

# **Ethnic Conflict Management and Deliberative Transformative Moments in Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Inaugural dissertation submitted by Simona Mameli in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor rerum socialium at the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences of the University of Bern.

Submitted by Simona Mameli from Cagliari, Italy

[2018]

Original document saved on the web server of the University Library of Bern



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-No derivative works 2.5 Switzerland  
licence. To see the licence go to <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/ch/> or  
write to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California 94105,  
USA.

## Copyright Notice

This document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-No derivative works 2.5 Switzerland. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/ch/>

**You are free:**



to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

**Under the following conditions:**



**Attribution.** You must give the original author credit.



**Non-Commercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



**No derivative works.** You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work..

For any reuse or distribution, you must take clear to others the license terms of this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights according to Swiss law.

The detailed license agreement can be found at:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/ch/legalcode.de>

The faculty accepted this work as dissertation on 24.05.2018 at the request of the two advisors Prof. Dr. Adrian Vatter and Prof. Emer. Jürg Steiner without wishing to take a position on the view presented therein.



*To Iris and to all children of mixed marriages in divided societies: let your superordinate identity and your enthusiasm be the strongest instruments to promote inclusiveness and deliberative talks across divisions, against prejudices and hatred.*



## **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	9
Chapter 1: Theoretical background .....	22
1.1 Social-psychological approaches to ethnic conflict.....	22
1.2 Institutional approaches to ethnic conflict: from consociationalism to deliberation..	31
1.3.Deliberation and Ethnic Conflict Management .....	37
Chapter 2. Hypotheses, data collection, and type of analysis.....	45
Chapter 3: First Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica .....	67
3.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations	67
3.2. Group structure .....	71
3.3. Group discussion .....	72
3.4. Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes	118
3.4.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation .....	118
3.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation .....	121
3.5. Outcomes and deliberation .....	123
3.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 1 .....	123
Chapter 4: Second Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica.....	127
4.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations	127
.....	127
4.2. Group Structure .....	130
4.2. Group discussion .....	131
4.3 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes .	166
4.3.1.Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation.....	166
4.3.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation .....	170
4.5. Outcomes and deliberation .....	176
4.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 2 .....	176
Chapter 5: Third Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica.....	180
5.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations	180
.....	180
5.2 Group structure .....	182
5.3 Group discussion .....	183
5.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes .	215
5.4.1.Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation.....	216
5.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation .....	217
5.5 Outcomes and deliberation .....	219
5.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 3 .....	219
Chapter 6: Fourth Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica.....	221
6.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations	221
.....	221

6.2. Group structure .....	226
6.3. Group discussion .....	227
6.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes .	267
6.4.1.Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation .....	267
6.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation .....	270
6.5 Outcomes and deliberation .....	272
6.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 4 .....	273
Chapter 7: Fifth Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica.....	275
7.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations .....	275
7.2. Group Structure .....	280
7.3. Group discussion .....	281
7.4. Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes	292
7.4.1.Transformative moments from a high to a low level of deliberation.....	292
7.4.2.Transformative moments from a low to a high level of deliberation.....	293
7.5. Outcomes and deliberation .....	294
8.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 5 .....	294
Chapter 8: Group 6 of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica .....	296
8.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations .....	296
8.2. Group structure .....	301
8.3. Group discussion .....	302
8.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes .	323
8.4.1.Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation .....	323
8.4.2. Transformative moments from a low to a high level of deliberation .....	325
8.5. Outcomes and deliberation .....	326
8.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 6 .....	327
Conclusion .....	329
Bibliography .....	342
Attachment 1. Questionnaires (Bosnian language) .....	352
Attachment 2. Questionnaires (English translation).....	369



## **Introduction**

In the aftermath of any civil war, reconstructing inter-ethnic trust and dialogue across the division lines in order to rebuild a common citizenship represents the most serious challenge for peace-builders. While the adoption of power sharing formulas at the institutional level may help, nevertheless, institutions alone, cannot help much, if there are not changes in attitudes and behaviours at societal and inter-group level. In this sense, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, although violence stopped after the Dayton Accord, the ethnic conflict has not yet run out of its destabilizing potential.

The relevance of ethno-mobilization as a potential destabilizing factor in internal and international politics and the pervasiveness of ethnicity within contemporary civil wars world-wide, induced many scholars of different disciplines, from history to political science, from anthropology to sociology and social psychology, to dedicate their work to develop different approaches for understanding ethnic-conflict. Ways are proposed to prevent such conflicts and to find solutions that they do not occur again. My dissertation fits in the same branch of research, and intends to focus on the role of deliberation in ethnic conflict management, taking Bosnia-Herzegovina, and specifically the mixed community of war-torn town of Srebrenica, as a case study. Focusing my research on possible strategies for ethnic conflict settlement does not require further justification, given the moral and scientific interest universally shared to find answers to put an end to human suffering, in particular violations of human rights and minority rights. Ethnic conflicts also have economic costs that are often considerable.

Political science approaches to conflict management in divided societies have their traditional roots in Arend Lijphart's work on consociationalism and

power sharing formulas for granting stability to deeply divided societies<sup>1</sup>. However, if a political culture aimed at accommodating conflicting requests among political leaders and across society at large does not exist, institutions *per se* will not solve the problems. On the contrary, power sharing institutions may freeze or even worsen inter-group separation<sup>2</sup>. Adis Merdžanović has made this argument in a particularly forceful way for Bosnia and Herzegovina. For him, power sharing institutions are not the solution but the problem for Bosnia and Herzegovina<sup>3</sup>. Deliberative scholars have only relatively recently started to deal with conflict management in deeply divided societies<sup>4</sup>. Nevertheless, the literature is already rich in claims and intuitions about the possible role that deliberative practices may play in conflict mitigation within deeply divided societies<sup>5</sup>. For instance, within the deliberative field, some scholars have argued that deliberative participation in policy-making practices may help, if a super-ordinate goal has been established, to create transversal alliances among citizens of deeply divided societies, generating a feeling of attachment to the very deliberative practice that might help, in the long run, to overcome divisions<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, by multiplying occasions of positive inter-group contact, the way might

---

<sup>1</sup> Arend Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation. Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1968; Arend Lijphart, *Le democrazie contemporanee*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2001.

<sup>2</sup> For a review on various criticisms against possible pitfalls of consociational mechanisms applied in deeply divided societies, see Ian O' Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, ss. pp. 149-161. For specific problems of the consociational model applied to Bosnia and Herzegovina, see Florian Bieber, "Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina", in Florian Bieber, Carsten Wieland (Eds), *Facing the Past, Facing the Future: Confronting Ethnicity and Conflict in Bosnia and Former Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2005, pp. 151-161; Florian Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia. Ethnicity, Inequality and Public Sector Governance*, Housemills, UNRISD/Palgrave, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015. See also its the review by Jürg Steiner in *Swiss Political Science Review*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, June 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, 2006, p. 162.

<sup>5</sup> Among the others: John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia", in *Political Theory*, n. 33, 2005, pp. 218-242; Ian O' Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*; Lawrence Susskind, Sara McKearnan, *The Consensus-Building Handbook*, Sage Ed., Thousand oaks, California, 1999; Bora Kanra, "Islam, Democracy and Dialogue: The Case of Turkey", in *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 40, n. 4, 2005, pp. 515-540; John S. Dryzek, Simon Niemeyer, "Reconciling Pluralism and Consensus as Political Ideals", in *American Journal of Political Science*, n. 50/2006, pp. 634-649.

<sup>6</sup> *Cfr.* particularly Ian O' Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*

be paved for removing prejudices and inter-group conflict, according to the social-psychological approach of “Contact Hypothesis”<sup>7</sup>, stating that inter-group contact under the right circumstances may lead to remove negative prejudices and foster conflict reduction. Behind the contact hypothesis there is a premise, indeed, under which conflicts erupt and perpetuate throughout the lack of inter-group dialogue<sup>8</sup>.

Nevertheless the optimistic attractiveness of perspectives described by deliberative democrats, the lack of empirical investigation on the field has so far precluded any empirical confirmation of the role deliberative practices may play in conflict reduction within deeply divided societies.

Given the difficulties of consociational institutional models to promote by itself ethnic conflict transformation and reconciliation, especially at the grass root level of a society torn by severe wars and hatred, I intend to verify whether deliberative practices may help ethnic conflict mitigation in a deeply divided society. Personal interests and involvement in Western Balkans for a long time inspired the selection of the case study of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a heart-shaped and green diamond land in the middle of the Balkans. This is a country that counted the highest level of inter-ethnic tolerance during the ‘80s among former Yugoslav republics and autonomous provinces<sup>9</sup> and that nevertheless was severely torn apart during the early 90’s by a violent civil war opposing all three Bosnian constituent groups (Muslims and Croats versus Serbs, but also Muslim versus Croats and Muslims versus Muslims, in certain phases of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Originally developed within the Social Psychology field by Gordon W. Allport (G. W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1954)

<sup>8</sup> Many social-psychologists recognize the lack of communication at the basis for escalation of conflict, since dialogue limited within the in-group contribute to harden position under a process called “group polarization”, that, like a mirror, characterizes also the out-group’s inner interactions among its members. Cfr. Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Hove and New York, 2007, pp. 492-493; Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2003, p. 189. Lack of dialogue for escalating and perpetuating the conflict has been stressed also by political scientists (Cfr. f.i. Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, Ed. Einaudi, Torino, 2007) and scholars in the field of Peace Studies (cfr. Johan Galtung, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means. The Transcend Method*, United Nations Press, 2000).

<sup>9</sup> Duško Sekulić, Randy Hodson, Garth Massey, “War and Tolerance”, in *Revija za Sociologiju*, (Croatian Sociological Association Publ.), N. 33 (1/2), 2002.

conflict).<sup>10</sup> Bosnia and Herzegovina was forced, in the aftermath of the conflict by the Dayton Peace Agreements, to adopt strong power sharing mechanisms assigning strong veto powers to each ethnic group which to a great extent seemed to contribute in freezing ethnic divisions, especially between the two constituent entities (Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republic of Srpska).<sup>11</sup> It is a country defined as a “State without a Demos”<sup>12</sup>, often said able to survive day by day just because of the interferences of the International Community in its ordinary life<sup>13</sup>.

Taking into consideration the relevant literature on ethnic conflict management, and particularly the socio-psychological approaches considering the lack of dialogue as the most responsible factor both for escalation of conflicts and for perpetuating ethnic divisions, with a special focus on “Contact Hypothesis” and the beneficial effects that inter-group contact may play under the right circumstances (among which equal status of groups, societal environment fostering conflict reduction, cooperation on super-ordinate goals)<sup>14</sup>, I intend to verify, through an experimental method (organizing dialogue meetings among random samples of citizens in war-torn town of Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina) whether the same right circumstances experienced as favoring conflict reduction under the Contact Hypothesis may help the quality of discourse, namely deliberation, in deeply divided societies. In other terms, I am interested in investigating whether a positive causal correlation exists between contact and deliberation. The quality of deliberation will be measured using an adapted index for Discourse Quality Index (DQI), developed within the deliberative field, indicating how far a given dialogical interaction is from ideal

---

<sup>10</sup> Stefano Bianchini, *La questione jugoslava*, Giunti-Casterman Ed., Firenze, 1999, p. 164; Stefano Bianchini, *Sarajevo, le radici dell'odio*, Ed. Associate Editrice Internazionale, Roma, 2003.

<sup>11</sup>; Dario D'Urso, “L'insostenibile leggerezza della Bosnia –Erzegovina”, in I Quaderni Speciali di Limesplus – Rivista Italiana di Geopolitica – Kosovo, lo Stato delle Mafie, n. 6/2006, Gruppo Editoriale L'Espresso, Roma, 2006, p. 157; Florian Bieber, “Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, *op. cit.*

<sup>12</sup> Azra Hromadžić, *Samo Bosne nema*, Biblioteka XX vek, Belgrade, 2017

<sup>13</sup> Dario D'Urso, “L'insostenibile leggerezza della Bosnia –Erzegovina”, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-158.

<sup>14</sup> Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, *op. cit.*

deliberation<sup>15</sup>, and representing a quantitative indicator of the “spirit of accommodation” existing among participants. In particular, I intend to measure the quality of discourse among citizens in Srebrenica which is severely divided between Serbs and Bošnjaks (Muslims). I will observe how the DQI may change with relation to people experiencing right or wrong “contact” premises. I also intend to investigate, through qualitative analysis, the “turning points” affecting the development of dialogue, with the aim of individuating which factors better explain the DQI performance during experiments. While under my first hypothesis the DQI will represent the dependent variable, under the second hypothesis I will consider the quality of dialogical interaction as antecedent for ethnic conflict settlement. Here I intend to investigate the effects of deliberation on indicators of ethnic conflict settlement, presuming the existence of a positive relation between deliberation and ethnic conflict mitigation. In other terms, I am interested in analyzing if and how good deliberation might serve as indicator for ethnic conflict settlement. The main aim of the research is investigating, through empirical analysis, what is the role of good deliberative dialogue in ethnic conflict management and in inter-group conflict mitigation, hopefully contributing to support some claims about the role deliberation might play in divided societies.

I have done my experiments in the war-torn town of Srebrenica in 2010. What was the historical context at the time? Up to the civil war in the 1990's, Bosnia and Herzegovina seemed to be characterized by quite harmonious relations among the three ethnic groups of Serbs, Croats and Bošnjaks (Muslims). When the Winter Olympics were held in Sarajevo in 1984, the city seemed a good example of how various ethnic groups could get along in a peaceful way. Indeed, a study carried out at the beginning of the 80's by the Federal Institute for Social Research measured the quality of inter-ethnic relations in the Former Federal State of Yugoslavia and found out that Bosnia and Herzegovina was the most multi-ethnic and at the same time the most

---

<sup>15</sup> Marco S. Steenbergen, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Jürg Steiner, “Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index”, in *Comparative European Politics*, n. 1/2003, pp. 21-48; Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

tolerant among the constituent Republics. Nevertheless, during the 1990's, ethnic conflict erupted here even more severely and violently than in any other region of former Yugoslavia; fifteen years after the end of the civil war, when I did my experiments, the country remained severely divided and inter-ethnic reconciliation still appeared almost as a mirage<sup>16</sup>. Nor the current situation has changed: ethnic divisions remain crystalised, and ethnic conflict unmanaged.

In July 1995 the mixed town of Srebrenica was shelled and occupied by the Army of Republic of Srpska (VSA) lead by Ratko Mladić, despite being declared a protected area by the United Nations. More than 7,000 people were killed, and the question whether or not it constituted a genocide still remains a crucial division line between Serbs and Bošnjaks<sup>17</sup>.

The Dayton Agreements<sup>18</sup>, signed in 1995 by the governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the - at that time survivor - Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under the auspices of the International Community, marked the end of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at the same time establishing a detailed framework for reconstructing the Bosnian State and consolidating it by the democratization process, developed under international supervision within a consociational institutional framework. The Office of the High Representative (HR) was created in order to monitor the regular implementation of the democratization agenda; the HR's mandate, further strengthened in 1997,

---

<sup>16</sup> Cfr. Florian Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia. Ethnicity, Inequality and Public Sector Governance*, Housemills, UNRISD/Palgrave, 2006.

<sup>17</sup> In 2015 a British-sponsored draft resolution, influenced by Bošnjak diaspora, was presented to the United Nations Security Council condemning the Srebrenica massacre of 1995 as a "crime of genocide". Russia vetoed the resolution, but the issue contributed to harshen intergroup relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, threatening the unity of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single State (See Balkans Transitional Justice, Mladić Verdict Highlights Bosnia's Ethnic Divisions, 22/11/2017, at <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/mladic-verdict-highlights-bosnia-s-ethnic-divisions-11-22-2017>, last access on 5/3/2018).

In November 2017, when Former military chief Ratko Mladić was convicted a life sentence by the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia for genocide and crimes against humanity in relation also with Srebrenica massacre, Bosnian Serbs, including the current Mayor of Srebrenica, accused the Hague Tribunal of anti-Serb bias.

<sup>18</sup> General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Annexes, commonly referred to as "Dayton Agreements"; available at OSCE website, <https://www.osce.org/bih/126173?download=true> (last access 5/3/2018).

envisaged strong powers aimed at influencing the political-institutional functioning of the State<sup>19</sup>.

Far from fostering reconciliation, the Dayton Agreements established the principle of “ethnic separation” as a peace-making tool, hence offering an *ex post* legitimization to conflicting parties’ ethno-national policies and to their ethno-territorial claims. Indeed, the main feature of the post war reconstruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been the “institutionalization of ethnicity”, namely the promotion of ethnic groups’ representation as such within all public institutions<sup>20</sup>.

The institutional post-war power-sharing design, consequently, paid the most careful attention to the territorial factor and to the *ethnicization* of the political and institutional mechanisms. In other words, the ethnicity was institutionalized in close connection with the territory, split into tentatively mono-ethnic areas, and therefore seconding those claims reciprocally expressed by nationalists during the Dayton negotiations, and which were grounded on the assumption that the protection of each ethnic group was possible only and solely within the borders of a well-defined (ethnic) territory. This principle was basically acknowledged, and the post Dayton institutional design of Bosnia and Herzegovina stemmed essentially from that assumption<sup>21</sup>.

Bosnia and Herzegovina was divided in two “Entities” constitutionally recognized: the Serbian “Srpska Republic”, administratively centralized, and the Croat-Muslim “Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, made up of ten different cantons (five majority Muslim cantons, three majority Croat cantons, two mixed

---

<sup>19</sup> Cfr. Zoran Pajić, “Bosnia and Herzegovina: a Statehood Crossroads”, in Stefano Bianchini *et al.* (ed.), *Regional Cooperation, Peace Enforcement and the Role of the Treaties in the Balkans*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Cfr. Florian Bieber, *Institutionalizing Ethnicity in the Western Balkans. Managing Change in Deeply Divided Societies*, European Centre for Minority Issues, ECMI Working Paper n. 19, Flensburg, February 2004.

<sup>21</sup> Cfr. Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, Paper IECOB (Istituto per l'Europa Centro Orientale e Balcanica), Forlì, 2005

cantons)<sup>22</sup>. Sarajevo became the capital city, housing the central institutions. The Brčko District, located within the Srpska Republic, was subjected to a particular regime of international administration. The constitution of the Bosnian State, attached to the Dayton Agreements, established the creation of different central governmental bodies and introduced several typically consociational/power sharing mechanisms. The complex power sharing system, organized according to ethnic criteria, involved all Bosnian central institutions<sup>23</sup>. A bicameral legislature was introduced, where the three so-called “constituent peoples”, Bosnians, Serbs and Croats, had to be equally represented in the Second Chamber; an analogous disposition was set for the Collegial Presidency as well, composed by one member for each ethnic group. Moreover, also the Government formation had to fulfil strict ethnic/power sharing requirements. Besides the ethnic representation criterion, the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina invested each group with strong veto powers both within the Parliament and within the Presidency, listing the (few) competencies due to central institutions and leaving to the Entities full control over significant fields such as defence (and therefore Army), police, judiciary, education and culture<sup>24</sup>. At the same time, the Constitutions of each single Entity, negotiated before Dayton and not subjected to Peace Agreements’ regulations, had already introduced some consociational mechanisms.

However, the power sharing system adopted at the State central level in Bosnia and Herzegovina quickly turned out to be completely inefficient, ending in the crystallization of ethnical divisions and in misusing groups’ veto powers until

---

<sup>22</sup> Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, European Diversity and Autonomy Papers, EDAP 4/2005, available online at: [http://www.eurac.edu/documents/edap/2005\\_edap04.pdf](http://www.eurac.edu/documents/edap/2005_edap04.pdf), last access 5/3/2018.

<sup>23</sup> With the sole exception of the Constitutional Court. Cfr. Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>24</sup> Cfr. Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *op. cit.* The reform of the police sector at the central level was for a long time one of the most contested issue across the ethnic cleavage, and the European Community put the inter-ethnic agreement on it as a necessary requirement for signing the Stabilization and Association Agreement with the European Community. After a long deadlock, the police reform was finally launched, even with residual problems, and the European Community signed the SAA with the Country in June 2008.



complete deadlock, preventing any kind of political decisions<sup>25</sup>. Beyond freezing the ethnic divisions and fostering decisional impasse, the extensive application of the ethnical-proportional criterion has generated a drastic deterioration of the quality of services in several fields, from security to health care, facilitating the spread of corruption and instilling a sense of resignation on people, which very often changed in distrust of democracy<sup>26</sup>, not to mention the multiplication of costs for each level of governance.

Besides the deadlock of the political system, the process of homogenization and ethnic cleansing has gone on at the level of the individual Entities. Separate educational systems and curricula contributed to freeze inter-group divisions, and the same effect was produced by policies adopted by each Entity on almost every field, hindering the free movement of goods, services and people<sup>27</sup>. Conservative and nationalist parties have consolidated their power, hampering transversal cooperation among different groups, while their centrifugal rhetoric continues to hinder reforms and proper functioning of institutions<sup>28</sup>. As a consequence, economic reconstruction has faced grave difficulties, and the transition from the self-managed socialism and war to market economy has gone on with severe delays. Only the international intrusion, through the High Representative, has avoided the disintegration of the State and the adoption of political decisions at the central level. The Constitutional Court,

---

<sup>25</sup> On the inefficiency of the institutional design in post Dayton Bosnia, *cfr.* in particular David Chandler, *Bosnia. Faking Democracy After Dayton*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Pluto Press UK, London, 2000, and Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *op.cit.*

<sup>26</sup> Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>27</sup> *Cfr.* Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>28</sup> *Cfr.* the official document of the European Commission about progresses made in 2008 by Bosnia and Herzegovina, at pp. 7-8: Commission of the European Communities, Commission Staff Working Document, *Bosnia and Herzegovina 2008 Progress Report - accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2008-2009* - COM2008-674 - Brussels, 05.11.2008, available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press\\_corner/key\\_documents/reports\\_nov\\_2008/bosnia\\_herzegovina\\_progress\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press_corner/key_documents/reports_nov_2008/bosnia_herzegovina_progress_report_en.pdf), last accessed 5/3/2018

as well, whose composition did not have to fulfil strict ethnic criteria, has contributed to counter-balance centrifugal tendencies<sup>29</sup>.

Ethno-territorial division and the adoption of a coherent institutional power sharing design were supposed to act, at least in the aftermath of the end of civil war, as a guarantee against continuation of violence. On the other hand, hypothesizing a different approach in that context, namely an integrative one, was completely hopeless, given the level of mutual distrust and wariness among groups and the memory of atrocities of war.

The International Community did not want to enforce the application of an integrative model, but neither did it want to encourage the principle of territorial homogenization as a guarantee for stability. As a result, a pure compromise was set up between the integrative and the assimilative option, and this compromise turned out to be as complex as inefficient. Bosnia and Herzegovina, today, is an internationally recognized State subject; but there are serious doubts to what extent it is also internally recognized, by its own citizens<sup>30</sup>. The majority of Serbs and Croats pursue strategies, which vary from a reluctantly accepted coexistence to dreams of concrete separation, while Muslims keep on perceiving the State as their own national design<sup>31</sup>. The nationalist parties are perpetually in power, the undemocratic and intrusive authority of the High Representative and the post-Dayton institutional design might be depicted as the vertexes of a Bermuda Triangle which has been swallowing up Bosnia and Herzegovina, her central institutions and her legitimacy<sup>32</sup>. The Bosnian institutional system, based on a strict ethnic rigidity, has frozen divisions preventing any contextual policy aimed at changing common people's socio-psychological attitudes, severely hindering the reconstruction of dialogue across the borders of the ethnic cleavage.

---

<sup>29</sup> Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> Dario D'Urso, "L'insostenibile leggerezza della Bosnia –Erzegovina", in *I Quaderni Speciali di Limesplus – Rivista Italiana di Geopolitica – Kosovo, lo Stato delle Mafie*, n. 6/2006, Gruppo Editoriale L'Espresso, Roma, 2006, p. 155.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 157.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 157.

Lack of consensus on the main features of state building, challenges to Dayton Agreements and inflammatory rhetoric continue to hamper the functioning of institutions and the launching of proper reforms<sup>33</sup>.

Moreover, distrust of the State and widespread corruption<sup>34</sup> have caused a further detachment between politics and citizens, compromising the possibility to foster a lively and plural civil society, able to create opportunities for inter-ethnic dialogue and to promote change in strategies also at the political level, by voicing its opinions<sup>35</sup>. The citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina generally lack a common sense of belonging, a “civic nationalism” towards the State and its institutions, and as a consequence the stability of the system is more or less constantly under threat. The segmental autonomy of purely institutional consociationalism has contributed to perpetuate divisions, entrenching and enhancing ethnic affiliation and identity. Moreover, nationalism continues to pervade the political environment, and it could be reasonable to argue that political leaders, who got their power because they represent a particular ethnic affiliation, are even interested to maintain divisions in order to keep their positions. The civil society lacks any power of influence on the decision making process, and its attempts to create transversal allegiances among citizens across the ethnic cleavage remain limited<sup>36</sup>, while education systems, schools and media, organised in three different systems, perpetuate separation and ethnic conflict<sup>37</sup>.

If people are divided and political leaders are interested to keep up the conflict, there is poor room for ethnic conflict transformation and reconciliation,

---

<sup>33</sup> Commission of the European Communities, Commission Staff Working Document, *Bosnia and Herzegovina 2008 Progress Report - accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2008-2009* - COM2008-674 - Brussels, 05.11.2008, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 and ss.

<sup>34</sup> Commission of the European Communities, Commission Staff Working Document, *Bosnia and Herzegovina 2008 Progress Report - accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2008-2009* - COM2008-674 - Brussels, 05.11.2008, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

<sup>35</sup> Cfr. Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>36</sup> David Chandler, *Bosnia. Faking Democracy after Dayton*, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-153.

<sup>37</sup> Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, *op. cit.*; Florian Bieber, *Institutionalizing Ethnicity in the Western Balkans. Managing Change in Deeply Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*

even within consociational arrangements. Institutions, alone, as has been demonstrated, is not enough. Even more so because they were externally imposed from the outside onto the local people, from which derives their most severe limit, namely the inability to consider that citizens are at the basis of democracy<sup>38</sup>. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, focusing only on institutions and political representation has produced highly detrimental effects on social inter-ethnic relations; it should be imperative, therefore, to create new spaces for Bosnian citizens, to empower them for becoming new active subjects in the process of creation and sharing a common identity. The most important engine for change should start from within, from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and not from outside, although the support of the International Community in this process might remain desirable<sup>39</sup>. From this perspective, thinking that the ongoing State crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina could be settled and solved only through constitutional adjustments is illusory. The three Bosnian societies lack a sense of belonging to a common State, a sense of common identity transcending religious and ethnic cleavages, which necessarily constitutes the basis for a stable democratic State<sup>40</sup>. To come out of the nationalist nightmare and to give back the State to citizens, Bosnian people should be put at the core of debates on reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to discuss civil rights on secular and not ethnic bases and to allow institutions to become expression of citizens and not of ethnic groups anymore<sup>41</sup>. To start this process, it is of paramount importance to foster transversal dialogue among citizens, transcending ethnic divisions. Participation, therefore, remains the crucial point to re-start from, in order to create the basis for a positive elaboration of the conflict and for coming through divisions across Bosnian society, namely to develop a different political culture, a general “spirit of

---

<sup>38</sup> Andrea Oskari Rossini, Davide Sighele, “La Bosnia dopo Dayton”, in *I Quaderni Speciali di Limes – Rivista Italiana di geopolitica – I Balcani non sono lontani*, n. 4/2005, Gruppo Editoriale L'espresso, Roma, 2005, p. 111.

<sup>39</sup> Florian Bieber, “Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, in Florian Bieber, Carsten Wieland (Eds), *Facing the Past, Facing the Future: Confronting Ethnicity and Conflict in Bosnia and Former Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2005, p. 161.

<sup>40</sup> Zoran Pajić, “Bosnia and Herzegovina: a Statehood Crossroads”, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

<sup>41</sup> Andrea Oskari Rossini, Davide Sighele, “La Bosnia dopo Dayton”, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

accommodation” to sustain peace and conflict transformation across the Country. It is in this historical context that I have put my research.

# Chapter 1: Theoretical background

## 1.1 Social-psychological approaches to ethnic conflict

According to the social-psychology literature, when people see their goals as incompatible, as a zero sum game, conflict emerges. Conflict, in turn, can result in an immediate intention to hurt the opposing contestant, possibly leading to aggression<sup>42</sup>. Human beings have evolved to compete effectively for food and mates; but, although the capacity to act aggressively might have helped, aggression is just one strategy among many others that humans use to attain rewards and respect in accordance with individual perceptions and social norms<sup>43</sup>. Groups are generally even more competitive and aggressive than individuals, because phenomena like group polarization and distribution of guilt may induce people to behave more radically in groups than they would do if they were acting as individuals<sup>44</sup>. As a general rule, a conflict starts with a request or an accusation, perceived by the individual or the group as threatening fundamental basic needs<sup>45</sup>. The late Johan Galtung, Professor of Peace Studies and Director of the International Network Transcend, has identified four main classes of fundamental human needs, considered important world-wide, transcending different cultures and societies: survival, wellbeing, identity and

---

<sup>42</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 514-515.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>44</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiario, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, op. cit., pp. 170-172 and p. 189; Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 322-324; pp. 518-524.

<sup>45</sup> Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, Booklet Series, 2008; □ Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, Booklet Series, 2007; Ana Vasilache, *Manual on Ethnic Diversity and Conflict Management*, Partners Foundation for Local Development, Booklet Series, 2007

freedom. These needs are not negotiable, and when perceived as risks, individuals and groups mobilize to defend them<sup>46</sup>.

In order to explain escalation of inter-group conflicts the social-psychological literature refers to the basic human need to belong to a group and to maintain a *social identity* referred to as belonging<sup>47</sup>. Processes of *categorization* lead to *stereotypes and prejudices* against the out-group<sup>48</sup>. Under social or economic crisis, the entrenchment of groups and lack of mutual dialogue may lead to the development of mirror enemy images and, as a last resort, to inter-group conflict and sometimes even to violence<sup>49</sup>. Human beings are social animals: their unit of survival may be considered the group, not the individual, since their capability of survival is strongly linked with the existence of an organized group around them<sup>50</sup>. The *belonging to a group* serves many important functions; particularly, it helps the consolidation of a positive self-esteem of the individual belonging to it. This implies a positive attitude towards the in-group, namely a favoritism towards it that is at the basis of the social identity of human beings<sup>51</sup>. *Categorization* is instrumental for both adaptive and motivational functions. It serves an adaptive function because the number of information coming from the external world may be overwhelming for the human brain without channeling it into simplifying categories<sup>52</sup>. At the same time, categorization processes serve also motivational goals, because the individual's self-esteem is a function of the image of the in-group, the process helps the

---

<sup>46</sup> Johan Galtung, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means. The Transcend Method*, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-37; Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>47</sup> Jerome D. Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", in Anatoly Gromyko and Martin Hellman, eds., *Breakthrough—Emerging New Thinking: Soviet and Western Challenges Issue a Challenge to Build a World Beyond War*, Walker and Company, New York 1988, p. 2.

<sup>48</sup> Cfr. Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-227.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 488-503.

<sup>50</sup> Jerome D. Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", *op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>51</sup> Henri Tajfel, John C. Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Inter-Group Conflict", in W.G. Austin, S. Worchel, *The Social Psychology of Inter-Group Relations*, Brooks/Cole, Monterey, CA, 1979, pp. 33-47.

<sup>52</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-108; Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-145.

comparisons with others and the assignment of more positive features to the in-group with respect to out-groups to which the individual does not feel to belong to<sup>53</sup>. The favoritism towards the in-group is one of the effects that the process of categorization may determine, besides an erroneous perception of the differences between the in-group and the out-group, and the overestimation of both the homogeneity of the out-group and the internal diversification of the in-group<sup>54</sup>.

*Stereotyping*, as a natural function of the human brain, serves equal goals as categorization; it aims at simplifying the complex reality the individual has to deal with, inducing automatic responses to similar stimuli and mitigating the anxiety toward the unknown<sup>55</sup>. A stereotype can be defined as a cognitive structure which contains the knowledge, the beliefs and the expectation, positive or negative, owned by an individual in reference to a certain human group.<sup>56</sup> This cognitive structure is acquired both by personal experience and throughout the natural process of social learning<sup>57</sup>. The personal experience may contribute to the construction of erroneous stereotypes about a group because of many psychological errors that may intervene in the process. The “fundamental error of attribution” leads the individual to infer personal attributes to another person starting from a specific observed behavior. The “illusory correlation”, under which the human brain connects two variables not really linked together. The less the contact between groups, the stronger the anxiety and the negative feelings towards the other groups.<sup>58</sup> Besides personal experience, the acquisition of stereotypes may derive also from social learning processes, through which individuals internalize false images of the out-groups deriving from parents,

---

<sup>53</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-112; Louis Oppenheimer, “The Development of Enemy Images: a Theoretical Contribution”, in *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 12 (3), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2006, p. 271.

<sup>54</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-110.

<sup>55</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-160.

<sup>56</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 111-112.



relatives, media, and society in general<sup>59</sup>. The simplicity of stereotypes makes their adoption rather easy, especially when they are acquired during childhood. It is extremely difficult to modify or to remove them, like colour lenses that make the individual perceive a distorted reality, but he or she does not want or cannot remove them<sup>60</sup>. Stereotypes are, in this sense, positive or negative beliefs about a group's characteristics, which filter the perception of reality<sup>61</sup>. The simplification operated by the classification through stereotyping could easily induce mistakes and stimulate the creation of prejudices, namely evaluations of individuals or social groups and statements about them based on erroneous beliefs<sup>62</sup>.

As a direct effect of stereotyping function, the *prejudices* can be defined as a negative attitudes directed towards a specific social group or one of its members. While the stereotype is a cognitive frame, characterized by specific beliefs, the prejudice is a concrete attitude characterized by beliefs, as well, but also by affective sensations, more intense emotions and a strong trend to act<sup>63</sup>. The literature includes several explanations for the genesis of prejudice.

The theory of the "authoritarian personality", formulated by Theodor W. Adorno states that individuals subjected to severe education schemes within their families – or more generally within the society – tend to obey to authorities and to manifest hostility towards weaker people, which may be translated into anti-social behaviors aimed at unloading the repressed aggressiveness. According to this approach, in order to justify those anti-social behaviors, the authoritarian personalities tend to use negative prejudices against the targeted groups or individuals<sup>64</sup>. A second approach is based on the "Realistic Conflict Theory", formulated by Muzafer Sherif in 1966. The theory postulates that

---

<sup>59</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 156-158; Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiario, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, op. cit, pp. 112-113.

<sup>60</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 169-183.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 183.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 561; Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiario, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, op. cit, p. 119; Richard D. Ashmore, "Prejudices: Causes and Cures", in Barry E. Collins (Ed), *Social Psychology: Social Influence, Attitude Change, Group Processes and Prejudice*, Reading MA, Addison-Wesley, 1970, pp. 245-339; Paola Villano, *Pregiudizi e Stereotipi*, Ed. Carocci, Roma, 2003.

<sup>63</sup> Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiario, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, op. cit, p. 119.

<sup>64</sup> Theodor W. Adorno et al, *La personalità autoritaria*, Edizioni di Comunità, Milano, 1997.

prejudices develop as effect of hostility between conflicting groups, which compete for scarce and desirable resources. According to Sherif, conflicting interests lead, in the long run, to the development of mutually negative feelings and prejudices, and, at the end, they may turn into open conflict<sup>65</sup>. The third approach states, instead, that for prejudices to be generated it is not necessary to face an existing conflict; the perception of a “relative deprivation” that a group experiences comparing itself to another group may be enough<sup>66</sup>. When a group retains, correctly or erroneously, that the out-group acts better than the in-group, individuals develop negative feelings that pave the way to prejudice. The perceived easier access to resources and power for the out-group, in this framework, may play a crucial role in the exacerbation of negative attitudes towards the target-group<sup>67</sup>. A perceived unfair distribution of wealth may be regarded, therefore, as a sufficient cause for activating the relative deprivation feeling, then prejudices and, as a last instance, inter-group conflict.

Other scholars tend to underline the genesis of prejudices and inter-group conflict as deriving from the need for individuals to maintain a positive image of the self and of the in-group. According to the “Social Identity Theory”<sup>68</sup>, individuals need a positive self-image, and since self-esteem is in part determined by group belonging, they tend to valorize the in-group making all the best for seeing it excelling with respect to others. This motivational favoritism towards the in-group is reinforced by the trend manifested by individuals to distort information coming from the social world in order to favor the in-group. Whatever theory might better explain prejudices and inter-group conflict, during periods of uncertainty due to social, political or economic crises, the need for individuals to take shelter under the solidarity of the in-group in order to overcome difficulties may create an ideal environment for individuating an out-

---

<sup>65</sup> Muzafer Sherif, *In Common Predicament: Social Psychology of Inter-group Conflict and Cooperation*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1966.

<sup>66</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, pp. 490-491.

<sup>67</sup> Faye Crosby, “A Model of Egoistical Relative Deprivation”, in *Psychological Review*, n. 83, 1976, pp. 85-113; Ted R. Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970.

<sup>68</sup> Henri Tajfel, J.C. Turner, “An Integrative Theory of Inter-Group Conflict”, *op. cit.*; Henri Tajfel, John. C. Turner, “The Social Identity Theory of Inter-group Behavior”, in S. Worchel, W.G. Austin, *Psychology of Inter-group Relations*, Nelsen-Hall, Chicago, 1986, pp. 7-24.

group attributing to it faults for present sufferings<sup>69</sup>. Studies on ethno-politics and ethnic mobilization often refer to the role ethno-national entrepreneurs may play in exacerbating inter-group contraposition by identifying in the out-group a scapegoat, if the escalation of conflict may give them personal political or economic gains<sup>70</sup>. The process is made easier under conditions of political, social and economic crisis. Categorization processes, in these contexts, may help the cohesion of the in-group while the depiction of an external enemy to blame for present suffering lays at the basis for the endorsement of negative stereotypes and prejudices related with the out-group<sup>71</sup>. Threats to group's identity are perceived as undermining the biological and the psychological survival of its members, and therefore their emotional power may easily change into politicization<sup>72</sup>.

Once conflict starts, poor inter-group communication makes it worse<sup>73</sup>. As conflict escalates, the in-group sees the out-group as totally evil and sees itself in unrealistically positive terms. The spreading of negative feelings against the out-group, indeed, leads to the development of an "enemy image" and the acquisition of negative prejudices linked with it<sup>74</sup>.

More generally, ethnic conflicts demonstrate to be hardly manageable, firstly because they deal with fundamental human needs and values each group perceived to be challenged and nobody is ready to compromise on<sup>75</sup>. Facing real or perceived threats against the survival of their own identity, group members

---

<sup>69</sup> Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.

<sup>70</sup> Joseph Rothschild, *Ethnopolitics*, *op. cit.*; on the case of former Yugoslavia *cfr.* Nina Baltić, Tomasz Milej, *Human and Minority Rights in Violent Ethnic Conflict. Synthetic Report on Human Rights under the Yugoslav System, Processes of Ethnic Mobilization and EU Crisis Management*, MIRICO/Eurac Report, Bolzano, 2007.

<sup>71</sup> Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, *op. cit.*

<sup>72</sup> Jerome D. Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", *op. cit.*

<sup>73</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, p. 492.

<sup>74</sup> Louis Oppenheimer, "The Development of Enemy Images: a Theoretical Contribution", *op. cit.*, pp. 271-272; Jerome D. Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", *op. cit.*

<sup>75</sup> Johan Galtung, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means. The Transcend Method*, *op. cit.*, p. 37; Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

involved in a violent ethnic conflict demonstrate to be prone to die or kill, and they may perceive to be protagonists of a heroic battle against the enemy who is threatening them. In this perspective, murder gains not only legitimacy, but even becomes a heroic act, while violence is not subjected to moral sanctions anymore<sup>76</sup>. Stereotypes and prejudices, causing both an overestimation of hazard and the Manichean distortion in perceiving the other group's members intentions, multiply occasions for clashes and violence. These mechanisms can induce individuals to systematically make use of solutions based on force for managing the conflict. The collectivization of blames and responsibilities enflames hatred triggering a perverse feedback; the more a society is severely divided, the more the accumulated hatred is likely to explode and turning out into widespread violence<sup>77</sup>.

Inter-group communication, if it still exists, is heavily charged with intense emotions, mistrust, hatred, fear. Memories of recent bereavements caused by the enemy group hinder rationality, and a process of de-humanization can be triggered. The brutal behaviour of the enemy is perceived as a proof of its sub-human nature, and therefore deserving no humane handling but an equally beastly treatment, namely suppression through violence<sup>78</sup>. The de-humanization is the most radical form of enemy image, which implies a Manichean perception of the conflict, namely the creation of a self-image as absolutely good and pure and the enemy's one as completely dirty and evil<sup>79</sup>. Enemy images are self-fulfilling and self-reinforcing: making the in-group more inclined to behave aggressively towards the out-group, the hostile response of the latter will work like a confirmation of the negative image of the out-group that the in-group had

---

<sup>76</sup> Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, op. cit., pp. 53-56.

<sup>77</sup> Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>78</sup> Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, op. cit., pp. 54-58.

<sup>79</sup> Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, op. cit., p. 20.

developed, closing the ranks and behaving even more aggressively, if possible<sup>80</sup>. Under those premises, the mobilization of ethnicity may easily become a powerful destabilizing factor threatening the relations between different ethnic communities within a State<sup>81</sup>. Indeed, ethno-mobilization triggers a mechanism of reciprocity under which the (ethno) out-group may mobilize as well and develop, at its turn, an opposite enemy image based on the threat posed against it. In this sense, enemy images tend to develop between conflicting groups. Each side tends to attribute the same virtues and values for itself, and the same vices and evilness to the other<sup>82</sup>.

The mutual development of enemy images disrupts inter-group communication, reducing therefore the chances of finding out areas of common interest and possible agreement, and paving the way for further escalation of the inter-group conflict<sup>83</sup>. In this sense, the likelihood of violent ethnic conflict (and consequently the difficulties for ethnic conflict settlement in the aftermath of conflict) exponentially increases. The social fabric lacks pre-existent networks of civic organizations with respect to the ethnic cleavage. Civil society is not able to keep alive inter-group communication and to exert pressures against ethno-nationalist propaganda of unscrupulous political leaders. Such lack of communication is of paramount importance for the escalation of ethnic conflicts<sup>84</sup>. At the same time, civil society ideally constitutes the basic fundamental context where to foster reconciliation, the place where citizens, at least potentially, might compare their ideas and opinions on a not- ethnic basis and where transversal alliances, overcoming the ethno-national cleavage, could be formed and fostered, while at the same time political representatives could be

---

<sup>80</sup> Jerome D.Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; Louis Oppenheimer, "The Development of Enemy Images: a Theoretical Contribution", *op. cit.*, p. 271.

<sup>81</sup> Joseph Rothschild, *Ethnopolitics*, *op. cit.*

<sup>82</sup> Jerome D.Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 4.

<sup>84</sup> Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

kept under scrutiny<sup>85</sup>. Therefore, deeply divided societies where inter-group communication is poor or not existent and where a vibrant civil society lacks are more inclined to be swept away by the explosion of violent ethnic conflicts and, in the aftermaths of war, they might face stronger difficulties in reconciliation processes<sup>86</sup>. To summarize, according to social-psychological literature, at the basis for escalation and maintenance of conflicts there is the lack of communication between antagonist collective subjects, which paves the way for consolidating mutual stereotypes and producing negative prejudices associated with mirror-enemy images.

Peace studies, too, share the social-psychology perspective. Johan Galtung, for instance, used a simple example to illustrate how a more collaborative approach between parts could be triggered by simple dialogue and creativity. The example he gives deals with an orange whose ownership is disputed between two subjects A and B. Different outcomes/payoffs depend on different approaches adopted by the actors<sup>87</sup>.

(1) Only one subject takes the orange, generating an unequal result where one wins all while the other loses all.

(2) A and B cannot reach an agreement and the orange decays; it is the worst possible result for both subjects.

(3) A and B talk with each other; they discuss and realize that their objectives are compatible: A would like to drink an orange juice, B would like to use the orange peel to make a cake. The outcome is optimal for both players.

According to Peace studies perspective, therefore, lack of dialogue represents the first fundamental obstacle to conflict settlement. Social-

---

<sup>85</sup> Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>86</sup> Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict*, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

<sup>87</sup> Johan Galtung, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means. The Transcend Method*, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-27.

psychological approaches to ethnic conflict management start from the same point that contact and communication are needed in order to foster reconciliation. Social-psychology literature on conflict mitigation started under the premises of the “Contact Hypothesis”, developed by Gordon Allport<sup>88</sup>. Since stereotypes and prejudices are at the basis of escalation and perpetuation of conflict, Allport stated that contact had to be the premise to depart from. However, to be successful for triggering the process of conflict mitigation, contact had to occur under certain conditions: the equality of status for the groups in contact; their cooperative interdependence for gaining a common goal; frequent occasions for inter-action; the presence of an external social framework supporting contact and fostering a climate of tolerance<sup>89</sup>. Many empirical works have confirmed the relevance of these supporting factors<sup>90</sup>. For my dissertation, I want to know what exactly the contacts between ethnic groups have to be to increase the chances of accommodation and peace between the groups. Later in this chapter, I will show that the deliberative model gives an answer to this question. The deliberative model has historically been developed out of consociational theory to which I turn first.

## **1.2 Institutional approaches to ethnic conflict: from consociationalism to deliberation**

According to the consociational theory, culturally fragmented political systems need power sharing arrangements to increase democratic stability of the system and to settle centrifugal tendencies<sup>91</sup>. Such mechanisms are basically institutional: grand-coalition executives; veto power for minorities; proportional

---

<sup>88</sup> Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, op. cit.

<sup>89</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, op. cit., pp. 176-177; Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiaro, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, op. cit., pp. 179-183 and p. 190; Hugh Donald Forbes, *Ethnic Conflict. Commerce, Culture and the Contact Hypothesis*, Yale University Press, New Haven/London, 1997, pp. 20-22; Thomas F. Pettigrew, “Intergroup Contact Theory”, in *Annual Review of Psychology*, n. 49/1998, pp. 65-85; John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, Kerry Kawakami, “Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future”, in *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Sage Journals, Vol. 6, n. 1, 2003, pp. 5-21.

<sup>90</sup> For a review, cfr. John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, Kerry Kawakami, “Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future”, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

<sup>91</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, op. cit., pp. 9-10, citing Arendt Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation. Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*, op. cit.

representation system; segmental autonomy<sup>92</sup>. Even if, in the light of consociational theory, the adoption of a power sharing model could seem the best choice for deeply divided societies, nevertheless, the mere institutional design, alone, cannot be an active tool for settling the conflict. Indeed, power sharing institutions might rather contribute to entrench divisions, where political leaders representing opposing groups might be more inclined to perpetuate separation, which gives them power, instead of finding compromises and allegiances with enemy groups. For Bosnia and Herzegovina, this has recently be forcefully argued by Adis Merdžanović.

The consociational model is, essentially, an elitist model, since its success depends, almost completely on the willingness of leaders to cooperate. It requires an extremely mature political class, open-minded, aware of the dangerous tendencies of the system to centrifugal fragmentation.<sup>9394</sup>. Where political elites are immature, therefore, we should expect poor functioning of consociational arrangements. However, the consociational model, in its original formulation, did assume a further also important element to grant democratic stability in divided societies: a political culture inclined to accommodate divergences for avoiding centrifugal tendencies potentially detrimental to the country<sup>95</sup>. According to Arend Lijphart, father of consociationalism, the political culture played a crucial role in settling conflicts. He called this element “spirit of accommodation”, which is at a high level when politicians prove their willingness to bridge mutual gaps in order to settle serious disputes in widely non

---

<sup>92</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>93</sup> Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015. See the review of Jürg Steiner in *Swiss Political Science Review*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, June 2016.

<sup>94</sup> *Cfr.* Donald Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, California University Press, 2000, pp. 573-574. Horowitz states that “(...) what is needed”, on the contrary, “is a theory of timing and incentives for elite cooperation”. He argues that an integrative approach to power sharing could work better than Lijphart’s model in stabilizing divided societies. The integrative approach favours the creation of institutions and the adoption of practices aimed at stimulating the creation of inter-ethnic pre-electoral coalitions, or, even better, of inter-ethnic electoral parties. Horowitz’s model aims at stimulating more intra-group than inter-group cooperation for better reducing the likelihood of violent conflicts.

<sup>95</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-11, citing Arendt Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation. Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*, *op. cit.*



consensual environments<sup>96</sup>. In his ground-breaking book “The Politics of Accommodation”, Lijphart had indeed an entire chapter on the spirit of accommodation.

If the spirit of accommodation is poor, the logical consequence may be the inefficiency of the institutional design. Let us consider a country where power sharing mechanisms were simply imposed by external forces, like the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina at the end of the brutal civil war of the early ‘90s. These power sharing mechanisms did not genuinely emerge from a mature reasoning among internal political elites across the ethnic cleavages. The political game within this deeply divided society, since the first elections, rewarded the same ethno-national leaders who wanted and led the war<sup>97</sup>. And if political elites are interested to inflame further the conflict or at least to freeze it, because they gained electoral success riding on ethno-nationalist ideologies, they need to keep high inter-ethnic tensions in order to maintain their votes. Therefore, they would be completely uninterested to rational compromises, worsening instead the conflict and the polarization between the parties<sup>98</sup>. Strong power sharing mechanisms and particularly mutual veto powers for ethno-political representatives became in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina just a tool for consolidating ethnic belonging, entrapping society and individuals in rigidly defined ethnic categories and hampering possible evolutions<sup>99</sup>. This may be one

---

<sup>96</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 10.

<sup>97</sup> Florian Bieber, Carsten Wieland (Eds), *Facing the Past, Facing the Future: Confronting Ethnicity and Conflict in Bosnia and Former Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2005; Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, Paper IECOB (Istituto per l'Europa Centro Orientale e Balcanica), Forlì, 2005.

<sup>98</sup> Vladimir Goati, “Parliamentary Democracy and International Relations in Yugoslavia”, in Dušan Janjić (ed.), *Ethnic Conflict Management. The Case of Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 1997; Florian Bieber, “Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, *op. cit.*; Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, *op. cit.*

<sup>99</sup> Ian O’Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, p. 40; Florian Bieber, “Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-160.

of the most challenging hazard of applying rigid power sharing models to deeply divided societies<sup>100</sup>.

It has to be considered, however, that in the aftermath of a civil war, a society often expressively asks for inter-group division, since conflicting groups demand to recover from experienced traumas by elaborating them under the shelter of the in-group's solidarity<sup>101</sup>. In other words, in these contexts group isolation is first of all a need rather than a choice, and the institutional design only reflects an already existing divisions at the social fabric level<sup>102</sup>. There are no real options besides consociationalism, because fostering integrationist institutional designs could be interpreted by the groups as an attempt to be forcefully assimilated by their enemy counter-parts<sup>103</sup>. Therefore, although the consociational model might turn out to be ineffective for settling the conflict, it must be used but it needs to be supplemented with a cultural element, as it was in its initial form. When consociational theory was developed in the 1960's, it was generally accepted that power sharing institutions needed a cooperative culture in order to work. When empirical work on consociational theory turned from the initial country case studies to a large number of countries, the cultural aspect fell by the way side, leaving the institutional aspect standing alone, as Jürg Steiner shows in his analysis of the historical development of the consociational theory.<sup>104</sup> Since in ideal democratic terms the will of the people finds expression in their political leaders, inefficient consociational models – as in Bosnia and Herzegovina – risk to perpetuate instead of mitigating ethnic-division, since, like a dog biting its tail, ethno-nationalist leaders promote divisions, inter-group dialogue lacks and negative prejudices against the out-group are strengthened across the people, who in turn will keep voting for ethno-national leaders.

---

<sup>100</sup> John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia", *op. cit.*

<sup>101</sup> Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>103</sup> On the experience of Former Yugoslav Republic experimenting majoritarian designs, *cfr.* Vladimir Goati, "Parliamentary Democracy and International Relations in Yugoslavia", *op. cit.*

<sup>104</sup> Jürg Steiner, Wolf Linder's Swiss Democracy. An Early Advocate for a Deliberative Culture, in Adrian Vatter, Frédéric Varone, Fritz Sager (Herausgeber), *Demokratie als Leidenschaft*, Festschrift für Wolf Linder, Bern; Haupt, 2009.

Inter-ethnic conflicts can also be interpreted in terms of the prisoner's dilemma<sup>105</sup>.

Ethnic communities might be aware that cooperation would be the best option for everybody. Let us take, for example, the case of two rural Bosnian villages, one Muslim, one Serbian, speaking the same language and located very close to each other. Because of the lack of communication and mutual distrust, in each village parents prefer their children to attend mono-ethnic schools, to have separate educational systems for their children, entailing a duplication of costs for different buildings, different teachers and so on. Let us consider that the two villages would need also a new road getting them to the closest main town, but since their budget is limited, they do not have enough money for repairing the street. Lack of cooperation, therefore, means sub-optimal allocation of resources for both communities, since with a single school there could be extra resources for fixing also the road. Even if the better option would be cooperating, cooperation have nonmaterial costs for both players: memories of past atrocities and mutual diffidence may play as inhibitors, besides the costs of possible criticism and accusation of treason coming from the in-group, especially if a greater openness toward the out-group may result in cheating attempts from the latter. Moreover, if the local political leaders – the mayors of the two villages, for instance – got their power because of their ethno-nationalist radicalism, they will be interested in keeping alive inter-group conflict instead of mitigating it, since opting for cooperation will mean, for them, losing their political support. Hence, the margins for establish inter-group collaboration might be so narrow that communities would end up not cooperating<sup>106</sup>. To get out of this prisoner's dilemma would need a significant amount of mutual trust,

---

<sup>105</sup> Stuart Oskamp, "Effects of Programmed Strategies on Cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma and Other Mixed-Motive Games", in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 15, n. 2, June 1971, pp. 225-229; he defined the basic structure of the Prisoner's Dilemma at pp. 227-228.

<sup>106</sup> The example is not fictitious: the two villages do exist around Srebrenica, and the Nansen Dialogue, a Norwegian based NGO, has been working for promoting reconciliation through dialogue in the area, starting with a project of common elementary school. Source: Nansen Dialogue Centre - Sarajevo, <http://www.ndcsarajevo.org>.

which cannot be achieved without prior communication<sup>107</sup>. The meaning of the story is that step by step, by rebuilding a transversal dialogue among citizens, reconciliation could be fostered, starting for instance from recognising common ground for cooperation<sup>108</sup>. This would mean creating a “spirit of accommodation”.

While applying institutional designs to deeply divided environments, one should be aware that institutions alone do not necessarily grant democratic stability<sup>109</sup>. The problem with consociational institutional designs in deeply divided societies, therefore, is linked with their inability to find alternative paths to overcome ethno-national division among common people. In other words, they lack a complementary strategy aimed at changing the political culture and promoting a “spirit of accommodation” not just among leaders but also at the level of common people, stimulating the vibrancy of a transversal civil society. Coming back to theoretical studies on consociational models, it has to be underlined that the most relevant literature after Lijphart progressively neglected the “political culture” element, both for its conceptual vagueness and for the impossibility to be translated into operational terms. While constructing indexes to measure institutional variables like veto powers and proportional systems for elections was comparatively easy, that was not the case for the “spirit of accommodation”. Only very few studies on consociationalism did take into account the “political culture”; mostly they just assumed the mere presence or absence of a “spirit of accommodation” among parties, without being able to operationalize the concept<sup>110</sup>. Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli and Marco S. Steenbergen redeemed the concept of “spirit of accommodation” and provided it with a conceptual and operative definition<sup>111</sup>. They replaced the

---

<sup>107</sup> Cfr. Ronald L. Micheline, “Effects of Prior Interaction, Contact, Strategy, and Expectation of Meeting on Game Behavior and Sentiment”, in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 15, n. 1, Mar. 1971, pp. 97-103.

<sup>108</sup> Michelle LeBaron, Nike Carstarphen, “Negotiating Intractable Conflict. The Common Ground Dialogue Process and Abortion”, in *Negotiation Journal*, Vol. 13, n. 4, Oct. 1997, pp. 341-361.

<sup>109</sup> Ian O’Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>110</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.* p. 11.

<sup>111</sup> Marco S. Steenbergen, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Jürg Steiner, “Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index”, *op. cit.*; Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*

concept of spirit of accommodation with the concept of “deliberation”, defined in terms of a dialogical process through which the parties mutually explain their positions and justify them, showing to be prone to dialogue and, potentially, to “yield to the force of the better argument”<sup>112</sup>. As Jürg Steiner reports, Arend Lijphart agrees in a personal communication that the concept of deliberation corresponds pretty much to what he had in mind, when in the 1960’s he coined the concept of spirit of accommodation<sup>113</sup>. I have now arrived at the core of the literature review for my dissertation. In the next section, I will present what I understand by deliberation as basis for my empirical work in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

### **1.3.Deliberation and Ethnic Conflict Management**

Deliberative democracy theories, grounding their roots already in ancient Greek thought emphasize the dialogical aspect of the decision making procedure and essentially postulate that high levels of deliberation are good for democracy<sup>114</sup>. The philosophical development of the deliberative model of democracy has recently been well presented by Antonio Floridia<sup>115</sup>.

Deliberative democrats argue that the deliberative procedure could modify initial preferences of actors, through persuasion rising from reasoning and the inclination “to yield to the force of the better argument”<sup>116</sup>. The outcome of a deliberative decision making process should be, in other words, a more consensual policy, namely more respondent to participant actors’ interests and,

---

<sup>112</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 8-11; Marco S. Steenbergen, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Jürg Steiner, “Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index”, *op. cit.*

<sup>113</sup> Review of Jürg Steiner in Swiss Political Science Review, vol. 22, Issue 2, June 2016 of Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015.

<sup>114</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>115</sup> Antonio Floridia, *From Participation to Deliberation. A Critical Genealogy of Deliberative Democracy*, Colchester: ECPR Press, 2017.

<sup>116</sup> Dryzek and Braithwaite, cit. in Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

therefore, a more rational and sustainable one<sup>117</sup>. The deliberative literature, assigns great importance to citizens participation in the political process and to their dialogical expressions of preference. The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas developed a procedural conception of democracy, which emphasizes the role of citizens who organize themselves through informal associations where they can voice their opinions<sup>118</sup>. The decision making process, to be legitimate, must take into due account of their expressions. According to Habermas, in pluralistic and complex contemporary societies the legitimacy of the decision making process depends on the presence of a robust civil society and a vibrant public sphere of participation<sup>119</sup>. Generally speaking, ideal deliberative politics should fulfil some basic requirements<sup>120</sup>:

1. all citizens have to freely and equally participate in an open and public political process;
2. participants have to honestly express their sincere opinions;
3. arguments have to be logically justified;
4. the value of justification has to be stated in terms of “common good”, to be intended as promoting the improvement of the poorest, and not in utilitarian terms;
5. participants have to be really willing to listen to their counterparts’ argumentations, and they have to respect them. In other terms, it means to behave empathically;
6. participants have to be prone to yield to the force of the better argument, and to modify their initial preferences in the light of recent learning.

---

<sup>117</sup> *Ibidem*. pp. 23-27 and 59-60.

<sup>118</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, Polity Press, Oxford, 1997.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 367.

<sup>120</sup> This ideal but operative definition of “deliberative politics” was theorized by Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli and Marco S. Steenbergen, basically based on Habermas thought and enriched with a couple of relevant ideas coming from other deliberative theoreticians, John Dryzek, Amy Gutmann e Dennis Thompson among the others. *Cfr.* Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-24.

However, as Habermas pointed out, the deliberative model has to be understood in ideal terms: “(e)ven under favourable conditions, no complex society could ever correspond to the model of purely communicative social relations”<sup>121</sup>, namely a pure and perfect deliberation.

Starting from these premises, Steiner, Bächtiger, Spörndli and Steenbergen rescued the Lijphart’s concept of “spirit of accommodation” on the basis of its similarity with “ideal deliberative politics”, and elaborated an index to measure it, namely an index to gauge deliberation between opposite factions, the “Discourse Quality Index” (DQI), that demonstrated to be highly reliable in statistical terms<sup>122</sup>. The DQI index, made up of different indicators (among them: the level of respect, the quality of justification for arguments and the amount of consensual decisions), was used by Steiner and colleagues to measure the “spirit of accommodation” among legislative representatives in Germany, Switzerland, the UK and the US, recorded during parliamentary debates. In the light of the outcomes of this research, scientific significance was awarded to the following statements with regard to antecedents of deliberation:

1. Consensual institutional devices<sup>123</sup>, particularly the formation of grand-coalition governments, seem to better favour the mutual respect among parties during the dialogue.

---

<sup>121</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, *op. cit.*, p. 326; Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>122</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-73.

<sup>123</sup> The consensual model of democracy, evolution of the former consociational one, was later developed by Lijphart. Exemplified by Swiss and Belgian cases, it implies: dispersion of power in broad multi-party coalitions; balance of power between executive and legislative; multi-party systems; proportional electoral systems; representation of interests organized in corporative forms; federal and decentralized governments; bicameralism; jurisdictional control of constitutionality. The consensual model is opposite to the majoritarian or competitive one, exemplified by British system, that requires: power concentration in mono-party majoritarian governments; supremacy of executive over legislative; two-parties systems; majoritarian electoral systems; representation of interests organized in pluralistic forms; centralized governments; unicameral parliaments; flexible constitutions; no jurisdictional control of constitutionality. *Cfr.* Arendt Lijphart, *Le democrazie contemporanee*, *op. cit.*

2. Presidential systems appear to better favour the promotion of respect among parties than the parliamentary systems. Nevertheless, the latter seem to better perform in favouring the production of consensual policies, deliberated through dialogue.
3. In bicameral systems, political dialogue within the second chamber of the parliament results to better promote deliberation among parties than dialogical interaction within the first chamber.
4. Political discourse appears to be more articulated in terms of justification and reference to the common good in public arenas, even if these environments seem to be detrimental to the mutual respect among parties. The level of respect in the quality of discourse is generally higher in non public arenas, as for example parliamentary committees.
5. Good deliberation appears to be more likely when the discourse deals with a not-polarized issue.

As far as the outcomes of a good discourse quality are concerned, namely the consequences of deliberation, it has been determined that:

1. High levels of discourse quality seem to be positively correlated with unanimous decisions; namely, deliberation could help conflict settlement between clashing claims.
2. The higher the quality of discourse, the more fair policies – in the sense of social justice – are likely to be produced<sup>124</sup>.

The research of Steiner, Bächtiger, Spörndli, and Steenbergen shows that the concept of spirit of accommodation of consociational theory can be fruitfully replaced with the concept of deliberation that can be measured in a reliable and valid way <sup>125</sup>.

---

<sup>124</sup> Even if the voting power of the majority can always play a crucial role.

<sup>125</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, op. cit., pp. 9-11.



Some deliberative theorists argued that deliberative practice may also help in managing intractable ethnic-conflicts<sup>126</sup>. The premises lay on the assumption that through deliberative processes individual cultural identities could gradually change and multi-cultural conflict might find settlement through deliberative interaction among subjects in the public sphere<sup>127</sup>. Moreover, participation in deliberative practice may create a sense of common ground, helping to create a sense of belonging to a single community, transversal to social cleavages<sup>128</sup>, as well as premises for renewing contact and removing prejudices, in a social-psychology perspective. Hence, the opportunity to apply the model to deeply divided societies. Another member of our research team, Juan Ugarriza, has used the Discourse Quality Index (DQI) to analyze group discussions between ex-guerrillas and ex-paramilitaries in Colombia.<sup>129</sup>

The deliberative scholar Ian O'Flynn underlined, citing John Stuart Mill, that a democracy cannot survive if citizens don't share any sense of common belonging to the State<sup>130</sup>. This feeling of belonging, like a "civic nationalism", has been said to be essential for granting the stability of the State in two senses: first, in democracy, the authority to exercise political power lies on people; if they are divided, namely if they don't perceive to be part of a single *demos*, consequently the political authority will be weakened and divided as well. Secondly, if citizens don't perceive to be working together for a common enterprise, and therefore they don't feel a sense of common allegiance toward State institutions, they are

---

<sup>126</sup> John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia", *op. cit.*; John S. Dryzek, *Discursive Democracy. Politics, Policy, and Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990; John S. Dryzek, "Legitimacy and Economy in Deliberative Democracy", in *Political Theory*, n. 29/2001, pp. 651-669; Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*; Bora Kanra, "Islam, Democracy and Dialogue: The Case of Turkey", *op. cit.*

<sup>127</sup> John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia", *op. cit.*, p. 7, citing: Stuart J. Kaufman, *Modern Hatreds: The Symbolic Politics of Ethnic War*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2001.

<sup>128</sup> Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-162.

<sup>129</sup> Juan E. Ugarriza, Potential for Deliberation among Ex-Combatants in Colombia, PhD dissertation, political science, University of Bern, 2012.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 32-37

provided with no incentives to fulfil obligations and duties stemming from living in a self-governing society<sup>131</sup>.

Common people ideally represent the foundation of democracy, and if they are divided and unwilling to settle ethnic conflict, the higher political sphere cannot do anything but to mirror those feelings<sup>132</sup>. Here we come back to the “political culture” argument. How could be fostered a “spirit of accommodation” both at the grass root level of a deeply divided society and, as a result, at the higher political sphere level? The *deliberative decision making* model, according to this perspective, could be the right answer, as a tool for promoting the “spirit of accommodation” both among political leaders and within the broader public sphere, starting from promoting the acknowledgement of a “common ground” for people involved in deliberative talks. A political-institutional design aimed at backing the creation of transversal deliberative arenas and the development of a lively and active civil society might take advantage of adopting the deliberative model of decision making and confrontation, in this sense<sup>133</sup>.

According to Ian O’Flynn, participating at the decision making process to deliberate on the attainment of a common super-ordinate goal, even if not concerning fundamental values, can lend to the creation of a common sense of belonging among participants, namely a civic nationalism, since it would induce citizens to feel themselves part of the decisional process as such, irrespective of its final decisional outcome<sup>134</sup>. Indeed, the deliberative decision making process is expected to produce an outcome which could not be reduced to a “zero sum” game, since it implies positive payoffs for each participant. According to O’Flynn, the possibility to freely express opinions and the aptitude for listening and for yielding to the force of the better argument make everybody’s position to be treated with respect, stimulating the building of consensus on the procedure as such. At its turn, this consensus will act as an incentive to foster future

---

<sup>131</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 54-60.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 34-35; pp. 55-56.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 141 and ss.

involvement, participation and respect for rules, contributing, in the long run, to create a sense of civic belonging<sup>135</sup>.

In my perspective, deliberative practices may also help the social psychology approach to ethnic conflict. Indeed, meeting regularly individuals belonging to the hostile group, dialoguing with them about non polarized issues, listening to their argumentations and discussing together without pressures due neither to urgent decisions to be taken nor to the fear to give way on fundamental values, could also stimulate the process of removal of prejudices, according to the social psychological approach of “contact hypothesis”<sup>136</sup>. And if conflict mitigation may be fostered at the societal level, citizens are intuitively expected, in the long run, to replicate their new attitudes in their electoral behaviour, fostering political change and more tolerant leaders for leading the country<sup>137</sup>. For deliberative practices to get those scopes in deeply divided societies, participation and engagement of citizens in political decision-making processes should be fostered. This should also happen more generally in civil society at large, which would allow citizens to identify practical priorities in their daily lives and to overcome inner divisions by virtue of a superior common interest.

From a normative perspective, civil society participation in decision making processes should be promoted, for instance, within deliberative micro-arenas: forums for dialogue and confrontation, which enable citizens to express their opinion and to listen to others’ views<sup>138</sup>. At the beginning, dialogue should be focused on not-polarized issues, as social-psychology underlines, in order to

---

<sup>135</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 90 and ss. According to O’Flynn, “deliberative democracy provides normative standards that, if appropriately institutionalized, can lead to a stronger sense of common national identity among citizens” (p. 36). Since his approach to deliberation is procedural more than substantive (p. 48), he stresses the possibility for people to participate, to express their opinion and to get respect from others as being of paramount importance to allow individuals to be satisfied with being involved in the decision making process, irrespective of the final decisional outcome of the process.

<sup>136</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

<sup>137</sup> Vladimir Goati described instead the inverse process, characterizing the spreading on nationalist attitudes in Former Yugoslav Republics during the ‘90s and the effects on electoral preferences. *Cfr.* Vladimir Goati, “Parliamentary Democracy and International Relations in Yugoslavia”, *op. cit.*, p. 66 and ss.

<sup>138</sup> John S. Dryzek, “Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia”, *op. cit.*

not exacerbate tensions. The emphasis should be on the attainment of super-ordinate goals: common objectives, public goods that everybody needs but that are not producible without inter-group cooperation<sup>139</sup>. For instance, a super-ordinate goal might be the efficiency of the waste disposal service in the multi-ethnic village where conflicting groups live, or sports infrastructures for young people to be built in common spaces; but also wider ranging issues, such as, in some Balkans Countries, the perspective of facilitations and benefits stemming from a quicker march of approach toward the European Union. While experimental research in the psycho-sociological field has shown that cooperation among groups to achieve super ordinate goals, not attainable alone by single groups, can significantly make inter-group hostility decline<sup>140</sup> and plenty of empirical studies demonstrated that under the right contact conditions prejudices may be removed<sup>141</sup>, up to now it seems there is hardly any empirical research aimed at investigating the role of deliberative practices in ethnic conflict management. Here my dissertation comes in. Having laid out in the current chapter the theoretical background of my research, I will show in Chapter 2 how exactly I have proceeded in my research in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

---

<sup>139</sup> Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, *op. cit.*, 510-513.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 509-510.

<sup>141</sup> For a general review, see John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, Kerry Kawakami, "Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future", *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

## Chapter 2. Hypotheses, data collection, and type of analysis

I did my dissertation as part of a research group that includes also two dissertations done in political science at the University of Bern, by Juan E. Ugarriza<sup>142</sup> and Maria Clara Jaramillo<sup>143</sup>. Both Ugarriza and Jaramillo based their dissertations on the analysis of group discussions between ex-guerrillas and ex-paramilitaries in Colombia. As already stated in Chapter 2, Ugarriza used the Discourse Quality Index (DQI), which was at the time already a well-established measurement instrument. To get better at the internal dynamics of the group discussions, Maria Clara Jaramillo developed a new measurement instrument with the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM). I use the same instrument, actually having worked with Maria Clara Jaramillo on its development. In my own analysis, I will often establish comparisons with the findings of Jaramillo.

As announced in the Introduction, within Bosnia and Herzegovina the focus of my research is on Srebrenica, where the worst massacre took place in Europe since World War II. Before I go to the specifics of the data collection, I wish to present the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moment and its antecedents and consequences. While with the DQI each speech act is coded separately, with the DTM the coding takes account of the entire context in which an actor speaks up. Sometimes, an actor utters only a few words but still keeps deliberation at a high level. This would be the case, for example, if an actor reacts with the following statement “I agree with you” to a deliberative statement of the previous actor. The concept of Deliberative Transformative Moment allows capturing the ups and downs in the deliberative level of a discussion. A particular speech act may keep the discussion at a low level of deliberation, transforms it to a high level, keeps it at a high level, or transforms it to a low level. Therefore, we

---

<sup>142</sup> Juan E. Ugarriza, *Potential for Deliberation among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, PhD dissertation, political science, University of Bern, 2012.

<sup>143</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Deliberative Transformative Moments among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, PhD dissertation, political science; University of Bern, 2013.

have to do with the following four coding categories (the illustrations are taken from the research in Colombia).

### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>144</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>144</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

## *2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

## *3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

## *4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a

new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

Inter-coder reliability was checked by Maria Clara Jaramillo and Jürg Steiner for one of the six Colombian groups of ex-combatants. Of the 107 speech acts in this group, the two coders reached agreement in 89 cases, a high reliability.

I could apply these four coding categories quite easily to my research in Srebrenica, which is an indication that the categories have a general nature and can be used in different contexts. What are the antecedents and consequences that a group discussion is transformed from a low to a high level of deliberation or vice-versa. In other words, how can the deliberative dynamics in a group discussion be explained? Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself have developed these hypotheses in common with our adviser Professor Jürg Steiner. We were joined by Rousiley C. Maia, professor of political communication at the Federal University of Minas Gerais in Brazil. She applied the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) to group discussions between police officers and locals in the favelas (slums) of Belo Horizonte and Belém in Brazil. Our joint research efforts were published by Cambridge University Press in 2017 under the title “Deliberation across Deeply Divided Societies. Transformative Moments.” My dissertation has greatly profited that I could be part of this research group, and I hope that I could also make a major contribution to the research group. Now to the hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** *Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) are the more likely, the more deliberative leaders emerge.*

As I will show later in this chapter, in our research team we chose the strategy that the moderators should only submit the question to be discussed and then let the discussion freely flow wherever it went. With this research design we wanted to investigate to what extent actors emerged who did give the discussion new impulses and thus acting as deliberative leaders.



**Hypothesis 2:** *Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) are the more likely, the more participants pursue super ordinate goals.*

A super ordinate goal means that it has appeals to both sides of a deep division. Thereby, the criterion is not how an outside observer defines the concept but how it is perceived by the participants themselves. Therefore, the key point is whether participants arrive at a common perception.

**Hypothesis 3:** *Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) are the more likely, the more arguments are supported with reasons.*

Rationality had the central place, when the deliberative model was initially developed. It is Jürgen Habermas, who has most strongly emphasized the importance of rationality for the deliberative model. For him arguments must be critically assessed through “the orderly exchange of information and reasons between parties”<sup>145</sup>. Historically, the strong emphasis of Habermas on rationality has its roots in the writings of Immanuel Kant<sup>146</sup>. Another prominent voice emphasizing the importance of reasoning is by Joshua Cohen for whom deliberation is the “use of arguments and reasoning”<sup>147</sup>. More recently, Hélène Landemore stresses that “for an exchange of arguments to count as minimally deliberative, it should engage the reasoning ability of the individuals”<sup>148</sup>.

**Hypothesis 4:** *Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) are the more likely, the more arguments are supported with personal stories.*

---

<sup>145</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1992), S. 370), ‘den geregelten Austausch von Informationen und Gründen zwischen Parteien’.

<sup>146</sup> Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, and Marco R. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 30-31.

<sup>147</sup> Joshua Cohen, “Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy“, in James Bohman and William Rehg (eds.), *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, Cambridge. Mass., MIT Press, 1989.

<sup>148</sup> Hélène Landemore, “On Minimal Deliberation, Partisan Activism, and Teaching People How to Disagree“, *Critical Review* 25 (2013), 210-225.

Personal stories have gained increased attention in the deliberative literature. Iris Marion Young criticized in an influential way the Habermasian emphasis on rationality.<sup>149</sup> She argued that abstract rationality is not impartial but tends to replicate the perspectives of the powerful and to exclude the perspectives of the marginalized. Therefore, contrary to Habermas, democratic deliberation should not demand the „absence of emotional expression.“<sup>150</sup> Later on, Sharon R. Krause challenged the rational orientation of Habermas in a particularly forceful way. Starting from David Hume, she asserts that Habermas and theorists like him put too much emphasis on rationality, and that more attention should be given not only to stories but to sentiment and passion in general. She argues that “deliberation, as Hume conceives it, is not devoid of intellect, but it involves more than merely intellect. The process of practical reasoning is a holistic one, in which cognition and affect are deeply entwined.”<sup>151</sup> From this Humean position, Krause criticizes Habermas for being insufficiently aware that all reasons also have an affective element. To demonstrate that pure rationality is impossible, Krause refers to neuroscience and approvingly quotes Antonio Damasio, whose research suggests that “the cool strategy advocated by Kant, among others, has far more to do with the way patients with prefrontal damage go about deciding than with how normals usually operate”<sup>152</sup>. For Krause, “expressions of sentiment can contribute in valuable ways to public deliberation even when they do not take an explicit argumentative form”<sup>153</sup>. She sees a great range of emotional expressions with the potential of having a moral dimension: “By allowing informal, symbolic, and testimonial types of deliberative expressions, it can enrich citizens’ reflection on public issues and thereby

---

<sup>149</sup> Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton University Press, 1990).

<sup>150</sup> Iris Marion Young, “Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy,” in Seyla Benhabib, ed. *Democracy and Difference* (Princeton University Press, 1996), p. 124.

<sup>151</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions. Moral Sentiment and Democratic Deliberation*, Princeton University Press, 2008, p.103.

<sup>152</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*, p.20.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibidem*, p.118.

improve public deliberation. Such expressions are also tremendously important for the cultivation of moral sentiment”<sup>154</sup>.

Laura W. Black also sees great potential in storytelling to enhance deliberation; for her “the study of stories offers a discourse-centered approach that can help scholars focus attention on interactions that hold dialogic potential ... stories encourage listeners to understand the perspective of the storyteller. In this way, storytelling can provide group members with an opportunity to experience presence, openness, and a relational tension between self and other”<sup>155</sup>. For Black, stories “potentially have positive influences on deliberative discussion by helping group members participate in a sense of shared collective identity and seriously consider the views and values of their fellow group members”<sup>156</sup>. Like Young and Krause, Black criticizes the one-sided emphasis of ùon rationality; she agrees with “many contemporary deliberative scholars (who) point out the limitations of the theory’s rationalist tradition”<sup>157</sup>. Black, however, acknowledges that “not all stories will lead to dialogic moments. Although stories hold the potential for identity negotiation and perspective taking, these features are accomplished in interaction, and it stands to reason that they will not always be achieved .... On their own, stories are not necessarily dialogic—simply sharing one’s experiences does not guarantee a dialogic interaction”<sup>158</sup>. In testing our second hypothesis, we have to be aware of this other side of the medal of story telling.

**Hypothesis 5:** *Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) are the more likely, the more arguments are supported with humor.*

With his emphasis on rational justification of arguments, Jürgen Habermas objects to humor as a deliberative element. For him “jokes, fictional representations, irony, games, and so on, rest on intentionally using categorical

---

<sup>154</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*, p.122.

<sup>155</sup> Laura W. Black, “Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments”, *Communication Theory*, 18 (2008), p. 109.

<sup>156</sup> Laura W. Black, “Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments”, *op. cit.*, 109.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 110.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 109, 111.

confusions". He considers such items "as categorical mistakes"<sup>159</sup>. To this negative position of Habermas on humor, Sammy Basu has taken the most elaborate counter-position, writing an entire article on "dialogical ethics and the virtue of humor"<sup>160</sup>. Basu takes a philosophical perspective, going all the way back to what Aristotle and Plato wrote about humor, but he does not give empirical data to support his claims. As theoretical basis, however, Basu is very useful for the analysis of our data about humor. He acknowledges that jokes "can backfire. They may be rejected as rude"<sup>161</sup>. Basically, however, he stresses the positive aspects of humor for deliberation. He argues "that humor warrants inclusion in any robust conception of dialogic ethics"<sup>162</sup>. He distinguishes two characteristics of humor. First, it "encompasses ruptures in expectations, habits, logics, languages, patterns, schemes, rhythms, and so on." Second, given such incongruity, humor triggers a "leap away from the tyranny of the culturally expected"<sup>163</sup>. Basu discusses three ways of how humor can be fruitful for deliberation, as a mode of cognition, as a motivational frame, and as political instrumentality. From the perspective of cognition, according to Basu, "humor provisionally suspends decorum, putting the mind at liberty to hear all sides .... humor suggests that all knowledge – providential, prophetic and human - is laughably partial and incomplete ... humor keeps the process of reasoning open ended"<sup>164</sup>. With regard to motivation, humor is supposed to lead to "ease, modesty and tolerance ... the ability to laugh at oneself is both a technique and manifestation of self-consciousness, namely self-detachment and self-transcendence ... in enlivening a psyche made torpid by gravity, solemnity, melancholy and tragedy, (humor) makes one available for convivial relations with others and otherness"<sup>165</sup>. Finally, from a political perspective, "humor can be a

---

<sup>159</sup> Jürgen Habermas, "A reply to my critics", in J. B. Thompson and D. Held (eds.), *Habermas: Critical Debates*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982, pp. 271.

<sup>160</sup> Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 4 (1999), 378-403.

<sup>161</sup> Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *op. cit.*, p. 395.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 378.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 386.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 388.

<sup>165</sup> Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *op. cit.*, pp. 389-90.

social lubricant. It breaks the ice and fills awkward silences ... comedy can make palatable what is otherwise hard to swallow ... in rendering an authority figure funnily incongruous, humor exposes hypocrisy in one form or another”<sup>166</sup>. Basu presents a large plate of arguments that call for empirical testing.

There are other deliberative theorists, who address the issue of humor. For John Dryzek “deliberation can be open to a variety of forms of communication, such as rhetoric, testimony, the telling of stories, and humor”<sup>167</sup>. In a later article, Dryzek and Jensen Sass, put humor in an even larger package of deliberative forms: “Allowable (deliberative) communication includes rhetoric, silences, gossip, humor, ritual, the telling of stories, and what Mansbridge calls everyday talk”<sup>168</sup>. Whereas Basu considers humor as an antecedent of deliberation, Dryzek and Sass treat it as a deliberative element. Basu asks whether humor can help deliberation, while Dryzek and Sass treat humor as part of a very broad definition of deliberation. One can always argue how broadly the concept of deliberation should be defined. With regard to humor, we prefer not to make it part of the definition of deliberation but to side with Basu and to investigate to what extent humor helps and possibly hurts deliberation.

In conflict-affected societies, humour may have significant potential to contribute to the escalation or reduction of conflicts<sup>169</sup>. Before and after the Bosnian war, humor has always played an important role in inter-group relations, strengthening the need to find others to share a sense of belonging with, and contributing to discursively represented ingroup and out-groups<sup>170</sup>.

---

<sup>166</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 391, 393.

<sup>167</sup> John S. Dryzek, “Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building”, *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (2009), p. 1381.

<sup>168</sup> Jensen Sass and John S. Dryzek, “Deliberative Cultures”, *Political Theory* 42 (2014), 8.

<sup>169</sup> Craig Zelizer, “Laughing our Way to Peace or War: Humour and Peacebuilding”, in *Journal of Conflictology*, Volume 1, Issue 2 (2010) ISSN 2013-8857.

<sup>170</sup> Srdjan Vučetić, *Identity is a Joking Matter: Intergroup Humor in Bosnia*, *spacesofidentity.net*, [S.I.], apr. 2004. ISSN 1496-6778. Available at: <https://soi.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/soi/article/view/8011> (Last accessed: 5/3/2018); Uğur Ümit Üngör, Valerie Amandine Verkerke, “Funny as hell: The functions of humour during and after genocide”, in *European Journal of Humour Research* 3 (2/3) 80–101, 2015.

I was not only interested in the antecedents of upward Deliberative Transformative Moments, but also in what happens after such Moments. How long can a high level of deliberation be sustained and what are the factors influencing such length? For this question I have the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 6:** *After an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, the high level of deliberation is sustained the longer, the more participants were trained in deliberation.*

My research design, as described later in the chapter, allowed me to test this hypothesis, because for three of the six groups participants had participated in classes of the Nansen Dialogue Center, a Norwegian NGO, whose objective “is to contribute to reconciliation and peace building through interethnic dialogue”<sup>171</sup>.

**Hypothesis 7:** *After an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, the high level of deliberation is sustained the longer, the younger participants are.*

Here again, my research design allowed me to test this hypothesis, because there were two youth groups with older teenagers. My justification for this hypothesis is twofold. First, the massacre fifteen years ago happened when these participants were still very small. Second, young people have an easier way to communicate across ethnic divisions.

I was also interested in the outcomes of the group discussions, specifically whether agreements were easier when a high level of deliberation was sustained for a certain time.

**Hypothesis 8:** *Agreements across deep divisions are all the more likely, the longer after an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM) deliberation is kept at a high level.*

The crucial question is whether across the deep division there is some kind of agreement on concrete issues. The fact that the discussion flows at a

---

<sup>171</sup> <http://www.nansen-dialogue.net/index.php/en/>, last accessed 5/3/2018

high level of deliberation already indicates that the two sides listen to each other in a respectful way, which may already be useful for overcoming the deep divisions at a psychological level. Thus, having a high level of deliberation across deep divisions has already a value in itself, even if such deliberation does not lead to concrete policy results. A further step, however, is when the two sides come down to concrete issues and work out common policy solutions. According to the research design of our research group, the moderators did not put issues to a vote but let the discussion go freely wherever it went. There were also no cases where participants organized a vote on their own. Therefore, we define an agreement between the two sides, if there is open accord from participants of both sides and no open objection of either side. Such agreements should be more likely when deliberation continues for some time; as John S. Dryzek argues, deliberation is “a means for joint resolution of social problems.”<sup>172</sup>

Now I come to the question of how I collected the data to test these eight hypotheses. How did I organized the discussion groups between Serbs and Bošnjaks (Muslims) in Srebrenica? At the beginning of my research efforts, I considered to organize the experiments not in Srebrenica but in Sarajevo, the capital city of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where all three ethnic groups are represented, Bošnjaks, Croats, and Serbs. However, a pre-test realised in May 2008 convinced me to change the experimental location because with many mixed marriages, Sarajevo did not have sufficient deep ethnic divisions, a crucial precondition for my research question. The pre-test in Sarajevo included 12 university students randomly chosen in the University area, coming from different ethnic groups. The decision to select young people was due to the reasoning that they are supposed to be the next political class of the Bosnian future. However, the sample was biased in two ways. The first bias was the high education level of the people involved. The second bias was more subtle and difficult to correct, since it is related both to the high number of Sarajevans who belong to ethnically-mixed families and the high level of inter-ethnic integration

---

<sup>172</sup> John S. Dryzek, “Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (2009), 1390.

which has always characterized Sarajevo. Participants to the pre-test, who were asked to discuss about the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina, turned out to belong to a great extent to mixed families, with strong attitudes to inter-ethnic integration and as a consequence they represented a biased sample: they almost completely agreed with each other, like a group of friends. Moreover, a strongly shared “common ground” of discussion emerged, the feeling of dissatisfaction with politicians, in particular their responsibility for keeping high inter-ethnic tensions instead of finding concrete answers to the low development of the Country and its delay in the march towards the European Union, which would mean for young generations freedom of movement and new perspectives for the future. As a consequence of these biases, the Discourse Quality Index (DQI) was at an unusually high level with not much variation. Given this pre-test experience, the research design was reviewed in order to have a location with a really deep ethnic division. My choice fell on Srebrenica with its extremely deep division between Serbs and Bošnjaks due to the terrible massacre in 1995 of more than 7000 Bošnjak men and boys by the Serb side. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia was the first international criminal tribunal to enter convictions for genocide in Europe, with reference to events happened in Srebrenica in 1995. In April 2004, in the case of Radislav Krstić, the Appeals Chamber determined that genocide was committed through the execution of more than 7,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys following the take-over of the town by Bosnian Serb forces. In November 2017, Former military chief Ratko Mladić was convicted a life sentence by the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia for genocide and crimes against humanity in relation also with Srebrenica events.

I did my empirical research in 2010, 15 years after the massacre. Since the time of the massacre, there were no violent outbreaks in Srebrenica between Serbs and Bošnjaks. When I began my research, Srebrenica was quite a calm city, so that we did not have to anticipate that my research would endanger the safety and wellbeing of participants and myself. This benign anticipation was confirmed when I learned that participants were willing not only to be audio but



also to be video recorded. To be on the safe side, I still altered the voices on the audio recordings, did not put the video recordings on our website, and changed the names on the transcripts. Like Maria Clara Jaramillo in Colombia, I took a passive role in only setting up the topic for discussion and then letting it freely go, without asking delicate questions like memories of the massacre. Also like in Colombia, my research was embedded in the peace process, which, of course, was much further ahead in Bosnia and Herzegovina. After the Dayton agreement, which ended the civil war of 1992-95, the Office of the High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina was created with the task to help with the implementation of the agreement. This Office supported my research as a useful effort to contribute to the amelioration of the relations between Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica; it asked that the recommendations of our discussion groups be forwarded to the office, which I did. Like in Colombia with the Office of the High Commissioner for Reintegration, in Srebrenica, too, my research got legitimacy with the support of the Office of the High Representative. All in all, in Srebrenica I took all the possible steps to make my research safe for both participants and myself.

Before I go into the specifics of my data collection in Srebrenica, I present some background of the civil war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the town of Srebrenica, adding to what I presented in the Introduction<sup>173</sup>. Yugoslavia became Communist after World War II, but could keep its distance from the Soviet Union. After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the disintegration of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe, the international community held no immediate worries about Yugoslavia. Attention was directed to other places such as Romania, East Germany, and the former Soviet republics. Thus, it was all the more surprising when violence broke out in Yugoslavia in 1991. Communist leaders as as the Serb Slobodan Milošević and the Croat Franjo Tuđman had turned into fierce nationalists. Ordinary citizens who before did not seem to care much about their ethnic and national identities began to shoot at each other. In

---

<sup>173</sup> For more details see Markus Crepaz and Jürg Steiner, *European Democracies*, London: Pearson 2013.

Bosnia-Herzegovina the situation was particularly complex with 39 percent Bošnjaks (Muslims), 32 percent Serbs, 18 percent Croats, and the remaining 11 percent minor groups like Roma. In 1992, 63 percent voted for an independent Bosnia-Herzegovina, after Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia already had declared their own independence. Many Serbs and Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina opposed the creation of an independent state that they saw as dominated by Muslims; they would have preferred to be part of Serbia or Croatia. Thus, independent Bosnia-Herzegovina was from the beginning on shaky ground, and quickly a horrendous war broke out. In the capital of Sarajevo, where the various ethnic groups seemingly had lived peacefully together and where in 1984 well organized Winter Olympics had taken place, fierce fighting broke out.

After the Dayton Agreement in 1995, violence stopped but there was stalemate among the three major ethnic groups. In a thoughtful book about what happened after the Dayton agreement, Adis Merdžanović gives a pessimistic view<sup>174</sup>. He disagrees with the positive view of one of the prominent consociational scholars, Brendan O'Leary, that the absence of violence in Bosnia-Herzegovina since 1995 is evidence of consociational success. According to Merdžanović, the lack of violence in Bosnia is probably more due to the immense military presence in the immediate post-war years. He argues that democracy is still very fragile and mostly only on paper and not in daily political life. He sees the explanation for this failure in the negative influence of international actors. First of all, consociational institutions were imposed by the Dayton Accord from the outside, so that Merdžanović speaks in the subtitle of the book of Imposed Consociational Democracy. Secondly, he sees a highly negative influence of the Office of the High Representative. Merdžanović documents carefully, for all seven High Representatives from 1996 to the present, how they were running operations on a daily basis in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Based on this research, he calls the country in the main title of the book "Democracy by Decree", by which he means decrees by the High

---

<sup>174</sup> Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree. Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015.

Representative. Thereby, Merdžanović criticizes that the Office of the High Representative is zigzagging without any clear strategy. For the elites of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the strong influence of the High Representative means that they have no real responsibility to govern and can concentrate to mobilize their respective groups with extreme nationalistic ideologies and to get for them as many favors as possible. All in all, Merdžanović registers dysfunctionality of the polity.

The municipality of Srebrenica is located on the left bank of Drina river, in the region of Vlasenica, part of Republic of Srpska, one of the two constituting entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and massively inhabited by a Serbian majority. Traditionally, that territory is claimed by Serbs to historically belong to Serbian-Orthodox historical tradition, as Drina river also used to separate Western and eastern Christianity, and later on, in medieval times, to separate Bosnia from the rest of Serbia. Serbs and Muslims severely fought during the XX century for this territory, both during the 1941-1945 war, and in 1992-1995 conflict<sup>175</sup>.

Facing the rapid advancement of Bosnian Serbs military and paramilitary forces in Eastern Bosnia, on April 1993 the UN Security Council Resolution 819<sup>176</sup> declared the town of Srebrenica a “safe area”, where thousands of Bosnian Muslims fled to find shelter.

In March 1995, President of the Bosnian Serbs Radovan Karadžić issued a political order, known as “Directive 7”, containing a clear target: in order to extend Serb control in Eastern Bosnia, the directive authorised the forcible removal of the Bošnjak displaced, about 50.000 who had sought refuge in Srebrenica and its surroundings villages, calling for a violent intervention into Srebrenica, that was at that time a UN protected enclave, under the UNPROFOR Dutch contingent<sup>177</sup>. At the beginning of July 1995, with Serbian forces

---

<sup>175</sup> Antonio Violante, “Srebrenica: where the war never ended”, in *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia geographica Socio-Economica* 21, 2015: 137-156, p. 138

<sup>176</sup> United Nations Security Council, Resolution 819 (1993), adopted by the Security Council at its 3199th meeting, on 16 April 1993, S/RES/819 (1993), 16 April 1993

<sup>177</sup> Lara J. Nettelfield, Sarah E. Wagner, *Srebrenica in the Aftermath of Genocide*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2015, pp. 9-10. See also Sarah E. Wagner, *To Know Where He Lies: DNA Technology and the Search for Srebrenica’s Missing*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2008

advancing towards Srebrenica, about 15.000 muslim men and boys from the surroundings of the town began to flee through the mountains, trying to arrive, through the forests, to the Bošnjak controlled area, about 100 km away, and 25.000 more seeking shelter at the UN base of Potočari. The Army of Republic of Srpska entered Srebrenica on 11th July 1995, with the UNPROFOR forces unable to grant any kind of protection to the Muslim population in the enclave, and even supporting Mladić's troops to separate men and boys from women and children, in order for the first to be captured and transported to detention sites, then to be executed and buried in mass graves, while the second to be forced onto buses and driven away to the Bošnjak territory<sup>178</sup>.

Between 11th and 19th July 1995 more than 6.000 Muslim men and boys who tried to flee through the mountains were captured and killed by the Army of the Republic of Srpska. Another 1.200 from Potočari were killed. Corps were buried in mass graves in the surrounding areas, then dug up and reburied several times in different areas across Eastern Bosnia in the following months.

Once Srebrenica was cleansed, at the end of the war Bosnian Serb leadership officially invited Serbs from suburbs of Sarajevo and other muslim areas to move to Eastern Bosnia. In this sense, the new demographic picture of Srebrenica after the war contributed to prevent refugees and internal displaced returns, and paved the way to crystalize division along the ethnic lines in the town<sup>179</sup>.

The 1991 census counted 37.211 inhabitants in the Municipality of Srebrenica, out of which 27.118 (72,88%) were Muslims, 9.381 (25,21%) Serbs and the remaining declaring to belong to other groups, or "non declared". The urban core of Srebrenica registered similar balance between the two main national groups, with 3.683 Muslims (64%) and 1.649 Serbs (29%) over a total of 7.754 inhabitants<sup>180</sup>. The census 2013 registered a significant reduction of the overall population of Srebrenica, with 15.242 citizens in the overall municipal territory, of which an uncertain number – between 7.000 and 10.000 living in

---

<sup>178</sup> Lara J. Nettelfield, Sarah E. Wagner, *Srebrenica in the Aftermath of Genocide*, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>179</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>180</sup> Antonio Violante, "Srebrenica: where the war never ended", op. cit., p. 139.

urban center. Significantly, no official data on ethnic balance has been released for political reasons.

Dayton Peace Agreements signed on 21<sup>st</sup> November 1995 simply took into account the results obtained in the battlefield, consequently freezing boundaries along ethnic lines. In this sense, on the basis of electoral lists of 1991, the right of return for Bošnjaks living in Srebrenica in 1991 determined the paradoxal situation of a Muslim mayor being traditionally elected to lead a clearly Serbian majority municipality<sup>181</sup>, at least until October 2012, when the new rules excluded from the right to vote former residents who moved elsewhere in the meantime<sup>182</sup>. In 2012, the first Serbian Mayor in post war Srebrenica, Vesna

---

<sup>181</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>182</sup> In this sense, with a political administration directly elected by local polity, it may be argued that since 2012 the political situation of Srebrenica has somewhat improved, in parallel with some advancement related to the EU integration process of Bosnia and Herzegovina, such as the entry into force in October 2010 of visa facilitation and readmission agreements (signed in 2008), and the ratification and entry into force of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) on 1 June 2015. Bosnia and Herzegovina submitted the membership application to the European Union in February 2016. In December 2016 Bosnia and Herzegovina received the accession questionnaire from the European Commission. Reforms, however, proceed very slowly, because of political and economical problems, harshened by a huge beurocracy triplicating all procesdures to grant ethnical balance, and with ethnopolitics still ruling.

As Mirela Grünther-Đečević states, "17 years after the accession process first started, Bosnia and Herzegovina is still a so-called "potential candidate country". The complex constitutional structure stemming from the Dayton Peace Agreement is still highly dysfunctional and inefficient. The country of 3.5 million people has 13 constitutions, 14 legal systems and 152 ministries. Bosnia and Herzegovina has a highly complicated institutional set-up which results in a dysfunctional state. The oversized and underfunded nature of the public sector reduces the effectiveness of public policy and hampers reforms. The labour market situation is very difficult, with the unemployment rate at 27.5 %, particularly high among youth (62.7 %). The business environment remains weak, accompanied by unsustainable economic growth. Since 1991 the country's population has shrunk from 4.3 million to an estimated 3.5million today. The birth rate is negative, the population is rapidly ageing, while there is sizable outward migration, in particular of young people, with most skilled/educated people seeking opportunities abroad. People feel that they have no power to change their lives and that the only solution is to leave the country in search of a better life elsewhere. Besides that, the political rhetoric is increasingly destructive and nationalistic and the country is trapped in its highly institutionalised corruption" (Mirela Grünther-Đečević, "A never-ending accession process? Bosnia and Herzegovina's long road to the EU", in *The Green European Journal*, 24/08/2017, available at <https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/a-never-ending-accession-process-bosnia-and-herzegovinas-long-road-to-the-eu/#>, last accessed 8/3/2018). See also last Reports of the EU Commission on Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015 and 2016: European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Document, Bosnia and Herzegovina 2016 Report* accompanying the document *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - 2016 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy*, SWD(2016) 365 final, Brussels, 9.11.2016; European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Document Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015 Report* Accompanying the document *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee of the Regions EU Enlargement Strategy*, SWD(2015) 214 final, Brussels, 10.11.2015.

Kočević, presented herself as a candidate for “reconciliation”, aware that in Srebrenica severe crimes were committed...”on both sides”. Significantly, she never mentioned the term genocide. Ethnic conflict still persists in Srebrenica, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina generally, in so far dominant narratives both among Serbs and among Bošnjaks, tend to acknowledge their victimism but not admitting crimes committed against the out-group. Significantly, Bosnian-serb nationalist rhetoric influences historical narrative about Bosnian Serbs being threatened by Jihadist-Bosnian Muslims during the second world war and, as a last attempt, during the 90’s wars, and inspiring history books adopted for Serbian students in Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time, Bošnjak leaders tend to depict their group as a pure victim of Serbian violence, avoiding any room for admitting whatever responsibilities for war crimes against Serbs during the war. As school curricula remains separate in the overall country, there is poor room for hope about reconciliation between the two groups, with political elites in power representing the same or the direct descendance of 1990’s nationalist leaderships and gaining political success by keeping alive fears and ethnic hatred. The situation of Srebrenica is even more severe, hosting in Potočari the genocide memorial, unknowledged as such by Bosnian Serbs, who at their turn built their own war memorial, not far from Potočari, close to Bratunac, in the village of Kravica, there is a memorial to Serbian victims killed by Bosnian Muslims: 6.469 during the second world war, when Muslims were Nazis allied, and 3.967 died during the 1992-1995 conflict. As correctly puts Antonio Violante in his “Srebrenica: where the war never ends”, “every communities commemorates only its own dead, ignoring what happened to others (...). Therefore, when it comes to the last BiH war, every national group has built its own “true story”, transmitted to the young generations through school material, opposed to the “false” one presented by the others: the consequence of this in an augmentation of resentment and further cultural distance between communities”, that are however forced to live one close to the other<sup>183</sup>. Victims

---

<sup>183</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 153. For a more general illustration of clashing narratives in ethnic conflicts, see Marc Howard Ross, *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*, cambridge

and tormentors live as neighbours in Srebrenica, and torturers have no shame as they acted to protect their own national groups, to defend the ingroup from the outgroup. In such a context seems there is no hope for reconciliation.

Srebrenica, especially for the sense of guiltiness of international community, received lots of funds in the aftermath of the war. However, the economical situation never improved, with young people abandoning the region, and an unemployment rate even worse than the general unemployment rate in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The uncertain political balance during the period 1995-2012, with the town always administered by Muslim mayors, was not an incentive for Republic of Srpska to invest in the region. At the same time, the relative decentralized position of the town, especially with respect with the Bosnian muslim areas, prevented economic relations to be strengthened also in that directions.

Being Srebrenica such a divided town, with apparently no hope for reconciliation along the ethnic lines, it represented the ideal place to investigate the deliberative potential among citizens.

I turn now to the specifics of the data collection in Srebrenica. How did I choose the participants for the six discussion groups in Srebrenica? For three groups, I selected the participants with a method called *random walk*. This means that I walked the streets of Srebrenica and approached people in a random way asking them to participate in my research. It would have been better to draw random samples from lists of Serb and Bošnjak inhabitants of Srebrenica, but since no such lists existed, random walk was the second-best method. With random walk to select participants, I encountered two major difficulties. One was related to the living pattern of the Bošnjak population. It forms the numerical majority in Srebrenica, but many Bošnjaks are only formally registered in the town, but actually living somewhere else in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Croat/Muslim entity. I have seen in Srebrenica many empty houses belonging to Bošnjaks. It seems that many of them come back only for elections or commemorative events for the genocide, because the

traumatic memories make it hard for them to permanently live in Srebrenica. It appears that more moderate Bošnjaks tend to live permanently in Srebrenica. This means that I likely got more moderate Bošnjaks in my sample. Maria Clara Jaramillo had such a bias in Colombia also, where the most violent and psychologically troubled ex-combatants had to be excluded from the discussion groups. From a research design perspective this is not ideal, but such is life in societies with an internal armed conflict in the recent past or still going on. A second difficulty in searching for participants through a random walk was that some, both Serbs and Bošnjaks, were not willing to participate or, when they did promise to attend, did not show up.

For the other three groups in Srebrenica, I wanted participants who had been exposed to a program of reconciliation and peace building, so that I could examine whether participation in such a program made a difference in the behavior in the discussions. The Nansen Dialogue Center, a Norwegian NGO, has such a program; its main objective “is to contribute to reconciliation and peace building through interethnic dialogue.”<sup>184</sup> The staff of the center helped me to recruit people, who had participated in its activities, making the selection as randomly as possible. Among the persons recruited by the Nansen Dialogue Center, there were also some who did not show up. Thus, the six groups in Srebrenica had unequal size and not always the same number of Serbs and Bošnjaks. Again, this is the best that I could do in the place where the worst genocide in Europe since World War II had taken place.

The practical organization of the discussions in Srebrenica was basically the same as for Maria Clara Jaramillo in Colombia, so that comparisons can be made.<sup>185</sup> Participants had to fill out questionnaires before and after the discussions. As in Colombia, no briefing material was handed out beforehand and I did not intervene to encourage deliberative behavior. I was assisted by a friend from the region. At the beginning of the discussions, I gave the topic of the

---

<sup>184</sup> [www.nansen-dialogue-net/content](http://www.nansen-dialogue-net/content)

<sup>185</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Deliberative Transformative Moments among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, PhD dissertation, political science; University of Bern, 2013.



discussion, which was to “*formulate recommendations for a better future in Bosnia–Herzegovina.*”

Having presented the hypotheses and the data collection, I want to make some general remarks about the type of analysis that I have chosen before going into the specifics of the analysis in the chapters to follow. Like the other members of our research group, and in collaboration with them, I have chosen a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The success of my dissertation will very much depend on whether I am able to get an empirical handle on the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM), the central variable in my research design. As I have shown earlier in the chapter, the units of analysis are the individual speech acts, classified according to four categories: (1) speech acts remains at a low level of deliberation, (2) speech act is transformed from a low to a high level of deliberation, (3) speech act stays at a high level of deliberation, (4) speech transforms deliberation from a high to a low level. The quantitative aspect of the analysis consists in the coding of the speech acts according to these four categories. Using the data from Colombia, our research group checked the reliability of our coding. Two members of our group coded independently 107 speech acts and reached agreement in 98 cases, a high reliability.<sup>186</sup> The qualitative aspect consists in the verbal justification of each coding decision in a more or less lengthy paragraph. These justifications can be seen on the following website of our research group: [www.ipw.unibe.ch/content/research/deliberation](http://www.ipw.unibe.ch/content/research/deliberation). This website contains also the audio records of all the discussions of all three countries, all the transcripts in the original language and in English translation. The justifications of the coding decisions are in English. Thus, the entire research process is transparent, including the comparisons that I make with the PhD dissertation of Maria Clara Jaramillo on Colombia.

---

<sup>186</sup> Steiner et al., *Deliberation across Deeply Divided Societies*, p. 6.



## Chapter 3: First Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica

### 3.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>187</sup>

**Dušan:** Serb, male, 22 years old. He lives in a mono-ethnic neighborhood in Srebrenica. Both parents Serbian. Dušan was in the country during the civil war, he lost in the war both family members and friends. He finished the Gymnasium (Secondary School to prepare students for College), and he is currently a college student. With regard to attitudes, he considers his ethnic group as of equal importance among other ethnic groups of Bosnia-Herzegovina, but in terms of perceived group identity he feels himself close to Serbs, perceiving this identity as somewhat pre-ordinate and not changeable across life, even if he admits some criticism towards his group. Religion is sometimes an important component of his life. He actually considers personal values more important than group values. He is generally proud of his group, never afraid of individual Bošnjaks or Croats, but definitely angry towards Bošnjaks and their behavior as a group. He perceives that other groups – Bošnjaks, specifically - have threatened the survival of Serbs as a specific group with their history, culture and traditions in the recent past, and thinks that his group is still maintained in a position of disadvantage in current politics. For this reason, he strongly thinks that ethnic identities can be better protected by national/mono-ethnic States, and that each ethnic group should get its own national state. However, he admits that each ethnic group shares responsibility for war and war crimes. In terms of Bosnian inter-group relations, he feels that Bošnjaks think that Bosnia-Herzegovina is their own country and nobody else's, while both Croats and Serbs would like to leave Bosnia-Herzegovina to build their own country or to join their respective motherlands. He thinks that the Government

---

<sup>187</sup> The participants in this group were selected by random walk.

and International Actors tend to support ethnic groups other than Serbs, and he doesn't think that each group equally contributes to make Bosnia-Herzegovina a stronger country. However, he admits that not all Serbs agree on changing the present situation. He generally participates in elections, supporting the nationalistic Serbian PDP party. He once experienced inter-ethnic cooperation, but he does not recall to have ever cooperated with other ethnic groups for a specific goal.

**Nada:** Serb, female, 53 years old, both parents Serbian. She lives in a mono-ethnic neighborhood in Srebrenica, with scarce occasions of group contact. Nada was in the country during the civil war, she lost in the war both family members and friends. She is Dušan's mother. She finished professional secondary school and is currently unemployed. With regard to attitudes, Nada considers her ethnic group to be of equal importance with the other ethnic groups of Bosnia-Herzegovina. She strongly feels to belong to her ethnic group, believing that this belonging is a matter of birth and nothing cannot change it until death. She admits, however, some criticism against her own group. She is inclined to follow her personal values rather than the group values, and this factor induces some moderation in her group belonging. Thus, Nada is quite ambivalent with regard to personal and group values. She considers each ethnic group as equally responsible for the war and the war crimes, but she also considers Serbs to have been victimized over time by other groups, especially Bošnjaks, and to be kept in this subordinated position also in current politics. International actors and domestic politics tend, according to her perceptions, to support other groups more than Serbs. Sometimes Nada feels disgusted towards Bošnjaks, but she is never afraid of them. She is moderately proud of her own ethnic group. She thinks that ethnic identities can be better protected by mono-ethnic States, but she is not sure if each ethnic group should be entitled to have its own National State. In terms of Bosnian inter-group relations, she feels that Bošnjaks perceive Bosnia-Herzegovina as their own Country and nobody else's, while both Croats and Serbs would like to leave to build their own Country or to

join their respective motherlands. She doesn't think that each group equally contributes to make Bosnia-Herzegovina a stronger country: while Serbs work for the economic development of the country, Bošnjaks do not equally contribute to it, neither do Croats. She only sometimes participates in elections. She never experienced inter-ethnic cooperation and is not interested to do so. She feels that the social environment around her does not support inter-group contact and cooperation.

**Dragan:** Serb, male, 25 years old, both parents Serbian. In contrast to Dušan and Nada, he lives in a multi-ethnic neighborhood in Srebrenica. Dragan was in the country at beginning of the war but then moved to Belgrade, and came back to Srebrenica after the war. He lost in the war both family members and friends. He finished Technical Secondary School, and currently is unemployed. He considers himself not to be very good at speaking and convincing people. With regard to attitudes, Dragan considers his own ethnic group simply to be one among the other ethnic groups of Bosnia-Herzegovina. His ethnic group belonging appears to be less strong than Dušan's and Nada's. He perceives it as pre-ordinate, in the sense that it has been acquired by birth, and it will never change. He follows habits and traditions of his own ethnic group, but he also questioned himself about them. Religion is not very important for him. He thinks that the political class governing Srebrenica does very poorly support inter-ethnic dialogue and cooperation. Dragan is of the opinion that international actors are more oriented to help groups other than Serbs. He is a politically active citizen. In terms of inter-ethnic prejudices and stereotypes, he is not sure whether teachers of other ethnicities should be allowed to teach Serbian students. According to Dragan, in the recent past Serbs have been threatened in their survival as a specific group by other groups, even if Dragan thinks that the situation has now somewhat changed to the better. In contrast Dušan and Nada, he does not think that Bošnjaks are claiming Bosnia-Herzegovina as their own country, but he agrees that both Serbs and Croats would like to leave the country to become independent or to join their respective motherlands. He thinks that all

groups share responsibility for the past war, and he cannot say whether one group or another better contributes to the economic development of Bosnia-Herzegovina. He never felt afraid of individual Bošnjaks, but he has sometimes felt uneasy and angry with them as a group. He has often felt proud of Serbs and grateful to them. Personal values and group values seem to have equal relevance for him. Dragan cannot say if a mono-ethnic State could better protect its own ethnic group than a multi-ethnic State. He never experienced inter-ethnic cooperation and declares he is not even interested in it. Over all, Dragan has quite a strong Serbian identity, but less so than Dušan and Nada.

**Almir.** Bošnjak, male, 34 years old. Both parents Bošnjak. He lives in a multi-ethnic neighborhood in Srebrenica, like Dragan but in contrast to Dušan and Nada. He was in the country during the civil war and did participate in military and paramilitary operations,. He lost in the war both family members and friends. He finished Technical Secondary School and currently works as a taxi driver. He considers himself good at speaking and convincing people of his own arguments. With regard to attitudes, Almir manifests a strong ethnic group belonging, perceiving it as unchangeable, acquired by birth and to be kept up to death. Religion, moreover, is a very important component of his life. He follows his group's tradition and culture, but also questioning himself about them. He feels his personal values to be slightly more important than group values. He states that the political class governing the Municipality quite strongly supports inter-ethnic dialogue and cooperation; he is a political active citizen, participating in elections but declaring to be not a supporter of any party. Almir thinks that his own Bošnjak group has been threatened by other groups in its survival as a specific group with its history, culture and traditions. He thinks that his group is still maintained in a position of disadvantage by other threatening groups He also thinks that the – Serbs are mainly responsible of the war and war crimes. At the same time, he thinks that Bošnjaks are contributing the most to the development of Bosnia-Herzegovina, much more than the other ethnic groups. He also thinks that Serbs would like to secede with their own territories from Bosnia-

Herzegovina, either to become independent or to join Serbia. He sometimes feels disgusted and angry with Serbs, but is never afraid of them. He sometimes feels grateful to his own Bošnjak group, even if he gets often angry with their behavior. Almir does not think that mono-ethnic States can better protect ethnic groups than multi-ethnic States. He has never experienced inter-group cooperation and he is not interested in it. However, he admits that in the framework of his work as taxi driver he has the chance to work with Serbs. He thinks that the environment around him does not either support or hamper inter-ethnic cooperation.

### **3.2. Group structure**

Group 1 is made up of adults with no previous experience of inter-ethnic cooperation. All four participants have parents who belonged to the same ethnic group. During the civil war all four were in the country, although Dragan only at the beginning. All four lost family members and friends. Therefore, with regard to ethnic background and war experience there was a strong division in the group. With regard to their social situation, Dušan and Nada live in a mono-ethnic neighborhood, Dragan and Almir in a multi-ethnic one. The contact hypothesis would predict that Dragan and Almir would be more likely to engage in deliberative behavior in the group discussion. Professionally, Nada and Dragan are unemployed, a typical situation in Srebrenica. Almir is a taxi driver and Dušan a university student. Thus, none of the participants has a high social status, although Dušan may aspire to get one.

The responses to the questionnaires show that all four participants identify strongly with their ethnic group. All four, however, have also some criticism of their own group. Therefore, none of the participants is an extremist putting his or her own ethnic group above everything else. Teachers for school children from other ethnic groups are accepted, although Dragan does not take a clear position. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, there is always the question whether the country should be split along ethnic lines. Dušan of the Serb side is of this opinion, while the two other Serbs do not stand clear on this issue. Almir as

Bošnjak wants the country to remain united, which is understandable since the Bošnjaks have nowhere else to go, while Serbs and Croats could turn to their mother countries. The clearest divide emerges with regard to the item whether being multi-ethnic makes the country stronger; Almir answers in the positive, the three Serbs in the negative. A strong divide also comes with the question of the responsibility for the war. Since the participants are from Srebrenica where Serbs massacred a large number of Bošnjaks, Almir as Bošnjak is not willing to share responsibility for the war and the war crimes, while the three Serbs want to unload responsibility on all groups. However, each participant feels that his or her own ethnic group has been threatened in its identity by the other groups, which indicates the insecurity on all sides. With regard to the behavior item of past inter-ethnic cooperation, none of the participants remembers any such activities. Even more troubling, none of the participants expresses interest in such inter-ethnic cooperation. The attitudinal items show even more the deep division in the group.

### **3.3. Group discussion**

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

#### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>188</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers,

---

<sup>188</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.



justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

## *2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

### *3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

### *4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

***Moderator:*** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina, to be delivered to the High Representative?

***Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):*** We need to write something about youth, employment, lack of sport activities... I have no idea... Maybe that ...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As the only Bošnjak in the group, it is not easy for Almir to start the discussion. He does a reasonably good job in setting an agenda in suggesting three topics, youth, employment and sport activities. These three topics are closely linked in the sense that unemployment is particularly high among young people in Srebrenica, and young people have a particular need for spaces to practice sport activities. Given this linkage among

the three topics, Almir gives a coherent agenda to begin the discussion. How shall we interpret his statement that he has no idea? From a deliberative perspective such expression of uncertainty at the beginning of a discussion is rather helpful because in this way Almir does not say that he has all the answers. He rather opens space for others to continue the discussion in an interactive way. Overall, Almir begins the conversation at a high level of deliberation in setting a coherent agenda and expressing openness for others to step in.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Normally, we are all different generations and everybody has something to add for sure.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan is interactive in continuing the conversation in a cautious way stating that all have something to contribute. In this sense he sets an inclusive tone encompassing both ethnic groups. To express this openness at the beginning of the conversation means that the level of deliberation stays high.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** at first, my brother, why do foreign and people from other cities come here and develop their jobs, and we who live here do nothing!

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan is the first to make a substantive suggestion, that people from Srebrenica should not tolerate that foreigners and persons from other Bosnian cities take away jobs from them. As we have seen in the presentation of the group members, all are inhabitants from Srebrenica. Thus, Dragan appeals to a common interest of the group members and of inhabitants of Srebrenica at large. As a Serb, he pointedly includes also Almir and other Bošnjak people living in Srebrenica. Appealing to the common good of the inhabitants of Srebrenica, and proposing a concrete measure of how this common good can be helped, Dragan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. He helps the group to develop a common life world in the sense of

Jürgen Habermas.<sup>189</sup> With the first three speakers, an effort is made not to open the wounds between the two ethnic groups but to find a common ground which is very much in a deliberative spirit.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Let's take about 10 minutes to decide what should we write and then we'll write it, in order to not correct and erase all the time.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan takes quickly a leadership position. After in his opening statement, he encouraged everyone to make contributions, he turns now to procedural matters. He suggests that notes should only be taken after an initial discussion of ten minutes. He gives a justification for his suggestion that one would have to constantly erase what was written if one would take notes from the beginning. Such procedural matter is important because the results of the discussion should be submitted in written form to the High Representative. Thus, Dušan moves the conversation forward at a deliberative level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** We can start immediately. When you write one question another will already show up in our minds.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* A disagreement emerges between Dušan as a Serb and Almir as a Bošnjak. The disagreement, however, has nothing to do with the cleavage between the two ethnic groups but involves the procedural matter raised by Dušan. Almir is interactive and treats the earlier suggestion of Dušan with respect and gives a justification for the disagreement. According to Almir, questions are linked in the sense that in discussing a particular question another question may already emerge. Therefore, it would be better to take notes from the beginning. In treating the member from the other ethnic group with respect and in justifying why he prefers another procedure with regard to taking notes, Almir keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>189</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1981, S. 159.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Please you write. I can't write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan continues to be interactive and respectful. He does not agree with the argument of Almir but avoids a continuing conflict in suggesting that Almir take over the task of note taker. As justification Dušan says that he would not know how to take notes under the suggestion of Almir. In trying to find common ground, Dušan keeps the conversation at a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** I will write, it's not a problem.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir picks up the suggestion of Dušan, agreeing to be the note taker. Procedural matters can be potentially explosive because they may involve power. This is certainly true in the present case because the note taker may influence what should be forwarded as recommendations to the High Representative. Although Dušan and Almir come from different ethnic groups, they find consensus. They agree to disagree about the best procedure of how to take notes, but agree that the task should be taken over not by Dušan but by Almir. Although this is a brief exchange, it has many characteristics of good deliberation. The discussion is interactive, Dušan and Almir respect the argument of the other, justify their own argument and find common ground of how to proceed. The discussion keeps up a high level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** At first, write about the job and how difficult is to get employment.

(...) You have to become a member of political party if you want a job.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In his previous intervention, Dragan was the first member of the group to introduce a substantive issue into the discussion, the poor job prospects for inhabitants of Srebrenica. Now he is insisting on this issue to be discussed, probably since he feels the issue close to him, being he unemployed. As André Bächtiger has correctly pointed out, it is

compatible with good deliberation to insist on an argument.<sup>190</sup> Discussions should not be overly polite in the sense that actors are reluctant to repeat an argument. If an actor has the feeling that his or her argument has not been sufficiently picked up by other actors, an insistence on the argument is in order. In this way, all arguments can be thoroughly discussed. There are limits to insistence, however; if an actor repeats an argument times and again, it becomes tedious for the other actors and the flow of the discussion may be disrupted. Repeating his argument only once, Dragan is far away from being tedious, he has all the right from a deliberative perspective to insist on the poor employment situation among inhabitants of Srebrenica. While in his earlier intervention he wants to restrict the domestic job market of Srebrenica for foreigners and people from other Bosnian cities, this time he wants to open the job market to people who are not members of a political party. With his insistence on the poor job situation and still another suggestion of how the situation could be improved, Dragan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. He sets a broad issue for the group to be discussed.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** So everything goes within politics and parties.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan is interactive in supporting the argument of Dragan. In a substantive way, Dušan, however, does not add anything to what Dragan has already stated. If we would code the statement of Dušan with the Discourse Quality Index (DQI), only the aspect of interactivity would score high, all other aspects low. But interpreting the statement in the context of the ongoing discussion, Dušan' intervention lets the discussion continue at a high level of deliberation, giving positive support to a previous speaker helps the flow of the conversation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** How to write it?

---

<sup>190</sup> André Bächtiger, „On Perfecting the Deliberative Process: Questioning, Disputing, and Insisting as Core Deliberative Values”, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2-5, 2010.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir has spoken three times, and each time about the procedural matter of note taking. As we have seen above, he volunteered to be the note taker, which was tacitly accepted by the three Serbs in the group. It can be considered as a good deliberative gesture of the Serbs to leave the important role of note taker to the only Bošnjak in the group. Almir takes his role as note taker seriously. Instead of taking in a substantive way position to the issue of unemployment in Srebrenica, he asks how he should formulate the recommendation of the group for the High Representative. In asking this question, he moves the discussion forward in a concrete way, keeping the level of deliberation high.

***Dragan, Serb (code 1):*** How to formulate all of this?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although in his two previous interventions Dragan put the question of unemployment on the agenda and made two proposals of how the employment situation could be improved, he is now cautious of how the recommendation to the High Representative should be formulated. He rather asks the group for appropriate formulations, and does not attempt to impose his will. In opening space for the group to discuss the formulations, Dragan keeps the level of deliberation high. He is willing to listen to what other members of the group have to say.

***Dušan. Serb (code 1):*** My thoughts go in this way. Problems and unresolved questions we put on one paper, and on another paper we put something that is good, because we must admit that there are some good things that are made here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As we have seen at the beginning of the discussion, Dušan established himself as deliberative leader in expressing confidence that all members of the group have something to add, and he did also address the important procedural question of note taking. Here again, Dušan takes a deliberative leadership role in suggesting how specifically note taking should be done, the good things on one paper, the bad things on another. His

justification is that there are also good things in Srebrenica that should be specially noted. He keeps deliberation at a high level.

***Almir, Bošnjak (code 2): But everything is bad.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Until now Almir has only spoken on procedural and not on substantive matters. It seems now clear why this is so. In a substantive way, everything is bad for Almir. Such a statement is a discussion killer for the formulation of recommendations for a better Bosnia-Herzegovina. If everything is bad, what can still be discussed? With his negative statement Almir causes *a transformation of the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation*. The flow of the previous high level of deliberation is disrupted. It is difficult for other participants to continue the discussion at a constructive level because they are taken aback by what Almir says.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* The reason for this transformative moment is the despair expressed by Almir. In her dissertation on the ex-combatants in Colombia, Maria Clara Jaramillo<sup>191</sup> has also noted this reason as triggering transformative moments from a high to a low level of deliberation. In deeply divided societies with ongoing or past military actions, such despair is understandable. Many ex-combatants in Colombia were deeply disappointed that they did not get from the government what they were promised with regard to employment, housing, health care and education. They were also frustrated by the discrimination they suffered from many segments of society. For Almir as a Bošnjak it is also understandable that he expresses despair given that it was in Srebrenica that the horrible massacres of Bošnjaks by Serbs took place. As we have seen in the questionnaire items reported at the top of this analysis, in contrast to the three Serbs, Almir was not willing to accept that all ethnic groups shared the responsibility for the war and the war crimes. He obviously gave the main responsibility to the Serbs, and with three of them he should now

---

<sup>191</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.



discuss ways for a better Bosnia-Herzegovina. Expressing despair does not help such a discussion.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** There are some people who are doing their best, doing something.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan is indeed taken aback by the despair expressed by Almir. Although in the earlier discussion, he had emerged as a deliberative leader, he only repeats what he said in his previous intervention that not everything is bad. In order to bring back the discussion to high level of deliberation, Dušan would have to give reasons why not everything is bad. Then he could have entered a dialog with Almir. But simply repeating what he said before kept the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** The only thing that works good in Srebrenica is the Court, and that's all.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan does not justify why the Court works and why nothing else works. In this way, he does not open space for the discussion to go back to a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** The police work is not good at all.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir comes back to his earlier negative statement that everything is bad, and this time he gives as example the police. But he does not give any reasons why the police is not good at all, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** The work of the police, the municipality. Everything is bad.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In his previous statement, Dragan still made an exception for the Court for his general negative attitude. Now following Almir, expresses general despair. The contradiction between what Dragan says in the current and the previous statement violates the important

deliberative criterion of rationality. The two statements do not correspond to what Jürgen Habermas calls an “orderly exchange of information and reasons.”<sup>192</sup> The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

***Dušan, Serb (code 4): Put on the first paper "problems", and then we address particular tasks.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan tries to bring order back to the discussion in suggesting what should be written about the results of what is discussed. He had suggested earlier that on one paper they should write about unresolved questions, on the other paper about things that are already good. Dušan comes now back to this earlier suggestion in proposing that they should put on the first paper the heading “problems” and under these heading what tasks should be undertaken to solve the problems. With these procedural suggestions he gives the group directions of how to proceed, transforming the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. The group has now the option to accept or to reject the proposal of Dušan.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* What Maria Clara Jaramillo has shown for the ex-combatants in Colombia, we see here, too, the importance of deliberative leaders to transform a discussion back from a low to a high level of deliberation. Dušan has established himself as a deliberative leader early in the discussion. When Almir made his statement of despair that everything is bad, Dušan was so much taken aback that he was not able to fulfill his leadership role. With the current statement, however, he takes up again this role in setting a clear procedural agenda.

***Almir, Bošnjak (code 2): That’s stupid.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this vulgar expression, Almir does not take up the challenge of Dušan to continue the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>192</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1992, S.370, „den geregelten Austausch von Information und Gründen.“

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Foul language violates the important criterion of respect towards other participants. Maria Clara Jaramillo also has found instances among Colombian ex-combatants that foul language triggered transformations from high to low level of deliberation. In the same vein, Almir brings the discussion again down to a low deliberative level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** It's not.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In his previous statement, Dušan continued to act in the role as deliberative leader in transforming the conversation back to a high level of deliberation. This time, however, he reacts to the foul remark of Almir not in a substantive way but only defends himself that his suggestion is not stupid without giving reasons that it is not stupid. This short exchange between Almir and Dušan shows how foul language can be detrimental to good deliberation. Dušan keeps up a certain civility in not responding with equally foul language. He is so much taken aback by what Almir said that he does not further justify what he suggested in his previous statement. The level of deliberation remains low.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** What will you write?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan is also taken aback by the exchange between Almir and Dušan. In a somewhat hopeless way he wonders how the discussion should continue and what one should write down as recommendation to the High Representative. Dragan does not make any suggestion so that the level of deliberation remains low.

**Dušan, Serb (code 4): The issue of employment and development...Yes, the first issue is employment.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan brings the discussion back on track in proposing that the first priority should be employment. He picks up an issue that Almir brought up in his very first intervention. The conversation is back at a high level of deliberation.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Dušan is now fully back playing his role of deliberative leader. It is remarkable for his deliberative skills that he avoids the controversial procedural matter but turns to an issue for which he knows that he is in agreement with Almir. Although Almir just offended him and is from the other ethnic side, Dušan offers to Almir the olive branch. All this is highly deliberative.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** yes, yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir picks up the olive branch offered by Dušan in supporting employment as the first issue to be discussed. For the deliberative development of the discussion it pays off that Dušan did not react with equally rude language to the “stupid” remark of Almir. Methodologically, these exchanges reveal the advantage of not coding each speech act separately with the DQI but to look at the dynamic of what goes on from speech act to speech act. Almir could easily have derailed the discussion with his foul language, but thanks to the deliberative leadership skills of Dušan the conversation flows now again at a high level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Now we need to explain it, I mean the employment issue. What that means.

*Justification of level of deliberation:* While in his previous statement Dragan was confused not knowing where the discussion is heading. Gratefully he follows now the lead of Dušan asking the group to come up with explanations why the issue of employment merits high priority. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** (having asked the moderator how to proceed, he tells the group): She says to write what we think about it, briefly.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although participants were not assumed to ask questions to the moderator but to proceed on their own, Dušan wants to make sure that the group knows what it should do. In this sense, he

wants to give security to the group after the turmoil with the „stupid“ remark of Almir. Dušan continues to exercise his leadership role. The conversation stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Ok, say what to write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As we remember, Almir volunteered to be the note taker. He takes up this responsibility in asking the group what he should write. With this question he moves the discussion forward. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Politics.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* If we would code this speech act with the DQI, the level of deliberation would be very low. Dragan is indeed not articulate in uttering the sole word politics. In the context of the preceding discussion, however, other participants seem to know what he means, namely that politics is too much involved in who gets a job. Dragan certainly does not fulfill the rationality criterion of Habermas. But one has to consider that participants in this group are not accustomed to write political briefings. With his utterance, Dragan at least makes a beginning of what should be written down. As we will see below, this beginning was indeed understood by the other participants, who helped further to find an appropriate formulation of how the job market could be improved. Dragan, with his one-word formulation, has taken a shortcut, which according to Robert E. Goodin can be fitting good deliberation.<sup>193</sup> Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Huge involvement...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada has not yet spoken up to know, but from what she says and how she acts it is clear that she closely followed the discussion. She takes up the point of Dragan that politics plays too

---

<sup>193</sup> Robert E. Goodin, „Talking Politics: Perils and Promise,” *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (2006), 253.

much a role in the job market, emphasizing that its involvement is huge. She, too, takes a shortcut. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Huge involvement of political parties in the employment.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan again uses his deliberative leadership skills to put in a coherent way what the two previous speakers uttered. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Huge involvement...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir repeats what the two previous speakers said, while he is taking notes. After his „stupid“ remark, it is the second time that he supports what Serb members of the group said. As the sole Bošnjak, he makes an effort not to be an outsider in the group. His two brief supportive utterances can be considered as greeting formulas to the Serbs that he wants to be part of the group. We are reminded of the argument of Iris Marion Young that proper greeting formulas are a deliberative virtue.<sup>194</sup> Thus, deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Yes. (pause) Perhaps we should not use the term involvement.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan reacts in an interactive and supportive way to Almir, putting definitively behind him ill feelings that he still may have about the „stupid“ remark. After a long pause, Dušan continues and wonders whether „involvement“ is the right word to use. Again playing his deliberative leadership skills, Dušan tries to open a discussion about the exact editing of what should be written down. Deliberation remains at a high level.

---

<sup>194</sup> Iris Marion Young, „Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy,“ *Political Theory* 29 (2001).

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** But what else is it but involvement? Everybody pushes everyone, it does not matter which political party we speak about. (pause). Involvement of political parties.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a respectful way, Almir insists that involvement is the right word to be used. This is another case in the spirit of André Bächtiger that insisting on one's position is compatible with good deliberation, as long as it is done in a respectful way.<sup>195</sup> Deliberation remains high.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Yes, the politics, and put in parentheses parties and political ties. There is also too much nepotism in employment.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan does not insist that they search for another word for involvement. He rather continues the editing work telling Almir as note taker what to write down. Dušan also enlarges the topic in proposing that nepotism in general, not only political nepotism, should be included. Deliberation remains high.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker, Almir agrees with what Dušan proposes. The conversation remains very interactive, and thus continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Later on we will write it more nicely. (...) Now, what else? We can die and we will never get retirement.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan continues in his role as deliberative leader in attempting to move the discussion forward. Procedurally, he proposes that they postpone the written formulation concerning the employment situation with the hope that at a later stage they may find a nicer wording. Substantively, he wants to move to the discussion of the failing retirement system.

---

<sup>195</sup> Bächtiger, "On Perfecting the Deliberative Process."

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Will we write like this, that all those who are not from Srebrenica have a bigger privilege to work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir does not react to the suggestions of Dušan that they delay the exact writing on the employment situation and that they turn the discussion to the failing retirement system. Does this mean that this lack of interactivity on the part of Almir leads to a transformation from a high to a low level of deliberation? This case is difficult to interpret. After listening several times to the video and audio tapes, I come to the conclusion that the deliberative level remains high. Almir continues the prior conversation on the employment situation and simply ignores what Dušan said. On a positive note, one could interpret the behaviour of Almir that he did not wish to openly challenge Dušan, who anyhow could see that Almir wishes to continue the previous debate on employment. We can call this a strategy of conflict avoidance. As Maria Clara Jaramillo has shown for the Colombian ex-combatants, to react with silence to a disagreement may sometimes have good deliberative consequences, especially in deeply divided societies like Colombia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Moreover, as an alternative interpretation, Almir ignores what Dušan said because he is simply reading back what he wrote down, and he wants to be sure that what he wrote correspond to what group participants had in mind. Deliberation stays anyway at a high level..

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Sure, for work and for donations and for all.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The response of Dušan shows that he understands what Almir intends with his intervention. Tacitly Dušan agrees that the group continues the conversation on the bad employment situation and he reinforces the points made by Almir. This exchange between Almir as Bošnjak and Dušan as Serb shows that in such delicate situations tacit avoidance of conflicts may help the discussion to continue to flow at a high deliberative level. To be sure, this exchange does not correspond to the ideal Habermasian speech situation, but it is precisely the purpose of empirical work to



nuance broad theoretical statements. And here the nuance is that sometimes deliberation is more helped by silence than by words.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this supportive statement, Nada allows the discussion to continue to flow at a high level of deliberation. She tends to be shy in opening participating to the dialogue, but with her behavior as seen in the video and her short interventions she confirms to be concretely involved in the discussion.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** and people do not like this..

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan also continues the discussion at a high deliberative level in supporting the view that people from Srebrenica do not like outsiders to be privileged on the local job market.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** We can formulate like this "large equal distribution." Let's see how it will sound like. Large equal distribution.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan now begins with the detailed editing of what should be written about the job situation in Srebrenica. A large number of jobs should be distributed on a equal basis, irrespective of whether someone is Serb or Bošnjak. Thus, Dušan in a deliberative way has the common good of the entire community in mind. It is also in a deliberative sense that Dušan asks the group how his formulation sounds, which corresponds to the reciprocity principle that one is interested what others think.<sup>196</sup>

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** ...of jobs for people from other municipalities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir agrees with the goal postulated by Dušan and addresses the question of how the goal can best be reached. He comes back to his earlier critique that people from outside Srebrenica are

---

<sup>196</sup> For the principle of reciprocity see Jane Mansbridge, „The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy,” *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 18, 2010.

privileged on the local job market and demands that new jobs should be reserved for inhabitants of Srebrenica. As Dušan before him, Almir stresses the common good of all people in Srebrenica, both for Bošnjaks and Serbs. Given that a short while ago Serbs had massacred in a gruesome way a huge number of Bošnjaks, it is remarkable that Almir as Bošnjak acts in such a deliberative way. One should also note, however, that Almir neglects the common good of people in neighboring communities in excluding them from new jobs created in Srebrenica. Ideally, good deliberative actors should have the global common good in mind to which they would subordinate the common good of smaller territorial entities like countries and local communities. But even Jürgen Habermas acknowledges that the ideal of deliberation is as rare as “islands in the ocean of everyday praxis.”<sup>197</sup> Therefore, we should not take the ideal as our standard, but what Robert E. Goodin calls “good enough” deliberation for a particular context.<sup>198</sup> And according to my interpretation it is good enough that Almir is concerned with the common good of the entire community of Srebrenica. Thus, the level of deliberation remains high.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** ..of jobs and donations for people from other municipalities than Srebrenica. They are given to people who do not live here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan supports Almir that inhabitants from Srebrenica should be given priority on the job market. He expands the argument in including also donations, by which he means aid from domestic and foreign NGO's and governmental agencies. Deliberation remains at a high level.

(Almir as note taker begins to write down what should be sent to the High Representative with regard to the job situation in Srebrenica. He says aloud what he writes. Dušan helps him with some formulations. The two others, Nada and Dragan, accept tacitly what is written. The critique of the current situation reads

---

<sup>197</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996, S. 323/  
Jürgen Habermas, *The Inclusion of the Other, Studies in Political Theory*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1998

<sup>198</sup> Goodin, „Talking Politics.”

as follows: “Employment is given to people who live in Tuzla, Sarajevo, Bijeljina, Zvornik and others who do not live in the area of Srebrenica.” It was quite a struggle to arrive at this formulation, but the struggle was done in a very interactive way where all four participants listened to each other and attempted to come to a consensus. From a deliberative perspective it is remarkable that a consensus could be achieved. After all, Almir as Bošnjak could easily have made the argument that Bošnjaks should be privileged on the job market as compensation for the massacres that they had suffered from the hands of Serbs.)

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Do we want anything else?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Having reached closure on the issue of employment, Dušan once again takes up his deliberative leadership role in asking for the next topic to be discussed. It is very much in deliberative spirit that he does not make himself suggestions but opens space for others to speak up. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Will we add something about the cultural and sports activities, you know, the situation is bad...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan picks up the procedural proposal of Dušan and suggests that they discuss next cultural and sports activities, because, as he has shortly argued before, opportunities are poor. The conversation continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Let's write first this about subsidies. We all know how it goes for housing and assistance.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan respectfully disagrees with Dragan and proposes that they turn next to subsidies handed out by the municipal government of Srebrenica. Dušan justifies his proposal with the argument that they are all familiar with this issue. Indeed, the issue of sport and cultural activities could be more relevant to young generations (such as Dušan,

Dragan, Almir), while the issue of subsidies concerns all families, and therefore it is inclusive also for older people (such as Nada). In granting the inclusiveness of all participants in the discussion, Dušan again confirms his attitude to act as a deliberative leader. Dragan does not object and tacitly accepts the proposal of Dušan. For the second time in the discussion, a procedural conflict is resolved by silent acceptance of one of the proposals. Again, I think that such a behavior is compatible with good deliberation. After all, no deep values are involved but merely the issue what topic should be discussed next. Dušan does not say that cultural and sports issues should not be discussed, he only says that the question of subsidies should come first. So it seems quite reasonable that Dragan does not insist on his procedural proposal. It would be a very different matter, if deep values would be involved, where it would be good from a deliberative perspective that actors insist on their position, because otherwise important value positions may be suppressed.<sup>199</sup> Theoretically, it is important to note that it depends very much on the context whether insistence on one's position is desirable from a deliberative perspective. Depending on the context insistence may reveal undue stubbornness or unwarranted intimidation. In the present case, it was reasonable of Dragan to tacitly accept the counter proposal of Dušan so that the discussion could easily continue to flow at a high level of deliberation.

***Nada, Serb (code 1):*** Yes...(…) and for grants...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada agrees with Dušan that subsidies from the local government are an important issue and adds as a special case the distribution of grants. She confirms in this way that the topic chosen is inclusive, allowing her participation. Deliberation remains at a high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>199</sup> Bächtiger, "On Perfecting the Deliberative Process."

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Differences in humanitarianism ... Wait, how could I formulate that? To put something like “Municipal Commission permanently gives aid to the same people”.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan offers a concise critique of the current situation with regard to the local subsidies. In a deliberative spirit he offers his formulation in a tentative way leaving space for others to disagree. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Yes, yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan is clearly not dissatisfied that contrary to his own proposal the group now discusses first local subsidies. He completely supports the formulation of Dušan. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Scholarships are received only by children of those people who work in municipality.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan specifies with a concrete example the problem of uneven subsidies at the local level. With the information that scholarships are only given to children of people who work for the local government, Dušan helps to advance the discussion in justifying his general critique with a specific example. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** .and excursions..

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir adds another example where aid is unevenly distributed, implicitly agreeing with the former examples suggested by Dušan. Conversation is very interactive so that the flow of high deliberation is not disturbed.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** And excursions, and free books.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan agrees that aid for excursions is unevenly distributed and adds the distribution of free books as still another example. It is remarkable that at the grass root level of this group there is

uniform critique of corruption in the municipal government, irrespective whether people in the local government are Serbs or Bošnjaks. Deep division seems to be less between ordinary Serbs and ordinary Bošnjaks than between ordinary citizens in general and the local authorities. Deliberation in the group remains high.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** We need to write it nicely. What is the first to write? Grants or...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As designated note taker, Almir takes up his responsibility and asks what he should write down. He himself suggests the uneven distribution of grants.

**Dragan, Serb (code 2):** Then the various committees that are elected by the municipal committee...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this contribution of Dragan the discussion loses its direction and gets off-topic. It is therefore transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation. The topic should be the uneven distribution of local subsidies, yet Dragan refers to the appointment of the various local committees. There might be a linkage between the appointment of these committees and the uneven distribution of local subsidies, but Dragan does not make this linkage. Thus, his contribution is hanging out somewhere.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* To formulate a critique of the distribution of local subsidies is intellectually not an easy task. Up to now some illustrations of various fields have been mentioned. The task now would be to put these illustrations into a coherent critique. Dragan feels that the problem may have to do with how the various local committees are appointed but does not know of how to make the linkage. In her investigation of Colombian ex-combatants, Maria Clara Jaramillo also has found cases where an issue was intellectually over the heads of the participants so that the discussion drifted to a low level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** Municipal committees, sure, municipal committees...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan is taken aback by what Dragan said and simply repeats “municipal committees” without further elaboration. Up to now, Dušan often acted as deliberative leader, but this time he is unable to show of how the discussion could be brought back on track. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Grants, committees...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an equally helpless way, Dragan refers to committees and the suggestion of Almir that one should write something about grants. Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** Yes, that’s it...distribution of aid, scholarships...Huge, irregular distribution of aid, scholarships, grants for home repair. Some get 3, 4, 5 donations and some none.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan as deliberative leader now makes an effort to bring order to the discussion, but he fails. When he begins in saying “yes, that’s it” it is unclear to what he is referring to. He then repeats illustrations of uneven distributions without putting them in a coherent critique. The discussion drifts along without clear direction of what exactly should be written down. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Machines. Various machinery.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After Dragan had transformed the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation with his confusing reference to local committees, it is now already the second time that he keeps the discussion at a low level of deliberation. His reference to various machines has no clear linkage to the topic under discussion, the uneven distribution of local subsidies. It could be that subsidies are also distributed in the form of machinery to help, for instance, local production, but the link is not clear.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Agricultural Mechanization .... livestock...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir specifies that Dragan probably means agricultural machines and adds „livestock“ to the list. The discussion, however, does not become more coherent so that the level of deliberation remains low.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Yes, yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although the discussion remains interactive across the ethnic divide with Dragan as a Serb supporting Almir as a Bošnjak, it remains unclear what the group wishes to write down about the unequal distribution of local subsidies. The level of deliberation drags on at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** agricultural mechanization...livestock...incentives for economic development...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan as a Serb also supports Almir across the ethnic divide with regard to agricultural machines and livestock and adds incentives to economic development to the discussion. But he does not manage to bring more coherence to the discussion so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** It would be good if he reads this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir refers to the High Representative to whom the recommendations of the group will be sent to. Almir is pleased that the High Representative will read „this“ but it remains unclear what „this“ refers to, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** We need to say what we think even if...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan encourages the group to be truthful in what they want to write to the High Representative. But this appeal to



the deliberative criterion of truthfulness<sup>200</sup> is not enough to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation since it still remains unclear what participants should be truthful about. Thus the discussion is not moving ahead and stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Various machines ... Agricultural equipment .... livestock .... ... and so on (he is writing)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir as note taker writes down in an unsystematic way what was supposed to be decided by the group. This means that the group was obviously unable to formulate a coherent critique of what was wrong with the distribution of the local subsidies. It was simply intellectually over the heads of the participants to arrive at such a critique. Deliberation stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Those from the top are worst...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan tries to set a priority on the list of the items written down, but he is unable to do this in a systematic way, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** ..and so on..

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan encourages Almir to continue writing down what was said, but without making an effort to make the formulation more coherent. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Well now, whether we get a little touch of life in Srebrenica, what concerns ... we can not organize our lives ... There are no cultural and sport events ...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan makes an effort to move the discussion forward in coming back to his earlier demand that there should be

---

<sup>200</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1983, p. 98.

more cultural and sports activities. But he does not sufficiently justify this demand to be able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 4):** That's all true but people can not go to the theater when there is no bread in the house to eat. I work for 300KM and what now, they can bring Ceca, Saban Saulic and Iron Maiden.. I do what? I can only sit at home and think about how I can do with.. ...with 300KM and how to send a child to college. But about that you're right.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Dušan picks up in an interactive way the suggestion of Dragan, and as a deliberative leader he is able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. He argues that it is not enough to offer theater performances, that one must also have the necessary money to buy theater tickets. In an effective way he brings his personal story into play in telling the group how little money he earns.<sup>201</sup> He knows what could be played in the theater but for lack of money he is obliged to sit at home and to worry how he will be able to send his child to college. In these few sentences, Dušan brings in an emotional way the issue of poverty to the attention of the group.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* Dušan uses his personal story as advocated by Sharon R. Krause when she writes: „By allowing informal, symbolic, and testimonial types of deliberative expressions, it can enrich citizens' reflection on public issues and thereby improve public deliberation.“<sup>202</sup>

**Nada, Serb (code 1)** yes...with 300 KM.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada as mother of Dušan confirms that her son may earn only 300KM per month. Perhaps she refers also to her own low income. With his story Dušan has raised the interest of the other participants, as the continuation of the conversation reveals. The discussion is back at a high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>201</sup> For the importance of stories see Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*

<sup>202</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Do we want to write like this, that these individuals who own companies which exploit people ... I mean...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir is taken by the issue raised by Dušan with his personal story and, as note taker, wonders what he should write down. He enlarges the topic in looking for reasons for the low salary of most people in Srebrenica and refers to the exploitation by people who own companies. The discussions gains steam at a high level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Yes, yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The wide spread poverty unites the participants across the ethnic divide so that Dragan as Serb easily can support Almir as Bošnjak. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** In terms of salary. They open a company, hire 10 people, give them the three hundred marks salary...Can you understand? and keep workers 12 hours at work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir reinforces his argument that workers are exploited with the story of how companies operate. Thus, the discussion gets more and more vivid color, so that the conversation easily continues to flow at a high level of deliberation with a strongly interactive touch.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** yes...and also that

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada as Serb agrees with Almir as Bošnjak on how companies operate. It becomes increasingly clear that participants find common ground across the ethnic divide in their critique of the employers. The level of deliberation remains high.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** There are no workers' rights. They don't understand that workers also have rights.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After Dušan in his earlier intervention has brought the issue of poverty on the agenda, he raises now the issue to the general level of the lack of workers' rights. He criticizes the companies at the fundamental level that they do not understand the basic need of workers to have their own rights. The discussion is now clearly at a high deliberative level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Just, tell how to begin a sentence.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir as note taker is eager to put in writing what everyone seems to agree on. In this way, he likes the discussion to move on and to come to closure on the issue of poverty. The level of deliberation remains high.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Well, I just put it ... This is an item ... disrespect for workers' rights and defining it down. They give you minimal salary and you need to work 12 hours and on Saturdays too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Once again acting as deliberative leader, Dušan summarizes nicely as what has emerged as the consensus of the group. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** there..are...no...workers' rights...(he is writing down the sentence)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker Almir summarizes the main conclusion of the discussion. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** They even do not give you this minimal wages.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion continues at a very interactive level with a quick back and forth of the speech acts. Dušan seems to remember that the concept of minimal wage has a legal meaning, according to which employers are required to give to the employees at least a certain amount of money. He now reminds the other participants that this legally required

minimal wage is not paid, an important information, which reinforces the critique of the wage policies of the employers. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Should we first put issue of salary or what...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir still struggles how exactly to formulate the critique concerning the wide spread poverty in Srebrenica. This continuing struggle shows that participants are not accustomed to write political memos, which has to be expected. The important point, however, from the deliberative perspective is that they make an effort to arrive at some kind of formulation. To express uncertainty can even be a deliberative virtue opening space for a wider discussion. Thus, deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Just to mention what we mean by that...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan continues the discussion of the editing of the text concerning poverty. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Workers work...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada also helps with what should be written in insisting that workers do the real work, implying that they should get a real salary. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Workers work an average of 10 to 12 hours a day, 6-7 days a week... at the minimum salary of the Republic, this is...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan emphasizes again how hard people in Srebrenica work and claims that they get the lowest wages in the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina. With his initial story on poverty Dušan has truly launched an issue that finds the interest of all participants who reinforce each other in what is wrong with the wages for ordinary people in Srebrenica. Deliberation remains at a high very interactive level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** ...there is no...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The back and forth in the discussion is now so quick that Dragan has no time to finish before Almir continues. But it is clear that Dragan wants to add to the critique of the current wage policies in Srebrenica in saying “no”. The interruptions are not rude, which would indicate a low level of deliberation. They are rather an indication that participants all agree and wish to reinforce each other. Thus, deliberation stays at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** for the minimal wages of 200 Euros...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir also reinforces the general argument in expressing the low wages in Euros. Deliberation remains at a high interactive level.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** yes, that is

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada remains interactive in supporting what has been said on the problem of poverty in Srebrenica. The conversation continues to flow at a high interactive level of deliberation.

(noise, interruptions)

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** it means exploitation...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir repeats what he said before that the low wages mean that there is exploitation. From a deliberative perspective it is appropriate to insist on an argument if it is not done too often and thus becoming tedious. Almir, however, mentions the argument of exploitation only for the second time so that the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** They are not entitled to sick leave because in two days you lose your job.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan adds more detailed information about the exploitation of workers in Srebrenica. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Yes, yes, yes...They have no holidays.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion remains very interactive with Dragan adding still another aspect of how workers are exploited. Participants help each other to make the picture of exploitation all the more vivid. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Whatever the reason, two days of absence from work and you are fired.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan adds still another aspect of exploitation. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Yes, that's true.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Up to now Nada speaks up the least often but from the video tapes it is clear that she attentively follows the conversation. This time, she is not only expressing support with facial expressions and gestures but agrees with words with the previous speaker. Deliberation stays at a high level.

*(here there is a moment of silence, when Dušan is helping Almir to write down everything by repeating what has been said so far about job conditions)*

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Women also are not entitled to maternity. The aim of the state is to increase the population but a woman cannot be on maternity.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After helping Almir to write down on what the group has agreed upon, Dušan mentions still another example of exploitation. This time he gives not only an illustration but points out a contradiction in the governmental policies that on the one hand population

should be increased but on the other hand women do not get maternal leave. To point out such a contradiction has a high deliberative quality. Thus, it is clear that deliberation continues at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes, however we know it all, but what about...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir expresses that the group is aware of all these aspects of exploitation of the workers and tries to move on to other topics. Dušan helps him to formulate the question. The discussion is interactive at a fast pace. When participants interrupt each other, it is still not in a rude way but to move the conversation forward. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** What else?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan supporting Almir wishes to move the discussion forward to other topics. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Work of police. For the poor they implement a law but for rich...Let's write that too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir suggests as another issue for critical review the advantages that the rich get from the police. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Work of the police and institutions that are in charge.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Dušan supports Almir that the police treats the rich differently than the poor. He enlarges the issue in claiming that all local institutions give privileges to the rich. The conversation continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Well now, whoever has some problems say it now.



*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada, who did not say much until now, takes a leadership role in encouraging the group that this is the time to raise problems that they still may have. With this statement, Nada makes the group aware that the discussion will soon come to an end, so that they should not miss the opportunity to raise remaining issues. With this procedural statement, Nada keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Sure.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan, who acted until now as the main deliberative leader, supports Nada that this is the time to discuss remaining problems. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Work of the police... let's put that they implement laws and punishments only for poor... cannot put "poor"

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir insists on the importance of the problem that the police discriminates against the poor. For the letter to the High Representative, he wonders whether to use the term "poor" is politically correct.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** (shy laugh)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The video tapes show that she finds it funny that one is not allowed to use the term "poor." Her laugh brings a light moment to the discussion, which is compatible with good deliberation. As Sammy Basu puts it, "humor provisionally suspends decorum, putting the mind at liberty to hear all sides."<sup>203</sup> Therefore, the laugh of Nada does not disrupt the discussion but rather allows the level of deliberation to remain high.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** person in need?

---

<sup>203</sup> Sammy Basu, „Dialogic Ethics and the Virtue of Humor,“ *Journal of Political Philosophy* vol. 7 (1999), p. 385.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan comes to the help of Almir in suggesting an expression that is politically more correct. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir agrees that “person in need” is a better expression in a letter to be sent to the High Representative. Deliberation stays at high level. It is noteworthy that the group is concerned about political correctness. On the one hand, they are very critical about the authorities at all levels. On the other hand, however, they worry to write something to an authority that is not politically correct. This ambiguity reveals the mood of ordinary citizens in Srebrenica; they feel exploited but also intimidated by the authorities.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** Large firms do money laundry, no one is controlling their job, no one has the right to check their operations.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan gives still another illustration of how the rich and the powerful do not have to follow the law. In the quick back and forth, participants are able to get a more and more colorful picture of how the laws are only applied to the poor and powerless. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** It should be underlined.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir is obviously grateful that Dušan offers still another example of how laws do not apply to the rich and powerful. It becomes increasingly clear that the divide is not between Almir as Bošnjak and the three Serbs in the group but between the four participants as ordinary citizens on the one hand and the powerful in politics and business on the other hand. Good deliberation is easier under these conditions since the group discusses issues where they have wide agreement. The situation would most likely be different if they would discuss issues more sensitive to the ethnic dimension, for example whether the Serb part should split from Bosnia-

Herzegovina. It may be the wisdom of ordinary citizens that they do not address such sensitive issues. It may also be that questions of poverty and injustice are more burning issues for ordinary people like Dušan, Nada, Dragan and Almir, whatever their ethnic background.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** In principle...

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** it's true.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation of both speech acts:* Dušan and Almir speak at the same time, both stressing again that there is no justice for the poor and powerless. Deliberation is not disrupted by this brief disorderly sequence. Thus, deliberation is still at a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Will we write anything good?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Until now the group has expressed much critique of the situation of ordinary people in Srebrenica. Almir as note taker asks whether they should also write something positive. It is remarkable that he raises this question since early in the discussion he claimed that everything is bad in Srebrenica. Could it be that the civilized tone between him and the three Serbs in the group has led him to a generally more positive outlook? Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** There is something good. You have mentioned the culture and we'll write that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Dušan picks up from Almir and mentions culture as something good. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Culture, and sports...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion stays very interactive with Dragan supporting Dušan and adding sports about which one also can say something good. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Just write a few cultural activities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker, Almir is ready to write something about cultural activities. He does not pick up from Dragan that the group should also write something about sports. This, however, is a harmless omission since earlier in the discussion Almir himself wanted to write something about sports. Thus, not mentioning sports in the present context can be considered as a shortcut since earlier in the discussion culture and sports were sometimes lumped together. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** We don't have enough cultural and sport events.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Whereas for the issues of poverty and injustice, the atmosphere in the group was rather negative since participants could not see how the situation could easily be improved. For culture and sports the atmosphere is now more positive since based on what already exists, improvements can be made. In this spirit, Dragan demands more cultural and sports events. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** And to add something about the municipality. For instance when they award scholarships, donations and similar, you get to know for application one month after deadline. Their work is not transparent. What else?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan as deliberative leader raises a problem that is straight forward and can be more easily resolved than the other issues raised by the group. It is bureaucratic negligence if citizens know about applications for scholarships and donations only after the set deadline. To remedy such bureaucratic failures can be very useful outcomes of good deliberation. With this intervention, Dušan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** Ok, can be written down in brief terms.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada sees the suggestions of Dušan as a useful item that is unproblematic and does not need further discussion but can be written down quickly. This example shows that deliberation does not always have to deal with big questions of principle, but is often useful when dealing with trivial bureaucratic shortcomings. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** What else? ...Culture...Minimal motivation of youth, lack of sport and cultural activities. The manifestation “Days of Srebrenica” was very bad during the past years.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan summarizes what should be written about sport and cultural activities. As an example of how in this area things do not work well he mentions a local event that was badly organized in the past years. Such illustrations always help deliberation to continue to flow at a high level.

**Almir, Bosnjka (code 1):** Municipality is responsible for that. They work very badly and that’s it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Once again there is agreement across the ethnic divide between Almir as Bošnjak and Dušan as Serb. The municipality is criticized by both speakers irrespective of who was in charge of the Days of Srebrenica. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** yes, very badly.

**Nada, Serb (code 1):** yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The two other Serbs also agree that the municipality at large was responsible for the bad organization of the Days of Srebrenica. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** What else? There is so much of that, but we can’t write everything.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In order to move the discussion forward, Dragan makes a procedural statement. He acknowledges that there is still much to be discussed but warns that the letter to the High Representative cannot be too long. Dragan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** *It is ok.* We already wrote about some general problems on which we have agreed. It would be good if someone gives some personal experience. At the end of the day, we are not going to sign the letter with our names.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In this statement Dušan touches on two elements that are vividly discussed in the deliberative literature. He applauds that the group was able to agree on some general problems. This is in the spirit of Habermas who hopes that good deliberation leads to consensus. Yet, there is also the argument in the deliberative literature that the pressure to reach consensus may lead to the suppression of important conflicts.<sup>204</sup> Dušan also stresses the importance of personal stories, an aspect much discussed in the newer literature on deliberation.<sup>205</sup> Dušan adds the intriguing question whether personal stories cannot be held against the story tellers when he assures the group that they do not have to sign the letter to the High Representative. Obviously, Dušan is worried that the High Representative or someone in his office may take action against someone who told a story that they do not like, addressing for instance the Srebrenica Municipality with uneasy questions and, finally, coming to the signatories of the letter. This is a worry that I have not found in the literature. This example shows how in-depth empirical work can help to nuance abstract theoretical arguments. With this sophisticated intervention Dušan keeps the discussion at a very high level of deliberation.

---

<sup>204</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012, Chapter 6.

<sup>205</sup> Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy*, Chapter 2.

**Dragan, Serb (code 1):** Yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan agrees with the general statement of Dušan, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Whoever you meet on street will say the same things. Understand? Only those who have a job won't agree.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir tells a personal story and raises a question that is also discussed in the deliberative literature, namely to what extent opinions found in a deliberative discussion group can also be found in the external world. Through deliberation, opinions have supposedly become more reflective. Almir claims that such reflective opinions are shared by people who are unemployed in the streets but not by those who have a job. In this way, Almir expresses solidarity with the unemployed. With this personal story, Almir opens the view to the outside world and thus keeps the discussion at a high deliberative level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 1):** When you ask those people they say: "It's good"

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan agrees with the observations of Almir and keeps deliberation at a high level.

*(At this point Dragan answers a call on his mobile phone)*

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 2):** There are people from Milici who work here. I knew them before and when I meet them and ask what brings you here they say: "I work". Ooooooh! I also know to drive car, maybe I don't have diploma but... It's always the same.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Almir continues with another personal story, but this time he transforms the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. That Srebrenica has people from outside who work here, was fully discussed earlier, and the group arrived at the conclusion that such outside work should be restricted. For Almir to bring up the issue again with a

personal story disrupts the flow of the discussion. He appears to be off-topic with his remarks that he knows how to drive a car but has no diploma. Actually he works as a taxi driver, so he is referring to his personal story; but the sentence is not clearly formulated to be understandable by other participants. When he finishes his statement that it is “always the same”, it is unclear what exactly is always the same. From this speech act it is difficult for the other participants to let the discussion continue to flow at a high level of deliberation. As we see below, there was indeed nobody how reacted to this intervention of Almir.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* The phone call of Dragan had brought the discussion to a standstill from which it was difficult for the group to recover. Dragan expressed a certain *fatigue* with the discussion when he took the call. He already has expressed this fatigue when a short while ago he has said that they cannot write everything. Obviously, he has enough of the discussion and would like to leave shortly. Confronted with this atmosphere that the discussion will shortly come to an end, Almir did not feel bound to continue the discussion in an interactive way so that he permitted himself to make some random remarks. In the research of Maria Clara Jaramillo on Colombian ex-combatants there were also such instances of fatigue, especially late in a discussion. Theoretically it is important to note that people have only a limited attention span so that the dynamic of a discussion may change as it gets longer and longer.

***Nada, Serb (code 3):*** Should we say something positive?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nada is taken aback by the downward transformative moment and only repeats a question that was raised before. Deliberation stays at a low level.

***Dragan, Serb (code 3):*** What can we say positive? Nothing...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although in a previous statement Dragan has mentioned sport and culture with a positive potential, he now says that there is nothing positive to be said about life in Srebrenica. It seems that he



has enough of the discussion indicating with his statement that there is nothing more to be said. Fatigue has set in. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** You know what else, there are hundreds of firms opened but there is no employment. It's all fictive.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan is also repetitive going back with another illustration to the poor employment situation in Srebrenica, a topic that the group had concluded a long time ago. With this repetitive statement Dušan is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** I know that but how to start back with that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir indeed responds that the poor employment situation is old hat for the discussion of the group and expresses despair to come back to an old issue. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Our municipality serves for a huge money laundering.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan, too, is repetitive in complaining again about the corruption of the local government. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** ...for money laundering.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan only repeats what Dragan says, which keeps deliberation at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Yes, for money laundering...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan repeats what he said before. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** Yes, it's more used for laundering money than to help people which finance it. Transparency is on zero level. They live from our backs and when you go there for some assistance...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan says nothing that was not said before so that the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

(at this point there is a long silence indicating fatigue to continue the discussion much longer)

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Social system...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is incomprehensible what Dragan wants to say. Deliberation continue to be low.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** Well, now you want to write something about the culture? What are you saying? Did you have something on your mind?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this intervention Dušan does not move on the discussion on culture. He merely repeats an earlier question. Deliberation remains low.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Put only culture. Cultural life in Srebrenica is reduced to a couple of days in which some events are organized...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan is still showing fatigue with the discussion. He does not wish to elaborate on the cultural issue but suggests to write simply "culture". In this way he expresses the view that the discussion should soon come to an end. Deliberation does not pick up to a higher level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Cultural life Srebrenica is reduced to seven days...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this statement Almir keeps the discussion still at a low level of deliberation. He only repeats earlier criticism that Srebrenica has a poor cultural life, but does not make any suggestions of how it

could be improved. With the seven days he refers to the event Days of Srebrenica.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** ...to seven days poorly organized event Days of Srebrenica...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan merely repeats the criticism of Almir, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation. .

(Noise, then Almir repeats what he wrote down on culture)

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** And you know what else, our municipality has , perhaps with the villages approximately 9000 inhabitants. In the municipality institution there are about 100 of them who do nothing. Rather than create new jobs they only expand and open new departments in the municipality.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan repeats an earlier critique of the municipality. The discussion takes increasingly a tone of despair. It randomly jumps from topic to topic, losing a clear direction. There are no longer any suggestions of how the situation in Srebrenica can be improved. On this basis no transformation to a higher level of deliberation takes place.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** She recorded it and she can take everything from this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir recalls to the group that the moderator audio and video tapes the discussions. It is not clear, however, what point he wants to make with this statement; probably that the moderator could find herself alone other issues to be added, taking them from the audio and video records The conversation drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** Are we going to write something good?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This question has been asked already several times, so it does not help to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Everybody (code 3):** We don't have anything good! (general laughing)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* despair really setting in. It seems to be a nervous laughter. But at least the group feels a solidarity, and this across the ethnic divide.

**Dušan, Serb (code 3):** We will write something good on this place that is left on the paper. (...) What's good? For example, those Austrians...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dušan refers to the paper on which they should write about good things. He refers to Austrians, a NGO or governmental agency that is giving aid. His speech act is interrupted by Almir. Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** ...And they give all to the same people. Try to remember when they called you, me, him. Each foreign organizations, group that come to share any of the assets, they give it to the same people.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir interrupts Dušan to say that no matter what the Austrians could have done, the benefit of their action did not address nor Dušan, nor Almir, nor Dragan. In this way he extends the general critique of „unfair distribution of subsidies“ to the foreign aid givers, thus reinforcing the despair in the group. Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Yes, you're right.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan shares the view of Almir that the foreign aid givers are not better than the local authorities. The conversation drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** It's all the same. Since 2000 I am here, you know what I got, a greenhouse and I would not have gotten it if I would not have bribed a man to put me on a list. Since 2000...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir tells a personal story how he got something only by bribery. Sometimes, personal stories help to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation. But this time, the story of Almir only underlines the general despair so that the deliberation remains at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** Bribery and corruption.

(Noise)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan only confirms what has been said many times before that bribery and corruption are widespread in Srebrenica. The noise in the group indicates that the interest in the discussion quickly diminishes. Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Almir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Admittedly I have not applied but I know people who just needed it but they did not receive.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Almir contributes to the general confusion in admitting that he himself never applied to Public Calls for donations, but he knows somebody who did, and needed help, but did not receive it. Deliberation continues to remain at a low level.

**Dragan, Serb (code 3):** That's it, we won't write anymore.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Dragan has already earlier expressed eagerness for the discussion to end; he now has definitively enough and claims the end of the discussion. Deliberation remains at a low level.

### **3.4. Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 1 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether seven deliberative transformative moments, four downwards and three upwards, so that the discussion ended at a low level. I will first summarize my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. I will then show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

#### **3.4.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation**

For each of the downward transformative moments I have a different explanation. The first such moment was triggered by Almir, when he claimed that in Srebrenica “everything is bad.” The expression of such despair discourages a search for a better future, as the group is supposed to do. For Almir as Bošnjak it is understandable that he expresses despair given that in Srebrenica horrendous massacres of Bošnjaks by Serbs took place. As the only Bošnjak in the group, he wanted to express this despair early in the discussion to mark his position. In the questionnaire filled out before the discussion, Almir refused to accept that Bošnjaks shared equal responsibility with the Serbs for the war and the war crimes. Given this expression of despair, it is not surprising that Dušan as Serb was taken aback when he took next the floor and merely repeated what he said before instead of moving the discussion ahead. In her work with Colombian ex-combatants, Maria Clara Jaramillo also found that expression of despair can easily transform a discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. An example is when an ex-paramilitary made the following statement: “There will never be peace in Colombia. Why? And you know why there will never be peace? Because war is a business.”<sup>206</sup> This expression of hopelessness and

---

<sup>206</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, op. cit., p.141.

despair also made it difficult to continue the discussion. Dealing with deeply divided countries with civil war still going on or in the recent past, expressions of despair make it difficult to continue the conversation at a high level of deliberation and to search for ways to a better future for the country. Pessimistically, one could expect that in such countries despair would be a constant feature, so that discussions would always drag on at a low level of deliberation or that people would not even be willing to engage in any discussion at all about the future of the country. It is a remarkable finding of our research both in Colombia and Bosnia-Herzegovina that such a pessimistic view is not warranted. In all groups that we studied in both countries, there were always situations that helped to transform the conversation back to a high level of deliberation. Even in war torn countries there are always some people resilient enough to talk about a better future.

When the discussion is transformed for a second time from a high to a low level of deliberation, it is again triggered by Almir. This time, he reacts with the vulgar expression “stupid” to a procedural proposal of Dušan. Foul language violates the important criterion of respect towards other participants. This criterion does not mean that the conversation needs to be polite in a conventional sense. It is appropriate from a deliberative perspective to use harsh terms to criticize the proposal of other participants. One may, for example, criticize a proposal as illogical, as long as one points out in what respect the proposal lacks logical vigor. It is altogether another matter to use the term stupid, especially when it is not explained in what sense a proposal of another participant merits this characterization. Maria Clara Jaramillo also found instances among Colombian ex-combatants where words of disrespect transformed a conversation from a high to a low level of deliberation. An example is the following passage, where in an emotional outburst an ex-guerrilla lashed out at the entire group: “You’re next? Wake up! No opinion... This man here goes next... He isn’t giving his opinion either! Your group... Aren’t giving your opinion as well! And you... Neither!” This outburst took the other participants aback as the “stupid” remark of Almir in the current group in Srebrenica. We

should notice that we can not simply classify words a priori as respectful and disrespectful. It depends on the context how a particular word is perceived.

The third time when the discussion was transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation was when the participants were bogged down in the intricacies of the local governmental structures. This was intellectually simply over their heads. The group tried to figure out what committees were responsible for the various demands that the group had for the local authorities. This question was legally and politically too complex for ordinary citizens, so that the discussion quickly lost its direction. In her work on Colombian ex-combatants, Maria Clara Jaramillo also found cases where participants lost the thread of the discussion over the intellectual complexity of an issue, for example, when they addressed the question whether Cuba or Venezuela are better models for Colombia and got entangled in obscure differences between communism, socialism and Marxism. The lesson is that some topics are simply over the heads of ordinary citizens. In future research this could be remedied to some extent if participants would get systematic training in the issues to be discussed. This would raise the problem, however, that such training could influence participants in a biased way. In the deliberative literature it is a hotly debated issue whether participants should get instruction material on the issues to be discussed. For my research in Srebrenica I wanted that participants were as little as possible influenced by the research project itself, so that I did not distribute any instruction material before the discussions.

The last transformation moment from a high to a low level of deliberation occurred when an atmosphere of fatigue set in. A first sign of fatigue set in when Dragan apparently was so bored that he took a call from his mobile phone. Afterwards, the discussion lost its focus with arguments being repeated that were stated many times before and stories told that were off-topic unrelated to any substantive issue. Maria Clara Jaramillo also registered a trend among Colombian ex-combatants that towards the end discussions taper off. The question then is when exactly such fatigue sets in. Some groups reach this point earlier than others. It has to do with the attention span, which may depend on



characteristics of the participants, the issues being discussed, and most generally the overall group dynamics. Some discussions are simply more interesting and entertaining than others. The question then is whether moderators should attempt to prolong the discussion beyond the natural attention span. I decided against such an attempt because here again I wanted to discussion to be as close to everyday life as possible.

It is remarkable that all the mechanisms that led to transformative moments from a high to a low level of deliberation could also be found in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants. This is speaking for the validity of the analysis of Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself if our findings hold up across two continents with quite different sets of participants.

#### 3.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation

For these upward transformative moments, I also found explanations that correspond to what Maria Clara Jaramillo found for Colombian ex-combatants. One explanation refers to the importance of deliberative leaders, a factor largely neglected in the deliberative literature. The research of Maria Clara Jaramillo and my own research show that this is a crucial factor, at least in war torn deeply divided countries. In the discussion group 1 in Srebrenica, it was two times that Dušan acted as deliberative leader bringing the discussion back on track. In both situations, he made specific and clear procedural proposals of how the discussion should proceed. Dušan was also several times instrumental to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation. So what is it about Dušan that he so clearly emerged as deliberative leader? One factor may be that he is a university student, while none of the others have a university education. In Colombia, however, Maria Clara Jaramillo found that even people with a low level of education can emerge as deliberative leaders. From the answers of Dušan to the initial questionnaire we see that he has a particularly strong Serb identity. It is not clear how such a strong ethnic identity would motivate Dušan to act as deliberative leader. On the contrary, it seems more plausible that a more moderate participant would act as deliberative leader, being motivated to bridge

the ethnic divide. As Maria Clara Jaramillo has shown for Colombian ex-combatants, it is not easy to identify who is likely to emerge as deliberative leader. Perhaps my research of the other groups will throw more light on who these actors are.

The third and last transformative moment from a low to a high level of deliberation was triggered by a personal story. This is a factor widely debated and accepted in the deliberative literature.<sup>207</sup> Again it was Dušan who can take credit to bring the discussion back on track, this time with a well placed personal story, which opened the discussion on the topic of poverty in Srebrenica. When the discussion dragged on in an unfocused way on the theatre and concert life in Srebrenica, Dušan pointed out that the real issue was not to have more theatre or concert performances but for ordinary citizens to have enough money to buy theatre and concert tickets. In a very effective way, he then pointed out how little money an ordinary person earns, by far not enough to buy theatre tickets. According to the research of Maria Clara Jaramillo, personal stories were also effective among Colombian ex-combatants to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation. A good example is the following story told by an ex-paramilitary:

*When I came to Bogota, I was with a cousin and a friend of mine in one of the northern and wealthy neighborhoods, we were kind of lost. Then the police came, at first they asked us what we were doing, as my friend couldn't respond, at the end police said they didn't want to see us around anymore as neighbors had called to let them know that there were some strange and suspicious people and they didn't want you here.*

This story was a good starting point for the group to engage on a high deliberative level a discussion of the discrimination under which ex-combatants still suffered. This story helped to raise the interest of the group.

---

<sup>207</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*

### 3.5. Outcomes and deliberation

Deliberation has an intrinsic value in itself contributing to the self-actualization of persons participating in highly deliberative conversations<sup>208</sup>. Deliberation, however, is also expected to have a positive influence on the outcomes of group discussions. Thus, I want to see how the deliberative pattern in this group is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. I present the deliberative pattern of the group in graphic form. H stands for a sequence at a high level of deliberation, L for a sequence at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt altogether with four issues, unemployment, local subsidies, poverty, and culture. I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= decision on unemployment, D2= decision on local subsidies, D3= decision on poverty, D4= decision on culture.

#### 3.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 1

H ----- 11

L ----- 5

H - 1

L --- 3

H -----D1----- 31

L -----D2- 14

---

<sup>208</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, op. cit., p. 45.

H -----D3----- 54

L -----D4----- 24

There was a total of 143 speech acts, 97 at a high level of deliberation, 46 at a low level. Now where are the four decision points located? D1 on the unemployment situation in Srebrenica is made about two thirds through a long sequence of high deliberation. The main critique offered on this issue in the letter to the High Representative reads as follows: "People who do not live in the municipality of Srebrenica gain jobs." Since of the four participants only one, Almir, has a steady job, and this merely as a taxi driver, it was easy for the group to find common ground in identifying workers from outside as the major problem for the high unemployment of the indigenous people. This common ground allowed a high level of deliberation, which, in turn, led to a clearly formulated critique of the current situation. If we look more closely, causality is more complex, because there is an interaction effect between finding a common ground and deliberation. Deliberation helped the group to find common ground and common ground helped deliberation, so that a positive feedback loop could evolve over a long sequence of high deliberation.

Contrary to D1, we have a negative feedback loop for D2, which deals with the subsidies distributed by the local authorities. The letter to the High Representative contains the following critique: "The municipality's commission unevenly distributes aid (scholarship, grants, various agricultural machinery, livestock, etc.)." When the group attempted to discuss how this situation could be remedied, it went intellectually over their heads because they were not informed how the local authorities were organized and what offices or committees were responsible for what subsidies. As a consequence, the discussion dragged on at a low level of deliberation, which, in turn, increased the confusion in the group. As a result of this negative feedback loop, the letter to the High Representative is vague and does not contain specifics of how the situation could be improved.

For D3 about poverty, the decision was made towards the end of the longest stretch of high deliberation. This long stretch was launched by Dušan, when he told his personal story that he would like to go to the theatre but that he cannot afford it. This story rose the vivid interest of the group and in a very interactive way this issue was discussed from very different angles. As a consequence, the letter to the High Representative was in great detail:

*Failure to comply with workers' rights. Employees work an average of 10 to 12 hours a day, six to seven days a week, at a wage of 400 KM. This means exploiting people. People are not entitled to sick leave, regardless of the justification. Law is only for the poor. Our municipality is more inclined to money laundry than helping citizens.*

As for the issue of unemployment (D1), the group quickly found common ground, which led here, too, to a positive feedback loop between common ground and deliberation. The long sequence of high deliberation paid off and helped to arrive at a substantive critique sent to the High Representative.

For D4 about culture, the issue was raised several times in the discussion but never systematically followed up. The group attempted to write something about culture, only when general fatigue had set in. The discussion at this point tapered off at a low level of deliberation. In the letter to the High Representative the group merely wrote: "Cultural life is reduced to seven days of poorly organized "Days of Srebrenica". This is indeed not very substantive. Nothing is said how this event could be better organized. The issue of the local theatre that was slightly discussed earlier, was not even mentioned in the letter to the High Representative.

My analysis shows that there is indeed a linkage between deliberation and outcome. A long sequence of deliberation helps to arrive at a substantive outcome. By contrast, if the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation, the outcome lacks substance. As an intervening variable, one has to consider the

issue under discussion. If the issue is intellectually over the heads of the participants or if fatigue with the discussion has set in, it is most difficult to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. The best condition to transform a discussion to a high level of deliberation and to keep it at this level for some length of time is when participants share a common interest such as fighting unemployment and poverty.

## **Chapter 4: Second Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica**

### **4.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>209</sup>**

***Emina***, Bošnjak, female, 50 years old, both parents Bošnjak. She lives in a mono-ethnic Serbian neighborhood. Emina got a secondary school diploma in tourism and hospitality, and she works as a cook. She is politically active, and experienced inter-group cooperation in several projects and initiatives organized by an NGO. She identifies herself both as Bošnjak and as Bosnian. The latter term refers to the country at large; in my research some Bošnjaks identified also as Bosnians, but none of the Serbs and Croats did so. Emina is ambivalent; she identifies with the whole country but also with her ethnic group, whose traditions she values. Her Muslim religion is an important component of her life. She thinks that group identity is pre-ordinate, and cannot change across life. Bošnjaks, in her view, are just one among the constituent groups of Bosnia-Herzegovina. She was in the country during the war, in Tuzla. She is from Srebrenica, living here before and after the war. She lost friends and parents during the war. However, she did not help military or paramilitary forces during the conflict. She manifests a quite strong group identity: she appears to be proud of her group, and admits no criticism towards it. She thinks that Serbs are the most responsible for the war during the 90's. According to her view, during the war Bošnjaks were threatened in their collective identity, culture and traditions, and even in their very existence. She always feels uneasy, disgusted, angry, and afraid of Serbs. The opposite she feels for Bošnjaks. She does not think that Bošnjaks want the country only for themselves. She has no clear opinion about the political plans of Croats, but she is sure that Serbs would like to secede and to have their own Country

---

<sup>209</sup> Participants in this group were selected by random walk.

outside of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Emina claims that ethnic identities should have less importance, which would make the country less divided. In this sense, she demonstrates tolerance and openness towards equal rights for all groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but only under the condition that the other groups want the country to stay united. Individual personal interests are, in her view, almost as important as group interests. Srebrenica, in her opinion, is a city where Serbs are dominant. She has good friends belonging to all three ethnic groups. Nevertheless, she would not be happy if her son would marry a Serbian woman. She thinks that she is always good at speaking and convincing people about her own arguments.

**Vladan**, Serb, male, 27 years old, both parents Serb. He got a secondary school diploma in economics, but he is unemployed. He feels very close to his ethnic Serbian group. For him, group identity is pre-ordinate, he will not change it across his life. His Christian-orthodox religion is a quite important component of his Serbian identity. Serbs, he thinks, are one among the constituent groups of Bosnia-Herzegovina. He thinks that Bosnia-Herzegovina is a united country. He lives in Milici, a little town – about 12.000 people – close to Srebrenica, which has a clear Serbian majority. Vladan declares that he was in Milici all his life. He says, however, that he was not in Bosnia-Herzegovina during the war. It is not clear, therefore, if he was actually in the region during the war or not. He lost friends and relatives during the conflict. From his questionnaire, it is difficult to define his position towards ethnic cooperation because of missing answers. It seemed to avoid any question related to ethnicity and to politics. He declares to have ordinary contacts with Bošnjaks as well as with Serbs.

**Milena**, Serb, female, 37 years old, both parents Serb. She got a secondary school diploma in chemistry. She is housewife. She does not feel confident with her capacity of speaking to convince others about her arguments. She comes originally from Bratunac, only 10 kilometers from Srebrenica; for 5 years she now lives in Zvornik, a Serbian majority city still in the Republic of



Srpska. She states to live in a multi-ethnic neighborhood of Serbs and Bošnjaks. Milena showed up to the meeting with her 4 year old daughter. She manifests a very strong ethnic group belonging of Serbian, of which for her Christian-orthodox religion is a very relevant component. Milena defines her group as the most important of the ethnic groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina. She thinks that each ethnic group should be entitled to its own national state, because only ethnic states, she believes, can protect collective identities. According to her view, among nations it is possible to cooperate, although full mutual trust is never possible. Without a good leader, she states, a nation is like a man without head. Her preference for group interests appears to be dominant over personal interests. She feels uncomfortable when she sees a Serb in trouble. If the person was a Bošnjak, she cannot say if it would do the same. According to her view, the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina pays too much attention to help and support ethnic groups other than Serbs. Yet, according to her view, Bošnjaks and Croats are the most responsible for the civil war. To a certain extent, however, she admits that all groups share some responsibilities. She has only good friends among Serbs, neither among Bošnjaks nor Croats. She will certainly dislike her son to marry a Bošnjak or a Croat. She believes that Bošnjaks are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat. She strongly is of the opinion that Bošnjaks think that the country is theirs and nobody else's, and that Croats would like to leave Bosnia-Herzegovina to build their own country or to join their Croatian motherland. She also admits that Serbs, too, would like to leave Bosnia-Herzegovina to build their own country or to join their Serbian motherland. She constantly feels uneasy and disgusted towards Bošnjaks, sometimes also afraid. She is always proud and grateful towards Serbs. During the last six months, she had only few occasions of communicating and contacting Bošnjaks, and when it happened, it was always unfriendly. Exactly the opposite is true for her contacts with Serbs. She never experienced participation in inter-ethnic cooperation projects. However, she said, she may be interested in. She thinks that the social environment around her (family, friends, politics) does not support inter-ethnic cooperation.

**Svetlana**, Serb, female, 51 years old, both parents Serb. She finished secondary school, she used to work in the hospitality sector and she is now retired. She evaluate herself to be, generally, not very good at speaking and convincing people. Svetlana thinks that Srebrenica is a multi-ethnic city where the social environment sometimes supports inter-ethnic cooperation. She herself lives in a multi-ethnic neighborhood. However, she never experienced inter-ethnic cooperation, nor is she interested in it. She was in the country during the war. She did not help military or paramilitaries. She lost relatives and friends during the war. She declares to be very close to her ethnic Serbian group and its traditions. Christian-orthodox religion is a crucial component of her life and of her identity. However, she thinks that ethnic groups should adapt and blend into the larger society. She is more individualist in her preferences rather than group oriented. She thinks that all ethnic groups are responsible of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Svetlana thinks that each group equally supports economic development of the country. However, she cannot say whether Bosnia-Herzegovina is a united country or not. She is not sure, as well, about having good friends among Bošnjaks and Croats. She has, definitely, good friends among Serbs. She would not be happy if her son would marry a Bošnjak woman. She sometimes has felt grateful to Bošnjaks, but also, sometimes, angry and afraid of them. She has often felt grateful to Serbs, but also, sometimes, uneasy and angry with them. She has often had a chance to communicate with Bošnjaks during the last six months, but this relation was not very close. She thinks that the social environment (family, friends, and politics) is not supporting inter-ethnic cooperation.

#### **4.2. Group Structure**

As for group 1, also group 2 is made up of adults, with no previous experience of inter-ethnic cooperation. They all lost family members and friends

during the war. From their life stories, there is a clear divide between Emina as a Muslim Bošnjak and the three Serbs, and particularly between Emina and Milena. They have, indeed, both very hostile feelings towards the other ethnic group. Emina blames Serbs as the only responsible of war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. She always feels uneasy, disgusted, angry, and afraid about Serbs, and never grateful or proud of them. Milena, by contrast, has exactly the same negative feelings towards Bošnjaks. She even thinks that Bošnjaks are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat. She thinks that each ethnic group should be entitled to its own national state, she wants only ethnic states; she believes that only in this way can collective identities be protected. She blames Bošnjaks, because they think that the country is theirs and nobody else's. The two other Serbs, Vladan and Svetlana, are also very proud of their ethnic and religious identities but are not as hostile towards Bošnjaks as Milena.

## **4.2. Group discussion**

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>210</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if

---

<sup>210</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

## *2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

### *3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

### *4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

**Moderator:** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina? Your responses will be delivered to the High Representative.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** To have a better education and kindergartens for children, where they can play. Here in our example, they open private kindergartens and you have to pay 2KM<sup>211</sup> for one hour, and the child starts to scream and cry when the clock runs out because they want to stay. These kindergartens are private. And we do not have such a playground to bring a child to play and to go somewhere out. As I see it, here conditions don't exist because

---

<sup>211</sup> About 1 euro

it is very dirty around the school. I do not know what the conditions at school are, but ... I'd really like from them to pay attention mostly on children. Those conditions for children must be improved.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena begins the discussion at a high level of deliberation. She makes a coherent argument, supported by her personal story, that public kindergartens should be improved to the level of private kindergartens, which are too expensive for people like her. Milena talks about a problem, and this problem – the impossibility to afford a private kindergarten - is in front of the eyes of all participants, as Milena's little daughter is with her at the meeting, playing something at the table and looking at participants with curiosity. This is a good example of storytelling, involving “much emotion and empathy” otherwise “not allowed in a purely rational approach to deliberation”.<sup>212</sup> It is an example that personal stories can have a place for deliberative justification of an argument, as theorists like Mansbridge and Krause have claimed<sup>213</sup>, and as Maria Clara Jaramillo also found in her work with ex-combatants in Colombia<sup>214</sup>.

**Vladan, Serb, (code 1):** Do we write sentences?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan asks a relevant procedural question. Clarification on procedural questions, as we have already noticed in Group 1, support deliberative talks insofar induces participants to focus on a common super-ordinate issue, above any conflict line.

**Svetlana, Serb, (code 1):** Yes, write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana is interactive and answers the question of Vladan in a positive way. Deliberation still flows high.

---

<sup>212</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>213</sup> Jane Mansbridge, „The place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy“, in *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18/2010; Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, op. cit.

<sup>214</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit.

**Milena, Serb, (code 1):** Something, where children can learn to play, because most of them sit at home playing computer games and do not make real friendships... , for example, theater. My children do not leave the house, and just sit at a computer.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As before, Milena elaborates on her earlier proposal that there should be better public kindergartens. Again she support her proposal in an effective way with a personal story. Again, it is an example of storytelling good for justifying an argument.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** And school program to improve a bit.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Emina, as Bošnjak, supports the two Serbs concerning the need to improve public schools. She expands the discussion from kindergarten to public schools in general. A common life world develops between Serbs and Bošnjaks in the group. It is a potential common interest, transcendental to the ethnic line, and in this sense owning the right characteristics to be defined as a super-ordinate goal.<sup>215</sup>

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** I do not know that because I do not have school children.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena remains interactive. It is in a deliberative spirit to acknowledge that she has no knowledge about the school level. To be sure, deliberation is talk centered, but this does not mean that one has to express an opinion on every issue. It shows a certain modesty and caution to admit that one has not enough information to have formed an opinion.

---

<sup>215</sup> As a strategy for conflict transformation, a super-ordinate goal is a shared goal that can be attained only if conflicting groups work together; in this sense, it may trigger inter-group cooperation, eliminating competition for material and social resources. It is necessary, however, that cooperation should: provide repeated opportunities to disconfirm out-group stereotypes; produce successful results; take place between equals; be supported and promoted by social norms. Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis Group, 2007, pp. 510-511.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** There are some things that are improved.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* On a positive note, Emina acknowledges that there are school programs that have become better. The discussion stays interactive and on topic.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Oh, the math is hard for them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena stays interactive and addresses a specific issue in the school program. Even she said to not have experience with school programs because her children are still in their kindergarten ages, she knows something about difficulties of students facing mathematics.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Some courses still have it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina stays on topic and takes up the issue of math raised by Milena. Talks still runs on a positive deliberative track.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Now, since my children have finished the school it is time for them to find some employment. For instance, my son went to Serbia to look for a job. He graduated Medicine and now he works in construction and cannot find a job here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana expands the discussion to what happens after school and with the help of a personal story she shows how difficult it is to find a job in Srebrenica. It is another good example of storytelling, justifying the argument recalling for empathy and emotion.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Yes, that's it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena stays interactive supporting Svetlana with regard to the poor job situation in Srebrenica. The reference to the argument at stake is inferred by looking at the overall discourse flow interaction and development. In this sense, the qualitative approach used in my research,



and previously by Maria Clara Jaramillo's analysis of ex-combatants in Colombia, allows to better categorized a speech act in the context of the overall discussion flow, overcoming the limits of a pure DQI coding. In this sense, even if standing for itself this statement would not be deliberative, linked with the overall context of previous statements, this shortcut is appropriate from a deliberative perspective<sup>216</sup>.

***Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):*** The program and lessons in schools must be the same and not different for each nationality whether they are Serbs, Croats or Bošnjaks. We need to have one single program in the whole territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in order to bring some sort of mutual agreement. We don't have other options then to live one next to each other, and separate programs in schools will just make it much harder.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina turns the discussion from the local level of Srebrenica to the country at large and makes the very deliberative proposal that the three ethnic groups should all have the same school programs. Despite of her personal background, made up of a strong feeling of in-group belonging and negative sentiments towards Serbs as the out-group, she is able to make an extraordinary declaration demonstrating a true spirit of deliberation. She justifies her proposal in stating that it will help the three ethnic groups to live together, making therefore reference to the *common good*, overcoming egocentric viewpoints, consistently with Habermas' theories<sup>217</sup>. In this sense, this speech act could come from a textbook on deliberation.

***Milena, Serb (code 2):*** I do not know what to say, I swear. ..I'm just worried about these little children, what kind of future they will have.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Emina as Bošnjak had opened wide space to address the basic problem of the relations among the three ethnic

---

<sup>216</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit. p. 40.

<sup>217</sup> Jürgen Habermas, „Morality and Ethical Life: Does Hegel's critique of Kant apply to discourse ethics?“ *Northwestern University Law Review* n. 83, 1989, p. 45.

groups. But Milena, as Serb, is not willing to enter this discussion, which seems to be sensitive to her. Instead, she returns to the school issue in Srebrenica. In this way, going off-topic, she uses a strategy of conflict avoidance. She also does not add anything to the school issue, so the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of transformative moment:* Milena's reaction to the very deliberative proposal made by Emina clearly indicates a step back, a closure, towards the perspective of setting up a new perspective for BiH, that of inter-group dialogue. Emina has tackled a very sensitive issue in BiH that is closely related to the issue of re-interpretation of historical past for ethno-nationalist purposes. Each group, indeed, teach to in-group pupils historical facts reinterpreted according to the in-group (ethnic) revisionism. In this sense, inter-group conflict is perpetuated generations after generations, reinforcing prejudices and stereotypes against out-group. Milena, as a quite strong nationalistic oriented person, probably would be inclined to openly reject Emina's proposal. However, probably because of the experimental context, with the presence of a moderator, she rather prefers to avoid conflict, opting instead for going off-topic, coming back to previous issues and dropping the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

This is also a good example about the usefulness of questionnaires specifically set to better analyze participants' personal attitude towards inter-group relations. Adding light to personal attitudes towards intergroup relations, this possibility, indeed, may facilitate and strengthen the reliability of analysis of transformative moments during inter-group talks<sup>218</sup>.

***Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):*** Well as soon as they begin to learn and we separate them.

---

<sup>218</sup> As described in the Introduction, my research sensitively differed from the research design of Maria Clara Jaramillo, insofar I was specifically interested in observing how inter-group conflict (and related prejudices and stereotypes) influenced deliberation. In this sense, my questionnaires were much more oriented in this direction, with several items taken from the field of social psychology, allowing a more detailed description of attitude of participants to inter-group contact.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina tries to come back to the issue of separated school programs but is interrupted by Milena, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Milena, Serb (3):** That's why I say, that if only they could have a better future, to live better, to think and to socialize, not to fight...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena still does not address the question of separated school programs for Bošnjaks, Croats, and Serbs and thus continues the strategy of conflict avoidance. Instead, she makes a general statement of a better future not giving any specifics, so that she does not open space for the discussion to return to a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (3):** If parents find a job everything would be better.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana returns to the job issues, but does not add anything new, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yes, that's true.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena is interactive, supporting the statement of Svetlana, but since this statement did not move the discussion forward, neither does the support of Milena.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** If you have a job, you would pay those 2KM for private kindergarten.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana comes back to the high costs of private kindergarten and links it with the job situation. Although this link is clearly formulated, it does not bring any new aspects into the discussion, so that deliberation stays at a low level.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Yes, that is ...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina does not know how to continue the discussion and does not finish the sentence. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yes. To provide employment for the youth, so that when they finish college they can get a job. How many are without a job, sitting at home. Parents were encouraged to educate them and later... nothing.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena does not add anything to the discussion about the job situation and expresses despair, which is not opening new space to move the discussion ahead.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 4): They employ them on political party lines, or family relations.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina brings a new aspect into the discussion claiming that jobs are given out based on political party affiliation and family relations. She tells this as a story with which she gives the impression to be familiar with. In this way she opens space of how the job market could be made more open, in relation to a better future for BiH. The discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* With this new topic, Emina has introduced another potential super-ordinate topic, able to join personal interest across the ethnic cleavage, and again demonstrates to be highly deliberative. Indicating potential common interest instead of focusing on sensitive issues means leveraging on self-interest and individualism as a potential antidote to ethnic group identification and polarization. In my questionnaires, there were several items aimed at investigating attitude of participants towards preferring individual vs group interests. In this sense, even if Milena and Emina clearly manifest a similar sense of in-group loyalty, and the same strong closure to out-group, Milena also retains group's interests as super-ordinate towards her personal ones; Emina, instead, is much more oriented to her personal and

individual interests priority. In this sense, her deliberative potential, as capacity of transforming the conflict identifying more common ground for inter-group talk, may be considered higher than Milena's one.

Finding common interests as a ground for common talks, generally on the base of individual interests, at its turn, may trigger the perception of belonging to a super-categorized group, transcending the ethnic cleavage. As Karina V. Korostelina puts it, this process is based on the revaluation of former out-group members of a new common in-group. "Super-categorization does not eliminate in-group favoritism; it readdresses favoritism and leads to the acceptance of former out-group members", making "attitudes towards former out-group members to be more positive, even if they had a long history of violence".<sup>219</sup>

My interpretation should also get some more light on what happened some speech acts ago, when Emina proposed the unification of school programs as far as history is concerned. While fighting corruption, to be achieved, should be pursued by both ethnic groups without implications for their own group identity (and in this sense it is a super-ordinate goal), the issue of reforming history programs at school should be considered too sensitive for nationalist identities to be acknowledged as a super-ordinate goal, unless discussants are all moderates and interested to actually move towards inter-group talk and reconciliation. As Milena clearly manifests the traits of a nationalist person, the previous attempt of Emina to discuss reform of school programs as a super-ordinate goal met with failure.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Yeah, that child who is trying and studying...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena this time picks up from Emina and finds now a reason why many children who study hard are discriminated on the job market. While in her previous statement, Milena expressed diffuse despair, she gets from Emina the idea that you only get jobs when you have

---

<sup>219</sup> Karina V. Korostelina, *Social Identity and Conflict. Structures, Dynamics and Implications*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2007, p. 202.

good party and family relations. It is the essence of deliberation that actors learn from each other. The discussions flows at high level of deliberation.

***Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):*** Actually ... that is corruption.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina makes it now very explicit in what direction she wants to argue; giving privileges on the job market based on party and family relations is pure corruption. In this way, she sets the issue of corruption squarely on the agenda. The issue of corruption, again, comes at the top of the agenda, as in Group 1, for people of Srebrenica.

***Milena, Serb (code 1):*** Yes! This is his uncle who is her cousin, a friend of his, and so they employ one after another.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With her storytelling, Milena gives a vivid illustration of how such corruption works. It is remarkable that she as Serb agrees with Emina from the Bošnjak side on the problem of corruption. In this sense, Emina was successful in indicating a common ground for talk, a super-ordinate goal to be potentially achieved across the ethnic-line.

***Svetlana, Serb (code 1):*** In former times, employers used to search for trained people...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana joins in to agree that there is wide spread corruption on the job market. He makes the current situation all the more dire in referring to former times when there was no corruption on the job market since employers hired the most trained people.

***Milena, Serb (code 2):*** There are those who have completed school and get nothing, they went to school in vain. Although he is educated, he began to work in a pizzeria. If a child wants to learn we need to provide conditions. Better conditions for children is the most important. Although, there is nothing we can demand. Nobody listens to us...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena does not address the question of how corruption on the job market could be overcome. In great despair, she says that nobody will listen to their demands. Since mutual listening is key to deliberation, Milena gives to the group the message that it is pointless to continue the discussion since neither the High Representative nor anyone else will listen to what the group proposes. She transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation, closing space for improving the situation with regard to corruption.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* The reason for this transformative moment is the despair expressed by Milena. Despair, as previously observed for Group 1, tends to trigger transformative moments from a high to a low level of deliberation. If negativism prevails, there is no space left for discussion.

***Jumbled speech acts (code 3):*** yes.....

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Everyone in the group speaks at the same time, agreeing with Milena that nobody will listen to them. On the audio, it is not understandable what everyone says. The discussion seems to have come to a real deadlock with regard to the question put by the moderator how Bosnia-Herzegovina can arrive at a better future.

***Svetlana, Serb (code 3):*** I do not even know what's a donation, what is assistance, scholarships; I didn't get anything in my life, what should I say. Now I need to say that somebody helped me with school, with job... never and nothing.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana confesses that she has no experience, nor knowledge of how to get any public help. Such lack of knowledge is very detrimental to good deliberation, because there is no factual basis on which to build an argument. Her diffuse cry that someone has to help her does not advance the discussion, so that deliberations stays at a low level.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** We are not much of a speaker...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Following Svetlana, Milena also acknowledges that it is hard for the members of the group to participate in such a discussion, because they are not accustomed to speak up publicly. She refers to a basic problem of the deliberative model, the lack of public speaking skills of many people. In my questionnaires, I tried to control for this issue, posing a specific question related to the self-evaluation of participants about their capacities to explain arguments and convince other people about them.<sup>220</sup> According to this self-evaluation, Emina considers herself always good at speaking and convincing people about her arguments, Milena thinks she is not good at speaking and convincing people, while Svetlana says that it depends, but in average she is not very good at speaking and convincing people. Vladan did not provide an answer to this question.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** Oh, this is enough.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana indicates that she enough of the discussion, fatigue sets in. Discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** It is enough, four sentences....What have you written?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena agrees with Svetlana that the discussion should come to an end and asks Vladan, the note taker, what he has written up to now. Discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

---

<sup>220</sup> The question was formulated in this way.

„Do you think you are good in speaking, in the sense that you might convince somebody about your arguments, for instance because your reasons may be shared?“

- a. No, I am not good at speaking and convincing people
- b. It depends, but in average I'm not very good at speaking and convincing people
- c. Yes, sometimes I am quite good at speaking and convincing people
- d. Yes, I'm always good at speaking and convincing people about my arguments



**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** Everything you have said. I was secretary. They said only a few things.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan expresses with his smile and with his statement that he does not take very seriously his task as note taker. He claims that he has written down everything that was said but does not actually say what he has written down. If Vladan would have presented to the group what he has written down, this may have transformed the discussion back to a high level of deliberation with people agreeing or disagreeing with the note taker. But since Vladan did not say what he has written down, the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Let me tell you, I am only interested in children. Before the war we didn't have anything we wanted but it was ok. We could go to school normally, now only if mom and dad have money they can go.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena comes back to the school issue and in a nostalgic way says that in former times things were better, which does not help to move the discussion forward.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Right there you can mention corruption, to reduce it a bit if it's possible.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina reading back the notes taken by Vladan, notes that he did not write down the topic of corruption, already discussed some time ago, when the discussion was still at a high level of deliberation. Emina has mentioned corruption before, so that in the present context she does not move the discussion forward.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yeah. You cannot even visit the doctor, nothing.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena gives just another example why she is despairing. Since she does not make any argument how things could be improved, deliberation drags on at a low level.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Nothing. Look how much corruption and bribery we have. We need to work on it a little.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina repeats her story about corruption and bribery and brings some optimism into the discussion in stating that they need to work on corruption, but since she does not give any hint how this can be done, she is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yes, look how many children are good students and do not have money to go to college. A bad student who has rich mother and father goes to college, while good students are not accepted. Mom, Dad, or whoever needs to intervene to receive it. Bribery is everywhere, so you cannot even go to a doctor without paying a bribe.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena becomes increasingly repetitive that poor people cannot go to good schools or go and see a doctor. This is an issue that obviously goes to the heart of Milena, but in continuing to make the same point, she does not open space for the discussion to move on how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** We can't take medical checks without the money.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina is interactive picking up the point from Milena that without money they cannot see a doctor. Such interactivity is good from a deliberative perspective, but since the discussion turns in circle, it does not move forward in answering the question put by the moderator to the group. The discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Or if you do not have a connection. Only if you say that someone or someone else sent you there, then everything will be cool. It

is impossible. The worst thing for me is that my child sees that. You cannot even to the doctor, if you don't know somebody...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena repeats the complaint about corruption. As a personal story she brings in her child who supposedly suffers from seeing all the corruption. Although this is emotionally an effective story, it is not enough to move the discussion forward because no new issue or argument is raised.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Yes, that is if you do not have money...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina remains interactive supporting previous speakers, but not moving the discussion forward.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yes, if you do not have money, as you said.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena is also interactive, but not moving the discussion forward.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** You have to pay and that's it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina repeats in other words what she said before. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** I do not have to write all the details, everything is recorded anyway.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan as note taker finds an excuse for not writing down too much. His excuse is that the discussion is taped anyhow. Already in an earlier intervention, Vladan gave the impression that he does not take very seriously his task as note taker. In Group 1, note taking was taken seriously, which sometimes led to high level deliberation about what should be written to the High Representative. This was not the case in the present group, so that the interventions of Vladan about his note taking did not transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. Following our research design,

the moderator let the discussion go wherever it went including how the note taker exercised his task.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina seems to agree with Vladan about the way he takes notes.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena also seems to agree with the note taking of Vladan, although for here, too, it is not clear what she is referring to with her “yes, yes” . .

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** It's just a huge problem.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* When Emina refers to a huge problem, it seems that she is no longer talking about note taking, and it is unclear what she is referring to. The discussion continues to meander along without direction, far away from the question of a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina assigned to the group.

**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** We wrote a little but we have said enough, so I can write it in details later.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan intervenes again as note taker and states that he has written enough and that he can write it down after the meeting more in detail. With this statement, Vladan wants to come to an end of the discussion and not to transform it back to a high level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** OK, write it all nicely.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena agrees with Vladan that the discussion should come to an end, and it is time to finalize the letter to the High Representative.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Say if you have something else.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina acted often as deliberative leader, and in this role she wants to make sure that the group agrees with Vladan and

Milena that the discussion should come to an end. Emina herself seems to agree with this conclusion and does not raise any other issue. So it seems at this point that the discussion will no longer go back to a high level of deliberation.

**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** Nothing else.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan reaffirms his earlier statement that the discussion should come to an end.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** I do not know... We've said for employment, we said almost everything in brief; all what we are interested in.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena agrees that there is nothing else to be discussed. Discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** We said the most important - work. Yes if you and your husband work in some firm you would not have a problem to pay 2KM for private kindergarten.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana also agrees that they finished talking about what is important.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** True, although I'm still sorry for children who do not have what they need. It's not that we have ...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although there seems to be agreement that the discussion has come to an end, Milena still repeats how she is sorry for the children, without moving the discussion in a new direction.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** The point is not that only you should work. Everybody should work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana also insists on the work issue mentioned often before, without introducing any new aspects.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** I'm sorry to see children who are not able to work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena repeats almost with the same words what she said several times before.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 4): It does not matter who is which nationality, while we have a job. Let factories work.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Finally, Svetlana brings new aspects to the discussion that are highly relevant for the peaceful relation between Serbs and Bošnjaks in a town like Srebrenica. She is not only asking for new jobs but demands that neither Serbs nor Bošnjaks should discriminate each other. In this way, Svetlana opens space to discuss the relations between the two ethnic groups, bringing discourse to high level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* The statement of Svetlana represents a transformative moment from low to high level of deliberation. Insofar, the discussion had drag on at a low level of deliberation, with participants just repeating past arguments and evidencing discussion fatigue. With her intervention, even if Svetlana is repeating, as well, her key topic, lack of jobs, here she is presenting two new aspects: first, in a very deliberative way, she is underlining how the topic may represents a super-ordinate goal that groups should fight to achieve across the ethnic cleavage; second, there are factories that may be reactivated and work, offering therefore employment opportunities to local people. The discussion is back to a high level of deliberation, and the floor is left opened to further discuss these new aspects, both relevant for a better future of BiH.

**Milena, Serb (code 2): So that everyone has money for its own purposes. Private employers only exploit their workers.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena does not use the space opened by Svetlana and only repeats what was said many times before. The discussion is immediately transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* The deliberative opportunity launched by Svetlana has been immediately rejected by Milena. Again, it seems that explicit references to setting up bridges across the ethnic cleavage, to overcome divisions and pave the way to reconciliation, is a sensitive issue. Again, as happened with the issue of unified school programs for all ethnic groups, Milena declines the offer to deliberate on the topic, and depicts the opportunity of new private jobs, offered by Svetlana, in negative terms. It is not even clear what Milena means when she claims that in that way everyone will have then money for own purposes. Maybe she is referring, again, to politicians? The connection is not clear, nor is the link between this enrichment and the exploitation of private employees. The discussion has back to a low level of deliberation.

***Svetlana, Serb (code 3):*** Either the political party or government. For whom you voted, he will give you a job. Well I do not give voice to anyone. Am I not right?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After Svetlana had expressed in her previous statement the need for Serbs and Bošnjaks not to discriminate each other, after the statement of Milena she now expresses frustration with the corrupt political parties, who give jobs only to their own people. She tells the group that she will abstain in elections, but does not argue how such abstention could bring Serbs and Bošnjaks closer together. Thus, the discussion does not get any new impulses and stays at a low level of deliberation.

***Milena, Serb (code 4):*** If you don't vote for anyone, those votes will help the current authorities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena is interactive and offers Svetlana an argument why abstention in elections may be counterproductive in

helping the current authorities. This rational argument seems to be based on a good knowledge of how elections work. Milena transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in opening space to discuss of how to use elections in an effective way.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* With this statement, Milena has opened the floor to the issue of political elections, that is, as well, a sensitive issue in Srebrenica. Formally, Bošnjak community represents a majority in the city, expressing also the local government. However, most of Bošnjaks are only formally registered as living in Srebrenica, actually living somewhere else, and coming back time after time and especially for commemorations and for elections. It happens therefore that the Serbian minority, actually a majority living in Srebrenica, is never able to get the political administration of the city. In this sense, Milena is complaining with Svetlana that avoiding to express her vote, she is supporting current authorities. The issue is very sensitive, since could imply also a nationalistic warning to Serbs not participating to elections, therefore leaving room to Bošnjak politicians. However, how the statement is formulated, is actually adding the topic to the agenda, leaving room for discussion. In this sense, Milena triggers a transformative moment to the debate, from low to high deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 2): They neither will last eternally. I had to take a loan for my kid to go to school.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana does not use the space opened by Milena to talk about using elections in an effective way. It is unclear what she means when she says that they neither will last eternally. Does she mean that the local authorities will not last eternally? But who would replace them? Svetlana does not address such questions; instead she come back to the dire situation of people like her. The discussion is transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* Svetlana rejects the opportunity to discuss about the effectiveness of political elections and



formulates, instead, a confused and mixed statement, coming back to despair about her situation. This sentence closes the door to the opportunity for participants to intervene in a constructive way. In this sense, the discussion is drag on at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Most of the people do that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena is interactive and supports Svetlana that most people have to take a loan to send their children to school. It is understandable that the participants come back times and again to their dire economic situation, but just complaining without making any suggestions of how the situation can be improved does not move the discussion forward on a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** I do not know anything about the scholarships or something else, the State took everything.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana continues to complain about the state, without making any suggestions of how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Some students cannot even register for school. I know a woman whose father could not pay for her to go to school. She finished it after she got a child.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena's personal story does not help to transform the discussion to a high level of deliberation, because the story is not used to make an argument of how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** I think this is enough, we have enjoyed it, we have written and printed everything.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now Svetlana has really enough of the discussion, which should have come to an end already a while ago but still

continued. Svetlana gives the impression that enough has been said, so that she is not willing to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation and to address still other issues about a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** These are the most important things we put. Children, youth, business, corruption.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena agrees with Svetlana that the discussion should come to an end and summarizes the main points, without adding anything new.

(They give the paper to the moderator, who asks if it was possible to go deeper for each point).

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 4):** We have not yet put down the issue of visas... and how necessary it is to regulate it so that youth can travel.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It was in line with the research design that the moderator encouraged further discussion but did not intervene in any substantive way. Emina picks up on this suggestion and is able to bring a new aspect into the discussion, transforming it to a high level of deliberation. For a better future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, it is indeed highly relevant that the visa problem is solved so that young people can travel abroad and come back with new ideas.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* After the discussion was drag up at a very low level of deliberation, and participants were insisting on ending the talks, the request to go a little bit deeper into the issues was taken positively by Emina, who immediately identified a crucial issue for the future of BiH. The issue of visa regime has all features to represent a super-ordinate goal, not touching sensitive topics for group belonging.

The context is that as a non-member of the European Union, Bosnia-Herzegovina has a difficult visa regime. At the time being, particularly, the visa regime was a relevant issue in relation to the potential candidate status of BiH.

Indeed, sometime after the visa regime was actually liberalized for BiH citizens, allowing them to travel without visa requirements for tourism, up to 3 months per year, into the Schengen area. The floor was now open to debate a crucial, and again, potential super-ordinate topic. Emina demonstrates, again, her capacities as deliberative leader and brings the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** That's true. It's important for young people, to socialize and see something, to learn about different culture.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Milena follows up on the visa idea of Emina and elaborates on the advantages for young people to go abroad. This is also a demonstration that a relevant super-ordinate goal, not touching sensitive issues for group belonging, may create good room for inter-group talk. The discussion is kept at a high level of deliberation.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Not to be trapped in bags...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a humorous way Emina is looking forward for young people to travel with the necessary visa abroad and hopes they will travel lightly. As Sammy Basu correctly argue, humor can help deliberation.<sup>221</sup>

(long silence)

**Moderator:** Is there anything else? Is there anything that is specifically related to Srebrenica, anything positive, something that functions well?

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 2):** No.

---

<sup>221</sup> Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 4 (1999), 378-403.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Although a moment ago, Emina has shown some optimism in proposing that young people should be better served with visas, so that they can go abroad and come back with new ideas, she now does not see anything that is positive in Srebrenica and functions well. Expressing such hopelessness and despair, she transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* As observed before, as well as in Group 1, and in Colombia experiments, despair may kill deliberation. Introducing the issue of visa regime, Emina was surely opening the floor to further elaboration on how the free circulation of people into the European Union may help the future of BiH generations; however, she was again referring to something that, as for the time being, is not working in BiH. When questioned about current situation, she manifests again criticism stating, in a simple word, that there is nothing positive to indicate. The discussion, in this way, is closed. Deliberation, here, has been killed by despair.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** I don't see anything positive here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana joins into this hopelessness and despair. Deliberation remains at a very low level.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Can we say just how it is.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* When Milena says that they should say how it is, obviously means that she agrees with the preceding speakers that there is nothing positive. The flow of discourse remains at a low deliberative level.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):** All breaks down in Srebrenica; depending from which side they come, everybody takes and does nothing for Srebrenica and people who live here. For the citizens of Srebrenica little is done. For nobody, no matter which nationality they are. Politicians speak so much about Srebrenica, but when it's about the work, they do not do anything.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina expresses once more the frustration of the group with the political authorities in Srebrenica. Even if criticism towards current situations may have the potential to trigger the individuation of super-ordinate goals across the ethnic cleavage, despair does not help to come to a positive agenda and to a coherent and clear formulation of what should be done. Deliberation remains low.

**Milena, Serb (code 4): Let us speak about the spa here. Before a lot of people from Serbia and even from Croatia used to come here to visit this spa. And now no one mentions it. I just know some people who are still talking about it, praise the spa, and it still remains unused. It was known in former Yugoslavia, and perhaps abroad. I wonder why they do not reconstruct the spa, to take advantage of its potential. People could find employment here. We have medical and physiotherapy schools, and people could work in the spa. They now do not work for what they are taught. The other day I read that about 100 doctors are necessary.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an unexpected turnaround, Milena overcomes her despair and talks with great enthusiasm about the benefits for Srebrenica, if the spa would again be opened. Srebrenica was very famous spa resort, within Yugoslavia, for the healthy power of its thermal water, and for the beauty of its landscapes. During the war, spa ruined and never recovered back. This is a very concrete project that the group could talk about, although it is already very late in the discussion. Nevertheless, Milena manages to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation, opening space for a discussion about a better future.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* Notwithstanding the discussion fatigue demonstrated by participants, Milena puts on the table a fresh issue, that, again, has the characteristics of setting up a most across the ethnic cleavage. It is a non-sensitive issue, contrary to the previous issues of joint education of children or local elections, and in this sense it opens the floor to discussion, raising back the level of deliberation up to a high level.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Well, they are needed in our hospital too. If you want to heal you have to go to Zvornik.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana is interactive and favors the spa idea, adding that the many new doctors would also be helpful in the hospital.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** What about the “Argentarija” hotel? It might be that people could also work there. And it made me hope for a spa, it is the health resort.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena gets more and more enthusiastic about her spa idea and adds another argument that guests of the spa will bring new business to a local hotel, which in turn would hire more people. Space is now wide open how the spa could be opened again and attract guests.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** I wonder whether it (the spa) is not in the interest of current political power holders. I have this feeling that they work only in reducing everything to a minimum and not to reconstruct or use our resources.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina is interactive with Milena and supports the spa idea, but warns that the local power holders may not be interested in the idea. This is valuable information that keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Moreover, criticizing the local political power, after the issue of political elections had disrupted the deliberative path of discussion, she is also remarking her position against local government: even if the current political leadership is expression of Bošnjaks majority – presumed or actual it is – nevertheless she does not identify herself with it. This adds even more new terrain for deliberative talks across the ethnic line.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Before the war this was a really nice town, friendly, and now nobody does anything. And the silver mine<sup>222</sup>; I do not know how it works. As I know, they do not employ neither.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena agrees with Emina that it is difficult to convince the local authorities to do anything positive for the town, but she still has another idea, to open again the local silver mine.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Oh, nothing. As I heard it (the silver mine) is ruined too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina adds the relevant information that the silver mine is also ruined. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation on ideas to revitalize the town, although the prospects do not seem good. But, at least, Milena and Emina make an effort to think about new ideas.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Well, someone buys it (the silver mine) and destroys it completely.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena continues to elaborate on her idea of the silver mine and suggests as a first step that it should be completely torn down. She does not say who should do this and how the silver mine should be reconstructed again, but at least she offers a first step.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** People are dissatisfied; only a few are working.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina again supports the ideas of the spa and silver mine, since there are so few people in Srebrenica who have work.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** Just a little is invested in firms. They need to enable and reconstruct those factories so that people can work.

---

<sup>222</sup> Srebrenica, by the way, draws its name from Srebro, meaning „silver“.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena expressed so much hopelessness and despair earlier in the discussion; so it is amazing how all of a sudden she has ideas how Srebrenica could have a better future. Now she suggests that local factories need new investment so that they can be reconstructed. To be sure, Milena does not say how this could be done, but she puts also the issue of the local factories on the agenda of the group. Deliberation stays high.

***Vladan, Serb (code 2): You have said everything.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As twice before, Vladan wants to end the discussion. He is not willing to take up the issues of the spa, the silver mine and the factories. The discussion is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* As Maria Clara Jaramillo also found out, dialogue fatigue negatively affects deliberation. Vladan has enough of sitting at the table and taking notes. Telling everybody that “they” have said everything, he definitely disrupts the flow of discussion. It will be very difficult for them to recover the discussion at high level of deliberation, when they are directly asked to quit discussion.

***Milena, Serb (code 3):*** I’m not old neither young but I see that children are unhappy. They can learn something through the computer, they can be in touch with somebody, but they can barely find some important information there. That internet is not helping them much.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena yields to Vladan and does not insist that the issues that she has brought up are further discussed. Instead, she comes back to her worries about the children in Srebrenica but does not offer anything new, except to say that the internet is not good for the children, without making any suggestions how the situation with the internet could be remedied. Thus deliberation stays at a low level.



**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** I am not young either.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With his off-topic remark the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** But I'm older than you. I saw that there are those children who have gone, I do not know by whom, to the sea. And small children went too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena continues to express her concern about the fate of children in Srebrenica. This time she seems to refer to small children, who are given away abroad to be adopted because of the dire situation in Srebrenica. Again, she does not offer any suggestion of how the situation could be improved, so that the situation stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 4):** The only people who work something are NGO's. And it's not much, they can't do as much as the local government should do. If something is done, it is done by some NGO. The government just separates people; frightens one side against the other, says that we do not need to live together, so that they can rule us. They want to prolong their time.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This is an important contribution of Emina, when she makes the statement that the local government wants the two ethnic groups to be separated so that it keep its power. The message of this statement is that ordinary citizens of both sides have to begin to work together to get rid of the corrupt local politicians. Thereby, she expresses hope that perhaps some NGO's may be on the side of ordinary citizens, although Emina acknowledges that NGO's have little power. This statement could be out of a textbook on deliberation with its emphasis on citizen deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* With her statement, Emina opens the way to high deliberative discussion. While the discussion was dragging on at a low level of deliberation, after Vladan had pushed participants to

quickly over the discussion, Emina tries to launch a new argument, which has a strong relation to the improvement of future of BiH: the work of NGOs. Discussion is back at a high level of deliberation.

***Svetlana, Serb (code 2): Will we sign?***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* There is a strange group dynamic in the sense that several times it is proposed that the discussion should come to its end, and then it continues nevertheless. Now it is Svetlana who does not want to talk about the suggestion of Emina about citizen activities across the ethnic divide but prefers that they sign the letter to the High Representative. In this way the discussion is transformed again to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* The proposal of Emina would have been crucial for a discussion about a better future, if it would have been made earlier in the discussion. However, at this point fatigue is increasingly setting in. Svetlana again manifests her willing to come to an end. With her request about signing the letter, the opportunities for participants to take over the issue opened by Emina are disrupted. The discussion precipitates again down to a low level of deliberation.

***Vladan, Serb (code 3): Right at the top.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan agrees that the discussion has come to an end, as he was firstly suggesting sometime before, and as note taker he indicates that they should sign the letter to the High Representative right at the top.

***Svetlana, Serb (code 3):*** And this is what we will send to the High Representative.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana reinforces her position that the discussion should end in stating categorically that they have now what will be sent to the High Representative.

**Milena, Serb (code 4):** What is needed is a language school, for children to learn. Especially English they need to learn more in school. They learn, I think German and English. But most of the children should learn English. They need to have opportunity to learn it. All items are in English, and on those computers. It would be easier for them to communicate with everyone. That's just necessary. I understand it (English) well but I am not able to speak it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Notwithstanding the discussion fatigue demonstrated by Vladan and Svetlana, Milena continues to insist on the issue of better education for children, adding however a new related topic to the agenda: the need for children to better learn English, in order to be able to better take the opportunities that contemporary world offers. The topic potentially opens the floor, again, to new constructive interventions. The discussion is back on its high deliberative track.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* According to the research design it is up to the participants and not the moderator to bring the discussion to an end. Although Vladan and Svetlana have stated categorically that the discussion has ended, Milena continues the discussion and even manages to transform it back to a high level of deliberation in putting more English language training on the agenda. This proposal goes together with her earlier suggestions that young people should get easier visas to go abroad to learn about new ideas. And for this, Milena continues now, learning English is essential. It is a good idea for improving the future of BiH. Discussion may re-start again on a high deliberative path.

**Emina, Bošnjak (code 1):** I can understand some occasional words.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emina interacts and stays on topic in giving her personal story of understanding English.

**Milena, Serb (code 1):** And at school we must pay.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena also stays on topic in regretting that they have to pay for English language lessons.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 2): Have we finished?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana gets impatient and definitively does not want to address still another issue. With this refusal she transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

*Explanation of the transformative moment:* As evident in her previous interventions, Svetlana has definitely enough of discussions. This time, as Vladan before, she explicitly ask participants to have a stop. Participants will be taken aback by Svetlana's intervention, and as such it will be very difficult to recover the discussion back to high levels of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** Do we have anything that is positive? We need to put one point at least.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena yields to Svetlana and does not insist that the discussion on English language training continues and seems now also ready that the discussion comes to an end. She suggests that in the letter to the High Representative at least one positive item should be put. But since she does not say what this positive item could be, the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** We have written nongovernmental organizations.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Vladan reminds Milena that they have already written down the positive role that some NGO's play. Nothing new enters the discussion, so that it stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** If at least someone does something for these children; to help them to socialize and travel. It does not matter where you go ... just go...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena expresses once again her concern for the children. As André Bächtiger argues, it is compatible with good deliberation to insist on an argument,<sup>223</sup> but Milena has now expressed her concern for the well-being of the children so many times that it becomes tedious. Deliberation stays at a low level.

***Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):*** I am a member of the association “Strength of women” from Tuzla, and they have sent some children from Srebrenica somewhere outside.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion is still not at the end with Emina being interactive with Milena giving her an information what her organization does with children from Srebrenica. This information, however, does not bring any new aspect about a better future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, so that the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

***Milena, Serb (code 3):*** There are children who cannot afford to travel, so at least in this way they can go to seaside. There they meet other people, learn something, have a contest, just great. It was on the television once. Children ... and there are a few of them. Now there is only one class from school. Before it were the 4-5 grades.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena still expressing her concern about the well-being of the children.

***Emina, Bošnjak (code 3):*** People are leaving this place.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This is a relevant information, but since Emina does not say how this exodus from Srebrenica could be stopped, the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

---

<sup>223</sup> André Bächtiger, Shawn Rosenberg, Seraina Pedrini, Mirjam Ryser, and Marco R. Steenbergen, “Discourse Quality Index 2: An Updated Measurement Instrument for Deliberative Processes,” Paper Presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, September 10-12, 2009.

**Milena, Serb (code 3):** That's it. You don't have a job, so you have to go somewhere else. I don't think that we can add or say anything more.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Milena summarizes the main point of the discussion that since there are no jobs, people have to leave, but even she wants to bring the discussion to an end.

**Vladan, Serb (code 3):** That's all (handing to the moderator the letter to the High Representative)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is by agreement of the group that the discussion should come to an end.

### **4.3 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 2 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether fifteen deliberative transformative moments, eight downwards and seven upwards, so that the discussion ended at a low level. Again, I will start with summarizing my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. Afterwards, I will show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

#### **4.3.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation**

For all negative transformative moments from high to low level of deliberation, I found explanations that correspond to what Maria Clara Jaramillo found for Colombian ex-combatants: off-topic and confusion, despair and hopelessness, discussion fatigue.

However, I add new nuances to these explanations, considering the personal back-ground of participants and particularly their attitudes towards inter-group dialogue and contact.

The first downward transformative moment was triggered by an off-topic statement that worked as conflict avoidance strategy. The statement is of Serb Milena, when she reacted to the very deliberative proposal made by Emina about unifying school programs for all three constituent national groups of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Emina's proposal was opening a new perspective for the country of inter-group dialogue and reconciliation. However, Emina tackled a very sensitive issue in Bosnia-Herzegovina, that of historical revisionism. As each national group teaches its own version of historical happenings, ethnic nationalism is perpetuated generation after generation, reinforcing prejudices and stereotypes against out-groups. As a very ethno-nationalistic oriented person, Milena could hardly accept the proposal made by Emina.<sup>224</sup> Having a single history for Bosnia-Herzegovina means for a strong Serb like her to be ready to come to compromise with Bošnjaks, to discuss and maybe to accept their interpretation of the history. In Srebrenica that means to accept the thesis of the genocide perpetrated by Serbs against Bošnjaks. Instead of explicitly rejecting the proposal made by Emina, Milena opts, however, for a strategy of conflict avoidance, going off-topic, coming back to previous issues and dropping the discussion to a low level of deliberation. Maria Clara Jaramillo, in her research of ex combatants in Colombia, found similar situations where a speech act was so off-topic that the discussion was transformed to a low level.<sup>225</sup> Actors may sometimes have good reasons to avoid a conflict, and such a behavior is not necessarily always detrimental to good deliberation. In this case, however, conflict avoidance leads Milena completely off-topic, with detrimental effects for the deliberative flow of the discussion.

The second transformative moment from high to low levels of deliberation is triggered by despair and hopelessness, and again the speech act comes from Milena. At this occasion, she does not continue to discuss the question of how corruption on the job market could be overcome. She instead expresses a great

---

<sup>224</sup> Investigating personal attitudes of participants in relation to inter-group relations, including prejudices and stereotypes about the out-group, in this sense, may facilitate and strengthen the reliability of analysis of transformative moments during inter-group talks.

<sup>225</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. Cit., p. 201.

despair, saying that nobody will anyway listen to their demands. It appears to her therefore pointless to continue the discussion. She transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation, closing space for improving the situation with regard to corruption. As Maria Clara Jaramillo already noticed in her research with ex combatants in Colombia, despair may be often detrimental to deliberation. As she states, "Deliberation is basically an optimistic model in the sense that it is based on hope that ultimately life can be somehow improved if people are only are willing to talk with each other about common solutions. Expressions of extreme hopelessness and despair can easily discourage other participants to continue the discussion at a constructive deliberative level".<sup>226</sup>

The third transformative moment, from high to low level of deliberation, again, is provoked by Serb Milena. This time, lack of respect towards other's ideas was the triggering factor. The discussion had just turned to a high deliberative path, when Serb Svetlana in relation to the need of creating new jobs also in the private sector, had introduced the relevant issue that neither Serbs nor Bošnjaks should discriminate each other. The deliberative opportunity launched by Svetlana has been immediately rejected by Milena. It seems that, as soon as the discussion tackles issues potentially sensitive along the ethnic cleavage, Milena reacts in a very negative way. As we have seen in the introduction of the participants, she was among the three Serbs the most hostile towards the Bošnjaks, which manifests itself in such ethnically sensitive issues. As respect for the ideas of others comes at the heart of deliberative theory, the flow of discussion is transformed towards a low level of deliberation.

The fourth negative transformative moment is due, for the second time, to despair. This time it is Serb Svetlana who does not use the space opened by Milena to talk about using elections in an effective way. It is remarkable that now it is Milena who opened space for a high level deliberation, while at other times she was responsible that the discussion turned down to a low level. So the group dynamics allows participants to take over different roles and not to stick

---

<sup>226</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit., p. 151.



constantly with the same role. Svetlana does not use the space offered by Milena and instead reacts with a confused and despairing statement.

The fifth transformative moment is triggered, for the third time, by despair. The discussion seemed at that time to come to an end with a prolonged silence and the tacit request from participants to let the discussion come to an end. Hence, I as moderator asked participants if they had something to add in reference to the specific situation in Srebrenica, anything positive, something that functions well. The negative answer given by Emina, as a pure expression of despair and hopelessness broke definitely with the possibility for the discussion to continue at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation is killed by despair and hopelessness: nothing positive exists, not in Srebrenica nor in Bosnia-Herzegovina in general. As such, the future of the country cannot be but gloom. Also Maria Clara Jaramillo found that despair in deeply divided society may frequently overwhelm the potential for high deliberation, triggering transformative moment from high to low level of deliberation. An example is the following statement by ex-paramilitary Bruno: "There will never be peace in Colombia. Why? And you know why there will never be peace? Because war is a business."

The sixth negative transformative moment was triggered by fatigue. When Vladan, as note taker, tells everybody that "they" have said everything, he definitely disrupts the deliberative flow of the discussion. Dialogue fatigue negatively affects deliberation. Also the seventh and the eighth negative transformative moments were triggered by fatigue. In both cases, it was Svetlana who transformed the discussion flow from high to low level of deliberation. The first time came when she interrupted the positive deliberative flow opened by Emina, who had introduced into the discussion the fresh issue of NGOs and their role to improve living conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The opportunities for participants to take over the issue opened by Emina were therefore disrupted, and the discussion fell down to a low level of deliberation. Svetlana, however, was not able to put an end to the discussion, and instead a new fresh topic was launched by Milena, namely the need for free English courses for children and adults. Svetlana intervenes, this time very abruptly, and explicitly asking if they

have finished. With this refusal to address the new topic, she transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation. With her constant attempt to make the meeting over, Svetlana acts as “dragging down actor” for the discussion. As observed by Maria Clara Jaramillo in her empirical research with dialogues of ex combatants in Colombia, “(...) in addition to deliberative leaders, there [are] also actors who took an opposite role, dragging down deliberation”<sup>227</sup> Considering the background of Svetlana as a not polarizing ethnic oriented person, but instead of being potentially open to inter-group dialogue and empathy, I do not think that her fatigue and willingness to abandon the discussion was due to her hostility towards inter-group contact and exchange. As the remuneration of 20 KM for participating in the discussion was a very good incentive to take part to the discussion, and considering her despair, repetitively expressed through her speech acts, about her poor economic situation, it is more probable that she simply felt bored by the discussion, that she considered her task for the 20KM done and that she had, maybe, something else to do, and therefore it was time to move on. It is worthwhile to notice instead that Emina and Milena, even if extremely polarized in their ethnic belonging and therefore potentially unwilling to experience inter-group contact and talk, were the most inter-active and deliberative across the group. This comparison between Svetlana on the one hand and Emina and Milena on the hand shows how complex it is from the group dynamics who wants to be deliberative and who not.

#### 4.3.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation

Discussion of group 2 was characterized by seven upward transformative moments. Also for these positive transformations, I found out explanations that fully correspond to those factors already identified by Maria Clara Jaramillo as triggering upward transformation from low to high level of deliberation. Also in this case, I claim that having more background information on participants and

---

227 Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit., p. 201.

their attitude to inter-group relations may add further nuances to these explanations.

The first upward transformative moment is triggered by Emina, when she brings a new aspect into the discussion claiming that jobs are given out based on political party affiliation and family relations (nepotism). She talks as she is familiar with this issue, and expecting that also other participants have the same experience. She is right. Participants start to be positively interactive. The discussion is transformed to a high level of deliberation. I claim that it is not only a matter of storytelling and fresh subjects to transform a discussion to a high level of deliberation. I claim that a topic to be successful in bridging divisions across the ethnic line and create favorable conditions for deliberation, should concern a joint inter-group target not undermining group identities and affiliation. This super-ordinate goal can be better achieved if groups cooperate together to get it.<sup>228</sup> To fight corruption is a super-ordinate issue. It is diffused among Bošnjak politicians, as well as among Serb politicians. In this sense, changing the political class should be a common goal for the participants in the group. To reduce corruption from the political system of Bosnia-Herzegovina could be achieved only if the electorate, across the ethnic cleavage, agreed on removing their corrupted politicians. Unfortunately, political power, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, is strongly linked to ethno-nationalism. The political system is built upon ethno-political affiliation, and the perpetuating of nationalist narratives. This means that even if in principle there should be room for hope in considering the removal of the current political class as a common target across the ethnic cleavage in our discussion group, in time of political campaign there are serious doubts that this target could be effectively achieved. Political campaigns, indeed, tend to polarize the electorate on a strict ethno-nationalistic base, causing moderates to abandon their potentially positive inter-ethnic attitudes. As previous empirical researchers have found out, while “ordinary citizens have the potential capacity to address political issues in a deliberative way”, one should consider

---

<sup>228</sup> Mazufar Sherif and Carolyn Wood Sherif, *Groups in harmony and tension*, Harper & Row, New York: 1957.

that this process is possible when the conditions for deliberation are particularly favorable conditions, and specifically when citizens do not have to make any authoritative decision.<sup>229</sup> I particularly refer, here, to the research made by Simone Chambers, as one of the earliest attempts to study the level of deliberation among citizens with direct observations, when the issue at stake was a very politically sensitive one, as the potential independence of Québec in Canada. She disappointedly found out that the potential for deliberation emerged during preliminary informal conferences among citizens discussing the issue at stake was almost killed by the polarized tones that the political campaign assumed in the proximity of the effective referendum.<sup>230</sup> Finding common interests as a ground for common talks, generally on the base of individual interests, at its turn out, may trigger the perception of belonging to a super-categorized group, transcending the ethnic cleavage. In very divided societies, this step may represent the very base for triggering ethnic contact, inter-group dialogue, and, lastly, pave the way to reconciliation.

The second upward transformative moment was triggered by Svetlana. In the previous section, I noticed that Svetlana generally acted as a “dragging down” actor, often destroying the flow of deliberation, especially because of fatigue. In one intervention, however, she was able to transform the level of deliberation from low to high. It was when she claimed that everybody, no matter the ethnic group, should be entitled to have a job. In a very deliberative way, she is underlining how the topic may represent a super-ordinate goal that groups should fight to achieve across the ethnic cleavage. According to her, there are factories that may be reactivated and work, offering therefore employment opportunities to all local people. The discussion is back to a high level of deliberation, once again, by a new topic featuring the characteristics of a super-ordinate goal.

---

<sup>229</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, op. cit., pp. 42-45.

<sup>230</sup> Pamela Johnston Conover came to similar conclusions with their focus groups in UK and US, aimed at investigating to what extent ordinary citizens are able and willing to address political issues in a deliberative way. Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

The third positive transformative moment was triggered by a rational argumentation made by Milena, when she offers Svetlana an argument why abstention in elections may be counterproductive in helping the current authorities. This rational argument seems to be based on a good knowledge of how elections work. Milena transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in opening space to discuss of how to use elections in an effective way. As a contribution to the theoretical controversy in the deliberation theory about the justification of arguments, whether they all need to be justified in a very rational and logical way, or whether narratives and storytelling may also serve the same scope<sup>231</sup>, I found out, so far, that both cases may be relevant, consistent with what Maria Clara Jaramillo found out in her research with ex combatants in Colombia. As she states,

*“Although personal stories and humor sometimes helped to raise the level of deliberation, rational arguments sometimes also played a role. (...) So deliberative scholars should not go overboard in stressing the importance of stories and humor; the Habermasian argument that rationality is important for good deliberation still keeps its relevance”.*<sup>232</sup>

The fourth transformative moment is triggered, once more, by the introduction of a new topic having the features of a super-ordinate goal: the liberalization of visa regime for citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina. For a better future of the country, it is indeed highly relevant that the visa problem is solved, so that young people can travel abroad and come back with new ideas. It is Bošnjak Emina who triggers this upward transformation, confirming her attitude as a good deliberative leader. As noted by Maria Clara Jaramillo, deliberative leadership is to be considered crucial as a triggering factor for upward transformative moment.

---

<sup>231</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>232</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit., pp. 73-74

*“An important factor causing a transformative moment from a low to a high level of deliberation is the existence of deliberative leaders. (...) Such leaders (...) took the floor at the very beginning of the discussion at a high level of deliberation. In this way, they established themselves as deliberative leaders. When later in the discussion, the level of deliberation remained low, meandering without clear direction (...) leaders took several times the initiative to bring back the discussion to a high level of deliberation”.<sup>233</sup>*

Emina had already earlier introduced herself as a potential deliberative leader. This time, she intervened for recovering the discussion at a high level of deliberation, definitely confirming her leadership role. It is interesting to note that she admitted in the questionnaire to be confident with her deliberative potential. It is also interesting observing that her strong attitude to in-group favoritism, as well as her rancorous feelings towards the Serbian out-group, did not preclude her to assume a deliberative leading role. One has to notice, however, that several items in her background questionnaire she indicated the potential for deliberation leadership. She has wished, for instance, in a very deliberative spirit that collective identities should have less importance in Bosnia-Herzegovina, because they are the reason that it is definitely a divided country. In this sense, she also demonstrates tolerance and openness towards equal rights for all groups, even if under the condition that the country should remain united. She lives in a mono-ethnic neighborhood: while she has ordinary contacts with Bošnjaks, she has poor occasions of contact with Serbs, even if, as she admits, she has good friends belonging to all three ethnic groups. Maybe this can be considered a possible openness to inter-group dialogue, even if starting from very strong ethno-national affiliation? I will try through the analysis of other groups to try to find an answer to this question.

The fifth upward transformative moment was triggered by a new topic introduced into the discussion by Milena, having the features, once more, of a

---

<sup>233</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 72.

super-ordinate goal. Notwithstanding the discussion fatigue demonstrated by some participants, Milena overcomes her despair and talks with great enthusiasm about the benefits for Srebrenica, if the spa would again be opened. It is a non-sensitive issue, and in this sense it opens the floor to discussion, raising back the level of deliberation up to a high level.

The sixth positive transformative moment was triggered once again by Emina, confirming her role as a deliberative leader. She introduced again a new topic for the future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, namely the positive work of non-governmental-organizations. I would observe that, contrary to previous topics, this one has not the features of being a potential common goal to make groups cooperate together for its achievement. In this sense, the potential to trigger effective deliberative flows may be considered lesser than those related to a super-ordinate goal. I will come back to this issue while analyzing other speech acts and dialogues, in order to verify the recurrence of this dynamic, both for super-ordinate goals and for neutral deliberative topics.

The seventh and final upward transformative moment was activated again by Milena, when despite the discussion fatigue already expressed several times by Svetlana and Vladan, did anyway propose a new topic for discussion: the need for English classes, for both children and adults. This topic has the characteristics of a super-ordinate goal. To improve opportunities for citizens in general, both Bošnjaks and Serbs could agree of how to distribute public resources at the municipal level. It is worthwhile to note how, Milena notwithstanding her personal background and strong ethno-nationalist affiliation, far more than Emina, is able to turn to be highly deliberative, and transformed the discussion to high levels three times, even as she acted as “dragging down”, three time, too. I will come back later to this ambivalence. I will come back to ambivalence as an attitude, and not necessarily as a specific content of a speech act, across my analysis. In principle, I agree with Maria Clara Jaramillo when she

says that ambivalence may be a very deliberative element, against “clear-cut positions” that may instead close the door to deliberative potential<sup>234</sup>.

#### 4.5. Outcomes and deliberation

How did deliberation impact on the outcomes of group discussions? As for Group 1, I will investigate in this section how the deliberative pattern is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. Again, I will use the graphic form for Group 2, where H stands for a speech act at a high level of deliberation, and L for a speech act at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt altogether with eight substantive issues: better conditions for children, complication of school programs; unemployment; nepotism; corruption; liberalization of visa regime; NGOs; need of schools for foreign languages. In this order, I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= decision on better conditions for children; D2= decision on complication of school programs; D3= decision on unemployment; D4= decision on nepotism; D5= decision on corruption; D6= decision on liberalization of visa regime; D7= decision on NGOs; D8= decision on school of foreign language.

##### 4.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 2

H----D1----- D2--D3- (11)

L----- (8)

H--D4---D5 (5)

L----- (30)

---

<sup>234</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, op. cit., p. 89.



H- (1)

L-- (2)

H- (1)

L----- (6)

H---D6 (3)

(Intervention of moderator)

L---- (4)

H----- (9)

L---- (4)

H-D7 (1)

L--- 3)

H---D8 (3)

L----- (9)

There were in total 91 speech acts, 34 at a high level of deliberation, 57 at a low level.

The discussion was dominated by despair and, later on, by fatigue. Nevertheless, eight decisions were adopted. Where are these decisions located?

D1, D2 and D3 were all located at the very beginning of the discussion when it was at high level of deliberation. These decisions were formulated in these terms in the letter to the High Representative: D1 “Better conditions for children for meeting and playing”; D2 “Programs at school are complicated and profuse”; D3 “More work places in Bosnia-Herzegovina”. All these three decisions represent, again, super-ordinate goals. They entail relevant interests across the ethnic cleavage, and to be obtained they require a certain level of cooperation or at least coordination between Bošnjaks and Serbs. It is relevant to note that these targets do not entail sensitive issues, such as unification of history programs at schools, or discrimination along the ethnic cleavage. As we observed in Chapter3, also here there is an interaction effect between finding a common ground and deliberation. Deliberation helped the group to find common ground and common ground helped deliberation, so that a positive feedback loop could evolve over a relatively longer sequence of high deliberation. As soon as a politically sensitive issue are tackled, however, the dynamic of deliberative discussion tends to stop. In deeply divided societies, where ordinary citizens are expected to be more or less polarised along in-group affiliation and out-group repulsion, it may happens that as soon as the potential common ground is perceived as a potential threat to in-group identity and survival, it is highly probable that the positive flow of deliberative discussion will be interrupted. A good example for this pattern is when Milena adopted a strategy of conflict avoidance, going off-topic to avoid to consider Emina’s proposal to unify historical books at school.

When the flow of discussion is recovered to high levels of deliberation, the group quickly agree on two proposed items. D4 is taken almost immediately, and it is formulated in the following terms: “Employment of young people independently from political affiliation”. As a related issue, also D5, “Corruption in all segments of society is big”, is adopted immediately afterwards, following the trend of positive deliberative interaction<sup>235</sup>.

---

<sup>235</sup> See previous footnote.

When the deliberative flow is interrupted by Milena with her expression of despair and hopelessness, the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation for a very long time (30 speech acts), with many expressions of despair, hopelessness, and fatigue. During this long sequence no decisions were made.

After a quick back and forth between high and low levels of deliberation, D6 “Liberalisation of Visa”, is taken, once again, when the discussion – even if short – was at a high level of deliberation.

D7 “NGO”, is taken immediately after an upward transformative moment, as well as D8 “Need for school of foreign languages for children”.

As a conclusion, as for Group 1, a linkage between deliberation and outcome is valid also for Group 2. A sequence of deliberation helps to arrive at a substantive outcome. By contrast, if the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation, the outcome lacks substance. As an intervening variable, one has to consider the issue under discussion. If the issue is politically sensitive, or if despair, or fatigue with the discussion have set in, it is most difficult to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. The best condition to transform a discussion to a high level of deliberation and to keep it at this level for some length of time is when participants share a common interest, as a super-ordinate goal, such as fighting unemployment, nepotism, corruption, and improving living conditions for children and young people.

## **Chapter 5: Third Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica**

### **5.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>236</sup>**

**Mevlida**, 27 years old, woman, Bošnjak. She used to live in Zvornik (Rep. Srpska), and for one year she lives now in Srebrenica in a mono-ethnic Bošnjak neighborhood. She was in the country during the war and lost both friends and family members. She is religious. Mevlida is politically active. She declares that her ethnic group is threatened, but she does not take position on the question of who is responsible for the war. With regard to inter-ethnic cooperation she takes a moderate position in all questions raised in the questionnaire.

**Esen**, 27 years old, woman, she defines herself Bosnian (she is Bošnjak). She has been living in Srebrenica for 2 years, in a multi-ethnic neighborhood, living in Sarajevo before. She thinks that in Srebrenica one ethnic group is more dominant than others. She was in BiH during the war and experienced loss of friends and relatives. She is religious. She appears to be very close to her ethnic identity, defending her group, and thinking that the BiH government defends too much other groups. According to her, every ethnic group is responsible for war, but Serbs a little bit more. She is against fractioning BiH, even if she admits that her group has been threatened as a collective identity during the last years. She is politically active.

**Katarina**, 53 years old, Serbian woman: She lives in Bileća, Rep. Srpska, close to Trebinje, where she thinks that one ethnic group is dominant, in a mono-ethnic neighborhood. She was in BiH during the war, losing friends and relatives. She does not think that religion is an important component of her life. She thinks

---

<sup>236</sup> The participants in this group were selected randomly among teachers participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center.

that group's interests are more important than individuals' scopes. She does not think that her group was threatened in its identity during the last years. She is politically active.

**Snežana**, 58 years old, Serb, woman. She does not think that religion is an important component of her life. She lives in Srebrenica, in a mono-ethnic neighborhood, since 1981. She was in BiH during the war, losing friends. She manifests a strong group belonging. She is moderate in many of her declarations, but when the issue of inter-ethnic marriage come on, she is not sure that she will be happy if her son will marry a women from another ethnic group. She is politically active.

**Božana**, 47 years old, Serb, woman. She is not very religious. She lives in Bratunac, that she defines almost as an "multi-ethnic" in a mono-ethnic neighborhood. She has been living there for seven years, living in Donji Vakuf before. She was in BiH during the war, losing friends and relatives. She manifests a strong group belonging. She thinks that all groups should be blamed for responsibility of the war in BiH. She seems timidly to admit that maybe each ethnic group should be better protect in a mono-ethnic State, and she does not say whether Bošnjaks are claiming BiH to be their country and nobody else's. She doesn't know how to answer the question of accepting her son marrying a woman from another ethnic group. She is politically active.

**Sabina**, 27 years old, Bošnjak, woman. She is very religious. She has been living in Srebrenica for one year, in a mono-ethnic neighborhood, living before in Kalesija (Fed BiH, close to Tuzla). She was in BiH during the war, but she did not experience loss of relatives or friends. She stands for a united BiH, against fractioning, but she thinks that the political system does not support this scope. She is open to dialogue with all groups, admitting that all of them are responsible for war. However, she thinks that inter-ethnic marriages are not stable, and she could not be happy if her son would marry a Croat or a Serb woman. She thinks that Croats and Serbs want to secede and to either join their mother-countries or to stand as new independent countries. She is politically active.

**Aida**, 27 years old, Bošnjak, woman. Religion is a very important component of her life (she is the only one in the group wearing a scarf). She's been living for 10 months in Srebrenica-Potočari (the place where genocide took place), living in Srebrenica before. She defines her city multi-ethnic, as well as her neighborhood. She thinks that the political system does not support inter-ethnic dialogue. She was in BiH during the war, helping military and paramilitaries of her group, and losing friends and relatives. She claims that Serbs are the most responsible of war. She manifests a strong group belonging, but admitting that sometimes she is not proud of what they have done. She is in favor of a united BiH, She could not be happy if her son would marry a Serb or a Croat. She thinks that Croats and Serbs want to secede and to either join their mother-countries or to stand as new independent countries. She is politically active.

**Andjela**, 27 years old, Serb, woman. She is moderately religious. She has been living in Srebrenica for 4 years, defining it as a multi-ethnic city, in a multi-ethnic neighborhood. She was not in BiH during the war. She lost friends and relatives during it. She manifests a strong group belonging. She is not sure that a united country is the best way to protect and defend ethnic groups. War was due to all ethnic groups in BiH. She admits she could not be happy if her son would marry a Croat or a Bošnjak woman. She is not politically active.

---

## 5.2 Group structure

The eight participants in this group have in common that they are all teachers who did participate in the activities of Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center. They are all women, which is an interesting setting since one may expect that women are particularly prone to deliberate especially if they among themselves.<sup>237</sup> With regard to age, the spread was from 27 to 58. Ethnically, the group was exactly split with four Serbs and four Bošnjaks. With

---

<sup>237</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 216.

one exception, during the war they were all in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Also with one exception, they all reported to have lost family members and friends during the war. All participants expressed a strong identity with their ethnic group, not being happy if one of their children would marry someone from the other ethnic group. All but one of the participants declared that they were politically interested. Religiously, there was a split between the Serbs and the Bošnjaks in the group with all of the latter declaring themselves very religious, whereas for the former religion is not important. This is a highly relevant difference showing that the Serbs defined themselves more in ethnic terms, the Bošnjaks more in religious terms. Who was responsible for the civil war? One Bošnjak woman was firm that the Serbs were responsible, while all other participants either responded that all sides were responsible or did not take position on this sensitive issue. These generally moderate positions on the guilt for the civil war augured well that some deliberation might be possible in this particular group.

### 5.3 Group discussion

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

#### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>238</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if

---

<sup>238</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

## *2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

## *3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*



This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

#### *4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

***Moderator:*** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina, to be delivered to the High Representative?

***Katarina, Serb (code 1):*** I suggest that we first discuss and then write one paper... we should be economical and not use eight papers but only one.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina opens the discussion on a procedural matter, which seems appropriate from a deliberative perspective. She proposes that the group should first have the discussion and write the letter to the High Representative only afterwards. She does not wish that notes are taken during the discussion. The justification is that this method to proceed is more economical.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Will we have anything from writing this (letter)?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina asks the fundamental question whether writing the letter will have any consequences for the people in Srebrenica. This is a very relevant question given the general frustration with the political leaders, as we seen in the other discussion groups. So it is understandable that Sabina at the very beginning wants to know whether it is worthwhile to have the discussion at all. With this question, Sabina keeps the level of deliberation high, opening space for the group to discuss whether ordinary citizens have any influence at all. If this question would be answered in the negative, it would be pointless to have the discussion.

**Božana, Serb (code 1):** Yeah, will they fulfill what we write?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana as Serb reaches over to Sabina as Bošnjak and also expresses doubts whether the letter to the High Representative will have any effect. It is important that at this very beginning of the discussion there is a common view expressed across the ethnic divide, indicating that at the grass root level people from both sides may have similar life worlds in the sense of Habermas.<sup>239</sup> The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** So that we do not write this in vain.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* When Katarina in her earlier statement proposed how the discussion and the writing of the letter should be organized, the implication was that the letter would have a purpose. Now Katarina reacts in an interactive way with Sabina and Božana and shares their concern that the letter may have no impact. It makes sense for the group to address the question of whether writing a letter to the High Representative will have any effect. This is an issue that is also widely discussed in the deliberative

---

<sup>239</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1981, S. 159.

literature with the worry that discussions in mini publics may have no policy impact. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation<sup>240</sup>.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** Who will fulfill this? All of them work for their needs. And we are just material, as this letter.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana shares the doubt that the letter will have any policy impact. As justification for her doubts she claims that political leaders look only for their own needs, misusing ordinary people as non-human material for their own purposes. Thus, Snežana claims that political leaders have no interest in involving ordinary citizens in a deliberative manner. The discussion is already at the heart of politics in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and both ethnic sides are involved. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** Shall we begin?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida intervenes for the first time and proposes that the discussion on the letter to the High Representative should begin. Without stating it explicitly, she seems to be of the opinion that it makes sense for the group to write a letter to the High Representative. With this procedural proposal, she opens space to put aside the doubts of the previous speakers and to address the question assigned to the group how life in Bosnia-Herzegovina can be improved. With this statement, Aida takes on a deliberative leadership position, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** What do we write in this message? Let's think about it.

*Interpretation of level of justification:* Katarina agrees with Aida that despite all the doubts about the effectiveness of the letter to the High Representative, the group should begin with the substantive discussion. She urges the group to think about what should stand in the letter. It is in a

---

<sup>240</sup> Steiner, *Foundations of Deliberative Democracy*, Chapter 10.

deliberative spirit that she wishes to hear what other participants have to say. The level of deliberation stays high.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** To send our message to him.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana, too, overcomes her doubts about the effectiveness of the letter and now agrees that the group should send a message to the High Representative. In her earlier statement, Snežana claimed that political leaders only care for their own needs and treat ordinary citizens as non-human material. It is remarkable how Aida could change the group dynamic when she proposed that they should begin with the substantive discussion. Now even Snežana, who had expressed the most doubts about whether the letter will have any influence turns around and wants to send a message to the High Representative. Deliberation continues at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** What shall it all be?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina asks again the other participants what they shall put into the letter. She tries to stimulate ideas to be expressed, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** Oh, we need so much.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana states in a general way that there are so many needs. With this formulation she encourages the other participants to articulate specific needs. Deliberation continues at a high level.

**Mevlida, Bošnjak (code 1):** I need everything, I have nowhere to live.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mevlida speaks up for the first time. In an interactive way, she follows up to what Snežana said and agrees with her that there are many needs. Mevlida becomes specific and tells her story that she has nowhere to live. Presumably she lives with family or friends. Mevlida is the first to articulate a specific need, thus opening space for others also to become specific. This is a good example how a story helps to keep deliberation at a high

level, as Maria Clara Jaramillo has shown with many cases in her dissertation on the group discussions between ex-guerrillas and ex-paramilitaries in Colombia.<sup>241</sup> Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Me too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion flows in an interactive way with Katarina having listened to Mevlida and adding her own story that she has nowhere to live. These two stories of Mevlida and Katarina create a common life world across the ethnic divide. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** First, let's start from that, I have no job, I have nothing-

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina adds her own story telling the group that she has no job. She even adds that she has nothing at all, expressing in this way utter despair. With the stories of Mevlida, Katarina and Sabina a basis is set to discuss how life in Srebrenica can be improved. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** OK, they said to do this in the form of theses. First housing, then my job, and car.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana attempts to bring order into the discussion. She reminds the group that the moderator and her helper demanded that the letter to the High Representative should be written in the form of theses. Having listened to what was already mentioned, Snežana lists housing and jobs, and adds cars as unfilled needs. Deliberation continues at a high level.

**Esen, Bosnian (code 1):** Wait, I did not understand, do they think about us in personal terms or something else.

---

<sup>241</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion continues in a serious way with Mevlida raising the procedural question whether they should deal with personal matters or with something broader. It is in a deliberative spirit that Mevlida acknowledges that she has not understood what is expected of the group and asks other participants to clarify for her. Articulating such a question corresponds to the key deliberative criterion of reciprocity, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** I cannot put a shoe on another shoe, while I am barefoot. What should I do?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina uses a metaphor to answer Mevlida. She argues that one cannot discuss general matters when the most basic personal needs are not fulfilled. If one is barefoot, one cannot talk about shoes. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Mevlida, Bošnjak (code 1):** I thought about us, not only about me.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now Mevlida gives her own answer to her earlier question and proposes that they should discuss matters that concern all in the group. Again Mevlida refers to the principle of reciprocity that all in the group should listen to each other, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** I think of all of us, too. We are all the same. We all have the same needs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina agrees with Mevlida that the group should discuss common problems. As justification she states that they have all the same needs. In this way Katarina creates a common life world, which according to Habermas is an important precondition for deliberation.<sup>242</sup> Katarina follows up on the metaphor in her earlier statement that when all are

---

<sup>242</sup> Habermas, Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns, S. 159.

barefoot they have the same needs. The discussion flows nicely at a high level of deliberation with the participants building on each other's contributions with no hard edges across the ethnic divide between Serbs and Bošnjaks.

**Božana, Serb (code 1):** Let's put the economy, because it's the most necessary.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana stays on topic and adds the economy to the list of great needs. Her justification is that the economy is the most important issue to be resolved. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** First, employ people, and then children will be born, everything will be just good.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina as Bošnjak agrees with Božana as Serb that the economy is the most important issue. It continues to be remarkable how easily it is for the group to reach over to the other ethnic side. Sabina justifies the importance of the economy that its improvement will allow families to have children and care for them. It should be noted that in the culture of Srebrenica to have children and to be able to care for children is of great emotional value. If it would be easier to have children, Sabina sees a bright future over all. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Božana, Serb (code1):** To bring back people. The first thing is that people are moving out of here. There is no single person on the streets in the evening. This is horrible. I live here, and swear to God, as years are passing by, it is worse and worse.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion flows nicely at a high level of deliberation. In her earlier statement Božana claimed that improving the economy is the most important task. Now she justifies this claim. Her argument is that due to the bad economy people leave Srebrenica, which can be seen in the empty streets in the evenings. Božana uses emotions to underline her point. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes it is so.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Again there is agreement between Sabina and Božana across the ethnic divide. Sabina agrees that the situation gets worse and worse. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Božana, Serb (code 1):** And still everybody speak about donations.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana gives a further justification why the economic situation is so bad. She refers to donations that people speak about but that never arrive. Deliberation stays high.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** That's true.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Once again Sabina agrees with Božana across the ethnic divide. The two women develop increasingly a common life world between themselves. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 2):** I think also to leave. It's so empty. At night you can only meet dogs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela speaks up for the first time, and with her expression of despair and hopelessness she transforms the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. Sabina and Božana already began to express high dissatisfaction with the current situation in Srebrenica. Andjela now makes a step further in telling the group that she plans to leave Srebrenica. As justification she picks up from Božana that at night there is nobody on the streets. Andjela brings in the additional aspect that one meets only dogs in the streets. From other discussion groups we know that stray dogs are a big problem in Srebrenica. So when Andjela refers to dogs, she must have these stray dogs in mind. With her statement, Andjela does not open space how the situation in Srebrenica can be improved. She prefers an exit strategy to a



voice strategy in the sense of Albert Hirschman.<sup>243</sup> So for her it seems pointless to discuss means to improve the situation in Srebrenica. Maria Clara Jaramillo has found many cases in Colombia where utter despair transformed a discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation<sup>244</sup>.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** I also say, it's like a horror movie. I really do not know why it is like that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina is now also completely overtaken by despair and hopelessness, keeping deliberation at a low level. She uses the metaphor of a horror movie to describe the situation in Srebrenica. It is interesting how she addresses the question of how the situation can be explained. Since she does not know herself the explanation, in a deliberative spirit she should have asked the other participants to help, which would have corresponded to the principle of reciprocity. But Sabina speaks to herself acknowledging that she does not know why the situation is like it is. With this self-centered statement she gives expression to her helplessness.

**Snežana, Serb (code 4): But if we developed the economy ....**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana breaks the cycle of despair and hopelessness and transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. She expresses hope that if the economy could be improved, the situation in Srebrenica could become better. Snežana takes up a thread that was developed earlier in the discussion and that was lost with all the talk about how awful the situation was. From a group dynamic perspective it is remarkable that it is Snežana who brings new hope to the discussion since in her first statement she expressed disgust about the political leaders who looked only for their own needs and who treated ordinary people as mere material. The example of Snežana shows how attitudes may change over the span of a discussion.

---

<sup>243</sup> Albert Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, Harvard University Press, 1970.

<sup>244</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** At least a couple of factories where people can work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina is interactive with Snežana and becomes specific how the economy could develop, suggesting that opening a few factories would give people work. She keeps deliberation at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** Srebrenica was an industrial city before. Here we can launch an appeal to the High Representative to take a part and help in the reconstruction of some companies.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida has established herself as a deliberative leader early in the discussion. She had not spoken for a while and takes now again a leadership role in spreading optimism to the group. She begins with a look back into the history of Srebrenica and reminds the group that it was once an industrial city, so that this tradition could be taken up again. She sees the letter to the High Representative as a possible way to make progress in bringing back some companies. The group dynamic is now far away from the beginning of the discussion when other participants expressed severe doubts whether such a letter could have any impact. Aida keeps deliberation at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Spa? Factories?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina adds to factories a spa that could be reconstructed. Before the war Srebrenica had a flourishing spa for tourists. In a deliberative spirit following the principle of reciprocity Katarina asks the group whether they agree that these two items should be put into the letter to the High Representative. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Mevlida, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes. Write that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mevlida was attentive to what Katarina proposed and is supportive that the reconstruction of factories and the

spa should be put into the letter to the High Representative. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** This is probably the potential with the least investment. You have water, you have the nature.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It was Snežana who had transformed the discussion back to a high level of deliberation when in her last intervention she claimed that progress in the economy was possible. Now he gives good justifications for her earlier claim. Speaking in economic terms, she argues that reconstruction of factories and the spa could bring the highest effect with the least amount of investment. She continues that for the running of the factories Srebrenica had enough water and nature would help to attract tourists to the spa. This was up to now the most sophisticated justification offered by any member of the group and corresponds pretty much to what Jürgen Habermas understands by rationality as “the orderly exchange of information and reasons”.<sup>245</sup> Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Božana, Serb (code 1):** These industrial zones that exist only need to be restarted. Or at least to open the spa.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is remarkable how the group dynamic develops. When Božana last spoke she expressed utter despair and hopelessness characterizing the situation in Srebrenica as horrible and getting worse and worse. Now with Snežana, Katarina, Aida, and Mevlida offering at an inter-ethnic level ways of how the economy could be improved, Božana also becomes more optimistic and sees chances that factories and the spa could be reconstructed. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** If at least one factory opens that can employ young people.

---

<sup>245</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1992, S. 370.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina shows empathy. If at least one factory would be reopened, jobs should go to young people. Earlier in the discussion Katarina told the group that she is very needy having nowhere to live and this at the age of 53. Yet, she wants to give the first jobs available to young people. Such empathy is keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Now we will put down the theses and we will explain them later.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina is also influenced by the more optimistic group dynamic. While in her last intervention Sabina compared the situation in Srebrenica to a horror movie, she is now willing to help to work on the letter to the High Representative, which means that she sees ways to get out of the horror movie. She makes a procedural proposal that they should begin the letter to the High Representative in the form of theses that will then be explained later in the letter. So Sabina is no longer as despairing and hopeless as earlier in the discussion when she brought down the discussion to a low level of deliberation. This time she is able to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Božana, Serb (code 1):** We have "Feros" (Factory in Potočari) and it's still closed.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana gets even more specific and mentions a factory that could be reopened. With this information, she opens more space of how to go about to develop the economy. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 1):** People come from other places and work here and those who live here have nothing. Write down that we need to be realistic.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela raises another issue but stays on topic. In order to get more jobs for the people living in Srebrenica, she

wants to limit the access of people from the outside to the local labor market. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** It is true. Maybe we should write that we need to change the current structure of employment in Srebrenica and indicate that the problem is that more people who work here are from the outside. How did I express that? It is easier to express verbally, but when it comes to writing.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida supports Andjela that the local people should be privileged in the local labor market. It is remarkable that she is unsure of how to express this idea in writing. In a deliberative spirit, she asks the other participants whether she expresses it well. Her statement is a good example of how ordinary people are often unsure of how to express their arguments, not only in writing but also in oral form. Acknowledging such difficulty corresponds to a key idea of deliberation in the sense that reciprocity is easier when actors are not too sure whether they choose the right words to express an idea. Other actors can then step in with suggestions about the right words. With this statement Aida keeps deliberation at a high level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 1):** You write, you have the best handwriting.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela asks Aida to write down the proposal about the restriction of outsiders to the local labor market. In a light hearted manner, she gives as justification that Aida has the better handwriting. With this procedural proposal the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** You speak and I will write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida accepts to do the writing but Andjela should dictate her, what to write. Here again there is an instance of an easy going pattern across the ethnic divide, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** Give me some juice, I'm thirsty.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** What do you want? Tea? Coca Cola?

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** Give me a tea.

*(Sabina and Katarina giving drinks also to others)*

*Interpretation of level of deliberation for this sequence:* In the deliberative literature it is often mentioned that having drinks or even a meal together relaxes the atmosphere and helps deliberation.<sup>246</sup> Here is a good example. Serbs and Bošnjaks are sufficiently comfortable to serve each other drinks. The main serving is done by Sabina as Bošnjak and Katarina as Serb. Although talking about who wishes what drinks is not on the topic assigned to the group, it keeps the general atmosphere at a high level of deliberation and makes it easier to continue the discussion at this high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** What did you write?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After this short break, Sabina wants to know from Aida what she wrote down about the limits for outsiders on the local labor market. Thus the group has no problem to stay on the issue discussed before the break, so that deliberation stays at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** Determine the structure of employment; in our local community more people work who come from the outside.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As asked by Sabina, Aida reads what she wrote about people from the outside working in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** First we need to start with the economy.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The group now goes into the details of the theses with which to begin the letter to the High Representative. Snežana proposes that the economy should be at the top of the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

---

<sup>246</sup> Jürg Steiner, Maria Clara Jaramillo, C.M. Maia, Simona Mameli, *Deliberation across Deeply Divided Societies. Transformative Moments*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, p. 160.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):**

We already wrote that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida as note taker answers Snežana that the economy is already at the top of the list. The group works in a serious manner on the letter to the High Representative. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Starting with the economy. Running the spa "Guber".

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina agrees that they should begin with the economy. She then suggests the restoration of the spa as another item to be put on the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** We will write it down now.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida agrees that the economy and the spa should be the two top priorities on the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Definitely, that spa is very important.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina also wants to put the spa on the list but does not object that the economy should top the list. There is wide agreement across the ethnic divide. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** Will you explain it later in the paper?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida comes back to the procedural proposal made by Sabina earlier in the discussion that the theses should be explained only later in the letter to the High Representative. Aida asks Katarina whether she would do this with regard to the spa. Deliberation continues at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Perfect.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina agrees to take over this task. With a quick back and forth the discussion is very interactive with the participants being seriously engaged with what to put in the letter to the High Representative. This sequence is in a stark contrast to the beginning of the discussion when severe doubts were expressed whether such a letter made sense at all. The discussion continues to flow at high level of deliberation between the two ethnic groups.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** Implement projects that will help young people in this community. Young professionals.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As a third item to be put on the list, Aida mentions projects that help young people, in particular young professionals. She picks up a proposal that was already made by Katarina earlier in the discussion. Here is another example of an agreement across the ethnic divide with Katarina coming from the Serbian side, Aida from the Bošnjak side. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Young professionals, housing allocations. What can you do if you don't have a flat? A flat is a base from which you can move on.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina is glad that Aida has picked up the issue of young people, and she agrees that the emphasis should be on young professionals. Katarina adds as a fourth item to be put on the list, allocations for housing. Her justification is that having a flat is the basis from which you can move on. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 1):** Yeah, sure.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana agrees that it is essential to have a flat. Earlier in the discussion, Katarina stated that all participants have the same needs irrespective of their ethnic background. The ensuing discussion increasingly shows that she was correct in her evaluation, since up to now no



disagreements emerged on what to put on the list for the High Representative. Here again, Snežana spontaneously agrees with Katarina that housing is a key demand to be forwarded to the High Representative. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Esen, Bosnian (code 1):** Young people are not getting married because they don't have their own apartment.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mevlida agrees that housing is a crucial demand and offers as justification that lack of housing prevents young people to get married. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** You cannot give birth to a child because you need to give him something to eat.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina in an interactive way follows up Mevlida about the problem to get married and mentions as a further problem besides lack of housing that some young people may not even have enough food to raise children. Mevlida and Sabina, both young women, 27 years of age, use the problems of young people to get married in an effective way to draw the attention of the group to the dismal situation in Srebrenica. Increasingly a common life world in the sense of Habermas is created in the group.<sup>247</sup> Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** The High Representative in accordance with his mandate should influence that more young people take a part in public institutions and authorities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida stays on the topic of young people and wants to give them more of a say in public institutions and authorities. In a general way, she expresses optimism that the letter to the High

---

<sup>247</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1981, S. 159.

Commissioner could have an influence on the situation of young people in Srebrenica. With such optimism, Aida keeps deliberation at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** And educate them too, not like us who are now old and uneducated. They really make me so nervous.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina in an interactive way stays on the topic of young people and adds that they need to be better educated. To justify her argument she tells the story of her generation that although she is only 27 is uneducated. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Božana, Serb (code 2): How is Draže?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana addresses Snežana about how her son is doing. This question must have been stimulated by the general discussion about how to help young people. The question, however, comes out of the blue and is not linked with the previous discussion. Therefore, the flow of the discussion is disrupted, and deliberation is transformed to a low level. In her work on Colombia, Maria Clara Jaramillo also has found cases where off-topic remarks transformed discussions from a high to a low level of deliberation.<sup>248</sup>

**Snežana, Serb (code 3):** Well, he is good. He opened the gym.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana answers the question at a personal level without any link to the general discussion. Therefore, deliberation remains at a low level.

**Božana, Serb (code 3):** So he is good?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana also continues at a personal level without any link to the general discussion. Deliberation stays at a low level.

---

<sup>248</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.

**Snežana, Serb (code 3):** Oh, no, there are no visitors (in his gym).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana corrects the story of her son that indeed he is not doing so well, since he has little business in his gym. This would have been an opportunity for Snežana to make a general argument about the situation of young people in Srebrenica, but she remains at a purely personal level, so that the level of deliberation stays low.

**Božana, Serb (code 3):** There will be... He should hope.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana gives hope to Snežana that her son will soon do better, but she does not make any argument why his situation will improve. This sequence between Božana and Snežana would have been a good occasion to use the example of the son of Snežana to discuss why young people have so many difficulties to find work and what could be done about it. But because the dialogue remained at an idiosyncratic personal level it had no relevance for the general question assigned to the group of how life could be improved in Srebrenica. This is a good example that sometimes personal stories are so much off topic that they are of no help with deliberation.<sup>249</sup>

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** The legislative on executive powers.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina is taken aback by the personal exchange between Božana and Snežana and is at a loss of how to continue the discussion at a more general level. What she says about the legislative and executive branches of government does not make sense, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation. This is also the position of John S. Dryzek for whom personal stories are only relevant for deliberation when they are connected to general issues.<sup>250</sup>

---

<sup>249</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 69.

<sup>250</sup> John S. Dryzek, "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building," *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (2009).

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** Is there anything else?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* That the flow of the discussion is interrupted by the story of the son of Snežana is also made clear when Aida raises the question whether there is anything else to be discussed. The implication is that perhaps the discussion has come to an end. With her question Aida does not transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Andjela, Serb (code 3):** Put it under the theses also.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela is unclear what should be included among the theses to be sent to the High Representative. The discussion has lost any direction dragging on at a low level of deliberation.

**Snežana, Serb (code 3):** Let's not write just about young people but put something more concrete about the economy.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana wants to include something more concrete about the economy but does not say what this could be. With this vague suggestion she is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** Have we mentioned the economy, the spa?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina picks up the issue of the economy but does not follow up the suggestion of Snežana to include something more concrete. She also refers to the possibility to run again the spa but does not add anything new to what was already discussed earlier. The discussion continues to drag on at a low level of deliberation.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** We have it as first to run the economy.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida repeats what was already decided that the economy should be mentioned first in the letter to the High Representative. The discussion becomes repetitive keeping the level of deliberation low.

**Božana, Serb (code 3):** We need to continue to run the industry that we have.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana is also repetitive, restating that the industrial development should be based on the factories that already exist. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** Improving the economy and industry in order to develop the community and employ people.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida also says nothing that was not said before. So the discussion still does not get any new impulses to be transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

**Božana, Serb (code 3):** There are already facilities, which are just empty.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Božana simply repeats what she said in her previous statement. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** If we wait for another couple of years we will not have anyone to hire.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina expresses utter despair anticipating that in the coming years most people will have left Srebrenica so that the problem of hiring becomes moot for lack of people to be hired. Whereas in the sequence before Sabina spoke, the discussion suffered from repetition, with the statement of Sabina it turns to despair and hopelessness. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** People are leaving. No one can hold out on the bare turf. This everyone knows.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina joins Sabina in despair that there is no future in Srebrenica so that people are leaving. It is interesting to note the group dynamics with regard to despair; it was a high at the beginning of the discussion, became lower and now increases again. Such ups and downs in the

level of despair, Maria Clara Jaramillo also found in Colombia.<sup>251</sup> Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** Right. What else should we discuss?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida also joins into the despair and hopelessness. With her question whether there is anything else to be discussed she implies that all has been said. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** They also know what we need. So many of them come and go and do not do anything. I'm so sick of all those empty talks.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina also wants closure of the discussion. She refers to political leaders, presumably also to the internationals from the European Union and NGO's. According to Katarina, they know the needs of the people but do nothing about them. The implication is that it is pointless to continue the discussion about the letter to be sent to the High Representative. Such doubts about the value of sending the letter were already expressed at the very beginning of the discussion. In between there were some more hopeful sequences, but with the statement of Katarina the old doubts have reemerged. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Snežana, Serb (code 3):** Also, no one is trying to see where all the invested money went.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Snežana touches on the issue of corruption criticizing that nobody investigates where all the allocated money disappears. Since Snežana does not make any suggestion of how such an investigation could be started deliberation remains at a low level.

---

<sup>251</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** Everybody speaks about investments and the poor are getting worse and worse.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina repeats her complaint that all the talk about investments is just empty talk, while the situation of the poor people gets worse and worse. Implicitly she supports Snežana that corruption is wide spread. The discussion has now taken a turn where space is closed to come up with proposals of how life in Srebrenica could be improved. Thus, deliberation remains at a low level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 3):** They say a lot of money is invested in water and steam and we still do not have permanent water supply.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela expands on the issue of corruption and gives as an example the water supply where it is claimed that money is invested but no results are seen, so that somewhere this money disappears. Andjela, too, does not offer any solution to such corruption so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 4):** Investigate once again in which part of our local community funds were invested. For example, people who live in some buildings still do not have water supply and no one is informed. It has no logic; you need to inform people to prepare and to have a water tank close to those buildings.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida makes a concrete proposal how life could be improved with regard to the problem of water supply. After all the expressions of despair, Aida opens some space to come back to the topic assigned to the group of how life in Srebrenica could be improved. She gives reasons how the problem of lacking water supply can be resolved. Her argument is that information must be improved. The discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 2): Irresponsible people. It is pure contagion.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina does not use the space opened by Aida and comes back to the issue of corruption. She claims that corruption is contagious making people more and more irresponsible. The implication is that nothing can be done against such contagion. With the expression of such despair and hopelessness Katarina transforms the discussion immediately back to a low level of deliberation.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** It is only here that people use their conscience so little when they make some conclusions or laws.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida does not pursue her proposal of how the problems with the water supply could be solved but follows up Katarina about the desperate situation in Srebrenica. Aida goes so far as to claim that there is no other place where people lack so much conscience so that corruption is so high. With such a statement Aida keeps deliberation at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** And citizens are not informed about anything.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina continues to complain about political leaders who keep ordinary people in the dark. With this statement Katarina reinforces her claim that corruption is spreading more and more with the consequence that there is no transparency of what goes on among the corrupt leaders. Deliberation drags on at a low level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** You have to quarrel with them (laughing)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina tells Katarina that she should quarrel with the political leaders. From the laughter that she gets from this statement it is clear that Sabina means this as a sarcastic joke in the sense that political leaders would not be impressed if Katarina would confront them. Deliberation remains at a low level.



**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** Recently we applied for internet connection and we have waited one month. First we were refused to sign. After, they usually postpone their obligations. When I call them they say: "Well, we'll try to provide you", I said: 'I do not know how you do when you do not try?'"

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida gives another example how things do not work in Srebrenica, reinforcing the atmosphere of despair and hopeless in the group. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Well, that's it?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina gives a sign that the discussion has come to an end. Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** Oh my God, we wrote a lot to him, I doubt he will read all of this. Does he know how to read this at all? (the letter is written in Serbo-Croatian).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina comes back to the doubts expressed already at the beginning of the meeting whether the letter to the High Representative will have any effect. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** I am interested in how much is his salary.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida gets off topic addressing the salary of the High Representative. Deliberation drags on at a low level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** I do not care, I have nothing of it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina stays off topic keeping deliberation at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** I'm just interested. I heard that one man in Bijeljina has a salary of 166'000KM.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina stays off topic. This discussion about high salaries reinforces the despair and hopelessness of participants who are all ordinary people. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 3):** Where does he work?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela stays off topic asking where the man who earns 166'000KM works. She keeps deliberation at a low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** In the bank.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina answers the question of Andjela. The discussion is now completely off topic, keeping deliberation at low level.

**Andjela, Serb code 3):** Maybe it's his bank?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela continues with the off topic issue of the high salary of the banker. Deliberation remains at low level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** Well I do not know that. Man, 166 000KM monthly salary!

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The question of high salaries is of great interest to the group but does not help to come up with proposals of how to improve the general situation in Srebrenica. Discussing high salaries would only be relevant if the group would come up with proposals of how to arrive at a more equal salary structure. But since no such proposals are made, deliberation drags on at a low level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 3):** Oh, I'm not going to earn that much in my whole life.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This discussion of high salaries is just contributing to the despair and hopelessness in the group. When Andjela claims that she will not make as much as the banker in her entire life, she does

not suggest any ways how this could be changed.<sup>252</sup> Deliberation stays at a low level.

**Mevlida, Bošnjak (code 3):** He has 250.000 euros monthly salary (laughing).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Still the salary issue, keeping deliberation at a low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 3):** What would you do with that money, ah?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Still the salary issue, keeping deliberation at a low level.

**Mevlida, Bošnjak (code 3):** I have no idea (laughing)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The laughter shows that the participants begin to joke about the high salaries. This is a well-known mechanism of tension release in a bad situation. The laughter also reinforces the common life world of the group that we have already seen earlier in the discussion. But it is already too late in the discussion that the awareness of the common life world helps to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 3):** When you look what some individuals own. It's horrible.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina stays with the issue of great inequality but she does not make any suggestions of how one could get at more equality, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

---

<sup>252</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 69.

**Andjela, Serb (code 3):** I think we were recorded all the time.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Andjela is worried that all this discussion about high salaries was recorded. This worry shows that Andjela is reluctant to express her critique of the people higher up. Such worries are not conducive to a free flow of deliberation, which remains at a low level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 3):** Yes we were.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina confirms that the tapes were always on. Deliberation stays at low level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 4):** We should put this in some frame? "Dear Mr. Minister ...".

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Despite all the doubts expressed about the usefulness of writing the letter to the High Representative, Aida acts again as deliberative leader and proposes the format in which the letter should begin. She is able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Let us define it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Earlier on Katarina had expressed doubts on whether the High Representative will read the letter at all. But now she yields to the leadership of Aida and wants to help on how the High Commissioner should be addressed. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** If I was smart I would have done something with my life. Put the title as follows: "Dear Mr. High Representative."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The first sentence of Sabina is interesting in the context of the discussion. Up to now participants put the blame of the bad situation in Srebrenica on others. Now Sabina acknowledges that she could have done herself something more with her life. This acknowledgment brings some optimism to the group in the sense that everyone is to some extent also responsible for his or her life situation. Given her first sentence, Sabina is

now willing to actually write the letter to the High Representative and proposes of how he should be addressed. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 1):** How do I write that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker, Aida asks for advice how to write what Sabina proposes. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Write as you will; however she (the moderator) will type it later. If I write, she won't be able to read it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina is seriously involved in how to write the letter to the High Representative. In practical terms, she tells Aida to do the writing since her own hand writing is not readable. She reminds the group that the moderator will type the letter afterwards, so that she needs a readable version. Deliberation continues to a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** She (moderator) should do it if she really wants to.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina agrees with Sabina that the group should leave it to the moderator to type the final version of the letter. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Aida, Bosnian (code 1):** What should we do next?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida keeps up her leadership role and asks the group what still has to be done. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Nothing, just write this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Sabina responds Aida that the group has finished the work so that the letter can be

finished. According to the research design, the moderator did not intervene,<sup>253</sup> and it was up to the group to decide when to come to closure. Aida and Sabina took over this task in a concise way with Aida putting the question and Sabina giving the answer. On this procedural matter, deliberation was kept at a high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** We need to finish this letter. I hope that we will accomplish at least something.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is remarkable how group dynamic has changed again. While Katarina earlier was doubtful whether the High Representative will even read the letter, she now expresses hope that the group has accomplished something. It seems that the leadership of the two Serb women Aida and Sabina pushing the group to come to closure and to finish the letter had an effect on Katarina from the Bošnjak side. Again the group was able in an inter-ethnic way. Deliberation continues at high level.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 1):** We will do that (what Katarina proposes) at the end. "In today's discussion ...", so, make a little introduction. "We concluded the following and then take all this and we will eventually put what we said."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Aida is at the core of her leadership role proposing to the group the structure of the letter to be sent to the High Representative. She keeps deliberation at high level.

**Sabina, Bošnjak (1):** What we concluded is the best for our local community.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sabina keeps up the optimistic tone keeping deliberation at a high level. It is remarkable that she refers to the common good of the entire community involving both ethnic groups.

---

<sup>253</sup> See Chapter 2.

**Aida, Bošnjak (code 1):** The economy, industry, employment, retention of young, developing our community, determining the structure of employment, participation of young and educated people in local government and authorities, review the funds invested in our local community, because we who live here do not see where all the funds that are often mentioned in the media are invested. We still live in a city that is ruined and not functional for life. That is the frame.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This is a succinct summary of the discussion, keeping deliberation at high level.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** Put this also: 'We hope that all this will not remain only on paper. We expect your positive attitude and we send you our warm regards. We wish you good health and successful career. Srebrenica, 19/08/2010.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Katarina is now definitely in a different mood, saying optimism that the letter will have a positive effect. Deliberation continues at high level.

**Andjela, Serb (code 1):** She (the moderator) will type this later.

*Interpretation of deliberation:* Andjela wants to make sure that the moderator will type the letter so that the High Representative does not have to decipher unreadable handwriting. Deliberation stays high.

**Katarina, Serb (code 1):** We have finished.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nobody from either ethnic group objects to the summary of Aida, so that the discussion ends at a high deliberative note with Katarina declaring the meeting finished. .

## **5.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 3 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether six deliberative transformative moments, three downwards and three upwards, so that the discussion ended at a high level. Again, I will start

with summarizing my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. Afterwards, I will show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

#### 5.4.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation

At the beginning, the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation for a long stretch of 24 speech acts. Then the Serbian woman Andjela, who speaks up for the first time, utters so much despair and hopelessness that she transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. She is so fed up with life in Srebrenica that she tells the group of her plan to leave the town. No other participant has uttered before such an extreme position. If one takes such an exit strategy, it becomes pointless to discuss about measures to improve life in Srebrenica. Indeed, as the next speaker, Sabina from the Bošnjak side, joins into the despair and hopelessness expressed by Andjela. Such despair and hopelessness triggering downward Deliberative Transformative Moments I found already in the first two groups. Therefore, the findings of Maria Clara Jaramillo in Colombia in this respect, are increasingly confirmed by my own research in Srebrenica.

The second downward Deliberative Transformative Moment was triggered by a speech act that led the discussion off-topic. Maria Clara Jaramillo found such cases also in Colombia, and in my analysis of the first two groups I encountered off-topic cases also for Srebrenica. In the present case, it was Serbian woman Božana, who led the discussion off-topic. Before her intervention, the discussion dealt at a high level of deliberation with youth unemployment and the need for more education for young people. Out of the blue, Božana all of a sudden addressed Snežana, another Serbian woman and asked her how her son Draze is doing. The two women engaged each other at a very personal level about the life of Draze, who has some successes but also some failures in his professional career. His story could have kept this discussion at a high level of deliberation if it would have been put in a general context. The



dialogue between the two women, however, remained at a personal family level in the sense that Božana was curious how the son of her friend is doing. This is a good example of how not all personal stories are helpful for deliberation, a point that was forcefully made by Sharon R. Krause.<sup>254</sup> After Božana and Snežana had their personal conversation about a family matter, the discussion had great difficulties to get back to a high level of deliberation and indeed stayed at a low level for a long stretch of 20 speech acts.

The third downward Deliberative Transformative Moments was, like the first one, triggered by the expression of despair and hopelessness. Before this happened, the discussion dealt at a high deliberative level with how communal funds could be used so that everyone could have access to a water tank. Then, the Serbian woman Katarina negated that funds could ever be used for this purpose, because there was so much corruption at higher levels. With this negative position, Katarina sent the message that it was pointless for ordinary people like themselves to talk about the distribution of funds. Katarina was supported from the Bošnjak side that the leaders in Srebrenica do not have any conscience. With this inter-ethnic agreement about the prevalence of corruption among the town authorities, the discussion had great difficulties to find the way back to the question of how life in Srebrenica could be improved and dragged on without any clear direction for a long period of 20 speech acts.

My analysis of the third group confirms what I have found in the first two groups and what Maria Clara Jaramillo has found in Colombia that despair and hopelessness as well as off-topic remarks can easily trigger downward Deliberative Transformative Moments.

#### 5.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation

It was Snežana from the Serbian side who was responsible for the first upward Deliberative Transformative Moment. She was able to break a long sequence of despair and hopelessness, when she argued that the key to improve life in Srebrenica was the development of the economy. With this

---

<sup>254</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*

argument she opened space about how the economy could specifically be developed, and this space was widely used by both sides of the ethnic divide. It was proposed, for example, that the old spa could be opened again, which would help to revitalize tourism. Another suggestion was that old factories should be reopened within a plan of an industrial zone. This discussion about the development of the local economy continued at a high level of deliberation for a very long period of 30 speech acts. Thus, Snežana was able to reset the agenda of the group in a positive direction away from the atmosphere of despair and hopelessness. She turned out as a deliberative leader, an important role that I noticed already in the first two groups and that Maria Clara Jaramillo also registered in her research on Colombia. Perhaps it should be noted that Snežana with 58 years was the oldest in the group, which may have given her an incentive to move the discussion back to the topic assigned to the group.

The second upward Deliberative Transformative Moment is also triggered by a participant who exercises leadership skills. This time leadership comes from Aida of the Bošnjak side. After a long sequence of despair and hopelessness she shows a way how life in Srebrenica can be improved in a very concrete way. She refers to the problem that some buildings do not have water supply and advocates that local community funds should be used so that every building has a water tank. With this proposal she opens space how one could approach the local authorities so that such fund will be allocated. This time, however, the space is not used because Katarina from the Serbian side finds it hopeless that the corrupt authorities would ever allocate such funds to the poor people in the community. As we have seen in the previous section, Katarina with her return to despair and hopelessness transforms the discussion quickly back to a low level of deliberation.

For the third upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, it is once again Aida who shows leadership. This time, the group ridiculed and was angry about the high income of a local banker without the discussion going anywhere. Then, Aida brought the group back to its task to write a letter to the High Representative about ways to improve life in Srebrenica and in Bosnia and

Herzegovina in general. Contrary to the previous time, now Aida's intervention was successful to keep deliberation at a high level. Indeed, the group became serious to agree what should be written in the letter. After another 14 speech acts at a high level of deliberation, Katarina could exclaim "we are finished" to the relief of everyone. For all three upward Deliberative Transformative Moments it was leadership that was responsible, and it was good for the integration of the group that the deliberative leaders came from both sides of the ethnic divide. Thus, it was not one group that dominated.

## 5.5 Outcomes and deliberation

How did deliberation impact on the outcomes of group discussions? As for groups 1 and 2, I will investigate in this section how the deliberative pattern is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. Again, I will use the graphic form, where H stands for a speech act at a high level of deliberation, and L for a speech act at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt altogether with five substantive issues: development of the economy, reopen factories, reopen the spa, restrictions on workers from the outside, better education for the young. In this order, I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= decision on development of the economy, D2= decision on reopening factories, D3= decision on reopening of spa, D4= decision on restrictions on workers from the outside, D5= decision on better education for the young.

### 5.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 3

H-----D1---- (24)

L-- (2)

H—D2—D3-----D4-----D5----- (33)

L----- (21)

H- (1)

L----- (21)

H----- (15)

There were in total 117 speech acts, 73 at a high level of deliberation, 44 at a low level. Thus, 62 percent of all speech acts were at a high deliberative level, which corresponds roughly to the first group with 67 percent of the speech acts at a high level. By contrast, in group 2 there were only 37 percent of the speech acts at a high level. The present group began the discussion very well from a deliberative perspective. The first 59 speech acts were all at a high level of deliberation with the exception of a short interruption of two speech acts at a low level. This beginning seemed to support our expectation mentioned at the beginning of the chapter that women discussing among themselves are particularly deliberative.<sup>255</sup> Afterwards, however, the discussion got off-topic and increasingly displayed a sense of despair and hopelessness. As in the first two groups, substantive agreements were only reached when the discussion could be kept for a long time at a high level of deliberation. The six agreements all concerned issues on super-ordinate goals. It was easy to see that it was in the common interest of both ethnic groups to develop the economy, to reopen old factories and the spa, to restrict access to the local labour market and to do more for the education of the young. So once again, as in the previous two groups, sensitive inter-ethnic issues were not addressed.

---

<sup>255</sup> Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 216.

## Chapter 6: Fourth Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica

### 6.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>256</sup>

**Tarik**, Bošnjak, male, 48 years old, both Bošnjak parents. He finished secondary school and works as a keys and metal manufacturer. He is religious, considering faith as a very important component of his life. He is also political active, always participating in political elections, and declaring to sympathize for non-ethnic parties. He has been living in Srebrenica for 8 years. During the war, he used to live in Vogošća, near Sarajevo. He experienced the war neither as a soldier nor supporting any paramilitary actions. He lost several friends and relatives during the war. Tarik thinks that Srebrenica is a multicultural city, with a city administration actively supporting inter-group dialogue. His neighborhood is almost multi-ethnic. However, he stated that he never experienced directly inter-group cooperation. Tarik shows a quite strong group identity, perceived as a destiny and not changeable across life. In Bosnia and Herzegovina national identities are very strong, and he is in favor of that, in so far as within his own national group it was possible to defend national culture and identity during the war, under attacks from other groups. However, he doesn't blame Serbs nor Croats, as national groups. All national groups are collectively responsible, he thinks, for war and for war crimes. Cooperation among groups is possible, but full trust impossible. He clearly perceives how Bosnian Serbs desire to secede from Bosnia. And he would not be so happy if his daughter would decide to marry a Serb, or even a Croat, even if he declares to have good friends belonging to both groups. He thinks that he is good at talking and to convince people through discussion about his better argument.

---

<sup>256</sup> The participants in this group were selected randomly among adults participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center

**Amela, Bošnjak**, is 31 years old. She completed gymnasium and she works as a translator. She is political active. Daughter from a multiethnic marriage, she feels to belong to the overall Bosnian group, and this feeling is almost strong. She has good friends among Bošnjaks, Serbs and Croats, and ordinary contacts with all of them. She never participated to inter-group projects, but she would like to. Across all her life, she says, she did experience inter-group contact and cooperation. She used to live in Vogošća during the war, moving to Srebrenica only in 2008. She does not know how many people live in Srebrenica. She lost close relative and friends, during the war, but she did not support any military nor paramilitary part. When questioned about war responsibility, she cannot decide if responsibility of war and war crimes should be equally shared among groups. She felt her group threatened during the war. She strongly feels to belong to Bošnjak ethnic group and she will never change her identity in this sense. She considers religion as a very important component of her life. She thinks that Srebrenica is a multicultural city, and that political authorities actively support its multi-ethnic character. However, her neighborhood is almost mono-ethnic. She feels to be good at speaking and at convincing people about her arguments and ideas.

**Milan** is Serb, 41 years old. He completed secondary school and works as a mechanic. He has been living in Srebrenica since he was born, from both Serbian father and Serbian mother. He does not know how many people live in town. He is very religious, and considers his belonging to Serb community very strong. He was in Srebrenica during the war, where he lost many friends and close relatives. He directly helped Serb forces. He thinks that the Serbian community, as ethnic group with its own identity, traditions and culture, was threatened during the war. He thinks that no group should be claimed to be responsible for war and war crimes, as all groups should better share all that responsibility. He declared to not full trust Bošnjaks, neither Croats. Within the boundaries of his own ethnic community, he thinks that life may be safer. He

seems to be inclined to recognize an important role to group leaders<sup>257</sup>. A national group, he thinks, must have a good leader to guide it, otherwise it is like a body without head. He thinks that mixed marriages are inherently instable. He definitely would not be happy if his children would get married with Bošnjaks. Bosnia is a very divided country, he admitted, and quite often he thinks that it would be better if ethnic identities may be less important than they are. Political authorities in Srebrenica are very poor in supporting reconciliation, he thinks. They do not hamper inter-group dialogue, but neither do they anything to actively promote it. He thinks that he is not good at talking, nor at convincing people through dialogue and discussion.

**Mina** is 52 years old. She is Bošnjak, from Bošnjak Muslim<sup>258</sup> parents. She is very religious. She lives in Potočari, Srebrenica. She finished elementary school, and currently she is housewife. She was in Srebrenica also during the war, she just changed neighborhood. She lost relatives and friends. She did not actively support Muslim armies during the war.

She thinks that Srebrenica is almost a multi-ethnic town, as well as her neighborhood. However, she does not know how many people live there. Political authorities do very little to support inter-group cooperation. She never experienced inter-group cooperation in the framework of a project, nor is she interested to do so. She manifests a strong sense of belonging to her ethnic

---

<sup>257</sup> In social psychology, collective identities tend to be stronger when individuals assign more importance to collective and less to individual values; at its turn out, stronger collective identities seem to be more inclined to acknowledge authorities and to obey to it. See Karina V. Korostelina, *Social Identity and Conflict. Structures, Dynamics and Implications*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2007, and also Stanley Milgram, who designed a famous study that investigates the effects of authority on obedience (Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*, 1974, Reprint edition, Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2009).

<sup>258</sup> During the 1950s and '60s, Bosnian Muslim politicians worked with intellectuals to formulate an argument for distinct, secular Muslim nationhood and ethnicity based on historical, cultural, and political factors, which finally resulted in the constitutional addition of "Muslims" as one of the nations of Yugoslavia in 1968 in Bosnia, and in 1971 federally (see Brenna Miller, *Transnational Networks and Bosnian Muslim Identity in Tito's Yugoslavia*, American Council for International Education, Ohio State University, 2014) The recognition of Muslims as constituting Nation responded also to an attempt, by Tito, to limit ethnic rivalries in Bosnia. It was only in 1993 that the group renamed itself as Bošnjaks. The fact that Mina underlines her Muslim origin contradicts her definition as a Bosnian, term which seems instead to overcome ethnic boundaries and to include all citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with no specific reference to ethnic belonging.

community. She thinks that she would rather be a Bošnjak than a Serb, and that her sense of belonging will die with her, as she will never change her identity across her life. She thinks that every ethnic group must have a good leader. She feels proud, and grateful, to be Bošnjak. She thinks that her group was threatened in its own identity and culture during the war. Serbs are the most responsible for war and war crimes in Bosnia. She would not be happy to have her children attending the same schools with Serbs, and even less if they would decide to get married with a Serb man or woman. Serbs are considered bully and not trustful. Serbs should not be allowed even to get a political career in Bosnia. However, she says to have ordinary contacts with Serbs, even good friends belonging to that ethnic group<sup>259</sup>. However, she admits that she would like ethnic identities to count less than they do in Bosnia and Herzegovina, that is perceived as a very divided country.

She does not think she is good at speaking nor at convincing people about her arguments.

**Svetlana.** No information is available about her age and occupation, nor about her parents' ethnicity, and whether she used to live in Srebrenica even before and during the war<sup>260</sup>. She appears to be in her thirties. She is Serb, and she feels to strongly belong to her ethnic group. She is proud of her group, and she claims that she will never change her group identity till the end of her days. She appears to be in favor of inter-group separation, especially as far as school and marriages is concerned. She thinks that Bošnjaks would like Bosnia to be their country and nobody's else; that Croats would like to secede to join Croatia; and Serbs to secede to join Serbia. Definitely in her view Bosnia is not a united country, but she would like if ethnic identity may count less than they actually do in ordinary life in Bosnia.

---

<sup>259</sup> Social psychologists would explain this contradiction very simply, as occasional direct contact experience with out-group members is not able to change prejudices and stereotypes; those occasional contacts, such as a couple of friends belonging to the out-group, are considered simply exception to the general rule applying to the Serbs. See □ Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1954.

<sup>260</sup> As she arrived late to the meeting, she did not fillout the entrance survey, but only the second one, submitted to participants after the inter-group talk.



She claims she has good friends belonging to Bošnjak and to Croat communities. However, she feels that generally speaking among groups some sort of cooperation may exist, but there will never be full trust. Political authorities in Srebrenica do not support very much inter-group cooperation.

**Mira** is 47 years old. She defines herself both as Serb but also as belonging to Bosnia at large. Daughter of Serb parents, she is very religious. She graduated economics and she works as economist. She has been living in Srebrenica for 15 years, moving to town after the war, living before in Sarajevo. During the conflict, she lost friends but not close relatives. She never helped military forces. She does not know how many people live in town, but she thinks it is almost a multiethnic city, and that political authorities are quite supportive towards inter-group cooperation. She is politically active, always participating in elections. She feels to belong to Serb community, but she refuses to use the term “ethnic”. She rather prefers to define them as a nation, or a group, or a community. She thinks her belonging to Serb community will last as long as she will be alive. She is proud of her group, she has nothing to be ashamed about them. She thinks that school system is better to remain separate for each ethnic group, and she would be very disappointed in case her son would decide to marry a Bošnjak woman. She admits Bosnia is a divided country, and she would be happy if national belonging were not as important as they are. She feels the risk of Bosnian implosion, in so far Serb would like to secede, as well as Croats, while Bošnjaks would like to maintain the whole country for themselves. She thinks she is good at talking and at convincing people about her arguments.

**Ana** is 33 years old. She is Serb, both her parents are Serb. She finished secondary school and she works as a librarian. She feels a strong belonging to Serbian community, and she will always be Serb. She is proud and grateful to her community. During the war, Serbs were threatened as a community, but they resisted. She is in Srebrenica only for 7 years. She did not even live in Bosnia during the war. She did not lose relatives or friends in the war. She does not

know how many inhabitants Srebrenica has, but she thinks it is almost a multiethnic city, even if local authorities are not very much supportive about inter-group cooperation. She does not trust Bošnjaks nor Croats. Bosnia is a very divided society, and she often thinks that it would be better if ethnic identities counted less than they do. She never experienced intergroup cooperation in the framework of a project, but she has frequent contacts with Bošnjaks and Croats because of work, even if she doesn't feel so comfortable with them. She doesn't have any friends belonging to those communities. She thinks that cooperation among groups may be possible, but full trust never. She thinks she is good at speaking and eventually at convincing people about her opinions.

*Emir*, Bošnjak, is 48 years old. He studied metallurgic engineering at the secondary school and he works as carpenter. He was not in Bosnia during the war, but he lost several friends and relatives. He lives in Srebrenica since he was born, son of Bošnjak parents. He thinks that his town is almost multi-ethnic, with public authorities supporting inter-group cooperation. However, he lives in a mono-ethnic neighborhood. He feels too strongly to belong to the Bošnjak community, and religion is a very important component of his life. He will belong to his ethnic community until he will die. He shows some openness regarding the opportunity for children to attend inter-ethnic schools and multi-ethnic marriages, too. He says that because of work he has ordinary contacts with Serbs. He even says he has good friends among Serbs. However, he blames them to be the most responsible for war and war crimes on Bosnia and Herzegovina. He doesn't think that ethnic groups contribute to the same extent to the development of the country. He thinks that sometimes he can be good at speaking and at convincing people about his position.

## **6.2. Group structure**

The eight participants in this group have in common that they are all teachers who did participate in the activities of Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center. They are equally divided between Serbs and Bošnjaks, with four

participants from each side. With regard to gender there are five women and four men. The age composition is quite homogeneous with the youngest 31 and the oldest 52, not a large difference. For the other characteristics, I have no data for Svetlana because she came late and did not fill out the initial questionnaire. Of the remaining seven participants, five lived in the country during the war while two managed to go abroad. All but one lost families or friends during the war. Ethnic identities were so strong for six of the participants that they object to inter-ethnic marriages. Only Emir expressed some openness to inter-ethnic marriages. With regard to religion, from both sides of the ethnic divide, all write in the questionnaire that they are religious. Of great relevance is the question how participants see the responsibility for the war and the war crimes. Of the Bošnjaks two held Serbs responsible for the war, while the two others wanted to share responsibility between both sides. From the Serb side, they either wanted to share responsibility between the two sides or did not answer the question. Given the massacre in Srebrenica by the Serb side, it is remarkable that two Bošnjaks did not give responsibility one sided to the Serbs. Finally, it is important for the interpretation of the data whether participants feel generally comfortable to speak up in front of others. Five participants answered this question positively, two negatively. Thus, from this perspective there was quite openness to speak up in the discussion to come. Overall, these data reveal deep ethnic divisions in this group, so that this group, too, fits into our research design.

### **6.3. Group discussion**

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

#### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of

the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>261</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.** the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

## 2. *The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-

---

<sup>261</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

*3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

*4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

**Moderator:** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina, to be delivered to the High Representative?

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** I take a key problem. Someone should try to push through a law on the protection and welfare of animals that would, for

example, shelter dogs, cats and others. I cannot send my child to walk to school, I have to drive it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir begins the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Based on his personal story he proposes a law that would protect children from stray dogs. His story is that stray dogs are so dangerous for children that Emir must drive his child to school.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** That is so.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Already at the very beginning of the discussion, the issue of stray dogs is something on which agreement emerges across the ethnic divide in the sense that Mina as Serb supports Emir as Bošnjak.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** That is exactly the problem. That law. It was better before, when we did not have it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira is interactive and stays on the issue of stray dogs. In a respectful way she tells Emir that there is already a law concerning stray dogs and that this law did only make things worse. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Yes, but this law that we have now is not complete, can you understand?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina continues the discussion on the law concerning stray dogs and argues that the current law should not be abolished but made more complete. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Some partial laws were adopted.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion continues in an interactive way to understand the current legal situation with regard to stray dogs. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** The new law says that you are not allowed to kill them but nobody knows what to do with them (stray dogs).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir clarifies what the current law says. But in his view the law does not say what should be done with stray dogs. In an interactive way, the group is able to understand what the problem is with the current law on stray dogs. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Law must be changed.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Having listened to the others, Mira changes her position and no longer wants to cut the law but agrees that it should be changed. Good example of the force of the better argument. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** I thought that they still don't know how to finance the implementation of that law.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir brings a new aspect to the discussion that it is not only the content of the law but also the finances for its implementation. It is in a highly deliberative way how the group attempts to come to terms with the current situation with regard to stray dogs. Good deliberation also means to create a good informational basis, which the group does.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The issue of stray dogs is of interest to both ethnic groups, so that Mina as Serb has no problem to agree again with Emir as Bošnjak.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** It seems to me that after the enactment of the law, within a year each municipality must have a refuge for dogs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion moves quickly forward with Emir making a concrete proposal of how to handle the problem of stray dogs that every municipality must have a dog shelter.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** That's ok, but who is going to finance all of that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Good deliberation means also to raise questions, which Mira does putting on the agenda who will finance such dog shelters.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** That is what I am speaking about. If this letter (to the High Representative) cannot help us we need to seek for some alternatives, for sure.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir is interactive in responding to Mira that the letter to be sent to the High Representative may help to finance a dog shelter. Emir, however, acknowledges that this may not work, so that they have to look for another solution. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Who is responsible for that (stray dogs)?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina stays on topic in putting still another question on the agenda, who in the municipality is responsible for stray dogs. The implication is that one has to know the answer in order to be able to proceed in an effective way with the proposal of a dog shelter.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Who of us is in charge for that? We cannot abandon the animals, leave them on the streets.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira insists on the necessity of a dog shelter. Thereby, she brings a new argument into the discussion that not only the wellbeing of school children is involved but also the wellbeing of the dogs. The discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.



**Mina, Serb (code 1):** You cannot keep a dog in the house, but you are not allowed to leave it outside.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Apparently speaking from his own experience, Mina justifies why a dog shelter is necessary.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The issue of the dog shelter makes it easy for the group to reach agreement across the ethnic divide. Thus, Emir as Bošnjak has no problem to give support to what Mina as Serb has said.

**Amela, Bošnjak (code 1):** You can find a lot of them in front of school.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Amela speaks for the first time and confirms what Emir said at the very beginning of the discussion that stray dogs are a particular problem in front of the school.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Consensus across the ethnic divide continues with Mira as Serb agreeing with Amela as Bošnjak on the problem of stray dogs in front of the school.

**Ana, Serb (code 1):** Yes, they are on the street.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana as another Serb agrees with Amela across the ethnic divide that stray dogs in front of the school are a problem.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** This is still ok, wait until the snow falls, and then it will be much worse.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina adds the relevant information that when the snow comes, the problem with stray dogs will be even more severe. Up to now the discussion flows nicely with everyone contributing at a high level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 2):** What happened with that dog in front of the supermarket?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana stays on the topic of stray dogs, but asking for the fate of a specific dog she takes the discussion off-topic, transforming it to a low level of deliberation. For the next six speech acts the discussion stays with this specific dog and therefore remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** Yes, that one with a broken leg.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Husky?

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** I saw it near bus station.

**Ana, Serb (code 3):** It's an ugly dog.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** No, it's not, that's a very nice dog.

**Ana, Serb (code 3):** That's a great dog, a very determined dog, but it scares you when you pass near it. Well, that is a very nice Siberian dog but it's still not right to leave it to walk on streets just like that.

*Justification of the code of the seven preceding speech acts:* The discussion of a specific dog is clearly off-topic, leading the discussion nowhere. Whether this dog has a broken leg and how ugly it is, does not help to come closer to a solution about the dog shelter.

**Emir, Bošnjak (4):** I think that we have a problem now. It looks like all responsible people from our municipality including the Major do not see those dogs. I believe when people catch dogs in some local communities like Skelani, Jadar, Podravanje, Sase, Potočari etc. that they bring them here to town because they are so upset.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It was Emir who initially brought the issue of stray dogs on the agenda. He attempts now to get away from the discussion of a single dog and to discuss again the issue in general terms. He does this successfully with the story that the responsible people in the municipality have never seen the stray dogs, presumably because they live in

better neighborhoods. Emir also tells the story that people from neighboring communities take their stray dogs to Srebrenica. With these stories Emir transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Wait, you said that Husky is well known but when they organize some actions for catching the dogs it still remain on the streets. Why do they organize those actions at all?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira now uses the example of Husky to make the general point that the actions of the municipality to catch stray dogs are not successful. The discussion is interactive and remains again at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Last time Janjić (a man from the vet station who is in charge of the municipality to catch dogs) caught about one hundred dogs as I remember. They allowed that number and he caught that number. You remember when those people from Sarajevo also came?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion remains interactive with Emir telling Mira that the dog catcher of the municipality is successful in catching exactly the number of dogs that the municipality allowed him to catch. Emir corrects Mira in a very respectful way although they come from opposite ethnic groups. The discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Yes, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira accepts the correction of Emir without problem. If the group would discuss an ethnically more sensitive issue, it might be more difficult to reach such an agreement on the factual basis of the discussion. By contrast, the issue of stray dogs cuts so much across the ethnic divide that a common life world easily develops among the participants.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 2):** And those people from the municipality hid Husky in a garage.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir returns to the fate of Husky, getting in this way again off-topic. The discussion is once again transformed to a low level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** They believe that they can sell it somehow.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina continues on the Husky story, which does not help to bring back the discussion to a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** And that somebody will buy it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation on the question what happens to Husky.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** So we cannot do anything with this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina realizes that the discussion on the fate of Husky is leading nowhere, but he does not make any suggestion where the discussion should go next, so it still remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 4):** What else can we do, concretely, for our city? It would be good if the Guber spa starts to work again. It's not a problem that it is privatized, but with each privatization there are some conditions what and how to do it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir acts as deliberative leader. He has brought the question of stray dogs on the agenda; now he finds that one can move to another issue and proposes that the local spa should be opened again. The spa was already on the agenda of the second group in Srebrenica. Emir informs the group that the spa is in private hands, which in his view is not a basic problem, but if the spa has to be opened again one has to consider that it was

privatized. This is a rational presentation of the issue. The discussion is transformed to a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Let's do it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Not only on the issue of stray dogs but also on the spa issue there is cross-ethnic agreement with Mina as Serb supporting Emir as Bošnjak. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Can we read? "Mister High Representative, we send you this letter that contains basic needs of Srebrenica's citizens and our local community, so that we can organize and create better conditions in this area for a better life for all of us. These needs are reflected to the real problems that we deal with each day and resolving these problems would definitely make our lives better. Our problems and needs are..." and then we just name them. Is that ok?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With the discussion changing from the issue of stray dogs to the spa issue, Svetlana reminds the group that they have to write the letter to the High Representative. This is an important procedural matter, which keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Svetlana reads what she has prepared as introduction of the letter and suggests that they add now one proposal after another that the group decides.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** That's ok.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Also on this procedural matter there is inter-ethnic agreement with Emir as Bošnjak supporting Svetlana as Serb. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** First we need to start with the economy. We need to know that we cannot live only from walls, grass or whatever. We need money.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik speaks up for the first time, and in an interactive way states that the economy should be the first issue to be addressed to the High Representative. From his personal experience he tells the group that he suffers from poverty and needs money one way or another. He opens space to talk about how to improve the economic situation, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bosnian (code 1):** That's true.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation;* Emir agrees with the demand of Tarik keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** We live thanks to money. Not from walls. This building is nice but if you don't have money to buy something to eat or drink in it, we don't need it. So first, we need to develop the economy. How to regulate that? We need to force our politicians.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik repeats his argument making it even more vivid saying that even having enough to eat and drink is a problem. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** There are a lot of projects that aim at economic development.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana stays on topic in offering the information that there are already some projects to help economic development. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yeah. Here we have as much resources as you want but nobody takes them up. Here is an example. They sold the transportation company. It was said that they will hire 200 workers. After three years four years it is just wasted.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik stays on topic and gives a reason for the bad economic situation, the waste of resources. As example he gives transportation. Tarik keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** You're right there, but you know we have to force it all.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir stays interactive, agrees with the analysis of Tarik, but sets a somewhat more optimistic tone in telling the group that they have to take actions.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes! Yes, to force it all; but who is responsible?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik stays interactive agreeing with Emir that people have to take action. He then raises the relevant question of who is responsible. Un answer is needed, so that they know against whom they have to take actions. Tarik keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** So let's then put down: "the need for projects for the economic empowerment."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana summarizes and writes down nicely what emerges as a consensus in the group. It is remarkable that Svetlana as Serb agrees so much with the two Bošnjaks Tarik and Emir. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** To make accountable the people who have privatized the company (of transportation).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir answers the question of Tarik of who is responsible for the bad economic situation and states that it is the people who have privatized the transportation company. With the issue of privatizations Emir broadens the discussion about economic matters. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Yes

**Mina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes

*Interpretation of level of deliberations:* Mina and Mina agree both with Emir that privatizations are a problem. Agreements between the two ethnic sides continues. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** To meet obligations under the Privatization Agreement is a basic question.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After Emir gets support from Mina and Mina, he insists on his argument that how the Privatization Agreement is implemented is a basic problem. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** The basic question.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik gives further support to the argument that privatization is a basic problem. The discussion remains interactive at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Can we say it like this: "We should have an impact on privatized companies?"

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana keeps up conscientiously her role as note taker and summarizes well what was said about the problem of privatization. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** To bring about responsibility.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik wants to have the term of responsibility in the letter to be sent to the High Representative. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.



**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Entrepreneurs?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker Svetlana asks the group whether they should refer to the responsibility of the entrepreneurs. The discussion stays in an interactive way on topic.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** The Privatization Agency has an obligation to bring privatization to an end.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir makes a very concrete proposal how the question of privatization should be dealt with in proposing that the responsible governmental agency should cut all future privatizations.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 2):** Have an effect on the owners.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The proposal of Emir that the Agency of Privatization should stop all privatizations is now on the agenda and calls for the opinions of the other participants. Svetlana, however, does not follow up and makes a general remark that is not related to what Emir had proposed. In this way she gets off-topic to what is now on the agenda and transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** To do a revision.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With this remark, Emir does not help the group to get a handle at what he proposed before with regard to privatization. It is unclear what he means by a revision and who should do such a revision. Emir is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** It will not help the audit.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is unclear what Mina means with this statement. To what audit is he referring to? And what will not help in such an audit? Mina keeps the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Amela, Bošnjak (code 3):** The revision of privatization.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Amela, who has not spoken for a long time, attempts to define the topic under discussion. But she only repeats that privatization should be revised but does not add anything new so that the deliberation remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb, Bošnjak (code 3):** What is it?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira seems lost where the discussion stands. She is not able with her question to transform it back to a high level of deliberation because she does not bring any new elements into the discussion.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** That means: "You bought and you have in the contract that ..."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir attempts to explain how the contract of privatization works, but he is not able to make clearer how one should go about to cause the Authority of Privatization to stop all future privatizations. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb, Bošnjak (code 3):** It has already been done and still nothing.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira is incoherent in what she wants to say; she does not make clear what has already been done and in what sense nothing has occurred. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation without clear direction.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** We do it with "I to you, you to me" way.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir makes another effort to spell out what he has in mind with his proposal with regard to privatization; but again he is not successful in not making clear with whom he wants to negotiate

according to the saying “I to you, you to me.” The discussion still drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 3):** How can we say that? What you said just now is that these private owners actually have to fulfill ...

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* That the discussion continues to be confusing is seen with the question of Svetlana as note taker. It is apparent that she does not understand what Emir means with the saying “I to you, you to me.” The level of deliberation stays low.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Well, revision of privatization, and the privatization agency to conduct their purchase contracts ... privatization purchase contracts because they are bound and obliged.

*Justification of contract:* Emir is still not able to express clearly what he has in mind with the privatization contracts. It is not clear who is supposed to be bound and obliged. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 4):** No, I was thinking of the obligation of the employer to the worker.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After the incoherent statements of the previous speakers, Svetlana formulates a clear sentence expressing what the issue should be on the agenda. She proposes that the fundamental question should be the obligations that employers have towards the workers. Svetlana opens space for the discussion to continue at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes, but who will force the employers to do that? It must be the Agency for Privatization. In the contract they have written that they (the employers) have to keep the existing number of workers, and in the period of three to five years they need to invest some amount of money and they need to employ more workers.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With her clear statement Svetlana has helped Emir to clarify for himself what he wants to propose. He agrees with Svetlana that the basic issue is the obligation that the employers have towards the workers. He changes now his position and is no longer insisting that the Agency for Privatization should stop all privatizations. In broader terms, Emir wants the agency to make sure that the contract of privatization is correctly implemented, in particular that the existing number of workers is kept and that investments are made so that the number of workers can even be increased. This is a good example of how the force of the better argument made Emir change his mind. In setting in a clear way the issue to be discussed, Emir took a new perspective. The discussion has now gone back to a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** The most dangerous is that when they sell the company and then you don't have neither employees nor employers. You do not even know who the authorities are, or who worked there.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik refers to the problem that after privatization the companies disappear so that it is impossible to hold anyone responsible. This is a relevant information to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Let's see. We said, "economic empowerment, implementation and revision of privatization." I also do not know how to say it, to include certain social groups of the population.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As a conscientious note taker, Svetlana continues to do a good job to summarize the essence of the ongoing discussion. In a deliberative spirit she asks the group how to refer to the various societal groups mentioned in the discussion. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Regarding the social problems, mineral and material wealth should be returned to the local level. That was before the war. The state must give over to the local level.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir brings still another relevant issue on the agenda that the control of mineral wealth and of material wealth in general should be brought back to the local level. This is an important policy issue for Bosnia-Herzegovina, which has the potential to broaden the discussion.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Now we have something else. Mining, forests.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Once again we have agreement across the ethnic divide with Mira as Serb supporting Emir as Bošnjak that minerals are an important topic. As an example of other material wealth Mira adds forests. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** We have as another example the Drina River. How much (money) are we seeking?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir adds as another example of material wealth the Drina River, which passes Srebrenica. Emir becomes more specific and asks how much they charge the state for all the material wealth at the local level. The discussion is very policy oriented and thus stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** We cannot make them pay.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira stays interactive, answering Emir that Srebrenica will not be able to make the state pay for the material wealth at the local level. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** We cannot, but let us say that the local authorities charge something and give a percentage to Banja Luka, for example, or to some other local community. That's how it worked before the war.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir agrees with Mira that it may be hopeless that Srebrenica gets state money for its local material resources and proposes that the local authorities collect some money and shares it with other local communities, a solution that worked before the war. The discussion is now on very specific policy matters, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** The forest charges do not go to Banja Luka, and the problem is that they are paid irregularly.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is remarkable how ordinary citizens of both sides of the ethnic divide are willing to talk about minute policy issues. Mira gives further information about the money from the local forests are allocated. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Yes, that is it.

**Ana, Serb (code 1):** Yes, sure

*Interpretation of level of deliberations:* Svetlana and Ana have listened to Mira and support what she has said. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Do it our way. Say it our way that everybody understands us. Rustic language is best, and the High Representative understands the peasants. He understands them well. The peasant, when he says that there is no bread to eat, he says it very clearly.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik moves away from the detailed policy discussion and makes a general remark of how the letter to the High Representative should be written. He proposes that the group should use a simple language, the language of the peasants, and he assures the group that the High Representative will understand such language. Since writing this letter is what the group is expected to do, the remark of Tarik is relevant and not off-topic. Therefore the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Well, then tell us what to write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina in a respectful way reacts to Tarik and asks him what he would write in the letter to the High Representative. How the discussion develops one does not notice who comes from the Serb side and who from the Bošnjak side. In this way the discussion is not disrupted with sniping remarks across the ethnic divide.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** I have some other suggestions. For example the Guber Spa. You have the economy and some other problems that will cost us a lot. I am saying that for a least 5 years. I spoke to a former Mayor, and to current one. The river bed should be cleaned urgently.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik answers Mina and comes back to the spa, supporting other participants who earlier in the discussion advocated that it should be opened again. Tarik also brings the cleaning of the Drina River on the agenda. Furthermore, Tarik makes some general remarks about the bad situation of the economy and mentions as a personal story that he has spoken on the economy with the former and the current majors. With this elaborate statement he keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Ecology.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir follows up Tarik's proposal that the Drina River should be cleaned broadening the agenda mentioning the ecology as a general problem.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** So, ecology.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik agrees with Emir that the cleaning of the Drina River should be seen in the context of the ecology at large. The discussion continues to flow in an interactive way at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Purification of the sewage in order to protect the environment.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana picks up the issue of the dirty river and the environment in general and puts as a particularly urgent matter on the purification of the sewage. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** The river bed is so dirty and so messy.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik reinforces his proposal that the river needs to be cleaned in describing in vivid colors its current messy state. The discussion stays on topic.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** We have cleaned it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a respectful way Mira informs the group that she has helped to clean the river.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes, but they cleaned only parts.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an equally respectful way Tarik adds to the statement of Mira that they have cleaned only parts of the river. These are stories helping the discussion to stay at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** People throw trash, throw all the garbage. So, first we need to educate the people and then clean the river bed.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is amazing how Serbs and Bošnjaks address the cleaning of the river not in a partisan way but for the common good. Mina as Serb does not claim that it is Bošnjaks who throw garbage into the river but refers to people in general. This statement is very much in a deliberative spirit.



**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** When they clean the river bed they need to clean everything, not only some parts. I walk there every day. One willow fell in the river bed. And people throw everything, sofa, trash, garbage.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik insists how dirty the river is, adding his personal story that he has even seen sofas. The discussion remains on topic at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** You know, the problem is garbage.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira agrees with previous speakers that garbage in the river is a problem. The discussion stays on topic.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Junk is the biggest problem.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* From both sides of the ethnic divide, they continue to agree that garbage in the river is a great problem. The discussion remains interactive.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 2):** Hey Mira, you are defending the municipality!

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* For the first time in this group there is a sniping remark across the ethnic divide. Tarik as a Bošnjak addresses directly Mira as Serb and criticizes her that she is defending the municipality. He seems to refer to an earlier statement of Mira that she helped to clean the river. With his sniping remark across the ethnic divide, Tarik transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation

**Mira Serb (code 4):** No, (smiling) but it should be my profession.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira does not let herself be provoked from the other side of the ethnic divide and simply smiles. Jokingly she adds that cleaning the river would be a good profession for her. In using humor she transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** With your story, you defend the municipality. When they cleaned it near that butcher, down the playground, they cut willows and left all branches. I asked Kiko (former mayor): "Kiko, what are they doing down there?". He said: "We clean a river bed.". I told him not to clean a river bed like that, the branches need to be pulled out and not left like that.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik insists that Mira defends the municipality and from the tone of his voice this time in a less disrespectful way. He then spells out what goes wrong with cleaning the river. He goes in minute details what should be done differently. To give to his story more credibility he tells the group that he brought his complaint to the mayor himself. Tarik stays on topic and adds relevant information about his talk with the mayor, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Just to say that this is not done by the municipality. That was done by a donation.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* For good deliberation it is important that participants have a common basis of facts. Mira corrects Tarik that the cleaning of the river was not done by the municipality but thanks to a donation. She makes this correction in a respectful way, so that the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** I do not know, but they should cut and remove all branches from the bed (of the river). We all agree.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik yields to Mira in acknowledging that he does not have knowledge who did the cleaning of the river. He does not apologize to Mira but extends a palm branch to her in stating that they all agree, which may also refer to the correction that Mira has made, although it may just refer to what should be done with the branches in the river. Such ambivalence is sometimes good for deliberation, as is the case with the exchange between Tarik and Mira. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** What we said for the letter? In addition to the other things, realization of projects in order to protect the environment.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana continues to be a conscientious note taker and adds to the letter for the High Representative that projects should be undertaken to protect the environment. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 1):** Infrastructure.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana wants to make sure that infrastructure is mentioned in the letter, an issue that was addressed earlier in the discussion. The discussion remains very interactive with participants listening to each other. Thus, in the current case, Ana was attentive when Svetlana made suggestions what should be contained in the letter and chose the right moment to make sure that the infrastructure as an important issue was not forgotten.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Underline here that as soon as possible, within our ability, to do the sewer in the city. Soon we will be in a situation that I, for instance, I have to make a septic tank that I have nowhere to put. The whole of Srebrenica has this problem.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir comes back to the issue of the sewer and reinforces its urgency with a personal story. Participants have the impression that the discussion comes soon to an end, so they want to make sure that all items discussed so far are included in the letter to the High Representative. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1 )** Should we write "investment in municipal infrastructure, resolving the problem of sewage network"? We cannot say "resolve the problem of stray dogs" because by the law those animals are protected but they did not find a way how to care for them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana as note taker becomes increasingly important in the discussion. She summarizes well the issue

concerning the sewer problem. With regard to the stray dogs she expresses uncertainty about the proper formulation. To express uncertainty and to ask others for advice is very much in a deliberative spirit.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir acknowledges that the formulation with regard to stray dogs is a problem.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Construction of dog shelter, then?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Encouraged by the support of Emir, Svetlana offers herself a formulation with regard to the stray dogs, and this in the form of a question, which is in a deliberative spirit.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Taking care of stray dogs? For us the problem is that the laws are made in accordance with European standards, and we do not have the conditions for it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina gives the relevant information that the laws concerning stray dogs are made in accordance with EU standards and that Bosnia-Herzegovina has not yet the conditions for the implementation of such laws. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** This is European Union (laughing).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira mocks all the regulations that come out of Brussels, which causes laughter by the group. They laugh about themselves, which is in a deliberative spirit.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** We definitely do not have conditions for this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina insists that they do not have the conditions to have a law for stray dogs according to EU standards. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation. The group continues to struggle in a serious way what to do with stray dogs.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Not even they had the law on protection of animals in 1948, 1949, 1950. That means that first we must build a state, to raise the standard of living.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir continues in a sophisticated way the discussion about the application of EU laws to Bosnia-Herzegovina. About half a century ago, Western European countries did not have either laws for the protection of animals according to their current standards. Bosnia-Herzegovina is where Western Europe was half a century ago. Therefore, it must develop its state and its standards of living before it can have animal protection laws according to EU standards. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 2): How to build a dog shelter, when we do not have anything to eat, and we need to give to dogs?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina expresses despair and hopelessness with the general situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where people do not have enough money to eat and should pay for dogs. After the long deliberative discussion about stray dogs, the discussion seems to be at a dead end, being transformed to a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** There is castration?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a tentative way, Mira mentions castration as an option, without actually supporting it and not saying how such a program could be done with stray dogs that are difficult to catch. The deliberation stays at a low level of deliberation with both sides of the ethnic divide not knowing what to do with stray dogs.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Yes, castration.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir confirms that castration would be an option, but without saying how this option would work. The discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** Everything is regulated, but you will only reduce the number of dogs and then let them go again, understand?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina states why castration is not an option. Mira and Emir do not insist on the option, which shows that they never stood behind it but only mentioned it because no other options seem in sight. The discussion about stray dogs drags on at a low level of deliberation without any direction.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** It is gradual. It's going slowly. Everything should be resolved in the period let's say of 10-15 years.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is not clear whether Emir is still referring to the stray dogs, or whether he refers to the general situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Whatever the reference, this vague long term perspective does not move ahead the discussion about a better future. The level of deliberation remains low.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** The largest problem is that no one has obligations. Everyone has rights and no one has obligations.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After the group had discussed for some time without success what should happen with stray dogs, despair and hopelessness sets in. Mira complains with resignation that nobody wants to take over any obligations. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Amela, Bošnjak (code 3):** And what about the wild pigs that come down into the city?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* To make the problem with stray dogs worse, Amela brings the wild pigs into the discussion that come down from the mountains surrounding Srebrenica. Since Amela does not make any suggestion of how the problem of the wild pigs can be solved, the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 3):** Here's a hunter, let him solve the problem. One night one came down and was stuck in the fence.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana tells a story illustrating that the wild pigs are indeed a problem. Referring to a hunter in the group to solve the problem is more meant as a joke. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Down in Black River, one wild pig literally came in the courtyard.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir tells another story about wild pigs, but the story is not saying anything of how the problem could be solved so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 4): Pigs also wants to learn a little culture here (laughter).**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana brings some humor into the group lightening up the atmosphere of despair and hopelessness. As Sammy Basu has argued,<sup>262</sup> humor helps deliberation so that the discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Or where we live is also wilderness, so for them it is all the same (more laughter).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina picks up on the subtle humor of Ana. They both can laugh about the lack of culture in Srebrenica. It is a kind of black humor. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Is it banned hunting them?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After humor had relaxed the atmosphere, Mira goes back in a serious way to the question of hunting wild pigs

---

<sup>262</sup> Sammy Basu, „Dialogic Ethics and the Virtue of Humor,“ *Journal of Political Philosophy* vol. 7 (1999).

that Ana had raised earlier more like a joke. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Yes, but if they make a mess you have a right to kill them on your property.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina gives Mira a relevant information, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Can we say "adaptation of the law about the Animal Protection considering the real capabilities of the local community"? It means to adjust enactment of laws and not to bring any abnormal ones.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana acts again as conscientious note taker and proposes a formulation that would encompass both stray dogs and wild pigs. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** Yes, we can do it like that. They need to think also about our capabilities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira agrees with the formulation of Svetlana. The discussion continues to be highly interactive and stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** The maximum penalty is precisely in this sector. Regarding the Law on Animal Protection and Welfare they can punish you with 200 000KM. And to do any kind of misconduct in the field of economy is not consider as such a big crime.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir broadens the discussion from stray dogs and wild pigs to the issue of penalties. He finds it wrong that the penalties are lighter for misconduct with economic matters than with ill treatment of animals. In this way he raises a fundamental question of the penal system, which would open space for a wide ranging discussion.



**Amela, Bošnjak (code 1):** But on the street, you cannot walk normally because of the dogs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Amela seems to disagree with Emir and insists on high penalties for violations of the law on the protection of animals. As reason she mentions her personal problem with dogs on the streets. She expresses her disagreement with respect so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** We have a problem going into retirement. They increased the length of working years and now it is 65 years. When young people come and want to work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana addresses another issue that is topical for a better future. She criticizes that the retirement age will be raised to 65. She gives a reason for this objection that young people will not find enough jobs. Svetlana keeps the level of discussion at a high level in inviting the group to still address another important issue.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** They will never come in line. They go with the EU standards.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir reminds Svetlana that as with stray dogs for retirement age, too, Bosnia-Herzegovina follows EU standards. This is relevant information, so that deliberation remains at a high level.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** What shall we write more?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina takes over role as moderator and asks in a neutral way whether the group wants to add anything more to the letter for the High Representative. At this late stage of the discussion this is a relevant question, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Mina shows that the group can do well without a moderator.

**Ana, Serb (code 1):** Write, it really hurts me personally, infrastructure in Srebrenica more than dogs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Ana answers to Mina not adding more issues but proposing that the emphasis in the letter should be more on infrastructure than on stray dogs. She keeps the discussion on topic.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Yes, that's right.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina supports Ana that the emphasis should be more on infrastructure than dogs. Discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** "The development of infrastructure in rural areas" (she is reading what she wrote).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker Svetlana reads aloud what she wants to write about infrastructure. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Oh, everywhere.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina is attentive to what Svetlana proposes and wants that it is written that infrastructure is a problem not only in rural areas but everywhere.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** So, "strengthening the infrastructure."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is remarkable how the group takes seriously how the letter should be written. Svetlana yields to Mina in a respectful way. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes, but to build the entire city rather than for one part to have everything and others, for instance Petriča, nothing. In the recent ten years I saw only three programs.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik stays on the topic of infrastructure and wants that all parts of the city should have their infrastructure improved. To reinforce his argument he mentions one part of the city that he fears will get nothing. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** This is it in essence. I add only "communal infrastructure and solving the sewage network".

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The group takes great pain to find the right formulation with regard to the infrastructure. Svetlana brings back in the sewage issue that was discussed earlier.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** That's it. We will be great when they do this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After in an earlier part of the discussion despair and hopelessness had prevailed, some optimism has returned, and the group discusses in great detail what it should write to the High Representative about infrastructure. This optimism is now expressed by Mina who hopes that some of their proposals will be accepted. It is remarkable how the group dynamic of a discussion can change from hopelessness to hope.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** Education? We didn't put anything on it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* It is not yet the end of the discussion, and again it is Svetlana who brings still another issue on the agenda. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 1):** Look at Kasipović (Education Minister), what he was doing, my dear God, How much money he turned to the other side.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik is interactive and supports Svetlana that education also needs improvement. To support his argument he refers to the Education Minister, who is corrupt in giving money to the wrong persons. The claim is that corruption in education should be stopped. The discussion flows at a high level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 1):** Welfare.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina adds still another issue that is relevant for a better future.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 2):** Here I am, for example, I as a single mother I'm not protected by any law. I thought of that. No law. I had a problem, I faced the first 3-4 years, and whomever I spoke to told me that there is no law.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After the discussion went smoothly between the two ethnic groups, Svetlana seems comfortable enough to talk about her problems as a single mother. She does not say what her problem is but expresses despair that single mothers are not protected by any law. With this despair she transforms the discussion down to a low level of deliberation because her utter despair does not open space for positive solutions. Earlier in the discussion, Svetlana was quite optimistic, but now telling her personal story, the surface falls and she reveals to the group her real feelings.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 3):** What do you think, madam, that I am protected from? I am a male. By neither women nor men are protected by laws. Neither you nor me. So, there is no law. For those who survived, there is no law.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Finally someone is referring to the war, when Tarik talks about those who survived. He enlarges the point of Svetlana that not only women, but men, too, are not protected by any laws. So he reinforces the despair of Svetlana keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** There is no law for anybody.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina follows the two previous speakers in expressing despair that nobody is protected by any law. It is remarkable that this despair is expressed from both sides of the ethnic divide. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** Old laws were better – bring them back to us.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a nostalgic way, Mira wants to bring back the old laws, but does not say how this could be done, so the level of deliberation remains low.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Protection of workers.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir repeats that workers should be protected without adding anything that was not said before, so the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 3):** Protection of workers! We now try to install 90 percent of the laws that we had before, and they worked well.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik claims that attempts are made to reinstall most of the old laws, but he does not say who is doing that. The discussion stay at a low level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** They are not trying.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir contests that the authorities try to reinstall the old law. He does not give any evidence for this statement, so that the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 3):** They're trying.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This exchange of unsupported claims does not move the discussion forward.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** Who is trying? You and me?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir continues the fruitless controversy whether anyone is trying to reinstall the old laws.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 3):** For example, they abolished free schooling.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik mentions free schooling as an example of a law that was abolished. The implication seems to be that he wants again free schooling, but he does not say this explicitly and does not offer an argument why free schooling would be a good policy. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** I work 14 hours for 400KM. I do not have any kind of insurance, nor any other rights.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir repeats the old complaint that people like him have no rights and no money which does not move the discussion forward.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** They sit in the government and shaping the laws that suits them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina expresses hopelessness that people like him have any influence on the laws since the authorities shape the laws according to their own interests. If ordinary people like Mina have no influence on the laws then it is pointless for the group to make suggestions for a better future, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 3):** They bring laws when they need them. Look how unanimous they are when they want to increase their wages.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana shares the hopelessness of Mina that ordinary people have any influence on the laws, and she gives a specific illustration for her claim. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** No law longer protects workers. The courts are the courts, but you cannot get anything from them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina extends his hopelessness to the courts. The level of deliberation stays low.

***Mira, Serb (code 4):*** And the local community failed a little. They have a law that protects them but there are no control institutions that are working.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira is more positive than the previous speakers in correcting them that laws exist to protect the people. She acknowledges that there is a lack of institutions to enforce the laws. To correct this situation she refers to the local community at large, opening space of how the local community could become active. With her less hopeless statement Mira transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

***Emir, Bošnjak (code 2):*** And you know why they are not working? Because people are not protected from those of whom they should. Here's a case that I had in Potočari before July 11 last year. Six policemen and some of us were there. One man pulled out the gun on us without any reason. The police did not react. Not to mention that the Mayor said "oh, kill him". That's it; the laws exist, but only on paper.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir immediately rejects the hope of Mira that institutions can be installed that make sure that laws are implemented. To support his claim he tells a personal story where the police did nothing to protect him against a gunman. With such expression of hopelessness, the discussion is again transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

***Mira, Serb (code 3):*** Yes, that is it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Overwhelmed by the powerful story of Emir, Mira does not insist on the option that the local community should make sure that laws are enforced. Instead she agrees with Emir that laws exist only on paper. Again, we have agreement across the ethnic divide on an important issue.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** You have nowhere to complain.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina continues on a tone of despair, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 3):** You don't, yes.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik agrees with Mina across the ethnic divide that ordinary citizens have nowhere to complain, keeping deliberation at a low level.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 3):** How the laws function you can see from the greater number of charges in Strasbourg. People are increasingly complaining there because they cannot do it here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* To reinforce his point that laws are not enforced in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Emir tells another story, this time not linked to a personal experience. Apparently he has heard that more and more people from Bosnia-Herzegovina turn to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. He interprets this as a sign that people are not satisfied with how laws are enforced in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He does not express hope that the European Court of Human Rights will have an influence on law enforcement here, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** They brought us in the position without any way out; you have to do everything they say.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mina continues in a hopeless tone that there is no way out of the current situation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 4): Should we write something about the education? Investing in education?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* When Svetlana spoke last, she told her story as single mother, expressing utter despair about her situation, claiming that she has no rights at all. She has remained silent for quite a while, but seems



to have recovered and proposes investment in education. Given the low level of deliberation before she speaks, this is a relevant proposal for a better future. She transform the discussion to a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** I wrote the equipping of schools and the gym to gain practical work. Will we write dedication to him?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Svetlana as note taker summarizes what has been said about education. She then asks whether the letter should be dedicated to the High Representative. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Mira, Serb (code 1):** That's good.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mira seems to agree that the letter should be dedicated to the High Representative, keeping the level of deliberation high.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 2):** We can write what we want but if he does not implement what we write there is no sense.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik doubts that the High Representative will implement anything contained in the letter- Therefore he objects that the letter is dedicated to the High Representative. With this statement Tarik expresses the view that the whole discussion was pointless, which transforms it to a low level of deliberation.

**Ana, Serb (code 3):** There is nothing that will be implemented. This is a dead letter.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ana joins Tarik in his negativism, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

**Tarik, Bošnjak (code 3):** I doubt anyone will read this.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Tarik goes even further in his negativism, expressing doubt whether anyone will read this letter.

**Mina, Serb (code 3):** Let's write and maybe a miracle will happen. Write "grateful citizens of Srebrenica."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* From the context, Mina's reference to a miracle and grateful citizens sound more like sarcasm, which keeps the level of deliberation low.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 4):** And ask him to visit us here for a public hearing in the Cultural Center. Not to visit the local authorities but common people.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir makes it as a serious proposal that the High Representative should come and visit ordinary citizens, bypassing the local authorities. This proposal corresponds very much to the deliberative criterion that democracy should start from below. With this proposal Emir transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

**Svetlana, Serb (code 1):** "If you can find any possibility to implement some (or all) of the foregoing requirements we can create better quality and a more beautiful life for all. Thank you in advance. We invite you to participate in a public hearing"

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker Svetlana reads how she includes the proposal of Emir into the letter to the High Representative. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Emir, Bošnjak (code 1):** "It would be our great pleasure if you can find time to visit us, but only the citizens and not the local government. Sincerely, citizens of Srebrenica."

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Emir insists that the letter should say that the High Representative visit only the citizens and not the local authorities. There is no objection and the discussion comes at a high tone of deliberation to an end.

## **6.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 4 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether 15 deliberative transformative moments, eight downwards and seven upwards, so that the discussion ended at a high level. Again, I will start with summarizing my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. Afterwards, I will show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

### **6.4.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation**

The first time that the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation occurs when Ana from the Serb side gets off-topic. Up to this moment there was a serious discussion about what to do with stray dogs. Ana then asks about a specific dog, Husky, seen in front of the supermarket, which led to a pointless bantering whether this dog is ugly or not. In previous groups, there were also cases where off-topic remarks transformed a discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. .

The second time that the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation once again involves Husky, the dog seen in front of the supermarket. In the meantime the discussion had returned to the general problem of stray dogs, but then Emir from the Bošnjak side told the group that the municipality had hidden Husky in a garage, which was an off-topic information with regard to the general discussion about what to do with stray dogs.

The third instance of a transformation from a high to a low level of deliberation is again due to an off-topic remark. Bošnjak Emir had proposed that all future privatizations should end. Serb Svetlana, instead of addressing this proposal, makes a vague remark about owners that is not related to what Emir had proposed. In this way he gets off-topic to what is now on the agenda and transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

The fourth downward Deliberative Transformative Moment is due to a sniping remark across the ethnic divide. When the garbage issue is discussed, Serb Mira shows some understanding for the problems confronting the local officials. She is sharply criticized by Bošnjak Tarik that she defends the municipalities. Listening to her voice on the tapes, it is clear that Tarik shows disrespect for what Mira said. We have already seen in previous groups, how lack of respect can transform a discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation.

The fifth time that the discussion is transformed back to a low level of deliberation is when Mira from the Serbian side expresses utter despair and hopelessness with the general situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where people do not have enough money to eat and should have to pay for a dog shelter. We have seen such cases of despair already in previous groups.

It is again utter despair and hopelessness that for the sixth time transforms the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. This time it is Svetlana, also from the Serb side, who talks about her severe problems as a single mother. She does not say what exactly her problems are but expresses despair that single mothers are not protected by any law. With this despair she transforms the discussion down to a low level of deliberation because her utter despair does not open space for positive solutions. Earlier in the discussion, Svetlana was quite optimistic, but now telling her personal story, the surface falls and she reveals to the group her real feelings.

It is again despair that transforms for the sixth time the discussion back to a low level of deliberation. This time despair is expressed from the Bošnjak side. Emir rejects the hope of Mira that institutions can be installed that make sure that

laws are implemented. To support his claim he tells a personal story where the police did nothing to protect him against a gunman. With such expression of hopelessness, the discussion is again transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

The seventh Deliberative Transformative Moment occurred when Tarik from the Bošnjak side complains that the education minister, instead of investing in education, takes a large salary for himself. This is another case of despair leading to a downturn in the level of deliberation.

The last time that the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation it is once again despair that causes this downturn. Bošnjak Tarik doubts that the High Representative will implement anything contained in the letter sent to him by the group. With this statement Tarik expresses the view that the whole discussion is pointless, which transforms it to a low level of deliberation.

Overall, it was four times that a downward Deliberative Transformative Moment was due to despair, expressed two times from the Serb side, and also twice from the Bošnjak side. It is also remarkable that the cases of despair all occurred in the latter part of the discussion. We have seen such cases of despair already in the previous three groups, so that a clear pattern begins to be set in. In the current group, off-topic remarks led three times to a downturn in the level of deliberation. In groups 2 and 3 we have already seen such cases, but not in group 1. The remaining downward Deliberative Transformative Moment in the current group was due to lack of respect towards someone of the other ethnic side. Such lack of respect we have already seen in groups 1 and 2, but not in group 3. In the current group there was no downward Deliberative Transformative Moment due to fatigue, which we have seen in groups 1 and 2, but not in group 3. There was also no case in the current group where the discussion was transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation because the issue under debate was above the intellectual level of the participants; we have seen such a case in group 1.

#### 6.4.2. Transformative moments from low to high levels of deliberation

The first case of an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurred when Bošnjak Emir continued his leadership role and brought up in a rational way a super-ordinate issue of interest to both Serbs and Bošnjaks. He had already brought the question of stray dogs on the agenda; now he moves to another issue and proposes that the local spa should be opened again. Emir informs the group that the spa is in private hands, which in his view is not a basic problem, but if the spa has to be opened again one has to consider that it was privatized. This is a rational presentation of the issue. It also helped that the spa is a super-ordinate issue not linked in a one-sided way to one of the two ethnic groups. I have already noted for the previous groups the importance of leadership, rationality and super ordinate goals.

The second upward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurs thanks to Serb Svetlana. After incoherent statements of the previous speakers about the bad economy, Svetlana states that the crucial issue is the obligation of the employer to the worker. This is a clear statement expressing what the issue should be on the agenda. Svetlana shows leadership in giving the discussion a clear new direction. In this case, too, it helps that she articulates a super ordinate goal of interest to both Serbs and Bošnjaks workers.

The third time that the discussion is transformed from a low to a high level of deliberation, it is thanks to well used humor by Serb Mila. The discussion is how to clean up garbage in the river that passes Srebrenica. The exchange of corresponding proposals is at a high level of deliberation, until Bošnjak Tarik makes the sniping remark against Serb Mira that she is too much understanding for the failures of the municipal officers (discussed in previous section). Mira does not let herself be provoked from the other side of the ethnic divide and simply smiles. Jokingly she adds that cleaning the river would be a good profession for her. In using humor she transforms the discussion quickly back to a high level of deliberation. For the previous groups we have not yet find such a case where humor helped to bring back a discussion to a high level of deliberation. In her dissertation about ex-combatants in Colombia, Maria Clara

Jaramillo, however found several cases of humor helping to transform a discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

This group seems to have a good sense of humor since the fourth upward Deliberative Transformative Moment is also triggered by well used humor. The group discussed the problem of wild pigs that come down from the mountains into the town and cause damage around private houses. No serious proposals are made of how to handle the problem and despair sets in, until Ana from the Serb side gets laughter with the remark that pigs want to learn a little culture here. Mina, also from the Serb side, gets even more laughter when she banters that we live also in wilderness, so for the pigs it is all the same. Both Ana and Mina can laugh about the lack of culture in Srebrenica. It is a kind of black humor. The discussion is back at a high level of deliberation.

The fifth upward Deliberative Transformative Moment comes in the context of whether workers are protected by any laws. Mina from the Serb side is despairing claiming that there are no laws at all protecting workers, which keeps deliberation at a low level. Mira, who is also from the Serb side, takes a more differentiated view, arguing that laws indeed exist but that there are no control institutions making sure that the laws are indeed enforced. With this rational analysis she opens space to address the question of how to get better control institutions. It also helps that the rights of workers is a super ordinate issue, of concern to both sides of the ethnic divide. .

Before the sixth upward Deliberative Transformative Moment takes place, utter despair and hopelessness had set in. Serb Mina, for example, complains that ordinary citizens have always to do everything that the authorities tell them. At this point, Serb Svetlana takes over a leadership role and proposes that the group should address the issue of how more could be invested in education. As a superordinate goal this helped to launch the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

The seventh upward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurs toward the end of the discussion, when the group has to decide what to write to the High Representative. Tarik from the Bošnjak side is very negative and doubts whether

anyone in the office of the High Representative will read the letter at all. Emir, also from the Bošnjak side, is more hopeful and makes the constructive proposal that the High Representative should bypass the local authorities and come directly to the common people for a public hearing. This proposal corresponds very much to the deliberative criterion that democracy should start from below. Svetlana from across the Serb side, supports Emir that the High Representative should come for a public hearing. Once again, this case shows how important it is that someone takes up a leadership role, which Emir did in this crucial final stage of the discussion. It also helped with lifting the level of deliberation that the goal of having a public hearing with the High Representative would appeal to both Serbs and Bošnjaks.

Overall, the analysis of this group has shown how crucial it is for lifting the level of deliberation that the proposed issue is of a super ordinate nature appealing to both sides of the ethnic divide. It needs leadership to make such a super ordinate proposal and thus to bring the group out of dragging on at a low level of deliberation. This pattern of leadership and super ordinate goals, I found in groups 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7. In three of these groups, 1, 2, and 5, it helped further in lifting the level of deliberation that the arguments for addressing a super ordinate issue were presented in a rational way. The importance of leadership, rationality, and super ordinate goals, we have already seen in the previous groups. What was new in the present group was, however, that humor played a role in transforming the discussion from a low to a high level of discussion, and this even twice, in groups 3 and 4.

## 6.5 Outcomes and deliberation

How did deliberation impact on the outcomes of group discussions? As for the previous groups, I will investigate in this section how the deliberative pattern is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. Again, I will use the graphic form, where H stands for a speech act at a high level of deliberation, and L for a speech act at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt



altogether with five substantive issues: protection of animals, economic empowerment of the community, reduction of privatization, development of infrastructure and sewage system, equip schools for practical education In this order, I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= decision on the protection of animals, D2= decision on economic development of the community, D3= reduction of privatizations, D4= development of infrastructure and sewage system, D5= equip schools for practical education

#### 6.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 4

H -----D1 (19)  
 L ----- (7)  
 H – (1)  
 L ---- (4)  
 H -----D2-----D3 (21)  
 L ----- (10)  
 H -----D4 (25)  
 L 1 (1)  
 H ----- (14)  
 L ----- (9)  
 H ----- (22)  
 L ----- (14)  
 H – (1)  
 L ---- (5)  
 H --- D5 (3)  
 L ---- (4)  
 H --- (3)

There were in total 161 speech acts, 107 at a high level of deliberation, 54 at a low level. Thus, 66 percent of all speech acts were at a high deliberative level, which corresponds roughly to the first group with 67 percent of the speech

acts at a high level and the third group with 62 percent. By contrast, in group 2 there were only 37 percent of the speech acts at a high level. As in the first three groups, substantive agreements were only reached when the discussion could be kept for a long time at a high level of deliberation. The only exception was with D5 on education where agreement was reached only after three speech acts at a high level of deliberation, but this decision was already prepared in earlier sequences of the discussion. All agreements concerned issues on super-ordinate goals. It was easy to see, for example, that it was in the common interest of both ethnic groups to develop the economy of the community. So once again, as in the previous three groups, sensitive inter-ethnic issues were not addressed.

## Chapter 7: Fifth Group of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica

### 7.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>263</sup>

**Laila, Bošnjak**, girl, 13 years old, student, both parents Bošnjaks. She is a student. She strongly feels to belong to Bošnjak community, and she will always belong to. She is very religious. She has been living in Srebrenica for 8 years, coming from Vozuća. She was not even born during the 90's war in Bosnia. However, she states that she lose relatives during the conflict. She thinks that Srebrenica is a multiethnic town, even if local authorities are not very supportive to promote inter-ethnic cooperation. She thinks that Bosnia and Herzegovina is a united country. Sometimes, however, she would like ethnic identity to count less. She is definitely in favor of a multi-ethnic country. However, she thinks that among nations may be cooperation, but never full trust. She is not sure if Serbs are the most responsive of war and war crimes in Bosnia during the 90's. However, definitely Bošnjaks are not. Even if she has good friends belonging to other ethnic groups, including Serbs, she would not be happy to see her son marrying a Serb woman. She thinks that other ethnic groups threatened Bošnjaks in their own identity during the past. She is empathic towards Serbs, and she has sometimes contacts with them. She frequently participates to interethnic projects.

She feels to be sometimes good to talk and convincing people.

**Samir, Bošnjak**, 13 years old, student, both parents Bošnjaks. Religion is an important component of his life. He used to live in Tabaći-Lukovac, moving to Srebrenica 4 years ago. He never participated to interethnic projects, but he would like to. He thinks that Bosnia is definitely a divided country, and that local authorities in Srebrenica do not support inter-group cooperation. Even if he was not even born, he lose relative during the conflict. He is in favor of minority

---

<sup>263</sup> The participants in this group were selected randomly among students participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center.

integration in his country, but he thinks that only mono-ethnic national states can ensure and protect ethnic identities.

He is very empathic towards Serbs. He completely disagree about the fact that mixed marriages are inherently instable. He definitely thinks that Bošnjaks and Croats are not responsible for 90's war in Bosnia; however, he is not sure if Serbs are. He has good friends belonging to Serb community. However, he would not be happy to see his son married to get married with a Serb woman. He thinks that Serbs would like to secede from Bosnia.

He sometimes has contacts with Serbs, but he doesn't feel to be very close to them.

He thinks he is not good to convince people about his arguments.

**Goran**, 14 years old, **Serb**, student. Both parents Serbs. He thinks that sometimes religion is an important component of his life. He used to live in Potočari, moving to Srebrenica 4 years ago. He thinks that Srebrenica has 10.000 inhabitants, and that is a multiethnic town. He lives, however, in a neighborhood where his ethnic group is almost predominant. He was not born at the time of war in BiH, but he lose close relatives during the conflict. He thinks that Srebrenica is a multiethnic town, with local authorities not supporting so much inter-group talk and cooperation. He never participated to inter-ethnic projects. He feels to belong to his ethnic community, and this belonging is perceived as unchangeable. He thinks that each group in BiH deserves same rights. He thinks that all groups are collectively responsible for war in Bosnia during the '90s. However, he thinks that each group should be entitled to have his own national country, because ethnic states can better protect their citizens. He thinks that multi-ethnic marriages are inherently instable. Nevertheless, he is very empathic towards Bošnjaks. He would be even happy to get his children married with Bošnjaks. He has good friends belonging to the Bošnjak community, and he feels almost close to them. He thinks that he may be sometimes good to talk and convince people about his positions.

**Zoran**, 14 years old, **Serb**, student. Both parents Serb. He is very religious. He was not even born during the war in BiH in the 90's, and he didn't lose any relatives or friends during the conflict. He thinks that Srebrenica has 5000 citizens and that is a multiethnic town, even if local authorities are very poorly supportive towards interethnic cooperation. He lives in a multiethnic neighborhood, and has some direct experience with multi-ethnic projects and cooperation.

He thinks that Bosnia is a divided country and often hopes ethnic identities to count less in ordinary life. He is in favor of equal rights for all ethnic groups in the country, but he thinks that ethnic identities may be better protected in mono-ethnic than in multi-ethnic states. Among nations may some cooperation exist, but never full trust. He doesn't say anything about collective responsibilities for 90's war in the country. He thinks that other ethnic groups threatened Serbs in their own identity during the '90s.

He is very empathic towards Bošnjaks, he has good friends belonging to Bošnjak community, frequent contact with them, feeling quite close to them. He doesn't think that multi-ethnic marriages are necessarily more unstable than mono-ethnic ones. However, he would not be happy to get his child married with a Bošnjak.

He thinks is very good at talking and convincing people about his arguments.

**Jovan**, 13 years old, **Serb**, student. Both parents Serbs. Religion is quite an important component of his life. He was not born at the time of war in BiH, but he did lose relatives during the conflict.

He has been living in Srebrenica since he was born. He thinks the town is almost multiethnic, with local authorities not very supportive about inter-ethnic cooperation. He experienced some inter-group cooperation. He strongly feels to belong to his ethnic group, and he will always do. He is in favor of mono-ethnic states and he doesn't think that other ethnic groups should be entitled to same rights as dominant group. Mono-ethnic states can ensure better protection to

their citizens. Among nations may some cooperation exist, but full trust never. He is not sure about responsibilities for 90's war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He thinks that all three ethnic groups contribute to economic growth of the country. He has good friends belonging to Bošnjak community, and he is also quite empathic towards them. However, he would not be very happy if one day his child would like to get married with a Bošnjak woman.

He thinks that sometimes he can be quite good at talking and convincing people about his arguments and position.

**Azmina**, 14 years old, **Bošnjak**, student, both parents Bošnjaks. She thinks that religion is a very important component of her life. She was not born at the time of Bosnian war, but she lost relatives during the conflict. She thinks that Srebrenica is a multiethnic town. She lives in a multi-ethnic neighborhood. However, she thinks that local authorities do not support interethnic cooperation very much. She used to live in Zivinice, Djurdjevik, moving to Srebrenica 4 years ago. She feels to strongly belong to Bošnjak community. She often wishes that ethnic identity may count less than effectively do in Bosnia and Herzegovina. She perceived that the country is very divided, as both Serbs and Croats would definitely like to secede with their territories from BiH. She thinks that all groups should enjoy equal rights, but it doesn't mean having its own national state. She doesn't think that ethnic states can protect their citizens better than multiethnic states. However, she admits that people feel more safe when living in a mono-ethnic national state, and that among ethnic groups is possible to build cooperation but not full trust.

She doesn't think that mixed marriages are inherently instable. She is quite empathic towards Serbs. She has even good friends belonging to Serb community. However, she would not be happy if her son one day would like to get married with a Serb woman. She acknowledges Serbs as the most responsible for war and war crimes in Bosnia during the '90s. Bošnjaks were threatened in their own identity during those years. She thinks that Serbs are not reliable because they are prone to fraud. She feels proud and grateful to

Bošnjaks, while she feels angry and frightened by Serbs. However, she states she has good Serb friends, and she feels quite close to them.

She never participated to inter-group projects, but she would like to.

She thinks that sometimes she could be good at talking and convincing people about her arguments.

**Marijana, Serb**, 13 years old, student. Both parents Serbs. Religion is a strong component of her life. She was not born during the 90's war in BiH, but she lost relatives during the conflict. She has been living in Srebrenica since she was born. She thinks that Srebrenica is a multi-ethnic town with about 10.000 citizens. She lives in a multi-ethnic neighborhood. Local authorities, she says, do not support at all inter-ethnic cooperation.

She strongly feels to belong to Serb community: she was born as Serb, she will die as Serb. She is very proud and grateful to Serbs. She thinks that the world would be better if all ethnic groups were like Serbs. Bosnia is a divide country. All groups share responsibility for war and war crimes in Bosnia during the '90s. Even if she is in favor of all groups enjoying equal rights in Bosnia, she is not very empathic towards Bošnjaks. She thinks that among groups cooperation may be possible, but full trust never. Mixed marriage are inherently instable. Even if she has good Bošnjak friends, she would not very happy if her child one day would like to get married to a Bošnjak woman. She sometimes feels angry and frightened by Bošnjaks.

She never participated to inter-group projects and she is not interested to.

She may be able, sometimes, to talk and convince people about her arguments.

**Ermina, Bošnjak**, 14 years old, student. Both parents Bošnjaks. Religion is a strong component of her life. She was not born at the time when ethnic groups started to fight in Bosnia, during the '90s, but she lost relatives during the conflict. She has been living in Srebrenica for 7 years, moving from Kalesija. Srebrenica is a multiethnic town whose local authorities do not support

interethnic cooperation. She lives in an almost mono-ethnic neighborhood. She strongly feels to belong to Bošnjak community, and she will never change this identity, she states. Bosnia is a divide country. Serbs would like to secede, as well as Croats. Bošnjaks were threatened in their own identity during the past. They are definitely not responsible for war and war crimes in Bosnia during the 90's, but she is not sure if Serbs are. Probably all groups share some responsibility. Sometimes, she would like ethnic identities to count less in Bosnia. She supports equal rights for all groups in Bosnia. However, she is not in favor of teachers belonging to other ethnic groups teaching in her school. She feels some empathy towards Serbs. She doesn't think that mixed marriages are inherently instable, but she cannot say if she would be happy if her children, one day, would like getting marries with Serbs. She never participated to inter-ethnic projects, she is not interested to.

She thinks she is rarely good at talking and convincing people about her arguments.

## **7.2. Group Structure**

Talks lasted about 25 minutes, in a relaxed atmosphere. Participants were about 13-14 years old and know each other because of their involvement in NDC activities. They sat at the table in separate groups, girls and boys and during the talks there was a big noise and overlapping of speech acts, so it was only partially understandable. It was also very hard to assign speech acts to right people, because of noise and overlapping. All people spoke, included person 2, Samir (who seems the smallest child and lives far away from Srebrenica, but he came nevertheless, boy, Bošnjak) even if some of them not in "open speeches" and just within their small groups.

They played jokes together, they laughed and they did not show any sign of division among themselves (only at a certain point, person 2 and person 6 seemed somewhat pushed out the two main groups girls and boys talking each other, but this did not seem relevant).



### 7.3. Group discussion

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

#### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>264</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the

---

<sup>264</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

*2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

*3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

*4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-

combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.

**Moderator:** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina, to be delivered to the High Representative?

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** Should we put "more fun for youth"?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As a teenage girl Marijana begins the discussion at a light note proposing in a general way more fun for young people. Knowing the dismal situation in Srebrenica, this is a relevant demand. Marijana opens space to continue the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb (code 1):** We need him to send us one liter of Rakia!

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran continues at a light note. He refers to the High Representative, who should be asked to send to the group the well known local spirit Rakia. This demand is, of course, meant as joke, especially among a group of teenagers. From a deliberative perspective, jokes may have positive and negative effects. Often the effect depends on the context. In the present context at the beginning of a meeting between Serbs and Bošnjaks such a light hearted joke helped to loosen up the atmosphere, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** C'mon get serious.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As a Bošnjak, Ermina responds to Goran in a respectful way. She has understood the joke and does not mind its light hearted manner. With a relaxed atmosphere having been established in the group, Ermina suggests that a serious discussion should now begin. With her statement she keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** Sure, to build a new park and a new bus station.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana comes back into the discussion and in an interactive way takes up the suggestion of Ermina to get serious and makes substantive suggestions of how life could be improved in Srebrenica. The proposal of Marijana to build a new park and a new bus station opens space for further discussion keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** And also to reconstruct some parts of Srebrenica, for example the Argentarija Park.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* After Ermina asked in her first statement that the discussion should become serious, she makes now a substantive proposal herself postulating that parts of Srebrenica should be rebuilt, referring in particular to a specific park. With this statement, Ermina as Bošnjak supports Marijana as Serb that some new constructions are needed in Srebrenica. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb, (code 1):** Also a brand new garbage container should be bought.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran stays on the issue of a better infrastructure and proposes that the town needs a new garbage container. After the light hearted beginning, which allowed relaxing the atmosphere between the two ethnic groups, the discussion now flows at a high level of deliberation with more concrete proposals to improve life in Srebrenica being made.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Put all that down, and we also need a reconstruction of the Guber spa.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ermina remains active bringing another infrastructure item into the discussion. She proposes that the local spa should be reconstructed. Before the civil war, the spa was a tourist attraction. In

proposing that the spa should be reactivated, Ermina shows optimism in the future of Srebrenica, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb (code 1):** Stadium also.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran is interactive and stays on the issue of infrastructure proposing that Srebrenica also needs a new stadium. It is in deliberative spirit that at the beginning of the discussion the group stays on the same issue and establishes a list of potential improvement proposals in the infrastructure of Srebrenica. Discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** Get serious, they're recording this. Restore those buildings near gas station for socially vulnerable persons.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana finds the proposal of Goran to build a new stadium as not serious in the dire situation in which Srebrenica finds itself. She makes instead a proposal that is more affordable, to restore buildings in a poor neighborhood close to a gas station. Does Marijana show disrespect for the stadium proposal of Goran? Should she have justified why from a cost perspective building a new stadium is exaggerated? It would have been better if she would have done so. But it must have been obvious to the other participants that a new stadium would cost too much for Srebrenica, so that Marijana took a shortcut in expressing her disagreement. With her own proposal, she gave an implicit justification what Srebrenica could afford and what not. Overall, Marijana was able to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb (code 1):** We need brand new buildings. There is nothing to reconstruct.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran remains interactive and now goes into specifics with regard to the issue of the infrastructure. He argues that it is not worthwhile to renovate old buildings and that the better solution is to construct new buildings. With this statement he moves the discussion forward, keeping it at high level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** This is adding another task.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ermina as Bošnjak supports Goran as Serb that constructing brand new buildings is a worthwhile further task. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level of deliberation with a constructive dialogue across the ethnic divide.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** We should force the government to listen to the people. When it wants something to say, it should not be dismissed.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana makes a statement very much in deliberative spirit. It is a key aspect of deliberation that actors listen to each other. Thereby it is of particular importance that the government listens to the grievances of ordinary citizens. Dania expresses this key element of deliberation in simple language that everyone can understand. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Goran, Serb (code 1):** Let's get serious ... Change the authorities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran follows up on Marijana and shares her concern that the political authorities do not listen to what ordinary people want to say. He makes the radical proposal that the current authorities should be thrown out. While up to now the discussion dealt with questions of improving the infrastructure, Marijana and Goran now have given it a critical political turn, keeping it at a high level of deliberation.

**Azmina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Help people in surrounding villages.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Azmina speaks for the first time and broadens the discussion in being concerned about the surrounding villages of Srebrenica, which also need help. This proposal corresponds to deliberative spirit in the sense that Azmina cares also for the wellbeing of others, which keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Radovan, Serb (code 1):** I will vote for you at the next election.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Zoran also speaks for the first time. Jokingly he says that at the next election he will vote for Azmina. Thereby, it is noteworthy that Zoran and Azmina come from the opposite sides of the ethnic division in Srebrenica. Thus, the good natured joke further relaxes the atmosphere across the ethnic divide, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Azmina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Thank you.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Azmina understands the joke across the ethnic divide and reacts in a friendly positive way. This exchange means that relations in the group between Serbs and Bošnjaks are good, which keeps deliberation at high level.

**Zoran, Serb (code 1):** Of course, first you need to become a candidate.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Zoran continues with the joke, which is not yet too distractive for the flow of a high level deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** I am the only realistic candidate here .... Increase the number of employees in the police and reduce crime.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana briefly continues the joking but then quickly comes back on topic proposing that life could be improved if crime was reduced. She also has a suggestion of how this could be done in increasing the police force in Srebrenica. The discussion again continues substantively at a high level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** That's right.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Once again there is agreement across the ethnic divide with Ermina as Bošnjak supporting Marijana as Serb that the police force should be reinforced to get more control over crime.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** Write that. Criminals have bigger incomes than our authorities.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana continues the discussion on crime and claims that criminals have higher incomes than the political authorities. Although Marijana does not give evidence for this claim, it opens space to discuss further the situation of criminals in Srebrenica. The level of deliberation stays high.

**Goran, Serb (code 1):** Ermina! Write that we need our own FBI! (laughing)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran stays on the topic of crime. When he demands that Srebrenica needs its own FBI, he means this as a joke. Given the context that participants are teenagers, such a brief joke does not disrupt the flow of the discussion, so that deliberation remains at a high level.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** And also build a new police station.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana stays on the topic of crime and the police and suggests that a new police station needs to be built. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb (code 2): That's not...** (interrupted by Marijana)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran is interrupted by Marijana, so that he cannot say what he wanted to say. Such interruption is against deliberative rules and disrupts the flow of the discussion, which is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 3):** You cannot force a man to become a cop.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With her interruption of the previous speaker, Marijana has violated a basic deliberative rule, so that the discussion is now at a low level of deliberation.



**Zoran, Serb (code 3):** Say again something funny (laughs)

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The flow of the discussion has now really been broken with Zoran getting completely off-topic asking that something funny should be said. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Goran, Serb (code 3):** Provide new containers.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Goran attempts to bring the discussion back on topic but only repeats what he said before that new garbage containers are needed. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Marijana, Serb (code 4):** Provide funds for the renovation of sewage.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This time Marijana does not interrupt the previous speakers and makes an effort to bring the discussion back on topic. She is successful in doing so because with the demand for a sewage renovation she broadens the list of how life in Srebrenica can be improved. After Marijana with her previous speech act transformed the discussion to a low level of deliberation, she is now able to bring it back to a high level.

**Azmina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Expand the market square

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Azmina has still another proposal of how life in Srebrenica can be improved, which keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** Funding is needed for new instruments for musicians in Srebrenica.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ermina turns to a cultural aspect, which has not yet been addressed up to now. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Laila, Bošnjak (code 2): We have five tasks.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Laila speaks up for the first time. She is not interactive in not taking position to any of the proposals on the agenda. Instead she says something that does not make sense. It is unclear to what five tasks she is referring to. With this confusing statement, Laila transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 3): Provide funds for maintenance of sanitation.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Marijana simply repeats a proposal that she made before when she referred to sewage problems.

**Laila, Bošnjak (code 3): What's that?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now Laila speaks for the second time and raises a question, but again it is unclear what she has in mind. Does she not understand what sanitation means or is she unclear what maintenance of sanitation means? The level of deliberation remains low.

**Marijana, Serb (code 3): That's it, write more street lighting.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* From a deliberative perspective Marijana should answer the question of Laila, or if she has not understood she should ask Laila to clarify her question. But Marijana is not interactive but exclaims “that’s it”, which seems to mean that for her the discussion should be over. But then she still adds another item to be put on the list for improvements in Srebrenica. Given the context of the statement, deliberation remains at a low level.

**Zoran, Serb (code 3): Do you have anything more?**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Zoran agrees with Marijana that the discussion should come to an end and does not make any effort to transform it back to a high level of deliberation.

**Jovan, Serb (code 3):** Read it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Jovan has not said anything up to now and is agreeing with Marijana and Zoran that the discussion should come to an end. Turning to Ermina as note taker, he asks her to read what she has written for the letter to the High Representative. From a deliberative perspective it is not good that Jovan, and also Laila, did not intervene in a substantive way into the discussion. Perhaps both were not comfortable to speak up in an ethnically mixed group. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 4):** To update some parts of Srebrenica, for example the spa "Guber" and the park, that authorities do not remain deaf for the voice of the people, to help homeless people, increase the number of employees, rebuild roads in the surrounding villages, provide funds for maintenance of sanitation, and also to provide mechanization for agriculture.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ermina has done an excellent job in listening to the proposals made in the group and to put them in writing. In this way, she opens once more space for the participants to say whether they agree with her summary, transforming the discussion to a high level of deliberation.

**Marijana, Serb (code 1):** What else should we put?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Whereas in her previous intervention Marijana gave the impression that she had enough of the discussion, now she seems open if someone adds to the summary of Ermina. The level of deliberation stays high.

**Zoran, Serb (code 1):** Reconstruct our old hotel. Tourists have nowhere to sleep.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Zoran in an interactive way takes up the invitation of Marijana to still add something to the summary. He also gives a justification why the old hotel should be renovated.

**Jovan, Serb (code 1):** We could put something about tourism.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now Jovan seems comfortable enough to say something substantive in agreeing with Zoran that tourism should be developed. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Zoran, Serb (code 1):** Yeah, yeah, we can reconstruct and repair our fortress so that people can see what Srebrenica had.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Zoran pursues the topic of tourism in proposing that the fortress should be reconstructed and renovated. With this statement he also expresses a certain pride about the history of Srebrenica. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Ermina, Bošnjak (code 1):** That's it.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* With the positive optimistic note of Zoran, Ermina as note taker brings the discussion to an end at a high level of deliberation.

#### **7.4. Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 5 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether 4 deliberative transformative moments, two downwards and two upwards, so that the discussion ended at a high level. Again, I will start with summarizing my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. Afterwards, I will show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

##### **7.4.1. Transformative moments from a high to a low level of deliberation**

The first downward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurs when Serb Marijana proposes that a new police station should be built and Goran, also from the Serb side, seems to take a negative position but can also utter “that’s

not ...” before Marijana interrupts him, so that Goran is prevented from making his point. Such interruptions are clearly against deliberative spirit.

The second time when a discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of discussion takes place when Bošnjak Ermina proposes funding for new music instruments and Bošnjak Laila is not interactive in responding to her but says in a vague way that “we have five tasks”. It is unclear to what tasks she is referring to so that her statement is definitively off-topic.

In the previous groups it was common that off-topic remarks led to downward Deliberative Transformative Moments, but it had not yet happened until the current group that a participant interrupted another in such a rude way that the discussions was transformed to a low level of deliberation.

#### 7.4.2. Transformative moments from a low to a high level of deliberation

The first upward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurred when Serb Marijana brought the important sewage issue on the agenda of the group. This is clearly a super ordinate issue of great concern for both Serbs and Bošnjaks in their daily life.

The second upward Deliberative Transformative Moment is due to Bošnjak Ermina, who acted as note taker for the letter to be sent to the High Representative. When the discussion dragged on at a low level of deliberation, she informed the group in a very thorough way on which issues the group had reached agreement, for example that the spa should be reopened and that funds should be provided for the maintenance of proper sanitation. With this extensive summary, Ermina proved leadership opening space for other issues to be added to the letter for Representative.

Super ordinate issues and leadership are two factors that we have already encountered in the previous groups to help to raise the level of deliberation.

## 7.5. Outcomes and deliberation

How did deliberation impact on the outcomes of group discussions? As for the previous groups, I will investigate in this section how the deliberative pattern is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. Again, I will use the graphic form, where H stands for a speech act at a high level of deliberation, and L for a speech act at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt altogether with five substantive issues: restructuring parts of Srebrenica including parks and the spa, the government should not refuse to listen to the voice of the people, help people in surrounding villages, improve police force to reduce crime, do something for tourism. In this order, I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= restructuring parts of Srebrenica including parks and the spa, D2= the government should not refuse to listen to the voice of the people, D3= help people in surrounding villages, D4= improve police force to reduce crime, D5= do something for tourism.

### 8.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 5

H -----D1----D2--D3-----D4 (21)

L ---- (4)

H --- (3)

L ----- (6)

H -----D5- (6)

There were in total 40 speech acts, 30 at a high level of deliberation, 10 at a low level. Thus, 75 percent of all speech acts were at a high deliberative level, which is higher than in the first group with 67 percent, 66 percent in the fourth group, 62 percent in the third group and 37 percent in the second group. It is remarkable that young people were so deliberative. Is it a generational effect or is it due to the fact that for the participants in this group the massacre in 1995

was already past history when the discussion took place in 2010? I will come back to this question in the Conclusions.

As in the first four groups, substantive agreements were only reached when the discussion could be kept for a long time at a high level of deliberation. All agreements concerned issues on super-ordinate goals. It was easy to see, for example, that it was in the common interest of both ethnic groups to develop local tourism and to reconstruct the spa. So once again, as in the previous three groups, sensitive inter-ethnic issues were not addressed. From a deliberate perspective it is particularly remarkable that the group expanded its horizon in including also the wellbeing of the surrounding villages.

## Chapter 8: Group 6 of Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica

### 8.1. Participants: their personal background and attitudes towards inter-group relations<sup>265</sup>

*Ilija, Serb*, male, 18 years old. Both his parents are Serb. He has been living in Srebrenica for 14 years, before living in Ilijaš, BiH. He was not in the country during the war, and he did not lose any relative or friend during the war. He thinks that Srebrenica has 3000 citizens, and that political institutions did not do anything to actively support inter-group reconciliation. He is a student, studying at the Secondary School for medical technicians. He feels religion as an important component of his life. He manifests a strong belonging to his ethnic group, perceiving this belonging as unchangeable until the end of his life. Serbs, he thinks, have been under threat from other ethnic groups. Men and women may feel safe only if they live in a mono-ethnic community, and group values should prevail on individual ones. He gets out only with Serbs, and he would never see as a positive thing a marriage with a Bošnjak women, neither for himself nor for his children, in the future. He is definitely against interethnic marriages, and instead he supports keeping ethnic communities separated. His empathy towards Serbs is strongly marked, while towards Bošnjaks and Croats is very low. He thinks that the International Community spends too much money assisting other ethnic groups rather than Serbs. However, he admits that members of each ethnic group should have the right to find a job and to follow its own culture and tradition in his country. He stated he never experienced inter-group cooperation, nor he is interesting to. He feels to be good, sometimes, in arguing and convincing people about his positions.

---

<sup>265</sup> The participants in this group were young people selected by random walk.



**Igor, Serb**, male, 21 years old, unemployed. He completed Secondary School, with a diploma of Chemical Technician. Both his parents are Serb. He used to live in Srebrenica before the war, moving from the town during the conflict, and then coming back four years ago. During the war, he lost close friends. Srebrenica has 4000 citizens, he thinks. Political authorities did not support at all inter-ethnic talks and cooperation at local level. There is scarce support to inter-ethnic cooperation at a general level. He is not politically active. He feels an almost strong belonging to Serbian community, and religion as an important component of his life. He thinks that each ethnic group should have its own Country. Women and Men may feel safe only when their ethnic group represents the majority. In his own Country, Igor thinks that ethnic groups other than his should not be allowed establishing their own parties, taking jobs, nor their children attending schools. He is in favor of inter-ethnic separation and mono-ethnic marriages. Nations may cooperate, but there will never be full mutual trust between them. Bošnjaks, he feels, would love to keep the Country only for themselves. His empathy towards Serbs is strongly marked, while towards Bošnjaks and Croats is very low. He has no friends belonging to those communities. He gets out only with Serbs, having poor contacts, and even undesired, with Bošnjaks. Even less for Croats. Bosnia is a divided country, he thinks. He finally admits that sometimes he hopes ethnicity to be less important in ordinary life.

He never participated to inter-ethnic projects, nor he is interested to. He thinks he is not good at all to dialogue and convincing people about his ideas.

**Pero, Serb**, male, 19 years old, student. His parents are both Serbs. He thinks that Srebrenica has 4000 inhabitants. Political authorities are not perceived as supporting towards intergroup cooperation. He lives in a mono-ethnic neighborhood. He moved to Srebrenica 6 years ago, but he does not say where he used to live before. He was not in the Country during the war, and he did not suffer from any loss of relatives or friends because of the war. He thinks that Serbs are the most important ethnic group in Bosnia and Herzegovina. His

feeling of belonging to the Serbian community is very strong: he was born Serb, he will die as Serb. He thinks that the world would be better if the other ethnic groups were like Serbs. Ethnic groups other than Serbs should be allowed to vote, to form their own parties, and to work. However, teachers from other ethnic groups should not be allowed to teach to Serbian students. He thinks that among groups cooperation is sometimes possible, but full mutual trust never. Men and women may feel safe only when they live in a place where their own ethnic groups represents the majority. That's why Serbs would like to live in his own Countries, while Bosnian Croats would live to join Croatia. Bošnjaks, he said, would like to keep Bosnia and Herzegovina only for themselves. As Ilija and Igor also Pero manifests a very low degree of empathy towards people belonging to ethnic groups other than Serbs. He would feel bad to see a Serb suffering, while he will not feel bad at all to see a Bošnjak or a Croat suffering as well. He thinks that Bošnjaks are the most responsible for criminal rate in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Croats. Bošnjaks and Croats are considered also threatening economic growth of the country. Croats and Bošnjaks are the most responsible for war crimes in BiH during the '90s<sup>266</sup>. Pero has no friends among Bošnjaks and Croats. He has very poor contacts with Bošnjaks, no one with Croats. He never participated to any kind of project aimed at fostering inter-group cooperation, and he is not interested at all to participate in the future. He thinks he is not good at talking and convincing people.

**Mirijana, Serb**, female, 19 years old. Her parents are both Serb. She used to live in Serbia, moving to Bratunac, a mono-ethnic Serbian town close to

---

<sup>266</sup> As Ilija and Igor, also Pero seems to be very extreme in his statements against Bosnjaks and Croats. Surprisingly, he was not in BiH during the war, and he did not lose any relatives or friends. His radicalization may be the result of post-war segregation and institutionalisation of ethnic conflict, instead. See Florian Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia, Ethnicity, Inequality and Public Sector Governance*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006, and more specifically Azra Hromadžić, *Samo Bosne nema*, Biblioteka XX vek, Belgrade, 2017, specific about young people growing up through the internationally guided creation of post war Bosnia. Azra Hromadžić's book is a recent translation of original *Citizens of an Empty Nation: Youth and State-Making in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina*, University of Pennsylvania Press, USA, 2015.

Srebrenica, in 1996, after the war. She strongly feels to belong to his own ethnic group. She has experience of intergroup cooperation, participating to activities of local and international NGOs. She sometimes hopes that ethnic identity may count less in BiH. Bosnia is a divided country, definitely. She thinks that ethnic groups can be better protected and feel safe only when their community represents the majority. Each group should live in its own country. Mirijana is much more empathic than Ilija, Igor and Peto. She has good friends belonging to Bošnjak and to Croat communities, having frequent contacts with them. However, she cannot say if she would be happy if her children, one day, will decide to marry a Bošnjak or a Croat. She thinks that each group shares responsibility for war crimes in BiH during the '90s. She thinks that sometimes she may be good at talking and convincing people.

**Miloš, Serb**, male, 25 years old. He works as electrician. Both parents Serb, he is been living in Srebrenica sinche he was born. He was not in Bosnia during the war. He did not miss neither relatives nor friends during the war. He thinks that Srebrenica has about 5000 citizens, and that local authorities do not support at all interethnic cooperation. He feels a quite sense of belonging to his community. He thinks is a long lasting belonging. The world would be better if all ethnic groups were like Serbs, he thinks. Religion is an important component of his life, sometimes. He manifests some openness when he says that in his country all ethnic groups should be entitled to work, to vote, to set up their own parties. However, he thinks that national states, with no ethnic group being clearly the majority, may better protect their citizens. Among ethnic groups may exist cooperation, sometimes, but full trust is impossible. He is able to feel empathy with Bošnjaks and Croats. He thinks that all groups share responsibility for war crimes in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the '90s. However, he thinks that mixed marriages are inherently instable and he would not be happy if his son would like to marry a Bošnjak woman. He also thinks that international community spends too much money helping other ethnic groups rather than Serbs. He doesn't have good friends belonging to Bošnjak nor to Croat

community. He doesn't think that Serbs would like to secede from Bosnia to have their own State, nor that Bošnjaks would like to have BiH only as their country and nobody else. Rather he thinks that Bosnia is a united country, even if general atmosphere does not support inter-ethnic cooperation. He never participated to any kind of interethnic project. He lives in an almost mono-ethnic neighborhood. He has almost no contact with Bošnjaks, even less with Croats. In both cases, he is not willing to have more.

**Elvir, Bošnjak**, male, 20 years old. Both parents are Bošnjak. He was in Bosnia during the war. He used to live in Sarajevo before moving to Srebrenica. He lost friends and relatives during the war.

He thinks that Bošnjaks and Croats are the most important groups in BiH, while Serbs are just a minority. He thinks that Bosnia is a united country. He feels a strong sense of belonging to Bošnjak community. He thinks that this belonging will never change. He shows poor empathy towards Serbs. He would not mind to see them suffering. He has, however, some good friend belonging to Serb community. He thinks that all ethnic groups share responsibility for war crimes in Bosnia during the '90s.

**Nino, Bošnjak**, male, 18 years old. Both parents are Bošnjak. He was in Bosnia during the war, losing friend and relatives. He used to live in Srebrenik, Tuzla, before moving to Srebrenica, when he was 8 years old. Local authorities and politicians, as well as the general environment in Srebrenica, does not support interethnic cooperation. He would like that ethnic identities were less important in Bosnia. However, he admits, among ethnic groups in Bosnia there may be cooperation, but never full trust. He is against mono-ethnic national states. He does not think that they can better protect their citizens than multi-ethnic states. He thinks that all groups should be entitled to work, to vote and to be voted in BiH. Teachers should be allowed to teach also to school were pupils belong to other ethnic groups. He is able to feel empathy with Serbs, for instance if he sees a Serb in difficulty he feels bad. However, he thinks that Serbs are

definitely the most responsible for war crimes in Bosnia during the war in the '90s. He has good friends belonging to Serb and Croat communities, even with not frequent contacts. Nevertheless, he would not be happy if his son would like to marry a Serb or a Croat woman. Serbs want to secede from Bosnia, as well as Croats.

He participated once to a project of inter-ethnic cooperation. He thinks that local authorities sometimes are supportive about interethnic cooperation, but the general environment is not (neighborhood, relatives, friends, etc).

**Miki, Serb**, male, 19 years old. Both parents Serb. He was in Bosnia during the war, missing relatives because of the conflict. He feels a strong sense of belonging to Serb community, and he feels it as unchangeable and everlasting. He is proud of Serbs. He thinks that Serbs are the most important ethnic group in Bosnia. The world would be better if all groups were like Serbs.

Bosnia is not a united country. Bošnjaks are the most responsible for war crimes in Bosnia during the '90s. Bošnjaks are also increasing criminal rates in Bosnia. Among groups cooperation is possible, but full trust impossible. National mono-ethnic states may better protect their citizens than multiethnic states. That's why Serbs want to secede from BiH. Mixed marriages, he thinks, are instable. However, he recognizes the right for all ethnic groups to live, work, to vote and to be voted in Bosnia. He is quite empathic towards Bošnjaks and Croats, much more towards Serbs.

He had some experience of inter-ethnic cooperation, in the framework of an international seminar. Local authorities and general environment are not very supportive of inter-ethnic cooperation. He thinks he may be good at talking and at convincing people about his positions.

## **8.2. Group structure**

According to my research design, this was one of the two groups of young people. They were all between 18 and 21 years of age with the exception of Miloš, who was 25. Mirijana was the only woman in the group. Five of the participants were still in school, while two were already in the work force and one

was unemployed. Six were from the Serb side, two from the Bošnjak side. For my research, the crucial question is how strongly participants felt about their ethnic identity. For six of the participants ethnic identity was very strong; they had no friends outside their group and could not imagine marrying across the ethnic divide. Mirijana from the Serb side and Nino from the Bošnjak side, by contrast, had weaker ethnic identities and had friends from the other side, but they, too, rejected inter-ethnic marriages. Thus, overall, the ethnic divide was strong in this group. When the experiments took place in 2010, the civil war had already ended 15 years ago, so that all participants were small children. Furthermore, it has to be considered that half of the participants were taken outside the country during the war. Given that the war experience was not so immediate, it is remarkable that hostility towards the other side was still so strong among these young people. When asked whether the town of Srebrenica made any efforts for ethnic-cooperation, all participants answered in the negative. Five of them expressed also no interest in such cooperation, while the other three were willing to make an effort to reach over to the other side. A last interesting question is whom participants held responsible for the civil war. Three of the participants gave responsibility to both sides, three exclusively to the other side, while two did not answer this question.

### **8.3. Group discussion**

To facilitate the reading, I repeat here the four coding categories, which I have explained in Chapter 2. It also should be a reading help that I put the speech acts in bold letters, which led to an upward or downward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM).

#### *1. The speech act stays at a high level of deliberation*

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of

the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,<sup>267</sup> which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

## *2. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from high to low*

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-

---

<sup>267</sup> See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

### *3. The speech act stays at a low level of deliberation*

This third category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act stays at this level. Participants do not manage to give to the discussion again a direction. In the case of the Colombian ex-combatants, for example, this would mean that the speaker is unable or unwilling to put on the agenda a topic relevant for the peace process. Instead, the speaker brings up topics or stories that are off topic, or the speech act is incoherent and confusing. The key criterion for this third category is that the speech does not open new windows for the group to talk about the peace process.

### *4. The speech act transforms the level of deliberation from low to high*

This fourth category is used if the preceding speech act was at a low level of deliberation and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a high level. Participants are successful in adding new aspects to a topic already discussed or to formulate a new topic, in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants relevant for the peace process. Success means that good arguments are presented why an old topic should be further discussed or why a new topic should be put on the agenda. In this way, the speech act opens new space for the discussion to continue in a meaningful way.



**Moderator:** What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina, to be delivered to the High Representative?

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Let us put positive and negative facts, from any area. We can also put theses, the first thesis, and so on. This means we would agree on this and that. For this we need some 40 minutes. So we just put theses; nothing more.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana makes a good effort to give structure to the discussion. She offers two ways of how the letter to the High Representative could be written, either by positive and negative facts or by theses. She prefers to do it by theses. Starting with this relevant procedural topic, Mirijana manages to begin the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Miloš, Serb (code 2): Turn this off so that we can play.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš does not follow up on the proposal of Mirijana of how to organize the letter to the High Representative, but tries to be funny in demanding that the tape recorder is turned off, so that they can play. Sometimes humor can help deliberation but what Miloš says is sarcasm raising doubts whether the whole discussion has any value at all. In this way he transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 4): I will write.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana disregards the sarcastic remark of Miloš and continues with procedural matters in offering that she will take over the task of note taker. Disregarding the remark of Miloš was a good device of Mirijana to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in going back to procedural matters, which are relevant at the beginning of a discussion.

**Miloš, Serb (code 2):** What do I need? To start with, I need a loan of 20 000KM.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš disrupts the discussion again. His demand that

he needs a loan of 20 000 KM is not justified in any way and seems to be meant as another sarcastic remark, which transforms the discussion once again to a low level of deliberation.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 4):** C'mon get serious. The sooner we finish, the sooner we can leave. Just think about it, you will get money if you go home.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana does not take seriously the demand of Miloš that he wants a loan and scolds him for not being a serious participant in the discussion. Mirijana is herself committed to really begin the discussion in a serious way transforming it back to a high level of deliberation.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** What?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš becomes now interactive and wants to know from Mirijana what she means by her remark that he will make money when gets home. Thanks to this pattern of reciprocity deliberation stays at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** If you work you will get money.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana clarifies her remark telling Miloš that if he works he will get money. Reciprocity continues so that deliberation remains at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** Well, I work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš is no longer joking but informs Mirijana that he is actually working. Reciprocity between Miloš and Mirijana continues keeping deliberation at high level.

***Mirijana, Serb (code 2): OK, just be silent.***

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now Mirijana loses patience with Miloš that he is holding up the discussion and tells him in a rude way that he should shut up. This lack of respect transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

***Miki, Serb (code 3):*** You don't need to draw, just write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as note taker does some drawing on her note pad. Miki reprimands her telling her that she should better write down what is said. This is also not a respectful statement, keeping deliberation at a low level.

***Mirijana, Serb (code 3):*** Come on, I will write and you tell.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana is annoyed at the order she gets from Miki. The discussion has gotten an unfriendly tone and does not make any headway to finally begin to address the topic assigned to the group of how life can be improved in Srebrenica and in Bosnia-Herzegovina at large. Deliberation remains at a low level.

***Miki, Serb (code 3):*** This has become your standard answer.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miki complains that Mirijana always gives the same answer. The unfriendliness continues and the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

***Mirijana, Serb (code 3):*** Well, nothing but repeating.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana insists that her task as note taker is simply to repeat in writing what people say. There is still no effort to enter

the discussion in a substantive way. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 3):** Well, since you know it, just copy.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino tells Mirijana simply to copy what people say, which does not add anything new to the discussion that remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 3):** Copy and paste, copy and paste.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Using computer language, Mirijana defines her role, but nothing is new, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

**Miki, Serb (code 3):** You know that I was copying and cheating in school, too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Sometimes personal stories can help deliberation, but the story of Miki is irrelevant for the topic assigned to the group. Perhaps the story loosens up a little the tense atmosphere in the group but not enough for the discussion to be transformed back to a high level of deliberation. There is no laughter as reactions to the story of Miki, so that deliberation stays at a low level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 4):** Shall we put something about education.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Finally the discussion turns to a substantive issue with Mirijana proposing that the group should discuss questions of education. Mirijana has already twice raised the level of deliberation and thus emerges as deliberative leader. An active moderator would have a long time ago directed the group to begin to talk about substantive issues. But since our research design did ask moderators not to intervene, it was up to the group to set the agenda. For this group it took a long time for someone to set a substantive issue on the agenda. But finally Mirijana took a leadership role. If the

moderator would always act as leader, we could not establish how deliberative leaders emerge out of the group.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** Yes, one of the problems in Srebrenica is education.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor speaks up for the first time and is immediately interactive supporting Mirijana that education is a problem in Srebrenica. The ice seems to be broken, so that the discussion gets momentum, keeping it at a high level of deliberation.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** Training of youth, something like that. Here you see these two men, they failed last two years.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana and Igor get support across the ethnic divide with Nino as Bošnjak agreeing that training of young people is an important issue to be discussed. He supports his view with a relevant story referring to two group members who failed their exams. A common life world begins to develop across the ethnic divide keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Do we have to explain a little bit each thesis or can we just list it?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as note taker raises the important procedural question whether the proposals of the group shall only be listed as theses or whether they need to be explained to some extent. Mirijana continues in her leadership role, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Moderator**, being asked directly by Mirijana, the moderator breaks the rule of not intervening and gives the following answer: "You do not need to explain, but if you want to and if you have something to say, then do it." In the spirit of the research design, this answer leaves it up to the group of how to proceed.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** I'll write in parentheses to include teaching, we cannot run an all inclusive education in our schools. Let's continue. And employment?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana gives the implicit answer that listing of the theses is sufficient and gives as example how she will write down the thesis about education. Then she puts issues of employment on the agenda. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Pero, Serb (code 1):** Yes, bravo, I do not even work with books.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Pero speaks up for the first time and tells her personal story that she is not able to work with books. With this story she support the previous speakers that education is a problem in Srebrenica. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** Put in parentheses how people coming from other cities to work here. Write that with capital letters.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš after a long pause comes back into the discussion. While at the beginning of the discussion, he was disruptive trying to be funny, now he refers to a relevant problem that people from other cities come too often to Srebrenica to work here. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Igor, Serb (code1):** Put down that even those who have jobs do not want to work.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Igor reacts to Miloš in criticizing that there is lack of work ethics among the people in Srebrenica. So the problem would be less that people coming from the outside work in Srebrenica. Igor expresses the disagreement with Miloš in a respectful way, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** The reason is that the government representatives are from the other cities. Just put it that way.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš enlarges his point why people of Srebrenica are discriminated on the job market. Not only are they invaded by workers from the outside, but government representatives mainly come from other parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Thus, Srebrenica is put into the context of the entire country giving breath to the discussion, which stays at a high level.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** The High Representative will go mad (laughing).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino reacts to the criticism of Miloš that Srebrenica is in a discriminated position within Bosnia-Herzegovina and expresses fears that the High Representative will be upset. Implicitly, Nino makes the suggestion that the group should be more cautious in what it puts into the letter to the High Representative. This is a relevant concern keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Third, following the theses - check loans.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as note taker keeps track of the discussion and wishes to add loans as a third thesis. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Elvir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Write no potable water, electricity is expensive, no cheap tariffs, sewage is bad ... my washing machine almost stopped working.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Elvir enters the discussion for the first time and helps to move it forward with his personal story with his washing machine. The story shows that problems with water and electricity hit home in a very concrete way. The discussion is very active across the ethnic divide with both sides sharing the same problems. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Shall we put something related to cultural events or anything like that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana adds the lack of cultural events to the discussion, which gains more and more substance, keeping deliberation at high level.

**Elvir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Regarding to that, we have only “Dane Srebrenica”.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Across the ethnic divide Elvir supports Mirijana that there is a lack of cultural events. He gives substance to this claim in mentioning that Srebrenica has only a single cultural event, called Dane Srebrenica. Both Mirijana and Elvir do not ask for separate cultural events for the two ethnic groups but have common events in mind, which indicates of much they share a common life world, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Ilija, Serb (code 1):** Write a lack of cultural and sporting activities and events.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Speaking after Elvir as Bošnjak, Ilija as Serb also supports more cultural events and adds the need for sport events. Deliberation stays at a high level of deliberation with no animosities between the two ethnic groups.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Oh, what lack of? You have a playground and run each day if you want.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as Serb disagrees with Ilija also of the Serb side that there is no need for more sport activities and gives a justification for this disagreement. From a deliberative perspective it is helpful if there are also disagreements within a group because this makes the discussion more open ended and less focused as a confrontation between the groups. Mirijana expresses her disagreement with Ilija in a respectful way, so that the discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.



**Pero, Serb (code 1):** Well, this is all recorded, have you forgotten?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Pero reminds the group that the discussion is recorded. The implication is that the participants should be more cautious in what they say. She wants to make sure that the group members will not get any negative repercussions when the High Representative reads the letter of the group. With this expression of caution, Pero shows solidarity with all group members from whatever ethnic side they come. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Elvir, Bošnjak (code 1):** So what! Let them record. You continue to write down on your papers.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now we have a disagreement across the ethnic divide. This disagreement, however, has nothing to do with the ethnic divide and is also expressed with respect. Elvir is simply less worried about negative repercussions of what they write to the High Representative. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** What else can we write about these things?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana attempts to move the discussion forward in asking for more problems to be added to the list to be sent to the High Representative. Given our research design, it was not up to the moderator to move the discussion forward but to let members of the group take over this task. Mirijana, who emerges increasingly as deliberative leader, takes over this task in the present situation, keeping deliberation at high level.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** It is bad sanitation. Pollution of the city is huge. Just write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino follows up on the suggestion of Mirijana and adds the bad pollution to the list of problems. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

**Ilija, Serb (code 1):** Write that we do not have trash cans.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ilija also follows up on Mirijana to add more problems to the letter for the High Representative. He mentions the lack of trash cans, which is related to the problem of pollution because without trash cans people may throw away trash contributing to pollution. The discussion remains interactive with an effort of the participants to stay on topic. The level of deliberation remains high.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Will we mention lack of organizations and facilities for young people, something like that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana still adds to the list mentioning as a problem the lack of organizations and facilities for young people. Deliberation flows at a high level.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** Oh, we don't need that; we have youth organizations in Srebrenica more than enough. Write that we need some fun. Although, this all goes in same bucket.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor objects that there is a need for more youth organization and activities. The debate becomes quite spirited but respectful so that deliberation remains at a high level.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** But let's write something positive, too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino suggests that the group should write also about positive things in the letter to the High Representative. With this suggestion, Nino keeps an optimistic tone, keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Pero, Serb (code 1):** What is positive?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Pero is interactive and asks Nino what he thinks is positive in Srebrenica. She seems to be really curious to get an answer. It is remarkable to have this reciprocity across the ethnic divide with

Pero as Serb asking a serious question to Nino as Bošnjak. Deliberation remains high.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** The positive thing is that we love this city and it's cheap to live here. Write that we need a loan.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor steps in and answers that it is cheap to live here. It is striking that despite all the problems mentioned in the discussion, Igor declares that they love to live here. He speaks in the plural for the entire group, creating a common life world. He also comes back to the demand for more loans. Deliberation remains at high level.

**Pero, Serb (code 1):** We do not need it, do not write.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Pero does not agree that they need more loans. As in all previous cases of disagreements, here, too, it is expressed with respect so deliberation remains at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** Like the one who wrote and got a loan and all spent all at Cindo's bar.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš agrees with Pero that they do not need more loans. He supports his position with a relevant story of someone who misused loans. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Pero, Serb (code 2):** Hey, let's finish.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an abrupt way Pero wants to finish with the discussion altogether, although several issues are not yet fully discussed. In this way she transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

**Ilija, Serb (code 3)** How many do we have?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ilija wants to know how many theses already have been written down. This purely informative question does not give to the discussion a new impulse, so that it remains at a low deliberative level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 3):** Four theses. Let's write something positive.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* As note taker, Mirijana answers Ilija that she has written down as yet four theses. Mirijana then disagrees with Pero that the discussion should stop now and suggests that something positive should be added, but this aspect has been covered before, and Mirijana does not add anything to what has been said before, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

**Miki, Serb (code 3):** Pollution, did you put it? That is positive.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miki adds pollution and claims that this is something positive, but does not give any justification how pollution can be seen as something positive. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 3):** It is better that you write, you know that?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino asks Mirijana as note taker that she should write but does not say what more should be written. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Ilija, Serb (code 4):** Write that we have a lot of touristic locations.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Ilija makes an effort to continue the discussion in proposing that tourist attractions should be better used. This is a new proposal that has the potential to improve life in Srebrenica. So Ilija is very much on the topic assigned to the group. With this intervention Ilija opens new space for the discussion to continue, transforming deliberation back to a high level.

**Pero, Serb (code 1):** And the internet?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Pero, who a short moment ago wanted to finish the discussion, is stimulated by Ilija to come back into the discussion suggesting better internet connections. In an interactive way, this demand is linked to the tourist issue, since tourism depends on good internet connections for hotel reservations and the tourists themselves. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** We'll put bad infrastructure. Shall we also put that we have natural resources, which is positive but negative is that there is no one to use them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana continues in an interactive way with the issue of tourism and demands that the given natural resources should be better used. She keeps deliberation at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** There is no market.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš asks for the establishment of a market, which may also be an attraction for tourists. So Miloš stays on topic keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** The government does not care about it. Each day I can bring 15 liter of Guber water and sell it here.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor supports Miloš that Srebrenica needs a market. With a personal story he shows how a market could work. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** Put the corruption, too.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino adds corruption as a problem to be solved. Deliberation remains high.

(Participants talking to each other, drinking juices and eating biscuits, laughing, friendly atmosphere).

**Nino, Bošnjak (code 1):** Write as a positive thing that we, Serbs and Bošnjaks, agree with each other.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Nino uses the increasingly friendly atmosphere in the group to suggest as a positive thing to be sent to the High Representative that Serbs and Bošnjaks agree with each other on the needs in Srebrenica. This is a crucial statement that reaches across the ethnic divide.

**Mirijana, Serb (code1):** One of the positive things in Srebrenica is that young Serbs and Bošnjaks are in good relations and are willing to work together in our interest.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as a Serb agrees with Nino as a Bošnjak that among the young people there are good relations between the two ethnic groups and that both groups are willing to work together for the common interest. It is almost too good what a high deliberative turn the discussion has taken. Perhaps young people are more willing to open to the other side. It is remarkable that this deliberative turn has come without prodding of the moderator. Deliberation is now really at a very high level. Both groups have found a common life world where they share the same problems and the same ambitions for the future.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** Do we have something else to put down? It is a disgrace that we wrote only on half of the paper.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor wants to continue the discussion using forceful language to encourage the other participants to do so. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 2): We have finished.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana disagrees with Igor that the discussion should continue. In this way she blocks space to further deal with still hanging issues like corruption. The discussion is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

**(Moderator** states that discussion should continue for another 15 minutes.)

**Igor, Serb (code 3):** Will talk another 15 minutes. We'll lie about something.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor makes fun of the demand of the moderator that the discussion should continue for another 15 minutes, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Noise

**Mirijana, Serb (code 3):** So what does he want now?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana is annoyed by the sarcastic remark of Igor. Deliberation remains at a low level.

**Igor, Serb (code 4): You know what would be good? They need to organize something during the winter.**

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor gets away from his sarcastic mood and makes a relevant proposal. He states that winter is a problem for young people in Srebrenica, so that during this time something needs to be organized for them.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** There is no place to hang out.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana is no longer annoyed with Igor and supports him that in winter young people need places to hang out. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** No, and that investment money goes to the municipality, rather than us.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Keeping up his active role, Igor complains that the local authorities keep the investment monies for themselves instead of actually helping ordinary people. In this way, Igor comes back to the corruption issue that was raised earlier by Nino. It is remarkable that Igor as Serb agrees with Nino as Bošnjak that corruption is a problem in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** We have mixed up all good and bad. We need first to put the good and then bad things.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš makes a relevant procedural proposal of how to organize the letter to the High Representative. On a positive note, he wants first to put the good things. Early in the discussion, Miloš was not at all serious making all kind of funny disrupting remarks. Group dynamics has helped him to take the discussion seriously getting involved in the minute details of how the letter should be formulated. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** We'll put the lack of places to hang out, bars, pools, sports and recreation halls.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana comes back to her earlier claim that there are no places to hang out and specifies the places where young people would like to hang out. This is a relevant specification to what she said earlier keeping deliberation at a high level.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** How it started, Potočari will soon be the center of town (Potočari is the cemetery of genocide).

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This is the first time that the genocide is mentioned, and it is noteworthy that it is done by the Serb side. Deliberation stays at a high level.



**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** Do you have sport center on Potočari?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* The discussion gets a very serious note, staying with the place of the cemetery of the genocide. Miloš as Serb asks the Bošnjak side whether the place has a sport center. The question indicates that Serbs and Bošnjaks live separated in Srebrenica so that Miloš does not know the answer. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Elvir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes we have.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Elvir from the Bošnjak side answers matter-of factually that yes, indeed, there is also a sport center at Potočari.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** So you have everything, mosque, sport center. Also a restaurant?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* This is an amazing exchange that continues between the two ethnic sides. Again in a matter-of factual way, Miloš asks whether there is also a mosque close to the genocide cemetery. This is a sequence in the discussion that easily could have erupted into hostility between the two sides with strongly different interpretation of what happened at the massacres in the 1990's. Perhaps with the participants being young, the atmosphere remained calm in the group, which the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Elvir, Bošnjak (code 1):** Yes five.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Again in a calm way Elvir answers that there are five mosques. He does not give any comments which could have enflamed the discussion, which remains at a high level of deliberation.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** Oh, we see.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In a polite way, Miloš appreciates the answers of Elvir, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** So, will I write anything more?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an earlier intervention, Mirijana had demanded in an abrupt way the end of the discussion, transforming it to a low level of deliberation. Now she asks politely whether as a note taker there is anything that she had to write down. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** Wait a second. Put that we do not have a library.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor keeps up his active role, adding still another issue to be added to the list to be sent to the High Representative. Deliberation remains at a high level.

**Miloš, Serb (code 1):** How many theses do we have now?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Miloš who was so disruptive at the beginning of the discussion, continues to be interested in how the letter to the High Representative will exactly look like. Deliberation stays at a high level.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Eight.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* In an interactive way, Mirijana answers as a note taker that she has written down eight theses. Deliberation stays high.

**Igor, Serb (code 1):** Write something like; we have a lot of talents in Srebrenica and do not have the money to finance them.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Igor still keep up his activity and suggests a positive statement about the talents in Srebrenica, telling the High Representative that they need more money to be developed. Deliberation stays high.

**Mirijana, Serb (code 1):** Should we put scholarships in high school for those who live in the villages?

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Mirijana as note taker adds herself another issue that is particularly deliberative because it concerns people who do not live in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays high.

***Igor, Serb (code1):*** We will not write more.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Now even Igor gives the signal that he has nothing more to add. At this point of the discussion, it is helpful for the group to hear this signal from the very active Igor. Deliberation stays high.

***Mirijana, Serb (code 1):*** Ecological problems - pollution of water and soil, the problem of employment, a lack of cultural and sport events, unused economic resources, then the lack of sports and recreation center, the inability of education. That's it. We have finished.

*Interpretation of level of deliberation:* Having heard the signal of Igor, Mirijana nicely summarizes what she has written down. So without intervention of the moderator, the group manages itself to bring the discussion smoothly to an end, at a high note of deliberation.

## **8.4 Summary explanations of transformative moments and their effects on outcomes**

The discussion in group 6 began at a high level of deliberation. There were altogether 10 deliberative transformative moments, five downwards and five upwards, so that the discussion ended at a high level. Again, I will start with summarizing my explanations for the downward transformative moments and then turn to the upward moments. Afterwards, I will show how the deliberative pattern influenced the outcome of the discussion relating it to the letter brought to the High Representative.

### **8.4.1. Transformative moments from high to low levels of deliberation**

The first downward Deliberative Transformative Moment occurred after Serb Mirijana had introduced the discussion in a highly deliberative way,

proposing how the group should proceed, and Miloš, also from the Serb side, tried to be funny, suggesting that they should play rather than continue the discussion. His remark was not funny at all but disrespectful for the task of the group.

Shortly afterwards, Miloš disrupts the flow of the discussion again in a disrespectful manner in claiming that he needs a large loan without saying for what purpose. He continues to be frivolous not taking seriously the task of the group. In this way he transforms the discussion for the second time from a high to a low level of deliberation.

Later in the meeting, when the discussion had returned to a high level of deliberation, Mirijana loses patience with Miloš and tells him to shut up for a while. To be sure, Miloš had disrupted the discussion twice, but it was still a lack of respect, when Mirijana told him in no uncertain terms that he should be silent for a while.

The fourth time that the discussion went from a high to a low level of deliberation, it was due to Serb Pero, who out of the blue exclaimed that she had enough and that the group should end the discussion, although many issues were still on the table. Once again, it was a lack of respect that brought the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

The last time when the discussion was transformed from a high to low level of deliberation, it was once again due to a lack of respect. As Pero before, this time it was Mirijana who abruptly called for an end of the discussion.

In previous groups, we have already seen how a lack of respect can easily transform a discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. It is still remarkable, however, that in the present group all downward Deliberative Transformative Moments were caused by disrespectful utterances. Thereby, disrespect was not directed at the other ethnic side. The first three cases took place within the Serb group. The last two cases about bringing the discussion to a premature end were not directed at anyone in particular. Since this was a youth group, expressing disrespect was perhaps usual bantering common among young people in Srebrenica without relevance to the ethnic divide.

#### 8.4.2. Transformative moments from a low to a high level of deliberation

The first upward Deliberative Transformative Moment takes place when Serb Mirijana ignores a rude remark of Miloš who is also from the Serb side. This episode occurs at the very beginning of the discussion. Mirijana was the first to speak up with suggestions of how to structure the discussion. Miloš, as we have already analyzed in the last section, made fun of the whole discussion and expressed the wish to go and play. Mirijana does not react but offers in a constructive deliberative way that she volunteers to be a note taker for the letter to be sent to the High Representative.

As we have seen in the previous section, Miloš continues to be disruptive in claiming that he needs an unreasonable high loan without giving any justification. Although Mirijana later in the discussion becomes impatient with Miloš, at first she is patient and asks Miloš to be serious. In avoiding to be disrespectful herself, Mirijana brings the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Mirijana is responsible for the third upward Deliberative Transformative Moment. For this group it took a long time of bantering for someone to set a substantive issue on the agenda. But finally Serb Mirijana took a leadership role and proposed that something should be done about education, which is clearly a superordinate issue of interest to both Serbs and Bošnjaks.

The fourth upward Deliberative Moment is due to Serb Ilija, who argues that Srebrenica has many touristic locations and that they should be better used. Tourism is a super ordinate issue from which both Serbs and Bošnjaks can profit.

When the discussion dragged on at a low level of deliberation and seemed to come to an end, Serb Igor brought up a super ordinate issue of importance to young people across the ethnic divide. He stated that it was particularly during winter time that the municipality needed to organize something for young people in their free time. In this way he transformed the discussion once more to a high level of deliberation.

Overall, the articulation of super ordinate goals was of particular importance to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation. In three of the five cases, proposing super ordinate goals of interest across the ethnic divide helped to raise the level of deliberation. In previous chapters, we have already registered the importance of super ordinate goals. Leadership and respect, which we have already seen in previous chapters, was also important in the current group. Finally, in the first case it was the ignoring of a rude remark that helped to quickly bring back the discussion to a high level of deliberation. We have not encountered this factor in the previous chapter, although Maria Clara Jaramillo has found such situations in her dissertation about the ex-combatants in Colombia.

## **8.5. Outcomes and deliberation**

How did deliberation impact on the outcomes of group discussions? As for the previous groups, I will investigate in this section how the deliberative pattern is related to the substance of the recommendations that the group sent to the High Representative. Again, I will use the graphic form, where H stands for a speech act at a high level of deliberation, and L for a speech act at a low level of deliberation. Each sign stands for one speech act, and at the end of each sequence I give the number of speech acts in this sequence. The group dealt altogether with nine five substantive issues: In this order, I locate the time points when a decision on the respective issue was made: D1= more inclusive classes in schools, D2= Impossibility to get a job (young and adult people from other cities come and work in Srebrenica, while young people in Srebrenica do not have here work for political reasons), D3= lack of cultural-sport events, D4= ecological problem (water pollution and environment around), D5= creation of infrastructure, D6= Srebrenica is rich in environmental resources that need to be adequately used, and in this way it is possible to solve the growing of problems, D7= One among positive facts is that in Srebrenica young people (both Serbs and Bošnjaks) are in good relations and we would like to work together for our

interest and for the interest of our city, D8= Lack of places to go out (sport-recreation center), D9= Because of geographical distance and financial problems, many students (primary and secondary school) cannot get a proper education. The municipality helps only in a limited way, but in an insufficient way, so that support is needed to those young people that would like to get an education.

#### 8.5.1. Sequences in the discussion of Group 6

H – (1)

L – (1)

H – (1)

L – (1)

H ---- (4)

L ----- 8)

H ----D1----D2-----D3-----D4----- (28)

L ---- (5)

H ---D5-D6----D7- (9)

L --- (3)

H ---D8-----D9--- (19)

There were in total 81 speech acts, 62 at a high level of deliberation, 19 at a low level. Thus, 77 percent of all speech acts were at a high deliberative level, which is about as high than in the fifth group with 75 percent, but higher than the 67 percent in the first group, the 66 percent in the fourth group, the 62 percent in the third group and the 37 percent in the second group. It is remarkable that the two groups with the largest percentage of high deliberate speech acts were both youth groups. I will analyse this finding in the Conclusion.

As in the first five groups, substantive agreements were only reached when the discussion could be kept for a long time at a high level of deliberation. All agreements concerned issues on super-ordinate goals. It was easy to see, for example, that it was in the common interest of both ethnic groups to develop a

better infrastructure. So once again, as in the previous groups, sensitive inter-ethnic issues were not addressed. From a deliberate perspective it is particularly remarkable that the group expanded its horizon in including also the wellbeing of the surrounding villages.



## Conclusion

The major result of my research is that the concept of Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM) that Maria Clara Jaramillo had developed in her doctoral dissertation with ex-combatants in Colombia<sup>268</sup> worked also with Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica. This result was not necessarily to be expected. After all, it was only fifteen years before I undertook my research that Srebrenica suffered the worst massacre in European history since World War II, when about 8'000 Bošnjak men and boys were shamelessly killed by Serbs. When I began my research, I was not sure whether I would find any Bošnjaks and Serbs who were willing to sit together at the same table. As I described in Chapter 2, I encountered indeed refusals from both sides, when I selected with the method of random walk the participants for the six discussion groups. A sufficient number of subjects, however, were willing to participate in my research, so that the results have some validity.

Bringing Serbs and Bošnjaks to the same table did not yet mean that they would deliberate at all. It was conceivable that they would only criticize each other for the war crimes committed in the early 1990's. Local leaders in Srebrenica, in fact, during the time of my research still constantly came back to the massacre and the civil war in general. By contrast, participants in our research groups never referred to the war and were sometimes quite deliberative and criticized their local leaders for the lack of deliberation, making the argument that leaders only want to keep the two ethnic groups apart to keep their power. These observation lead to the important conclusion that in deeply divided society's deliberation is easier at the level of ordinary citizens than at the level of political leaders. It is not only that political leaders profit from the deep divisions for their political career, it is also that ordinary people usually suffer more from the deep divisions in their daily life than their leaders. From my research I come to the conclusion that the ordinary people who were willing of participate in my

---

<sup>268</sup> Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Transformative Deliberative Moments Among Ex-Combatants In Colombia*, Doctoral Dissertation in Political Science, University of Bern, 2013.

research project, had enough of the deep divisions and wished to go ahead with their daily life attempting to solve in common super ordinate problems of interest to both sides like stray dogs or the garbage in the local river.

There were also sequences in the discussion of all six groups that were not deliberate at all but dragged on without clear aims. It was such up and down in the level of deliberation that allowed me to apply the concept of upward and downward Deliberative Transformative Moments (DTM) and thus to get at the internal dynamic of the group discussions. In all six discussion groups, there were altogether 57 Deliberative Transformative Moments, 27 upwards and 30 downwards. In my dissertation, I took great pain to describe in a qualitative way each of these Moments. In this way, my research should give a good impression of what actually happened in the various groups and how the participants spoke up. Theoretically, I was interested to determine the factors that triggered Deliberative Transformative Moments. I was also interested to see how long a high level of deliberation was sustained and how long discussions dragged on at a low level of deliberation. Finally, I was interested how decision outcomes were influenced by the internal dynamics of the group discussions.

### **Upward Deliberative Transformative Moments**

With regard to the factors triggering the 27 upward Deliberative Transformative Moments, twelve were due to leadership skills of participants, eight to the presentation of super ordinate goals, two to rational arguments, two to humor, two to ignoring rude remarks, and one to telling a story.

**Hypothesis 1** stated that upward Deliberative Transformative Moments are the more likely, the more deliberative leaders emerge. This hypothesis was already supported by Maria Clara Jaramillo in her research about guerrillas and paramilitaries in Colombia. Indeed, in her doctoral dissertation she had an entire chapter about deliberative leaders. In this context, it is important to remember that in our research designs both Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself acted as passive moderators only giving the topic to be discussed and then letting the discussion flow freely. This meant that we did not intervene when the discussion

dragged on at a low level of deliberation. We did not give clues how the discussion could be transformed back to a high level of deliberation. It was up to the participants themselves to take over this role. The hypothesis was also supported by my own research in Srebrenica with the highest number of upward Deliberative Transformative Moments having been triggered by leadership skills. In Srebrenica, too, there were actors who over the course of the discussion emerged as deliberative leaders in giving to the discussion new impulses. A good illustration comes from the fourth group in Srebrenica where there were four sequences where thanks to leadership skills the discussion was transformed from a low to a high level of deliberation. Two times it was Bošnjak Emir who took over a leadership role, the other two times it was Svetlana from the Serb side who took over this role. Thereby, they supported each other, which was a remarkable sign of inter-ethnic cooperation. My conclusion for future research is that it is better to leave it to the participants to find ways to transform a discussion back to a high level of deliberation rather than for the moderator to take over this role. It is in the spirit of the deliberative model to empower the participants themselves and not to guide them like school children to strictly adhere to rules of deliberation.

**Hypothesis 2** about the importance of super ordinate goals was also already supported by Maria Clara Jaramillo in her doctoral dissertation on ex-combatants in Colombia. Ex-guerrilla Ana, for example, set super ordinate goals for the group when she exclaimed:

*For me, basically and most importantly, in order for us to reach agreement we need to be able to talk in a civilized way, just like human beings.*

For Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica, I found similar efforts to reach agreements on common goals. Mirijana from the Serbian side, for example, made the following statement emphasizing the need to work for super ordinate goals:

One of the positive things in Srebrenica is that young Serbs and Bošnjaks are in good relations and are willing to work together in our interest.

There were also concrete policy proposals that would serve both Serbs and Bošnjaks. As a consequence, such proposals were able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. Svetlana from the Serb side, for example, asked for a new job policy and requested that both Serbs and Bošnjaks should equally profit from such a new policy. In articulating this super ordinate goal, Svetlana was able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

With regard to ***hypothesis 3*** about the importance of rationality the results are mixed. There were only two cases where rational arguments triggered upward Deliberative Transformative Moments. Yet, initially the deliberative model was strongly based on rationality, most forcefully by Jürgen Habermas, for whom arguments must be critically assessed through “the orderly exchange of information and reasons between parties”<sup>269</sup> Thus, reasons must be given why something should be done. This criterion is not fulfilled when Stefan in group 5 postulates that something should be done for tourism without giving a reason why. When, by contrast, Milena in group 2 argues that electoral abstentions by dissatisfied people are counterproductive, because it only strengthens the authorities, this is a rational argument stating why one should participate in elections. In her study in Colombia, Maria Clara Jaramillo also found only a few cases, where rationality helped to raise the level of deliberation. The findings of Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself shows that the use of rationality is not the only way how discussions can be transformed from a low to a high level of deliberation. These findings do not, of course, invalidate the normative position of Habermas that deliberation *should* be based on rationality, but it shows that there are other types of deliberation.

---

<sup>269</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1992, 370.

For ***hypothesis 4*** about the role of personal stories the results are also mixed. In recent years, a big development in the deliberate literature was that several authors have postulated that telling personal stories should have a prominent place in deliberation. Sharon Krause was one of the first to make this argument in claiming that personal stories “can enrich citizens’ reflection on public issues and thereby improve public deliberation”<sup>270</sup> In her research on ex-combatants in Colombia, Maria Clara put a damper on the enthusiasm about the benefits of personal stories on deliberation. To be sure, she found seven cases where personal stories helped to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation. But there were also five cases where personal stories had a detrimental effect on deliberation. In my own research in Srebrenica, the role of personal stories for deliberation was even less favorable. There were altogether five personal stories that had an effect on Deliberative Transformative Moments, but for four of them the effect was negative, and it was only for one case where the effect was positive. This case, however, is remarkable in showing how a personal story can help to transform a discussion back to a high level of deliberation. Dušan from the Serb side uses his personal story to bring in an effective way the issue of poverty on the agenda of the group. He tells the group that he would like to go to the local theatre but that he has not the necessary money if he wants to send his child to college. Dušan uses his personal story as advocated by Sharon R. Krause quoted above.

Next, I turn to ***hypothesis 5*** about humor as a factor that may help to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation. Sammy Basu made this argument in a theoretical way, when he wrote that “humor can be a social lubricant. It breaks the ice and fills awkward silences”<sup>271</sup> Both Maria Clara and myself can show that this theoretical argument holds up in empirical reality, although only in very few cases. In my own research, there were only two cases where humor helped to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of

---

<sup>270</sup> Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions.*, *op. cit.*, p.122.

<sup>271</sup> Sammy Basu, “Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor”, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 4 (1999), 391.

deliberation. One case was when the fourth group discussed the problem of wild pigs that come down from the mountains into the town and cause damage around private houses. No serious proposals are made of how to handle the problem and despair sets in, until Ana from the Serb side gets laughter with the remark that pigs want to learn a little culture here. Mina, also from the Serb side, gets even more laughter when she banters that we live also in wilderness, so for the pigs it is all the same. Both Ana and Mina can laugh about the lack of culture in Srebrenica. It is a kind of black humor, which transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

I found two cases that I did not consider in my initial hypotheses. Both cases were situations, where ignoring rude remarks helped to transform a discussion back to a high level of deliberation. It seems at first sight that these cases go against the key criterion of the deliberative model that one should always be willing to talk about all issues. The model is said to be talk centered. So how can a mute reaction help deliberation? It was Maria Clara Jaramillo who in her doctoral dissertation found for the first time in the literature a good interpretation for such cases. Her prime example deals with paramilitary Belisario who made the very rude remark that the guerrillas were cattle thieves and rapists. The guerrillas ignored this remark and continued the discussion as if Belisario would not have spoken at all. Since Belisario did not continue with rude remarks, the situation could be saved from deteriorating into a shouting match. I found two similar cases in the fifth group, although they were of a milder kind. The first instance happened at the very beginning of the discussion. Mirijana from the Serb side had begun the discussion in a serious manner in proposing ways how the group should proceed. Miloš also from the Serb side then was very disruptive in suggesting that they should turn off the tape recorder and go and play outside. Mirijana ignored this remark, which would have put in jeopardy the whole enterprise of the discussion between Serbs and Bošnjaks. Disregarding the remark of Miloš was a good device of Mirijana to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in going back to procedural matters, which are

relevant at the beginning of a discussion. Should all rude remarks be ignored to save a high level of deliberation? The answer is not so simple because sometimes such muteness may backfire with the actors have made the rude remarks claiming that they are not being taken seriously. It is an interesting task to integrate muteness into the deliberative model. I am glad that Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself could put this issue on the agenda for future research.

### **Downward Deliberative Transformative Moments**

With regard to the factors triggering the 30 downward Deliberative Transformative Moments, seven were due to disrespect, six to despair, six to fatigue, six to being off-topic, four to personal stories, and one to being intellectually over the heads of the participants. For the interpretation of these factors I look at the initial hypotheses in reverse. If a speaker makes a statement not including any of the factors that helped to transform a discussion from a low to a high level of deliberation, one may expect that the discussion can no longer be sustained at a high level of deliberation but is transformed to a low level.

Maria Clara Jaramillo has found quite a few cases where the key deliberative criterion of mutual respect was violated. In the previous section we have already discussed the worst case, when a paramilitary called the guerrillas cattle thieves and rapists. In my research in Srebrenica, I did not find any such cases of extreme ugly disrespect. The worst case was when Almir from the Serb side called a procedural proposal of Dušan from the Serb side „stupid“. It seems logical that if respect helps deliberation that disrespect has the opposite effect.

Despair was widespread among ex-combatants in Colombia, as Maria Clara Jaramillo could document. Ex-paramilitary Bruno, for example, exclaimed: „There will never be peace in Colombia. Why? And do you know why there will never be peace? Because war is a busniss.“ Such despair pulls the level of deliberation way down. In my own research in Srebrenica I did not find such extreme despair, but still quite a high amount of hopelessness. When Serb Dušan proposed that in the letter to the High Commissioner, they should also mention something that is good in Srebrenica, Almir from the Bošnjak side short

back that in Srebrenica “everything is bad.” When a speech act contains only utter despair, all the factors that contribute to high deliberation are missing, so that it is almost inevitable that the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation.

Fatigue was a factor both in Colombia and in Srebrenica. Maria Clara Jaramillo and myself came across situations where one of the participants had enough and wanted to finish the discussion. Such fatigue always had a detrimental effect on deliberation, since all positive factors for deliberation were missing.

Off-topic remarks were another factor that led to downward Deliberative Transformative Moments for guerrillas and paramilitaries in Colombia and for Serbs and Bošnjaks in Srebrenica. An example in my own research occurred when all of a sudden two of the female participants began to talk about private matters of a common friend.

As already mentioned in the previous section, I found four cases where a personal story led to a downward Deliberative Transformative Moment. An example is when Andjela from the Serbian side tells the group: “I think to leave. It is so empty. At night you can only meet dogs.” With this story Andjela does not open space of how the situation can be improved, since she wants to leave anyhow. She prefers the exit strategy to a voice strategy in the sense of Albert Hirschman<sup>272</sup>.

Finally, I found a case where the topic was intellectually so much over the heads of the participants that confusion resulted dragging the discussion back to a low level of deliberation. The issue was how the various municipal committees are appointed and how the tasks are distributed among the various committees. Knowing the answer to these questions would have been important for the group in order to implement its various policy proposals. But the issue was simply too complicated for ordinary citizens to get a good overview. It is remarkable that there was only one case in this category. Otherwise, the groups dealt with mundane matters of their daily life like the problem of stray dogs or how to clean

---

<sup>272</sup> Albert Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, Harvard University Press. 1970.



up the Drina River. In Colombia, Maria Clara Jaramillo also found only one case where too much complexity of an issue transformed the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. This case came up when a group addressed the question whether Cuba or Venezuela were better models for Colombia and got entangled by the intricacies of what is meant by Marxism.

### **Sequence of high and low levels of deliberation**

I am not only interested how Deliberative Transformative Moments come about but also in what happens after such Moments. If we have an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, how long can the high level of deliberation be sustained? And vice versa, if the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation, how long does it drag on at this low level? In all six groups together, there were 403 speech acts at a high level of deliberation, 230 speech acts at a low level. This finding gives quite a positive picture of the deliberative quality of Serbs and Bošnjaks discussing with each other how to improve life in Srebrenica. There was, however, quite a bit of variation among the six groups. In group six, 77 percent of all speech acts were at a high level of deliberation, 75 percent in group five, 67 percent in group one, 66 percent in group four, 62 percent in group three, and 37 percent in group two. How can this variation be explained? In Chapter 2, I formulated two hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 6:** After an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, the high level of deliberation is sustained the longer, the more participants were trained in deliberation.

**Hypothesis 7:** After an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment, the high level of deliberation is sustained the longer, the younger participants are.

Let me take first ***hypothesis 7***, which is supported and shows an optimistic picture for the future of deliberation in deeply divided societies. The two youth groups are indeed the ones with the greatest number of speech acts with a high level of deliberation. Group 6 is particularly impressive. After they bantered back and forth for the first 16 speech acts without addressing substantive issues,

they found their way with 87 percent of the speech acts at a high level of deliberation for the remainder of the discussion. To further improve the picture, one has to consider that the bantering at the beginning of the meeting did not occur across the ethnic divide but mainly between Mirijana and Miloš, both of the Serb side. Towards the end of the session there was such a good feeling between the Serb and Bošnjak teenagers that Mirijana could exclaim without anyone objecting: *“One of the positive things in Srebrenica is that young Serbs and Bošnjaks are in good relations and are willing to work together in our interest.”* Although my findings look optimistic for the future of inter-ethnic relations in Srebrenica, I may mostly have found a period effect in the sense that these teenagers did not have much of memories of the massacre 15 years before and may become more hostile towards the other ethnic group as they get older. With young people it is always difficult to disentangle period and generational effects. So let us hope that these young people as they get older will continue to have the willingness to work together for the common good of both ethnic groups.

To test ***hypothesis 6***, I chose the research design that participants in three of the six groups were trained prior to our group discussions in an educational program of the Nansen Dialogue Center, a Norwegian NGO, whose objective “is to contribute to reconciliation and peace building through interethnic dialogue.”<sup>273</sup> Let us look first at the two youth groups: participants in group 5 did get this training, participants in group 6 did not. According to the hypothesis, participants in group 5 should have been more deliberative, but as we have seen above, this was not the case. If there was a difference between the two groups, as we have also seen above, group 6 was slightly more deliberative. This is a disappointing result for the efforts of the Nansen Dialogue Center. One would have hoped that young people would be fast learners and would apply the lessons about deliberation, when they took part in my research project. For the four adult groups, the results are mixed. The participants of groups 1 and 2 did not participate in the deliberative training, while participants in groups 3 and 4 did

---

<sup>273</sup> [www.nansen-dialogue-net/content](http://www.nansen-dialogue-net/content)

so. Deliberation in groups 3 and 4 was quite high, 62 percent in group 3 and 66 percent in group 4. In group 1, however, deliberation was at about the same level with 67 percent. The clear outlier is group 2, where only 34 percent of speech acts were at a high level of deliberation. Let me take a closer look at this outlier to check whether something special went on in this group. There was one Bošnjak, Emina, and three Serbs, Milena, Svetlana, and Vladan. At first sight one may expect that the intimate atmosphere of a small group would be conducive to deliberation. The numerical distribution between the two ethnic groups, however, is problematic. Emina is the only Bošnjak having to deal with three Serbs. She was at the time 50 years old, so that she was old enough to have strong memories of the Serb massacre 15 years ago. As a woman she was also confronted with two men at the Serb site, which was not a comfortable position given the local anti-feminist culture. As background one has to consider that they all lost family members and friends during the war. From their life stories, there is a clear divide between Emina as a Muslim Bošnjak and the three Serbs, and particularly between Emina and Milena. They have, indeed, both very hostile feelings towards the other ethnic group. Emina blames Serbs as the only responsible of war in Bosnia-Herzegovina. She always feels uneasy, disgusted, angry, and afraid about Serbs, and never grateful or proud of them. Milena, by contrast, has exactly the same negative feelings towards Bošnjaks. She even thinks that Bošnjaks are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat. She thinks that each ethnic group should be entitled to its own national state, she wants only ethnic states; she believes that only in this way can collective identities be protected. She blames Bošnjaks, because they think that the country is theirs and nobody else's. The two other Serbs, Vladan and Svetlana, are also very proud of their ethnic and religious identities but are not as hostile towards Bošnjaks as Milena.

What does this analysis of group 2 tell us about the validity of hypothesis 6 for this group? Hard to tell. If the four participants would have attended the deliberative program of the Nansen Dialogue Center, would they have acted in a more deliberate way? Perhaps. But perhaps not, because the preconditions for

deliberation were extremely bad in this group. If it is so difficult to come to a conclusion with regard to this group, and if we consider only the three other adult groups, there is no support for hypothesis 6. This finding does not mean that educational programs for deliberation are always useless. It only means that the program of the Nansen Dialogue Center had no visible influence on the participants in my research. It seems to me that such programs need to be stretched over a longer period of time, for example a year-long program built into the school curriculum already at an early age. In my common book with Jürg Steiner, Maria Clara Jaramillo, and Rousiley Maia we make corresponding recommendations<sup>274</sup>.

Now I come to the last hypothesis to be tested:

**Hypothesis 8:** Agreements across deep divisions are all the more likely, the longer after an upward Deliberative Transformative Moment (DTM) deliberation is kept at a high level.

The crucial question is whether across the deep division there is some kind of agreement on concrete issues. The fact that the discussion flows at a high level of deliberation already indicates that the two sides listen to each other in a respectful way, which may already be useful for overcoming the deep divisions at a psychological level. Thus, having a high level of deliberation across deep divisions has already a value in itself, even if such deliberation does not lead to concrete policy results. A further step, however, is when the two sides come down to concrete issues and work out common policy solutions. According to the research design of our research group, the moderators did not put issues to a vote but let the discussion go freely wherever it went. There were also no cases where participants organized a vote on their own. Therefore, we define an agreement between the two sides, if there is explicit accord from participants of both sides and no open objection of either side. Such agreements should be

---

<sup>274</sup> Jürg Steiner, Maria Clara Jaramillo, Rousiley Maia, Simona Mameli, *Deliberation across Deeply Divided Societies. Transformative Moments*, Cambridge University Press, 2017.

more likely when deliberation continues for some time; as John S. Dryzek argues, deliberation is “a means for joint resolution of social problems.”<sup>275</sup>

In my research, I could indeed register many such agreements when the discussion was sustained for a long time at a high level of deliberation. The longest stretch of deliberation was in group 1 with 54 continuous speech acts at a high level of deliberation. The group addressed the issue of poverty at great length and towards the end of this sequence it reached agreement on the following statement to be sent to the High Representative.

There is failure to comply with workers' rights. Employees work an average of ten to twelve hours a day, six to seven days a week, at a wage of only 400 KM. This means exploiting people. People are not entitled to sick leave, regardless of the justification. Law is only for the poor. Our municipality is more inclined to money laundry than helping citizens.

This is a powerful statement agreed upon by both Serbs and Bošnjaks. Maria Clara Jaramillo also found that guerrillas and paramilitaries often came to agreements when they were able to sustain a discussion for a long time at a high level of deliberation. These findings show that deliberation can have profound policy consequences.

---

<sup>275</sup> John S. Dryzek, “Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (2009), 1390.

## Bibliography

- Theodor W. Adorno et al, *La personalità autoritaria*, Edizioni di Comunità, Milano, 1997
- Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1954
- Richard D. Ashmore, "Prejudices: Causes and Cures", in Barry E. Collins (Ed), *Social Psychology: Social Influence, Attitude Change, Group Processes and Prejudice*, Reading MA, Addison-Wesley, 1970, pp. 245-339
- André Bächtiger, "On Perfecting the Deliberative Process: Questioning, Disputing, and Insisting as Core Deliberative Values", *Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2-5, 2010*
- André Bächtiger, Shawn Rosenberg, Seraina Pedrini, Mirjam Ryser, and Marco R. Steenbergen, "Discourse Quality Index 2: An Updated Measurement Instrument for Deliberative Processes", *Paper Presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, September 10-12, 2009*
- Balkans Transitional Justice, *Mladić Verdict Highlights Bosnia's Ethnic Divisions*, 22/11/2017, at <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/mladic-verdict-highlights-bosnia-s-ethnic-divisions-11-22-2017> (last access 5/3/18)
- Nina Baltić, Tomasz Milej, *Human and Minority Rights in Violent Ethnic Conflict. Synthetic Report on Human Rights under the Yugoslav System, Processes of Ethnic Mobilization and EU Crisis Management*, MIRICO/Eurac Report, Bolzano, 2007
- Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 4 (1999), 378-40

- Stefano Bianchini, *Etno-politica e State-building. Il problema controverso dell'efficienza istituzionale in Bosnia-Erzegovina*, Paper IECOB (Istituto per l'Europa Centro Orientale e Balcanica), Forlì, 2005
- Stefano Bianchini, *La questione jugoslava*, Giunti-Casterman Ed., Firenze, 1999
- Stefano Bianchini, *Sarajevo, le radici dell'odio*, Ed. Associate Editrice Internazionale, Roma, 2003
- Florian Bieber, Carsten Wieland (Eds), *Facing the Past, Facing the Future: Confronting Ethnicity and Conflict in Bosnia and Former Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2005;
- Florian Bieber, "Power Sharing, Political Representation and Group Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina", in Florian Bieber, Carsten Wieland (Eds), *Facing the Past, Facing the Future: Confronting Ethnicity and Conflict in Bosnia and Former Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2005, pp. 151-161
- Florian Bieber, *Post-War Bosnia, Ethnicity, Inequality and Public Sector Governance*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006
- Florian Bieber, *Institutionalizing Ethnicity in the Western Balkans. Managing Change in Deeply Divided Societies*, European Centre for Minority Issues, ECMI Working Paper n. 19, Flensburg, February 2004
- Laura W. Black, "Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments", *Communication Theory*, 18 (2008)
- Stefano Boca, Piero Bocchiario, Costanza Scaffidi Abate, *Introduzione alla Psicologia Sociale*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2003
- David Chandler, *Bosnia. Faking Democracy After Dayton*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Pluto Press UK, London, 2000
- Joshua Cohen, "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy", in James Bohman and William Rehg (eds.), *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, Cambridge. Mass., MIT Press, 1989
- Markus Crepaz and Jürg Steiner, *European Democracies*, London, Pearson 2013

- Faye Crosby, "A Model of Egoistical Relative Deprivation", in *Psychological Review*, n. 83, 1976, pp. 85-113
- John F. Dovidio, Samuel L. Gaertner, Kerry Kawakami, "Intergroup Contact: The Past, Present, and the Future", in *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *Sage Journals*, Vol. 6, n. 1, 2003, pp. 5-21
- John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia", in *Political Theory*, n. 33, 2005, pp. 218-242
- John S. Dryzek, "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building", *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (2009), 1390
- John S. Dryzek, *Discursive Democracy. Politics, Policy, and Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990
- John S. Dryzek, "Legitimacy and Economy in Deliberative Democracy", in *Political Theory*, n. 29/2001, pp. 651-669
- John S. Dryzek, Simon Niemeyer, "Reconciling Pluralism and Consensus as Political Ideals", in *American Journal of Political Science*, n. 50/2006, pp. 634-649
- Dario D'Urso, "L'insostenibile leggerezza della Bosnia –Erzegovina", in *I Quaderni Speciali di Limesplus – Rivista Italiana di Geopolitica – Kosovo, lo Stato delle Mafie*, n. 6/2006, Gruppo Editoriale L'Espresso, Roma, 2006, p. 157
- Antonio Floridia, *From Participation to Deliberation. A Critical Genealogy of Deliberative Democracy*, ECPR Press, Colchester, 2017
- Hugh Donald Forbes, *Ethnic Conflict. Commerce, Culture and the Contact Hypothesis*, Yale University Press, New Haven/London, 1997
- Jerome D. Frank, Andrej Y. Melville, "The Image of the Enemy and the Process of Change", in Anatoly Gromyko and Martin Hellman, eds., *Breakthrough—Emerging New Thinking: Soviet and Western Challenges Issue a Challenge to Build a World Beyond War*, New York, Walker and Company, 1988



- Johan Galtung, *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means. The Transcend Method*, United Nations Press, 2000
- Vladimir Goati, "Parliamentary Democracy and International Relations in Yugoslavia", in Dušan Janjić (ed.), *Ethnic Conflict Management. The Case of Yugoslavia*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 1997
- Robert E. Goodin, „Talking Politics: Perils and Promise,” *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (2006), 253
- Ted R. Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970
- Mirela Grünther-Đečević, "A never-ending accession process? Bosnia and Herzegovina's long road to the EU", in *The Green European Journal*, 24/08/2017, available at <https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/a-never-ending-accession-process-bosnia-and-herzegovinas-long-road-to-the-eu/#> (last accessed 8/3/2018)
- Jürgen Habermas, "A reply to my critics", in J. B. Thompson and D. Held (eds.), *Habermas: Critical Debates*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982
- Jürgen Habermas, *Between Facts and Norms*, Polity Press, Oxford, 1997
- Jürgen Habermas, *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996
- Jürgen Habermas, *The Inclusion of the Other*, Studies in Political Theory, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1998
- Jürgen Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1992, S.370, "den geregelten Austausch von Information und Gründen"
- Jürgen Habermas, *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1983, p. 98
- Jürgen Habermas, "Morality and Ethical Life: Does Hegel's critique of Kant apply to discourse ethics?", in *Northwestern University Law Review* n. 83, 1989
- Jürgen Habermas, *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1981, S. 159

- Albert Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, Harvard University Press, 1970
- Donald Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, California University Press, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 2000
- Azra Hromadžić, *Citizens of an Empty Nation: Youth and State-Making in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina*, University of Pennsylvania Press, USA, 2015
- Azra Hromadžić, *Samo Bosne nema*, Biblioteka XX vek, Belgrade, 2017
- Maria Clara Jaramillo, *Deliberative Transformative Moments among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, PhD dissertation, political science; University of Bern, 2013
- Bora Kanra, "Islam, Democracy and Dialogue: The Case of Turkey", in *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 40, n. 4, 2005, pp. 515-540
- Stuart J. Kaufman, *Modern Hatreds: The Symbolic Politics of Ethnic War*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2001
- Karina V. Korostelina, *Social Identity and Conflict. Structures, Dynamics and Implications*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2007
- Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions. Moral Sentiment and Democratic Deliberation*, Princeton University Press, 2008
- Hélène Landemor, "On Minimal Deliberation, Partisan Activism, and Teaching People How to Disagree", in *Critical Review* 25 (2013), 210-225
- Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press, 1990
- Michelle LeBaron, Nike Carstarphen, "Negotiating Intractable Conflict. The Common Ground Dialogue Process and Abortion", in *Negotiation Journal*, Vol. 13, n. 4, Oct. 1997, pp. 341-361
- Arend Lijphart, *Le democrazie contemporanee*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2001
- Arend Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation. Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1968
- Jane Mansbridge, „The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy,” *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 18, 2010

- Joseph Marko, *Post-conflict Reconstruction through State and Nation-building: The Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, European Diversity and Autonomy Papers, EDAP 4/2005, available online at: [http://www.eurac.edu/documents/edap/2005\\_edap04.pdf](http://www.eurac.edu/documents/edap/2005_edap04.pdf), last access 5/3/2018
- Adis Merdžanović, *Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015
- Ronald L. Micheline, "Effects of Prior Interaction, Contact, Strategy, and Expectation of Meeting on Game Behavior and Sentiment", in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 15, n. 1, Mar. 1971, pp. 97-103
- Brenna Miller, *Transnational Networks and Bosnian Muslim Identity in Tito's Yugoslavia*, American Council for International Education, Ohio State University, 2014
- Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*, 1974, Reprint edition, Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2009
- Lara J. Nettelfield, Sarah E. Wagner, *Srebrenica in the Aftermath of Genocide*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2015
- Ian O'Flynn, *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006
- Louis Oppenheimer, "The Development of Enemy Images: a Theoretical Contribution", in *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 12 (3), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2006
- Stuart Oskamp, "Effects of Programmed Strategies on Cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma and Other Mixed-Motive Games", in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 15, n. 2, June 1971, pp. 225-229
- Andrea Oskari-Rossini, Davide Sighele, "La Bosnia dopo Dayton", in *I Quaderni Speciali di Limes – Rivista Italiana di geopolitica – I Balcani non sono lontani*, n. 4/2005, Gruppo Editoriale L'espresso, Roma, 2005

- Zoran Pajić, "Bosnia and Herzegovina: a Statehood Crossroads", in Stefano Bianchini *et al.* (ed.), *Regional Cooperation, Peace Enforcement and the Role of the Treaties in the Balkans*, Longo Ed., Ravenna, 2007
- Partners Foundation for Local Development, UNDP Romania, UNDESA New York, *What is Ethnic Conflict, Booklet Series*, 2008
- Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Intergroup Contact Theory", in *Annual Review of Psychology*, n. 49/1998, pp. 65-85
- Marc Howard Ross, *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007
- Jensen Sass and John S. Dryzek, "Deliberative Cultures", in *Political Theory* 42 (2014), 8.
- Duško Sekulić, Randy Hodson, Garth Massey, "War and Tolerance", in *Revija za Sociologiju*, Croatian Sociological Association Publ., N. 33 (1/2), 2002
- Jacques Sémelin, *Purificare e Distruggere. Usi Politici dei Massacri e dei Genocidi*, Ed. Einaudi, Torino, 2007
- Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Wood Sherif, *Groups in harmony and tension*, Harper & Row, New York, 1957
- Muzafer Sherif, *In Common Predicament: Social Psychology of Inter-group Conflict and Cooperation*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1966
- Eliot R. Smith, Diane M. Mackie, *Social Psychology*, Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Hove and New York, 2007
- Marco S. Steenbergen, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Jürg Steiner, "Measuring Political Deliberation: A Discourse Quality Index", in *Comparative European Politics*, n. 1/2003, pp. 21-48
- Jürg Steiner, André Bächtiger, Markus Spörndli, Marco S. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action. Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, Cambridge University Press, 2004
- Jürg Steiner, Maria Clara Jaramillo, C.M. Maia, Simona Mameli, *Deliberation across Deeply Divided Societies. Transformative Moments*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017

- Jürg Steiner, *Review of Adis Merdžanović, Democracy by Decree: Prospects and Limits of Imposed Consociational Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag, 2015, in Swiss Political Science Review, Vol. 22, Issue 2, June 2016
- Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012
- Jürg Steiner, "Wolf Linder's Swiss Democracy. An Early Advocate for a Deliberative Culture", in Adrian Vatter, Frédéric Varone, Fritz Sager (Herausgeber), *Demokratie als Leidenschaft, Festschrift für Wolf Linder*, Haupt, Bern, 2009
- Henri Tajfel, John C. Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Inter-Group Conflict", in W.G. Austin, S. Worchel, *The Social Psychology of Inter-Group Relations*, Brooks/Cole, Monterey, CA, 1979, pp. 33-47
- Henri Tajfel, John. C. Turner, "The Social Identity Theory of Inter-group Behavior", in S. Worchel , W.G. Austin, *Psychology of Inter-group Relations*, Nelsen-Hall, Chicago, 1986, pp. 7-24
- Lawrence Susskind, Sara McKearnan, *The Consensus-Building Handbook*, Sage Ed., Thousand oaks, California, 1999
- Juan E. Ugarriza, *Potential for Deliberation among Ex-Combatants in Colombia*, PhD dissertation, political science, University of Bern, 2012
- Uğur Ümit Üngör, Valerie Amandine Verkerke, "Funny as hell: The functions of humour during and after genocide", in European Journal of Humour Research 3 (2/3) 80–101, 2015
- UNDESA/UNDP and The Centre for Conflict Resolution, Skills development for Conflict Transformation. A training manual on understanding conflict, negotiation and mediation, 2008
- Ana Vasilache, *Manual on Ethnic Diversity and Conflict Management*, Partners Foundation for Local Development, Booklet Series, 2008
- Paola Villano, *Pregiudizi e Stereotipi*, Ed. Carocci, Roma, 2003

- Antonio Violante, "Srebrenica: where the war never ended", in *Acta Universitatis Lodzensis, Folia geographica Socio-Economica* 21, 2015: 137-156
- Srdjan Vučetić, *Identity is a Joking Matter: Intergroup Humor in Bosnia*, spacesofidentity.net, [S.l.], apr. 2004. ISSN 1496-6778. Available at: <https://soi.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/soi/article/view/8011> (Last accessed: 5/3/2018)
- Sarah E. Wagner, *To Know Where He Lies: DNA Technology and the Search for Srebrenica's Missing*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2008
- Iris Marion Young, "Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy," *Political Theory* 29 (2001)
- Iris Marion Young, "Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy," in Seyla Benhabib, ed. *Democracy and Difference* (Princeton University Press, 1996)
- Craig Zelizer, "Laughing our Way to Peace or War: Humour and Peacebuilding", in *Journal of Conflictology*, Volume 1, Issue 2 (2010) ISSN 2013-8857

---

- General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Annexes, commonly referred to as "Dayton Agreements"; available at the OSCE webpage, <https://www.osce.org/bih/126173?download=true> (last access 5/3/2018)
- Commission of the European Communities, Commission Staff Working Document, *Bosnia and Herzegovina 2008 Progress Report - accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council - Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2008-2009* - COM2008-674 - Brussels, 05.11.2008, available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press\\_corner/key-](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press_corner/key-)

[documents/reports\\_nov\\_2008/bosnia\\_herzegovina\\_progress\\_report\\_en.pdf](#), last accessed: 5/3/2018

- European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Document, Bosnia and Herzegovina 2016 Report* accompanying the document *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - 2016 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy*, SWD(2016) 365 final, Brussels, 9.11.2016;
- European Commission, *Commission Staff Working Document Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015 Report* Accompanying the document *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee of the Regions EU Enlargement Strategy*, SWD(2015) 214 final, Brussels, 10.11.2015;
- United Nations Security Council, Resolution 819 (1993), adopted by the Security Council at its 3199th meeting, on 16 April 1993, S/RES/819 (1993), 16 April 1993
- <http://www.nansen-dialogue.net/index.php/en/> , last accessed 5/3/2018

## Attachment 1. Questionnaires (Bosnian language)

### Upitnik 1

*Poštovani,*

*Molimo vas da popunite iskreno ovaj upitnik. Ne postoje „točna“ ili „netočna“ pitanja i vaši odgovori neće biti ni na jedan način osuđivani. Molimo odgovorite po osobnom/ličnom nahođenju.*

*Vaše ime i e-mail adresa potrebni su samo zbog aministracije. Biti će uklonjeni iz upitnika što je prije moguće i neće biti upotrijebljeni u podacima izvučenim iz ove studije.*

*Unaprijed se zahvaljujemo na vašoj pomoći!*

**Vaš Ime:**

---

**P1.** Vaše godine?

.....

**P2.** Vaš spol?

.....

**P3.** Koja od navedenih kategorija najbolje opisuje Vaš identitet?

- a. Bošnjak/inja
- b. Hrvat/ica
- c. Srbin/kinja
- d. Bosanac/Bosanka
- e. Drugo (navesti) .....

**P4.** Kako biste definirali svoju skupinu/grupu?

- a. Najvažnija etnička skupina/grupa u BIH
- b. Etnička skupina/grupa podjednake važnosti kao i ostale etničke skupine/grupe u BIH
- c. Etnička skupina/grupa od nevelike važnosti u BIH

**P5.** Koliko se osjećate povezanima sa skupinom/grupom odabranom pod pitanjem br.3?

- a. Vrlo povezan/na
- b. Povezan/na



- c. Ne baš povezan/na
- d. Nimalo
- e. Ne mogu odabrati

**P6.1.** Kako biste definirali Bošnjake u BIH?

- a. Najvažnija etnička skupina/grupa u BIH
- b. Jedna od etničkih skupina/grupa u BIH
- c. Etnička manjina u BIH
- d. Drugo (navesti).....

**P6.2.** Kako biste definirali Hrvate u BIH?

- a. Najvažnija etnička skupina/grupa u BIH
- b. Jedna od etničkih skupina/grupa u BIH
- c. Etnička manjina u BIH
- d. Drugo (navesti).....

**P6.3.** Kako biste definirali Srbe u BIH?

- a. Najvažnija etnička skupina/grupa u BIH
- b. Jedna od etničkih skupina/grupa u BIH
- c. Etnička manjina u BIH
- d. Drugo (navesti).....

**P7.** Mislite li da je vjera važna komponenta u Vašem životu?

- a. Nimalo
- b. Ne tako važna
- c. Da, ponekad
- d. Da, mnogo

**P8.** Formalno obrazovanje. Molimo navesti diplomu koju ste stekli.

.....

**P9.** Vaše zanimanje?

.....

**P10.** Gdje živite u BIH?

.....

**P11.** Koliko stanovnika ima Vaš grad/mjesto?

.....

**P12.** Jeli Vaš grad/mjesto?

- a. Čisto etnički grad/mjesto
- b. Mjesto gdje je jedna etnička skupina/grupa prilično dominantna
- c. Prilično multi etnički grad/mjesto
- d. Potpuno multi etnički grad/mjesto.

**P13.** Jeli Vaše susjedstvo/komšiluk?

- a. Jedno- etnički
- b. Jedna etnička skupina/grupa prilično dominantna.
- c. Prilično multi etnički
- d. Potpuno multi etnički

**P14.** Koliko dugo živite u tom susjedstvu/komšiluku?

.....

**P15.** Ako ste se tu doselili nedavno, gdje ste živjeli prije toga?

(navesti mjesto i regiju).....

**P16.** Po Vašem mišljenju, koliko vladajuća struktura u Vašoj općini podržava inter etnički dijalog i suradnju?

- a. Nimalo
- b. Jako malo
- c. Donekle
- d. Prilično
- e. Potpuno

**P17.** Da li glasate na izborima u vašem gradu/zemlji?

- a. Nikad
- b. Ponekad
- c. Generalno da
- d. Uvijek

**P18.** Koju političku stranku/partiju podržavate?

.....

**P19.** Jeste li ikada sudjelovali/učestvovali u projektima inter etničke suradnje?

- a. Nikada, nisam zainteresiran/na
- b. Nikada, ali bih volio/voljela
- c. Da, jednom (navesti temu suradnje)
- d. Ponekad (navesti temu)
- e. Često (navesti temu)

**P19bis.** Ako je Vaš odgovor na prethodno pitanje odgovorom pod C, D ili E : je li projekt bio promoviran od strane nevladine organizacije ili udruženja.

- a) Da ( navesti ime organizacije/udruženja)
- b) Ne sjećam se
- c) Ne

**P20.** Vaš maternji jezik?

.....

**P21.** Koje druge jezike Bosne i Hercegovine govorite/pišete/razumijete?

.....

**P22.** Razina poznavanja (osnovno, dobro, izvrsno)

.....

**P23.** Kako učite taj jezik?

.....

**P24.** Mislite li da ste dobri u poznavanju jezika u toj mjeri da možete argumentirano razgovarati?

a. Ne, nisam dobar/dobra u poznavanju jezika da bih mogao/la razgovarati i uvjeravati ljude.

b. Ovisi, ali generalno nisam dobar/dobra u poznavanju jezika da bih mogao/la razgovarati i uvjeravati ljude.

c. Da, ponekad mogu razgovarati i uvjeravati ljude.

d. Da, dobar/dobra sam u poznavanju jezika i uvijek mogu/la razgovarati i uvjeravati ljude u svoje argumente.

**P25.** Kojoj etničkoj skupini/grupi pripada Vaš otac?

a. Bošnjak

b. Hrvat

c. Srbin

d. Bosanac

e. Drugo (navesti) .....

**P26.** Kojoj etničkoj skupini/grupi pripada Vaša majka?

a. Bošnjakinja

b. Hrvatica

c. Srpkinja

d. Bosanka

e. Drugo (navesti) .....

**P27.1.** Razgovarajmo o prošlosti. Jeste li bili u BIH za vrijeme ratnih djelovanja?

(Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor)

(Da) (Ne)

**P27.2.** Jeste li u ratu bili vojnik ili pomagali svojim vojnicima?

(Da) (Ne)

**P27.3.** Jeste li izgubili bližu rodbinu tijekom rata?

(Da) (Ne)

**P27.4.** Jeste li izgubili prijatelje u ratu?  
(Da) (Ne)

**P28.** U kojoj mjeri se slažete ili ne slažete sa sljedećim tvrdnjama? (Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	U potpunosti se slažem	Slažem se	Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem	Ne slažem se	Nikako se ne slažem
(a) Radije bih bio/bila dio svoje skupine/grupe nego bile koje druge	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Postoje određene stvari u mojoj skupini/grupi zbog kojih se stidim	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Svijet bi bio bolji da su i ostale skupine/grupe kao moja.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Ljudi bi trebali podržavati svoju skupinu/grupu iako se ne slažu sa postupcima te iste skupine/grupe	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Često poželim da su kolektivni identiteti manje važni u Bosni i Hercegovini	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Od rođenja pripadam svojoj etničkoj skupini/grupi i uvijek ću biti dio te skupine/grupe.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g) Mislim da je BIH ujedinjena zemlja.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P29.** Neki ljudi tvrde da je za zemlju bolje kad se različite etničke skupine/grupe drže svojih zasebnih običaja i tradicija. Drugi, pak, tvrde kako je bolje kad se te skupine/grupe prilagode i uklope u šire društvo. Koja od ove dvije tvdnje je bliža Vašem razmišljanju?

- Etničke skupine/grupe trebaju se držati svojih zasebnih običaja i tradicija.
- Etničke skupine/grupe se trebaju prilagoditi i uklopiti u šire društvo.
- Ne mogu izabrati

**P30.** U kojoj mjeri se slažete ili ne slažete sa sljedećim tvrdnjama? (Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	<b>U potpunosti se slažem</b>	<b>Slažem se</b>	<b>Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem</b>	<b>Ne slažem se</b>	<b>Nikako se ne slažem</b>

(a) Druge etničke skupine/grupe trebale bi također imati pravo glasa u mojoj zemlji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Druge etničke skupine/grupe trebale bi također imati pravo zapošljavanja u mojoj zemlji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Druge etničke skupine/grupe trebale bi također imati pravo osnivanja političke stranke/partije u mojoj zemlji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Nastavnici druge etničke pripadnosti trebaju imati pravo podučavati u školi koju pohađaju moja djeca.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) ) Druge etničke skupine/grupe trebaju imati pravo slaviti svoju kulturu i tradiciju.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Osobe druge etničke pripadnosti trebaju imati pravo političke karijere u mojoj zemlji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g) Svaka etnička skupina/grupa treba imati svoju nacionalnu državu.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h) Etnički identitet će biti bolje zaštićen u nacionalnim/monoetničkim državama.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i) Moguće je uspostaviti suradnju između nacija, ali ne i potpuno povjerenje.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(j) Muškarci i žene se mogu osjećati potpuno sigurno samo onda kad je etnička skupina kojoj pripadaju u većini	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

	<b>U potpunosti se slažem</b>	<b>Slažem se</b>	<b>Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem</b>	<b>Ne slažem se</b>	<b>Nikako se ne slažem</b>
(k) Svaka nacionalna skupina/grupa bez vođe je kao čovjek bez glave.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(l) Etnički mješani brakovi su nestabilniji od drugih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(m1) Razljutilo bi me kad bih vidio/vidjela da se Bošnjak/Bošnjakinja loše tretira.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(m2) Razljutilo bi me kad bih vidio/vidjela da se Hrvat/Hrvatica loše tretira.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(m3) Razljutilo bi me kad bih vidio/vidjela da se Srbin/Srpkinja loše tretira.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n1) Smeta mi i uznemiruje me kad vidim da je bošnjački narod nemoćan i u nevolji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n2) Smeta mi i uznemiruje me kad vidim da je hrvatski narod nemoćan i u nevolji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n3) Smeta mi i uznemiruje me kad vidim da je srpski narod nemoćan i u nevolji.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P31.** Postoje različita mišljenja o etničkim skupinama/grupama koje žive u Bosni i Hercegovini. U kojoj mjeri se slažete ili ne slažete sa sljedećim tvrdnjama? (Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	<b>U potpunosti se slažem</b>	<b>Slažem se</b>	<b>Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem</b>	<b>Ne slažem se</b>	<b>Nikako se ne slažem</b>



(a1) Prisutnost Bošnjaka povećava stopu kriminala u BIH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(a2) Prisutnost Hrvata povećava stopu kriminala u BIH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(a3) Prisutnost Srba povećava stopu kriminala u BIH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b1) Bošnjaci su općenito dobri za ekonomiju moje zemlje.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b2) Hrvati su općenito dobri za ekonomiju moje zemlje.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b3) Srbi su općenito dobri za ekonomiju moje zemlje.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Vlada/Internacionalci troše suviše novca pomažući drugim etničkim skupinama/grupama.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Svaka etnička skupina/grupa pomaže u ojačavanju ove zemlje.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e1) Bošnjaci su najodgovorniji za rat i ratne zločine u BIH 90ih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e2) Hrvati su najodgovorniji za rat i ratne zločine u BIH 90ih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e3) Srbi su najodgovorniji za rat i ratne zločine u BIH 90ih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e4) Svaka skupina/grupa dijeli odgovornost za rat i ratne zločine u BIH 90 ih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e5) Nijedna skupina/grupa se ne treba okrivljavati za rat i ratne zločine u BIH 90ih.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

	U potpunosti se slažem	Slažem se	Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem	Ne slažem se	Nikako se ne slažem
(f1) Imam dobre prijatelje koji pripadaju bošnjačkoj zajednici.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f2) Imam dobre prijatelje koji pripadaju hrvatskoj zajednici.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f3) Imam dobre prijatelje koji pripadaju srpskoj zajednici.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g1) Kad bih ja ili moje dijete htijelo sklopiti brak sa Bošnjakom/Bošnjakinjom, moja familija/skupina/grupa bila bi vrlo sretna.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g2) Kad bih ja ili moje dijete htijelo sklopiti brak sa Hrvatom/Hrvaticom, moja familija/skupina/grupa bila bi vrlo sretna.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g3) Kad bih ja ili moje dijete htijelo sklopiti brak sa Srbinom/Srpkinjom, moja familija/skupina/grupa bila bi vrlo sretna.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h1) Bošnjaci su generalno nepouzdati jer su skloni prevarama.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h2) Hrvati su generalno nepouzdati jer su skloni prevarama.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h3) Srbi su generalno nepouzdati jer su skloni prevarama.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

	U potpunosti se slažem	Slažem se	Niti se slažem niti se ne slažem	Ne slažem se	Nikako se ne slažem
(i1) Bošnjaci su generalno neuljudni	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i2) Hrvati su generalno neuljudni	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i3) Srbi su generalno neuljudni	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(j1) BIH Bošnjaci misle da je zemlja njihova i ničija druga.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(j2) BIH Hrvati bi se željeli otcijepiti od BIH i biti neovisni ili se pridružiti svojoj pradžini.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(j3) BIH Srbi bi se željeli otcijepiti od BIH i biti neovisni ili se pridružiti svojoj pradžini.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P32.1.** Molimo navedite koliko često ste prema BIH Bošnjacima osjećali sljedeće.

	Nikad	Rijetko	Ponekad	Prilično često	Skoro uvijek
(a) Zahvalan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Ponosan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Uznemiren/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Zgađen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Ljut/ta	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Uplašen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P32.2.** Molimo navedite koliko često ste prema BIH Hrvatima osjećali sljedeće.

	<b>Nikad</b>	<b>Rijetko</b>	<b>Ponekad</b>	<b>Prilično često</b>	<b>Skoro uvijek</b>
(a) Zahvalan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Ponosan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c)Uznemiren/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Zgađen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Ljut/ta	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Uplašen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P32.3.** Molimo navedite koliko često ste prema BIH Srbima osjećali sljedeće.

	<b>Nikad</b>	<b>Rijetko</b>	<b>Ponekad</b>	<b>Prilično često</b>	<b>Skoro uvijek</b>
(a) Zahvalan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Ponosan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c)Uznemiren/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Zgađen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Ljut/ta	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Uplašen/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P33.1.** Naznačite koliko često ste komunicirali sa Bošnjacima u proteklih šest mjeseci.

- Nikako
- Rijetko
- Ponekad
- Prilično često
- Redovno/uvijek

**P34.1.** Koliko blisko bi ste ocijenili vašu vezu sa Bošnjacima?

- Nimalo bliska
- Slabo bliska
- Bliska

- d. Prilično bliska
- e. Vrlo bliska

**P33.2.** Naznačite koliko često se komunicirali sa Hrvatima u proteklih šest mjeseci.

- a. Nikako
- b. Rijetko
- c. Ponekad
- d. Prilično često
- e. Redovno/uvijek

**P34.2.** Koliko blisko bi ste ocijenili vašu vezu sa Hrvatima?

- a. Nimalo bliska
- b. Slabo bliska
- c. Bliska
- d. Prilično bliska
- e. Vrlo bliska

**P33.3.** Naznačite koliko često se komunicirali sa Srbima u proteklih šest mjeseci.

- a. Nikako
- b. Rijetko
- c. Ponekad
- d. Prilično često
- e. Redovno/uvijek

**P34.3.** Koliko blisko bi ste ocijenili vašu vezu sa Srbima?

- a. Nimalo bliska
- b. Slabo bliska
- c. Bliska
- d. Prilično bliska
- e. Vrlo bliska

**P.35.** Koliko često ste se susretali sa interetničkom suradnjom u određenom okviru ?  
(navesti)

- a. Nikad
- b. Nekoliko puta, prilikom.....
- c. Često, prilikom....
- d. Uvijek, zbog....

**P36.** Mislite li da vaše okruženje (obitelj/porodica, susjedi/komšije, političari):

- a. Spriječava interetničke veze i suradnju.
- b. Ne spriječava interetničke veze i suradnju, ali ih i ne promovira.
- c. Bojažljivo promovira interetničke veze i suradnju.
- d. Snažno potiče interetničke veze i suradnju.

**P37.** Za svaku od navedenih vrijednosti označite koliko su vam lično/osobno bitne.  
(Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	<b>Vrlo bitno</b>	<b>Bitno</b>	<b>Ni bitno ni nebitno</b>	<b>Nebitno</b>	<b>Potpuno nebitno</b>
(a) Neovisnost i individualni uspjeh	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Privrženost normama i poštovanje autoriteta.	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Moji osobni/lični ciljevi su mi važniji od grupnih ciljeva	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Grupni ciljevi su mi važniji od osobnih/ličnih ciljeva	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(o) Društvena prihvatljivost	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(p) Ugodan život	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P38.1.** Za svaki od ovih pridjeva naznačite koliko su bliski vašim osobnim/ličnim stavovima. (Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	<b>Vrlo blisko</b>	<b>Blisko</b>	<b>Niti je blisko niti nije blisko</b>	<b>Nije blisko</b>	<b>Nikako nije blisko</b>
(a) ambiciozan/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) hrabar/ra	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) milostiv/va	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) iskren/na	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P38.2.** Za svaki od ovih pridjeva naznačite koliko su bliski stavovima vaše skupine/grupe. (Molimo, odaberite samo jedan odgovor u svakom redu)

	<b>Vrlo blisko</b>	<b>Blisko</b>	<b>Niti je blisko niti nije blisko</b>	<b>Nije blisko</b>	<b>Nikako nije blisko</b>
(a) ambiciozni	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) hrabri	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) milostivi	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) iskreni	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

**P39.** Šta je, po Vašem mišljenju, „nacija“?

- (a). „Nacija“ je isto kao „etnička zajednica“
- (b). Nacija je multikulturalna zajednica, uključujući manjine
- (c). Nacija je Država

**P40.** Odaberite „Da“ ili „Ne“ odgovor na slijedeća pitanja:

- (a) Ako se osjećate dijelom određene etničke/jezične/religijske skupine/grupe, slijedite li tradiciju i običaje te skupine/grupe?  
(Da) (Ne)
- (b) Jeste li promišljali o podrijetlu kulturne tradicije Vaše skupine/grupe, njenim ciljevima i namjerama, te satusu i poziciji u društvu?  
(Da) (Ne)
- (c) Mislite li da su, u nedavnoj prošlosti, druge skupine/grupe ugrozile vašu skupinu/grupu i njenu povijest/istoriju, kulturu i tradiciju?  
(Da) (Ne)
- (d) Ako ste odgovorili potvrdno na prethodno pitanje (P40c), mislite li da je Vaša skupina/grupa zadržala taj svoj nezavidan položaj?  
(Da) (Ne)
- (e) Ako ste odgovorili potvrdno na prethodno pitanje (P40d), mislite li da se pripadnici Vaše skupine/grupe generalno slažu kako je potrebno promijeniti tu situaciju  
(Da) (Ne)

**Srdačno se zahvaljujemo na popunjavanju ovog upitnika!**

**U slučaju da Vas budemo trebali kontaktirati, možete li navesti svoj broj telefona ili  
Vaš e-mail?**

**Vaši podaci neće ni u kojem slučaju biti objelodanjeni.**

Email:

Tel.:



## Attachment 2. Questionnaires (English translation)

### *Questionnaire 1*

*Dear Participant,*

*Please fill in the following questions with absolute sincerity. There are not “correct” or “un-correct” questions, and your answers won’t be judged in any sense. Please answer according to your pure sincerity.*

*Your name is required only for administrative purposes, as well as your e-mail address. It will be removed from this questionnaire as soon as possible and will not appear in any data files generated from this study.*

*Thank you in advance for your help!*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Q1. What is your age (in years)?

.....

Q2. What is your sex?

.....

Q3. Which of the following categories best describes your identity?

- a. Bošnjak
- b. Croat
- c. Serb
- d. Bosnian
- e. Other (specify) .....

Q4. How would you define your group?

- a. The most important ethnic group of BiH
- b. An ethnic group of equal importance with other ethnic groups of BiH
- c. An ethnic group of little importance of BiH

Q5. How close do you feel to the group that you mentioned under question Q3?

- a. Very close
- b. Close
- c. Not very close
- d. Not close at all
- e. Cannot choose

Q6.1. How would you define the Bošnjak group of BiH?

- a. The most important ethnic group of BiH

- b. One among the ethnic groups of BiH
- c.. An ethnic minority of BiH
- d. Other (specify).....

Change Q6.2 and Q6.3 as done for Q5

Q6.2. How would you define the Croat group of BiH?

- a. The most important ethnic group of BiH
- b. One among the ethnic groups of BiH
- c.. An ethnic minority of BiH
- d. Other (specify).....

Q6.3. How would you define the Serb group of BiH?

- a. The most important ethnic group of BiH
- b. One among the ethnic groups of BiH
- c.. An ethnic minority of BiH
- d. Other (specify).....

Q7. Do you think religion is an important component of your life?

- a. not at all
- b. not so important
- c. yes, sometimes
- d. yes, very much

Q8. How many years of formal schooling have you completed? Pls indicate also the last class you attended.

.....

Q9. What is your profession?

.....

Q10. Where do you live in BiH (city, town)?

.....

Q11. How many inhabitants does your city/village have?

.....

Q12. Is your city/village...?

- a. Only one ethnic group
- b. One ethnic group quite dominant
- c. Quite multi-ethnic
- d. Definitely multi-ethnic

Q13. Is your neighborhood...?

- a. Only one ethnic group

- b. One ethnic group quite dominantc. Quite multi-ethnic
- d. Definitely multi-ethnic

Q14. How long have you been living there?

.....

Q15. If you moved there recently, where did you use to live before?

.....(specify place and region)

Q16. In your view, how much the political class governing your municipality does support inter-ethnic dialogue and cooperation?

- a. Not at all
- b. Very poorly
- c. Somewhat
- d. Quite strongly
- e. Definitely strongly

Q17. Do you regularly vote for elections in your town/Country?

- a. Never
- b. Sometimes
- c. Generally yes
- d. Always

Q18. Which party do you support?

.....

Q19. Have you ever participated in inter-ethnic cooperation projects?

- a. Never, and I'm not interested
- b. Never, but I would like to
- c. Yes, once (specify topic of cooperation)
- d. Sometimes, dealing with...(specify topic)
- e. Often, dealing with...(specify topic)

Q19bis.

If you answered c, d or e to the previous question: was a non governmental organization or association promoting the project?

- a) yes, its name was (specify)
- b) I cannot remember
- c) No

Q20. What languages do you speak most often at home?

.....

Q21. Which other languages of Bosnia-Herzegovina can you speak/write/understand?

.....

Q22. At what level (elementary, good, excellent)

.....  
 Q23. How do you learn them/it?  
 .....

Q24. Do you think you are good in speaking, in the sense that you might convince somebody about your arguments, for instance because your reasons may be shared?

- a. No, I am not good at speaking and convincing people
- b. It depends, but in average I'm not very good at speaking and convincing people
- c. Yes, sometimes I am quite good at speaking and convincing people
- d. Yes, I'm always good at speaking and convincing people about my arguments

Q25. To what group did/does your father belong?

- a. Bošnjak
- b. Croat
- c. Serb
- d. Bosnian
- e. Other (specify) .....

Q26. To what group did/does your mother belong?

- a. Bošnjak
- b. Croat
- c. Serb
- d. Bosnian
- e. Other (specify) .....

Q27.1. Let's talk about the past. Were you in BiH during the last war? Yes/No

Q27.2. Were you involved as a soldier or did you helped your soldiers? Yes/No

Q27.3. Did you lose close relatives during the war? Yes/No

Q27.4. Did you lose friends during the war? Yes/No

Q28. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Please tick only one box on each line)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
(a) I would rather be a member of my group than any other group	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) There are some things about my group that make me feel ashamed of it	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

(c) The world would be a better place if other groups were more like my own group	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) People should support their group even if they disagree with its actions	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) I often wish group identities would be less important in Bosnia and Herzegovina	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) I belong to my ethnic group since I was born and I will always be part of that	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g) I think that BiH is a united Country					

Q29. Some people say that it is better for a country if different ethnic groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions. Others say that it is better if these groups adapt and blend into the larger society. Which of these views comes closer to your own?

- a. Ethnic groups should maintain their distinct customs and traditions
- b. Ethnic groups should adapt and blend into the larger society
- c. Cannot choose

Q30. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please tick one box on each line.

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
(a) Other ethnic groups than mine should also have the right to vote in my country	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Other ethnic groups than mine should also have the right to seek employment in my country	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Other ethnic groups than mine should also have the right to form a political organization in my country	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

(d) Teachers from other ethnic groups than mine should also be allowed to teach in schools that my children attend	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Other ethnic groups than mine should also have the right to celebrate their own culture and traditions	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Persons from other ethnic groups than mine should also be able to run for political office in my country	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g) Each ethnic group should get its own national state	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h) Ethnic identities can be better protected by national/mono-ethnic States	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i) Among nations is possible to create cooperation but not fully trust	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(j) Men and women can feel completely safe only when the majority belong to their nationality	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(k) Without leaders every national group is like a man without a head	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(l) Ethnically mixed marriages are more unstable than others	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(m1) I would get very angry if I saw a Bošnjak	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

person being ill-treated					
(m2) I would get very angry if I saw a Croat person being ill-treated	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(m3) I would get very angry if I saw a Serbian person being ill-treated	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n1) It upsets and bothers me to see Bošnjak people who are helpless and in need	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n2) It upsets and bothers me to see Croat people who are helpless and in need	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(n3) It upsets and bothers me to see Serbian people who are helpless and in need					

Q31. There are different opinions about ethnic groups living in Bosnia and Herzegovina. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Please tick only one box on each line)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
(a1) The presence of Bošnjaks increases crime rates in BiH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(a2) The presence of Croats increases crime rates in BiH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(a3) The presence of Serbs increases crime rates in BiH	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b1) Bošnjaks are generally good for my country's economy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b2) Croats are generally good for my country's economy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

(b3) Serbs are generally good for my country's economy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Government/Internationals spend too much money assisting other ethnic groups than mine	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Each ethnic group helps to make this a stronger country	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e1) Bošnjaks are the most responsible for war and war crimes in BiH during the 90's	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e2) Croats are the most responsible for war and war crimes in BiH during the 90's	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e3) Serbs are the most responsible for war and war crimes in BiH during the 90's	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e4) Every group shares the responsibility for war and war crimes in BiH during the 90's	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e5) No group has to be blamed of being responsible for war and war crimes in BiH during the 90's	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f1) I have strong friends belonging to the Bošnjak community	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f2) I have strong friends belonging to the Croat community	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f3) I have strong friends belonging to the Serbian community	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g1) If I or my child wanted to marry a Bošnjak boy/girl my family/group would be very happy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g2) If I or my child wanted to marry	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)



a Croat boy/girl my family/group would be very happy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(g3) If I or my child wanted to marry a Serbian boy/girl my family/group would be very happy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h1) Bošnjak people are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h2) Croat people are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(h3) Serbian people are generally unreliable because they tend to cheat	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i1) Bošnjak people are generally rude	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(i2) Croat people are generally rude					
(i3) Serbian people are generally rude					
(j1) Bošnjak people of BiH think that the Country is theirs and nobody else's					
(j2) Croat people of BiH would like to leave BiH with their territories to build their own country or to join their motherland					
(j3) Serb people of BiH would like to leave BiH with their territories to build their own country or to join their motherland					

Q32.1. Please indicate how often you have ever felt the following about the Bošnjak Community of BiH.

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Almost always
(a) Grateful	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Proud	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Uneasy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

(d) Disgusted	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Angry	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Afraid	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

Q32.2. Please indicate how often you have ever felt the following about the Croat Community of BiH.

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Almost always
(a) Grateful	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Proud	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Uneasy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Disgusted	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Angry	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Afraid	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

Q32.3. Please indicate how often you have ever felt the following about the Serb Community of BiH.

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Quite often	Almost always
(a) Grateful	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) Proud	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) Uneasy	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Disgusted	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) Angry	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Afraid	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

Q33.1. Indicate how often did you have conversation with Bošnjak people within the last six months.

- a. never
- b. Seldom/rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. quite often
- e. Regularly/always

Q34.1. How close/friendly would you say your relationship is (or was) with these Bošnjaks, currently or at the time when you were the closest?

- a. Not close at all
- b. Poorly close
- c. close
- d. quite close
- e. very close

Q33.2. Indicate how often did you have conversation with Croat people within the last six months.

- a. never
- b. Seldom/rarely

- c. sometimes
- d. quite often
- e. Regularly/always

Q34.2. How close/friendly would you say your relationship is (or was) with these Croats currently or at the time when you were the closest?

- a. Not close at all
- b. Poorly close
- c. close
- d. quite close
- e. very close

Q33.3. Indicate how often did you have conversation with Serbian people within the last six months.

- a. never
- b. Seldom/rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. quite often
- e. Regularly/always

Q34.3. How close/friendly would you say your relationship is (or was) with these Serbs currently or at the time when you were the closest?

- a. Not close at all
- b. Poorly close
- c. close
- d. quite close
- e. very close

Q.35. How often have you experienced inter-ethnic cooperation for a given scope (specify)?

- a. Never
- b. In few occasions, for...
- c. Often, for...
- d. Always, for...

Q36. Do you feel that social environment, around you (family, neighbors, politicians):

- a. Hampers inter-ethnic close relations and cooperation
- b. Does not hamper inter-ethnic close relations and cooperation, but neither promotes them
- c. Timidly promotes inter-ethnic close relations and cooperation
- d. Strongly fosters inter-ethnic close relations and cooperation

Q37. Indicate for each set of values how much do you feel close to in your personal attitude to life (Thick only one per line).

	Very		Neither close		Very
--	------	--	------------------	--	------

	close	Close	Nor far	Far	far
(a) Independence and individual success	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) Adherence to norms, respect for authority	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(e) My personal goals are more important than group goals	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(f) Group goals are more important than my personal goals	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(o) Social Recognition	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(p) Comfortable life					

Q38.1. Indicate for each adjective how much does it reflect your **personal** attitudes (Thick only one per line).

	Very close	Close	Neither close Nor far	Far	Very far
(a) ambitious	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) courageous	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) forgiving	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) honest	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

Q38.2. Indicate for each adjective how much does it reflect, in your opinion, the attitudes **of your group** (Thick only one per line).

	Very close	Close	Neither close Nor far	Far	Very far
(a) ambitious	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(b) courageous	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(c) forgiving	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)
(d) honest	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)	(...)

Q39. What is a “nation” in your view?.

(a). Saying “nation” is the same that saying “ethnic community”

- (b). The nation is a multi-cultural community, including minorities
- (c). The nation is the State

Q40. Thick either Yes or No in answering to the following questions:

- (a). If you feel to be part of a specific ethnic/linguistic/religious group, do you follow its traditions and habits?  
(Yes)    (No)
- (b). Have you ever questioned yourself about the roots of your group cultural traditions, its goals and intentions and its status and position within society?  
(Yes)    (No)
- (c). When you think about your group, do you think that other groups have threatened its survival as a specific group with its history, culture and traditions in the recent past?  
(Yes)    (No)
- (d). If you answered Yes to the previous question (Q40c), do you think your group is maintained in a position of disadvantage by the threatening group you have in mind?  
(Yes)    (No)
- (e). If you answered Yes to the previous question (Q40d), do you think members of your group generally agree on the need of changing this situation?  
(Yes)    (No)

Thank you very much for filling in the questionnaire!

Just in case we might need to contact you back, could you please indicate a phone number or an e-mail?

Your data won't be divulged to third persons in anycase.

Email:

Phone N.:

---