

Snježana Šušnjara

Razvoj pedagogike in šolstva v Bosni in Hercegovini od konca druge svetovne vojne do leta 1970

Povzetek: Takoj po končani drugi svetovni vojni se je v Bosni in Hercegovini začel intenziven razvoj celotnega vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema. Tako hiter napredek je bil pogojen s potrebami gospodarskega razvoja, industrializacijo in prehodom delovne sile iz kmetijske panoge, pa tudi s spremembami in celotni družbeno-politični strukturi ter »potrebi, da vsi delovni ljudje in državljani s svojim odločanjem in delovanjem sodelujejo v razvoju socialistične družbe« (Hromadžić 1982, str. 4–5). Hitro naraščanje natalitete v letih po drugi svetovni vojni in pomemben porast števila otrok v osnovni šoli sta pripeljala do nenehnega razkoraka med številom učencev in razpoložljivostjo šolskih prostorov ter učiteljev. V bosansko-hercegovskih šolah so prevladovala načela tako imenovane stare šole, ki so temeljila na verbalizmu, intelektualizmu in šibki usmerjenosti v življenje ter prakso. Bosna in Hercegovina je po letu 1945 sprejela marksistične teorije in njihov nesporen vpliv na vzgojo in izobraževanje. Šola je postala narodna, dostopna, obvezna za vse in brezplačna. Vzgoja in izobraževanje sta bila v vlogi ustvarjanja novega socialističnega človeka. Vpliv sovjetske pedagogike je bil očiten in ta pedagogika se je v Bosni in Hercegovini poskušala prikazati kot edina možna, kar je bilo značilno za vse države »ljudske demokracije« oziroma socialistične države, nastale po drugi svetovni vojni. Pedagogika v Bosni in Hercegovini je bila torej marksistična, a tudi vse bolj usmerjena k učencu in prizadevanju, da se ga vsaj deklarativno postavi v vlogo subjekta v vzgojno-izobraževalnem procesu.

Ključne besede: povojni razvoj, izobraževanje učiteljev, učenci, marksistična pedagogika, socialistični pristop

UDK: 37(091)

Znanstveni prispevek

Dr. Snježana Šušnjara, izredna profesorica, Univerza v Sarajevu, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za pedagogiko, Franje Račkog 1, 71000 Sarajevo, Bosna in Hercegovina; e-naslov: ssusnjara@yahoo.com

Uvod

Šolstvo in pedagogika v nekdanji Bosni in Hercegovini ne moreta biti predstavljena brez vsaj delnega seznanjanja z razmerami v izobraževanju pred drugo svetovno vojno, zato bomo na začetku tega prispevka pogledali šolstvo v kontekstu prejšnjih režimov v pedagoški zgodovini Bosne in Hercegovine. V drugem delu prispevka bo prikazano, kako je potekal razvoj šolstva in pedagogike v novem socialističnem obdobju, torej po drugi svetovni vojni in nastanku socialistične jugoslovanske države ter njenih republik. Znano je, da se je v novem sistemu želelo vzpostaviti samoupravni socializem, ki so ga bile republike dolžne razvijati v okviru svojih izobraževalnih sistemov. Bosna in Hercegovina je bila leta 1945 agrarna, gospodarsko zaostala skupnost, v kateri je bilo večinsko kmečko prebivalstvo nepismeno (70 %) in je živelo v razmeroma primitivnih razmerah. V tistem času je 83 % prebivalstva živelo v vaškem okolju in mestnega prebivalstva je bilo samo 17 %. Kamberović (2000, str. 16) navaja, da je skoraj pol milijona ljudi nosilo opanke, ki so jih večinoma izdelovali sami iz goveje kože. Takšno stanje ni bilo le posledica vojnih razmer, ampak tudi predvojnega zgodovinskega razvoja države. Katastrofalnost razmer ilustrira podatek, da je v takratni zvezni vladi (23. 10. 1945) pomočnik ministra Briner moral dati pisna navodila o vedenju uslužbencev v stavbi ministrstva. Med drugim je napisal, da je prepovedano odstranjevati žarnice, pisati po stenah in vratih, metati odpadke skozi okno, pljuvati po hodnikih, ter natančno opisal uporabo toaletnih prostorov (prav tam, str. 15). Torej socialno-kulturna struktura družbe, iz katere bi morali iziti bodoči državni uslužbenci in med njimi tudi prosvetni delavci, ni bila obetavna. Zaradi specifične zgodovinske dediščine je bila nastala družba v Bosni in Hercegovini popolnoma drugačna kot v drugih delih takratne Jugoslavije. Takšna socialno-gospodarska situacija in struktura prebivalstva je karakterizirala družbo v tej republici še dolgo po vojni. Da bi lahko čim natančneje prikazali ta čas, je treba z uporabo zgodovinske metode raziskovanja pojasniti družbeno-ideološko osnovo socialističnega pristopa ter razvoj vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema. Pri tem so analizirana dela njihovih takratnih vodilnih pedagogov, ki so v času novega režima delovali v procesu preobrazbe bosansko-hercegovske družbe in spremembe njene strukture ter so sodelovali v oblikovanju posameznih oddelkov na filozofski fakulteti in tudi zapustili različna

dela na področju pedagogike. Seveda je vse potekalo pod nadzorom komunistične partije, zato se v teh delih pogosto citirajo vodilni politično-prosvetni delavci tega časa in njihovi govori ter prispevki, objavljeni v pedagoški periodiki. Pomembno je izpostaviti, da je danes pedagoška literatura, ki obravnava socialistično obdobje, redka in je nujna uporaba literature avtorjev iz preučevanega obdobja. Navedeni teksti so polni značilnih fraz za tisti čas, kar tudi lahko pomeni pristranskost dejstev in ne da jasne ter realne podobe dejanske situacije. Politika je bila prisotna povsod in je pomembno vplivala na šolstvo. Namen tega članka je predstaviti razvoj šolstva in pedagogike v Bosni in Hercegovini v času socializma ob poskusu izpostavljanja določenih predpostavk in razumevanja tega zgodovinskega obdobja z današnje perspektive.

Šolstvo v Bosni in Hercegovini pred drugo svetovno vojno

Šolstvo v Bosni in Hercegovini se je v času Avstro-Ogrske prvič gradilo načrtno in sistematično. Odprte so bile prve državne osnovne ter srednje šole in med njimi tudi učiteljišča. Učitelji so ob poučevanju in ukvarjanju s poukom urejali časopise in revije, v katerih so pisali o problemih šolstva in vzgojno-izobraževalnega procesa. Bili so prvi pobudniki in ustvarjalci pedagoških idej ter so s prevajanjem najnovejših pedagoških spoznanj Evrope bogatili pedagogiko tega obdobja, ki se je delno opirala tudi na razsvetljenstvo (Bevanda 2001, str. 274). Učitelji so bili zbiralci kulturne dediščine, v skupnosti, v katerih so živeli in delali, so prinašali časopise, promovirali so izboljšave v kmetijstvu, tako da je upravičena trditev, da v času Avstro-Ogrske v Bosni in Hercegovini »osnovna šola nikoli ni bila – še posebno ne na vasi – samo za učence. Bila je prosvetni center svojega okolja.« (Papić 1987, str. 8)

V tem času so nastali tudi prvi pedagoški časopisi, ki so bili zaslužni za razvoj takratne pedagoške misli (*Školski vjesnik*, *Učiteljska zora*, *Krščanska obitelj*, *Srpska škola*) (Bevanda 2001, str. 47–49). Večina pedagoških delavcev tega časa se je šolala v Zagrebu, Beogradu, Pragi, na Dunaju ter v Gradcu in ob vrnitvi so delali kot učitelji in profesorji. V šolstvu tega časa je prevladoval herbartizem in večina učiteljev je sledila načelom te pedagoške smeri tudi v praksi. Učitelji so, da bi dosegli svoje pravice in si izborili boljši status, oblikovali učiteljska združenja in to prakso povezovanja učiteljev srečamo tudi v poznejših obdobjih in režimih (Šušnjara 2013b, str. 57–65).

V času Kraljevine SHS je šolstvo v Bosni in Hercegovini stagniralo in lahko rečemo, da je bilo precej nerazvito. Kriza je prevladala na vseh področjih, zato tudi kulturno-prosvetno življenje ni bilo aktivno. Kazal se je velik razkorak med uradnimi stališči in zakoni ter življenjsko prakso. Vključenost otrok v šolo je bila zelo majhna in primanjkovalo je učiteljskega kadra. Za uvajanje novih reformnih usmeritev ni bilo možnosti, ker je v šolah prevladovala omenjena stara šola pod vplivom Herbartove pedagogike. Kljub temu je treba izpostaviti zanimivost tega obdobja. Če so učitelji v Avstro-Ogrski ustvarjali pedagoško dediščino, je v obdobju SHS to počel profesorski kader. Sami so se seznanjali z novimi prizadevanji v

šolstvu sosednjih držav ter tako spoznali tudi pojav in značilnosti delovne šole. Zaradi dejstva, da so se pedagogi in drugi profesorji na srednjih šolah v Bosni in Hercegovini usposabljali v tujini, so vplivi novih teorij in praks prišli tudi sem prav po njihovi zaslugi. Nova spoznanja so bila prilagojena razmeram v domovini, saj, kakor navaja Bevanda, »Bosna in Hercegovina niti ni mogla imeti tako plodnih tal za razvoj pedagogike, ker ni bilo institucionalnih okvirov za to [...]« (Bevanda 2001, str. 274).¹

V času Kraljevine Jugoslavije ni bilo centralno vodene znanstvene infrastrukture – vse je bilo predpisano, unificirano in v glavnem so se šolstvu postavljale omejitve. Šolski sistem je bil dualističen in dogmatski, vzgajalo pa se je v duhu zvestobe kralju in dinastiji (prav tam, str. 281).

Razvoj srednjih šol med obema vojnama, še posebno učiteljskih in pedagoških šol, ki so imele profesorje pedagogike, filozofije in psihologije, je dal vzpodbudo, da se je k pedagoškim problemom v šolski praksi začelo pristopati iz širših znanstvenih pozicij. Za to obdobje je značilen intenzivnejši razvoj meščanske pedagogike, v kateri so se prekrivali teoretski koncepti delovno-aktivne šole, še posebno pa je bil prevladujoč vpliv Herbartove pedagogike. V širjenju pedagoških idej in pogledov v obdobju med obema vojnama je posebno mesto pripadlo časopisom *Učitelj*, *Prehled*, pa tudi pedagoški biblioteki *Budučnost* (Muradbegović 1986, str. 146–151).

Politično-pedagoške implikacije razvoja šolstva po drugi svetovni vojni

V Bosni in Hercegovini je po drugi svetovni vojni prišlo do popolne družbene preobrazbe. Podoba naselij se je zaradi hitre industrializacije in prehoda delovne sile iz vasi v mesta spremenila. S sociokulturnega vidika so bile razlike med vasjo in mestom majhne, kar ilustrira tudi dejstvo, da tukaj ni bilo večjih industrijskih mest. Kot smo navedli v uvodu, je večina prebivalcev predvojne Bosne in Hercegovine živela na podeželju (83 %) in samo 17 % je bilo mestnega prebivalstva (Kamberović 2000, str. 16). Prisilna industrializacija v času od leta 1945 do 1953 je med prebivalce vnesla nemir in razdor ter privedla do hitrega propadanja vasi. Ni se razmišljalo o tem, da so spremembe med nepripravljeno in neizobraženo prebivalstvo prišle prehitro, ampak se je pogosto uporabljalo tudi nasilno ločevanje kmeta od njegovega ognjišča ter se ga je uvajalo v nove procese, ki jih ni razumel. Prav tako se je spreminjala tudi podoba mesta. Na področjih, kjer so bile v preteklosti vasi, so se zgradili industrijski obrati in delavske barake, izginjala pa so tudi zemljišča za obdelovanje, saj so postala del mest. S prisilnim preseljevanjem kmečke populacije v industrijske predele je prišlo do vdora ruralnih elementov v mesta, ki so s seboj prinesli drugačne običaje in kulturo in vse to je pripeljalo do sporov, v katerih je na začetku zaradi številnosti zmagovala kmečka stran, katere moč je sčasoma popustila in leta 1953 dokončno usahnila (prav tam,

¹ Omeniti je treba, da je bila že ob koncu 19. stoletja, natančneje leta 1887, v Bosni in Hercegovini objavljena knjiga avtorja Jegliča, ki je obravnavala pedagogiko in predlagala metode dela učiteljev in učiteljskih pripravnikov: Jeglič, Anton Bonaventura (1850–1937). *Uzgojeslovje za učitelje i učiteljske pripravnike* (po najboljim piscima sastavio Antun Jeglič). Sarajevo: Spindler i Löschner, 1887.

str. 184–185). Očitno je, da v obdobju po vojni proces modernizacije družbe ni bil dobro sprejet pri večinskem kmečkem prebivalstvu. Najpomembnejše posledice so bile v spremembi strukture prebivalstva, kjer je opazen pojav porasta števila mestnega in zmanjšanje kmečkega prebivalstva.

Z vidika modernizacije družbe in zmanjševanja števila nepismenih, ki jih je bilo takoj po vojni kar 70 %, se je začelo intenzivno delo za razvoj celotnega vzgojno-izobraževalnega sistema v Bosni in Hercegovini, ki je bil pod vplivom potreb gospodarskega razvoja, industrializacije in prehoda delovne sile iz kmetijstva, »pa tudi sprememb v celotni družbeno-politični strukturi in neizbežnosti, da vsi delovni ljudje in prebivalci s svojim odločanjem in delovanjem čim uspešneje sodelujejo v razvoju socialistične družbe« (Hromadžić 1982, str. 4–5). A tudi ta proces ni potekal gladko in brez ovir. Pomanjkanje učiteljev je bilo očitno in del prosvetnega kadra ni bil pripravljen usvajati novih idej in jih sprejeti. Ocenjevalo se je, da so imele tri četrtine učiteljskega kadra končan učiteljski tečaj namesto učiteljišča. Knjižni fond je bil majhen, a tudi povpraševanje po knjigah ni bilo spodbudno. Vaške knjižnice so bile ponekod »kup neurejenih knjig v neki omari šole, narodnega odbora ali vaške zadruga« (Dobrivojević 2011, str. 15). V določenih predelih države je bilo manj knjižnic kot v času Kraljevine Jugoslavije, čeprav se je propagiralo množično odpiranje knjižnic in domov kulture. Tako se navaja, da je bilo v Varešu pred vojno deset knjižnic, po vojni pa niti ena (prav tam). Na vzgojne cilje v letu 1945/46 so vplivale naslednje ideje: »V naši osnovni kot tudi srednji šoli se danes postavlja tudi vprašanje metod, vsebin, odnosov z dijaki in v povezavi s tem tudi vprašanje zdajšnjega učiteljskega kadra in ustvarjanje novega. V naši šoli mora čim prej zavladati duh delovne skupnosti [...] To pa sploh ni bilo lahko za veliko število starejših učiteljev [...] in pogosto je šlo tudi za popolnoma brezplodna prizadevanja, kadar je šlo za učitelje, ki so bili zavestno in načelno proti novostim.« (Papić 1981, str. 104) Najpomembnejša pridobitev v letu 1947/48 in nekaj popolnoma novega za bosansko-hercegovsko šolstvo je bilo načelno sprejeto sedemletno šolanje, saj so še naprej delovale tudi štiriletne šole, malo zaradi pomanjkanja kadra, malo pa zaradi nezadostnega odziva učencev v ruralnih okoljih (prav tam).

Diplomo učitelja je bilo možno pridobiti tudi v skrajšanih programih, po kratkih tečajih in po izražanju vdanosti politiki ter izvajanju njenih zahtev in pravil. Zato je bila razlika med naprednimi in svojemu poslanstvu predanimi učitelji in tistimi, ki so na to poslanstvo gledali kot na vsak drugi poklic. Subotić navaja, da je v petdesetih letih takratni zvezni prosvetni minister Rodoljub Čolaković pogosto poudaril: »Poslanstvo učiteljev je verjetno eno od najtežjih poslanstev in ga lahko izvajajo ljudje, ki ga razumejo kot *poslanstvo* in ga izvajajo z ustvarjalnim navdušenjem ter istočasno z neizmerno potrpežljivostjo, ljudje, ki vedo, da je njihovo delo dolgotrajen, sistematičen, vsakodnevni napor.« (Subotić 1985, str. 238)

Na tretjem plenumu SK KPJ decembra leta 1949 je prišlo do obračuna z dogmatizmom v znanosti in s tem tudi v pedagogiki. Na plenumu je bilo poudarjeno, da mora biti cilj vzgoje in izobraževanja »oblikovanje vsestransko izobraženega svobodnega graditelja socializma, ki sta mu tuja birokratizem in stereotipno razmišljanje« (Papić 1981, str. 112). Tako je prišlo do novih kvalitativnih teoretskih

razpravah in do razhoda z razumevanji, polnimi dogmatizma in birokratizma, ter do razhoda s SSSR. Ta politični obračun s stalinizmom so podprli tudi pedagogi s svojimi prispevki o sovjetski pedagogiki, ko so odkrivali negativne značilnosti tega pristopa ter razkrivali zmote v političnih in teoretskih stališčih. S tem so prispevali, navaja Filipović, »k afirmaciji dialektično-materialističnega mišljenja v pedagogiki« (Filipović 1971, str. 514).

Po razhodu z vplivom sovjetske pedagogike je bilo največ pozornosti vseh izobraževalnih subjektov usmerjene k uvajanju čim več praktičnega dela v šolo in izobraževanju bodočega delavca. Politiki so v svojih govorih to posebej izpostavljali in tako je tudi Rodoljub Čolaković, tedaj že podpredsednik vlade, na srečanju prosvetnih delavcev v Kragujevcu leta 1958 izpostavil, da je treba »zlomiti in uničiti intelektualistični duh v pouku – to pomeni rešiti eno od osnovnih težav v naši šoli. Razmaknite zidove šole! Več fizičnega dela v šoli – delavnice, več šolskih vrtov, več športnih terenov, več vsega tistega, kar bo zadovoljilo potrebe in interese učencev! Od učencev zahtevajte bistveno več predanosti delu, a pojdite po drugačni poti, in ne po utrjeni, ki ne pelje nikamor in ne pomaga razvoju ter razcvetu učenceve osebnosti [...]« (Čolaković v Subotić 1985, str. 236) Uradna prosvetna politika, ki je bila uniformirana, polna normativnosti in ni dopuščala uvajanja novih iniciativ v šolsko prakso, je poudarjala: »Nenehno moramo težiti k temu, da se naši otroci z izobraževanjem pripravljajo in vzgajajo za življenje, v katerem samo delo in njegovi rezultati odločajo o posameznikovem položaju v družbi, da se osebnost mladega človeka oblikuje na osnovah marksističnega pogleda na svet. Šola ima nezamenljivo vlogo pri razvijanju socialistične samoupravne zavesti mlade generacije, kar je bistveni pogoj, da mladi uspešno prevzemajo odgovornost za nadaljnji samoupravni razvoj naše družbe.« (Mesihović 1987, str. 4–5) V petdesetih letih se je gimnazije kritiziralo kot šole, v katerih je prevladoval elitistični duh, kjer se je podcenjevalo vsako fizično delo in ki so se imenovalе »gosposke šole«. S širjenjem mreže teh šol bi lahko prišlo do kadrovske nesorazmernosti, ker se v teh šolah »ne pripravlja splošno kvalificiranih delavcev, ampak delavce, ki bodo jutri upravljali tovarne«, od načina upravljanja tovarn pa je bila odvisna prihodnost socializma (Čolaković v Subotić 1985, str. 234–235). Čolaković je nenehno opozarjal na to nevarnost: »Duh, ki vlada v šoli, je intelektualen, ne glede na deklaracije o politehnizaciji pouka [...]« (Ibid., str. 233) V petdesetih letih se je v šolah prek tiska začelo promovirati samoupravljanje učencev, pri čemer se je poudarjalo: »[P]redmet samoupravljanja učencev je treba določati tako, da se izhaja iz splošne normativne definicije samoupravljanja (kot osnovnega družbenega odnosa), po tem iz naravne delovne zadolžitve, ki jo opravljajo učenci, in tudi glede na razvojno obdobje učencev.« (Bročić 1975, str. 17) Menil je, da samoupravljanje učencev vsebuje osnovne pogoje za pravilni razvoj mlade osebnosti ter da je to tudi način boja proti odtujenosti otrokove osebnosti, njegovih pravic in dolžnosti v procesu vzgoje in samorazvoja. Vzgojanje otrok v samoupravnih pogojih omogoča, da živijo zdravo življenje: »[V]zgojanje v tem duhu, na samoupravnem temelju je v osnovi družbeni problem – enako ekonomski in prosvetni, sociološki in filozofski, pedagoški in psihološki. To ne more biti odtujeno od integralne skrbi in interesov delavskega razreda za izgradnjo moderne samoupravne družbe.« (Arslanagić 1975, str. 8–9) Vzporedno

z razvojem šolstva se je nenehno ozaveščalo učitelje, ki naj bi svoje znanje prenašali učencem, vendar ni bilo poskrbljeno za njihov materialni položaj, kar kaže, da se status učiteljev v samoupravnem socializmu, ki je zagovarjal enakost dela, glede na prejšnja obdobja ni pomembno spremenil. Tako je Petar Mandić leta 1969 v Banjaluki na prvi okrogli mizi na temo *Položaj učiteljev v samoupravni socialistični družbi* dokazoval, da materialni položaj prosvetnih delavcev ni bil na zadovoljivi ravni, čeprav sta bili vzgoja in izobraževanje z Občim zakonom o šolstvu opredeljeni kot dejavnost izjemnega družbenega pomena. Takšno protislovno in neustrezno stanje je povzročilo prepričanje prosvetnih delavcev, da so nezadostno družbeno priznani in da je njihov materialni status nižji od drugih z enakimi kvalifikacijami v družboslovnih in naravoslovnih dejavnostih (Ilić 1989, str. 311). Da se materialni položaj učiteljev ni bistveno izboljšal niti v naslednjih letih, kažejo izjave Rodoljuba Čolakovića v intervjuju leta 1983, 25 let po tem, ko se je profesionalno ukvarjal s šolstvom: »Danes imamo, tako mislim, 150.000 učiteljev. To je v vojaškem jeziku 15 divizij in zamislite si, kaj bi lahko naredili, če bi bili v teh divizijah sami entuziasti, 'skojevci'! Veste kakšna moč je to?! [...] Ja, a pogledjte, kako so danes plačani učitelji! Ne imenujemo jih več učitelji, ampak [...] ne morem izgovoriti tega izraza, ki je zamenjal krasno ime za učitelja [...].« (Čolaković v Subotić 1985, str. 239)

Pomanjkanje šolskih prostorov in učiteljskega kadra – iskanje načinov modernizacije

Kot smo že izpostavili, se je v obdobju po drugi svetovni vojni prizadevalo ustvariti funkcionalno državo. Povsod se je gradilo in poskušalo ustvariti normalno življenje. Vseeno pa je izobraževanje zelo trpelo, saj v šolah ni bilo dovolj prostora za sprejem vseh otrok, tako da so številni otroci po več let ostali brez šolske izobrazbe in posledično so bili nepismeni, niso nadaljevali šolanja in jih je bilo treba zaposeliti. Zato so pozneje šli v večerne šole, organizirane na delavskih univerzah, da bi pridobili osnovno izobrazbo in izpolnili norme delavskega razreda (Šušnjara 2013a, str. 43). Ob tem se je v teh petdesetih letih stalno poudarjalo, da mora biti šola socialistične družbe vzgojnega značaja, »da vzgaja aktivne tvorce socialistične države« (Subotić 1985, str. 234).

Tudi kadrovske težave so bile velike, saj ni bilo dovolj učiteljev. Pri tem je pomembno izpostaviti partizanske tečaje, ki so se v času vojne izvajali na področju zunaj vojnega delovanja in na katerih se je prizadevalo borce, ki so pokazali interes za izobraževanje, usposobiti za vlogo učitelja. Iz tega kadra so izšli povojni učitelji, ki so sodelovali pri množičnem opismenjevanju in izobraževanju naroda (Šušnjara, 2013a, str. 44). Hkrati je bila prisotna tudi politična borba za ustvarjanje novih odnosov v družbi, s katerimi bi pridobivali prebivalce za sprejemanje novih načinov življenja in oblik mišljenja. Politični forumi so narekovali smeri razvoja teorije in prakse vzgojno-izobraževalnega dela. Besede Josipa Broza Tita so v mnogo primerih citirane kot spodbuda in opomin, kako je treba delati in česa ni priporočljivo narediti. Filipović ugotavlja, da je Tito znal ustvariti trdno vez med

politiko partije in pedagogiko in zaradi tega je bila »prevlada politike nad pedagogiko 'kultivirana' in sprejeta kot normalno dejstvo, kar je imelo pozitiven vpliv na razumevanje in vedenje političnih in strokovnih delavcev na ministrstvih, komitejih in odborih, pa tudi na pedagoge v različnih institucijah.« (Filipović 1971, str. 512) Da bi ilustriral omenjeno kultiviranje, navaja Filipović prioritete v razvoju mladih, ki jih je Tito poudaril, in to so učenje, fizični razvoj mladih in obnova porušene države. Nasprotno ravnanje bi imelo neizmerno negativne posledice »za osebnost učencev in prihodnost socialistične preobrazbe naše družbe« (prav tam). Mladina, predvsem podeželska, je pogosto *prostovoljno* sodelovala v delovnih akcijah leta 1949 in tja so prihajali predstavniki posameznih podjetij, da bi jih pridobili za delo v industriji in rudarstvu, s ciljem, da bi se onemogočila njihova vrnitev na podeželje (Kamberović 2000, str. 143). Kljub temu pa se je prav s procesom ustvarjanja industrijske družbe in slabljenja agrarne vloge ustvarjala drugačna podoba od tiste, ki je razvoj naroda opisovala na ravni besed. Jugoslovanska oblast je v svoji zaslepljenosti z ideološko obarvanim pogledom prezrla bistvo družbe, ki jo je hotela preobraziti, ker sta se zavest družbe in zavest voditeljev zelo razlikovali (prav tam). Premalo je bilo kritičnega presojanja procesov, ki so potekali v tistem času, in zavedanja, da mladi prihajajo iz družin, ki so prisiljene spremeniti svoja stališča, način življenja in razmišljanje. Realnost je bila zelo drugačna od tistega, kar je prikazovala literatura tega obdobja.

Pomembno vlogo v razvoju pedagoške teorije in prakse v povojnem obdobju je imel časopis *Naša škola*, ki je bil oblikovan leta 1950. Ta časopis je vplival na spodbujanje empiričnih in teoretskih raziskav ter na prenašanje pedagoške teorije v prakso, z namenom pridobivanja mladih kadrov v znanosti (Muradbegović 1986, str. 146). Ustanovitelj časopisa je bil Pedagoško društvo Socialistične Republike Bosne in Hercegovine, ki je bilo ustanovljeno istega leta. To društvo je nastalo, kot poudarja Muradbegović, v času utrjevanja pedagoške teorije in prakse, ko je tako praktično kot teoretsko prišlo do jasnega razmejevanja in obračunavanja z oblikami dogmatizma, birokratizma in drugih »socializmu tujih pojavov v pedagogiki, kot tudi v vseh vzgojno-izobraževalnih institucijah in drugih oblikah družbenega življenja« (Muradbegović 1980, str. 300). Pedagoška teorija in praksa v takratni Bosni in Hercegovini sta se začeli vse bolj utemeljevati na osmišljanju lastnih rešitev, pri čemer sta se sklicevali na nauk »klasikov marksizma, izvorne dediščine narodnoosvobodilne revolucije in razvojne tokove ter odnose naše samoupravne socialistične družbe« (prav tam, str. 301). Nenehne pobude so prihajale iz kongresnih resolucij, programov in dokumentov KPJ in SKJ, še zlasti pa iz govorov, dela in sporočil Josipa Broza Tita. Člani omenjenega pedagoškega društva so veliko prispevali k razvoju pedagoške teorije in prakse ter so bili člani uredništva in različnih družbeno-političnih organizacij, institucij, komisij idr. (prav tam). V času razprave o pripravi šolske reforme v petdesetih letih se je šli očitati, da je v glavnem izobraževalna in premalo vzgojna. Kot *vzgojna* se je pri tem razumela vzgoja v duhu komunistične morale (Subotić 1985, str. 235). Ko je Miroslav Vrabec, profesor Višje pedagoške šole iz Banjaluke, na okrogli mizi o položaju učiteljev leta 1969 govoril o potrebi, da naj šolanje neposredneje koristi proizvodnji materialnih dobrin, je poudaril, da tak pristop zahteva premik pozornosti od vzgoje k izobra-

ževanju, zato se tudi sodobna pedagoška teorija »ob upoštevanju sedanje prakse razvija z inovacijami, ki predvsem pospešujejo izobraževalno usposabljanje mlade generacije [...]« (Ilić 1989, str. 314). Isti avtor se je vprašal tudi: »Ali ni indikativno, da ima šola program izobraževanja, a nima programa etičnega oblikovanja učencev, da sta teorija in praksa etičnega oblikovanja neprimerljivo slabše razviti od teorije in prakse izobrazbenega oblikovanja učencev? Učitelji so torej predvsem inštruktorji in organizatorji učenja učencev, in zato lahko imajo pozivi [...], da morajo biti učitelji najprej vzgojitelji, v današnjem svetu objektivno gledano samo deklarativni, in ne dejanski učinek.« (Prav tam)

Problem nepismenosti in njegovo reševanje

Pomembno je poudariti, da je bilo – ob tako veliki stopnji nepismenosti prebivalstva – težavno obnavljati državo in vnašati kakršne koli spremembe. K temu so prispevala leta pred vojno, ko je večina prebivalstva ostajala zunaj šole. V Bosni in Hercegovini je bilo leta 1941 okoli 70 % nepismenega prebivalstva, v osnovne šole s 4100 učitelji je hodilo okoli 150.000 učencev, razporejenih v 1100 štirirazrednih osnovnih šol, v srednjih šolah je bilo okoli 25.000 učencev in 1000 učiteljev in profesorjev, medtem ko predvojna Bosna in Hercegovina ni imela niti ene visokošolske ustanove, razen verskih (Šušnjara 2013a, str. 46). »Najtežja dediščina in posledice kolonialnega položaja Bosne in Hercegovine so bile na področju izobraževanja, znanosti, zdravstva in socialnega stanja.« (Šipovac 1975, str. 531–536)

Intenzivnejše delo na področju organizacije izobraževanja se je začelo že leta 1945, redno šolsko leto 1945/46 pa se je za osnovne šole začelo v novembru, ker se je šele konec avgusta zaključilo šolsko leto, ki se je začelo v juniju leta 1945 (Papić 1981, str. 100–102). »S tem se je začela aktivnost v vseljudskem izobraževanju in odpiranju osnovnih šol, ki so imele potrjen učni načrt in program. Iz teh šol se je razvila osemletna osnovna šola [...]« (Kalezić 1985, str. 10) Na področju izobraževanja v Bosni in Hercegovini je bilo zato treba začeti od začetka. Po vojni je v primernem stanju ostalo samo 101 šola v državi in 38 šol v zasebnih stavbah. Vzporedno z obnovo in izgradnjo države se je širila mreža šol, saj je na področju izobraževanja v velikem delu države že stoletja vladala praznina (Šušnjara 2013a, str. 46).

Partijski uradniki so poudarjali, da mora biti boj proti nepismenosti v Bosni in Hercegovini na prvem mestu. Ker se je opismenjevanje izvajalo brez dobro izdelanega načrta, so tečaji na začetku trajali samo dva tedna. Pri izobraževanju so bili najbolj angažirani učitelji in tudi študentje. Vladni organi so priporočali, da se prosvetna akcija izpelje predvsem prek kulturno-prosvetnih društev, a tudi prek različnih konferenc, raznih prireditev, predavanj, tiska, organiziranja dneva boja proti nepismenosti in »individualnega prepričevanja«. Pomembno vlogo v populariziranju kulturno-prosvetnih tečajev in tečajev opismenjevanja naj bi imeli absolventi učiteljskih tečajev. Pri tem se je posebej izpostavljalo izobraževanje kmečkih žensk, ki jih je bilo treba naučiti, kako skrbeti za zdravje in ga ohranjati, kako vzdrževati čistočo, kuhati raznovrstne in okusne jedi, kako

se pripravlja ozimnico, kako se vzgaja otroke, neguje bolnike ter porodnice idr. A kljub obsegu akcije in impozantnim podatkom o številu »opismenjenih« in »prosvetljenih« je bila realnost drugačna. Večine kmetov, še posebno žensk, branje in pisanje nista zanimala in so našli številne razloge, da so se izognili tej obveznosti (Dobrivojević 2011, str. 14–15). Po popisu leta 1953 je bilo v Bosni in Hercegovini 39,4 % nepismenih, vendar je ta podatek treba vzeti z zadržkom – tudi sami partijski uradniki so namreč priznavali, da so bili tečaji za opismenjevanje »bolj tek za številkami, kot pa je bilo dejansko opismenjenih ljudi« (prav tam). Dogajalo se je, da so osebo, ki je pozabila brati in pisati, ponovno povabili na tečaj in spet prešteli »opismenjene« (prav tam).

V teh petdesetih letih se je poudarjalo, da mora biti šola socialistična skupnost in da se spremembe ne smejo dogajati na površini. Šole so vseeno, še posebno gimnazije, počasi sprejemale proletarsko-razredni značaj in tako je Čolaković, kot navaja Subotić, leta 1956 ocenil, da »mora biti šola socialistične družbe predvsem izobraževalna, kar pomeni, da izobražuje aktivne delavce socialistične družbe. A to naša šola v teh desetih letih ni počela sistematično.« (Subotić 1985, str. 234)

V Akcijskem programu opismenjevanja in osnovnega izobraževanja delovno-aktivnega prebivalstva v Bosni in Hercegovini, ki ga je konec leta 1973 naredila Republiška konferenca SCSRN BiH, je bilo izpostavljeno, da nepismenost ni bila samo rezultat »kulturnega nasledstva«, ampak ekvivalent nesrečne zgodovine, »nazadnjaškega okupatorja, ki je vladal v najbolj črni temi poneumljanja zatiranih narodov na naših tleh« (Šipovac 1975, str. 531–536). Tako Šipovac priznava: »Samoumevno je, da nepismen človek ni kompetentna oseba ne v družini ne v proizvodnji – in ne v družbi kot celoti. Zato je nepismenost velika bolezen našega družbenega bitja, njegova največja in najtemnejša bolečina.« (Prav tam) Pozitivna gibanja so očitno vlagala velike napore na področju opismenjevanja, saj se je samo tako lahko prispevalo k razvoju celotne skupnosti in hkrati okrepilo komunistični režim in dogme, ki se jih je bilo treba naučiti in jih prenesti mladim in tudi delavskemu razredu, ki je bil večinoma nepismen. »V danem trenutku našega socialističnega razvoja se nepismenosti nikakor ne more in ne sme tolerirati. Samoupravna družba zahteva ozaveščenega državljana, ki v skrajni instanci te družbe ne more smiselno graditi brez ustrezne stopnje izobrazbe in kulture.« (Prav tam) Zato je bil sprejet sklep, da nepismenost ni samo problem izobraževalnih institucij, ampak je to naloga celotne družbe in vseh njenih državljanov. Od skupno 109 občin v Socialistični republiki Bosni in Hercegovini je v letu 1975 polovica imela status ekonomsko nepopolno razvitega področja. Najbolj nerazvite občine so dobile tudi do 70 % sredstev za izgradnjo osnovnih šol od države, medtem ko so zelo razvite občine financirale program izključno s svojimi sredstvi (Hromadžić 1982, str. 4).

Kot smo že navedli, je bil v Bosni in Hercegovini po drugi svetovni vojni velik delež otrok, primerno starih za vstop v šolo, in obenem je bilo več deset tisoč tistih, ki so primerno starost za vstop v šolo že prerasli. V 718 osnovnih šolah je bilo prva povojna leta 120.722 učencev in 1434 učiteljev, šole so imele povprečno po 170 učencev in vsak učitelj je delal povprečno z več kot 80 učenci (Šušnjara 2013a, str. 48). Vzporedno z akcijo popravljanja, obnove in gradnje novih šolskih objektov je bil izdelan tudi koncept moderne osnovne šole z višjimi zahtevami glede

izobraževanja. Tako je že ustava iz leta 1950 razglasila obvezno osemletno šolanje za otroke od sedmega do petnajstega leta. Hitro naraščanje natalitete v letih po vojni in znatno povečanje števila otrok, primernih za šolanje, sta vodila k nenehnemu razkoraku med številom učencev in razpoložljivostjo šolskega prostora (prav tam). Toda tudi stotine zgrajenih šol v prvih desetih letih povojnega razvoja niso mogle zadovoljiti potreb v Bosni in Hercegovini. Konec šestdesetih let je bilo tako v državi 2948 osnovnošolskih zgradb z 9606 učilnicami (prav tam). V primerjavi z drugimi republikami in pokrajinami je bil tu zaznan največji obseg novogradnje šolskih prostorov. Kljub temu to ni bilo dovolj za število učencev, ki se je še vedno stalno povečevalo. Preobremenjenost šolskega prostora glede na število učencev na eno učilnico je bila tukaj za 28,6 % večja od povprečne vrednosti za osemletne osnovne šole v Jugoslaviji (prav tam). Hkrati je bila prisotna težnja relativnega zaostajanja vključenosti učencev glede na druge republike in pokrajine, pa tudi pogoji dela v šolah so bili neustrezni. Zaradi tega se je na začetku sedemdesetih let začela akcija izgradnje 1000 šol v Bosni in Hercegovini in začelo se je tudi podpisovanje družbenega dogovora o realizaciji vključenosti vseh šolskih obveznikov v osnovne šole (prav tam). Sprva se je načrtovala gradnja 1031 osnovnih šol, a se je zaradi demografskega gibanja in intenzivne izgradnje prometnih zvez pokazalo, da je mreža osnovnih šol precej razpršena in neracionalna. To je bil razlog za umik načrtov gradnje štirirazrednih osnovnih šol na področjih, kjer se je zelo zmanjševalo število šolskih obveznikov. Tako je bilo to število zmanjšano za 197 %, a je to hkrati pomenilo porast gradnje skupnega šolskega prostora za okoli 60.000 m², ker se je v osemletnih osnovnih šolah poleg učilnic načrtoval tudi prostor za razne laboratorije, delavnice idr. (prav tam). Poudarjalo se je, da se bodo sredstva, vložena v šolstvo, še posebno v kadre, mnogokratno vrnila skupnosti, za kar se je v Narodni skupščini leta 1957 še posebno zavzel Rodoljub Čolaković: »Danes je investicija v prosveto prav tako pomembna, če ne pomembnejša od investicije v tovarne in druge gospodarske objekte.« (Subotić 1985, str. 238) Če lahko sklepamo po statističnih kazalcih, je v obdobju od leta 1945 do leta 1953 izobrazbena raven bosansko-hercegovaškega prebivalstva rasla. Tako je bilo leta 1945/46 783 šol z 2161 učenci, leta 1952/53 pa je bilo 2353 šol in skupno 330.867 učencev (Kamberović 2000, str. 82). Kamberović tudi trdi: »[T]oda zaradi dejstva, da modernizacijski procesi niso zajeli celotne družbene sfere (še zlasti ne politike), se je na koncu tega obdobja pokazalo, da bosanska družba ni prestopila meje tradicionalizma in vstopila v kategorijo moderniziranih družb« (prav tam, str. 185).

Nastanek Katedre za pedagogiko

Kot je bilo že izpostavljeno, Bosna in Hercegovina med obema vojnama ni imela univerz, fakultet, višjih in visokih šol (razen verskih). V letu 1948 je bilo v celotni državi samo 4000 visokoizobraženih ljudi (Bevanda 2001, str. 17).

Univerza je bila v Sarajevu ustanovljena leta 1949, v Banjaluki leta 1975, v Tuzli leta 1976 in v Mostarju leta 1977. Filozofska fakulteta v Sarajevu je nastala leta 1950, Katedra za pedagogiko pa leta 1963. V Mostarju in Banjaluki so se

leta 1951 odprle višje pedagoške šole. Leta 1966 je nastala Akademija znanosti in umetnosti v Sarajevu (prav tam).

Hiter razvoj vzgojno-izobraževalnih institucij v Bosni in Hercegovini je pojeval tudi sodobnejšo obravnavo razvoja pedagoške teorije in prakse. Nastale potrebe so zahtevale strokovnjake pedagoge tako za delo v šolah kot tudi v drugih organizacijah združenega dela in v socialnih službah. Potreba po kadrih je torej nastala, še preden so bile ustvarjene razmere za oblikovanje teh kadrov na visokošolskih institucijah. Temu pritrjuje tudi podatek, da se je na Višji pedagoški šoli, odprti leta 1946 v Sarajevu, leta 1950 oblikovala Katedra za pedagogiko. Vendar je ta študij končala samo ena generacija 20 študentov, ker se je v tem času začel izvajati študij na Filozofski fakulteti v Sarajevu. Zaradi potrebe po strokovnem kadru v praksi je Ministrstvo za prosveto v Bosni in Hercegovini odločilo, da se leta 1954 določeno število izbranih učiteljev pošlje na študij pedagogike v Beograd in Zagreb. Prav ta skupina izbrancev je v času študija pokazala dobre rezultate in tako so bili oblikovani prvi kadri za ustanovitev Katedre za pedagogiko na Filozofski fakulteti v Sarajevu leta 1963 (Muradbegović 1984, str. 391).

Skoraj vsi bodoči profesorji na novoodprti Katedri za pedagogiko v Sarajevu so študirali in doktorirali v Beogradu. Med študenti iz Bosne in Hercegovine, ki so leta 1960 študirali v Beogradu, je večina imela zaključeno učiteljsišče in dve do tri leta delovne dobe praktičnega dela v šoli na delovnem mestu učitelja, nekateri pa so imeli tudi zaključeno višjo pedagoško šolo (Svrđlin 2005, str. 31). Podobno je bilo tudi z ustanovitelji Katedre za pedagogiko. Tudi profesorji Petar Mandić, Nikola Filipović, Muhamed Muradbegović in Branko Rakić so najprej delali na osnovnih šolah v Bosni in Hercegovini in v različnih prosvetnih odborih. Ob tem so izredno študirali pedagogiko in se pozneje zaposlili na Oddelku za filozofijo kot asistenti (Mandić in Filipović), po specializaciji v Beogradu pa so ustanovili Katedro za pedagogiko ter začeli pripravljati program in sprejem študentov. Pomembno je poudariti, da so bili vsi zgoraj navedeni profesorji člani SKOJ-a in pozneje KPJ-ja ter so imeli pomembne funkcije znotraj partijskih struktur, ob aktivnem sodelovanju v družbeno-političnem življenju. Profesor Filipović je bil celo predsednik Predsedstva Socialistične republike Bosne in Hercegovine (1988–1989).² Znano je, da je bil pomemben bosansko-hercegovski didaktik in avtor prvega učbenika *Didaktika* v Bosni in Hercegovini ter eden od četverice utemeljiteljev sodobne pedagoške misli v tej državi. Skupaj s profesorji Rakićem, Mandićem in Muradbegovićem³ je v šestdesetih letih 20. stoletja prispeval k preobratu v razvoju pedagoške misli

² Nikola Filipović (1926–2001) je bil pomemben bosansko-hercegovski (in jugoslovanski) didaktik in več kot 40 let javni in kulturni delavec. Njegov znanstveni in strokovni opus zajema 300 del. Osnovni področji njegovega znanstvenega dela sta bili vzgoja mladih in didaktika.

³ Muhamed Muradbegović (1928–1983): osnovna področja njegovega znanstvenega zanimanja so bila metodika osnovnošolskega pouka, težave visokošolske didaktike in vprašanja organizacije ter vsebine prostega časa mladih. Objavil je več del s to tematiko.

Petar Mandić (1927–1999) se je ukvarjal s težavami sodelovanja družine in šole, spolno vzgojo mladih in inovacijami pri pouku. Objavil je niz knjig in več kot 150 znanstvenih in strokovnih člankov. Bil je predsednik Zveze pedagoških društev Jugoslavije in Pedagoškega savjeta BiH.

Branko Rakić (1912–2002) se je ukvarjal s psihopedagogiko, pedagoško psihologijo, šolsko pedagogiko, metodologijo pedagoškega raziskovanja in psihologijo osebnosti. Objavil je več kot 200 znanstvenih in strokovnih del s teh področij (Komšić (ur.) 2010, str. 233–236).

in znanstvenoraziskovalne dejavnosti v vzgojno-izobraževalnem procesu na področju Bosne in Hercegovine. Do tega obdobja so se namreč pedagogi ukvarjali s tekočimi vprašanji pedagoške prakse in prosvetne politike, kar je bil v razmerah obnove in izgradnje šolskega sistema ter nezadostne razvitosti pedagoške teorije prepotraben proces. Filipović in omenjeni profesorji so »ob razvojno-aplikativnih vprašanjih raziskovali tudi temeljna teoretska vprašanja pedagogike, objavljali znanstveno-metodološko zasnovane raziskave, publicirali monografska dela, zasnovovali in zbirali znanstveni podmladek, vodili pedagoško založniško dejavnost in organizirali znanstvena srečanja.« (Ilić 2005, str. 51)

Seveda sta imela ustanovitev in delovanje Katedre za pedagogiko na Filozofski fakulteti v Sarajevu zelo velik pomen za razvoj pedagoške znanosti v državi. Omenjeni profesorji, pedagogi, so neposredno sodelovali v pripravi, vzpostavitvi in delovanju sprva Katedre za pedagogiko in pozneje Oddelka za pedagogiko in psihologijo, kot tudi pri ločevanju tega oddelka. Katedra za pedagogiko je prvo generacijo študentov vpisala leta 1963. K razvoju pedagoške znanosti so njeni člani prispevali tako »v tej sredini kot tudi širše, ker so bistveno prispevali k oblikovanju novih spoznanj in tehnologiji izobraževanja« (prav tam, str. 57). Prav tako so ti profesorji sodelovali v najpomembnejših aktivnostih Zveze pedagoških društev Bosne in Hercegovine in Jugoslavije; bili so uredniki pedagoških časopisov, ki so takrat izhajali (*Naša škola*, *Prosvjetni list*, *Porodica i dijete*), kot tudi ustanovitelji in uredniki pedagoške, psihološke in andragoške zbirke *Kreativnost* v okviru sarajevske založbe Svjetlost (prav tam).

Izmed vseh fakultet v nekdanji Jugoslaviji, na katerih se je izvajala pedagogika, se samo v Sarajevu niso izvajala predavanja iz predmeta zgodovina pedagogike in šolstva. Do leta 1969 je sicer gostoval prof. M. Ogrizović iz Zagreba, po tem pa so bila predavanja ukinjena. Profesor Filipović je, ob zavedanju nevarnosti marginaliziranja pomena zgodovine pedagogike in šolstva ter ignoriranja pedagoške dediščine, ki je bila pomembna za splošno kulturno dediščino države, nameraval rešiti ta problem. O tem pričajo teme takratnih magistrskih in doktorskih nalog, s katerimi je poskusil nekako zapolniti praznino zaradi zapostavljenosti zgodovine pedagogike in šolstva, kot na primer *Pedagoška misel v BiH 1918–1941* (kandidata Mladena Bevande) ali *Razvoj in problemi pedagoške znanosti v BiH 1945–1980* (kandidata Mileta Ilića). Da njegova prizadevanja niso bila zaman, vidimo iz referata ob praznovanju 20-letnice Oddelka za pedagogiko leta 1983, v katerem je bilo sklenjeno, »da se v najkrajšem času usposobijo kadri za potrebe raziskovanja zgodovine šolstva in pedagoških idej v Bosni in Hercegovini, ker so vidne potrebe posameznih regij in republike po teh kadrih« (Bevanda 2005, str. 118). Vendar se je na realizacijo tega sklepa čakalo polnih deset let.

Tudi Muradbegović navaja, da je Oddelek za pedagogiko s svojim znanstvenim angažiranjem spodbujal ustvarjanje potrebne klime, kar je imelo pomemben vpliv na širino in kakovost razvoja pedagoške misli v državi (Muradbegović 1986, str. 146–151). Na Oddelku za pedagogiko je bilo do leta 1979 14 zagovorov doktorskih disertacij in 28 zagovorov magistrskih tez iz pedagoških znanosti. Da pa so bile te teme pogosto režimsko določene in sprejete, se vidi iz naslovov posameznih magistrskih in doktorskih nalog – *Pedagoški smisel Marxovih del*, *Samoupravni*

sistem in vrednotne orientacije mladih, Odnos KPJ/SKJ do vzgoje in izobraževanja (Bevanda 2005, str. 118–121). Prvi profesor zgodovine pedagogike in šolstva na Oddelku za pedagogiko po uvedbi predmeta na oddelek leta 1993 je bil dr. Mladen Bevanda.

Sklep

Bosna in Hercegovina ni imela posebno plodnih tal za razvoj pedagoške misli, saj za to ni bilo zagotovljenih osnovnih institucionalnih pogojev. V letih po drugi svetovni vojni je na vseh področjih prevladovala družbena, gospodarska in kulturna zaostalost. Iz vsega navedenega je razvidno, da so različna obdobja v burni zgodovini Bosne in Hercegovine vplivala tudi na razvoj šolstva v tej deželi. Takratni režimi so na vseh ravneh izobraževanja določali način izvedbe pouka in primernost učnih vsebin. Po drugi svetovni vojni je bila dežela porušena in potreben je bil čas za obnovo in vzpostavitev normalnega življenja, kar pa je bil dolgotrajen proces, saj se je pojavljala težnja po hitri industrializaciji brez predhodno jasno postavljenih ciljev in predvidevanja tveganj. Kljub temu je vladajoča ideologija postavljala vidne (v smislu sodelovanja v boju in političnih aktivnostih) posameznike na pomembna mesta, kjer se je odločalo o izgradnji družbe in tudi o vprašanih prosvete in šolstva. Tako so ključna mesta v prosvetni politiki zavzemali ljudje, ki so hkrati imeli tudi visoke položaje v partiji in ki jih je slednja poslala na šolanje, da bi nato z njimi širila in spodbujala svoje ideje. Enaka situacija je bila tudi pri kadrovske zasedbi na novonastalih fakultetah v državi. Večina bodočih profesorjev je študirala v Beogradu ali Zagrebu, zatem pa so postali nosilci ali prenašalci idej samoupravnega socializma – sicer ni bilo možnosti za napredovanje. Tako sta v tem duhu nastali tudi pedagoška teorija in praksa ter se pod *budnim očesom* partije postopno razvijali. Čeprav so si številni politiki prizadevali za izločitev intelektualizma iz pouka in zmanjšanje vpliva gimnazij, ker naj bi se prav v teh »šolah čistih rok« podcenjevala vrednota dela, kot je pogosto trdil politik Rodoljub Čolaković, se to vendarle ni zgodilo v tolikšni meri, kot je bilo zaželeno. Navkljub vsem prizadevanjem, da bi se šolstvo v Bosni in Hercegovini moderniziralo, učitelji pa bi postali ključni dejavniki teh prizadevanj, je bilo to – presenetljivo – še naprej v težkem položaju ter neprestano pod nadzorom političnih interesov, pa tudi materialni položaj učiteljev ni bil na zavirljivi ravni. Premalo pozornosti se je namenjal tudi dejstvu, da so se za učiteljski poklic odločali predvsem tisti, ki niso imeli drugih možnosti. Zaradi tega so posamezni politiki pogosto opozarjali, da je osnovna šola temelj celotne družbe, in če se ta temelj ne bo gradil v socialističnem in sodobnem duhu, bo to negativno vplivalo na celotno šolstvo.

Literatura in viri

- Arslanagić, R. (1972). Vrijednost pionirskog samoupravljanja. V: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević in P. Mandić (ur.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, str. 5–10.
- Bevanda, M. (2001). *Pedagoška misao u BiH 1918-1941*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- Bevanda, M. (2005). Doprinos prof. dr. Nikole Filipovića povijesti pedagogije i školstva u BiH. V: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar in M. Slatina (ur.). Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, str. 118–121.
- Bročić, M. (1972). Mladi danas i sutra. V: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević in P. Mandić (ur.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, str. 11–19.
- Dobrivojević, I. (2011). Od ruralnog ka urbanom. Modernizacija Republike Bosne i Hercegovine u FNRJ (1945-1955). V: H. Kamberović (ur.). *Identitet Bosne i Hercegovinu kroz historiju 2*. Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu, str. 7–26.
- Filipović, N. (1971). Odnos pedagogije i politike u vremenu od 1945-1970. *Naša škola*, št. 9–10, str. 511–525.
- Hromadžić, M. (1982). Prevladan najveći problem u osnovnom obrazovanju. *Prosvjetni list*, št. 655, str. 4.
- Hromadžić, M. (1982). Najveći problem osnovnog obrazovanja je riješen. *Prosvjetni list*, št. 655. Sarajevo, str. 4–5.
- Ilić, M. (2005). Naučno-metodološke vrijednosti pedagoško-didaktičkog opusa profesora dr-a Nikole Filipovića. V: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar in M. Slatina (ur.). *Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, str. 50–59.
- Ilić, M. (1989). Učešće bosansko-hercegovačkih naučnih pedagoških radnika u radu naučnih i stručnih skupova (1945-1980). V: N. Filipović, R. Arslanagić in V. Bandur (ur.). *Zbornik radova sa simpozijuma 100 godina učiteljstva u BiH*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, str. 310–320.
- Kamberović, H. (2000). *Prema modernom društvu*. Tešanj: Centar za kulturu i obrazovanje.
- Komšić, I. (ur.). (2010). *Spomenica Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu (1950-2010)*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet.
- Muradbegović, M. (1972). *Motivacija za učešće pionira u samoupravljanju*. V: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević in P. Mandić (ur.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, str. 44–54.
- Kalezić, P. (1985). Počeci svenarodnog osnovnog obrazovanja. *Prosvjetni list*, št. 694, str. 10.
- Mesihović, M. (1987). Pozdravna riječ na svečanoj akademiji povodom 100 godina učiteljstva u Bosni i Hercegovini. *Naša škola*, št. 1–2, str. 3–5.
- Muradbegović, M. (1984). Dvadeset godina odsjeka za pedagogiju i psihologiju. *Naša škola*, št. 5–6, str. 391–400.
- Muradbegović, M. (1986). Fundamentalna i primjenjena istraživanja u pedagoškim naukama u BiH. *Naša škola*, št. 7–10, str. 146–151.
- Papić, M. (1987). Sto godina učiteljstva u BiH – referat na svečanoj akademiji. *Naša škola*, št. 1–2, str. 6–11.
- Papić, M. (1981). *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1941-1955*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Subotić, G. (1984). Pedagoške misli Rodoljuba Čolakovića. *Naša škola*, št. 3–4, str. 232–240.

- Svrđlin, Đ. (2005). Život i djelo Nikole Filipovića. V: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar in M. Slatina (ur.). *Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, str. 29–44.
- Šipovac, N. (1975). Nepismenost-bauk prošlosti i sadašnjosti. *Naša škola*, št. 9–10, str. 531–536.
- Šušnjara, S. (2013a). *Razvoj specijalnog školstva u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1958. do 1990. godine*. Zagreb, Sarajevo: Synopsis.
- Šušnjara, S. (2013b). Učiteljstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini u vrijeme Austro-Ugarske. *Anali za povjest školstva*, 12, št. 37, str. 55–74.

Prevedla: dr. Ksenija Domiter Protner

Snježana Šušnjara

Development of school systems and pedagogy in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the period after World War II to the 1970s

Abstract: The intensive development of the educational system in Bosnia and Herzegovina started immediately after the war. This was dictated by the needs of economic development, industrialization of the country and by the transfer of the labor force from the agricultural to industrial sector, but also by the changes in the whole of the social and political structure and “necessity to engage the whole working class and other citizens to be successfully involved in the development of the socialistic society.” (Hromadžić 1982, pp. 4–5)

There was a constant gap between a sudden increase of natality in the afterwar period, the number of children who needed to attend schools and the amount of students, schools space and the lack of teachers.

The so called old school dominated in schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was based on verbalism, intellectualism and it was not practical at all. After 1945, Bosnia and Herzegovina accepted the Marxist theory and its decisive input towards education. A school declaratively became national, accessible, obligatory and free for all. Functioning in this way, education became a weapon in the politicians' hands who dreamed of creating a new socialistic individual. An influence of soviet pedagogy was evident. This pedagogy attempted to exclusively impose its principles as the only worthy, as it was the case in all the countries of „national democracy“ or socialistic countries created after the Second World War. Nevertheless, pedagogy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was a Marxist one, but it attempted to be focused on pupil and to put him/her, at least declaratively as the subject of the educational process.

Keywords: afterwar development, natality, pupils, Marxist pedagogy, socialistic approach

UDC: 37(091)

Scientific article

Snježana Šušnjara, Ph.D., associate professor, University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Pedagogy, Franje Račkog 1, 71000 Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina; e-mail for correspondence: ssusnjara@yahoo.com

Introduction

The school system and pedagogy in the former Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot be fully understood without a discussion of the school systems that functioned before the Second World War. Therefore, first, we present the school systems in the pedagogical history of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the second part of this work, we explain the development of the school system, showing how pedagogy was enhanced in the new socialistic period established after the Second World War. This period refers to the time when the new socialistic country of Yugoslav and its republics appeared. The efforts of this new regime were concentrated on establishing self-managed socialism. The republics were responsible for developing socialism through their educational systems. In 1945, Bosnia and Herzegovina was predominantly an agrarian country and economically underdeveloped. A majority of the population (83%) lived in rural areas. Only 2% of the population settled in towns. According to Kamberović (2000), almost half of a million people wore primitive hand-made leather shoes. These conditions not only resulted from the war's destruction but also because of the previous historical development of BiH. Following illustration clearly showed how difficult the situation was at the time. In the Allied government, founded in 1945, Briner, an assistant to a minister, was required to organize written instructions related to behavior rules in setting up a Ministry. More precisely, he wrote that it was forbidden to take down bulbs, scratch walls and doors, throw garbage out of windows, spit in the corridors, among other regulations. He particularly gave instructions on how to use a toilet (*ibid.*, p. 15). This sociocultural structure of society, from which future state employees as well as future teachers were to be recruited, was not a promising aspect. Bosnia and Herzegovina had a specific historical background and its society, which completely differed from other societies in former Yugoslavia. Such a socioeconomic situation and inhabitant structure characterized the BiH society for several years after the Second World War.

In presenting this period of time, I attempted to uncover the social and ideological basis of a socialistic approach and the development of an educational system using a historical method. I also analyzed works of leading pedagogues

of the time in BiH, who participated in the rearrangements and changes in the BiH society. These pedagogues were founders of the department of pedagogy at the faculty of philosophy and authored numerous pedagogy-related articles and books. Naturally, the Communist party controlled these processes. The contents of pedagogical periodicals were full of ideas and speeches of leading politicians who worked as educators at the time. However, the current pedagogical literature related to the socialistic period is unfortunately of poor quality, and I had to concentrate on the texts from the researched period to obtain the necessary information. These contents were burdened with ideological phrases that were characteristic of the time, which proved that one-sided facts were present, without showing a clear and realistic picture of the situation at hand. Everything was dictated by policy and its viewpoints of certain situations were presented in the same manner.

This study presents the development of schooling systems in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the socialistic period and attempts to introduce certain assumptions and hesitant thoughts regarding this historical period from the present perspective.

Political situation in the country before the Second World War

During the period of the Austrian–Hungarian monarchy, the school system in Bosnia and Herzegovina was for the first time created systematically and according to plan. To address the state of education at the time, public elementary schools were first set up and organized, and functioned according to patterns that prevailed in the entire monarchy. Later, the authority began establishing conditions to open secondary schools and among them, teacher training schools. Apart from teaching and lecturing, teachers were initiators and founders of several educational and popular magazines and the main promoters of the newest educational achievements in Europe. Therefore, they brought modern perspective to BiH pedagogy, which was partly based on enlightenment (Bevanda 2001, p. 274). Teachers were collectors of national treasures, bringing new things into the regions they worked. They modernized life in the social community to improve living conditions of the inhabitants and had multiple responsibilities in society. Therefore, “...elementary schools had never been only for the pupils, especially in villages. The school was an educational center for the entire community.” (Papić 1987, p. 8)

The first educational magazines appeared during this period of time. These magazines significantly influenced the development of pedagogical ideas (*Školski vjesnik*, *Učiteljska zora*, *Kršćanska obitelj*, and *Srpska škola*) (Bevanda 2001, pp. 47–49). A majority of the educational personnel of that period finished their schooling in Zagreb, Belgrade, Prague, Vienna, or Graz. When they returned home, they worked as teachers or professors in the BiH schools. Further, Herbartian standards prevailed in the school system and a majority of the teachers followed this style in the educational process. To ensure a better position for teachers and to fight for their rights, the teachers united through various teacher associations. This practice continued in the regimes that followed (Šušnjara 2013b, pp. 57–65).

In contrast to the practice of the Austrian–Hungarian Empire, where education was becoming widespread, schooling stagnated in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians (SHS) and it can be said that it was merely undeveloped in BiH. A crisis prevailed in all aspects of the states functioning and the cultural-educational sector of life was not spared. The promotion of officially structured attitudes and legal regulations did not correspond with real life and school practices. The number of children who attended schools was small and the lack of teachers was obvious. The modification of a certain school reforms was an abstract idea. As mentioned, schools worked under the influence of the Herbartian pedagogy. Nevertheless, one particularity is noteworthy. While the teachers in the Austro–Hungarian Empire created the pedagogical heritage, during the period of SHS rule, professors undertook this mission. They learnt about new trends in education from neighboring countries and thus, became aware of the working school phenomenon and its characteristics. Because the pedagogues and professors from secondary schools in BiH received a foreign education, they brought the influences of new pedagogical theories and practice to the schools. New experiences needed to be adopted for the existing educational conditions in BiH because, as Bevanda said, “Bosnia and Herzegovina could not had been fertile soil for the development of pedagogy, with the lack of the institutional frames for such actions [...]” (Bevanda 2001, p. 274)¹.

By accounting for the abovementioned factors, we note that no significant positive turn in educational policy occurred in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia during the period. In fact, given the situation, everything in the country was prescribed in a centralized order without proper scientific infrastructure, and was unified and mostly restricted. This led to a dual and dogmatic school system. Children were educated in the spirit of loyalty to the King and the dynasty (ibid., p. 281).

From a wider scientific perspective, the development of secondary schools between two wars—especially teacher training schools which gathered professors of pedagogy, philosophy, and psychology—was a stimulus for approaching pedagogical problems and school practices. The special characteristics of this period were the intensive development of civil pedagogy with the mutual involvement of the theoretical conception of an active working school and the dominant influence of the Herbartian pedagogy. The educational magazines *Učitelj* and *Pregled*, published between the two wars significantly contributed to spreading pedagogical ideas and concepts at the time. Similarly, *Budućnost*, a pedagogical library, also contributed to the cause (Muradbegović 1986, pp. 146–151).

¹ It is important to emphasize that there was a book in BiH published at the end of 19th century, in 1887. The book dealt with pedagogy presenting the practical work of teaching. Jeglič, Anton Bonaventura (1850–1937): *Uzgojeslovje za učitelje i učiteljske pripravnike* (according to the best authors, collected by Antun Jeglič), in Croatian language, published in Sarajevo: Spindler i Löschner, 1887, II, 249pp.

Political and pedagogical implications of developing school systems after World War II

After the Second World War, Bosnia and Herzegovina's society faced a complete transformation. In addition, the physiognomy of settlements changed because of the sudden industrialization and movement of labor forces from villages to towns. Sociocultural differences between villages and towns were not as significant given that industrial centers were a new phenomenon in the area. As emphasized in the introduction, a majority of the pre-war population in BiH lived in villages (83%) and 2% of population lived in towns. However, forced industrialization, which occurred from 1945 to 1953, created a feeling of insecurity among the local population. This also provoked a rapid disappearance of the village and its physiognomy. Furthermore, this transformation interrupted villagers' daily lives, rendering them unprepared and unaware of the situation. In some cases, the authority demonstrated force to dislocate villagers from their homes and include them in processes they did not understand. These actions also contributed to the transformation of towns. New industrial facilities and laborer sheds were built on the areas where villages were previously located. The fertile soils disappeared and this territory became a part of a town. The rural population was forced to move to industrial zones and villager's began applying to the area their own customs and ways of living. This provoked a conflict between two completely different groups of people. In the beginning, villagers who were of a majority won, but they lost their power as time passed and finally, lost the battle in 1953 (Kamberović 2000, p. 184–185). The process of modernization, which started after the war, was not welcomed by a majority of rural population. With respect to the favorable tendency demonstrated by the authority, the most important results noted were within the social structure of the population. Namely, while the urban population increased, that of the rural decreased.

In the light of the modernization of society and the decreasing number of illiterate people, which totaled 70% after the end of the war, intensive work was initiated to develop the educational system. This effort was dictated by not only economic growth, forced industrialization of the country, and the transformation of labor from agronomy, but also changes in the entire sociopolitical structure and the necessity that all working people and civilians successfully participate in the development of the socialistic society with their decisions and engagement. (Hromadžić 1982, pp. 4–5) However, this process was not easy and was not without obstacles. The lack of teachers was evident and a part of the pre-war teachers was not ready to adopt and follow the new ideas. It was estimated that three-fourth of the teachers had finished a basic course instead of attending a teacher training school. The amount of books was poor but at the same time, the demand for books was not encouraging. Libraries in villages were sometimes considered "a pile of books pressed into some bookcases in a school, national board or village community without any order." (Dobrivojević 2011, p. 15) Even though the opening of libraries and houses of culture was propagated, in some parts of BiH, the number of libraries was smaller than that in the time of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. For

example, Vareš, which had 10 libraries, had none after the war (ibid.). Therefore, the educational intentions from 1945 to 1946 were encouraged by further ideas where “in our elementary and secondary schools we face questions of methods, content and relations towards pupils. In accordance to this, there is a problem with the existing teaching staff and efforts are being made to create new teaching staff. The spirit of labor in the community should get round as soon as possible [...] These are not easy questions for the larger number of older teachers [...] for often the intentions are completely unfruitful when we are dealing with teachers who are principally and consciously against new concepts” (Papić 1981, p. 104). The most important acquirement in 1947–1948, an entirely new phenomenon for the BiH school system, was the seven-year schooling at a time when four-year schools prevailed. This was because of the lack of teachers and pupils, especially in the rural regions (ibid.).

Some teachers acquired their diplomas after finishing shorter school programs or educational courses. They were also eager to express loyalty to the current policy, accepting to promote its rules and attitudes. Thus, there was a difference among progressive teachers who were committed to their profession and those who did not take their profession seriously. Subotić claimed that the minister of education, Rodoljub Čolaković, emphasized more often: “The profession of a teacher is probably one of the most difficult professions and it could be performed only by those people who understand it as a profession. Then they perform it with the excitement of creators and with enormous patience at the same time. These are people who are aware that their work is a longstanding, systematic and constant effort” (Subotić 1985, p. 238).

In December 1949, on the third Plenum of the League of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (SK KPJ), a settling account on dogmatism in science and pedagogy was given. It explained that the aim of education should be “[...] the forming of an universally educated free constructor of socialism, who is distanced from bureaucracy and narrow mindedness” (ibid., p. 112). This introduced new qualities in theoretical thinking and a break in ideas full of dogmatism and byrocratic opinions, meaning a dislodging from the SSSR. This political settling of accounts with Stalinism was followed by the pedagogues and their articles regarding sviet pedagogy, which highlighted the negative points of this approach and related delusions in political and theoretical visions. They contributed with this to, as Filipović noted, “an affirmation of dialectic and materialistic opinions in pedagogy” (Filipović 1971, p. 514).

After separating from the influence of sviet pedagogy, great emphasis was laid on the intention of all educational subjects to include more practical work in schools, focusing on the education of future laborers. Politicians preferred to emphasize these aspects in their speeches. Therefore, Rodoljub Čolaković, the vice-president of the government, pointed out at a meeting of teachers in Kragujevac in 1958 that the “intellectual spirit had to be broken down to peace and to liquidate. By this, I understood this was solving one of the basic problems in our schools. Put away the school walls! More physical work – laboratories, more school gardens, more terrains for gymnastics, more of all issues that would satisfy the

needs and propensities of the pupils! The demands of pupils pleading for more activities, but used a new path instead of the previous one that lead nowhere, that does not help the pupils to develop their potential to flourish and fly [...]” (Čolaković in Subotić 1984, p. 236). However, the official educational policy was uniformed and full of normative tendencies. This was the reason why it was not possible to bring in new initiatives in the educational practice. At that time, it was declared “we need education which would prepare and educate our children for life in which only work and labor results define the position of human beings within society. The individual should be formed according to the Marxist standard and its world view. The school has an irreplaceable role in the development of self-managed socialistic awareness of the young generation. This is an important condition for the young generation if we want them to take over responsibility for further self-managed development of our society” (Mesihović 1987, pp. 4–5). In the 1950s, gymnasiums were criticized because schools were considered to be a place where the noble spirit prevailed and physical work was often underestimated. These schools were called “noble schools” and their influence needed to be reduced. The key issue was the fear of the increasing network of these schools and their direct influence on the industry, which could result in the disproportion of personnel. Consequently, these schools “[...] did not prepare qualified laborers at all, but laborers who would lead the factories.” From the aforementioned, the future of how the socialist system would be managed depended on who managed the factories (Subotić 1985, pp. 234–235). Čolaković constantly focused on this danger and warned that “the spirit which prevailed in the school is intellectualistic one, no matter on declaration of polytechnisation of the teaching process [...]” (ibid., p. 233).

Together with the overall regulation of the educational system and the reformation of the school system structure, changes were made in the 1950s in connection with the promotion of the self-management of students through schools and educational magazines. The key point was “the subject of students self-management should be defined by starting with a general normative definition of self-management (as a basic social relation), and later review a natural perspective on the role of students labor which they carry out, as well as from the position of their ages” (Bročić 1975, p. 17). To the effect of this approach, it was considered that student self-management contained the basic pre-conditions for the regular development of a young person, and this was a tool used to fighting against the alienation of a child’s personality, rights and duties within the process of education, and self-development. Children would have a healthier life if they were educated in self-management conditions.

In fact, “[...] raising children in the spirit of self-management is primarily a social issue – equally economic and educational, sociological, philosophical, pedagogical and psychological. A child cannot be alienated from integral care and the interests of the labor class for the building of a modern self-managed society” (Arslanagić 1975, pp. 8–9). Together with the development of schools, the enlightening of teachers’ spirit was also worked on, because they were responsible for transferring their knowledge to the students. However, the teachers’ material

position was not a prosperous one. This proves that in self-managed socialism, which proclaimed the equality of everybody's work, the status of teachers had not significantly changed in comparison to previous periods. This was analyzed at the first round table, which took place in Banja Luka in 1969. The meeting was addressed the topic of *The Position of Teachers in a Self-managed Socialistic Society*. Petar Mandić claimed that the material position of the educational laborer was not at a satisfying level, even though the general law of education determined the educational sphere as an activity of major social importance. Therefore, such contradictory and unfavorable conditions provoked a belief concerning educational laborers that they were not adequately recognized socially and their material status was lower than that of others with the same qualifications within the social and economic spheres. (Ilić 1989, p. 311) Despite all these objections, the material status of teachers had not significantly improved in the years that followed. This can be seen in the interview done with Rodoljub Čolaković in 1983, which took place 25 years later. He expressed education as his greatest interest and stated that "Today we have about 150.000 teachers. This in military terms is, 15 divisions and – imagine what they could have done if they consisted of enthusiastic individuals, 'members of the SKOJ! Do you know what power this is? [...] Yes, but look how badly teachers are paid! We do not call them teachers any more, but [...] I can't even say this word which has changed that beautiful teacher's name [...]" (Subotić 1985, p. 239).

Lack of school space and teachers: identifying ways of modernization

As mentioned, after the Second World War, a new functional state needed to be established. The entire country was a huge construction site and education significantly suffered during this period. With the lack of facilities, numerous children were left out of school for several years. Later, as adults without an education, they needed to find a job and this was not an easy task. Therefore, the University of working people organized evening schools for them, and thus, they were able to satisfy the working class norms (Šušnjara 2013a, p. 43). In the 1950s, it was recommended that the school of the socialistic society should primarily aim at building character "to raise active laborers for the socialistic country" (Subotić 1984, p. 234).

Another problem was the lack of teachers. People who attended the partisan's courses during the war in the liberated regions became post-war teachers, who contributed to the mass education of the people (Šušnjara 2013a, p. 44). Together with the country's reconstruction, a political struggle began emerging, aiming to form new relationships within society to incite citizens to accept new ways of living and thinking. The political forums dictated the developmental directions of the theory and practice of educational work. The words of Josip Broz Tito were quoted in many cases as motivation and a warning regarding what was recommended to be done and what was not allowed. Filipović pointed out that Tito knew how to make strong relationship between the party's policy and pedagogy. This was

the reason why “[...] the domination of policy over pedagogy was ‘cultivated’ and accepted as a normal fact which had a positive effect towards understanding the behavior of political and professional employees in ministries, committees and boards, as well as pedagogues in different institutions” (Filipović 1971, p. 512). To illustrate the mentioned cultivation, Filipović presented priorities in the development of youngsters, which was highlighted by his comrade Tito. These were made up of learning, physical development of youngsters, and the reconstruction of a destroyed country. If it were acted upon in a contrary manner, negative consequences would be foreseeable “[...] for a student’s personality and for the future of the socialistic transformation of our society” (ibid.). Youngsters, mainly from villages, generally participated “willingly” in organized work activities in 1949, where facilitators from certain enterprises would visit to recruit them for work in industry and mining. This was also aimed at preventing their return to villages (Kamberović 2000, p. 143). Nevertheless, through the process of creating an industrial society and decreasing the role of the agrarian field, the opposite was achieved, which annulled everything that was said about the people’s progress. The Yugoslav authorities, who were exalted with their ideologically colored picture of a society, were unable to feel the essence of the society they wanted to transform, because their social consciousness significantly differed from that of managers (ibid.). There was a lack of critical judgment on the processes that developed at the time as well as the lack of awareness that a majority of the youth were from families that were blackmailed and forced to change their settlements, way of living, and thinking. The reality was completely different from the one presented in the literature of the time.

The educational magazine *Naša škola*, which was established in 1950, played an important role in developing pedagogical theory and practice in the post-war period. The magazine influenced the instigation of empirical and theoretical researches and the transfer of pedagogical theory and practice, all with an aim to produce new experts in the science (Muradbegović 1986, p. 146). The Pedagogical Society of SR BiH, founded in 1950, founded magazine *Naša škola*. The society was established, as Muradbegović pointed out, at the time of the consolidation of pedagogical theory and practice, when practically and theoretically, it came to the clear delimitations and conflicts with the dogmatic approaches, bureaucracy, and all other values “[...] which were strange to socialism within pedagogy and in the whole educational institution and other forms of social life” (Muradbegović 1980, p. 300). Pedagogical theory and practice in SR BiH began to increasingly produce its own solutions by relying on lessons of “[...] Marxists classics, genuine trends of national-freedom revolution and developmental directions and relations of our self-managed society” (ibid., p. 301). Constant motivations were arriving from congress’ resolutions, programs, and the documents of KPJ and SKJ, and especially Josip Broz Tito’s speeches, acts, and messages. The members of the pedagogical society significantly contributed to the development of pedagogical theory and practice. They were members of various movements and sociopolitical organizations, institutions, and commissions (ibid.). During the discussion related to the preparation of school reforms in the 1950s, there were objections that the school was more

educational than an institution that reared children. Upbringing was deemed the spirit of communist morals (Subotić 1985, p. 235). On the topic of the more direct servicing of schooling toward the production of material goods, Vrabec Miroslav, a professor at a higher pedagogical school in Banja Luka, emphasized during the round table meeting related to teachers' position in 1969, that such an approach conditioned the transfer of attention from upbringing to education. Therefore, modern pedagogical theory "by reflecting on current practices, evolved through innovations primarily advanced educational capacities of the young generation [...]" (Ilić 1989, p. 314). Ilić also wondered "If it was indicative that the school has a program of education and does not have a program for the ethical formation of a pupil, that theory and practice of ethical formation are incomparably poorly developed in comparison with the theory and practice of the educational forming of a pupil ... Teachers are, consequently, primarily instructors and organizers of pupil's learning and the reasons for appeals [...] that teachers before anything else should be the rearer, who could objectively have only a declarative but not active reach in the world of today" (ibid.).

Problem of illiteracy and its resolution

It is important to emphasize that illiteracy was an obstacle in the post-war period in the country that had started with its developmental process. The years before the war contributed to this process, when the majority of people were left out of schools. In 1941, there were about 70% illiterate people in BiH. About 150,000 pupils went to elementary schools taught by 4,100 teachers who worked in 1,100 elementary schools, which had classes up to the fourth grade. There were 25,000 students in secondary schools and 1,000 professors. Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have any faculty except the theological faculty (Šušnjara 2013a, p. 46). "The controversial heritage of the colonial position of BiH and its consequences can be seen in the field of education, culture, health and social care" (Šipovac 1975, pp. 531–536).

More intensive work on the organization of elementary education started in 1945. The regular school years in elementary schools started in November 1945–1946. This is because after the end of the previous school years, the new school year began in June 1945 and finished in October (Papić 1981, pp. 100–102). "Thus, educational activities reached a new dimension. New elementary schools were opening with proper curriculums. Today's elementary schools are products of those war schools [...]" (Kalezić 1985, p. 10). It is obvious that the educational process in BiH began right from scratch. However, on problem at the time were the school buildings. There were 101 schools that were on state property and 32 that were on private property. These schools somehow functioned in the post-war period. Together with the country's reconstruction, the school network was in a construction phase as well. (Šušnjara 2013a, p. 46). The party officers underlined that fighting against illiteracy in BiH should take precedence. However, the process of educating people was led without previously elaborated plans and this was

why these courses initially lasted only two weeks. Teachers were mostly engaged in this process, but the students were also involved. The authorities had pointed out that educational action should be promoted through not only existing educational-cultural associations but also various conferences, different performances, lecturing, newspapers, and through commemorating the struggle against illiteracy and “individual convincing.” The most important role of making these courses popular was played by individuals who had finished the teacher’s courses. A special emphasis was placed on educating women on, for example, healthcare awareness, cleanliness, cooking, preparing winter provisions, rearing children, and treating ill people and pregnant woman. Even though great efforts were made and the number of those who were educated was significant, the reality was different. A majority of the villagers, especially women, were not trained to read and write. Therefore, the women began finding excuses to avoid this obligation (Dobrivojević 2011, pp. 14–15). According to the census from 1953, Bosnia and Herzegovina reported to have 39.4% illiterate people. However, this information should be taken with reserve, that is, even the party officers admitted that alphabetical courses were “mostly running for numbers than the real status of those made literate.” In fact, there were several instances in which people who forgot how to read and write were asked to take the course again and subsequently, reported as literate (ibid. pp. 14–15).

In the 1950s, it was pointed out that schools needed to be the socialistic community and these changes should not be made superficially. Subotić quoted that Čolaković often claimed that “[...] the school of a socialistic society must be primarily rearing one, this means to educate the active laborers of the socialist country. This was not accomplished systematically in this ten year” (Subotić 1985, p. 234).

In a report by the commission related to the problem of illiteracy, it was said that illiteracy was not a result of “a cultural heritage” but it was the equivalent of an unhappy history and “the darkness of the occupations that oppressed our poor people” (Šipovac 1975, pp. 531–536). Therefore, Šipovac admitted that is a well known fact that an illiterate man is not a complete person, neither in his family, neither in production nor in the whole of society. Illiteracy is the real illness of our social sphere of life; it is one that has the biggest and darkest pains” (ibid.). Positive efforts have obviously been taken to contribute to progress and empower the communist regime and dogmas. They needed to be transferred to young people and the working class that were mostly illiterate. “In this moment of our socialistic development, illiteracy cannot be tolerated. An autonomous society requests conscious citizens who need to be educated in order to contribute to their development” (ibid.). Therefore, it was concluded that illiteracy was not exclusively the concern of educational institutions but a problem faced by the society as a whole. In 1975, SR BiH had 109 municipalities, half of which had the status of being economically undeveloped areas. A majority of these areas got 70% financial aid from the Republic to construct elementary schools, whereas developed municipalities financed this process from their own financial funds. (Hromadžić 1982, p. 4).

As mentioned, many children who were a school age did not attend schools, as was the case with many adults, after the Second World War. There were 120,722 students within 718 elementary schools and 1,434 teachers in the first school year after the war. Schools had an average of 170 students and every teacher worked with approximately 80 students per day. The concept of a modern school with high educational standards was analyzed with the concept of school building reconstruction. Following this, the Constitution of 1950 made education compulsory for children aged 7–15 years in a school that had up to the eighth grade. However, the higher birth rate in the post-war period and the significant number of children who missed on going to school because of the war created a large discrepancy between the number of children and the number of seats available (Šušnjara 2013a, p. 48). Even though 100 schools were built in the first decade of post-war development, they were not enough to satisfy the BiH needs for schools. At the end of the 1960s, BiH had 2,948 school buildings with 9,606 classrooms. In comparison with other republics and regions, this project saw maximum completion. However, this was not enough for the existing number of children that constantly increased; the demand was 28.6% higher than that in other schools in Yugoslavia. At the same time, some schools were unable to accommodate them in the grades as per their age. The lack of the space was an ongoing problem. Moreover, work conditions were not satisfactory. Considering these conditions, it was decided to start a project called “1.000 schools in BiH.” A social agreement was signed and the project initiated. At first, it was planned to build 1,031 school buildings, but demographic movements and the intensive construction of the roads proved that the existing network of elementary schools was irrational. Therefore, the construction of new schools was stopped in regions where there was a significant decrease of the number of students. This also meant an increase in the construction of the total school space by about 60.000 m². This space was intended to serve different laboratories and workshops, among other facilities (ibid.). It was promised that all resources implemented for schooling and especially for the teaching staff would be multiplied and given back to the community. This was especially pointed out by Rodoljub Čolaković in the 1957 National Assembly: “Investment in education today is of a great importance, even more important than investment in factories and other economic objects” (Subotić 1985, p. 238). According to the statistics, from 1945 to 1953, the educational level of Bosnian-Herzegovian population was increasing. In 1945–1946, there were 783 schools with 2,161 pupils, while in 1952–1953 there were 2,353 schools with 330,867 pupils (Kamberović 2000, p. 82). Kamberović also claims that “because of the fact that modernized processes were not an input in all social spheres (especially politics), it was discovered at the end of this period that the Bosnian society did not go over the borders of traditionalism and therefore, did not enter into the category of modernized societies” (ibid., p. 185).

Establishment of the Chair of pedagogy

As emphasized, Bosnia and Herzegovina did not have faculties or universities between the two wars (except religious faculties). In 1948, there were only 4,000 highly educated persons in the whole of BiH (Bevanda 2001, p. 17). The University in Sarajevo was established in 1949, and subsequently in Banja Luka in 1975, Tuzla in 1976, and Mostar in 1977. The faculty of philosophy in Sarajevo was established in 1950 and the chair of pedagogy in 1963. Higher pedagogical schools were opened in Mostar and Banja Luka in 1951. The Academy of Art and Science was established in 1966 in Sarajevo (*ibid.*).

The sudden development of educational institutions in BiH was conditioned by the modern treatment of the development of pedagogical theory and practice. The growing needs requested that experts in pedagogy work in schools and organizations associated with labor and social services. Thus, a need was created even before conditions were made to form these cadres in high school institutions. In 1946, data from the higher pedagogical school was made public in Sarajevo, confirming that the chair of pedagogy was formed at the Academy in 1950. Only one generation of around 20 students finished their education. The forming of this chair overlapped with the establishment of the faculty of philosophy in Sarajevo. The constant need for professional education forced the Ministry of Education in BiH to send a certain number of teachers to study pedagogy in Belgrade. The group showed good results and this was the starting point for establishing the chair of pedagogy at the faculty of philosophy in Sarajevo in 1963 (Muradbegović 1984, p. 391).

Almost all future professors at the newly opened chair of pedagogy in Sarajevo studied and finished their PhD in Belgrade. Of the students in BiH who studied in Belgrade in the 1960s, a majority had completed their education at the teacher's training school and worked 2–3 years as teachers. Some of them even enrolled at higher pedagogical school (Svrđlin 2005, p. 31), which was also the case with individuals from the chair of pedagogy. Professors Mandić, Filipović, Muradbegović, and Rakić first worked in elementary schools in BiH and were members of various educational boards. They studied pedagogy as well as worked as teachers and were later employed at the department of philosophy as assistants (namely Mandić and Filipović). Once they finished their specialization in Belgrade, they founded the chair of pedagogy and began implementing working programs and accepting students. It is important to emphasize that all the mentioned professors were members of the SKOJ, and later, the KPJ. They also had important functions within the party's structures, actively participated in the sociopolitical sphere, and self-managed labor programs. Professor Filipović was even the president of the Presidency of SR BiH (1988–1989)² He was also known for being an expert in didactics in BiH and was the author of the first book on didactics

² Nikola Filipović (1926-2001) was a distinguished Bosnian-Herzegovian (and Yugoslav) didactic, public and cultural worker for over 40 years. The scientific and professional work of dr. Filipović is made of cca. 300 works. The basic field of his scientific work was the education of youngsters and didactics.

in BiH (Didactics ... 1977) as well as one of the four founders of modern pedagogical thought in BiH. Together with professors Branko Rakić, Petar Mandić, and Muhamed Muradbegović,³ he contributed to the modernization and development of pedagogical thoughts and scientific and research activities in the educational process in BiH in the 1960s. Until that time, pedagogues dealt with the current issues of pedagogical practice and the educational policy, which were conditions for the necessary process of reconstructing and building of the school system and the development of pedagogical theory. Filipović and the abovementioned professors “[...] apart from developmental-applicative issues also studied fundamental-theoretical issues of pedagogy, where they promoted scientific-methodological based researches, published monographic works, created and gathered scientific new generations, founded editing-pedagogical activities and organized scientific gatherings” (Ilić 2005, p. 51).

However, the founding and actions of the chair of pedagogy at the faculty of philosophy in Sarajevo was of great importance to the development of pedagogical science in BiH. The aforementioned professors and pedagogues indirectly participated in the preparation, establishment, and actions at the chair of pedagogy, and later, through the department of pedagogy–psychology as well as through a division of the same department. The chair of pedagogy accepted the first generation of students in 1963, and had the key responsibility of developing pedagogical science in addition to other education functions. The pedagogical works of its members were crucial to “[...] this region and wider because these works made great contributions in innovations of acknowledgement and in educational technology” (ibid., p. 57). These professors also participated in the most important activities of the union of pedagogical societies of BiH and Yugoslavia; were editors and correspondents of pedagogical magazines of the time (*Naša škola*, *Prosvjetni list*, and *Porodica i dijete*); as well as founders and editors of pedagogical, psychological, and the adult pedagogy library Kreativnost set up by the Publishing House Svjetlost, Sarajevo (ibid.).

At all the faculties where pedagogy was taught in former Yugoslavia, only the faculty in Sarajevo did not have lectures on the history of pedagogy and schooling. Although professor M. Ogrizović would visit from Zagreb as a guest professor on the history of pedagogy and schooling, this stopped in 1969. Professor Filipović attempted to solve this problem. He was aware of the importance of subject and the pedagogical heritage of BiH as the general and cultural history of the BiH peoples. The topics of the master’s and doctoral theses proved the efforts of Fili-

³ Muhamed Muradbegović (1928-1983) was an expert for the methods of elementary school teaching; he especially dealt with issues concerning free time of youngsters, and the problems of university teaching. He published several works in these fields.

Petar Mandić (1927-1999) dealt with issues of co-operation in the school and family, the sexual education of youngsters and innovations in the teaching process. He published several books and more than 150 scientific articles. He was the president of the Union of the Pedagogical Societies of Yugoslavia and the Pedagogical Council of BiH.

Branko Rakić (1912-2002) dealt with psychopedagogy, pedagogical psychology, school pedagogy, methodology of pedagogical research and the psychology of a person. He published more than 200 scientific works in these fields (Komšić 2010, pp. 233–236).

pović, who attempted to compensate for this emptiness because of the discontent of the history of pedagogy and schooling. Some of the topics included Pedagogical thought in BiH 1918–1941 and Development and problems of pedagogical science in BiH 1945–1980. However, his efforts were in vain and this was visible from the report made in 1983, during the 20 year anniversary of the department of pedagogy. The report concluded that “[...] the Republic and some of its regions needed experts from the field of the history of education and researches related to pedagogical ideas which were necessary. This process should be done as soon as possible” (Bevanda 2005, p. 118). Nevertheless, this conclusion was realized only 10 years later.

Muradbegović also claimed that the department created the necessary climate with its scientific engagement and this significantly influenced the quality and quantity of development of pedagogical thought in BiH (Muradbegović 1986, pp. 146–151). Until 1979, 14 doctoral theses and 28 master’s theses were defended in the field of pedagogical science at the department of pedagogy. Some topics of master’s and doctoral works were politically colored to please the regime, and this was obvious from their titles, for example, *The pedagogical meaning of Marx’s work*, *The selfmanaged systems and orientation values of youngsters*, and *The relation of KPJ/SKJ towards upbringing and education* (Bevanda 2005, pp. 118–121). Mladen Bevanda was the first professor on the history of pedagogy and schooling at the department of pedagogy in 1993, when the subject first became part of the curriculum.

Conclusion

Bosnia and Herzegovina was not a fertile basis for the development of pedagogical thought because of the lack of institutional conditions. Social, economic, and cultural backwardness prevailed in all the sectors in the period before and after the Second World War. From the abovementioned facts, it seems that the different periods of the tempestuous history of Bosnia and Herzegovina influenced the development of the school system in this country. The ongoing regimes from various periods of time ordered how and what to teach at every level of the school system. After the Second World War, the country was destroyed and time was needed for the reconstruction and promotion for normal living conditions. This was a long-standing process because of the rapid industrialization of the country, without previously clearing and settling goals and possible risks. However, the leading ideology posted eminent individuals in the important positions to make decisions regarding the country’s reconstruction or educational issues. These individuals were advanced in the sense of their participation in the war and policy. Hence, key positions in educational policy were taken by people who at the same time performed high duties toward the party. The same party sent them to acquire additional education and this was a way of promoting its own ideas. The same situation appeared at newly founded faculties in SR BiH and among the staff. A majority of the future professors studied in Belgrade and became promoters of the

ideas of self-managed socialism. Other than these instances there were no other promotions. Pedagogical theory and practices gradually developed in the same spirit and under the open eye of the party. The content for this work clearly showed that Herbartism prevailed in the teaching, along with elements of the working school. Even though many politicians wanted to expel the spirit of intellectualism from the teaching process and minimize the influence of gymnasiums, because these schools of “clean hands” diminished labor values, as it usually was emphasized by Rodoljub Čolaković, this had not happened in a manner as it was said. Despite all efforts to gain a modernized school system in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and promote teachers as the fundamental factor in these attempts, the school system was surprisingly still in a bad situation and under the constant control of politics. The material position of teachers was not better than those teachers in the previous regimes, which was called colonial and backward. The fact that the teacher’s vocation had been chosen by those who did not have a second choice did not seem an important issue. Therefore, some politicians continued to express concern that the school was the basis of the whole society and if this basis had not been built in a socialistic and modern manner, this would be negatively transferred to the entire school system.

References

- Arslanagić, R. (1972). Vrijednost pionirskog samoupravljanja [The Value of Pioneers’ Self-management]. In: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević, and P. Mandić (eds.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem [Education through Self-Management]*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, pp. 5–10.
- Bevanda, M. (2001). *Pedagoška misao u BiH 1918–1941 [Pedagogical Thought in BiH, 1918–1941]*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Sarajevu.
- Bevanda, M. (2005). Doprinos prof. dr. Nikole Filipovića povijesti pedagogije i školstva u BiH [Contribution of prof.dr. Nikola Filipovic to the History of Pedagogy and the School System in BiH]. In: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar, and M. Slatina (eds.). *Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo [Nikola S. Filipovic and his Work]*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, pp. 118–121.
- Bročić, M. (1972). Mladi danas i sutra [Youngsters Today and Tomorrow]. In: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević, and P. Mandić (eds.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem [Education through Self-Management]*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, pp. 11–19.
- Filipović, N. (1971). Odnos pedagogije i politike u vremenu od 1945–1970 [The Relation of Pedagogy and Policy in the Period of 1945–1970]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 9–10, p. 511–525.
- Hromadžić, M. (1982). Prevladan najveći problem u osnovnom obrazovanju [The Largest Problem in Elementary Education is Eliminated]. *Prosvjetni list [Educational News]*, issue 655, p. 4.
- Ilić, M. (2005). Naučno-metodološke vrijednosti pedagoško-didaktičkog opusa profesora dr-a Nikole Filipovića [Scientific and Methodic Values of Pedagogical and Didactic Opus of prof. dr. Nikola Filipovic]. In: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar, and M. Slatina (eds.). *Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo [Nikola Filipovic and his Work]*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, pp. 50–59.

- Kamberović, H. (2000) *Prema modernom društvu [Towards Modern Society]*. Tešanj: Centar za kulturu i obrazovanje.
- Komšić, I. (2010). (ed.) *Spomenica Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu (1950–2010) [The Testimonial of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo]*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet.
- Muradbegović, M. (1972). *Motivacija za učešće pionira u samoupravljanju [Motivation for Participation in Pioneers' Self-Management]*. In: R. Arslanagić, I. Dizdarević, and P. Mandić (eds.). *Vaspitanje samoupravljanjem [Education through Self-Management]*. Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, pp. 44–54.
- Kalezić, P. (1985). Počeci svenarodnog osnovnog obrazovanja [Beginings of People's Elementary Education]. *Prosvjetni list [Educational News]*, issue 694, p. 10.
- Mesihović, M. (1987). Pozdravna riječ na svečanoj akademiji povodom 100 godina učiteljstva u Bosni i Hercegovini [Welcoming Speach on Ceremonial Academy regarding 100 Aniversary of Teacher's Profession in Bosnia and Herzegovina]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 1–2, pp. 3–5.
- Muradbegović, M. (1984). Dvadeset godina odsjeka za pedagogiju i psihologiju [Twenty Years of the Department of Pedagogy and Psychology]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 5–6, pp. 391–400.
- Muradbegović, M. (1986). Fundamentalna i primjenjena istraživanja u pedagoškim naukama u BiH [Basic and Applicative Researches in Pedagogical Sciences in BiH]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 7–10, pp. 146–151.
- Papić, M. (1981). *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1941–1955 [Schooling in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1941–1955]*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Papić, M. (1987). Sto godina učiteljstva u BiH – referat na svečanoj akademiji [Hundred Years of Teacher Profession in BiH – Formal Paper on the Ceremonial Academy]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 1–2, pp. 6–11.
- Subotić, G. (1984). Pedagoške misli Rodoljuba Čolakovića [Pedagogical Thoughts of Rodoljub Colakovic]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 3–4, pp. 232–240.
- Svrđlin, Đ. (2005). Život i djelo Nikole Filipovića [Life and Work of Nikola Filipovic]. In: M. Bevanda, M. Ilić, A. Pašalić, L. Pehar, and M. Slatina (eds.). *Nikola S. Filipović i njegovo djelo [Nikola S. Filipovic and his Work]*. Sarajevo: Filozofski fakultet Sarajevo, pp. 29–40.
- Šipovac, N. (1975). Nepismenost-bauk prošlosti i sadašnjosti [Illiteracy, Problem from the Past and from Today]. *Naša škola [Our School]*, issue 9–10, pp. 531–536.
- Šušnjara, S. (2013a). *Razvoj specijalnog školstva u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1958. do 1990. godine [Development of Special Schooling in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1958–1990]*. Zagreb – Sarajevo: Synopsis.
- Šušnjara, S. (2013b). Učiteljstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini u vrijeme Austro-Ugarske [Teachers in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Austrian-Hungarian period]. *Anali za povjest školstva [Annals of the History of Schooling]*, 12, pp. 55–74.