
The religious schools continued to operate throughout this period of Yugoslavia’s independence, although King Alexander attempted to introduce a more western-style of education into the mektebs and madrasahs (Djordjevic 1992). The changes proposed included less emphasis on religion and a broader range of subjects in the curriculum, but these were only partially implemented.

All the educational changes introduced were part of King Alexander’s attempt to unify the various states that constituted the Kingdom and create a Yugoslavian identity among its citizens, indicating the importance placed on the role of education in developing future citizens. However, many of the changes were unsuccessful, mainly because many schools did not implement them. Teachers continued to teach as they always had, they continued to use pre-First World War textbooks which were developed independently within each nation state and reflected the social and cultural history of each state, rather than that of Yugoslavia (Djordjevic 1992, p.149). It has been claimed that the quality and content of education during this period was ‘deficient’ due to a shortage of qualified teaching staff and to the ‘xenophobic nationalism’ that continued to be promulgated through education (Bideleux and Jeffries 1998, p.432).

The historical texts indicate that throughout this period education suffered from a lack of resources and authority, a situation in which teachers continued with their time-hallowed traditions and routines. Against the backdrop of much social and political change the effect on the everyday lives of teachers and pupils is likely to have been minimal, particularly those in the rural areas.

This chapter has suggested that the new ruling authorities introduced changes to the school curriculum in order to imbue it with their own ideological beliefs. In theory, they furthered the central control of education and retained control of teachers’ training and classroom
practice. In practice, however, their efforts appeared to make little difference to what actually happened in Bosnia’s schools. The religious community maintained their influence, as did the nationalists, and attempts to unite the Bosnian people with a shared national identity again failed. The picture that is unfolding is that of a gradual development in the social and cultural context of education, with the increasing modernisation and urbanisation of Yugoslavia, as in other countries across Europe. Alongside this was the disruptive political context which was using education to preserve and promote the identification of national identities and nationalist political, social and cultural affiliations despite the attempts at unification. The post-Second World War period was to bring a major ideological shift and concomitant educational changes to education and teachers’ practice.
Chapter 6 – The dominance of communism

Bosnia as a federal state of communist Yugoslavia 1945-1992

After the Second World War the Kingdom of Yugoslavia became a federal state governed by the Communist Party. Bosnia, along with all the other regions (banovines) established by King Alexander, became a state republic within the federation of Yugoslavia (see p.257). The communists\textsuperscript{11} ruled the region for longer than any other government since the Ottomans. As education is a central plank of communist government the political changes instituted by them had a major impact on education. The key issues during this period were:

- the establishment of communist hegemony and its impact on education;
- the influences of the centralist versus autonomy debate;
- the continued existence of pre-communist influences in the country;
- the growth of nationalist politics and their impact on education.

Social and political context

At the end of the Second World War Bosnia’s future was again decided by external agencies, without any representation from Bosnia or Yugoslavia. The Yalta Agreement, in 1945, determined that Britain/America and the USSR would have equal political influence over Yugoslavia. In reality, the proximity of the USSR and its predominance in the region as a whole meant that it had greater domination of Yugoslavia than did Britain/America. The fact that the communist Partisan party won the post-war elections in Yugoslavia also meant that its government was more closely aligned to the USSR than to the west.

\textsuperscript{11} This chapter uses the term ‘communist’ to describe the government of the USSR and Yugoslavia during this period because those involved in government at the time described themselves as communists and belonged to the Communist Party.
The influence that the USSR had over several eastern Europe countries provided an
opportunity to extend the Soviet model of government, which they did either through
annexing the country or by establishing a communist government within it. Whichever
approach was used, there was an impact on the organisation and content of education
systems in these countries. This stemmed from the government’s desire to control
education because of the crucial role that they considered it to play in informing and
shaping people to conform to the values and beliefs of communism.

The formation of a communist government in Yugoslavia, therefore, meant more than just
political change. Communism is a political and social system with founding principles
based on class membership, state control and a planned economy. It requires people to
adopt the values and beliefs of communism and demonstrate them in the way that they live
and work. Under Soviet communism, the model first adopted by Yugoslavia, major social
systems such as education, employment and housing were provided and controlled by
central government.

The newly-elected communist government immediately ‘abolished the monarchy and
proclaimed Yugoslavia a republic based on the federal principle’ (Djilas 1991, p.159).
This consisted of a central government with six socialist republics – Bosnia, Croatia,
Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia – each with autonomy and part of federal
Yugoslavia. The republics were defined partly through their historical borders and partly
through nationalist principles, each republic contained mainly its own national group,
described by Djilas (ibid, p.161) as ‘sovereign homelands of sovereign nations’. The
exception to this was Bosnia, which was ethnically mixed.

The borders of each republic were broadly similar to those established by King Alexander,
although Bosnia came close to disappearing. Lovrenovic (2001, p.179) describes the
‘considerable disagreement about the political and territorial status of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the new federal Yugoslavia’. There was still some feeling that it should be divided between Serbia and Croatia and it was saved only by the fact that, during the war, the Partisans had supported the confirmation of Bosnia’s borders and its continued existence as a separate state. This support was affirmed by the post-war communists and gave Bosnia recognition as an equal republic.

The post-war political, social and economic circumstances of Yugoslavia were challenging for the government; as Lilly (2001, p.5) states, the communist party’s ‘policies and rhetoric were necessarily limited by existing conditions, institutions, and social relations in postwar Yugoslavia’. Each republic still harboured the desire for independence or autonomy and the tensions that had surfaced during the Second World War between the different ethnic groups had still to be reconciled. The slogan used by the Partisans during the war, ‘brotherhood and unity’, was adopted by the communist government as their main aims were to unite all Yugoslavians with one identity and to create a Yugoslav nation built on the social and economic principles of communism. Education was to play a major part in helping the government achieve these aims, despite the tensions between ‘policy and rhetoric’ identified by Lilly (op.cit).

The communist government, for pragmatic and ideological reasons, attempted to assert its authority from the start. Pragmatically it needed to take control in order to begin the process of reuniting the country after the nationalist divisions deepened by warfare; ideologically it held the belief that socialism would unite the citizens and lead to economic prosperity, ensuring continued political support for the Party. Its authority was asserted through the way in which it directed the policy of the republics. Whilst in theory each republic had autonomy within federal Yugoslavia the extent to which this was allowed has been questioned. Lovrenovic (2001, p.180) describes the style of the federal government
as ‘centralist and unitarist’, illustrated by the fact that the 1946 constitution clearly stated in Article 11 that the constitution of each republic was required to conform to that of the federal government (Djilas 1991). Jambrek (1975, p.79) writes that ‘[A]ll institutions [this included schools] … were administrative units of the all-encompassing central government …’ and government ministries within each republic, including those for education, were overseen by federal ministries and were required to comply with federal directives.

In pursuance of its ‘unitarist’ policy the government banned all national, cultural and educational organisations that had been established prior to the Second World War (Lovrenovic 2001, p.180). Whilst this was done to assert the communist idea of a united Yugoslavia it served to further deepen nationalist tendencies and created the climate in which those tendencies had to be kept hidden, only to resurface years later. Brown (2001, p.146) asserts that, despite the apparent unity of Yugoslavia, nationalism was always stronger than communism and ‘[U]nofficially, it became the principal ideology, one driven by mutual antipathy or disdain’.

Education was an important aspect of the communist government’s strategy to bring about the desired social and economic change. Shimonjak (1970, p.51) describes communism as ‘using education only as a means of bringing up the so-called New Soviet Man’ and that ‘the most important duty of the new communist education was the indoctrination of children in communist ethics …’. It was thought that through education children and young people would be informed of the benefits of the communist system, embrace these and develop the required values and characteristics to become good communist citizens. To help advance this strategy, Party members were appointed to influential positions, including within the Ministry of Education (Lilly 2001).
In addition to schools, the communist government also established the ‘Pioneer’ organisation for all children aged 7-15. The organisation, run by local Party members, was a further method by which the communist party could educate children to the attitudes and values espoused by them. A Pioneer member, Ahmed (a parent), reported that Pioneer members were required to swear an allegiance to Tito, to Yugoslavia and to fellow comrades.

In 1948 Yugoslavia was expelled from Cominform (the Communist Information Bureau). The reasons for the expulsion have been debated over, but the move allowed Yugoslavia to break away from Soviet hegemony. It also caused the Soviet bloc countries to impose economic embargoes against Yugoslavia, creating economic hardship in the country. The resulting decline in economic conditions led to the development of policies and strategies intended both to maintain social and economic living standards at an acceptable level and, by so doing, keep the communist government in power.

Once independent of the Soviet Union the Yugoslav government developed a version of communist socialism they named ‘market socialism’ which was based on the principles of decentralisation of government and workers’ control of industry. These principles of market socialism and self-management were later applied to the education system. The principles were considered liberal and innovative, and were in conflict with the traditional (Stalinist) communist policy of centralisation.

The government continued to delegate political and economic powers beyond the level of the republic to committees and workers’ councils at district level, reducing the influence of the republican governments. These moves to decentralisation of government gave more autonomy to local communes, allowing them to participate in the planning and managing of local schools. Bideleux and Jeffries (1998, p.556) claim that part of the reason for the
introduction of these measures was the need to ‘transcend Yugoslavia’s religious and
ethnic divisions’; local decision-making was seen as a way to ‘assist and encourage the
diverse nations within the Yugoslav Federation to live and work together peacefully and
constructively’ (ibid). In order to be successful the decision-making had to be at the most
local level, small communities making decisions rather than regional constituencies.
However the rhetoric of this has to be weighed against the reality; Wilson claims that
‘behind the façade of self-management, the Communist Party exercised a control firm
enough for all the practical purposes of a dictatorship’ (1979, p.78). This claim is based on
the fact that all those participating in the self-management committees at district level were
faithful Party members who would take their directive from the Party, ensuring that
government policy was followed.

In 1963 Tito changed the name of the country from the Federal People’s Republic of
Yugoslavia to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. He instituted a new
constitution which extended the principle of ‘self-management’ to education, health and
social administration, introducing local decision-making into these areas. Bideleux and
Jeffries (1998) claim, however, that management continued to be from the centre and
political appointments to the local councils were made to ensure that the government’s
desired policies were implemented.

Unlike Russian communism, Yugoslav socialism allowed its citizens to own property, earn
their own money and work and travel abroad. These positive political and economic
conditions created a social climate described by Glenny (1999, p.574) as ‘a kind of
harmony among communities emerging from the bloodiest imaginable civil conflict’.
Respondents in this study reported that life had been good under Tito; several had owned
two houses, all had good jobs and, although these memories were coloured by subsequent
events, several expressed the view that Bosnia was ‘better’ when the communists had been in power.

Although the economic prosperity of Yugoslavia in the mid-twentieth century was shared by all its citizens it was not earned in equal measures; Croatia and Slovenia were wealthy republics whilst Bosnia was poor. In 1961 Bosnia was officially declared ‘under-developed’, this was mainly due to its geography and agricultural economy, and steps were taken to modernise and improve it. A major road-building scheme was launched; many towns were provided with electricity, water and telephone connections; new factories were built to generate work and there was a programme for the building of schools and public libraries. Whilst these provided some benefit to the republic it remained poor in comparison with others (Lovrenovic 2001).

This imbalance in economic ‘earning power’ contributed to nationalist tensions as the richer republics began to resent subsidising the poorer ones; Glenny (1998) reports that the wealthier republics began to demand greater control and autonomy for themselves. According to Glenny, this political wrangling created ‘sheer chaos – nobody knew who was responsible for decision-making’ (ibid, p.584). The chaos, however, created opportunities for local, nationalist, politicians to increase their own popularity by defending national interests. The nationalist politicians had never really gone away, throughout the 1950s and 1960s Croats and Serbs had continued to argue in government about the use of language, Bosnia’s borders and the economy. Tito managed, through his strong control and charismatic leadership, to keep these opposing factions under control and maintain the semblance of unity.

The calls by the republics for more autonomy did eventually lead to further decentralisation of government and greater powers for the republics. In 1971 the central
government decision-making bodies were restructured to give more representation to the republics, further strengthening their influence. This gave considerable power to their voice in government and Ross Johnson claims that this ‘[D]evolution of political power … was the major factor responsible for the reactivization of the national question …’ (1974, p.15).

The nationalist issue became a dominant feature of political discussion and debate. Those involved had mostly been educated in the inter-war period when claims to nationalist identity, particularly Serbian and Croatian, had been strong and this was now resurfacing. The contemporary education programme was based on the communist principle of ‘brotherhood and unity’ but this was increasingly being challenged.

The continuing decentralisation of decision-making further allowed for the growth of nationalism, which was publicly exhibited. It was particularly strong in Croatia, where Yugoslavism was perceived as Serbianism. The radical nationalist movement in Croatia attempted to ‘cleanse’ the Croatian language of Serbian influences and to introduce a handbook on Croatian grammar into schools. Tito denounced the movement, seeing it as a threat to the communist ideal of unity. He sent the police and army into Zagreb, Croatia’s capital, to arrest the nationalist ringleaders, replaced leaders in the Croat Party and launched an ‘antinationalist campaign’ (Ross Johnson 1974, p.19). Djilas (1991, p.179) reports that any opposition to the unitarist policy was ‘punished by imprisonment’; causing Glenny (1998, p.593) to comment that ‘Tito had reverted to standard techniques of communist repression.’ Tito’s tactics may have suppressed national feelings but they did not eradicate them, they would re-surface later with grave consequences. Izetbegovic, the first post-communist leader of the Bosnian government, is quoted as saying ‘[B]y their oppression the Communists created this longing among people to express their religious or national identity’ (in Thompson 1992, p.99).
Following Tito’s death, in 1980, the republics fiercely pursued their nationalist agenda and began their battle for political power. By the mid-1980s, serious economic decline led the federal government to introduce austerity measures, which contributed to the discontent felt towards the central government and a consequent growth of nationalist political parties. This growing nationalism led Slovenia, in 1989, to declare its independence from the Yugoslav federation, a secession that occurred reasonably peacefully.

In the reduced federal government Serbs and Croats openly resumed their pre-war antagonism, described by Brown (2001, p.145) thus: ‘conflicts were largely frozen in an age of communist dominion. When the ice melted, they simply thawed out, ready not to be settled but to be resumed.’ Malcolm (1994) argues that the autocratic and oppressive nature of the communist federal government had contributed to the rise in nationalism by providing each republic with the vision of ‘other’ republics as a focus for their dissatisfaction with the entire political system.

Whilst the nationalist politicians were arguing in Yugoslavia, across the rest of eastern Europe communism was in decline; the Berlin Wall, which had embodied the political distance between east and west, was dismantled in 1989. Eastern European countries were asserting their national rights and breaking away from Soviet hegemony. These events impacted on Yugoslavia. By 1990 the Communist Party had all but disappeared and the federal communist government was replaced in the republics by nationalist governments.

The respondents in this study reported different experiences of this turbulent and uncertain period; two said that there was little anticipation of change, that they had lived with socialism for so long that they could not envisage any other way. In contrast, another couple reported that the poor economy and growing nationalism caused them to fear that
the country would ‘fall apart’. In Bosnia they could already see the effects of the nationalist politics, with schools introducing nationalist teaching programmes and jobs being allocated according to nationality, one person recounted that ‘the aluminium factory in Mostar was owned by Croatsians and the Director of the factory had to be Croatian’.

Whether this was true or not, it indicates the perceived level of influence of nationalist politics in some parts of the country.

In 1992, following declarations of independence from Slovenia and Croatia, Bosnia held a referendum on its move to independence; this was supported by 63% of the population (Atlapedia 2002). In response, Serbian leaders declared the north-eastern area of Bosnia, which was dominated by Bosnian Serbs, as the ‘Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina’. It is unlikely that this response came from the Serbs’ fear of domination by Bosnia as this was an idea that had never been voiced and Serbia had long been geographically and politically stronger than Bosnia. It is more likely that the declaration was perceived as a move towards integration with Europe; a move repudiated by the Serbs because of their belief that all Slavs were Serbs and that these lands were all Serbian. This ideological viewpoint had been propagated for years through the Serbian education system in order to emphasise the distinction between Serbs and Croats and the Serbian leaders would have received this nationalist message strongly through their own education in the inter-war years. The move by the Serbs also made real the threat that had long been feared by Bosnians and Croats, that the Serbs intended to extend their own borders. It also demonstrated that the nationalist loyalties engendered in pre-communist education had not disappeared but, having been repressed for so long, became vociferous when released.

The European community acknowledged Bosnia’s independence on 6th April 1992. This led the Serbs to declare the establishment of the ‘Serbian Assembly of Bosnia’ and to begin fighting for control of Serb-dominated areas in Bosnia, causing the Bosnian Muslims
and Bosnian Croats living in those areas to flee or be killed. The civil war in Bosnia began on 8th April 1992.

**Primary education in Bosnia - 1945 -1992**

There were many changes to education during this period stemming from the communist ideological belief in the importance of education, which they regarded as developing in young people the ‘right’ attitudes and values so helping to bring about a communist society. This led to education reform being a priority activity during the post-Second World War reconstruction and development of Yugoslavia (Dizdar and Kemal 1996).

Lilly (2001, p.38) claims that education came under the remit of the government departments of agitation and propaganda, both of which were required to ensure the ‘correct Marxist-Leninist education of the masses’.

Primary education was regarded as being of special public interest and, as such, was centrally planned, financed and managed. In developing the education system the Yugoslav communist government was able to build on existing Russian influences; McCreight (2002, p.41) claims that ‘[T]he Russians had had a presence, to one degree or another, in Balkan education systems for most of the previous two centuries’.

One of the first changes introduced was to the structure of the education system. The structure inherited by the communist government varied across the country, with primary education lasting between four to eight years. Following the Soviet model, the government made primary education compulsory for eight years, from seven to fifteen years of age.

There were also changes to the post-primary system, with the introduction of an eight-year academic high school, the gymnasium. Any pupil choosing to attend the eight-year gymnasium was required to attend primary school for only four years before transferring.
This change was described at the time as confusing (see McCreight 2002) but was instituted nevertheless. In addition, under the communist system, the choice was limited to those pupils/parents who were members of the Communist Party, those who were not Party members were directed to a school. For most pupils though, the expectation was that they would attend eight years of primary school and progress either to a vocational school or become a teacher (op.cit).

Religious schools, of all denominations, were abolished by the government on the basis that it was important to ‘unify and democratise education, eliminating the existence of separate and clearly unequal schools for the rich and poor’ (Lilly 2001, p.45). Others argue, however, that the real reason for the abolition of these schools was to ensure that the government maintained full control over the organisation and content of education (see Ramet 1998, Lilly 2001, McCreight 2002). Shimonjak (1970) also suggests that religion was removed from education because it was associated with western ideas and the old Imperial Russian society, from which the communists wanted to disassociate.

The government published a standard curriculum which all schools were required to adopt. Mathematics and science were compulsory for all pupils because of the government’s belief that strength in these would contribute to scientific and technological developments that would aid the country’s economy. In contrast, arts subjects, such as art and music, were considered less important and were allocated less time in the teaching programme. Religious education was deleted from the curriculum because of the communist view that it was ‘politically corrupting’ young people. In addition, teachers were not allowed to practice their religious beliefs as this was seen as acting against the state. Religion was replaced on the curriculum by ‘moral and social education’ which taught pupils the ‘characteristics of socialist man’ (Alexander 1979). Whilst not part of the standard
curriculum, religious education remained as an option for those pupils/parents who wanted it but pupil participation gradually decreased until, in 1952, it was abolished completely.

In the republics, Ministries of Education opened new schools and provided them with resources and finance (Lilly 2001). Donia (2000, p.42) describes how school textbooks ‘were a primary medium for promoting the political culture of the socialist regime’ and McCreight (2002, p.47) believes that ‘[T]he central value of the new, approved textbooks was their adulation of socialist principles, not necessarily their value in learning the subject at hand’. The emphasis in all textbooks was on pupils developing communist values and political loyalty to the party.

The issue of textbooks became a major point of debate in the centralisation versus decentralisation discussion. The federal government supported central control of education whilst most of the republics favoured decentralisation. In 1945, there was a debate over whether textbooks should be published centrally and distributed to all republics or whether each republic, with its own ‘history, literature and … operating under unique educational conditions’ (Lilly 2001, p.62) should publish its own texts. Some republic ministers favoured the centralist approach, not only on the basis of providing a uniform approach to education but also because they were financially unable to produce the required textbooks. Other republics, however, wanted control of the textbooks, and hence the educational content, of their own schools. The central government decided on the centralist approach; it took control of the schools, planned and issued the curriculum and required the central Ministry of Education to approve the textbooks used. Many books in the republics were not approved and were replaced by new ones, translated from Russian, which were more ideologically-acceptable. It is claimed that educational materials were ‘heavily politicized’, for example those used in literacy courses ‘consisted primarily of political slogans or stories and poems from the war’ (Lilly 2001, p.89). In addition, history in the
curriculum was required to cover the ‘People’s Liberation Struggle’ to educate children about the courage and struggle of the Partisans to liberate Yugoslavia from ‘the enemy’, replacing the nationalist view of history with a common, unified Yugoslavian view.

Donia (2000, p.42) describes history lessons that ‘glorified the victorious struggles of Tito’s partisans against their home-grown adversaries and against German and Italian occupiers’ and how they ‘idealized the “brotherhood and unity” formula for relations among Yugoslavia’s nationalities’ (ibid).

The centralist policy was overturned by the 1946 constitution which abolished the central Ministry of Education and gave greater responsibilities to republic ministries, including the publication of textbooks. This led to the emergence of different educational programmes in the republics as each prepared its own textbooks, including its own version of history. For example, Wachtel (1998) reports that teachers in Croatia were advised in detail what to teach about Croatian and Yugoslavian history whilst teachers in Bosnia received less information and those in Serbia were left to decide for themselves what to teach.

By 1948 the central government realised that there were major differences in the educational programmes of the republics and that much teaching of history and literature ‘had become openly nationalistic’ (Lilly 2001, p.63). To counter this, the central Ministry of Science and Culture was given the responsibility of ‘unifying’ education again and an educational programme, approved by central government, was issued for all primary schools to follow.

McCreight (2002), however, proposes that this centralisation-decentralisation debate may be misleading. He suggests that for teachers, parents and pupils the debate was academic as, whatever was legislated for, their impression remained one of central control and no local autonomy. He quotes teachers whose perceptions were that the curriculum was
centrally controlled, with all teachers following the government issued plan and programme, teaching the same topic on the same day and at the same time. McCreight (ibid) also quotes others who refute this view, for example an OECD report that supports the claim that education management was decentralised. But for teachers, parents and pupils what was important was not the reality of the situation but their perception of it as it was this perception that would influence their actions.

The intention of the communist government was to use the education system to foster the development of a unified Yugoslavia, which was seen as vital for the development of the country. The view was that ‘[M]ass literacy, education and secularisation would free the people from the “vestiges of the past” in their national consciousness …’ (Djilas 1991, p.180). To this end, education programmes were required to teach both the Latin and Cyrillic script and to teach the history, literature and culture of all the peoples of Yugoslavia. However, Lilly (2001, p.63) notes that the government had to steer a balance between reducing nationalist tendencies and creating a ‘common historical identity’ for Yugoslavians, whilst at the same time avoiding being considered ‘unitarist’ as this remained unpopular; indicating the continuing strength of nationalist ideology.

However, this was not strictly adhered to in all republics, for example in schools in Croatia the Latin script dominated and Serbs living in Croatia did not have access to Serbian newspapers or radio stations. Initially Serbs in Croatia accepted this and it was not until the 1970s that they began to demand the inclusion of Serbian culture in educational programmes. This indicates that, despite the hold of the government, the nationalist tendencies were not wholly quashed and were able to make their voice heard.

In addition to creating a common education system the communist government also wanted to extend the provision of education; it has been claimed that in 1945 the majority
of the population was illiterate (Dizdar and Kemal 1996, McCreight 2002). The Five Year Plan drawn up in 1946 by the central government emphasised the importance of primary education and provided support to state schools rather than private or religious schools, but this was only partially successful. Wilson claims that by 1966 the illiteracy rate was still 20% and that only 65% of school age children actually attended school (Wilson 1979, p.167).

In 1966, following the declaration of Bosnia as ‘under-developed’ the government made a commitment to improve conditions within the republic. This included, inter alia, the extension of educational provision, building primary schools in villages, where previously they had only been in towns, and building secondary schools and colleges to extend educational opportunities.

However, increasing the provision of education proved difficult, mainly because of a lack of suitably qualified teachers. Lilly (2001, p.69) claims that the number of primary school pupils in Bosnia rose by 76% between 1939 and 1949 whilst the number of teachers fell by 29%. This was due, in part, to the closure of the church schools and the subsequent emigration of teachers with a religious faith. In response to this, more teachers’ schools were opened and the length of training reduced. This also served to increase the number of ideologically-sound teachers in schools, meaning those trained under the communist government system. Teacher training at the time, whilst developing subject knowledge was based mainly on teaching student teachers more about communism and how to ‘teach in the communist manner’ (Shimoniak 1970, p.154). Lita (2004, p.25) claims that, under the communist tradition, ‘the teacher had the responsibility to impose ideologically coloured knowledge on students and to be the transmitter of the state policy’.
Teacher training in Yugoslavia was initially modelled on the Soviet system. Those wanting to teach lower primary pupils attended Pedagogic Schools, these were post-primary vocational schools. Intending teachers of upper primary pupils attended Pedagogic Institutes which were attached to the University. The communist government introduced the first Pedagogical High School in Bosnia, in Sarajevo, in 1945. This was followed in 1949 by the first University in Bosnia, in Sarajevo.

As part of their training, the students would take political and general courses that were common to all students (Leon, 1970). They also studied pedagogy and teaching methods plus general subjects for lower primary or specialist subjects for upper primary teaching. Teaching practice was limited to a short period at the end of the course. Teachers in this study who trained during this period reported having two periods of classroom practice, each of ten days. Teachers were trained to teach only the government approved programme and what was required of them in their role as a teacher. Lita (ibid, p.26) claims that an important role for teacher educators was ‘to train teacher-propagandists, teacher activists and teacher indoctrinators’, whilst Savova (1996, p.8) believes that the communist method of teacher training led to teachers who ‘feared dealing with unconventional and provocative ideas’.

During the Second World War unqualified teaching staff had been recruited due to the shortage of qualified staff. Some of these stayed on after the war, and one parent in this study (Aldijana) reported that the Director of her primary school was less well-qualified than the majority of the teachers and, in her view, did not fully execute his responsibilities. In contrast, another parent (Elvira), reported that the Director in her school had been ‘responsible for everything in the school’. These contrasting views indicate some variation in the quality of provision.
All teachers were required to demonstrate loyalty to the Communist Party; failure to do so could result in persecution, threats from the secret police and removal from employment, despite the lack of qualified teaching staff. Teachers were expected to be active Party members and a mouthpiece of the government, loyally supporting their directives and actively denouncing enemy states. Communist thinking was expected to pervade all aspects of teaching. Shimoniaik (1970, p.60) reports that some school Directors used pupils as ‘agents’, to report teachers who exhibited anti-party behaviour or who were ‘not thinking properly’. A teacher accused of speaking against the communists was required to publicly apologise and could be removed from their post.

Teachers’ work was monitored through classroom observations by the school Director, as well as inspection visits from local government/Party officials. Inspection of teachers’ work is important in the absence of nationally agreed testing systems (Nikandrov 1995, p.824), as was the case in Bosnia, but under the communist system the inspectors were verifying conformity to the government regulations rather than assuring the quality of the teachers’ work.

The shortage of teachers was further exacerbated by the policy of introducing primary education into more rural areas, where many teachers were unwilling to work. At this time rural villages lacked basic amenities, such as electricity and water, and were often difficult to get to. A parent in the study (Aldijana) reported that the commonly held perception was that newly qualified teachers were directed to work in the most rural schools and as they progressed in their career were gradually moved to schools nearer town, until at the end of their career they were teaching in town or city schools. Although this may have been the case in theory, in practice many teachers avoided appointment to the rural schools through having influential contacts in the Party or by leaving the teaching profession.
Another reason for teachers leaving the profession was that they were not well-paid and often had to take second jobs in order to earn a reasonable income. There was also an expectation by the government that teachers would undertake additional, unpaid, work as a public service, for example teaching literacy courses. The low pay and government demands made teaching an unattractive option and one taken only by those unable to obtain other professional work. Those who were recruited were often of a low academic standard; Lilly (2001, p.71) claims that in Montenegro ‘literate peasants’ were drafted in as teachers and that in Kosovo ‘literacy courses were taught by children’.

Due to the high demand for teachers not all non-communists could be refused work in the profession. In some areas and in some schools the Party had little authority, Lilly (2001, p.148) reports that ‘[M]any elementary school-teachers had close ties to the church.’ This was tolerated initially but the government became more forceful in pursuing its ideological agenda. By 1948 teachers were being told that they ‘must now master the principles of Communist education and the theories of Marxism-Leninism’ (ibid) in order to be good educators. They had to do this through reading the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Tito and by attending courses. Lilly (2001, p.149) quotes Marijan Stilinovic, a communist education leader, who said that it was ‘absolutely necessary that each of our teachers and directors have the works of Comrade Tito constantly at hand, and that they serve as a guidebook in their work’. Tibbits (1996) argues that this hardline approach led many parents to regard teachers as ‘transmission belts’ of the state; this view was supported by the comments of parents interviewed in this study who said that teachers did only what they were told to do.

The government also attempted to change the culture within schools. In place of the hierarchical teacher-pupil relationship, relations between teachers and pupils were to be based on mutual respect, cooperation and comradeship. In the spirit of these new relations,
pupils were encouraged to take responsibility for their own good behaviour but this proved unsuccessful. Pupils who had grown up experiencing the horrors and conditions of the Second World War became more disruptive and less well-behaved when the constraints, and fear, were removed. Parents in this study reported that their teachers were very strict and that they had feared them, indicating either that the policy had never been applied or that it had been tried and had failed.

Education could not escape the political or economic contemporary context; the government’s educational policies changed as the economic demands of the country became more pressing. The Five Year Plan published in April 1947 stressed the importance of technical education in order to meet the need for more and better educated workers. Whilst values were still important in education the emphasis in the new curriculum was changed to give more importance to the ‘applied and natural sciences’ (Lilly 2001, p.124).

By 1948 the central communist government was established and had suppressed political opposition, giving it more confidence to openly pursue its communist agenda. There were calls from some politicians for education to become more ideological, ‘beginning even in first grade readers’ (Lilly 2001, p.144). This statement relates to the comment I heard before beginning this study, when a primary teacher told me ‘If you want to know what the state thinks, what is important, all you have to do is look at the book for the first grade in school, there you will see what is important’ (see page 9). All pupils were expected to learn about, understand and accept Marxism-Leninism and to develop the values and attitudes it encompassed. This meant further change to the school curriculum, this time to give importance to values and the liberal arts.
Change in the school curriculum led to changes in the training of primary teachers, with the introduction of courses on ‘aesthetics’ and ‘moral upbringing’. These included learning about ‘the development of patriotism … the encouragement of collectivism and discipline, and the development of willpower’ (Lilly 2001, p.150). Teachers were seen as vital to the correct development of young people so it was important that teachers themselves held and espoused the beliefs and values perceived to be correct. This led, in 1948, to the development of a sector for schools within the agitprop department. The sector was charged ‘to supervise the development of more unified and ideologically correct class plans, textbooks, and pedagogical journals’ (Lilly 2001, p.180).

In order to encourage the recruitment of teachers and to attract those who were better qualified, both academically and ideologically, the government reduced the requirement to undertake additional work and introduced subsidised housing and heating for teachers. They also introduced ‘hardship pay’ to encourage teachers to work in the rural areas (Lilly 2001, p.180).

Following the split from the Soviet Union and the development of Yugoslav socialism, the government introduced ‘self-management’ and workers’ councils into education, as they had done in industry. In pursuit of this policy, in 1949 Djilas, a top Party official, made a speech to the Third Plenum of the Communist Party in which he argued for a freer education system, for the development of free people ‘not people whose minds have all been cut according to the same pattern’ (Lilly 2001, p.200). He believed that this could be brought about by an education which was based on socialist principles with the aim to ‘reduce the role of bureaucracy, further broaden the initiative of the masses, and strengthen self-management of the people’ (ibid). Djilas recommended greater decentralisation, giving more independence to the republics. He suggested that, whilst the framework of education remained the same across the country, republics could select the textbooks used
in schools. The belief in the Party now seemed to be that education would raise the consciousness of people and allow them to make the right decisions for themselves rather than because of the persuasion and coercion previously employed. This change of policy has been described as a move from ‘administrative command’ to ‘ideological guidance’ (Ross Johnson 1974, p.10). Education in schools was still based on socialist doctrine and was still seen as the means by which to create a socialist society. However, there was also a perception that the government seemed to be loosening its grip.

This freedom led to the gradual weakening of the hold of socialist ideology amongst the general population and greater access to ideas from western Europe, particularly through films and media. Tito, in a speech in 1953, expressed his disapproval of young people’s interest in jazz music and said that it would be overcome by the ‘correct and systematic work in the musical education of our youth’ (Lilly 2001, p.239). This highlighted the tension that existed for the communists, between the desire to give people freedom and how to respond if this freedom led them away from the correct political thinking.

Language use became an important educational and political issue. When the issue had previously been debated, in 1850, it had been agreed that Serbian and Croatian were one language with two scripts, Cyrillic and Latin. A later agreement in 1954 ratified this and added that in addition to two scripts there were two ‘variant spellings’ (Wilson 1979, p.172). Then in 1967, as part of the growing nationalist movement, the Croats issued the ‘Language Declaration’ calling for the recognition of four languages – Croatian, Macedonian, Serbian and Slovenian – and for standard Croatian, rather than Serbo-Croat, to be used in schools. In turn, the Serbs called for Serbs living in Croatia to be educated in the Serbian language and Cyrillic script. These demands were resisted by the federal government and no action was taken. Following this, in 1971, the Croatian republic government produced a handbook on Croatian grammar for use in all schools but this was
called ‘chauvinist’ and ‘separatist’ by the central government and other republics and was never adopted (Cviic 1995). However, the movement continued and led to the inclusion in the 1974 Constitution of a regulation guaranteeing even small ethnic minority groups an educational system in their own language and culture, although economics prevented these systems from becoming widespread.

Schools were increasingly used as a vehicle for the continuing political nationalist power struggles. During the early 1980s, there was a proposal for an all-Yugoslav core curriculum in subjects such as history and literature but this was abandoned due to strong objections from the Slovenes and Serbs (Cviic 1995). Nationalism continued to grow as a political force so that by 1989-90 social scientists in Croatia expressed concern about the language being used by the government and the insensitivity being displayed toward the Serb minority in Croatia. They presented to the Croatian government plans for educational programmes to develop ‘cross-cultural and inter-ethnic relations’ but these were disregarded (Woodward, 1995).

This period of the weakening of communist control allowed not only the nationalists but also the religious faithful to again make their voices heard. A few religious schools began to reappear, although the communist government fined Bosnian Muslim parents for allowing their children to study in the schools operating in the mosques (McCreight 2002, p.54). In 1990, the Serbian Orthodox bishops submitted a demand to the government for the return of religious education to the primary school curriculum but this was rejected. By 1992, however, schools in Croatia had re-introduced religion into the curriculum and pupils in this study who attended school in west Mostar, with a Croat-majority population, confirmed that this had become part of their education.
During the years 1990-92 unified Yugoslavia was beginning to disintegrate and nationalist politics continued to strengthen. In countries across eastern Europe, as communist governments fell, Marxist-Leninist ideology was banned from education and school curricula and textbooks were amended. Teaching methods were changed in line with the new political democracy and pupils were learning to discuss and develop understanding. In Yugoslavia, the communist ideology in education was replaced by the nationalist one. Donia (2000, p.42) describes how, in this period, ‘Serb, Croat, and Bosniac educators either prepared or adopted textbooks that reflected an understanding of the world from their respective national viewpoints’ each of which ‘glorified the struggle of its nationality and emphasized its oppression by others’. Education practice in Yugoslavia in 1992 was beginning to show a return to the pre-Second World War, pre-communist, nationalist traditions with each of the ethnic groups in Bosnia attempting to ‘nationalise’ the content of the education system.

The fall of communism contributed to the growing vocalisation of the need for reform and modernisation of the country’s education provision. In February 1992 a document was prepared by the Bosnian government entitled ‘Long-term Program of Development of Primary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1991 until 2010’. This offered proposals for educational development and addressed issues of teaching methods, technology developments, curriculum, assessment, standards and teacher training. However, the outbreak of war in April 1992 halted any discussion of educational development.

**Primary education in Mostar 1945-1992**

In 1945, immediately after the end of the Second World War, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina established a Ministry of Education. In theory the republic had autonomy to make its own decisions regarding educational provision but in reality, ‘guidelines’ from the
central federal government dictated the provision and structure of education in the republics. Mirsan, a retired government education official in Bosnia described it thus:

Everything was put into law, and everything that was in law we had to do. Through that law our country said what we had to do in every part of the school.

This may have been the official view that Mirsan was quoting or his perception of the situation, but in reality the law cannot define or control everything that happens in a school or classroom. However, if educationalists feel that they are under the control of the law they are likely to act more conservatively than they otherwise might. They are also less likely to feel able to make decisions and will refer decisions to others or wait to be told what to do.

There were three types of primary school in Yugoslavia, and in Mostar, as shown in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1 – types of primary schools in Bosnia 1945-1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular primary schools:</th>
<th>Special primary schools and institutes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mainstream schools attended by the majority of children</td>
<td>for children with special needs, usually identified as those with physical disabilities such as blindness, deafness or other physical handicap. The program in these schools was a reduced version of the regular curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallel primary schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>music and ballet schools, pupils attended these in addition to their regular school and the program was tailored for these ‘talented’ pupils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Mostar there were nine regular primary schools spanning east and west of the town. Each school had a number and a name, and could be referred to by either, for example number 3 primary school, *tre osnovno skola*, or Hauza Humo. The number of the school indicated the order in which they were built; number 3 primary school was the third school to be built in Mostar. Most parents and pupils in the study referred to schools by their number rather than their name. There was also one special school on the outskirts of the town.

The management of schools was hierarchical: central government directing the republic government who, in turn, supervised the Pedagogical Institutes and *zavods* who worked with the schools. Although in theory the Bosnian government had autonomy to make its own educational laws and manage its own schools, in practice the education ministry in the republic was required to implement directives issued by the central government.

The management of schools mirrored the way in which all institutions were managed by the central and republic governments. Schools, like other institutions, were considered to be ‘administrative units of the all-encompassing central government’ (Jambrek 1975, p.79) and, in common with industry, were established and self-managed by local commune assemblies. The assemblies were organs that were empowered to participate in educational planning and policy-making and to inspect schools to ensure that the decisions of the self-managing community were carried out. There were also schools’ councils that had responsibility for approving the programme of the school, the financial plan and the appointment and payment of staff, including the Director. School councils were usually constituted two teachers, two parents and three representatives of the local municipality, the *opcina*. Each school also had its own workers’ assembly to decide on specific issues within the school.
Each school had a Director and Assistant Director who were responsible for the running of the school. School Directors were trained teachers who were also expected to be committed Party members. The Directors were required to undertake training to develop their knowledge and understanding of Communist Party policies and practices and ways of ‘indoctrinating children in the communist world outlook’ (Shimoniak 1979, p.131). This was supported by Vahid, who was Director of a school during the communist era and described his role:

This was a time of socialism and they [the government] had power to control. In that system the power of the Director was limited … The law said what the Director could do, how to teach, and we had to do what the law said, only a little freedom was given to the school. (Vahid, school Director)

It was also supported by parents and pupils who, when asked who ran the primary schools that they and their children had attended up to 1992, all said ‘the Director’ but then qualified their statements:

The Director … the opcina (municipal government) would make the decisions and the Director would do whatever they said (Nina, parent)

He (the Director) did not have much power, he just followed the system. They had inspectors from Sarajevo and from Belgrade who came in to inspect the teachers, how they worked, and if they judged that a teacher was not qualified, if they were not satisfied with the teacher, the teacher would lose their job. (Aldijana, parent)

The Director, he followed instructions from Sarajevo (Savo, pupil)

Only one parent (Elvira) said that the Director had ‘responsibility for everything’. In essence, the Director was perceived as a ‘link’, transmitting and implementing messages from the government to the staff and reporting back to the government.

In implementing government policy, the Director was required to ensure that each week teachers produced their ‘teaching plans’, stating what they would be teaching in each
lesson. All teachers had to submit their plans to the Director. When the government inspector, from the local Pedagogical Institute, came in to inspect the teacher she/he would look at the teacher’s plans for the week and at individual lesson plans. They would then observe a class and write a report, giving one copy to the Director of the school. Occasionally, he or she would discuss the lesson with the teacher but this was not common practice.

Pedagogical Institutes were one level below the Ministry in the republic and were staffed by those who had held high level posts in education, for example school Directors, Pedagogy Academy (teachers’ school) teaching staff or university academics who were subject specialists. The Pedagogical Institute had responsibility for the curriculum, teacher evaluation, in-service training, school evaluation and data collection from schools. This has been described as an administrative service rather than a management function, although it has also been commented that the Institutes were ‘more accustomed to exercising ‘control’ over teachers and schools than to providing advice and support’ (OECD 2001, p.12). The Institutes were responsible for ensuring that teachers were delivering the prescribed curriculum and would do this by visiting schools, observing teachers in the classroom and writing reports on them. Through this they were able to exercise control; the teachers had to teach what was required, in the way that was expected, or face a negative report and the possibility of losing their job.

Below the Pedagogical Institutes were the zavods, local organisations which comprised groups of teachers who ‘met to control the pedagogy’ (Mirsan, government official). Zavod staff were experienced and qualified classroom teachers who had moved into an advisory role.
Children began primary school at six or seven years old and underwent eight years of compulsory primary education. Each school had a catchment area, defined by the Minister for Education, and pupils living within that area were assigned to the designated school by the Ministry. Parents and pupils referred to this as going to the school that they ‘belonged to’, although this was not an emotional belonging, they belonged to that school simply because of the proximity of their home to the school. All the parents and pupils in this study reported that they were able to walk to school as it was close to where they lived.

Classes contained pupils of all ethnic backgrounds. Class sizes could be as low as 6-8 in rural schools and as high as 35-40 in town schools, but more usually they were 28-30.

The school year was defined by central government. Across the country, school began on September 1st, with classes beginning on the first Monday in September, and comprised 37 weeks. Thirty five weeks were used for teaching the prescribed curriculum; the remaining two weeks were used for examination re-sits for pupils who were deemed to have failed the end of year tests. Each lesson lasted 45 minutes and breaks between lessons lasted for 5-15 minutes. All schools operated a shift system and pupils attended school at the times allocated to them, an example is shown below in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 – pupil school attendance shifts during the years to 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Week one</th>
<th>Week two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I – III</td>
<td>7.00 am – 11.00 am</td>
<td>1.00 pm – 5.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - VIII</td>
<td>7.00 am – 12 noon</td>
<td>1.00 pm – 6/7.00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason for the shift system was lack of space but it also meant that teachers could teach more classes. A consequence of the system was that children always had lunch at home and had plenty of free time which would either be spent helping around the house or
playing. One parent, Aldijana, also expressed the view that the shift system was operated because it created a ‘good work habit’ in people, as children had to get up early in the morning for school or leave home in the afternoon when they had been playing and did not want to leave. This, she believed, contributed to workers’ ability to be on time and attend work when required.

Finances for education, along with those for other public services, were initially provided by central government. As government policies changed, and ever increasing elements of decentralisation were introduced, the responsibility for managing and financing schools was devolved to republic then to district level governments (communes).

Schools were financed by local taxes raised by the Self-Managing Communities of Interest\(^{12}\). The money raised was distributed to schools based on criteria relating to the agreed school programme and the cost of education. Monthly payments were made to schools to cover workers’ incomes and costs such as transport and lunch, electricity, water, running costs and basic resources. In addition, each republic had a solidarity fund which distributed funds to ensure that each school received a minimum level of funding. Generally, the solidarity fund provided additional finance in economically under-developed areas where local taxes raised insufficient funds. There was also a solidarity fund at the federal level so that poorer republics could apply for federal support (OECD 1983). These payments were usually supplemented by money from municipal budgets and donations from citizens and businesses.

In Bosnia, the economy was poor and educational commitments could not always be met due to a lack of finances. The amount raised in local taxes was low; the republic could not

\(^{12}\) Communities of Self-Managing Organizations were formed to enable the public sector to be managed by social partners rather than the state. In reality, the state did become involved through these Self-Managed Communities of Interest.
always provide sufficient funding for schools to reach the minimum level and little money was received from central government. Josipa, the Minister of Education in Mostar was a government education official in 1990 and reported that:

We [education department in Mostar] did not receive a lot of support from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina [federal government], they needed to pay but did not provide enough, but we had a lot of support from the institution (opcina) where we live. (Josipa, Minister of Education in Mostar)

This was a long-standing problem. National economic conditions during the 1950s and 1960s meant that many republics experienced growth and prosperity, but this was not the case in Bosnia. During this period the economy of Bosnia declined, leading to reduced financial support for local services, including education. This had an impact on the quantity and quality of educational provision available, so that by 1970 it has been claimed that Bosnia had the highest illiteracy rates in the country and the highest proportion of people whose only education had been three years of primary school (Malcolm 1994, p.202).

Despite these financial constraints education provision remained free. All but one of the parents interviewed reported that they had paid no contribution towards the cost of education. Only one parent reported that they had bought textbooks for their children (Omer, parent), but this was a personal choice, to allow their children to be able to continue studying at home.

Traditionally, the pay of teachers was never high and many took second jobs to supplement their income. As a result many left the profession after a short while for better paid work. Azra, a teacher interviewed in this study, reported that she qualified as a teacher but went to work in a bank as the pay was higher. With declining economic conditions, teachers’
pay remained low, immediately prior to the civil war in 1990 they earned approximately 750DM (£250) per month.

The low pay levels also meant that many who were recruited as teachers were of a lower academic quality and unable to obtain other professional work. Although this did not apply to all teachers, many still entered the profession because of a desire to teach or work with young people.

The teaching programme in schools was issued by the government; each republic was responsible for issuing its own teaching programme but these had to be submitted for approval to the central government. In Bosnia, the programme was issued from Sarajevo, the capital city. The programme was written by staff in the Pedagogical Institute or the Council for the Advancement of Education, an inter-republic organisation set up to assist with the supervision of schools and with in-service teacher training.

The teaching programme stated by the month, week and lesson what was to be taught, listing subjects and amounts of time to be spent on each, followed by detailed content within each subject for each class from grade I to grade VIII. Zerina, a teacher, reported that at the beginning of each school year government staff would meet with teachers to give them the programme for the year and to tell them of any changes. Schools were inspected during the year by government appointed commissioners to check that they were following the programme.

The primary school was divided into lower school, grades I-IV, where classes had one teacher for all subjects and upper school, grades V-VIII, where they had specialist subject teachers. For all grades, subject lessons were formally timetabled, there was no ‘integrated’ learning as often happens in early primary years in western European schools.
The curriculum for grades I-IV comprised 18 hours of education each week, rising to 25-27 hours for grades VI-VIII.

The primary school curriculum followed by schools in Mostar is shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 – the primary school curriculum prior to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades I-III</th>
<th>Serbo-Croat language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrillic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As above plus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A foreign language (English, French, German or Russian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic work (cooking and clothing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades V-VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croat language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrillic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop activities/home economics – taken by boys/girls respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective subjects – these varied according to the locations, staffing and resources of the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the parents and pupils interviewed said that they learnt both Latin and Cyrillic. In their Serbo-Croat and Cyrillic language classes they were required to write in Latin script and Cyrillic script in alternate weeks. This practice is different from that experienced by those at school in the inter-war years (1918-1939), when nationalist language teaching had played a major part in their education. In Serbia, prior to the Second World War, many
pupils had learnt only Cyrillic whilst those in Croatia and Bosnia had learnt both. After the war, under government directive, the language was referred to as Serbo-Croat, rather than Serbian or Croatian.

A range of foreign languages were also taught in different schools; in Kosovo it was possible to study Turkish and Albanian, in Slovenia Italian and Hungarian and in Croatia Ukrainian, Italian, Hungarian, Czech and Slovak (McCreight 2002). In some instances the location of the school determined the language taught, for example Kosovo is in southern Serbia, close to Turkey and Albania, whilst Slovenia and Croatia border Italy and are close to Hungary. Elvira, a parent, attended school in Vojvodina, on the border of Hungary, so Hungarian was the foreign language taught in her school. In other cases the availability of teaching staff was the determining factor. Aldijana and Ahmed, both parents, studied German and Russian respectively as each of their schools had only teachers of those languages and they were offered no other choice. Where there were a number of foreign languages available parents and pupils reported that they still had no choice but were told by the teachers what they would study. Maya, a pupil, said she studied English:

because I was picked for it. Some classes were told to study English, some to study German and some French, I was just in the class for English. (Maya, pupil)

The parents and pupils did not question this decision, no-one expressed the view that they would have preferred a choice of language; there was an acceptance of how the system operated.

The anti-religious policies of the communists had their impact on education in Mostar. In 1950 Muslim religious schools were closed down and it was made illegal to teach children in mosques (Malcolm 1994). Pupils could choose to attend a religious school on Saturdays, provided by the mosque or the church, in addition to their regular primary
school but as these were not state-run there was no data available on how many pupils attended the Saturday schools. No parent or pupil in this study had attended, although one (Omer) said that he knew others who had attended but as his parents were from mixed ethnic backgrounds, Serb and Muslim, he had no religious education.

In the primary school, each teacher had his/her own classroom for teaching and the pupils moved around the school for lessons. Each class also had its own daily workbook, the ‘dnevnik rada’, which was a register and record book combined. The dnevnik rada contained the names and addresses of pupils in the class, their parents’ names and occupations, the subjects studied and the marks gained. For each lesson the teacher was required to write in the book what had been taught, the subject and the topic of the lesson, and the names of pupils who were absent. Pupils knew that they were not allowed to touch this book, except for the monitor who carried it from classroom to classroom for each teacher to complete. The system of the dnevnik rada was known by all the parents and pupils in this study, whenever and wherever they had attended school, it was a system that had endured.

Parents respected the dnevnik rada; this is likely to be as a result of learning about its importance through their own education. One parent told me:

If your child was ill, you must get a paper from the doctor and take this paper to the teacher so that she can write it in to the dnevnik rada
(Elvira, parent)

Pupils interviewed seemed fearful about being absent from school as they knew that any absence had to be accounted for. One pupil, Alisa, talked about feeling anxious when she had been ill one day, concerned that her mother should go to the school and take the note to her teacher. Parents, similarly, knew that if their child was absent from school then they
had to provide a note for this. If a pupil was absent from school without a note being provided the class teacher would contact the parent to find out the reason for the absence.

Despite the centralist control of the curriculum, there was no national framework for assessment at any level. The assessment of pupils’ learning has been described as characterised by:

- subjective assessment of knowledge acquisition;
- lack of standardized procedures for ‘measuring’ knowledge acquisition, this applied to individual subjects within schools and across schools at local and national levels;
- lack of professional support for teachers and schools in comparing assessment results;
- lack of procedures for data collection of assessment results;
- lack of assessment data influence on educational policy.

(from Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001)

Assessment in every subject was by written and oral tests, which were devised and marked by individual teachers. The tests were given informally at regular intervals; one pupil said:

We had tests for reading and writing every week or so, so that the teacher could see how well we were learning (Anida, pupil)

There were also more formal tests three or four times each year, when grades were recorded on the child’s school report. Grades were numerical, with five being the highest (excellent), three being acceptable (good), and grades two and one being regarded as unsatisfactory. Amel, a pupil, reported that, in order to obtain a grade five a pupil ‘had to know everything in the text book’. The tests were based upon teachers’ questioning pupils’ knowledge on their recall of information from the text book. Pupils reported that sometimes they knew which sections in the book the test would be based on and
sometimes it could be on anything in the book. In addition, there were no criteria for the attainment of grades; the teacher assigned a grade according to his/her own (unpublished) mark scheme.

The grades obtained were important because they determined the child’s progress through school. Those obtaining at least a grade 3 in all subjects automatically progressed to the next class. Those obtaining grade 1 or 2 in any subject were required to re-sit the test for that subject after the end of the school year, in their holiday time. If a pupil, after re-sits, had one or two subjects still graded at 1 or 2 then the teachers would meet to decide whether or not that pupil should be allowed to progress. There were no specific criteria for this, the teachers discussed and decided and the pupil and parents were informed. If the pupil had many subjects graded 1 and 2 even after re-sitting tests, they were not allowed to progress and had to re-take the school year. If, after having re-taken the year, they failed the end-of-year test a second time they were sent to a ‘special school’. Special schools were attended not only by those pupils who had failed the school tests, therefore deemed to be of low ability, but also those with disabilities such as hearing defects or physical disabilities.

Parents interviewed reported that this grading and assessment system operated fairly:

if grades were not good they [pupils] had to go to summer school for extra learning to improve grades … the students had more opportunities to improve their grades, if they got a poor grade the teacher would give them another test or an oral presentation to improve their grade. (Aldijana, parent)

the teachers were fair because they gave each student a grade based on how they had performed in the test because the government told them that the children are children, it doesn’t matter whether they are Serb or whatever. (Elvira, parent)

To report the outcome of the tests, teachers held ‘parents meetings’ every three months, after the tests. Attendance at these meetings was regarded as obligatory. One parent said:
it was really strict, if the parents didn’t come to the three-monthly meetings, the teacher would send the child back home until the parents had attended. (Nina, parent)

At the parents’ meetings, the pupils’ test results were not reported individually to each pupil’s parents but to the parents of the whole class together. One parent described it:

The parents all sit together in one room and the form teacher tells all the parents together in general, not individually, how the children in that class have done. For example she would say ‘we have several negative marks in our class this time and the mathematics professor says that they must practice more at home’. (Aldijana, parent)

Parents would not know until the end of year test results were reported whether or not it was their child who had attained the ‘negative marks’, leading to the possibility that all pupils were encouraged to ‘do better’.

In addition to the three-monthly meetings, there were weekly ‘information evenings’ for parents. Jakob, a parent, explained how these operated:

The ‘form teacher’ had ‘information evenings’ every week – say Tuesday and Wednesday – when parents could talk to the teacher about how their child was doing. They did not need an appointment, they can just turn up. The teachers like it if parents come regularly, say once a month to inform themselves. If necessary, the teacher can invite the parents to come, she would write in the pupil’s notebook [a book which parents must sign to say they have seen it]. If the class misbehaves or does something bad, the teacher can call the parents and ask them to come in.

Jakob believed that parents found these meetings helpful:

Sometimes children don’t always tell the parents what marks they have achieved, especially if they are low, and the form teacher warns the parents if the child needs to pay attention more, or needs extra classes. The form teacher talks to the parents but gets information from other subject teachers.
The assessment and reporting system was described the same by parents, who had attended school during the 1950s and 1960s, and pupils who attended school up to 1992, indicating that little changed during that period.

Similarly, parents and pupils reported that the teaching methods used were formal and teacher-centred, with teachers talking and pupils writing. There was one set book for each subject each year, and the pupils worked their way through this from beginning to end.

Pupils described their experiences:

She taught by writing on the board, she showed us how to write in our books… she gave us little tests (Alisa, pupil)

She talked to us and we wrote in our books (Amel, pupil)

There were few resources used in teaching, other than the set books and the blackboard.

Comments from pupils about how they had been taught included:

I don’t think we had games or things, I know we had books (Anida, pupil)

… at biology classes we had a microscope and it was only used once.
(Vida, pupil)

There was no differentiation in teaching, no individual teaching. One pupil described his school memories:

We, the pupils, were thought to be all equal and average (my italics)
(Sead, pupil)

This was supported by a former school Director who said that:

Teachers also address their teaching to all the pupils, so it is pitched at middle-ability children, not those who are the worst or the best. (Vahid, school Director)
When asked if it was possible to have classes of pupils according to ability, Vahid responded:

That is like individualism, here it is not very easy to do that.

There was a general feeling amongst parents that prior to the war teaching was ‘good’.

One parent described her schooling:

Before the war, the teacher was not allowed to yell at the students and if the students didn’t understand something and needed the teacher to explain something then the teacher would do it. The teacher would not continue with the material until they knew the students understood it. (Aldijana, parent)

Another said that:

I seem to remember that they were great, not like the teachers today. They would explain more and talk to the children more, individually – now they don’t talk to the children individually. (Elvira, parent)

This is supported by the findings of McCreight (2002) who, in a survey of staff and pupils in several Sarajevo schools, found that the staff rated their own school teachers as more competent than had the current pupils.

The comments from these parents, though, appear at odds with the view that there was no ‘individualism’ as they portray teachers who did practice some kind of differentiation in their lessons by taking time to explain more to those who did not understand. This could be due to the fact that these teachers stepped outside of what they were expected to do in order to help their pupils learn; it was said earlier that the law cannot control what happens in all classrooms.
Several parents commented that discipline had been ‘better’ when they were at school, although this was founded on strict teacher control and pupils fearful of teachers. One parent described some of her teachers in the 1960s as:

… very strict, up to 3rd-4th grade they would use a stick to ‘beat up’ the children, but then the parents stood up and they brought in a law to say that they couldn’t beat the children in the school. They used to leave children in the school for an hour or two at the end of the school day, like it was a jail, as a punishment. Some teachers brought in corn and made the children kneel down on the corn as a punishment, if they didn’t learn.

(Aldijana, parent)

However, pupils attending school during the 1980s reported that teachers were not so strict; Alisa, a pupil, liked her teacher ‘she was nice to everybody’.

As well as controlling schools the communist government saw it as imperative to have control over teacher training in order to ensure that teachers were trained to support and promote the communist party ideal.

The Austro-Hungarians had established teaching colleges, which the monarchy had maintained. When the communists took over, their extension of educational provision led to the need for more qualified teachers. Throughout Yugoslavia, vocational high schools, known as teacher-training schools, were established for those wanting to teach grades I-IV in the primary school. Students who had completed their eight years of primary education were able to attend the vocational high school. For those wanting to teach the higher grades, V-VIII, with their specialist subject teaching, Pedagogical Schools were established to provide two-year training courses. Students transferred to the Pedagogical School at the end of their high school education, usually at the gymnasium. In 1969, a period of growth for the universities, all the Pedagogical Schools became university Faculties, Pedagogical Academies.
In Mostar, the Pedagogical School opened in 1950 and developed into a Pedagogical Academy in 1969. It initially experienced success and growth but, following the decline in the economy during the 1970-80s, student numbers and university income decreased. This was experienced by all universities across Yugoslavia but Mostar seemed to have been most affected; its university has been described as ‘rather undeveloped in comparison to the other centres, mostly because the funds for the new faculties were not readily available any more, and the economic potentials of the region were not sufficient enough to provide for the opening of new departments or faculties’ (Dizdar and Kemal 1996).

Each university organised its own entrance examinations, usually testing students’ factual knowledge. University education, like schools, was free for those designated as ‘regular students’. Regular students were obliged to attend all lectures, do all the work and take all the examinations. ‘Irregular students’ were those who chose to pay for their own courses and examinations, so had no obligation to attend. The presence of irregular students was a sign of Tito’s introduction of some measures of the market economy, they are an unlikely presence in a communist society.

During the first year of teacher training for the lower grades of primary school students studied the subject knowledge for all the subjects that they would teach, plus psychology, sociology, pedagogy and defence. The subject content that they learned was that contained in the government-prescribed school programme for each subject, they would learn both the content and the timing of when it was to be taught. The end of first-year tests had to be passed for students to continue to year two.

In year two methodology was added to the subjects studied. Students were also required to observe teachers in schools, they were then given one lesson to plan and deliver, which was observed. Following this they planned and taught ten lessons, meaning that their total
teaching practice was 10-11 hours. During their teaching practice they were observed by their university lecturers and Government commissioners and their performance was graded.

A small survey of practicing teachers (six) indicated that teaching methods in the university mirrored those in schools; they reported that their professors used didactic methods, lecturing to them whilst they wrote notes.

At the end of each year, in order to be able to sit the examinations, each student was required to obtain an attendance certificate signed by each of their professors to show satisfactory attendance during the course. The certificate was taken to the Student Services Office for an authorisation stamp, to allow entrance to the examination. If a professor refused to sign the attendance certificate the student could not take that particular examination, but could re-enter the following year.

Once qualified, in-service training was usually provided by the Pedagogical Institutes, which organized and arranged seminars and workshops for teachers. The courses were mostly to enable the teachers to update their theoretical subject knowledge. The development of teaching skills was not considered necessary as the role of the teacher was to impart knowledge so it was important only to keep the subject knowledge up to date. There was no training offered to the school Director nor to other personnel such as education managers and administrators.

The general picture painted of education during the period 1945-1992 was one of tight control – by the government at central and republic level, by the Pedagogical Institute, by the Director and by teachers. It also indicates a system with minimal resources and low costs. Parents appeared to place a good deal of trust in the teachers. Parents’ involvement
was obligatory and pupils were expected to conform, through fear and ‘collective responsibility’ rather than through any personal involvement with the system. These characteristics are those that the communist government would encourage in its citizens, trusting of authority, conforming and mindful of collective responsibility.

As communism became the only politically acceptable ideology in Bosnia it became embedded in educational provision. The communist government introduced reform of the structure of education, its organisation, management and financing, the curriculum and teachers’ training and practice. For the first time religion was completely separated from education and a unified Yugoslav identity was developed, although nationalist affiliations were suppressed rather than expunged. As this period drew to a close the political stability of the communists was beginning to disintegrate and this was to have a major impact on the social and economic context, and on education in the country.
Chapter 7 - War and independence

Bosnia as an independent state 1992 - 2002

In 1992 Bosnia declared itself an independent state, an action that was immediately followed by the outbreak of civil war which continued until November 1995. This chapter covers the civil war and the post-war years, a period that had important political, social and educational impact. The chapter reports how education provision continued during the war and the role of the international organisations in negotiating peace. The educational implications of the peace agreement are described, as are the religious and nationalist influences on education during the post-war period.

Social and political context

On the 6th April 1992 Bosnia became an independent and autonomous state for the first time since the mid-fifteenth century (see p.258). However, the momentous declaration of independence was overshadowed by the outbreak of the civil war that began just two days later. Much has been written about the reasons for the war and the details of it (see Malcolm 1994, Silber and Little 1995, Glenny 1999). The war followed from the response of the Bosnian Serbs to Bosnia’s declaration of independence and, as the Serbs had been the instigators of the fighting, the Bosnian Croats and Muslims formed an alliance against them. Manuel (1996, p.73) reports that the first buildings to come under fire in Mostar were the university buildings, then the hospital, then the schools, ‘[E]very institution that played a key role in holding together the fabric of society was marked for destruction’.

During 1993, as the fighting spread, the alliance between the Bosnian Croats and Muslims gradually broke down. The Presidents of Croatia and Serbia then met in an attempt to reach agreement on the division of Bosnia between their two countries; this led to Bosnian Croats formally ending their alliance with the Muslims and turning against them. The war
became one with three enemies; Serbia and Croatia both fighting to extend their land, Bosnia to retain its independence. In towns where one ethnic group was in the majority, as was the case in most Bosnian towns, families were forced to flee their homes as the dominant ethnic group took control. The term ‘ethnic cleansing’ was coined during the Bosnian civil war to describe the events that took place.

The nationalist divisions of the warring factions impacted on other aspects of life: pre-communist national currency was re-introduced in Croatia (the kuna) and Bosnia changed its national currency from the Yugoslavian dinar to the German mark. There were changes in the language as nation states re-introduced old words to mark their national difference, parents in this study reported that their children would come home from school and tell their parents the words it was considered correct to use. Religious symbols began to re-appear in schools and other public places.

The effects of the new phase of the war, when Serbs, Croats and Muslims began fighting each other, were particularly felt in Mostar. This was due to two factors, firstly the pre-war population of Mostar had comprised all three groups living together and the fighting involved previously close neighbours becoming enemies. Secondly, Mostar is located in Herzegovina, which Croats consider to be ‘their’ country due to beliefs perpetuated through nationalist teaching (see p.259). This made Mostar a prize highly sought after by the Croats. When most Serbs had been driven out of the area the Croats declared Mostar the capital of their breakaway state, Herceg-Bosna; they introduced Croatian currency and national emblems in all institutional buildings, including schools. This intensified the fighting between Croats and Muslims as each tried to gain control of the town. The fighting was vicious; one ex-soldier reported that with the sights on the guns they could see across the river into the faces of those at whom they were shooting.
Mostar became a divided town, with Croats living on the west side of the Neretva river and Muslims on the east. The physical damage of the war was visible, buildings and roads pock-marked from shells, houses without windows, no electricity or water. Other damage was less visible - the fear, the anxiety, the hunger. At the height of the war normal family life was suspended as many families moved to live in cellars and ventured out only at night-time or when it was absolutely necessary. Work, other than the work needed for survival, became impossible for all but a few. Education provision was intermittent, according to availability of buildings and staff. The World Bank estimated that 70% of educational facilities were damaged (World Bank 1996). Where possible other buildings, such as hotels, were taken over and used as temporary school-rooms.

In February 1994, after almost two years of combat, the ‘Council of Bosnian-Hercegovinan Croats' announced that it supported the ‘territorial integrity’ of Bosnia (Malcolm 1994, p.256). This led to new discussions between the Croatian and Bosnian governments which resulted in a new Croat-Muslim alliance and a quietening of the fighting but not complete ceasefire, skirmishes continued in various parts of the country throughout 1994.

By 1995 agreement to end the war had still not been reached and hostilities grew. Negotiations were stepped up and, aided by Serbs losing territory for the first time in the war, accord was eventually reached. Political negotiations led by the international community resulted in the signing of the General Framework for Agreement for Peace (this became known as the Dayton Agreement) by the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia and the cessation of war in December 1995.

When fighting ceased the country was physically and emotionally battle-scarred. Everywhere roads were damaged, buildings had shrapnel craters and windows missing, trees had been uprooted for firewood. Houses could be seen where families had fled and
possessions were left or scattered, other houses had been taken over by internally displaced families. Communities were now mono-ethnic and nationalist symbols could be seen in and on buildings. Families began their return to normal life as school buildings opened up, shops and businesses began to reappear and houses and streets began to look occupied.

The Dayton Agreement instituted a new constitution for Bosnia and re-drew its internal borders, one of the recurring themes in Bosnia’s history. The constitution created a complex governmental structure, which was to have an impact on post-war settlements, and it is difficult to know whether the negotiators considered the lasting influence that the Agreement would have or whether it was seen as an interim measure. Under the constitution the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina comprises two ‘Entities’ and Republika Srpska. The state government and its Presidency has representation from all three ethnic groups. Republika Srpska constitutes 49% of the state and is governed and occupied almost wholly by Serbs. The Muslim-Croat Federation constitutes the remaining 51% of the land and is governed by a coalition of Muslims and Croats. The Muslim-Croat Federation is further divided into ten ‘cantons’ or regions. Five cantons are Muslim-controlled, three are Croat-controlled and two are ethnically mixed, including Herzegovina-Neretva, in which Mostar is located.

The governmental structure drawn up by the Dayton Agreement is shown in Figure 7.1. The state government has a Prime Minister and a three-person Presidency, with two representatives from the Federation and one from Republika Srpska. This government has responsibility for foreign policy, foreign trade, customs and immigration, monetary policy, international law enforcement, inter-entity transport and air traffic control, and there is a state-level Minister of Education. The state government is dependent on the two Entities for its funding.
The governments of the Federation and Republika Srpska each have a Prime Minister and each is responsible for defence of their own territory, police, health, environmental policies, agriculture and industry, refugees and displaced persons and reconstruction issues. They each raise funds from customs duties and excise taxes.

Republika Srpska is populated almost exclusively by Bosnian Serbs and operates in a near-autonomous fashion. Its mono-ethnic population means that it has not experienced the same issues in instituting education reform as has the Federation. For this reason, the investigation during this period is focused on the Croat-Muslim Federation (the Federation) within Bosnia.
The state and Federation government have little, if any, influence on education. The role of the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport was determined by the constitution and includes supervision of the canton ministries and co-ordination of education provision. Its effectiveness, however, requires the co-operation of the canton governments, an aspect over which the Federal Ministry has no control and which the canton governments can give or withhold as they choose. The canton ministries have been reported by representatives from the World Bank and the Soros OpenFund as refusing to co-operate with the Federal Ministry (personal communication), rendering ineffective the Federal Minister for Education.

The Minister of Education in the canton ministry in Mostar is a known member of HDZ, the Croatian national political party. It was reported that she had been instructed by the party not to co-operate with the Federation Ministry and that she would not go against these instructions (personal communication from the Head of Education, OHR). These views are supported by an OECD Review (OECD 2001) and a European group who both reported that schools were ‘exploited by political parties as a means of achieving their own ends’ (European Training Foundation 2000, p.25).

The canton governments have responsibility for culture, housing, public services, including education, and local land use and are able to delegate responsibility to the local municipalities if they wish. A report by the Federal Ministry (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports 2000) suggested that the local municipalities did not wish to take on many responsibilities because of the financial responsibility these would incur, which would have been difficult to meet in the post-war economic climate. The canton governments raise funds from property taxes and fees charged for public services.
The post-war governments faced a challenging task. At the beginning of 1992 the population of Bosnia was ethnically mixed, with the majority of Serbs living in rural areas in the east, bordering Serbia; the majority of Croats living in Herzegovina in the south and Posavina in the north, again in mainly rural areas, and the Muslims mostly living in small towns in northern and central Bosnia. Towns and villages across the country were also populated by mixed populations comprised all three ethnic groups and other minority groups such as Jews and Roma.

In 1995, at the end of the war, the population of Bosnia had reduced by 23%; there were approximately 250,000 people dead or missing, 200,000 wounded and 13,000 disabled. Population movements during and after the civil war were considerable (The World Bank Group 1998). In 2001, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) said that there were 263,500 Bosnian refugees still living outside the country and 518,400 displaced persons, that is refugees within their own country (Foreign & Commonwealth Office website 2002). Refugees returning to the country tended to go to areas controlled by their own ethnic group, whether this was their home town or not. There were some ‘minority returns’, people from one ethnic group returning to their own home in an area dominated by a different ethnic group, but these numbers were small.

In Mostar, the pre-war population was ethnically mixed, the 1991 census\(^{13}\) showed the population to be 126,628, of which 43,856 were Bosnian Muslims, 43,037 Bosnian Croats and 23,846 Bosnian Serbs. In 1999 the population was 63,973, a reduction of almost 50%. The 1999 population figures also highlighted the ethnic division of the town, with the figures given separately for Mostar West, 37,853, and Mostar East, 26,300. In Mostar

\(^{13}\) Population figures obtained from UNHCR office in Mostar, July 2002
West the majority of the population, 31,250, was Croat and in Mostar East the majority, 25,000, was Bosniak\(^{14}\). Most Serbs left Mostar during the war and only a few returned.

A 1999 population survey by UNHCR further identified that in west and east Mostar there were large numbers of displaced persons, those who had to flee their home town to find refuge in an area controlled by their own ethnic group. In Mostar West, 17,670 were displaced persons, over a third of the population, and in Mostar East, 22,412, 85% of the total population. In addition, in December 1999\(^{15}\) in the Herzegovina-Neretva canton there were 2,677 school pupils who were ‘returnees’ (11% of the school population), that is pupils returning to their home after spending time living abroad. This movement of the population had consequences for education provision, as teachers and pupils often lived in poor conditions, some had undergone traumatic experiences and they faced the difficulties of trying to build new lives in Mostar.

The war brought high social costs too. The ethnic cleansing and killings affected almost every family; there were many stories of family members going missing and several young people reported having family members killed, some of these witnessed by the children. There were many reports of rapes of young women. Families lost their homes; some were forced to live in garages for years as there was nowhere else available. Almost all families suffered deprivation; there were shortages of food, fuel, water, electricity. In some cases humanitarian aid was prevented from getting through. The social breakdown of society was on a massive scale.

Letica (in Spajic-Vrkas, 2003) described other social changes. Under communism there had existed an accepted social order based on Party loyalty and participation. The political

\(^{14}\) the term Bosniak has been re-introduced, it was first used in the mid-nineteenth century and is now used in government and official literature to describe Bosnian Muslims. Some Bosniaks in Mostar like the term, others do not.

\(^{15}\) Population figures obtained from UNHCR office in Mostar, July 2002
changes led to change in this social order and the war further disturbed social groupings. As market forces began to take hold, an effect both of political change and war-time conditions, this created what Letica termed a ‘mafiocracy’, where those able to make money by whatever means were able to survive and progress whilst others became further impoverished. In Mostar a large black market became established, and continued to thrive after the war ended, causing detrimental effects to the local economy.

The war had a huge impact on the country’s economy. In addition to the costs of war, annual per capita income fell from US$ 1,900 in 1990 to about US$ 500. Industrial output fell by 95% between 1990 and 1994, the official post-war unemployment rate was 19% but the unofficial figure was around 40% (OECD 2001), and whilst unofficial figures should be considered with caution there was evidence of high levels of unemployment in Mostar. By 2002 the official unemployment figure was being given as 40% (http://news.www.bbc.co.uk). There was damage to property and the infrastructure; factories, schools and universities had been bombed. The tourist industry was virtually destroyed.

Following the civil war and with Bosnia now an independent state, it developed its own currency, the convertible mark or KM, based on the German mark. In 2000, economic growth fell to 10% whilst GDP rose to only $1,195 per capita and its total foreign debt in 2001 was over $3 billion (Bosnia Today website 2001). In 1995 the share of GDP allocated to education was 2.1%, by 1998 this had risen to 5.2% (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports 2000). It was estimated that around 60% of the population lived in poverty (UNDP 2002). Even for those able to find work the average monthly take-home pay in 2002 was around 485 KM (£162) whilst monthly shopping cost an average of 450 marks (£150).
In the immediate post-war period many international agencies provided Bosnia with aid, financial and humanitarian. By 1998 the GDP of Bosnia had risen from its low point of US$800 to US$1,054, but donor aid represented 30% of this. The World Bank invested millions of US dollars in the reconstruction effort. Massive reconstruction was required; 50% of housing was damaged in the war along with 2,000km of roadway (25% of total), all railway lines, 50% of electricity-generating capacity and 40% of the telephone network. School buildings were in urgent need of repair and equipment, and as early as December 1995 the World Bank was discussing the financing of rebuilding and repairing schools, replacing school materials and rebuilding the teaching workforce. In 2001 the Federation government reported that 632 school buildings had been reconstructed, 208 were still in need of reconstruction and that the provision of equipment and materials in primary schools remained poor (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001).

In economic and social terms, the war was a severe set back for Bosnia (Dyker and Vejvoda 1996). Despite the massive influx of aid and seven years after the cessation of war, in 2002 it was reported that ‘signs of war are everywhere’ (Glover, 2002). Also in 2002, the World Bank stated that Bosnia needed to turn its attention to the reforms required to create a market-based economy but acknowledged that the needed reforms were ‘predicated on social development and institutional strengthening’ (World Bank 2002).

Many political changes have occurred since the end of the war. The first two post-war elections in Bosnia, in 1996 and 1998, both returned nationalist officials at state and Federation level. The nationalist politicians were unable to work together, each was concerned with protecting the rights and gains made by their own people rather than those of the new state. This had a detrimental effect on the economic development of the country which led to a collapsing economy and difficulties for international trade as
investors were required to work with ‘three separate bureaucracies run by Muslims, Croats and Serbs (Bosnia Today website, 2001).

Elections in November 2000 returned the first non-nationalist government, the 11-party Alliance for Change coalition, although it was claimed that this was a result of ‘intervention by officials of the international community’ (RFE/FL Newsline 2002). There were hopes that this government would make substantial progress with economic and political reform and the strengthening of social relations. Whilst small changes were started the government had a small majority and found it difficult to govern effectively. The coalition began to disintegrate and nationalist parties again began to be heard. Further elections in October 2002 saw a return to nationalist voting with nationalist candidates winning strongly at state, federation and canton level.

According to OSCE observers none of the post-war elections featured education as an issue. It was further suggested that those standing as nationalist candidates were satisfied with the educational arrangements and saw no need to change (personal communication, June 2002).

The civil war left an urgent need for social reconstruction work. The Dayton Agreement was intended to solve the internecine problems and help Bosnia rebuild its communities. To this end, in December 1995, 60,000 armed soldiers were stationed across Bosnia and Herzegovina, many in Mostar. Their purpose was to help maintain civilian peace, and although several analysts expressed doubt that they would succeed in this they have, so far, been successful in this. Brown (2001, p.107) wrote that Bosnia ‘consists of the two ‘Entities’ established by the Dayton peace agreements, intensely hostile to one another, with a central government neutered at birth’. Vasic (1996, p.131) goes further, stating that the Dayton Agreement was ‘more likely to lead to a definitive dismantling of Bosnian
society than to its progressive reintegration.’ Brown’s view (2001, p.152) was that the Federation of Bosnia ‘is really a marriage of incompatibles, with each side hating, distrusting, or despising the other’.

The conditions of the Dayton Agreement seemed to have contributed to social separation rather than integration because of the way in which internal boundaries were defined. Baranovic (2001, p.14) reported that there were areas in Bosnia that were ‘ethnically-cleansed of Serbs and Moslems’ and which became organised in ways ‘identical to their counterparts in Croatia: the army; the economy (with an identical currency); education (a similar school system, including the same textbooks); …’. In Republika Srpska the same can be said of the Serbs, that they have organised the Entity so that it mirrors life in Serbia. Jahn (1999) described how, since independence, Croatia’s language policy has ‘modified’ the language to remove words and sentence constructions that ‘sound Serbian’; old Croatian words have been revived and new ones developed. The language policy was initiated by politicians with a nationalist agenda and accepted by some, but not all, of Croatia’s inhabitants. In the Croatian areas of Bosnia, however, it was widely adopted as it securely identified them as Bosnian Croats. The Bosnian Muslims, too, began to revive some of their traditional language and whilst conducting this study I was mindful of which side of the river I was on and ensured that I used appropriate language for everyday words such as milk, bread, money and travel. Baranovic (2001, p.15) concluded that Bosnia’s ‘society is still deeply divided’.

The political and social events in Mostar have had a major influence on the education system. From being a multi-ethnic town Mostar became ethnically divided, with Bosnian Croats living on the west and Bosniaks on the east and very little movement in either direction. The politics of the town were also divided, with the Minister and Deputy Minister for Education in Mostar working in the same building in west Mostar but
occupying separate offices with separate staff and little communication between them. There were parallel education systems in the town with schools in west Mostar using the Croatian programme and those in east Mostar using the Bosnian programme.

**Primary Education in Bosnia 1992 - 2002**

1992 saw the start of civil war in Bosnia and this section describes the impact of this on educational provision across the country. It aims to provide the background setting for the reporting of events in Mostar, reported in the final section of this chapter, and draws mostly on evidence from government publications and reports from international organisations.

**War-time provision**

Contingency plans in the event of war had been drawn up by the Yugoslav government, of which Bosnia had been a part; as Mirsan reported:

> In the time of the communist regime, every school and every institution had a war plan – in peace time, when nobody thinks there will be a war, everybody was making plans about what we would do if a war did come. (Mirsan, retired government official)

However, these plans were in the event of Yugoslavia as a federal and united country going to war against an outside enemy, they were not plans for civil war. In addition, when the war began the Yugoslav federation had fallen apart and Bosnia had become an independent state, so when war came the plans were not put into effect.

Bosnia and Herzegovina was a newly independent state in 1992 but its education system remained as it was under the Yugoslav communist government. However, as the war progressed it became increasingly difficult for the highly centralised system to function and each of the three ethnic groups, Bosnian Muslims, Croats and Serbs, took control of
their own education system. To some extent the system remained centralised at republic
government level but, as will be shown, this also became difficult and local areas had to
take responsibility for educational provision. Amel, a pupil, reported how he had started
school in west Mostar and studied the Croatian language and school programme. When
Croats and Muslims began fighting the family was ejected from west Mostar and had to
find accommodation in the east, so he began attending a Muslim school, learning the
Bosnian language and programme.

At the start of war, in April 1992, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Physical
Culture in Bosnia published a government regulation making work compulsory for
employees in selected professions and critical industries, including teaching. The
regulation also stated that any teacher absent from work for more than 20 days without
reason or any teacher who ‘went over to the aggressor’s side’ would be fired from
employment. Many teachers continued in their employment but some left, especially those
who found themselves living and working in a community whose national status was
different from their own. Others left to work in the army, civil defence or humanitarian
organisations. Teachers of English often found better-paid employment as translators,
particularly in the later years when the international community became a strong presence
in Bosnia. Teachers in the study reported that those who remained in employment were
assigned to teach in particular schools, usually based on proximity of residence.

In May 1992 a regulation was published stating that, due to the continuing war, instruction
in all schools would cease on 15th May 1992, almost two months short of a full academic
year. Students would be credited with that year of schooling and would be issued with a
grade commensurate with their achievement to date. It further stated that examinations for
entry to the gymnasia (high school) and enrolment for the following school year would
take place when conditions made their organisation possible (Berman 2001).
In September 1992, with the war intensifying, the government announced that high school registration requirements would be announced through the media and would be based on students’ grades from the last four years of their primary schooling. This announcement also gave local school administrative units the authority to decide when the 1992-93 school year would start, where schooling would take place and the duration of the school year, according to war conditions and with respect to the safety of students and teachers.

For most schools across the country the school year of 1992-93 did not start until January 1993 and ended in May 1993, just five months later, due to the fighting becoming more intense. The school year 1993-94 began in November 1993 and continued as best as possible to the end of the year, June 1994. In addition, throughout most of the war period the school day was shortened and lesson times were reduced from 45 to 30 minutes. These data were confirmed by teachers, parents and pupils in Mostar, all of whom reported the same experiences.

It wasn’t until December 1993, eighteen months after the start of war, that the Bosnian Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Physical Culture issued guidelines to schools on responding to the war-time conditions; although these mostly served only to formalise existing practice. The guidelines were issued only to schools in Muslim-majority areas as by this time the Croats, Serbs and Muslims were working independently. Due to the confidential nature of war plans it is not known when these guidelines were prepared or by whom. The guidelines (Berman 2001) covered five areas:

1. Measures of protection and safety; stating that school premises had to be surveyed to ensure safety and to fix and adapt other premises to enable teaching.
2. Organisation of curriculum and instruction; schools continued to have responsibility to provide instruction and examinations but were allowed to amend the school term dates and holidays as the situation required, but taking account of the number of weeks teaching required.

3. The role of teachers in war conditions; teachers were responsible for teaching, the protection and safety of pupils, the evacuation of pupils if necessary, organising first aid, co-ordinating activities, e.g. cancelled classes, with parents and the local community.

4. Textbooks.

5. Evidence and documentation; schools had to keep official documents of pupils’ attendance and performance, as required by law, and to keep these documents secure and protected.

The circumstances of the war meant that schools followed the guidelines where possible but conditions were such that it was impossible for some (ibid).

Post-war provision

In September 1996 the school year started as it should on 1st September but because of population shifts, damaged buildings and poor resources the initial return to school was slow and difficult. Data show that the number of school buildings in Bosnia in 1990-91 was 2,531 compared to 1,026 in 1999-2000. Of these, only 25% were considered to be well-maintained\(^1\). From September 1997 onwards the school year began each year on 1st September and followed the pre-war calendar, as described in chapter 6.

During the war enrolment in primary schools decreased dramatically from approximately 542,000 in 1990 to about 255,000 in 1995 (The World Bank Group, 1998). This was due

\(^{16}\) figures obtained from ‘Statistical data for background purposes of OECD Review’ December 2000
to families fleeing the country and population shifts that meant pupils were no longer static populations registered at one specific school. In some cases pupils just stopped attending school because of the danger and uncertainty.

The number of teaching staff also decreased, although exact figures are not available as records were lost with the destruction of buildings. Where records do exist they are considered unreliable as the movement of the ‘front lines’, the use of informal premises for teaching and the improvised systems devised made it difficult to keep accurate records (UNICEF 1999, World Bank 2005). The number of qualified teachers who left the profession, through emigration, military action or casualty, is also unknown. In order to ensure the provision of education some cantons employed unqualified teachers during the war years.

One effect of the war was a halt on all financial transactions, due to communications failures and disruption to industry and the infrastructure. The World Bank Group (1998) found that there was no regular budget for education from 1992. In 1993, in response to the continuing breakdown of local governments the Bosnian government officially ended the public funding of education, that is monies collected through local taxation, and agreed that it would be financed from the national budget. Cantons began receiving their funding from Sarajevo, although amounts were minimal, and were able to use this to provide basic resources and contributions to teachers’ salaries.

The financial arrangements were a further division of the education systems as cantons received monies from Sarajevo, Zagreb or Belgrade according to whether they were Muslim, Croat or Serb controlled. As Croatia remained a wealthier state the Croatian-controlled cantons received higher funding than others, leading to inequalities in provision that could still be seen several years after the war (OECD 2001).
The pre-war average monthly salary for primary teachers was equivalent to approximately £250. By 1994 the average monthly salary of a primary teacher had fallen to 76DM (Bosnia had adopted the German mark as its national currency following independence and the outbreak of war), this equated to approximately £25 (OECD 2001). However, due to the severe economic crisis, teachers were often not paid at all. Asra, a primary teacher, reported that she had not been paid at all for her work during the war but that:

every week we were given five packets of cigarettes and every day half a loaf of bread (Asra, a teacher)

Immediately after the war teachers’ salaries began to rise, from the low point of 76DM to approximately 450DM (£150) per month in 2000 (OECD 2001); but this is still well below the pre-war figure of 750DM.

The end of the war was marked by the signing of the Dayton Agreement, which gave responsibility for education provision to the canton governments together with the authority to pass its own education laws. Some cantons introduced educational legislation that was a re-working of former laws. In some Croat-controlled areas they continued to follow laws laid down in 1996 by the State of Herzeg-Bosna, a ‘state’ that was claimed by Croatians in Bosnia but was never officially recognized so its educational laws were considered void. In the ethnically-mixed cantons, such as Herzegovina-Neretva in which Mostar is located, there was no new educational legislation because negotiation proved difficult and agreement could not be reached. The Education Minister in Mostar, Josipa, did report that a law had been passed but then said that this was to formalise the Croatian curriculum that had been introduced during the war ‘the plan and program used during the war was made into law’. The Minister governs schools in west Mostar, the Croatian side of the town. The Deputy Minister, Aldin, who governs east Mostar reported that no law
had been passed. These contradicting statements illustrate the impasse that existed in the ethnically-mixed cantons where ministers refused to co-operate or work together. In these cantons the legislative processes have been described as ‘paralysed since their creation’ (OECD 2001, p.13). Where new laws were not passed the regulations from 1990 were theoretically still in place but it was acknowledged that these former laws had ‘little bearing on actual practice’ (ibid, p.11).

The cantons were also given financial responsibility for education and the ability to raise funds through taxation. However, this brought further inequalities as the more wealthy cantons were able to raise taxes of 990DM (approx £330) per capita whilst others could raise only 250DM (approx £80). It has been reported that ‘Croat-majority areas consistently spend more per student than the Federation average’ (OECD 2001, p.17). In addition the age structure and school population varied from canton to canton so calls on budgets varied and in some cantons the demands were higher than in others. Most cantons were spending 30-40% of their cantonal budget on education (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001) and although this figure appears high because the cantonal budget was so small in reality it did not represent a large sum. In 1999, the Herzegovina-Neretva canton spent 28.7 million convertible marks (KM) on education, approximately £9.5 million, this was 4.13% of the GDP of the canton.

Education financing was largely supported by donations from outside Bosnia, although this was mostly provided for the reconstruction and re-equipping of buildings and was not long-term funding. Other sources of revenue for schools included donations, legacies or foundations and the selling of products or services, but there was little evidence of these activities in Bosnia. Schools were, however, raising funds through charges made to
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17 based on 1998 analysis OECD 2001
18 figures taken from Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001
parents, for example for books and the repair and maintenance of buildings and this was corroborated by the evidence from parents in east and west Mostar.

Across Bosnia, cantons made little change to the structure and organisation of the primary education system, pupils continued to start school at age six or seven and remained in compulsory primary education for eight years. Primary schools continued to be managed by a School Board, as they were under the communist government. The School Board retained responsibility to approve curriculum plans and teachers’ annual work plans, to prepare financial plans and reports and to deploy staff. The School Director’s responsibility remained the day-to-day administration, submission of curriculum and work plans to the Board for approval, implementation of the financial plans of the Board and other Board decisions.

Changes were introduced, however, to the school curriculum, the ‘plan and program’ published by the government. At the end of the war there were three curricula operating in Bosnia: one emanating from Bosnia (Sarajevo) and used in cantons with a Bosniak majority, one emanating from Croatia (Zagreb) and used in Croat-majority cantons and the old Yugoslav curriculum (from Belgrade) in Republika Srpska. This was confirmed by all those interviewed in Mostar including government Ministers, University staff, teachers and pupils.

The appearance of these curricula differed little from their pre-war predecessor (Kolouh-Westin 2004). Pupils in primary grades I-IV had 16-19 lessons per week and were taught by the same class teacher. In the higher grades, the number of lessons rose to 22-26 per week, with subjects taught by specialist teachers. There also appeared to be little change in the requirement for teachers to teach only the government issued programmes; McCreight
(2002, p.100) quotes a Sarajevan teacher who said that she ‘had to adhere to the schedule given to her’.

Although the programmes looked the same, and pedagogy appeared to be unchanged, there were changes in the content of the curriculum. As early as 1990 differences had begun to appear in the content of some subjects, particularly those identified as ‘nationalist subjects’: language, literature, history and geography. The common language, previously known as Serbo-Croat, was replaced by the three ethnic languages: Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian. In Croatia, the government revived the Croatian grammar text that had been quashed by Tito in 1971 and re-issued this to all schools in Croatia (Magas 1998), this included Croat-majority schools in Bosnia. There was little difference between these three languages, although each group had introduced linguistic differences they remained sufficiently similar to allow for common understanding. The script, however, is different: Bosnian and Croatian both use Latin script whilst Serbian uses Cyrillic. Croatian schools, including those within the Federation, used the Latin script; Serbians used mainly the Cyrillic script whilst most Bosnian pupils continued to learn both.

The changes in curriculum content led to changes in the textbooks used in schools. Donia described how textbooks were produced by each of the ethnic groups to reflect ‘an understanding of the world from their respective national viewpoints’ (2000, p.42). This, he claimed, simply replaced the communist indoctrination of pupils with nationalist indoctrination. In the Croat-controlled and Serb-controlled areas within Bosnia, schools began using textbooks brought in from Croatia and Serbia, giving pupils a wholly partisan view. Donia (ibid, p.43) also reported how the textbooks perpetuated the war, books teaching grammar contained sentences such as: ‘He was separated from his family’ and ‘We were banished from our home’. 
Baranovic (2001) reported changes made to history texts in Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian textbooks. His study found that Croatian-majority cantons in Bosnia used Croatian textbooks, those in Bosniak-majority cantons used Bosnian ones and those in Republika Srpska used Serbian texts. He reported that all the texts covered the main historical periods but differed in their approach to, and selection of, historical events, particularly with reference to national history. All the textbooks devoted a significant amount of space to the national history of their own people, 57% in Croatian textbooks, 40% in Bosnian ones. This meant that pupils living in Croat-majority areas used Croatian textbooks and were learning the history of Croatia but not that of Bosnia. Baranovic (ibid) also found that the books differed in their approach to each nation’s history, for example Croatian history books discussed Bosnian history as part of Croatian national history; they also separated Croatian history from that of Yugoslavia. Serbian books, in contrast, integrated Serbian history into that of Yugoslavia. Little reference was made in any of the textbooks to the history of the other nations, despite the fact that all pupils were studying in the same country. Further, the textbooks did not emphasise the similarities of Bosnians, Croatians and Serbs, only 4%, 3% and 11% respectively. More attention was given in the texts to ethnic conflict between the groups; this was apparent in textbooks from all three groups.

Baranovic concluded that the nation state, ‘i.e. an ethnically based state with one ethnically homogeneous nationality that constitutes the core of the nation state’ (ibid, p.24) was the central focus of the history books of each group, and that this was more ‘disintegrative than integrative’ in post-war social reconstruction in Bosnia. A similar study by Ledic (2002) found that nationalist values pervaded the Croatian textbooks used in most subjects in the primary curriculum. These textbooks were used by pupils in west Mostar as the schools followed the Croatian curriculum, so those pupils were living in Bosnia and experiencing a Croatian curriculum with its Croatian nationalist values.
In 1997, a review of educational provision in Bosnia (UNESCO 1999) revealed that the Federation government was aware that changes needed to be made to the education provision. In an attempt to revitalise the ‘modernisation’ reforms that had been discussed after the fall of communism and prior to the outbreak of war the Federation government, with the agreement of all the canton Ministers of education, appointed a team to write a new Bosnian programme for primary schools. Their remit was to modernise the programme, ensuring it did not have too many ‘facts’ and bringing it more into line with those in the European Union; they were to draw on existing programmes in Bosnia and Croatia and those submitted by the Federation cantons. The team consisted of educationalists from the pedagoska zavod and school zavod (advisory teams for pedagogy and schools), the philosophy faculty of Sarajevo University and the Pedagoska Akademija in Sarajevo (Pedagogy Academy, the university faculty for primary teachers).

The new programme they produced (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 1998) contained some points of principle: that primary education should provide the same opportunities for all, irrespective of national identity, and should teach respect, tolerance and creativity. It suggested that optional subjects be offered in addition to the curriculum, for example in foreign languages or computers, but the pupil would need family agreement in order to be able to study these optional subjects. It suggested that teachers would need ‘maximum creativity’ (ibid, p.22) and should be supported by modern technologies such as video, computers and multi-media systems of learning. It also suggested that they needed to employ more pupil-centred methods of teaching. At its core, however, it continued the tradition of identifying the subjects to be studied, providing detailed content for each subject and specifying the number of hours to be spent on each subject at each grade of schooling. In appearance this programme looked much the same as those issued by the communist, pre-war, government with its prescription of content and
hours of study. There were changes in the content of the national subjects but others, such as mathematics, science subjects, showed little change.

The new programme was distributed to all cantons in the Federation for consultation. Some cantons responded, those with a Croat-majority did not, and the revised curriculum was launched for the start of the school year 1999-2000. It was implemented in approximately 60% of primary schools (OECD 2001), but only in those cantons with a Bosniak majority and in east Mostar. Cantons with a Croat majority, and the schools in west Mostar, continued to use the curriculum programme from Zagreb.

The Federal government itself criticised the new programme for being overloaded with content and acknowledged that it was ‘abundant with facts and old-fashioned and overwhelming traditional methods’ (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001, p.24). The regular learning for all Bosnian pupils remained a diet of Bosnian language and literature, a foreign language, mathematics, nature and society in early grades, replaced by biology, history, geography, physics and chemistry in later grades, plus art, music and physical education. The overloading of content was identified as a particular issue for lower primary pupils where, it was claimed, ‘some of the mathematics, for example, is so demanding that it poses difficulties to teachers as well [as pupils]’ (OECD 2001, p.21). The new programme was also criticised for making little reference to pedagogy, particularly for primary schools where there was no reference to the concept of integrated learning and the focus remained on the teacher-centred exposition of knowledge, despite its declared principles. The document did state (p. 341) that schools needed to have ‘creative thinking’ and organisation in order to realise the programme, to encourage pupils’ thinking and to take account of their needs and interests. It also stated that teaching methods should be pupil-centred. The statements, however, did not appear to have been heeded as the new subject content was introduced but not the changes to teaching methods.
Religious education had begun to reappear on schools’ curricula in 1990-91 and the new programme confirmed its place on the curriculum, although pupils and their parents were able to choose whether or not to study religion. Schools offered the religious education of their ethnic group, in Bosniak-majority cantons and east Mostar this meant Islam and in Croat-majority cantons and west Mostar, Catholicism. The lessons were conducted by hodjas (Muslim clerics) and priests. Pupils in Mostar, where there were few pupils who did not follow the ‘majority’ faith in schools, reported that those who elected not to study religion left the classroom during the period of study, but usually no other provision was made for them so they ‘hung around’ waiting for the lesson to end and to rejoin the class. In some classes the pupils did remain in the room but continued with other work whilst the religious lesson took place (Amel, a pupil). There was no evidence of the Orthodox faith in schools in the Federation as few Serbs remained, most having moved to Republika Srpska.

Policy development and the role of the international organisations

In 1998, concerned with the continued separation of schooling across the country, the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia convened an Education Working Group to examine the school system in Sarajevo and propose ways to make it more accessible to minority ethnic returnees\(^\text{19}\). A sub-group was convened to examine school textbooks and ensure that those thought to contribute to ethnic hatred and intolerance be edited or withdrawn. One recommendation of the group was that no school textbook should make reference to the recent civil war as time was needed to give an ‘objective and fair interpretation’ (Donia 2000, p.47). Further recommendations were made that specific passages and sections of books, considered to be offensive to one or more ethnic group, be deleted or removed. The recommendations of the sub-group were not well-received by the

\(^{19}\) Returnees are those displaced persons and refugees returning back to their original place of residence.
Bosniak public, who saw them as a one-sided attack as no similar exercise was undertaken with Croatian or Serbian textbooks. The outcry was so strong that the report was not implemented. However, a year later the Ministers of Education of the Federation and Republika Srpska agreed to review textbooks and remove or ‘clearly mark’ any offensive language (ibid, p.53), although this political agreement was constrained by the Ministers’ ability to enforce it in the cantons.

The year 2000 saw the beginning of a range of political activity at the national level in relation to education. This was partly instigated by international community agencies such as UNHCR and UNDP working in Bosnia, as education became part of the human and civil rights agenda for ‘returnees’. Part of the remit of international organisations is to ‘promote social harmony’ and ‘national development’ (www.unesco.org) through the education process. They were particularly concerned therefore that schools in Bosnia were using only one of the country’s three languages as its official language. This was seen as presenting a barrier to returnees, for example a school recognising only the Bosnian language would be unacceptable to Croatian families wanting to return to the area. This was seen as a real problem by the families despite the fact that Bosnians and Croatians could easily understand each other’s language. A representative from UNHCR reported that some schools did provide separate classes for children from different ethnic backgrounds but others simply refused to accommodate them. In one school just outside Mostar the Director refused to accept returnee children from a different ethnic background, to be educated separately but in the same building, claiming that there was not enough space in the school; on investigation this proved to be untrue (personal communication, June 2002).

In February 2000 the international organizations in Bosnia held a symposium to discuss the ‘national group of subjects’, language, literature, history and geography. Their focus,
however, was on the fact that the reintegration of returnees was being made more difficult because of the educational provision in these subjects, not because of the educational impact of the subjects. Their difficulty in resolving the problem led to a call for the reform of the two parallel systems operating across the Federation.

In May 2000, in the first move towards reforming the parallel systems, the Federal Minister of Education and the Minister of Education from Republika Srpska signed an agreement on the co-ordination of their parallel education systems. This was intended to standardise the curriculum and included a statement that all students in Bosnia would study Cyrillic and Latin alphabets. This went some way to addressing the problem but left unresolved the bigger problem of the Bosnian and Croatian parallel systems in the Federation.

The agreement with Republika Srpska initiated the 70%-30% curriculum, where 70% of the curriculum would be ‘core’, compulsory and ethnically neutral, with the remaining 30% open for different cantons or municipalities to adapt to their own local needs. The 70/30 innovation proved problematic, and has been said to be ‘artificial and poorly implemented in practice’ (OECD 2001, p.22). This was supported by respondents in this study; when asked about extra-curricular work Esma, a teacher, talked about top-up classes held in the summer for pupils who failed their examinations. When prompted to discuss classes that were offered in addition to the government programme of lessons she said that these did not happen; pupils were allowed to stay at the school and play games after school but they were not supervised by teachers. The reason she offered for lack of teacher supervision of any ‘extra-curricular work’ was that teachers were paid only to work 25 sessions per week, each session lasting 45 minutes.
Bosniak Ministers in the Federation government were working towards the implementation of a common curriculum as they regarded this as essential to the progress of the country, but Croatians in Bosnia wanted to maintain separation. They regarded separation, evidenced through their use of the Croatian education programme, as a way of preserving their language and culture (personal communication, Deputy Education Minister of Mostar 2002). The Minister of Education in west Mostar, Josipa, justified the use of the Croatian language and programme in schools there because there were more Croats in the canton. In addition, many Croatian parents in the study appeared to prefer separate schools and wanted their children to be taught exclusively in their own language.

In September 2001 the OECD published its review of education policies in Bosnia (OECD 2001). This identified clearly the:

- lack of co-operation between the Federal Ministry and the canton Ministries of Education;
- problems caused by the existence of twelve separate legislatures and administrative units;
- problems that arose from the lack of policy leadership;
- need for modern management training;
- lack of participation in educational issues by teachers, parents, pupils and communities;
- lack of an accurate management information system.

The review criticised the technical and narrow view of curriculum promulgated by the school programmes. It stated that both teachers and curriculum experts understood curriculum to refer to ‘study programs’ of subject lists with allocated time allowances. It also found that there still existed a belief that the curriculum should be mandated by higher authorities, with teachers having no input or responsibility. This belief was supported by
the fact that curriculum development was still centralised and the 30% open part of the curriculum was not being used by teachers to develop their own curriculum initiatives; no teacher in this study reported developing any teaching outside of that prescribed by the government programme. The review found that ‘decentralisation has not led to greater empowerment of schools and teachers’ (OECD 2001, p.11, italics in original).

Assessment was described in the report as emphasising teaching rather than learning, with the programme describing ‘what teachers must and should do in classrooms, rather than illustrating and articulating what pupils should know and be able to do after teaching and learning have taken place’ (OECD 2001, p.25). Further, they found that this emphasis led to the understanding among pupils and parents that successful schools were those that completed the whole of the pre-determined curriculum and good schools were those that taught more content than others. This view of good education was also expressed by the parents in this study.

The OECD review also claimed that there was ‘unawareness of the need to change … no motivation to design or implement educational innovation’ and that ‘[R]emnants of past bureaucratic attitudes still block innovation’ (ibid, p.15). The report noted that there was an aim to reach ‘European standards’ in education but the reviewers felt that there was little understanding of what the standards were and how they might be represented in the educational process.

Although the OECD claimed that there was an unawareness of the need to change, in the same month that it published its review the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport published the *Basis for the Educational Policy and Strategic Development of Education in Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001). This document was drawn up by the Federal
Education Ministry in conjunction with the cantonal Ministries of Education (who were co-operating at that time with the Federal Ministry as a result of the election, in 2000, of the non-nationalist government, Alliance for Change) and representatives from the international community. The document addressed many of the concerns and issues highlighted in the OECD review.

The aim of the document was to initiate the discussion of educational policy in Bosnia, particularly in respect of the basic goals of education, strategies of education development, development projects and the implementation of programmes of changes. The document recognised that there were many weaknesses in the education system, describing these as:

- the centralization of education at canton level;
- old-fashioned teaching and the non-topicality of some teaching materials;
- the memorising of facts and knowledge;
- the strict division of subject areas, with no interdisciplinary learning;
- teaching as a collective act with no regard for individual pupils.

It also acknowledged the obstacles to change, citing these as the severe material and financial situation in the country, the political tensions that were reflected in the education system and the resistance to changing old habits and customs. All of these obstacles were apparent in Mostar.

The Federation government proposed replacing outdated education legislation with a new general law on education, which would co-ordinate the whole education system. It was suggested that the legal framework should include the:

- clearly defined rights, obligations and responsibilities of all decision making levels;
• basis for legitimate actions of all education personnel;
• arranged system of coordinated management of education and strengthening of administrative functions and capacities at all decision-making levels;
• generally accepted principles on educational policy and strategic development of education, with respect to the right on diversity and specific needs of canton and the school;
• systematically solved issue of the education financing at all levels, with respect to the education decentralization;
• identification of the education system and its compatibility with European and world education trends and capability of the system to comply with requests of modern democratic society and demands of the labor market;
• education for all, respecting the human rights: individual, ethnic, religious etc.;
• standards and instruments of quality education control;
• registration of children in primary schools and length of education at all levels;
• flexible and open curriculum;
• transparency of certificates and diplomas, vertical and horizontal passability;
• standards of professional development educators;
• shared responsibility of educators and parents/trustees as guarantee of successful education, life and health of young people;
• protection of rights of children that have left the school or do not have parents that would ensure them to attend classes and acquire the education level in accordance with their potentials.

(from Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001)

The Federal government document also acknowledged that ‘[T]here is no systematic collecting of data in education’ (ibid, p.22) and proposed the establishment of an Information System in Education (EMIS) and a Unit for Educational Statistics within the
Federal Ministry. Data could then be collected to inform decision-making. It proposed the establishment of ‘documentation centres’ where information on educational projects could be lodged and made accessible to all interested parties.

However, the Federal government lacked the political authority to implement any of these proposals as the legislative powers for education lay with the canton Ministries. The education Ministers in Mostar both indicated that it was unlikely that the Federation proposals would be implemented in the Herzegovina-Neretva canton. Representatives of the international organisations who were interviewed also acknowledged that introducing the proposals in the canton would be problematic.

The proposals were wide-ranging and complex and were intended to design changes ‘directed towards its [education’s] democratisation, modernization and compatibility with standards accepted in European countries and other parts of the world’ (ibid, p.5). The changes proposed for education were intended ‘to catalyse social cohesion, economic growth and development of the country’ (ibid, p.6). Changes were proposed to all aspects of education:

- **Education system** – the definition of minimum standards and norms for the infrastructure (buildings, facilities, personnel), rationalization of the system throughout the state at canton and municipality level, adaptation of the system for children with special needs, including talented children, and for returning adult learners.

- **Education management and financing** – the need for decentralization at canton level in order to strengthen management and autonomy within schools, improved management and administration at school level through education management training, democratic management and team work in schools, the need to address the motivation and
satisfaction of staff and the need to address the needs of users: pupils, parents and the local community. The need for greater equality in the financing of education, the widening of financial resourcing, better management of funds and more delegation of financial administration to schools.

- Curriculum and assessment – curriculum development related to the achievement of learning goals instead of simply defining content to be covered, awareness of the need to adjust the curriculum to meet the needs of individual pupils, modernizing the content and structure of the curriculum, in primary schools promoting the integrated learning approach, assessment of problem-solving skills and the application of acquired knowledge. The assessment procedures proposed would be assisted by the formation of the Standards and Assessment Agency (SAA), established as part of the World Bank Education Project 2000. The Agency to be staffed by specialists and to define performance standards, carry out state-level assessments, collect, analyse and publish assessment data and provide training in assessment.

- Teaching methods – the development of a ‘pedagogical culture’ that is pupil-centred and focussed on the learning process, the introduction of active teaching and learning strategies, the creation of a stimulating learning environment, the use of group and team work and democratic communication procedures.

- Teacher training – the need for the restructuring of initial teacher education and for the professional development of teaching staff to meet the new ‘educational vision’ described in the document, the introduction of post-graduate studies in education, the development of a system for accrediting pre-service and in-service training providers. It called for the status of teachers to be redefined through improved financial awards and professional promotion and for an opening up of the market for education trainers.
The document also proposed that the supply of textbooks be opened up to the market and stated that:

All the curriculum and textbooks have to contribute to establishment (sic) of tolerance, equality, and to promote human rights and peace through ethnic, cultural and religious differences in Bosnia and Herzegovina.  
(Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001, p.19)

It acknowledged that for the proposed changes to be implemented the co-operation and partnership of all those involved would be necessary, including educational authorities at all levels, educational institutions, teachers and the local community (pupils and their parents). There was a further statement that teachers, students, parents and employers should ‘…understand the changes in education as process of great benefit to them (sic)’ (ibid, p.7). This statement implies that they thought the proposals may have met with some resistance.

The document argued that decentralization of the education system was closely connected with liberalization and would offer opportunities for local participation in the development of curriculum, textbooks and teaching materials, financing and management of the school and teacher training. It asserted, however, that some functions should be centralized, viz: final graduation examinations, the development and monitoring of national education standards, the accreditation of teacher training programmes and the definition of state and federal interests in education.

Closely following the publication of this document, in June 2001 there was a second agreement between the Federation and Republika Srpska. From this came a statement on the ‘elaboration and implementation’ of a ‘Shared Strategy for the Modernisation of Primary and General Secondary Education in BiH’. The aim of the strategy was to raise
educational standards in Bosnia to the level of those in Europe. Five areas were highlighted for the modernization process: educational management, the curriculum, teacher training, inclusive education for children with special needs and the legal framework supporting the school system.

Working groups, funded by a European Union project, were established to look in detail at each of the areas identified. Working group members were from all three ethnic backgrounds and included representatives from Ministries of Education, Pedagogical Institutes, university staff, Directors of schools and parents. The first report from the project was published in June 2002, *Shared Modernisation Strategy for Primary and General Secondary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina First Report to the Ministers of Education in BiH* (Roeders and Stabback 2002) and contained initial recommendations. In the introductory letter to the report it clearly states ‘the SMS [Shared Modernisation Strategy] is a non-political process, focussing on the improvement of the quality of education in BiH’ (ibid). A representative of the international organisations reported that this comment was considered important to make given the politicised environment and the role of nationalist politics in hindering educational change thus far (personal communication June 2002).

A major recommendation in the report was to extend primary schooling from eight years to nine. The nine years would then be divided into three ‘phases’ based on the stages of children’s development. These phases were identified as:

- Grades 1-3 – early childhood, with education based on play and experimentation;
- Grades 4-6 – middle childhood, where education can introduce children to the wider environment, including other times, places and cultures;
Grades 7-9 – early adolescence, where education assists young people to understand
themselves and their own contexts at a deeper level, and where active participation and
questioning should be encouraged.

They also proposed that the curriculum should be designed around the desired learning
outcomes for pupils, so that content is then formulated and organised in such a way to
allow pupils to attain the desired outcomes. The report also stated that pupils needed to
learn not only knowledge but also a range of skills, values and attitudes to enable them to
become good citizens and employees.

The curriculum framework proposed ‘learning areas’, which ranged from high integration
in the early primary years to more subject based learning in the later years, and
recommended a core curriculum for all grades plus ‘electives’ in the third phase, grades 7-
9. This was to encourage decision making and ownership by schools and teachers,
although the report specified that each pupil should study three elective subjects and that
there should be two groups of subjects from which to choose. It further defined that these
two groups should be social-humanities subjects and natural sciences-mathematical. They
acknowledged the difficult position in respect of the status of religious education in
schools and suggested that the issue be put forward for further public discussion.

There was a further proposal that schools offer an ‘extended curriculum’, which would not
be compulsory, therefore would not be financed by the state. The extended curriculum
would consist of extra-curricular activities such as arts, sports and technical subjects to
allow pupils to pursue individual interests, courses that extended subjects in the core
curriculum, again to allow pupils to pursue individual interests and additional support for
pupils with special needs. There were additional recommendations for pupils with special
needs, including talented and gifted children and returnees. These included proposals for
the specific training of teachers and other educational personnel in the area of inclusive education.

It was further prescribed that each school ‘hour’ should consist of 45 minutes, the length of each lesson. The framework stated the number of ‘hours’ to be spent on each learning area/subject at each grade of primary school, these ranged from 16 per week in grade 1 to 30 per week in grade IX. The report also contained proposals for the length of the school year and the teaching week. These proposals were not dissimilar from the description of the curriculum during the communist era.

Finally, the report recommended that at the end of grade IX there should be external assessment. Teacher assessment was to remain for grades I – VIII.

The report also made recommendations for teacher training. It suggested that at the end of their training students should be able to demonstrate:

- professionalism and commitment to the teaching profession;
- knowledge of subject content;
- knowledge of ‘methodics’ and ICT, and their application;
- the ability to evaluate learning;
- the capacity to develop plans and programs;
- an understanding of the emotional, intellectual and physical needs of children, and their ability to reach their learning potential.

These were different from the traditional teacher training programmes and they recommended that teacher training be extended to four year courses for all, and should include a greater element of practice. Recommendations were also made for the
development of in-service teacher training and for the training of educational management personnel in schools, for example school Directors.

Further recommendations were made in relation to the establishment of student councils, parents’ councils and regulations governing the school board. Finally, the report recommended that the principles and proposals adopted be enshrined in a framework law.

Overall, the proposals in the report acknowledged the need for schools and teachers to be given autonomy, to become ‘depoliticised’ and be freed ‘from the influence of negative traditions, ideologies, opinions and beliefs’ (Roeders and Stabback 2002, p.48).

It was suggested that some of the recommendations of the report be implemented at selected ‘pioneer schools’ with effect from September 2002, in order that they could be evaluated and lead to the further improvement and development of the Strategy. However, this did not happen. The documents were not made public and remained at Green Paper stage (A Green Paper is a set of policy recommendations presented for consultation to key constituencies at a stage when amendments can be made). The elections of October 2002 returned nationalist governments at all levels, which stalled any changes being implemented as the nationalist politicians were not prepared to institute changes which threatened their existing nationalist programmes.

As a result of the slow progress being made, in 2002 the High Representative in Bosnia asked OSCE to co-ordinate and bring cohesion to international efforts at educational reform in Bosnia. In response, OSCE created an Education Department with a priority to ‘develop a framework strategy for education’. It began by monitoring access to education, equity of provision and the quality of educational provision (OSCE 2002a). OSCE also constituted the Education Group of International Organizations to work with international
and local participants to modernize the education system and speed up reform. The Group included representatives of OSCE, OHR, UNESCO, UNICEF, the European Commission, The Council of Europe, UNHCR and EC-TAER (OSCE 2002b).

This group produced *A Framework Law on Principles for Primary and Secondary Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, which was a draft proposal to be put out to consultation. The document recommended basic principles for primary education which would meet European standards and stated that the agreed principles must be universally applied throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. The principles covered:

- the rights of children to an appropriate education;
- the rights of parents and teachers;
- the duties of parents, schools and relevant public authorities;
- the local administration of the education system;
- the governance of schools;
- the assurance of harmonized curricula and high standards in education comparable to European norms;
- all related matters.

It also stated that the purposes of education are:

(a) to provide a person, through access throughout his or her life to education services, with the means through which he or she can develop his or her potential, intellectual, physical, moral and social to the greatest extent practicable;

(b) to contribute to the creation of a society where all people respect one another and where the rule of law, laid down in accordance with the principles of human rights, is respected and observed;
(c) to contribute to economic growth and prosperity and the creation of a society which

   can provide the best achievable living standards and a fulfilling life for all its members.

The document stated that equal respect should be given to all three languages and the right
of pupils to use any of them in school. It stated that schools should teach ‘the scripts in
common usage’ in Bosnia, referring to Latin and Cyrillic. It also noted that religious
freedom, tolerance and dialogue should be valued and that schools should not display
images of any particular religion. It recommended a common curriculum be determined,
to be followed by all schools in Bosnia, addressing directly the issue of the Bosnian-
Croatian divide within the Federation which is clearly illustrated by the parallel
educational systems in Mostar.

The legal framework suggested by the report needed the agreement of the Federal Ministry
and each of the canton Ministers of Education. As this required the canton Ministries to
give up or delegate some of their responsibilities to the state, agreement proved difficult
and the framework was not implemented.

In October 2002 elections were held for all levels of government and all returned
nationalist politicians, meaning that the proposed inter-ethnic agreements were halted. As
a result the discussions, papers and proposals for the reform of the education system were
not made public or put forward for consultation and no further progress was made.

At the end of 2002 the ethnic division of schooling was still apparent. Across Bosnia there
were 52 ‘dual schools’, that is schools operating within one building but with separate
Bosniak and Croatian curricula, staff and pupils. Each group occupied different parts of
the building or used the building at different times, and the two organisations had no
contact despite their proximity (OHR/OSCE 2003). In Mostar the parallel system continued.

Whilst the mono-ethnic nature of schooling was acceptable there appeared to be a growing dissatisfaction with the traditional approach to education. A UNDP survey found that many young Bosniaks wanted to leave the country, citing an outdated education system as one of their reasons (http://uk.new.yahoo.com, accessed 11.11.02).

**Education in Mostar 1992 - 2002**

Throughout this period the political and educational events at national level had an impact on provision in Mostar. The data in this section was drawn mainly from interviews with a range of respondents.

**War-time provision**

All the participants in this study reported that educational provision on both sides of Mostar was severely curtailed by the war. School buildings were seriously damaged; the World Bank Group (1998) estimated that over 50% were either damaged, destroyed, taken over by the army or used to house displaced persons. As school buildings became unavailable for use alternative accommodation was found, usually in individual’s homes, basements, shelters, garages or abandoned offices. Asra reported that whilst teaching in Mostar during the war:

> There was not one school, schools were in bunkers and basements around the city and the teachers moved around from place to place to teach in them. I taught in six different bunkers and basements (Asra, a teacher)

Pupils reported that they had attended school at a hotel in the town (Milica) and at someone’s house (Anida and Alisa). Alisa’s class, with seven pupils, had been taught in the bathroom whilst other classes used other rooms.
The Bosnian government attempted to continue its organization and management of schools in Muslim-majority areas, including east Mostar. Mirsan, a government official during the war, reported that

If we organized education in the schools – those that existed before the war – we were afraid that a pupil or teacher would die in the school or going to or from school. We needed to make sure this did not happen. We decided to disperse the schools, so that children would only spend a short time getting to and from school. For example, all the children from this street would go to one place, maybe ten children, or we would put older and younger children together. In some ‘schools’ all the grade I and all the grade IV children were together, in other ‘schools’ the classes were children from different grades. That was one way. Another way, in the parts [of the town] where there was war every day and in the part [of the town] where there was visual contact with the enemy, the West is higher than the East and can see what we are doing, in that part we organized that teachers would go in the night to teach, and they would give homework for the children for the next time. (Mirsan, government official)

Asra, a teacher who worked under this system confirmed this:

Before these [war] schools started there was a meeting of the teachers and the Ministry representative, he gave us the plan for teaching in the school and a schedule saying which places to go to each night. There were meetings every week on Sundays. (Asra, a teacher)

From these meetings teachers passed on information as to where the schools would be held and this went around the community to parents and pupils.

Selena, a pupil, told me that her school was closed from the first day of the war because it was hit by shells, she then spent some time at home before starting to attend school in the house of someone who lived nearby. When asked how she knew where to go, and when, she said:

There were people living in each section of the city who passed on any news, they told us that the school would be starting in this house for children in this part of the city (Selena, a pupil)
Anida, confirmed that they received information from neighbours:

The people from the school, the teachers who lived close by, they told us where the school was (Anida, a pupil)

Teaching staff were affected both professionally and personally. Aldin, a government education official, said that when the war started, teachers who ‘belonged to the other side’, that is to an ethnic group different from the majority, had to leave the area. This made it more difficult to find qualified staff to teach in the makeshift schools. The government in east Mostar organised the premises for teaching but it was the responsibility of the school Director in each local area to organize the teaching and find the staff to teach (Vahid, a former school Director).

Asra, who had trained as a teacher many years before the war but had worked in a bank for higher pay, told how she returned to teaching in response to the need:

the local government were looking for teachers – they put up notices in the places where we collected our food – so I responded to that (Asra, a teacher)

In east Mostar, the Muslim side, the severe damage to school buildings and disruption to the school year led to pupils receiving end of year grades after just a few months. Amel reported receiving certificates for two grades (two years of schooling) at the end of one year, and Alen, a pupil, said that he had received an end of year certificate after being in school for ‘about three months’.

In west Mostar, the Croat-controlled side, there was less physical damage, many school buildings remained intact and schooling continued to some extent. Pupils on the west, however, also reported spending limited time at school. Vida, a pupil, reported that in 1993 she:
… finished the third grade [third year of school] in less than a month, which was the only possible thing to do since all the time we had to stop the classes because of the constant shelling. (Vida, a pupil)

Teachers and parents confirmed this practice:

They were still given their end of year reports, at the end of 1993 school year they were given two reports, one for 1992 and one for 1993 (Nina, a parent)

In that one year they completed two grades [two years of schooling] (Zerina, a teacher)

Not only was the school year curtailed, when pupils were able to attend schooling the lessons were reduced from 45 to 30 minutes each, causing a further reduction in learning.

As early as 1991 the increasing nationalism and the stirrings of independence in Croatia had led two primary schools in west Mostar, where the majority of Croats lived, to begin to openly teach the Croatian ‘plan and program’ issued by Zagreb. Those on the east, with a Muslim majority population, continued to follow the programme issued by the Republic of Bosnia government in Sarajevo, which was the one that had formerly been approved by the Yugoslav central government in Belgrade.

The content of the Croatian and Bosnian/Yugoslavian programmes were similar, the two programmes had been issued by neighbouring republics following central government guidelines. Changes had been made in the Croatian programme, however, to reflect individual nationalist perspectives, particularly in language, literature, history and geography.

When the war began in 1992, all the primary schools in west Mostar adopted the Croatian programme whilst those in east Mostar continued to use the pre-war Bosnian/Yugoslavian programme. Aldin, a government official believed that:
War was seen as an opportunity by some to bring about the separation of education into ethnic groups – as this was what they wanted anyway (Aldin, a government official)

As the government offices were located in west Mostar schools in the east initially had difficulty in obtaining copies of the school programme as Mirsan, an education official during the war, recalled:

The education offices were in the west side and when the war came our computers and papers were all in the office in the west, so we had no programme, no papers. And we could not get anywhere, to Jablinica [a small town 46km from Mostar] or to Sarajevo [the capital of Bosnia, 112 km away, these were both Muslim strongholds]. I was then given one copy of a diskette of the programme and I was so happy, we made copies of the diskette. (Mirsan, former government official)

In 1994, the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina issued a Bosnian school ‘plan and program’ (curriculum) to replace the pre-war Yugoslav version. The changes reflected the new nationalist perspective; language in the new programme was Bosnian and names of people and cities had been changed to those that were considered Bosnian rather than Yugoslavian. The Bosnian ‘plan and program’ was adopted by schools in Bosnian-Muslim majority population areas.

On both west and east Mostar the shortened school year and reduction in lesson times meant that the ‘plan and program’ could not be covered in its entirety. Teachers reported that they taught only ‘the main things’ from the programme for each subject. Teachers made the decisions themselves as to what was considered ‘the main things’ as no guidelines on this were issued.

Teaching took place under difficult conditions; teachers were given candles so that they could prepare lessons, classrooms were basement rooms, bathrooms, boarded-up offices or any other available space and resources were limited. One pupil, Amel, reported that:
the school wasn’t like it used to be … we were at school sometimes without electricity and sometimes there were shells and we had to go under tables. When there was fighting we were sent home. (Amel, a pupil)

Attendance at school was erratic, for both pupils and teachers. Harija, a pupil, reported that she sometimes walked to school, a distance of several miles, only to find that there was no schooling because no teacher had turned up. Class sizes varied from three to 35, with pupils attending only when they considered it safe. Zerina, a teacher, reported that although they were afraid many pupils said they preferred to be in school rather than in the home, she felt that this was because it gave them something to do and was a link to normal life.

Classes were sometimes held by candlelight as there was no electricity, there was often no heating and some rooms did not have windows. Resources were scarce, there were few books available and often no blackboard, chalk or desks.

Despite these constraining conditions the teachers reported that they continued the familiar pre-war systems as much as possible. In particular, the dnevnik rada – writing in a diary book what lessons they had taught – was highly regarded. The teachers thought it important to continue with this record of what they were doing even though the book was no longer checked by anyone and, in many cases, was irrelevant as pupils were not stable populations. But the pre-war importance of this document had impressed itself on the teachers and they continued with it.

Teachers continued to use the teacher-centred methods of teaching, although these were more difficult as books, paper and pens were often in short supply. Teaching often meant reading text from the set book for the pupils to write down. Pupils described their wartime lessons:
We did all the subjects, but not all that was written in the books – we didn’t have books at that time but the teachers did, they had one book and they told us things and we wrote them down. (Alisa, a pupil)

The pupils didn’t have books, the teacher had a book so she would read to us and we would write it. The teachers were really nice, because they knew the situation wasn’t the best and they didn’t want to give us a lot of homework (Sadina, a pupil)

I knew the teachers, they used to read out to us and we would write down whatever they told us. (Anida, a pupil)

The teacher worked at the blackboard, writing, and we would copy in to our notebooks and she would tell us things. (Amel, a pupil)

This semblance of normality in such traumatic conditions could be perceived as a way of maintaining pupils’ equilibrium. Berman (2001, p.5), writing about schools in Sarajevo during the war, concluded that ‘the most important value of schools during the war can’t be measured by numbers and statistics…The war schools offered an additional sense of normal life to children and adults’. An OECD Review went further, referring to teachers as ‘windows of hope for many pupils and their parents during the crisis’ (OECD 2001, p.27).

Although the conditions imposed limitations on pupils’ learning the teachers continued to use the same assessment methods, written and oral tests that they devised themselves and assessed on a five-point scale. The assessments became more informal in recognition of the difficulties. Selena, a pupil told me:

In English, we had dictation that we had to write it down and spell correctly and we would be graded on that, but it was not really a proper test … There were no tests at the end of the year, we got our report cards and then just moved up a grade (Selena, a pupil)

Asra, an primary teacher of mathematics reported that:

There were some oral tests and I only wanted to test the main things in the subject. (Asra, a teacher)
Some teachers did try to maintain the formality; Zekia, a parent confirmed that her children:

had tests, the teacher would write questions on the board and they would write the answers in their books. The grades from the tests went towards the final grade at the end of the year, when they got their end of year report (Zekia, a parent)

This was a continuation of the pre-war tradition of termly test results contributing to the annual grade achieved by pupils. As a consequence of the war-time conditions, however, there was no reporting of assessments to parents or parents’ evenings.

One pupil in the study, Vida, reported that in assessment tests conducted during the war ‘we all cheated’. Other pupils when asked whether this applied to them smiled or shrugged their shoulders, implying agreement without confirming that they had cheated. McCreight (2002) found that in post-civil war Bosnia cheating continued to be common, and accepted, practice.

It was not only schools that were affected by the war, the universities also suffered loss of buildings, resources, staff and students. Dizdar and Kemal (1996) reported that 65% of teaching staff left their university posts or were not able to continue their work as before. This had an impact on teacher training which, in turn, affected the availability and quality of teachers in the post-war period.

Prior to the civil war, there was one university in Mostar, the University of Mostar, which was located on the west side of town. Staffing at the University reflected the ethnic diversity of the town with approximately 40% of Bosnian origin, 35% Croat and 22% Serb (Dizdar and Kemal 1996).
The war caused the destruction of some university buildings and resources and many of its staff were called on to undertake ‘war duties’. At the end of 1992, when the town became ethnically divided, staff and students who were Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Serbs moved away as west Mostar became a Croatian stronghold. Teaching staff from the university described how the political and university authorities in west Mostar changed the name of the university to Croatian University of Mostar ‘Sveuciliste u Mostaru’. They adopted the authority of the Ministry of Education of the ‘Croatian Republic of Herzegovina’, declared Croatian the official language and began following the programme for teaching in Croatian schools.

The Croatian University, just like the schools, suspended teaching in May 1993 for the remainder of that academic year. Later in 1993 the Pedagogical Faculty moved its teaching to Siroki Brieg and Neum, small towns 20km and 60km respectively from Mostar, where there was little fighting. In 1994 the Faculty returned to west Mostar and continued teaching and when the war ended the Sveuciliste quickly reinstated its teaching programme. The lack of teaching staff was supplemented by visiting professors from universities in Croatia.

When the Bosnian Muslims left west Mostar a university academic recounted that there was no suitable building available for a university in east Mostar so teaching was moved to Jablanica and Konic, small towns about 40-50 km away. There were few resources, and few students and staff, so teaching was difficult and there were periods when there was no teaching at all.
In 1993 the university was able to relocate to east Mostar and adopted the name Dzemal Bijedic University. The Director of the Pedagogical Faculty of the University, Amela, described the return to Mostar:

The Faculty became like a ‘refugee’ faculty, they lost all books. The Faculty professors decided that, despite this, they would continue to keep the Faculty alive. They, first of all, tried to contact all the students who had been with the Faculty when the war started, I went to areas where humanitarian aid was distributed and put papers up to say that all students who had been at the Faculty before should contact the University and let the Faculty know where they were, that they were still alive … I left the papers there for seven days, this was on the east only. (Amela, Director of the Pedagogical Faculty of Dzemal Bijedic University, east Mostar)

When it first returned the Dzemal Bijedic University began teaching in whatever premises they could find, usually in the basements of buildings and an unoccupied hotel. They used unorthodox methods for transmitting information to prospective students, the Director explained that they:

put up papers in the east, we could not use radio to say when the classes would be, or where, in case the information was picked up and the buildings and students would be killed. (Amela, Director of the Pedagogical Faculty)

The Director of the Pedagogical Faculty then heard that the army base would be moving out of its town centre location and she saw this as an opportunity for the university to take over the vacated military buildings. In 1993 they took over a site close to the centre of east Mostar and began to establish the new university. As with schools, teaching was suspended in May 1993 for the remainder of that academic year. The academic year 1993-94 began in January 1994 and continued through to September. In September 1994 they began the academic year 1994-95 and from September 1995 returned to a regular calendar. Shortages of staff and resources meant that teaching was conducted in shift systems, as it was in schools.
The Pedagogical Faculty of Dzemal Bijedic University offered courses for primary teachers for lower and upper grades, three-year and four-year courses but not in all subjects. Students intending to become teachers of English in primary schools studied a course in English language and literature which included modules in methodology and pedagogy. Elvira, a student on the course, seemed unsure about the level and title of her course and said that:

We were told that when we graduated we could be a teacher in a high school or in a primary school … you can be whatever you want, you can be an interpreter or something like that. (Elvira, student teacher)

When asked what she had learnt about pedagogy, she replied:

I haven’t started to study that subject yet, I didn’t have any lessons during the year because the professor is a regular professor in America so she is here only in June and July, she just comes to give us exams … I study from a book by myself, I just bought the books today. The University tells us which books to buy. If I don’t understand anything in the book there is a professor at the University that I can ask but he is not the proper professor.

As Elvira had already said that she had not studied pedagogy I asked how she knew how to teach, she responded:

I use the methods my professors used to teach me, I don’t know any other methods – but maybe I’ll change now that I have studied it!

Elvira’s course was a study of English language and literature, with modules in methodology and pedagogy. She reported that she would be required to observe ten lessons then write out her own lesson and be observed teaching it, by her supervisor in school and a professor from the university. As she did not have a supervisor at the school she thought that a teacher from another school may be brought in to observe. Her practical teaching skills would be assessed on the basis of this one lesson.
Post-war provision

Since 1995 Mostar has remained a divided town operating two parallel systems, Croatian on the west and Bosnian on the east. In west Mostar there were six regular primary schools and one special school. Schools ranged in size from 475 pupils to 1,203, with class sizes varying from 14-16. Each school had a Director and two of the larger schools also had Assistant Directors. In east Mostar there were four primary schools, two larger ones with 700+ pupils and two smaller ones with 250 and 290 pupils. Class sizes ranged from 16-20. The two larger schools each had two Directors, the two smaller ones each had one.

The politics of the divided town were hindering the legislative process so that no new educational laws had been passed. The OECD (2001) acknowledged that ‘[T]here is no canton-level education legislation, as the canton legislatures are not functioning effectively’.

There was also little evidence that this situation would change; a representative of OSCE indicated that change in the education system in Mostar was unlikely because the two political parties, in west and east, were satisfied with the current structure and were not willing to accept any change that would mean integration (personal communication). This was supported by the Deputy Minister for Education in Mostar, who reported that:

Mostar canton has a special system, the Minister and Deputy must be Croat and Bosnian, they rotate each year but in reality each speaks to and for their own group. (Aldin, Deputy Education Minister)

In practice this meant that west Mostar had an education minister, whether Deputy Minister or Minister, who was responsible for schools in the west, and east Mostar similarly had a minister responsible for schools on the east. There was no joint work or communication between the Minister and Deputy Minister, who worked in the same
building but from separate offices with separate staff and little communication between them. Government conservatism was also commented on by a University academic, Ivana, who commented that, in her view, education was not seen as important and that they had ‘no vision for the future’.

As with all aspects of its educational provision, Mostar continued to operate two budgets for education, one for the west and one for the east. This led to disparity in levels of funding and in teachers’ salaries. West Mostar was more economically active and so was able to raise higher taxes than east Mostar, in addition financial support was provided by the Croatian government. The government of the west were unwilling to share this budget to support the schools and staff in east Mostar. East Mostar was economically poor, with a large black market, it raised less in taxes, leading to less funding for education and other services. This low level of funding meant that teachers’ salaries were often delayed; in June 2002 teachers had not been paid for two months.

Schools continued to teach parallel curricula, schools on the west using the programme from Croatia and those on the east using the Bosnian programme, with their differences in the nationalist subjects. Teaching methods also remained the same, an OECD review found that ‘[L]ecturing is still the most frequent method even in Primary education’ (OECD 2001, p.23). Despite the changes that they had experienced during the war the teachers had returned to their pre-war classroom practice. One teacher explained that:

There are four main ways to teach maths and the teacher can choose which one to use … these ways are in the plan (Asra, a teacher)

This comment would indicate that teachers continued to look to the government for instruction on how to conduct their teaching as well as what to teach.
School textbooks had been amended, mainly at the instigation of the international organisations, to remove antagonistic, nationalist statements. However, one teacher, Zerina, told me that teachers still used ‘old’ words and phrases. She acknowledged that ‘teachers shouldn’t use those words but nobody sees in the classroom what we are doing’.

Many parents and pupils complained about the quality of teaching, feeling that it had deteriorated since the war. Pay remained low, one teacher questionnaire response indicated that pay was at ‘survival level’. Teachers responding to the questionnaire also indicated that their perceived social status was ‘weak’ and ‘very bad’, but they felt unable to do anything about it. The view of parents in the study was that the low pay and low status of teachers had led to a fall in the standards of teaching, with teachers not seeming to care about their job or their pupils. This was supported by research (UNICEF 1999, p.7) which came to the conclusion that, across a number of countries in transition in Central Europe ‘[P]re-reform education may have had its faults, but it was often of a high technical quality and it was virtually universal … many of today’s children are receiving an education inferior to that experienced by their parents’.

Many teachers were unqualified, they had begun working during the war to satisfy the demand and had continued afterwards; in 2001 the Bosnian government estimated that approximately 17% of primary school teachers were not appropriately qualified (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001). This was supported by Elvira, a student teacher who was teaching as an unqualified teacher in a primary school whilst completing the final year of her university course. She reported:

> In the school where I teach there is not a teacher of English who is qualified, there is my friend and I, we are both students so there is no-one to help us. We have to go to another school to ask for help and advice. But before the war I wouldn’t have got a job, before the war there were no people in school without a diploma.
Similarly a teacher of English reported that:

[I started teaching] in September 1996. I began teaching before I graduated because there were not enough teachers of English, and I didn’t even study this, I studied to be a teacher of Bosnian but I spoke English and I graduated from the high school …’ (Zerina, a teacher)

Classroom observations confirmed that standards were not high and that teaching methods were teacher-centred. In the lessons observed pupils worked from the set textbook for English for their grade and the teacher wrote sentences on the board for them to complete the missing words and then copy out. A grade IV class was observed being taught the use of ‘some, any, no’ in English and were taught that the negative phrase was ‘I don’t have no …’. There was little interactive work, other than pupils responding to questions asked by the teacher and no independent work.

Assessment methods also appeared unchanged, with tests set by the teacher at regular intervals to discover how much pupils had learned. There was no national framework regulating assessment, at any level. The OECD (2001, p.24) noted that ‘There is no formal institutional structure or mechanism that can develop and implement a set of common curriculum outcomes and learning standards at the level of the State of BiH’. The World Bank Education Project, set up in 2000, included the creation of a Standards and Assessment Agency. Realising that a common curriculum across the whole Federation would be unlikely at this stage, the Agency had the aim of developing standards in relation to pupil outcomes that could be shared by all, irrespective of the curriculum followed.

One of the biggest changes in educational provision, noted by parents in both east and west Mostar, was the introduction of charges. Two parents reported that:

Parents now have to pay for school books, tuition and, at the end of the year, they have to pay for the damage that students have done to
the school, such as writing on the walls, and the child cannot get a diploma if the parents do not pay. (Jakob, a parent)

They [the parents] do not receive a bill for this, the teachers tell the students what must be paid, the students come home and tell the parents and they send the money in to school with the child. (Elvira, a parent)

As with the school system, Mostar continued to provide two parallel teacher training institutions. The Sveuciliste in west Mostar trained primary teachers from all over Bosnia who considered themselves Croatian and who would be teaching in schools following the Croatian ‘plan and program’. They recognised only Croatian as the official language of the University. The Dzemal Bijedic University prepared students to work in schools using the Bosnian ‘plan and program’, although it did claim to recognise all languages and said that a student could have their certificate written up in their own language. An EU Administrator said that until the issue of reunification of the two universities was settled the EU Administration could not give any major support to the institutions (personal communication).

The civil war in Bosnia resulted in major political and social upheaval, which had a concomitant effect on educational provision. Nationalist ideology returned strongly to the fore, creating national identities and driving the educational agenda. Religion reappeared in education, although with less influence and control than formerly. Teachers, despite experiencing a degree of autonomy during the war years, appeared to return to the role of civil servant, responding to political directives to guide their teaching. Intervention by the international community did bring an end to the war but the political structures created in the peace process may have hindered rather than facilitated change. The structures appear to have made political decision-making more difficult and, although there was evidence of some change in the education system it was not of the order experienced by other post-communist countries in the region.
As this research drew to a close it was evident that political and educational developments in Bosnia were continuing with efforts being made to bring integration to the system, allowing for social reconstruction work to begin.
Chapter 8: Guiding themes revisited: analysis

The previous four chapters have described the social and political context in Bosnia from the inception of the state education system to the recent past, and considered how each period of Bosnia’s history influenced primary educational provision and the work of teachers. A number of major themes have come into play, including the significance of religious and nationalist influences on education, the importance of the political context in the implementation of change, the impact on teachers of major educational change and the need for international organisations to consider the implications and consequences of conflict resolution agreements on education.

This chapter returns to the guiding themes identified in the literature and which informed the research and re-examines them in light of the data collected in Bosnia.

Analysis Theme 1 – in times of transition, or conflict, the structure and organisation of school systems can become an arena for control by the prevailing political and ideological forces; this is particularly true when nationalism is one of the competing forces

This theme was derived from the literature, which indicated that political ideologues seek control of education because of its importance in the formation of nationality (Green 1990, Popkewitz 1991) and common identity (Moyles and Hargreaves 1998, Taylor 1999). The data from this study, set out in Chapters 4-7, provide strong support for the theme.

The literature suggested that education operates within the political, cultural and temporal framework of the society in which it is located; conflict or transition is therefore likely to have a major impact on education, particularly as schooling is often used as an instrument
of ideological transmission by the dominant political forces. Inevitably the dominant forces are unlikely to be the only political and ideological forces present in society and, by their very nature, the dominant forces will impose themselves or mediate with other ideologized forces in society. These other, competing, forces may over time gain sufficient support to provide an alternative to the dominant forces and eventually themselves prevail.

The history of Bosnia indicates that the country experienced conflict and political transition because its geographical location, on the borders of large, powerful nations, led to annexation by one empire after another. For over one hundred years these political forces, often externally located, were in conflict with the internally located ideology of nationalism. This competition was evidenced by change within the school system as each prevailing force attempted to use education to transmit its own ideology and create Bosnia as its own nation.

The study describes how education was initially under the control of the religious communities who used it to promulgate both the faith and, because faith and nationality were inseparable, national identity. Chapter 4 reports that this led to Bosnian Croat pupils being taught that Serbian cities were Croatian and Serbian pupils’ textbooks referred to the ‘Serbian lands of Bosnia’ (Jelavich 1990, p.72). They were able to do this because the ruling Ottomans considered mosque and government to be the same thing, it is also possible that there was indifference on the part of the regime in Constantinople to Bosnia as a small and distant state.

Conflict between Turkey and Russia led to the Austro-Hungarians assuming governorship of Bosnia, bringing with them a change in the prevailing ideology. The Habsburgs were more interested in education than had been the Ottomans as they regarded it as important to state and national interests. This led to greater interventions in education by the Austro-
Hungarians including the introduction of state-controlled education, the tight control of teacher training and the imposition of rules governing teachers’ work. They also attempted to subordinate the role of the religious communities as faith schools were perceived as counter to the national interest. Chapter 4 describes their efforts to introduce the idea of ‘Bosnian nationhood’, through attempting to change the school curriculum, seeing this as necessary for the strengthening of the state. The attempt failed as the population clung to their ethnic national identities and the forces of religion and nationalism remained strong.

The conflict of World War I strengthened the nationalist identities, with Muslims fighting Serbs. Following this war the Habsburgs were forced to withdraw from Bosnia and the new prevailing ideology became that of the Serbs as the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, later Yugoslavia, was dominated by Serbian leaders and Serbian monarchy. Chapter 5 describes how attempts to reform education to eradicate the influences of the Habsburgs and foster loyalty to the Serbian monarchy introduced pupils across Bosnia, irrespective of ethnic identity, to Serbian language, its stories and folklore. The attempts failed because they were seen as an imposition of ‘Serbianism’ and the study describes how schools continued to use earlier curricula and textbooks to educate pupils into their own ethnic language, literature and history. Religious schools also continued to exist during this period, further supporting the forces of religion and nationalism.

The study reports how the Second World War became an arena for these nationalist forces in the Balkans to find physical vent, with Serbs, Croats and Muslims fighting each other. At the end of this war there was a major ideological shift as communism became the prevailing force. The communist ideology required the subordination of the population and complete control by central government, including control of education. Chapter 6 illustrates how all the features of communist education described by Weiler et. al (1996) and Cerych (1997) became apparent in Bosnia. The study describes how the post-Second
World War communist government imposed its political agenda on schooling, abolished private schools and introduced changes to the structure, management and financing of schools. Changes to the curriculum and strict control of teachers’ work allowed the government to suppress both religious and nationalist forces. The data also reveal, however, that for some communist politicians the nationalist ideology remained powerful, particularly those fervently Croatian or Serbian. These politicians both supported the communist ideology and at times challenged its dominance, arguing for nationalism within the education system. As a result of these competing forces the ideology promulgated through education swung between communism and nationalism.

The communist government did appear to be successful in using the education system to create a Yugoslav national identity that all citizens ascribed to; several of the younger respondents in the study stated that they did not consider their ethnic identity until civil war broke out. However, it could also be considered that, for some, acceptance of the Yugoslav identity was simply acquiescence; Lilly (2001) suggests that some communist citizens did only as much as they had to and refrained from forbidden activities but did not necessarily consider themselves communists. This can be attributed to the fact that the communist ideal of the Yugoslav identity was a recent social phenomenon but the nationalist identity was deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of the people. Despite paying lip-service to the communist ideal deep down many ‘Yugoslav’ citizens still regarded themselves as Serbs, Croats or Bosnians.

However, the competing forces had been suppressed by the communists, not abolished, and as communism began to weaken, at the end of the 1980s, it created an opportunity for nationalism to resurface. Communism in Yugoslavia was challenged by the nationalist ideology, which soon began to assert itself as a dominant political force. During the period of political transition schools became central arenas in the debate with the reintroduction of
nationalist based religion to the curriculum and increasing calls for nationalist language, literature and history to be taught. By the time of the outbreak of civil war, in 1992, many schools had already reverted to the pre-communist nationalist agenda.

The war was based on control of land but the fighting was based on national identities as Croats, Muslims and Serbs, once more, fought each other. This is in contradiction to the findings of Collier and Hoeffler (2005) who suggest that ethnic and religious diversity lowers the risk of conflict and that the risk increases only when the largest ethnic group constitutes between 45% and 90% of the population. In Bosnia, the population was fairly evenly balanced between Croats, Muslims and Serbs, but this did not prevent the outbreak of war.

The study reports how the civil war led to reform of the primary school system with schools across Bosnia becoming mono-ethnic, teaching only the nationalist programme of Croatia, Serbia or Bosnia. The purpose of these changes was to replace the communist ideology with the nationalist one, using the school system as an arena for promulgating these political and ideological views. This supports the view of Beresford-Hill (1998) that following transition countries call for the restoration and re-invigoration of the teaching of national literature and local history.

In the post-war period, Chapter 7 illustrates how the nationalist politicians, as did earlier reformers, focused their attention on the curriculum, supporting the claim that it is the ‘battleground of competing ideologies’ (Moyses and Hargreaves 1998, p.28). In the post-communist development of the country it is reasonable to expect that educational reform might include discussion about the nature and purpose of education, consideration of suitable structures and what knowledge should be transmitted, but there is little evidence of this in Bosnia. The post-war canton governments instituted reform of curriculum content
but other aspects appeared to remain unchanged, demonstrating the conservatism (Pastuovic 1993) and inhibition of reform (Beresford-Hill 1998) suggested as concomitant to nationalism.

As Bosnia began to establish itself as a new nation state the nationalist ideology continued to dominate political decisions and maintain the separation of the education systems. This appeared to provide support for the idea that school reform is usually undertaken for the purpose of ‘national solidarity’ (Popkewitz 1991, p.131). Arnhold et.al (1998, p.15) argue that ‘[E]ducation for tolerance and reconciliation in ethnic and religiously divided communities is also an important aspect of democratisation’. But it is suggested here that the creation of national identity is an important part of nation-building and it may be a stage that has to be gone through in order to build sufficient national confidence and security to embrace other views, although Green (1997) questions whether governments should be continuing to use education for this purpose. In Bosnia and Croatia particularly they have continued to fight for their national identity to be recognised whilst also feeling threatened by the fear of takeover by Serbia. It could be argued that a greater strength of confidence in their nation and national identity would be a step towards helping reduce some of the nationalistic tendencies.

It is also acknowledged that nationalist ideology in education can be dangerous, leading to ‘xenophobia as a mode of state-building’ (Coulby, Cowen and Jones 2000, p.17). It is possible that this could describe the situation in Bosnia, where Magas (1998, p.48) claims that the nationalist language policy is a further attempt at ‘ethnic cleansing’.

It is worth noting, however, that whilst the nationalist, separatist ideology of the politicians governs what happens in schools it cannot be assumed that this is the view of all those involved in education. The research evidence suggests that the Bosniaks would have
preferred to see a common teaching programme in all Bosnian schools; this position is understandable given that this is what is offered in Bosniak-majority schools. The Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Serbs voiced preference for the ethnically-based separation, ensuring that their nationalist identity is transmitted through the education system.

The data in this study have provided strong support for the ideas set out in theme one. It has been shown how each major period of transition or conflict in Bosnia was accompanied by educational reform as new authorities asserted their control of the education system. It has also been shown how the forces of religion and nationalism have been recurring themes in Bosnia’s history, constantly challenging other prevailing forces for control of education in order to maintain their influence in the forming of national identities.

Analysis Theme 2 – in countries in transition, the process of educational reform follows a series of stages and its effective implementation relies on the presence of supporting factors

As noted in Chapter 3, various models have been offered that attempt to describe the process of educational change, all of which indicated that there are stages which all reforms follow with greater or lesser degrees of precision. However, most models of educational change are based on experiences within stable, western European or American countries and so do not describe all contexts, although increasing reference is being made to countries in transition (see Rado 1999, Wallace and Pocklington 2002, Polyzoi et.al 2003). The model proposed by McLeish and Phillips (1998) (see p.38) took account of political and social transition but appeared to present this as unproblematic. The data in
this study suggest that existing models of educational reform do not take sufficient account of the complexity of situations where transition has occurred in a number of dimensions.

In models of educational reform the first stages are usually inception and formulation of proposed changes; in the McLeish and Phillips (ibid) model the first stages are the fall of the authoritarian system and the ensuing political and social uncertainty. The data in Chapter 6 describe Bosnia’s education provision during 1945-1992 as highly centralised with the government publication of compulsory teaching programmes, compulsory use of state-authorised textbooks and teachers closely monitored by government inspectors to ensure conformity, creating a uniform and rigid system. This conformed in many ways to the authoritarian system outlined by McLeish and Phillips, who used descriptors such as ‘…uniformity, conformity, control, rigidity, stability, centralisation…’ (1998, p.7).

However the data also indicate that, contrary to popular understanding of communist society, this was not a period totally without challenge to the authoritarian system. Chapter 6 reports that, in response to demands from the nationalist republic governments, politicians debated on several occasions whether control of education should be centralised or decentralised. The data reveal, however, that there was always a return to central control and suggests that even when control was decentralised the government retained its authority through controlling local appointments. The challenges, therefore, did not seriously threaten the communist government’s authority because the questions were not about whether or not there should be control of education, they were about where that control should lie.

After Tito’s death, in 1980, a number of factors contributed to a serious challenge being posed to the communist government, including Yugoslavia’s rapidly declining economy and the growing strength of the nationalist political movement. Together these forces
created political change which eventually led to the ideological collapse of the former system, which is suggested by McLeish and Phillips as one of the necessary conditions for the beginning of educational reform. Unlike the McLeish and Phillip’s model, however, in Bosnia this was not followed by an ‘uncertain’ political phase as the nationalist politicians took control and pursued a fiercely nationalist agenda, particularly in education.

The next stages of educational reform, according to the McLeish and Phillip’s model, are national and local elections, which guide educational policy making; other models identify these stages as policy development. This study found that by 1990 educational reform had occurred in some schools with the introduction, in schools with Croatian and Serbian majority populations, of nationalist teaching programmes. This seemed to have occurred without formal policy discussion or development. Initially only small numbers of schools were involved but as conditions changed this number grew. Policy developments were not evident until February 1992, with the publication by the government of proposals for change. But the increasingly nationalist political and social climate led to the outbreak of civil war in April 1992, which halted the multi-party reform process and led to increasing numbers of schools introducing nationalist curricula. The war contributed to the complexity of the transition process in Bosnia; in addition to political and economic transition, experienced by all the eastern European countries in the post-communist years, it created a third dimension, that of transition to a new nation state.

The General Framework for Agreement for Peace (the Dayton Agreement) which brought an end to the civil war in 1995, instituted the post-war political structures in Bosnia. The Agreement was closely followed by national and local political elections. McLeish and Phillips proposed that elections create a stable, political climate and allow for national policy formulation and clarification of nature of educational reforms. This proposal is not supported by the data collected in Bosnia, where the elections appeared to contribute to
political instability. Chapter 7 describes how from 1996 to 2002 Bosnia experienced four elections, which impacted on the government’s ability to make policy and implement policy decisions.

Further, the political system instituted by the Dayton Agreement gave the national government little authority over educational provision so national elections had little impact on education. The local elections, at canton level, were more important to educational reform as it was the cantons that had responsibility for education. The local elections, without exception, returned nationalist politicians who made it clear that education was to continue to follow nationalist ideology, as had been instituted during the civil war. In all the elections, at national and local level, education did not feature as an election issue, meaning that none of the political parties was required to present a rational policy statement on educational issues.

It has been claimed by some writers (see Dyker and Vejvoda 1996, Brown 2001, World Bank 2005) that the Dayton Agreement created a political structure that hindered the reform process in Bosnia. The data from this study appear to support these claims; the cantons are divided along ethnic lines, The World Bank (ibid, p.43) refer to this as ‘institutionalized fragmentation’, and this made political agreements difficult to reach, including decisions on educational reforms. Current models of educational reform do not indicate how political intransigence impacts on the reform process.

This is not to claim that reform did not occur during and immediately after the war; the growing strength of the nationalist political parties led to reforms in the curriculum and textbooks in order to promote ethnically based education. And there were changes in the educational system, which went from one highly-centralised system to three parallel systems for Bosnian Croats, Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Muslims governed by politicians
in Zagreb, Belgrade and Sarajevo. These reforms, however, had not been subject to open political discussion and policy making, as the models of reform would suggest, but had been pragmatic responses to the unfolding political situation.

According to the McLeish and Phillips’ model, and others, the next stage of educational reform is the development of legislation. Moon, Murphy and Raynor (1998) assert that legislation can be effective in the reform process where there is likely to be resistance to change but it is also likely that legislation on its own will not bring about change (Sarason, in Fullan 2001). It is suggested, however, that legislation can be of two types: ‘framework’ or enabling legislation, which affirms the status quo and creates minimal change, or ‘instrumental’ legislation which introduces wide-ranging reform, much as was done in Britain with the 1944 Education Act, which reconceptualised the purposes and structure of education; reformed the curriculum and introduced new assessment methods.

The data reported in Chapter 6 do not provide evidence to support the idea of unproblematic progress to the stage of legislative reform as in Bosnia the elections in general did not lead to educational legislation. Almost every post-war election returned nationalist parties to government at all levels, which caused stalemate for most political decisions as agreement could not be reached. Proposals for change were published by the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport in 2001; a multi-ethnic educational group in 2002 and an international group in 2002. However, educational legislation was the responsibility of the cantons and they steadfastly refused to introduce reforming legislation which did not meet their nationalist agenda. The study reports the view of an official of OSCE in Mostar that legislation was unlikely to be effected in the canton of Herzegovina-Neretva as the two political parties in Mostar were satisfied with the current situation and unwilling to accept change (personal communication).
Where cantons had introduced educational laws these were of the ‘framework’ type and introduced for the purpose of legitimising the nationalist education that had been offered for several years without being written in to law. In the communist tradition, these laws simply defined the status quo, for example they confirmed the curriculum content and arrangements, class size and teachers’ work conditions and pay.

The final stage of educational reform proposed by the models is that of implementation, suggesting changes in classroom practice. The models suggest that this stage follows the introduction of legislation but the data in this study appear to contradict this. Whilst there was little evidence of legislation there was evidence of some change in classroom practice. Teachers changed their teaching in order to reflect the changes that had occurred in the government-issued teaching programmes and textbooks, which had been amended to reflect the nationalist ideology that had replaced communism. These could be considered important changes as the World Bank (2005, p.53) asserts that textbooks ‘often exert more influence on classroom practice than official curriculum documents’.

The findings in this study appear to indicate that the existing models of educational reform do not fully explain the process in all contexts as they do not take account of the multi-dimensional nature of transition. The data suggest that reform can emerge in different ways and that formal, legislative, processes are not always necessary for its implementation. The model in Figure 8.1 attempts to describe the process of educational reform in Bosnia, taking account of the multi-dimensional influences on education provision.

This model takes as its starting point both the dissatisfaction with existing educational provision and the political climate which allowed for change. Reform initially occurred in
only a small number of schools as the political and social conditions were not yet fully supportive, or there was ambivalence amongst teachers and others, as to what the future held. As the political and social conditions created a climate in which change was seen as desirable more schools and teachers engaged with the reforms. Further political changes then allowed for the introduction of legislation which legitimised the changed practice in schools. This model explains how the nationalist education reforms came to be introduced into Bosnian schools but it does not demonstrate that this occurred in three separate communities at the same time, adding to the complexity of their situation.

Cerych (1997) identified different types of reform: corrective, modernising, structural and systemic and concluded that most eastern European countries in transition exhibited corrective reforms, there was variation in the extent of modernising reforms and little
evidence of structural and systemic reform. This conclusion was supported by the evidence of reform in Bosnia, where corrective reforms were apparent through the removal from textbooks of all references to Tito and the communist ideology. Modernising reforms, according to Cerych, would have been exemplified by changes to the curricula and textbooks to align them to western European education models. However, the study found that the changes to curricula and textbooks in Bosnia were those that established the nationalist education agenda, which cannot be described as modernising reforms as many relied on the re-introduction of pre-communist teaching. There was also little evidence of structural or systemic reforms.

A sub-theme emerging from the literature (see Healey and De Stefano 1997, Datnow and Stringfield 2000, Fullan 2001, Levin 2001) was that successful implementation of educational reform requires certain factors to be in place, including:

- a perceived need or reason for change which is real and significant;
- the existence of champions for change;
- government support for change;
- reform proposals that are clear and simple;
- capability in those charged with implementing reform, including effective leadership and the capacity and willingness of teachers to engage in and take responsibility for implementing initiatives;
- support from those involved, for example school leaders, teachers and parents.

The government publication of February 1992, reported in Chapter 6, indicated an awareness of the need for Bosnia’s education provision to be modernised, a need which was real and significant if education was to be appropriate for the new political and economic climate that was emerging. It could be argued that this awareness of the need for
modernisation was limited to relatively few politicians and educationalists and may not have been shared by the mass of classroom teachers who were probably not then in a position to have an informed view or make professional choices due to their previous training and experience. However, those who wanted modernisation held influential positions and were able to initiate discussion and action, which was stopped by the outbreak of war.

During the war the social ethnic separation and the growth of nationalist ideology led to a change in the reason for educational reform. As nationalist politics took hold it was deemed necessary to introduce reforms to ensure that pupils received an ethnically based education. Chapter 7 reports the view of Aldin, a Bosnian government official, ‘War was seen as an opportunity by some to bring about the separation of education into ethnic groups – as this was what they wanted anyway’. This meant that the changes that were introduced to curriculum content had many of the factors required for successful implementation: a perceived need, champions (nationalist politicians), government support, support from teachers and parents and the proposals were clear and simple. As a result the changes were fully embraced and successfully implemented.

In the post-war context there appeared to be little perceived need for further reform of education; several reasons are offered for this. Curriculum change had already taken place to ensure that pupils received a nationalist education and this appeared to meet the needs of the politicians, some parents and pupils. The study found that there was no perceived need for further change as parents expressed satisfaction with the education that their children were receiving. The view of what constituted a good education was one that contained a lot of factual content to be taught and learnt, or memorised (OECD 2001), and this was what was being offered. This view, and parents’ satisfaction with the system, was likely the result of parents’ own educational experiences; they believed that they had received a
good education under the communist system and their children’s educational experience was familiar to them. Where dissatisfaction was expressed by parents and pupils it was with the attitude and discipline exercised by some teachers who they considered did not care for the pupils and who showed little interest in their job. No parents or pupils expressed a need for education itself to change. School staff also appeared to accept the new status quo and saw no need for change.

Whilst it may be assumed that this acceptance was not universal and that there were teachers, pupils and parents who would have welcomed change, dissatisfaction was not being publicly voiced. It is also possible that the years of subordination to external authorities had contributed to the disposition of many teachers, who expected only to teach what they were told to teach; it was not a common experience for teachers to express dissatisfaction with the curriculum programme or teaching methods. If there were teachers who felt dissatisfied it was possible that they did not know how to express their views or what channels were open to them.

Another reason for acceptance of the status quo could have been the stress and trauma of the war which resulted in many people living in physical and economic deprivation and feeling emotionally insecure. These people had spent their energy on rebuilding their lives, physically, emotionally and psychologically, and this would have left little zest for engaging in challenge and change.

Another factor that supports successful implementation was said to be the presence of champions or advocates, preferably with authority or power to introduce change (Healey and De Stefano 1997, Fullan 2001). Without champions, it is suggested, proposals for educational reform are less likely to be given broad consideration. The data in Chapter 7 indicate that there did not appear to have been any champions for educational reform in
post-war Bosnia, other than the politicians who were focussed only on change in the elementary school curriculum in order to promulgate the nationalist agenda. If there were supporters of reform these were likely to have been local educational personnel, or individual teachers or parents, without the authority or power to effect any change, particularly in an education system which was centralised and highly controlled at canton level.

It could be argued that external agents who were members of the international community took on, in part, the role of champions for change. In the District of Brcko, on the border with Republika Srpska, where international organisations had been working with returnees, there were a few ethnically mixed classes and attempts were being made to teach both the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets, but examples of this kind were rare and affected only individual schools.

Government support appears to be an influential factor for successful reform (Fullan 2001, Levin 2001) and there was evidence from published documents, outlined in Chapter 7, that the post-war Bosnian government supported educational change. However, the Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport had no authority to implement their own proposals and the majority of the canton governments ignored the proposals as they did not satisfy their nationalist agenda. The canton governments were responsible for educational provision and it was at this level that government support was lacking; the study reports how in Mostar the Croatian and Bosniak education officials did not communicate and worked totally separately with their own ethnically-based schools in east and west Mostar. Without canton government support any proposals for reform were unlikely to be implemented.
The literature suggested that proposals for change need to be clear and simple to be understood by, and gain the commitment of, those charged with implementing them (Fullan 2001, Levin 2001). This factor was found to be lacking in the reform proposals in Bosnia. The proposals described in Chapter 7 were complex; they covered the structure of elementary education, the content and structure of the curriculum, teaching methods and assessment. It is conjectured that this breadth and complexity contributed to lack of support for the proposals.

In addition, the reforms required practice that was vastly different from that described by the teachers as their normal classroom practice and it was possible that they may not have had the capacity for change of such a high order. It was also suggested that many school Directors did not have the capacity to manage such change due to their 'lack of modern education management' (Federal Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport 2001, p.11). Those educated under the communist system, and those who worked within it for many years, were less likely to have developed the skills required to implement the proposed reforms: they were unused to exercising democratic leadership, making autonomous decisions, developing their own curricula or selecting their own textbooks and resources. It is also suggested that this limited capacity for change was likely to continue for some time as the study found that the training of teachers, described in Chapters 6 and 7, continued to follow the communist model of preparing teachers to transmit facts to pupils using a teacher-centred approach.

Several authors have noted the importance of support for change from teachers, parents and pupils (Dalin 1978, Clark and Peterson 1986, Mortimore et.al. 1988, Dillon and Maguire 1998, Fullan 2001). The study found that this support was lacking in Bosnia, this could be attributed to the fact that the proposals were not congruent with their dominant beliefs and values; many school staff, parents and pupils held nationalist beliefs which
would not accommodate some of the proposed reforms, for example for mixed ethnic schools. It is also possible that parents were opposed to new proposals because one change that had affected them was the introduction of charges for textbooks and school repairs; this led many parents to express the view that the ‘old’ system had been preferable.

There appeared to have been little effort made by the Federation government to manage the educational reform process. The strong opposition of the nationalist politicians to the proposed reforms was known, yet no attempt appeared to have been made to counter these or to manage the introduction of the proposals. School personnel in Bosnia were used to the power-coercive model of change, the power of the communist government forcing people to act. The post-communist governments resisted employing this model because of its negative association with the communist government. However, school staff appeared to be unable to co-operate with either an empirical-rational strategy, where behaviour is changed as a result of reasoned consideration, or a normative-re-educative strategy, where change arises from individuals and groups seeking to reduce their own dissatisfaction. It was then suggested (personal communication OHR, 26.06.02) that if the cantons remained unwilling to adopt the proposed changes they may need to be imposed. This indicates a return to a power-coercive strategy as a means of introducing change.

The study found some support for the suggestion proposed by several authors, that in countries in transition educational reform follows a series of stages; although the stages described in the models do not fully reflect the Bosnian experience. Existing models appear to take account only of political and economic transition and not other dimensions of change that impact on education, such as the transition to a new nation state. The model suggested here, which attempts to explain the Bosnian case, would need to be tested further. The study also found evidence to support the claim that successful implementation of reform requires the presence of supporting factors. Chapter 7 reports that when
curriculum content was changed to embrace the nationalist reforms of education many of the identified supporting factors were present and the changes were successfully implemented. In contrast, in the post-war period, when new educational reforms were proposed these lacked many of the supporting factors and were not adopted. Although changes were introduced to the education system in Bosnia these appeared to demonstrate ‘incremental’ change as described by Archer (1979) rather than reform (Fullan 2001).

Analysis Theme 3 – where as a consequence of conflict there is significant change in the prevailing social and political ideologies there are concomitant changes in education. Macro-level change in education leads to micro-level change in classroom practice, but this usually takes much longer to implement than other aspects of change.

The literature suggested that social and political ideological change in a country usually leads to change in educational provision but that change in classroom practice takes longer to take effect than legislative change, possibly as long as ten years (Fullan 2001; Tejsner and Parkes 2002). The four periods of Bosnia’s history identified in this study each marked a change in the prevailing ideology, which occurred as a result of conflict, and each brought educational change.

Conflict usually arises from the desire of one state to exercise hegemony over another and concludes with one group emerging as dominant. More often than not this signals change in the prevailing political ideology as the ‘victors’ assert their authority in their new position. Chapter 4 describes how, following the Russo-Turkish war, the Austro-Hungarians assumed political control of Bosnia. This was a significant social and political change as Bosnia had been governed by the Ottomans for over 400 years and the eastern, Islamic hegemony was replaced with western, Catholic leadership.
The study describes how primary education in Ottoman Bosnia was provided by the churches and mosques, teachers were mostly untrained and their practice relied on exposition as only rote learning was required. In order to help establish their political ideology the Habsburg governors founded secular schools and introduced changes to the structure and curriculum of schooling. Although the building of new schools took time, the study found that by 1909 there were sufficient schools for the government to be able to introduce legislation making primary education compulsory. By 1913, 568 primary schools had been built.

Contrary to the claims in the literature, change in classroom practice in state schools was effected alongside or soon after the macro-level reforms. The increase in school provision created an increase in the need for teachers and the state assumed control of teacher training to ensure that the new curricula and textbooks were implemented in the classroom; although there was no evidence that the Austro-Hungarians attempted to reform pedagogic practice. The Austro-Hungarian government had no control over the religious schools, however, and it is likely that there was little change in practice in these schools.

The First World War marked the next significant change in political ideology as the Habsburgs withdrew and Bosnia became a federal state within the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, later Yugoslavia, dominated by the Serbs. Educational provision was further expanded and Chapter 5 describes the reforms that were introduced to remove traces of the Austro-Hungarian empire from the curriculum and textbooks and replace them with Serbian influences.

During this period the research found support for the idea that micro-level reform takes longer to implement. Djordjevic (1992), reported in Chapter 5, claimed that many schools
in Bosnia did not implement the reforms and continued to use curricula and texts from earlier years. Evidence was also found (Leon, 1970) that, despite having knowledge of the pedagogic theories of Herbart, the teachers continued their traditional teacher-centred practice.

Several reasons can be suggested for this; there may have been general disregard for the ruling authorities and disagreement with the reforms. Others may have been unsure of the reforms and felt more secure continuing with their existing practice. Some teachers may have been unaware of the reforms, and the geography of Bosnia meant that there were many isolated, rural villages at a distance from the centre where reforms could have been slow to reach.

The end of the Second World War brought a major shift in the prevailing political and social ideology as the Communist Party attained political power. The communist government introduced laws and directives which led to changes in the structure and management of education and curriculum; changes that influenced the whole ethos of schooling. The data also reveal how the ethos of schooling, reflected through the ‘hidden curriculum’ indicated the strength of the government’s control both of the education system and of the population. Factors such as teachers’ use of the dnevnik rada to record everything that happened in the school, the use of pupils as agents, the compulsory nature of parents’ meetings with teachers all signal the power and control wielded by the government, which is likely to have shaped the attitudes and behaviour of citizens.

Like the Austro-Hungarians, the communist government attempted to ensure micro-level change occurred through taking control of teacher education. In addition they issued state-approved teaching plans and textbooks which had to be adhered to and employed government inspectors to monitor classroom practice and ensure conformity to the
legislated reforms. Chapter 6 reports Aldijana, a parent, saying that if the government inspectors were not satisfied with the teacher, which means that they were not satisfied that they were following government instructions, the teacher would lose their job. Similarly, pupils were encouraged to report any teachers who they felt were not conforming to the government agenda. The data in Chapter 6 indicate that the micro-level change took a little longer to implement than the macro-level, but not much longer. This, in turn, implies that where a government takes full control of educational provision and puts pressures in place to ensure change occurs in classroom practice then it is possible to implement micro-level reforms in a shorter timescale.

As the communist government’s authority loosened, educational change began to occur to reflect the growing sense of nationalism felt by the different ethnic groups in Bosnia. The outbreak of civil war, in 1992, increased the speed of political and social change and nationalism became the dominant ideology. Macro-level reforms of the teaching programme and textbooks occurred quickly as the small pockets of change that had begun in 1990, as outlined in chapter 6, spread rapidly. There were changes to the content of the curriculum, to reflect the nationalist perspective, the issue of new textbooks to support the curriculum changes and the re-introduction of religion on to the curriculum.

Micro-level reform of these aspects of classroom practice was also effected quickly, the separation of the ethnic groups led to swift changes in their educational content. The disturbance created by the war led to disruption to children’s education similar to that described in the literature (Gosden 1976, Lowe 1992, Times Educational Supplement 2002). The disruption also created unusual teaching conditions, described in Chapter 7, which could be expected to lead to change in teachers’ pedagogic and assessment practices. It might have been expected that these circumstances would lead to new relationships being developed between teacher and pupils and changes in pedagogy but this
does not seem to have been the case. Pupils reported that traditional teaching and assessment methods continued to be employed, although adapted to the circumstances. This may have been because the teachers felt that they knew no other way or because it provided a sense of familiarity and continuity, for teachers and pupils, in an uncertain world, or it could have been that teachers felt they needed to continue with this practice in case they needed to report on events when the war ended. It could also be argued that the pedagogic style associated with communist teaching may have made it easier to continue with schooling during the unusual war-time conditions. Pedagogy that was teacher-centred and followed a set text, using few resources, and employing only teacher assessment was easier to maintain in the deprived conditions available.

When the war ended, in 1995, Bosnia was a country recovering from the aftermath of a bloody three year conflict. It was also undergoing major ideological shift, politically from communism to a liberal democracy, economically from a planned economy to a market-oriented economy and socially/politically from a federal republic to a nation state. Each of these alone would have had consequences for educational provision but together they created a unique situation which one would expect would have an impact on educational provision. The literature indicated that in countries in transition political, social and educational change may be sequential (see Batt 1991; Birzea 1994; Moyles and Hargreaves 1998) or concurrent (see Pastuovic 1993; Cerych 1995; Weiler et.al. 1996). In a short period of time Bosnia experienced significant political change followed by civil war which created major social change, and a change in the prevailing ideology. This political and social change created educational change but all were so closely bound that it is best described as concurrent change. No commentators have put forward a view on the merits or otherwise of sequential or concurrent change but it would appear that the Bosnian case highlights the difficulties when major concurrent change occurs.
The literature suggested that, in the countries that had experienced political transition, educational change was instituted through policy development and the enactment of legislation. As a country moves from communism to liberal democracy and free market economies it could be expected that concomitant changes in education might include decentralisation of authority; more freedom and democracy in decision-making for schools and teachers and an increase in the provision of private education. The civil war in Bosnia also resulted in nationalism becoming the dominant ideology and this too could be expected to lead to change in educational provision, with the nationalist agenda influencing what was taught in schools. Further, the physical and social disruption caused by the civil war created the conditions in which changes to educational provision could have been introduced as schooling was rebuilt at the end of the war. The data from the study show that not all of these expected changes occurred.

Chapter 7 describes some of the macro-level reforms that have occurred since 1995 as a result both of legislation and political decision making. Legislation delegated the responsibility for educational provision and financing to the cantons, but there was no evidence of legislative activity that changed the structure, organisation or management of education. Education in Bosnia was being used by the political leaders to further the nationalist cause, hence the focus on curriculum content with little consideration given to other aspects of provision. It is also possible to postulate that their preoccupation with nationalist concerns was considered inherently opposed to open and progressive styles of teaching as this could loosen their control on what is taught. This nationalist control of education mirrors the practice of the communists.

As the majority of cantons are now mono-ethnic, political decisions have led to educational provision becoming mono-ethnic and consolidation of the earlier changes to curriculum content particularly in the nationalist subjects of language, literature, history and
geography and religion. Curriculum changes were again accompanied by the issue of new textbooks. This reaction to educational freedom kept intact the notion that educational provision was based on a single, central authority; for teachers the authority simply changed from the communist government to the nationalist governments of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia.

The data in the study indicate that the macro-level reforms of new curriculum content and new textbooks were instituted at the micro-level, in the classroom. The main reason for this is likely to be that teachers were used to responding to government instructions and were simply following the directives regarding the teaching programme. In addition, these ‘reforms’ were consolidating war-time practice as many of the curriculum changes had been introduced during the civil war and the post-war reforms served to legitimise these. This meant that the post-war reforms had little impact on teachers. It is also likely that the curriculum reforms to the nationalist subjects resonated with the beliefs and values of the teachers and so they had little difficulty in incorporating them into their teaching. In contrast, there was little evidence of any reform in teachers’ practices in relation to pedagogy or assessment.

The literature discussed in Chapter 3 appeared to focus on teachers’ reluctance to change their pedagogy and various reasons were offered. Pastuovic (1993) believes that poor economic conditions impact negatively on teachers’ motivation for change and there was evidence of this in this study. Teachers reported low pay, sometimes waiting several months to be paid. Several teachers said they felt ‘fed up’ with teaching and pupils reported many teachers seemed uninterested in their work. In addition, the transition to liberal democracy would have allowed for the development of private school provision, which would have introduced a more competitive environment and possibly have created conditions for change. Whilst private provision was not obstructed the poor economic
conditions in Bosnia were not conducive to its introduction as few parents had sufficient funds to pay for private education.

The conservatism of schools (Vonk 1997) and the heritage of the communist system (Cerych 1995) have been cited as hindrances to micro-level reform, and evidence of this was found in this study. Chapter 7 reports that schools were required to teach the government issued teaching programme, using state approved textbooks, and that the cantons monitored the schools to ensure compliance. The continuation of earlier practice of controlling their work gave teachers a sense that little had changed, except that the government agenda was nationalist rather than communist. This would contribute to the inertia and conservatism in schools that would act against more than superficial reform of practice.

Leclercq (1996) noted the difficulty that teachers experience in changing their practice. Weiler et.al. (1996) attribute this to the fact that they find it threatening; adding that it is more difficult for teachers to execute change that they have not been involved in developing. These reasons are both supported by the findings of this study, although the teachers did not report feeling ‘threatened’ they did express satisfaction with their teaching practice and saw no need for change. Nor were any teachers involved in the discussions of the reform proposals, described in Chapter 7.

It can also be postulated that historical tradition in Bosnia has created in teachers an inability to change without the necessary enforcing regulation. The education that teachers received in the communist period, together with their training, had inculcated in them the characteristic of responding to instructions from above. Teachers were unable to think critically about educational provision and their own practice; they were not expected to make decisions about what methods to use to teach their subject, or what resources to use,
therefore they did not exercise any decisions. During the communist era pupils were recruited as agents in the classroom, reporting on teachers who exhibited anti-communist tendencies, thus ensuring that they did not stray from the ideological path. Teachers, as citizens, also had a responsibility to report any anti-communist suspicions so even in the staff room teachers could only espouse the communist ideology. Teachers were not empowered by these practices, rather the reverse, as Goldstein et. al. (1999) point out ‘… curricula which dictate to teachers disempower them since they generate a ‘culture of non-participation’ … [which] strongly militates against the implementation of change’. The conditions created by the communists contributed to the ‘culture of non-participation’, they ensured that the customs and attitudes that informed classroom practice were only those acceptable to the state; anything other than these would have brought repercussions. The removal of the communist state did not bring automatic freedom for these teachers, who were unaccustomed to freedom of thought.

The speed of change may also have influenced teachers’ reactions, Birzea (1994) refers to Durkheim’s concept of ‘anomie’ as a possible explanation. Anomie is a state experienced by individuals when social change occurs quickly, causing feelings of disorientation, anxiety and insecurity and one response to this is to revert to the familiar.

In addition, the communist ideology was replaced by the nationalist ideology so teachers were still required to toe the party line. It is possible, therefore, that teachers did not see the latest political change as having any impact on their practice unless government regulations were introduced to enforce change. Olek (1998) also suggests that where teachers changed their practice, for example in teaching the revised programmes, this was less a change of practice but simply conformity to a new set of ideas.
Another possible reason for the reluctance to change practice is that teachers, along with all the population of Bosnia, experienced major disruption to their lives during the war. Chapter 7 describes the immediate post-war period, families lived in uncomfortable conditions, sometimes in properties that were not their own; some were coping with the death of family members who had been killed, others had injuries. In Mostar, soldiers lined the streets, and there were feelings of uncertainty of the future. It is suggested that teachers, and others, coped with this by rebuilding their former lives as much as possible. This would include returning to working practices that were familiar and would bring a sense of security and professional competence that would be reassuring. This idea is discussed further in theme four.

One way in which change in teachers’ practice can be supported is through pre- and in-service training (Savova 1996, Lita 2004), although it has been noted that change in teacher education can be slow to be effected (Leclerq 1996, Savova 1996, Wilkin 1996). The data in this study provides evidence of the use of teacher education to support reform and how this can be instituted quickly or slowly depending on the political context. Chapter 4 reports how the Austro-Hungarians effected change quickly, introducing strict controls on teacher education and practice in order to ensure implementation of their reforms. Similarly, Chapter 6 describes how the communist government quickly established their reforms in teacher education to ensure teachers were trained in the communist ideology. The change to nationalist government control of teacher education brought changes to the subject knowledge component of teacher training but appeared to have changed little else; the descriptions of post-communist, post-war teaching training in pedagogy closely matched those of previous years.

Lack of change in teacher education is not uncommon, Savova (1996) and Leclerq (1996) found similar results in other eastern European countries. Various reasons have been cited
for this, including ‘conservativeness and inertia’ in the teacher education system (Savova 1996, p.38); the complexity of the change required (Leclerq 1996) and the lack of policy (Cerych 1997). In Bosnia, a lack of political will could be added to this list as, having ensured change to curriculum content, the nationalist politicians appeared to perceive no further need for change.

The findings from this study of Bosnia’s political and educational change appear to support the suggestion that conflict which leads to political and ideological change also leads to concomitant change in education. However, there is less evidence to support the view that micro-level change takes longer to implement than macro-level change. The evidence suggests that in highly centralised, authoritarian systems, such as those practiced by the Austro-Hungarians and communists, micro-level reforms may be implemented with relative speed. As these systems were largely still in existence when the nationalists assumed control, they were also able to establish change quickly. Further, there was evidence that when the reforms were supported by teachers, such as the curriculum changes introduced by the nationalists, they were relatively easy to execute. The changes effected, however, were of a superficial nature, changing what teachers taught but not how they taught. It is suggested, therefore, that the timescale for the implementation of micro-level change depends on the political context, whether or not teachers support the reform, the simplicity or complexity of the change and the depth of change teachers are required to make.

Analysis Theme 4 – the initial development of free market economies appears to affect detrimentally teachers’ remuneration and status, whilst at the same time increasing their responsibilities. In this context, teachers seek to attain status by
reverting to traditional approaches to schooling in an attempt to link current practice to a period when status was accorded

The literature indicated that the status of teachers depends on a number of interlinked factors, including not only their level of pay but also qualifications needed for entry to the profession and the general perception of the role of teachers within the social and cultural context.

In Bosnia the study found that teachers had, until recently, enjoyed high status. Under the Ottomans teachers were clergy and well-educated in comparison with the majority of the population so, even though pay was low or non-existent, they were well-regarded. Whilst the Austro-Hungarians introduced state education and lowered the qualifications for entry to the profession the contemporary social and cultural climate was one in which the role of teacher conferred status and respect. Under communist government, because of the high value placed on the public service role of education, teachers were accorded high status, despite low pay levels. In addition, teachers were often loyal and active Party members and, as such, were accorded status.

This is supported by respondents in this study, reported in Chapter 6, who expressed regard for teachers during this period and satisfaction with the communist educational experience. It could be argued that this satisfaction, trust and acceptance were natural concomitants of the communist system; the teachers were perceived as representatives of the state, therefore to express dissatisfaction with teachers could have been taken as dissatisfaction with the state, which would have brought its own consequences. However, in the post-communist period, when views could be more openly expressed, parents continued to say that they had been satisfied with their education and that of their children, under the communists.
Throughout these early periods the responsibilities of the teachers were confined to teaching the government issued programmes, using the state approved textbooks and maintaining the necessary records. Teachers were not required to exercise autonomy or make decisions.

When Yugoslavia emerged from communist rule and began its political and economic transition serious economic problems were already evident, as described in Chapter 6. These had already reduced teachers’ salaries dramatically, echoing the experiences of other post-communist countries. From 1989, one impact of the emerging free market economy had been that those teachers with good qualifications were able to leave teaching for better paid employment elsewhere, leaving those less well-qualified to teach. Declining pay levels, less well-qualified teachers and the fall of communism as the political ruling force all contributed to lessening the status accorded both to education and, in consequence, to teachers.

The war, as has been shown, exacerbated the poor economic conditions and had a further negative impact on teachers’ salaries; as the country’s finances plummeted teachers’ pay reduced tenfold from approximately £250 per month to approximately £25. Often teachers were not paid at all; one teacher (Asra) reported receiving cigarettes and bread each week in lieu of pay. Teachers reported that for some time they were paid with ‘consumer coupons’ which could be exchanged in the local shops for goods, usually food. The value of these coupons, however, was usually below the real value of a teacher’s salary. It is likely that this would have had a detrimental psychological effect on teachers as using coupons to purchase food is often a sign of poverty, and may have caused some teachers to experience a loss of self-esteem. The use of coupons would also have signalled to the local community the low economic status of teachers which could lead to a general perception of
teaching as low-status. In addition, the shortage of teachers meant that many unqualified teachers were allowed to practice, thus indicating teaching as a low qualification profession. However, during the war most of Bosnia’s population received little or no pay and it was understood that employment opportunities were taken as they became available, so these factors had less of a negative impact on the status of teachers than they would otherwise.

The study has also revealed how the conditions of war also affected the responsibilities placed on teachers. Whilst they were still expected to follow the government’s teaching programme and use the approved textbooks, they were able to make their own decisions about what to teach and what to omit; teachers and pupils reported covering ‘only the main things’ from the programmes. For the first time in their experience the teachers’ work was not monitored by government inspectors.

The war conditions also affected teacher-pupil relationships, which traditionally had been hierarchical and authoritarian and came to involve much more of a pastoral aspect, with teachers taking care of pupils experiencing disruption and uncertainty in their lives outside school. Whilst some authority and hierarchy remained the conditions in which teaching took place meant that the formal relationships that previously existed could not be sustained. Chapter 6 reports how lessons took place in teachers’ own homes, abandoned offices, basements and garages. At the height of the war classes took place at night and sometimes classes were conducted in candlelight as there was no electricity. In addition, variable class sizes and populations created more informality and teachers’ traditional control and discipline were also loosened; several pupils reported that their teachers had been ‘nice’.
The teacher’s role also extended during the war. As the usual communication channels could not be used teachers became conveyors of information, passing on messages about when and where schooling would occur, indicating to the local community what could be considered a safe time and place. In addition they were also seen as providing a sense of normality and security; one teacher (Zerina) reported that many pupils had told her they preferred to be in school rather than home as it occupied them and provided a link to their previous, normal, life. This important role contributed to teachers’ being accorded status during the war.

Following the war Bosnia was able to resume its economic transition to a free market economy. Free market economies are usually linked to government by liberal democracies, political systems that allow a degree of professional autonomy to teachers which brings with it increased levels of responsibility.

Chapter 7 reports that in the post-war years Bosnia experienced serious economic hardship and this, together with the transfer of financial responsibility for education to the cantons, had a detrimental effect on educational provision, including teachers’ pay and working conditions. Teachers’ post-war salaries remained low and continued to be paid intermittently. In addition, for the first time, pay differentials occurred; Chapter 7 describes how teachers in east and west Mostar were paid differently according to the taxes raised in each part of the town. Teachers also reported working in poor conditions; many school buildings had been repaired but not renovated to a high standard and there were still few resources. Schools also operated shift systems meaning that teachers often worked long hours.

The changed conditions influenced the perception of the role of teachers in the post-war society. Teachers were no longer message carriers and became simply teachers.
Economic conditions also created high levels of unemployment, meaning that education was perceived by some as having little value. The introduction of parental contributions to education was a new phenomenon in Bosnia and led to some parents becoming increasingly critical of provision and, as mentioned in theme two, expressing preference for the ‘old’ system. Several parents expressed the view that post-war teaching is not as good as it was during the communist era. There are several reasons why this may be true: the teaching may not be as good with fewer well-qualified applicants applying for teacher training causing quality to fall. It could be that the general perception of education and teachers has deteriorated causing negative views to be expressed whether they are true or not. Parents and pupils are able to openly criticise education and teachers, something they were not able to do before, and are exercising their right to do this and there may be expectations amongst parents and pupils that teachers will be more democratic and modern, but this is not being experienced in practice. Individual parents may have one or more reasons for their criticism, but the more this is voiced the more it becomes generally accepted.

The parents who contributed to this research also revealed dissatisfaction with the political and economic conditions, life for many of them had worsened rather than improved. They referred back to the ‘golden years’ of Tito’s leadership, when economic conditions were thought to be good, and most had good living standards. This general dissatisfaction was often aimed at those perceived to be government agents, including teachers who were still perceived as government ‘transmission belts’ (Tibbitts 1996). This general dissatisfaction together with other factors, teachers’ low pay, poor academic quality and the low value placed on education, appeared to contribute to teachers losing status in the post-war context.
The literature claimed that economic transition affected not only teachers’ remuneration and status but also increased their responsibilities but this was not supported by the findings from this study. Teachers and pupils confirmed that with the return to more normal conditions teachers returned to their traditional teaching methods. Nor did the government change their expectations of the teachers; they were required only respond to instructions from the centre and their work was once more monitored by government inspectors.

In many countries the status of teachers is declining as education and teachers are held responsible for many of the social ills that prevail. Lita (2004) also argues that under communism education had high value because it helped to secure a good lifestyle and social status whilst in a free market economy a good lifestyle can be secured in a number of ways, not all of which require high levels of education. This is supported by Kotasek and Svecova (1995, p.258) who describe the economic transition in the Czech Republic and how this led to ‘social stratification by income’.

Several possibilities are suggested for ways in which teachers could regain status in Bosnia. If government action were able to improve the economy and create employment which would require a well-qualified workforce this would contribute to raising the importance, and therefore the value, placed on education. It would also increase the demand for a well-qualified teaching force, leading cantons to consider how to attract such applicants, which may then lead to a rise in salary levels. These factors, raising the value placed on education, attracting well-qualified applicants and raising remuneration may, eventually, lead to teachers experiencing higher status.

The study has found evidence to support the assertion that the transition to a free market economy leads to detrimental effects on teachers’ remuneration and status, although status
was also found to depend on the political and social context and the value placed on the role played by teachers. However, there was no evidence that the transition process increased teachers’ responsibilities. In fact, it was found that despite gaining some authority during the war teachers relinquished this when normal conditions returned and were, therefore, unable to use this as a way of regaining status.

Nor was there evidence that teachers’ had reverted to traditional practice in order to regain status; they had not changed their pedagogic practice so had nothing to revert to. Teachers responded to the declining pay and status in different ways; there were fewer high-quality applicants to teaching, experienced teachers found other work if they could and those who remained appeared to be less committed to their work. All of these factors contributed to the continuing spiral of decline in the teaching profession.

**Analysis Theme 5 – contemporary resolutions of conflict are mediated by the involvement of international organisations, and resolution agreements have post-conflict consequences for education provision**

There was evidence in the literature that the development of globalisation and the increase in world trade and international communications had led to an increase in the number of international organisations and their growing involvement in world affairs. One sphere of activity was identified as their increasing role in conflict resolution and post-conflict settlement, with the recent civil war in the Balkans offering just one example. This study found support for the assertion that the conflict resolution agreement had consequences for education provision in Bosnia.
Chapter 7 reports on the number of international organisations that were involved in conflict resolution in Bosnia; political negotiations to end the war were led by European and American politicians and both during and after the war work was undertaken by The World Bank, UNHCR, UNDP, OECD, OSCE and the European Union. As described in the literature, the work conducted in Bosnia focussed on rebuilding the economy, reconstruction of housing and infrastructure and the needs of refugee and returnee families. Their role in education involved the provision of financial aid, personnel and technical assistance and support for refugee and returnee children in gaining access to education.

The literature revealed some criticism of the involvement of the international organisations, claiming that it is based on an ideological stance (Jones 1998) or that the west holds the balance of power and seeks to impose their ideas (Dalin 1978, Birzea 1994, Olek 1998). This criticism was supported to some extent by the findings of this study that the political agreements reached had exacerbated the local situation by emphasising the nationalist differences, with consequences for the economic, social and educational development of the country.

The study describes how the recent conflict in Bosnia was brought to an end as the result of intervention and negotiation by members of the international community which led to the signing of the Dayton Agreement. They also played a strong role in shaping the Agreement, an agreement which has had consequences for educational provision in Bosnia.

The Dayton Agreement, described in Chapter 7, provided Bosnia with a constitution and a political structure which commanded sufficient acceptance from the Presidents of the three countries to produce a new settlement ‘on the ground’, including educational provision. The complex state constitution and political structure provided by the Agreement gave
little authority to the state government and made it reliant on the two Entity governments (the Muslim-Croat Federation and Republika Srpska) for funding. The government of Republika Srpska encountered fewer problems in operating as it was a Serbian, mono-ethnic, government presiding over a Serbian majority population. Within the Muslim-Croat Federation each Minister of State had two deputies, to allow for representation for each ethnic group, and any decision making had to be by consensus, which led to delays in decisions.

The Federation government was given no responsibility for education provision and the canton education ministries were reported as refusing to co-operate with the Federation Minister for Education, which meant that the state was unable to institute any educational change. Educational provision was the responsibility of the local cantons, most of which were designated by the Dayton Agreement as either Muslim or Croat. The cantons were political institutions dominated by nationalist politicians and this influenced the development of educational provision, as decisions were made on the basis of nationalist politics rather than educational policies.

The study reports some of the educational consequences of the Dayton Agreement, for example that in the mono-ethnic cantons provision became wholly mono-ethnic, reinforcing the nationalist divisions that emerged from the war.

In the mono-ethnic cantons in Bosnia there were other, possibly unforeseen, consequences. Despite being labelled mono-ethnic, the cantons were experiencing the return of minority ethnic groups to their former homes and these returnee families wanted to send their children to school. In many areas the schools maintained their mono-ethnic nature, which had the effect of denying the returnee children the right to learn about their cultural identity and language, as provided for in the constitution drawn up by the Dayton Agreement. In a
few areas there were ‘shared’ schools, attended by Muslim and Croat children at different times or at the same time using different floors of the building but there was no integration in the shared schools. International organisation representatives requested schools to change this practice but went unheeded, indicating both the strength of nationalist political will in the cantons and the lack of authority of the international community. One educational consequence of the post-conflict resolution agreement negotiated by the international community was that it appeared to allow the education system to be used to continue the war-time hostilities.

The data from the study report how, in Mostar, the two main nationalist groups were unwilling to work together and unable to reach political agreement, causing the continued existence of two parallel education systems. The education agenda was openly being controlled by nationalist politics. The Dayton Agreement, which was designed by the international community to bring about conflict resolution, had created a political situation that supported the ethnic division of education provision. Since the end of the civil war attempts by the international community to bring about social integration have been thwarted by the nationalist politicians, with the support of the population, who appeared to prefer the maintenance of ethnic separation. Chapter 7 describes the consequences of the ethnic separation of education with both groups reverting to the pre-communist nationalist agenda and the nationalist teaching of language, literature, history and religion; this is discussed in theme one.

The study describes how the international organisations continued to work in Bosnia in the post-conflict period to help ensure the implementation of the Dayton Agreement and aid the development of the country. It also describes how it proved difficult for the international organisations to move beyond the level of providing financial support and provision of resources, needs that were easily met and were welcomed by the recipients.
Attempts to bring about educational reform were made by the international organisations, with the World Bank Project 2000, an EU-funded project and the Education Group of International Organisations set up by the OSCE in 2002, but the reforms proposed by each of these groups and described in Chapter 7 were obstructed by the intransigence of the nationalist politicians and the local population who supported them.

One possible reason for these consequences of the post-conflict agreement devised by the international organisations was their failure to understand the Balkan mentality. There are two views on how Balkan history has influenced its peoples; one is that their history of imperial domination, from the Ottomans to the communists, led to a general acceptance of the authority of government. An alternative view is that this history led them to regard the government as an ‘alien force’ which they distrusted and for which they had little respect (Magas 1998, p.69).

It is unclear which view was held by the international organisations, or if any consideration was given to the matter. The Dayton Agreement included provision for state and Federation governments but also instituted the Office of the High Commissioner; this was the highest political office in Bosnia and was held by an international politician appointed to oversee the implementation of the Dayton Agreement. The High Commissioner in 2002 was reported as saying that, given their history, ‘it’s not surprising that the people regard me as just another Hapsburg governor, someone they should petition to get their problems solved …’ (Glover 2002, p.3). However this was not borne out by experience, if it were then the people of Bosnia would have implemented both the word and the spirit of the Dayton Agreement or would have turned again to the Office of the High Commissioner to resolve the nationalist issues. Instead they adopted firm political positions and showed little inclination towards negotiation, whether mediated by international organisations or not.
The alternative view of the Balkan mentality would suggest that, as Bosnia began to exercise its own newly-found political autonomy, any external agency attempting to assert itself or urge reform was likely to be met with disregard. The situation in Bosnia, as illustrated in Chapter 7, was more representative of this view. The Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Serbs ignored the authority of the international community, showed distrust and little respect and continued their support of the nationalist politicians. The authority of the canton, pro-nationalist, governments was the strongest for the people of the Balkans as they attempted to build their own nation states and created their own national identities.

Other reasons, which support the ‘anti-authority’ view, can be suggested for the educational consequences of the post-conflict agreement in Bosnia. A Senior Adviser to UNESCO has stated that there was a perception that UNESCO promulgated western values rather than accepting and working with values inherent in the country but that this was more of a perception than a reality and needed to be addressed (Patru, 2003). Yet the evidence from this study seems to indicate that the proposals for educational reform in Bosnia developed with the support of the international community mirror the educational systems of western Europe, systems that have grown out of the social and cultural context of western Europe and which may not be possible, or acceptable, within other – different – social and cultural contexts. Any proposals for educational development in Bosnia need to take account of the long-held differences between the three ethnic groups and the fact that these cannot be ignored or papered over. Malcolm (1996, p.246) attributed the failure of earlier peace negotiations in Bosnia to the fact that ‘the international community had failed to consider the fundamental causes of the conflict’. It is suggested that there was also a need for them to demonstrate consideration and understanding in relation to educational conflicts.
The international community continued to work with politicians and educators in Bosnia in the development of post-conflict education provision. The government of Bosnia declared an intention to apply for entry to the European Union in 2007 and in order to be considered for this it will need to show that educational reform has been introduced, as well as meeting political, social and economic conditions. Major effort will be required to move the population away from their deep-rooted support for the nationalist politicians to find ways forward and promote social and economic development. The international community, therefore, may still have a role to play in continuing to mediate the post-conflict resolution agreements, including the development of educational provision.

The data provide evidence to support the claims found in the literature that conflict resolution agreements have post-conflict consequences for education as the political structure created under the Dayton Agreement appears to have hindered the development of educational provision. UNESCO claims that post-conflict mediation should ‘avoid replication of educational structures that may have contributed to conflict’ (www.unesco.org/education accessed 21.10.2003) but there was little evidence in Bosnia that this had occurred. There is evidence in the data to support to some extent the views of the critics in that the international organisations appear, in the draft legislation that they proposed, to have attempted to impose western ideas into Bosnian reform proposals without consideration of the suitability or appropriateness of these.

The analysis has highlighted the way that the educational reform process in Bosnia differs in many respects from that experienced by other post-communist countries. This was mostly due to the effects of the civil war, which itself resulted from the long-standing nationalist tensions in the region. The analysis also indicates the importance of the social and political context on educational change and the impact that this has on primary school teachers.
The following chapter reflects on this study and suggests ways of developing this research.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to investigate the influences of political and social changes on primary schooling in Bosnia. The aim was to gain a comprehensive understanding and to attempt to disentangle the complex issues surrounding the politics of the region and their impact on educational provision.

The research suggests that ethnic differences in the region, linked to religious affiliation, stretch back centuries and religious and nationalist influences continue to shape education. This is not unusual, but it is taken for granted when the majority of the population shares the same ethno-religious identity. It becomes problematic in more diverse societies, as existed in Bosnia, and is becoming increasingly common with the growth of globalisation and population movements.

It was also found that Bosnia’s history is one of recurring themes including the imposition of external authorities and constant threats to its borders, both of which fuelled the nationalist tendencies of the population. There did appear to be a difference, however, between the populations describing themselves as Bosnian Croat, Bosnian Serb and Bosnian Muslim or Bosniak. During the war each faction appeared to fight as passionately as the others but in the post-war period the Croats and Serbs demonstrated the more fervent nationalist tendencies, seeking ethnic separation, whilst the Bosniaks expressed the need for co-operation and integration. There are several reasons why this might be the case; the Serbs and Croats have longer national histories and traditions which are likely to have imbued their national character whilst the Bosniaks, it was claimed, were once Serbs and Croats themselves. The Bosniak attitude could be the result of their years of domination and submission, characterised by their conversion to Islam under Ottoman rule in order to seek favour and acceptance.
Links to other research

Existing literature revealed a number of themes that were investigated during the study. Research conducted in post-communist countries in central and eastern Europe indicated that in times of transition, or conflict, school systems can become an arena for competing political and ideological forces; this was particularly true when nationalism was one of the competing forces. This work provided evidence that confirmed this, particularly in relation to the influence of nationalist ideology in shaping educational policy and practice.

Literature on educational change in countries in transition proposed that reform follows a series of stages and that effective implementation, the final stage, requires the presence of identified supporting factors. Whilst this study provided support for the general principle of there being stages in the reform process, it challenged the existing models as these did not explain the Bosnian experience; a model was suggested. It did, however, confirm that the presence of the supporting factors was effective in contributing to implementation of change and that their absence was likely to lead to failure in implementation.

The educational reform process consists of macro-level change, identified by policy and legislative change, and micro-level change, identified by a change in teachers’ classroom practice. The literature identified that, following conflict or transition, macro-level change occurred within a few years but that micro-level change took longer to implement. This study found evidence that challenged this view and proposed that the political context in which change occurs was the main determinant of the speed and order of reform. It was suggested that in highly centralised political systems micro-level reform is enacted more quickly because of the degree of control over teachers’ work held by those at the centre, through the handing down of instructions which teachers were expected to follow and through the monitoring of their work by inspectors. The evidence also suggested that
where teachers supported reform it was implemented more quickly, but that the type of reform was also a factor. Where teachers were required to change their practice superficially, for example, to teach one set of facts rather than another, then this occurred more quickly than change of a higher order, for example a change in pedagogy or an expectation that teachers previously unused to decision making would demonstrate more autonomy in their professional decisions.

Evidence from research in eastern bloc countries undergoing transition to a free market economy indicated that the transition detrimentally affected teachers’ remuneration and status, whilst increasing their responsibilities. In Bosnia it was found that the poor economic conditions did detrimentally affect teachers and that they did experience a loss of status, but that this was due to a number of factors. Teachers traditionally had been accorded high status and in a free market economy conditions the low pay they received did contribute to a reduction in status. A perceived deterioration in the quality of teaching, possibly linked to raised expectations due to school charges and raised hopes following the war, also contributed. There was also some general dissatisfaction with post-war economic conditions and it was possible that these were directed at education rather than elsewhere. It was also found that teachers’ responsibilities in Bosnia were not increased; autonomy that they had begun to develop during the war-time teaching conditions was relinquished and practice reverted to responding to instructions from the centre.

Earlier research also suggested that in response to their reduced status teachers reverted to traditional approaches to teaching in order to regain status. This was challenged by this study, which found that teachers made little attempt to regain lost status; rather they left the profession if they were able to and those unable to leave demonstrated reduced commitment to their work, further reinforcing parents and pupils dissatisfaction and leading to further decline in status.
Finally, existing research indicated that international organisations were playing an increasing role in mediating conflict agreements and that these agreements had consequences for educational provision. This was confirmed by the data in this study which found that the General Framework Agreement for Peace (the Dayton Agreement) to end the civil war, created a complex political structure in Bosnia which hindered educational reform through its reinforcement of ethnic divisions.

**The contribution of this research**

There is a large body of work describing the development of education in Bosnia which is not available in the English language. This study contributes to knowledge on educational developments in central and eastern Europe by including the Bosnian experience. The evidence from the study adds weight to the view that the communist legacy has left many teachers unable to initiate and implement change and that, if teachers are expected to become more professionally autonomous, there is a need for in-service training and a revision to pre-service training.

The study also contributes to the research literature on educational developments in countries in transition. It shows that where transition involves political transition from centralised control to democracy, economic transition from a planned economy to a free market one and social/political transition when a new nation state is emerging, existing models of educational reform do not sufficiently take account of this multi-dimensionality and that a new model is needed. The study adds to the knowledge on the implementation of educational reform, suggesting that the political context is the main determinant of effective implementation. It also suggests that implementation by teachers occurs more quickly in contexts where their work is highly controlled, when the reforms are welcomed and when only superficial change to their practice is required.
Evidence is provided in the study that post-conflict agreements drawn up by the international organisations have consequences for education. This suggests that these need to be carefully considered to ensure that they contribute to the development of peace rather than the continuation of hostilities by other means, or further division of the community.

Development of the research area

The research was a case study of primary education in Bosnia, with Mostar as its prime location. This brought particular strengths, which are discussed in Chapter 2, but research of this nature also has limitations.

Research work serves two important purposes, one is to illuminate particular instances and provide insight and the other is to add to the more general body of knowledge, often referred to as its ‘generalisability’. As generalising from specific instances can be problematic, it has been suggested that terms other than generalisability are more suited to case study research, for example illumination, resonance (Schweisfurth 1999) and transferability (O’Leary 2004). Others suggest that social science research is always context-dependent and generalisability is ‘highly problematic’. Case study work, because of its individual nature, could be considered as not relevant to wider discussion but Stenhouse (in Burgess and Rudduck 1993) argues that it contributes to the cumulation of data. O’Leary (2004, p.58) asserts that qualitative research leads to ‘lessons learned’ that can be transferred to different settings. Whilst it is acknowledged that the detailed findings of this research could not be generalised to all cases they may be generalisable to theoretical principles and can be used to expand existing theory.

This research was intended to provide insight into the specific case of Bosnia’s educational development but it is hoped that the data generated can usefully contribute to the wider
discussion of how political change impacts on education. It has also been argued that case studies explain the reality of the experience rather than what ‘ought’ to be happening (Schweisfurth 1999, p.338), and this informs judgement and can be used to inform policy.

There are several ways in which this work could be extended. At the close of the study the international organisations had increased their role in educational reform discussions and further work could be undertaken to discover the consequences and effectiveness of their interventions. Further work could focus on one aspect of the study, for example teacher education or a case study of one school or one classroom to provide further micro-level detail. Alternatively, research could be undertaken on high school provision in Bosnia to test out whether the findings would be comparable.

Research in Bosnia could also be undertaken in order to chart its development as a newly-independent nation state and in order to compare developments with other central and eastern European countries. There is also a growing body of research focusing on education in post-conflict contexts and further work in Bosnia could contribute to this.
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Appendix 3 – interview schedules

Canton Minister of Education - Interview

When were you elected to this post? For how long will you hold office?

What is your relationship with the Federation Ministry of Education – what do they have responsibility for in Mostar & what do you have responsibility for?

Who funds education in Mostar?

How is primary education organized in this Canton?

How is it structured?

How are pupils/teachers allocated to schools?

Who governs/controls the schools?

Does the Canton provide the ‘instruction program’ to schools?
If so, who writes this?

Mostar pre-1990:
Do you have any records from before the war, e.g. the number of primary schools, the number of pupils, teachers? Do you have a pre-war plan/program?

Who was responsible for primary education in Mostar?

Who governed/controlled the primary schools?

Who provided the money for primary education?

How were teachers allocated to schools, or could they apply to work where they wanted?

In 1990-91, with the move away from communism & the declaration of sovereignty in Oct 1991/independence in 1992, did the government have plans for primary education?

Mostar 1992-95
Initially Mostar was fighting together against Serbian/JNA forces – how did this affect primary education provision?

Who made decisions about which schools stayed open/closed? On what basis was it decided?

How was this information transmitted to schools, parents & pupils?

Who kept track of what was happening to educational provision?
i.e. how many school places were open officially/unofficially, where they were, who staffed them, who attended them ….
Did the government still issue ‘instruction programs’ to schools during the war? If yes, who wrote these?

When Mostar itself became divided by fighting – what further impact did this have on primary education provision?

**Mostar 1996**
How soon were you able to re-open schools? Which schools?

How was this information transmitted to schools & parents?

Who funded school provision/reconstruction?

Who governed/controlled these schools?

How were staff appointed to schools?

How did the government go about rebuilding its primary education provision – there were so many priorities, did the government have policies or plans for primary education?

What is your plan, what are your key goals, for primary education in Mostar?

Are there any private schools in Mostar?

Is there a Federation policy on education?

I understand that the Federation has recently issued ‘guidelines’ on education (September 2001) – will the Canton accept these?

Is there a Canton policy on education?

Has the Canton made any laws in the last seven years that affect primary education?
Canton education officials/university staff/IO staff - Interview

Mostar pre-1990:
How many primary schools were there in Mostar:

Where were these schools located:

Entry requirements:

How were they funded?

Who were schools governed/controlled by:

Who appointed staff to the schools? On what basis were staff appointed?

Mostar 1992-95:
Who made decisions about which schools stayed open/closed? On what basis were decisions made?

How was this information transmitted to schools?

Who kept track of what was happening to educational provision?
I.e. how many school places were open officially/unofficially, where they were, who staffed them, who attended them …. 

Mostar 1996:
Who decided which schools would re-open? On what basis was the decision made?

How was this information transmitted to schools & parents?

Who funded school provision/reconstruction? How much was made available?

Who governed/controlled the schools?

How were staff appointed to schools?

How were pupils allocated to school places?

Mostar post-1996:
How many primary schools were there in Mostar:

Location of these?:

Entry requirements:

How were they funded?

Who were schools governed/controlled by:
Teachers - Interview

**Were you a primary school teacher in 1990?**
If yes:
Where did you study to become a teacher?

Which school did you teach at in 1990?

Did you apply for the post or were you 'allocated' to this school?

Where was this school?

Which pupils attended the school? Was there a defined 'catchment area' or any special entry requirements?

Who governed/ran the school?

Who funded the school?

How was the school day structured? How many lessons did you teach each day, how long did lessons last?

What did you teach? (subject & details of content)

How did you teach? (pedagogy)

What was the content & pedagogy based on? Instructions from 'the authorities' (who)? University teaching? School guidelines? Own educational philosophy?

What resources did you have to help with your teaching?

How were pupils assessed?

Were you assessed in any way?

Did you have any support/professional development?

Were you well-paid?

Was primary teaching a good job?

**Were you teaching in a primary school in 1992?**
If yes:
When did you qualify? Where did you study?

Where was the school?

Did the school stop teaching at all during the war?
If yes:
When did it officially close? Who decided?
How were you informed that the school had closed?

What did you do?

**During the war:**
Did you teach at all during the war?
If yes:
Where did you teach?

Who controlled or governed this?

Who funded it?

Did you teach every day or only some days, & was it all day or only part of the day?

Which pupils attended? How many? How did they know about the 'school'?

What did you teach? (content, not just subject)

Did you have any resources?

Did you assess pupils at all? (if yes - when, how)

Were you paid for this work at all?

**Were you a primary school teacher in 1996?**
If yes:
When did you qualify? Where did you study?

When did primary schools begin to re-open?

Which schools re-opened? Where were they located? How many?

Who decided which schools re-opened?
Who governed/ran the schools?

Who funded them? How? How much?

How were parents & pupils informed that the school had re-opened?

Which pupils attended the school?

Were there any special entry requirements?

Who decided which class pupils went in to? Was this based on age or previous school attendance?

Who taught at the school?

What did you teach? (content, not just subject)

Did you have any resources?
Did you assess the pupils? If yes, when & how

**Were you a primary school teacher in 2000/2002?**
If yes:
When did you qualify? Where did you study?

Which school do you teach at? Did you apply or were you 'allocated' to this school?

Where is this school?

Which pupils attend the school? How many? Is there a defined 'catchment area' or any special entry requirements?

Who governs/runs the school? – who controls primary education in Mostar?

Who funds the school? – who funds primary education in Mostar?

How is the school day structured? What time does it start/finish?

What do you teach? (subject & details of content)

What are the subjects studied in primary school?

How do you teach? (pedagogy)

What is the content & pedagogy based on? Instruction programs from 'the authorities' (who)? University teaching? School guidelines? Own educational philosophy?

If ‘instruction programs’ are used – who writes these?

What resources do you have to help with your teaching?

How are pupils assessed?

Are you assessed in any way? Does anyone ‘monitor’ the work that you do?

Do you have any support/professional development?

What is the ‘zavod’?

Do you know if there is a Federation policy on education? If yes, details

Do you know if there is a Canton policy on education? If yes, details

Have any laws been passed since 1995 that affect primary education?

Are you well-paid? Is primary teaching a good job?

Do you know the name of the Minister of Education in Mostar?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS RESEARCH
Are there any other comments that you want to make about your teaching experience?
Parents - Interview

After the fall of communism, & before the start of the war, what was life like here in Mostar – how were people feeling?

Did you have children at primary school in 1990?
Where was the school located?
How did your child get to school?
Were there any special entry requirements that your child had to meet in order that she/he could attend the school?
Which other children attended the school? How many children attended?
Who ran the school? Who was in charge, Director or the Ministry/government?
Did you have to pay anything towards your child's education? (if yes, details)
Who taught your child? What were the teachers like? How did they teach?
Did the teachers follow an ‘instruction program’ from the govt?
Did your child have homework? (if yes, details)
How was your child assessed at the school?

Did you have children at primary school in 1992?
If yes:
Did the school close at all during the war?
Do you know why, or who made the decision?

If the school did not close:
Where was the school?
How did your child get to school?
How did you find out about the school?
When did your child go - every day or only some days, all day or only part of the day?
Did you have to pay anything towards your child's education? E.g for books or other resources
Who taught at the school?
Did your child have any homework during this time? If yes, how did you cope with that?
Was your child's learning assessed in any way during this time? If yes, details
Did you have a child at primary school in 1996?
If yes:
Where was the school?

How did your child get to the school?

When did the school officially start teaching?

How did you find out about it?

Who ran the school?

Were there any special entry requirements that your child had to meet in order to attend the school?

Which other children attended the school? How many children attended?

Who decided which class your child would be in?

Who taught your child?

Did you have to pay anything towards your child's education at this school? E.g. for books or other resources

How was your child's learning assessed? (when, how)

Did you have a child at primary school in 2000/2002?
If yes:
Where is the school?

How does your child get to the school?

Who runs the school? (The Director or the Ministry?)

Do you have to pay anything towards your child's education? (if yes, details)

Were there any special entry requirements that your child had to meet in order that she/he could attend the school?

Which other children attend the school? How many children attend?

Do the teachers follow ‘instruction programs’ for their teaching? Where do these come from?

What are the teachers like?

Does your child have homework? (if yes, details)

How is your child assessed at the school?

Do you know if there is a Federation policy on education? If yes, details

Do you know if there is a Canton policy on education? If yes, details
Have any laws been passed since 1995 that affect primary education?

Are you satisfied with the primary education that your child receives?

Where did you go to primary school?

When you (the parents) were at school what subjects did you study?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS RESEARCH
Are there any other comments that you want to make about your child's experience of primary school?
Pupils - Interview

Date of birth:

Where did/do you go to primary school?

Did you attend primary school during 1990?

What year/class were you in (in 1990)?

Did you choose this school, or did the Ministry/government tell you to go there?

How did you get to school?

Which other children attended this school?

Who do you think ran the school? Who was in charge?

How was the school day structured? What time did you start/finish, have breaks …?

How was the timetable structured? How many lessons did you have each day, how long did each lesson last…?

What did you learn at school, what subjects?

What were your teachers like? How did they teach you?

What books or other resources did you have to help with your learning?

How were you assessed? When, who, how?

Were you at primary school in 1992?

If yes, what year/class were you in?

Did your school close down at all during the war? If yes:

Do you know why, or who made the decision to close it?

How did you find out that the school had closed?

What did you do?

If the school did not close:

Where did you go to school?

How did you get to school?
How did you find out about this school?

When did you go - every day or only some days, all day or only part of the day?

How did you know when to go?

Who taught at the school? How did they teach you?

What did you learn? Subjects/instruction program? Other things?

What books or other resources did you have to help you learn?

Was your learning assessed in any way? When, who, how?

At the end of the war, 1996, were you still at primary school?
If yes, which year/class were you in?

Is this the class that you should have been in, based on your age?

When did schools officially begin to re-open? Who decided this?

How did you find out about which schools were open?

How many schools opened in your area?

Who ran these schools?

How did you decide which school to go to?

How did you get to school?

Were there any special entry requirements that you had to meet so that you could attend this school?

Which other children attended this school? How many children attended?

How was the school day structured? What time did you start/finish, have breaks …?

How was the timetable structured? How many lessons did you have each day, how long did the lessons last?

What did you learn at school, what subjects/instruction program?

What were your teachers like? How did they teach you?

What books or other resources did you have to help with your learning?

How were you assessed? When, who, how?
Were you at primary school in 2002?
What year/class are you in?

Were there any special entry requirements that you had to meet so that you could attend this school?

How do you get to school?

Which other children attend this school? How many children attend?

Who do you think runs the school? Who is in charge?

How is the school day structured? What time do you start/finish, have breaks …?

How was the timetable structured? How many lessons do you have each day, how long does each lesson last?

What subjects do you have?

What are your teachers like? Do they teach you differently now than before?

What books or other resources do you have to help with your learning?

How are you assessed? When, who, how?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS RESEARCH

Are there any other comments that you want to make about your primary school experience?
### Appendix 4 – list of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Role and description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Josipa    | Minister of Education  
            Female politician, educational background, had responsibility for education in west Mostar |
| Aldin     | Deputy Minister of Education  
            Male politician, political background, had responsibility for education in east Mostar |
| Mirsan    | Retired government official (male), had held educational posts in a number of offices under the communist government |
| Vahid     | Retired primary school Director (male), had worked under the communist government |
| Amela     | Director of the Pedagogical Institute at the University Dzemal Bijedic, east Mostar  
            Female, had previously been a teacher and worked on a *zavod* |
| Ivana     | Professor at the Sveuciliste University, west Mostar  
            Female, taught on the English course which also prepared teachers, had previously been a teacher |
| Asra      | Teacher  
            Female, trained during the communist era but did not teach due to low pay, returned as a teacher during the civil war |
| Zerina    | Teacher  
            Female, began training at the very end of the war to teach Bosnian but became a teacher of English |
| Esma      | Teacher  
            Female, began training in 1999 to be a teacher of English |
| Marijana  | Student teacher  
            Female, training to be a teacher of English |
| Zekia     | Parents |
| Hilzema   |          |
| Aldijana  |          |
| Ahmed     |          |
| Josip     |          |
| Omer      |          |
| Nina      |          |
| Selena    | Pupils |
| Ramis     |          |
| Milica    |          |
| Sead      |          |
| Maja      |          |
| Anida     |          |
| Alisa     |          |
| Amel      |          |
| Amel      |          |
| Sadina    |          |
| Vida      |          |
| Jakob     |          |
| Matthew   | Representative of the Office of the High Representative |
| Dzenana   | Representative of Soros OpenFund |
| Daniel    | representative of UNHCR |
| Lyndsey   | Representative of OSCE |