

Educational Materials Reflecting Heteroglossia: Disinventing Ethnolinguistic Differences in Bosnia-Herzegovina

BRIGITTA BUSCH and JÜRGEN SCHICK

Introduction

Heteroglossic situations in classrooms are rather the rule than the exception, not only in urban spaces where the issue of the multilingual school is debated widely in academics and in politics, but also in situations that might correspond at first sight to what for a long time has been considered the norm, the monolingual classroom. This then becomes especially visible when, in the context of wider political changes, sudden shifts in language policy orientations also occur. Although processes of globalization and regionalization as well as the formation of larger political units beyond the level of nation state have de-centred the role of the nation state in many domains, language policies and education policies are still firmly rooted within the nation state paradigm. As educational materials for school usage are usually centrally produced and commissioned by national authorities, they not only reflect and shape national identities on the discursive level, but are also considered as a means of promoting a single unified standard as the national language or one of the national languages. In their strictly normative orientation, they not only often fail to build on the learners' own language resources, but can also accentuate processes of exclusion as they do not allow for deviation and variation, and emphasise the symbolic bond between national/ethnic identity and language.

In this chapter we focus on the development of the school manual *Pogledi* ('Views') (2000) designed for primary schools throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH) where in the present post-conflict situation language policies tend to emphasise national/ethnic differences by promoting the use of distinct 'pure' standard forms. The manual is based on a radically new

approach, consisting mainly of authentic texts, i.e. texts with no didactic or linguistic intervention. Literary texts, newspaper articles, advertisements and so on used in the book were left in their original form. The texts in the book thus represent a wide range of language in use: they mirror the heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981) of the Bosnian society. The manual allows pupils and teachers to recognize themselves and their linguistic practices in at least some of the texts, and relieves them from the pressure of a single prescribed standard. In the first section we will focus on recent language developments in the space¹ of former Yugoslavia. In the second² we will give an overview of recent political developments in Bosnia-Herzegovina and particularly the ethnic divisions that still characterize the school system. The final section reflects our experiences during the development of the manual *Pogledi*.

Unification vs. Division: Language Policies in the Space of former Yugoslavia

The history of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ) can be characterized as a sensitive, sometimes fragile equilibrium between centralistic and federalistic forces. Centrifugal and centripetal tendencies expressed themselves also in the debates around language and language policies. The South Slav space is usually described as a language continuum beginning at the Alpine mountain range in the north and stretching right to the shores of the Black Sea. Segmentation into different languages was determined by extralinguistic factors and depended on the respective political centres (Neweklowsky 2000). The number of officially recognized languages in the area varied. Until World War II there were three: Slovenian, Serbocroatian and Bulgarian. In 1944, when the Federal Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was founded, the number rose to four. To regroup the varieties spoken in the area of the member republic into an official standard language and to name it Macedonian was a compromise between the Serbian side, which claimed the Macedonian dialects as Serbian, and the Bulgarian side, which insisted on them being Bulgarian (Bugarski 2004).

In 1954 an agreement was signed concerning language use in the Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegronean and Serbian member republics. It confirmed that Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian was the official language in all four member republics, and allowed variation at the levels of lexikon, syntax and phonetics as, for example, the parallel and equal use of the ekavian and jekavian³ variant. Within the logic of imagining the South Slavic space as a language continuum, ekavian is usually attributed to the

eastern parts (mainly Serbia) and jekavian to the western areas (Croatia, Bosnia, Montenegro). That the notion of the language continuum was an idealized construct to promote the idea of unity in diversity became clear in the course of the more recent Yugoslav history when the 'Croatian spring' movement in the 1970s stipulated the recognition of a separate Croat language and based this claim on emphasizing a centuries-long tradition of a distinct Croat literary language. Škiljan (2001: 96) in his historic account of the linguistic situation in the South Slavic space draws attention to the fact that the notion of a dialect continuum is only a partial representation because historically there were also simultaneously different idioms present: the languages of changing state administrations (e.g. the Ottoman Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), different liturgical languages (e.g. Latin, Old Church Slavonic), idioms used in literary production with supra-dialectal or supra-vernacular systemic features, each with its own linguistic community (and with individuals participating in more than one community), with its own communicative efficiency and with its own symbolic power. Škiljan's examples mainly refer to pre-nation state periods when the use of a particular idiom had a social rather than a territorial connotation.

In the middle of the 1980s the first indications of the disintegration of the Yugoslav state became apparent, as, on the political level, the centres in the member republics gained in importance over the central state authorities. The Communist party split into six ethnonational parties that were eager to control the public sphere in their relative territories (Puhovski, 2000: 42). Borders became a central topic in political and media discourses, and Dragičević-Šešić (2001: 72) speaks of an 'obsession with maps' which 'flooded the cultural space'. There were different kinds of maps, 'ethnic' maps, 'historical' maps – showing the picture of the inner borders as quite different to what then were the actual borders between the Yugoslav member republics. Later these 'simple lines on maps became true borders, obstacles to human communication' (Dragičević-Šešić, 2001: 75), 'people have gone, been killed, expelled or forcibly settled on all sides, and mostly out of zones the maps prescribed' (Dragičević-Šešić, 2001: 84). Borders were reified and constructed as 'natural' dividing lines and had an external dimension – as a separation line between the successor states, and as an internal dimension excluding 'others' from the national consensus (Hodžić, 2000: 24).

Referring to ethnic conflicts, Bourdieu makes the point (1982: 138) that borders are not to be considered as a 'natural' category, but as social and political constructs. He emphasizes that the drawing of borders is linked to constructing, deconstructing and re-constructing social groups. This is

linked, as he states, with a particular vision of the world affirmed by demarcation from other world visions, and there is a dialectic relationship between these world visions and social practices. Pushing Bourdieu's argument a little further, the drawing of borders encompasses also a dimension of discursive constructedness, since discursive acts are one form of social practice through which social actors constitute objects of knowledge, situations and social roles as well as identities. Discursive acts are socially constitutive in a variety of ways being largely responsible for the production, the maintenance as well as the transformation of social conditions. Or as Wodak *et al.* (1999: 8) put it '... through linguistic representation in various dialogic contexts, discursive practices may influence the formation of groups.' Similarly it can be argued that language boundaries are social, political and discursive constructs. In this context metalinguistic discourses need particular attention (Busch, Kelly-Holmes, 2004).

In the process of the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, language played a crucial role in political and media discourses that aimed at affirming state boundaries between the newly-founded nation states. Whereas Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian had been the official state language in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the newly founded nation states declared Croatian (1990) and Serbian (1992) as the official languages in the respective states and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (1993) in Bosnia-Herzegovina. With these steps, the Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian language ceased to exist on the political and on the legal level. Or as the well known writer Rada Iveković puts it:

In the name of the (national) ideal – defined as an aim to achieve – language was seen as a means to materialize what had not actually come into being. ... Linguistic reform promoted by the state aimed at transforming society ... These transformations should extinguish the preceding system and wipe out memories linked to this time as well as denominate the new concept and the social and political context. (Rada Iveković, 2001, translation by B. Busch)

Constructing and Affirming Language Boundaries

Linguistic activities in the different states tended to emphasize differences, and a range of standard language reference works – dictionaries, grammars, orthographies – appeared. In Serbia 'difference' was mainly labelled through promoting the Cyrillic script as the Serbian national script. In public the idea of the Cyrillic script being imperilled by the current practice of the equal use of both Cyrillic and Latin scripts was launched and the defence of the Cyrillic seen as national duty. The constitu-

tional amendments adopted in 1989 still allowed the Latin script for ethnically mixed regions, but prescribed that the official script in Serbia is Cyrillic. Consequently Latin inscriptions disappeared from public spaces, state-controlled media and school manuals. Latin script was pushed into the background and reduced more or less to the private domain. The defence of the Cyrillic was a topic not only in the media but also in intellectual circles. For example, at the university of Belgrade a society for the protection of the Cyrillic was founded with the aim to 'prevent the annihilation of the Cyrillic script as the first step in the annihilation of the Serbian national identity' (cf. Jakšić, 2001: 14).

In 1993, when the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina was raging, the potentates in Republika Srpska, the Serbian part of Bosnia-Herzegovina, aligned their efforts of 'language cleansing' to the 'motherland' by adopting not only the Cyrillic script but also by prescribing in 1993 the ekavian variant for public use. In fact the authorities were well aware that the ekavian variant which is widely spread in Serbia was not used in the Serbian part of Bosnia in daily practice. The idea was that the 'ekavica should be given back to the people to which it belongs ... in order to liberate it from foreign influences.'⁴ All media were compelled by law to the exclusive employment of the ekavica and the Cyrillic script. In schools the manuals produced in Belgrade (in the Cyrillic script and in ekavian) were in use. The forced ekavization ended in a fiasco, and in 1998 the Republika Srpska authorities had to revise their decision and to re-allow the use of the jekavian variant in the public domain.

In Croatia a number of linguistic advice handbooks for a large general public appeared and were circulated among journalists and school teachers. Differential dictionaries that listed words labelled as Serbian and gave their Croatian equivalents were published in cheap pocket editions. It is interesting to note that there are considerable differences between these dictionaries, not only in the number of lexical items they list, but also in general orientation. Some represent an extreme attempt at purism, drawing on lexical items which stem from the language reform introduced by the totalitarian NDH⁵ state during World War II, others are more 'moderate' (Okuka, 1998: 88; Langston, 1999: 186f). The aim of such dictionaries and handbooks was, as formulated by certain authors, 'to bear witness to the existence of a separate Croat language' (Brodnjak, 1991; cf. Langston, 1999: 187) and to assist people who are 'striving to speak good Croatian in daily life to demonstrate their national consciousness also by means of language' (Pavuna, 1993; cf. Langston, 1999: 180). The authorities in the Croatian part of Bosnia aligned their language policy with the Croatian 'motherland'. Official documents and media appearing in the Croatian part of Bosnia followed the linguistic guidelines produced in Zagreb.

While in the Serbian part of Bosnia-Herzegovina language policies endeavoured to fortify the links with the respective 'motherlands', in the Bosnian/Bosniak part, authorities were eager to affirm their independence by promoting another standard which emphasized turcisms⁶ as inherently Bosnian and stressed differences in orthography. In the Bosnian language handbook, which also lists 'correct' and 'incorrect' words, language is coupled with national duty and loyalty as expressed in the foreword: 'we expect from you that you know your language and care for it' (Halilović, 1996: 7). In the state of Bosnia-Herzegovina there are now three emotionally loaded standards in use in the public domain. Although differences are being accentuated – especially on the level of lexicon and script – these differences do not exclude mutual comprehension.

State-controlled media and the school system were seen in the newly-founded states as a means of implementing the national languages, not only by using the new emerging standards but even more by transporting and amplifying metalinguistic discourses that linked 'correct' language use to national loyalty, and stigmatized 'wrong' language use as 'yugonostalgic'. Metalinguistic discourses that amalgamated political statements, philological positions and folk beliefs about language were also spread through advice columns which flourished in the media and created a policing environment. School authorities immediately started to implement new curricula and to publish new school manuals. In Bosnia-Herzegovina Serbian and Croatian authorities mainly drew on material published in the 'motherlands' and only partly developed their own materials. Bosnian authorities produced manuals for their sphere of influence.

In the national euphoria language boundaries had to be drawn, the unitary languages had to be brought into existence and needed to be policed. The unitary language, as Bakhtin (1934/1981: 270) formulates it, 'is not something given (*dan*) but is always in essence posited (*zadan*) – and at every moment of its life it is opposed to the realities of heteroglossia' and 'gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the process of sociopolitical and cultural centralization.' Despite the considerable pressure and the centralizing efforts even in public language use, the 'reality of heteroglossia' could not be wiped out. Even during the war, oppositional and independent media like Feral Tribune in Croatia or Oslobodjenje in Bosnia-Herzegovina allowed a plurality of voices and styles and took part in metalinguistic discourses with a critical and often sarcastic tone (Busch, 2004). Still, within the institutional context of the school environment a monolingual habitus is prevailing and 'wrong' language use can be sanctioned by social exclusion and school failure. In an

expert discussion, we organized during the development of the school manual *Pogledi* the linguist Milan Šipka summarized: 'The problem is not that there are differences, but how these differences are experienced and how people identify with respect to these differences. The problem is not communication, but the symbolization of language.'

There are very few empirical studies on the change of language use in the space of former Yugoslavia and it is difficult to say how much the efforts to promote unitary languages have actually resulted in changes in daily language practices in the public sphere. Langston (1999) presents a study based on a corpus he obtained from text samples taken in 1996/97 from different Croatian media, which he compares to samples taken in 1985. He concludes: 'Noticeable changes in lexical usage in the Croatian media have indeed taken place since the break-up of the Yugoslav state, but on the whole they are relatively minor' (Langston, 1999: 188 f). It seems that even the state media that had been principal actors in spreading metalinguistic discourses in their daily practice differ from the proclaimed principles. As far as school manuals are concerned, there are analyses available that focus on discriminatory discursive practices and on stereotypes present in texts but they do not systematically draw attention to exclusive practices in language use which are equally discriminatory.⁷ As school manuals have to pass revision and approbation procedures by school authorities it can be expected that often they not only comply with dominant and unitary discourses but also represent the unitary language proclaimed as the standard. In the manual *Pogledi*, designed for the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina, we attempted to avoid this less visible form of exclusion by drawing as much as possible on original texts that represent the multi-voicedness of society.

Separatist Educational Policies in Post-war Bosnia-Herzegovina

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) has yet to come to terms with its recent armed conflict. The effects of the conflict – which, at the time of writing, ended nine years ago – were devastating for the people of BiH. It is estimated that up to 250,000 were killed or were reported missing. Approximately half of the population were forced to leave their homes, either seeking refuge in another country or being displaced internally. Today's political situation in BiH is the result of the system upon which nationalist politicians agreed in the Dayton peace negotiations. Dayton was a means to end the war and one of the incentives to sign the agreement was to at least partly reward nationalist politicians and politics. Not surprisingly, nationalist politicians are still in control at several levels of government today. The

Dayton Peace Accords of 1995 left BiH with a rather complex structure. The agreement divides the state into two areas known as 'Entities' – the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and the Serb Republic (Republika Srpska, RS). The BiH Constitution assigns to the central state legislative power over only a few areas, leaving all areas not expressly granted to the state level, including education, within the responsibilities of the two Entities. The result of this framework is a division of public authority on occasionally more than three levels (the central state, the Entities and several local levels) and makes BiH both an over- and under-governed state where 'too many layers of government accomplish too little' (Democratization Policy Institute, 2002: 2).

The structure of authority in FBiH is organized quite differently from that in RS. In FBiH, power is widely decentralized and devolved to 10 Cantons and the municipalities within these federal units. The situation in RS could not be more different. With the municipality and Entity levels, the RS constitution knows only two functional levels of authority. De facto, power is concentrated at the Entity level. This complex power structure in BiH is augmented even more by the too-many international actors, who often lack coordination and joint planning. Furthermore, the international community (IC) lacks its own policing mechanism, and seems to have insufficient oversight over local policing structures (see Democratization Policy Institute, 2002: 3). Domination of nationalist rhetoric in BiH politics has made the IC believe that inter-ethnic conflicts are the main obstacle in the peace process. However, inter-ethnic reconciliation is but one axis of the peace-building process. The other one concerns the transition from a one-party system to a multi-party system, from a socialist to a market economy (European Stability Initiative, 1999). The main nationalist parties, the Bosnian Croat HDZ, the Bosnian Serb SDS and the Bosniak SDA are struggling to keep their authoritarian powers, wealth and influence they had acquired during the war. As a result, eight years of international efforts of pushing the peace process forward have so far been only partly successful.

Within the existing political and social context, it is not surprising that BiH youth seek to leave the country, if given the opportunity to do so (United Nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2003: 25). The enormous brain drain brought by the armed conflict between 1992 and 1995 could easily continue until prospects for a more prosperous future appear. School children and teachers, having been severely affected by the conflict, are still facing a variety of post-war problems today. These relate to poverty and a high unemployment rate (of parents or other care givers) amongst those returning after having been refugees, internal displacement, a weak infrastructure and a state of political and economic transition in general and

within the education system more specifically. The state of the education system reflects the overall situation of fragmentation and uncertainty. The constitutional framework of BiH does not install any coordinating body or institution for education issues at state level. While a Ministry of Education and Science continues to exist at the level of the Federation, education policy and related legislative powers are primarily vested with the cantons. By contrast, education in RS is solely on the Entity level under the responsibility of a central Ministry of Education. Apart from the meetings of Education Ministers hosted by the Office of the High Representative (OHR) and recently by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), there is very limited coordination between the Entities or among the cantons in the Federation.

Since Dayton did not set out any clearer or harmonizing regulations, education remained in the hands of nationalist politicians, who see education as a means of establishing three separate languages, cultures and histories (OECD, 2001: 7). Within these structures, three different curricula and sets of textbooks are in use in the territory of BiH. In particular, the so-called 'national subjects' like language and literature, history, arts, and even geography continue to be a matter of political debate. Despite several attempts of the international community to revise textbooks in terms of intolerance and offensive passages (partly by blacking-out words and sentences), textbooks still contain problematic passages and texts. The fact that the constitution recognises three official languages – Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian – has become a vehicle for a nationalistic agenda of separation of the education system. In practice, the language issue is often used as an argument that joint teaching of children with different national backgrounds is not viable (Council of Europe, 1999: 3f).

In RS, Serbian is prescribed as the medium of instruction. In the Federation, either Bosnian or Croatian is the official language of instruction, depending on the majority population in the respective area. While 'minority'⁸ children may generally attend classes in the curriculum and language of the local majority with all its nationalistic elements (OECD, 2001: 16), in practice the politics of separation have led to two wide-spread phenomena in BiH education: the bussing of children to 'mono-ethnic' schools outside of their area of residence and the 'two-schools-under-one-roof' system. According to a working paper distributed by the OSCE entitled 'Education reform agenda: An update,' by June 2003 there were still 26 school buildings housing 52 schools. In these schools, separate Bosniak and Croat curricula were in use and separate administrative structures existed. Children (as well as teachers) had no mutual contact, used separate school

entrances and had separate breaks and teachers did not share the same teacher's room.

The increasing numbers of returnees over the years raises further the issue of adequate education for minority children, including related questions of curriculum, textbooks and language of instruction. In March 2002, the international community urged the Entity education ministers to sign an 'Interim Agreement on Accommodation of Specific Needs and Rights of Returnee Children in Education'. The agreement stipulates that all children in both Entities shall be instructed in subjects of general education on the basis of the curriculum where they are presently living or in areas to which where they and their families return. Despite positive developments in certain areas, political obstruction has hampered wider-scale education reform in BiH over recent years. Since summer 2002, education reform in BiH has been coordinated by the OSCE. Under the authority of the Education Issue Set Steering Group (EISSG), made up of the heads of the major international organizations involved in education, working groups comprising local and international education experts are developing strategy papers, implementation plans or simply sharing information on ongoing reform projects.

As a first result of these coordinated activities, the BiH education authorities presented an Education Reform Agenda in November 2002, listing various goals for reform of the education system and proposed actions for the realization of these goals. Shortly before the end of the 2002/03 school year, the state parliament adopted a state-level framework Law on Primary and General Secondary Education. The law stipulates general education principles, which for the first time are to be applied in both Entities. In particular, the law contains provisions concerning human rights standards, horizontal and vertical mobility of students, country-wide recognition of diplomas, autonomy of schools and rights of parents and students within the school community. Since, as mentioned above, no specific education institution exists at the level of the state, the Ministry of Civic Affairs is in charge of the implementation of the framework law. In the future, Entity and canton education laws shall be harmonised with the framework law. In August 2003, the IC urged the twelve Entity and Canton Ministers of Education to sign an Agreement on a Common Core Curriculum for primary and general secondary education. According to the agreement, all students in BiH shall be taught in accordance with the Common Core Curriculum in the future.

Whether the new framework law, the common core curriculum and all related activities can bring about the hoped positive results still remains to be seen. Given the record so far, a certain skepticism prevails. Nevertheless,

education reform in BiH seems to be slowly moving ahead. However, in its above-mentioned working paper the OSCE also recognizes a legitimate doubt that any positive momentum of change would not stagnate, if the international community does not push and significantly finance the reform agenda. Reform initiatives are hardly forthcoming from local authorities, which leaves the international community still as the main driving force behind the process.

Pogledi: A School Manual Based on Multi-Perspectivity and Multi-Voicedness

Within the described framework of three parallel education systems, and textbooks often providing biased information on the other nationalities, the NGO KulturKontakt Austria started in 1998/99 with a project aiming at the 'Development of Supplementary Teaching Material for Civic Education in BiH'. The project had the objective of counteracting the existing situation by making available integrative and multi-perspective teaching materials based on innovative didactics and methodology as well as contributing to inter-ethnic cooperation and tolerance. The result and final product of the project was a manual entitled *Pogledi: Open Teaching and Intercultural Learning*, which can be used in interdisciplinary lessons of language and literature, geography, history, arts, music and other subjects. Topics, methodological and didactic approaches of the book were defined and elaborated by a project team consisting of some 25 teachers, teacher trainers, principals, members of the pedagogic institute and NGO representatives in a series of workshops between 1998 and 2000. The development work of the local team was coordinated, advised and moderated by three Austrian experts⁹ in the field of teacher training, intercultural and civic education and project work. Draft versions of the teaching units were tested in eight primary schools in Sarajevo and other towns, both in RS and the Federation. Consultations between the editorial team and the teachers involved in implementing the draft units ensured that valuable feedback from practice could still be considered for the final version of the book. Choosing the time consuming and intensive bottom-up approach offered the possibility of finding a viable compromise between what is desirable in terms of school-book development in a polarised post-conflict situation and what is feasible in terms of day-to-day practice.

The manual *Pogledi* consists of six teaching units dealing with the life of students between 13 and 15 years. Although each teaching unit is separate, there are some didactic and structural principles common to all six. The role of the student is conceived as active and creative, the teacher in this process

is not only a mediator, but also an advisor and guide to the student on his or her way to greater independence. Consequently dialogic forms such as open learning or project-oriented learning dominate. Topics focus on supplementary information and skills development not contained in the existing textbooks, especially with regards to the facilitation of inter-ethnic understanding and cooperation. What makes *Pogledi* unique even in today's context, and different from other teaching material developed by or with the support of international organizations, is that the book exists in only one single form. Whereas other materials are/were printed in three different versions, namely in Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian, there is only a single *Pogledi* version for upper primary and secondary schools throughout the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Federation as well as the Republika Srpska. This was not achieved by inventing an 'interlanguage' or by reverting to the language in use in textbooks in the region before the outbreak of the war, but by representing a wide range of language actually in use in BiH today.

Following the principle of an open-learning curriculum, each of the six units contains a collection of material offered to the learners as a resource. The texts and other materials are reproduced in their original form; that is to say, no didactic or linguistic interventions were made. Literary texts form different periods of time are present as well as contemporary texts stemming from diverse sources such as the media, advertisements, leaflets and official publications. Generational differences in language use are as much apparent as differences in language use due to the rural-urban divide, to political orientation or to geographic location. Some texts, like the one taken from the *Official Bulletin of the Federation of BiH* or texts announcing jobs in more official settings, conform to the new standard. Media texts show considerable variation, and this is even the case for articles reprinted from papers that have appeared over the past few years. Whereas media close to the ruling party strive to employ a 'correct' and uniform standard, others (like the Sarajevo-based daily *Oslobođenje*) have a quite different editorial policy and leave it up to the authors to choose their own style (Busch, 2004). Texts written for commercial purposes frequently draw on elements from youth codes or on borrowings from other linguistic environments.

Although differences are visible, it becomes obvious that they are not a major obstacle to communication. Care was taken that every single unit itself comprises a very wide range of texts. Texts in German and English were also included in the *Pogledi* text collection, as many of the learners have connections with these languages, not only through school and the media, but also through their personal biography. Some have themselves

spent some time in exile during the war years; most have family members living and working abroad. As far as the introductory essays are concerned and the description of goals and the didactic guidelines of the six teaching units, two of these were written in the Bosnian standard, two in the Croatian and two in the Serbian (one of which is written in Cyrillic). The *Pogledi* manual was officially presented in February 2001, was very well received throughout almost the whole BiH and was granted the status of approved teaching material. Between April and June 2001, more than 4500 copies of *Pogledi* were distributed to primary and secondary schools throughout BiH via the 12 Ministries of Education. Up to the end of 2002, 25 introductory workshops on how to use *Pogledi* had been held by members of the local project team in 20 towns in BiH, reaching approximately 600 teachers. Between May and September 2002, experiences with *Pogledi* and its achieved impact were evaluated among the participants of the introductory workshops.

Although the evaluation confirmed fears that the local authorities did not distribute the books to all schools in BiH, 86% of the teachers seem to have had access to *Pogledi*. In bigger towns the distribution density is somewhat higher than in rural areas. Teachers, students and parents widely welcomed the new teaching material and its innovative approaches. Practice has shown that interdisciplinary teaching is possible in accordance with the existing curricula, despite certain difficulties. In the classrooms, the main focus was on small learning projects, and the various teaching methods proposed in the book. Especially when implementing these 'active learning' projects, teachers reported highly positive experiences with the students. In cases where teachers faced obstacles to using *Pogledi* in the teaching process, the problems mostly related to reluctant principals and school inspectors, poor cooperation of teacher colleagues, necessary adjustments of timetables and – despite their low-budget concept – to financing of the learning projects. Given the relatively short time between the circulation of the book and the evaluation, these figures are quite impressive.

Conclusions

Whether *Pogledi* has been successful in initiating a 'new learning culture' in BiH schools cannot be answered yet, and definitely varies from school to school. Overall, it can be argued that *Pogledi* has stood the test of practice. The teaching material developed and produced locally facilitates not only the introduction of new methods and didactics, but also the development of a new learning culture in those schools where it is used. Probably its biggest

achievement lies in its contribution to fostering understanding in classrooms that have been under the influence of separatist politics for too long.

The basic principle that guided the development of *Pogledi* is that of a learner-centred approach. It aims at developing the ability to compare, evaluate, criticise and formulate one's own position. Neither as far as content is concerned nor on the level of language use was a normative approach taken. The idea was to make the multi-voicedness of society visible in all three dimensions which Bakhtin (Todorov, 1984: 56) described: heterology (*raznorečie*), i.e. the diversity of discourses, heteroglossia (*raznojazyčnie*), i.e. the diversity of language(s) and heterophony (*raznoglossie*), i.e. the diversity of individual voices. The idea is linked to the aspiration of counterbalancing mechanisms of exclusion and division. On the one hand, the individual learner will find him- or herself and their linguistic practices represented in at least some of the texts. On the other hand, they can find out for themselves that variation and difference is not necessarily a question of ethnicity or nationality, but depends on a range of other factors and does not necessarily hinder communication and understanding. Therefore *Pogledi* should be understood not as a manual that simply celebrates the colourful brightness of difference, but as a manual that has an emancipatory approach.

The manual *Pogledi* was designed for the specific post-conflict situation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, for a situation in which (national) language policies became a means of affirming national identities and of accentuating differences. In this process of disinventing and reconstructing standard languages according to new power aspirations and geometries, the intimate link between standard language and the nation state paradigm becomes evident. Reconfiguring borders and boundaries on a territorial and on a symbolic level also creates new minority-majority relations. In spite of the efforts of implementing a language policy that fosters a unitary national language via the education system and via the media, working with contemporary texts produced and used in everyday contexts shows that the *Lebenswelten* (life worlds) are heteroglossic. This is not only due to the processes of migration but also because information and communication flows have become more multi-directional.

The higher visibility of heteroglossia in some parts of the public domain is a phenomenon that can be observed in many countries. It coincides with a widely observed de-centring of the nation-state paradigm as the organizing principle in society. Some of the core functions that the nation state fulfilled in the past are now being delegated to other bodies on a supra-national or a sub-national level or to the private sector. This can be observed especially in the field of media. Whereas in the past in Europe the idea of a

national public sphere dominated, and media decisively contributed to the implementation and spread of national languages, in transnational, regional and private media increasingly 'impure' linguistic practices can be seen (Busch, 2004). Within the education system a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994) still prevails, although teachers are confronted with classes in which children from heterogeneous language backgrounds learn together. This is not only the case in urban centres with their specific histories of migration, but also in areas such as border regions.

Concepts of language awareness, of the development of meta-linguistic skills – such as translation, transfer and the development of strategies of comprehension – are increasingly being recognised as interesting learning strategies. The development of learning materials which allow for difference and variation in an emancipatory sense could be especially fruitful in situations with a complex linguistic setting:

- for situations where language use (in spoken and/or written form) differs significantly from codified standard languages (as for example with Romany or the Nguni languages in South Africa);
- for so-called mother-tongue teaching in urban centres where children from larger language spaces than the national are taught in a common course (as in the case of Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia, or from the Maghreb and the Middle East);
- for border regions (such as Alsace) where the regional dialect is spread in a cross-border dimension, whereas the two standard languages when taught as isolated subjects do not seem to have much in common.

Overcoming the monolingual habitus in education is decisive when it comes to questions of school success or failure, of social inclusion or exclusion.

Notes

1. In the context of language, it is more appropriate to use the term 'space' than 'territory' of former Yugoslavia.
2. The second section was written by J. Schick in 2003, and refers to the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina at that time.
3. Ekavian and jekavian relates to the reproduction of the old Slavonic sound 'Jat', which can be reproduced as 'e' or 'je' – as in the word for river 'rijeka' (jekavian) or 'reka' (ekavian).
4. *Alternativna informativna mreža* (AIM), 13 Sept 1993. This example is also discussed in Bugarski (1995).
5. The fascist NDH state (Nezavisna Država Hrvatska/Independent Croatian State) introduced a language reform that aimed at marking the difference between a Serbian and a Croatian language. In the course of this reform, an

etymological orthography was propagated and internationalisms were labelled as serbisms.

6. Turcisms are terms from Turkish that have been incorporated into the language
7. R. Rosandić and V. Pesić (1994). A dossier on school books and stereotyping was compiled by the AIM network in July 1995 under the title 'rat knjigama' (see: <http://www.aimpress.org>).
8. Where the term 'minority' is used in the rest of this chapter, it does not refer to the concept of national minorities, but only to illustrate the relation in numerical terms of two (or more) national groups within a certain area. Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs are all constituent peoples of BiH and cannot be considered as national minorities in any part of BiH.
9. The following long-standing experts were involved in the project: Margarethe Anzengruber, teacher for history and German in Vienna; Brigitta Busch, then director of the Arbeitsstelle für Interkulturelle Studien of the Council of Europe in Klagenfurt; Dietmar Larcher, then Professor for Intercultural Studies at the University of Klagenfurt and head of the Boltzmann-Institute for Intercultural Education Research in Klagenfurt.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1934/1981) *The Dialogic Imagination* (M. Holquist, ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982) *Ce que parler veut dire: L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris: Fayard.
- Brodnjak, V. (1993) *Razlikovni rječnik srpskog i hrvatskog jezika*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Bugarski, R. (1995) *Jezik od mira do rata*. Beograd: SlovoGraph.
- Bugarski, R. (2004) Language and boundaries in the Yugoslav context. In B. Busch and H. Kelly-Holmes (eds) *Language Discourse and Borders in the Yugoslav Successor States* (pp. 21–38). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Busch, B. (2004) *Sprachen im Disput: Medien und Öffentlichkeit in multilingualen Gesellschaften*. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Busch, B. and Kelly-Holmes, H. (2004) Language boundaries as social, political and discursive constructs. In B. Busch and H. Kelly-Holmes (eds) *Language Discourse and Borders in the Yugoslav Successor States* (pp. 1–13). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Council of Europe (1999) *Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Governance, Finance and Administration*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Democratization Policy Institute (2002) *An Agenda for Bosnia's Next High Representative*. On WWW at http://www.anonime.com/dpinstitute/europe/balkans/bosnia_and_herzegovina/20020501_bosnia_agenda.pdf. Accessed 01.12.03.
- Dragičević-Šešić, M. (2001) Borders and maps in contemporary Yugoslav art. In N. Švob-Đokić (ed.) *Redefining Cultural Identities* (pp. 71–87). Zagreb: Institute for International relations.
- European Stability Initiative (1999) Reshaping international priorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Part I, Bosnian Power Structures. On WWW at http://www.esiweb.org/reports/bosnia/showdocument.php?document_ID=4. Accessed 1.12.03.
- Gogolin, I. (1994) *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster: Waxmann.

- Halilović, S. (1996) *Griježdo lijepih reci: Pravilno – nepravilno u bosanskoj jeziku*. Sarajevo: Bastina.
- Hodžić, A. (2000) Preoccupation with the 'other'. In N. Skopljanac Brunner, S. Gredelj, A. Hodžić and B. Krištofić (eds) *Media & War* (pp. 19–41). Zagreb and Belgrade: Centre for Transition and Civil Society Research, Agency Argument.
- Iveković, R. (2001) *Autopsie des Balkans: Ein psychohistorischer Essay*. Graz, Wien: Literaturverlag Droschl.
- Jakšić, B. (2001) The disintegration of Yugoslavia and the division of language. Unpublished paper presented at the International Conference Slanugae-Society-History: The Balkans. Thessaloniki, 11–12 November.
- Langston, K. (1999) Linguistic cleansing: Language purism in Croatia after the Yugoslav break-up. *International Politics* 36, 179–201.
- Neweklowsky, G. (2000) Serbisch, Kroatisch, Bosnisch, Montenegrinisch: Perspektiven. In L. Zybatov (ed.) *Sprachwandel in der Slavia: Die slavischen Sprachen an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert* (pp. 543–559). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2001) *Thematic Review of National Policies for Education – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe*. CCNM/DEELSA/ED 3.
- Okuka, M. (1998) *Eine Sprache, viele Erben. Sprachenpolitik als Nationalisierungsinstrument in Ex-Jugoslawien*. Klagenfurt: Wieser.
- Pavuna, S. (1993) *Govorimo li ispravno hrvatski? Mali razlikovni rječnik*. Zagreb: Integra.
- Pogledi (2000) *Pogledi: Otvorena nastava i interkulturalno učenje. Materijal i upute*. (2000) Sarajevo: Kulturkontakt.
- Puhovski, Ž. (2000) Hate silence. In N. Skopljanac Brunner, S. Gredelj, A. Hodžić and B. Krištofić (eds) *Media & War* (pp. 41–53). Zagreb and Belgrade: Centre for Transition and Civil Society Research, Agency Argument.
- Rosandić, R. and Pesić, V. (1994) *Ratništvo, Patriotizam, Patrijarhalnost*. Beograd: most.
- Škiljan, D. (2001) Languages with(out) frontiers. In N. Švob-Đokić (ed.) *Redefining Cultural Identities* (pp. 87–101). Zagreb: Institute for International relations.
- Todorov, T. (1984) *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- United Nations in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2003) *Youth in Bosnia and Herzegovina 2003. Are You Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution?* On WWW at <http://www.undp.ba/publications/Youth%20in%20BiH.pdf>.
- Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Liebhart, K. (1999) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Chapter 10

After Disinvention: Possibilities for Communication, Community and Competence

SURESH CANAGARAJAH

So where do we go from here? Once we acknowledge that languages are inherently hybrid, grammars are emergent and communication is fluid, we are left with the problem of redefining some of the most basic constructs that have dominated the field of linguistics. It appears that matters like linguistic identity, speech community, language competence and even language teaching are based on constructs of homogeneity and uniformity that we have invented over time. Once these closed systems are taken away, we are confused as to how we can practice language communication.

In a move that will sound paradoxical, I want to argue that in order to find answers for the new questions that emerge after disinvention we have to return to precolonial/premodern societies and the ways language communication was practiced then. In some senses, this is not surprising. It is modernism (and the related movements of colonization and nationalism) that inspired the movement for inventing languages. These movements considered the fluidity and hybridity in precolonial forms of communication a problem and strove to move toward codification, classification and categorization that mark the field of linguistics today. Though post-modernism and post-colonialism have generated a healthy critique of these movements of disciplinary invention (see Hall, 1997; Mignolo, 2000), there is a lot to learn from precolonial communities on how to move forward in addressing the new forms of communication and community that are evolving in contemporary society.

Borrowing from this tradition doesn't mean that we can adopt premodern linguistic practices wholesale. We have to adapt those values and practices to contemporary social conditions. In fact, we have additional resources in the postmodern world to practice these values in more creative and complex ways. So, for example, while premodern societies in my own

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM

Series Editors: Professor Nancy H. Hornberger, *University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA* and Professor Colin Baker, *University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, Great Britain*

Recent Books in the Series

- Trilingualism in Family, School and Community
Charlotte Hoffmann and Johannes Ytsma (eds)
- Multilingual Classroom Ecologies
Angela Creese and Peter Martin (eds)
- Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts
Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge (eds)
- Beyond the Beginnings: Literacy Interventions for Upper Elementary English Language Learners
Angela Carrasquillo, Stephen B. Kucer and Ruth Abrams
- Bilingualism and Language Pedagogy
Janina Brutt-Griffler and Manka Varghese (eds)
- Language Learning and Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Approach
Margaret R. Hawkins (ed.)
- The English Vernacular Divide: Postcolonial Language Politics and Practice
Vaidéhi Ramanathan
- Bilingual Education in South America
Anne-Marie de Mejía (ed.)
- Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms
Angela Creese
- Words and Worlds: World Languages Review
F. Martí, P. Ortega, I. Idiazabal, A. Barreña, P. Juaristi, C. Junyent, B. Uranga and E. Amorrotu
- Language and Aging in Multilingual Contexts
Kees de Bot and Sinfree Makoni
- Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (4th edn)
Colin Baker
- Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression and Representation
Aneta Pavlenko (ed.)
- Raising Bilingual-Biliterate Children in Monolingual Cultures
Stephen J. Caldas
- Language, Space and Power: A Critical Look at Bilingual Education
Samina Hadi-Tabassum
- Developing Minority Language Resources
Guadalupe Valdés, Joshua A. Fishman, Rebecca Chávez and William Pérez
- Language Loyalty, Language Planning and Language Revitalization: Recent Writings and Reflections from Joshua A. Fishman
Nancy H. Hornberger and Martin Pütz (eds)
- Language Loyalty, Continuity and Change: Joshua A. Fishman's Contributions to International Sociolinguistics
Ofelia García, Rakhmiel Peltz and Harold Schiffman
- Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader
Ofelia García and Colin Baker (eds)

For more details of these or any other of our publications, please contact:
Multilingual Matters, Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall,
Victoria Road, Clevedon, BS21 7HH, England
<http://www.multilingual-matters.com>

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND BILINGUALISM 62

Series Editors: Nancy H. Hornberger and Colin Baker

Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages

Edited by

Sinfree Makoni and Alastair Pennycook

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto

2006