

English translation of discussions between Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica

(including codes of individual speech acts)

Codes for all six groups

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

This first category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation and the current speech act continues at this level. The coding of the current speech act is easiest if it fulfils all the criteria of good deliberation,¹ which means that the speaker has not unduly interrupted other speakers, justifies arguments in a rational way or with relevant stories, refers to the common good, respects the arguments of others and is willing to yield to the force of the better argument. Deliberation can still remain at a high level, if speakers do not fulfil all these criteria, as long as they stay in an interactive way on topic. If a speaker, for example, supports the argument of a previous speaker without adding anything new, the discussion continues to *flow* at a high level of deliberation. Deliberation should be seen as a cooperative effort, which means, for example, that deliberative burden can be shared with some actors procuring new information, while other actors formulate new proposals, etc. The crucial aspect is that a group takes a common perspective on a topic, by which we mean a subject matter that has a certain internal consistency. An example of a topic that we encountered in the discussions of Colombian ex-combatants is poverty in the country. As long as a speech act stays within this topic, even if the speech act is brief and not elaborate, the level of deliberation remains high. Our criterion is whether the discussion continues to *flow* in an interactive way on a particular topic with the actors listening to each other with respect. Deliberation also stays high if an actor introduces another topic, giving reasons why the topic is linked with the issue assigned to the group, which means the peace process for the Colombian ex-combatants. An actor may, for example, turn the discussion from poverty to corruption, and if the new topic is sufficiently linked to the peace process the discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

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

This second category is used if the preceding speech act was at a high level of deliberation, and the current speech act transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation. The *flow* of the discussion is *disrupted*. The topic debated so far is no longer pursued, and in the case of the Colombian ex-combatants no new topic related to the peace process is put on the agenda. Topics are mentioned that have nothing to do with the peace process and are therefore off

¹ See Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

topic. It is also possible that the speech act is so incoherent and confusing that it does not make sense. Under these circumstances, it is not easy for the other participants to continue the discussion in a meaningful way.

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

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

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

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

Group 1 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica²

Participants

Almir, Bosnjak, 34 years old, taxi driver

Dragan, Serbian, 25 years old, unemployed

Dušan, Serbian, 22 years old, university student

Nada, Serbian, 53 years old, unemployed

² The participants in this group were selected by random walk of the adult population in the town of Srebrenica, see Chapter 1.

Moderator

What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina; your responses to be delivered to the High Representative?

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

We need to write something about youth, employment, and the lack of sport activities... I have no idea... Maybe that ...

Justification of code: As the only Bosnjak in the group, it is not easy for Almir to start the discussion. He does a reasonably good job in setting an agenda in suggesting three topics, youth, employment and sport activities. These three topics are closely linked in the sense that unemployment is particularly high among young people in Srebrenica, and young people have a particular need for spaces to practice sport activities. Given this linkage among the three topics, Almir gives a coherent agenda to begin the discussion. How shall we interpret his statement that he has no idea? From a deliberative perspective such expression of ambiguity at the beginning of a discussion is helpful because in this way Almir does not claim that he has all the answers. He rather opens space for others to continue the discussion in an interactive way. We agree in this respect with Marli Huijer who is critical of “political leaders and citizens [who] prefer clear-cut positions to ambiguity;” Huijer sees ambiguity as a “huge accomplishment” for achieving deliberation.³ Overall, Almir begins the conversation at a high level of deliberation in setting a coherent agenda and expressing openness for others to step in.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Normally, we are all different generations and everybody has something to add for sure.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

At first, my brother, why do foreigners and people from other cities come here and develop their jobs, and we who live here do nothing!

Justification of code: Dragan is the first to make a substantive suggestion, that people from Srebrenica should not tolerate that foreigners and persons from other Bosnian cities take away jobs from them. Dragan appeals to a common interest of the group members and of inhabitants of Srebrenica at large. As a Serb, he pointedly includes also Almir and other Bosnjaks living in Srebrenica. Appealing to the common good of the inhabitants of Srebrenica, and proposing a concrete measure of how this common good can be helped, Dragan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. With the first three speakers, an effort is made not to open the wounds between the two ethnic groups but to find a common ground which is very much in a deliberative spirit.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

³ Marli Huijer, “Storytelling to Enrich the Democratic Debate: The Dutch Discussion on Embryo Selection for Hereditary Breast Cancer,” *BioSocieties* 4 (2009), 223–38.

Let's take about ten minutes to decide what should we write and then we'll write it, in order not to correct and erase all the time.

Justification of code: Dušan takes quickly a leadership position. After in his opening statement he encouraged everyone to make contributions, he turns now to a procedural matter. He suggests that notes should not be taken concurrently but each time only after a discussion of ten minutes. He gives as justification for his suggestion that one would have to constantly erase what was written if one would take notes concurrently. This procedural matter is important because the results of the discussion should be submitted in written form to the High Representative. Thus, Dušan moves the conversation forward at a deliberative level.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

We should start immediately. When you write one question, another will already show up in our minds.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Please you write. I can't write.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

I will write, it's not a problem.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

At first, write about jobs and how difficult it is to get employment.
You have to become a member of a political party if you want a job.

Justification of code: In his previous intervention, Dragan was the first member of the group to introduce a substantive issue into the discussion, the poor job prospects for inhabitants of Srebrenica. Now he is insisting on this issue to be discussed, probably since he feels the issue close to him, being himself unemployed. As André Bächtiger has correctly pointed out, it is compatible with good deliberation to insist on an argument.⁴ Discussions should not be overly polite in the sense that actors are reluctant to repeat an argument. If an actor has the feeling that his or her argument has not been sufficiently picked up by other actors, an insistence on the argument is in order. In this way, all arguments can be thoroughly discussed. There are limits to insistence, however; if an actors repeats an argument times and again, it becomes tedious for the other actors and the flow of the discussion may be disrupted. Repeating his argument only once, Dragan is far away from being tedious; he has all the right from a deliberative perspective to insist on the poor employment situation among inhabitants of Srebrenica. While in his earlier intervention he wants to restrict the domestic job market of Srebrenica for foreigners and people from other Bosnian cities, this time he wants to open the job market to people who are not members of a political party. With his insistence on the poor job situation and still another suggestion of how the situation could be improved, Dragan keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. He sets a broad issue for the group to be discussed.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

So everything goes within politics and parties.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

How to write it?

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

How to formulate all of this?

Justification of code: Although in his two previous interventions Dragan put the question of unemployment on the agenda and made two proposals of how the employment situation could

⁴ André Bächtiger, „On Perfecting the Deliberative Process: Questioning, Disputing, and Insisting as Core Deliberative Values”, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2-5, 2010.

be improved, he is now cautious of how the recommendation to the High Representative should be formulated. He rather asks the group for appropriate formulations, and does not attempt to impose his will. In opening space for the group to discuss the formulations, Dragan keeps the level of deliberation high. He is willing to listen to what other members of the group have to say.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

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

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 2)

But everything is bad.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

There are some people who are doing their best, doing something.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

The only thing that works well in Srebrenica is the Court, and that's all.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

The police work is not good at all.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

The work of the police, the municipality. Everything is bad.

Justification of code: In his previous statement, Dragan still made an exception for the Court for his general negative attitude. Now following Almir, he expresses general despair. The contradiction between what Dragan says in the current and the previous statement violates the important deliberative criterion of rationality. The two statements do not correspond to what Jürgen Habermas calls an “orderly exchange of information and reasons.”⁵ The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Dušan, Serbian (code 4)

Put on the first paper "problems", and then we address particular tasks.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 2)

That's stupid.

Justification of code: With this foul expression, Almir does not take up the challenge of Dušan to continue the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Foul language violates the important criterion of respect towards other participants. Almir brings the discussion again down to a low deliberative level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

It's not.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

What will you write?

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

⁵ Jürgen Habermas, Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1992, S.370, „den geregelten Austausch von Information und Gründen.“

Dušan, Serbian (code 4)

The issue of employment and development... Yes, the first issue is employment.

Justification of code: Dušan brings the discussion back on track in proposing that the first priority should be employment. He picks up an issue that Almir brought up in his very first intervention. Dušan is now fully back playing his role of deliberative leader. It is remarkable for his deliberative skills that he avoids the controversial procedural matter but turns to an issue for which he knows that he is in agreement with Almir. Although Almir just offended him and is from the other ethnic side, Dušan offers to Almir the olive branch. All this is highly deliberative.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, yes

Justification of code: Almir picks up the olive branch offered by Dušan in supporting employment as the first issue to be discussed. For the deliberative development of the discussion it pays off that Dušan did not react with equally rude language to the “stupid” remark of Almir.

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Now we need to explain it, I mean the employment issue. What that means.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

(Having asked the moderator how to proceed, he tells the group): She says to write what we think about it, briefly.

Justification of code: Although participants were not assumed to ask questions to the moderator but to proceed on their own, Dušan wants to make sure that the group knows what it should do. In this sense, he wants to give security to the group after the turmoil with the “stupid” remark of Almir. Dušan continues to exercise his leadership role. The conversation stays at a high level of deliberation.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Ok, say what to write.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1):

Politics.

Justification of code: If we would code this speech act with the DQI, the level of deliberation would be very low. Dragan is indeed not articulate in uttering the sole word politics. In the context of the preceding discussion, however, other participants seem to know what he means, namely that politics is too much involved in who gets a job. Dragan certainly does not fulfill

the rationality criterion of Habermas. But one has to consider that participants in this group are not accustomed to write political briefings. With his utterance, Dragan at least makes a beginning of what should be written down. As we will see below, this beginning was indeed understood by the other participants, who further helped to find an appropriate formulation of how the job market could be improved. Dragan, with his one-word formulation, has taken a shortcut, which according to Robert E. Goodin can be fitting good deliberation.⁶ Deliberation remains at a high level.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Huge involvement...

Justification of code: Nada has not yet spoken up to know, but from what she says and how she acts it is clear that she closely followed the discussion. She takes up the point of Dragan that politics plays too much a role in the job market, emphasizing that its involvement is huge. She, too, takes a shortcut. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Huge involvement of political parties in the employment.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Huge involvement...

Justification of code: Almir repeats what the two previous speakers said, while he is taking notes. After his “stupid“ remark, it is the second time that he supports what Serb members of the group said. As the sole Bosnjak, he makes an effort not to be an outsider in the group. His two brief supportive utterances can be considered as greeting formulas to the Serbs that he wants to be part of the group. We are reminded of the argument of Iris Marion Young that proper greeting formulas are a deliberative virtue.⁷ Thus, deliberation remains at a high level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes ... Perhaps we should not use the term involvement.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

But what else is it but involvement? Everybody pushes everyone, it does not matter which political party we speak about Involvement of political parties.

⁶ Robert E. Goodin, „Talking Politics: Perils and Promise,“ *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (2006), 253.

⁷ Iris Marion Young, “Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy,“ *Political Theory* 29 (2001).

Justification of code: In a respectful way, Almir insists that involvement is the right word to be used. This is another case in the spirit of André Bächtiger that insisting on one's position is compatible with good deliberation, as long as it is done in a respectful way.⁸ Deliberation remains high.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, politics, and put in parentheses parties and political ties. There is also too much nepotism in employment.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Later on we will write it more nicely. Now, what else? We can die and we will never get retirement.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Will we write like this, that all those who are not from Srebrenica have a bigger privilege to work.

Justification of code: Almir does not react to the suggestions of Dušan that they delay the exact writing on the employment situation and that they turn the discussion to the failing retirement system. Does this mean that this lack of interactivity on the part of Almir leads to a transformation from a high to a low level of deliberation? This case is difficult to interpret. After listening several times to the video and audio tapes, we come to the conclusion that the deliberative level remains high. Almir continues the prior conversation on the employment situation and simply ignores what Dušan said. One could interpret the behavior of Almir that he did not wish to openly challenge Dušan. We can call this a strategy of conflict avoidance. To react with silence to a disagreement may sometimes have good deliberative consequences, especially in deeply divided societies.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

⁸ Bächtiger, "On Perfecting the Deliberative Process."

Sure, for work and for donations and for all.

Justification of code: Tacitly Dušan agrees that the group continues the conversation on the bad employment situation and he reinforces the points made by Almir. This exchange between Almir as Bosnjak and Dušan as Serb shows that in such delicate situations tacit avoidance of conflicts may help the discussion to continue to flow at a high deliberative level. To be sure, this exchange does not correspond to the ideal Habermasian speech situation, but it is precisely the purpose of empirical work to nuance broad theoretical statements. And here the nuance is that sometimes deliberation is more helped by silence than by words.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Yes

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

And people do not like this.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

We can formulate this as "large equal distribution." Let's see how it will sound like. "Large equal distribution."

Justification of code: Dušan now begins with the detailed editing of what should be written about the job situation in Srebrenica. A large number of jobs should be distributed on an equal basis, irrespective of whether someone is Serb or Bosnjak. Thus, Dušan in a deliberative way has the common good of the entire community in mind. It is also in a deliberative sense that Dušan asks the group how his formulation sounds, which corresponds to the reciprocity principle that one is interested what others think.⁹

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

of jobs for people from other municipalities.

Justification of code: Almir agrees with the goal postulated by Dušan and addresses the question of how the goal can best be reached. He comes back to his earlier critique that people from outside Srebrenica are privileged on the local job market and demands that new jobs should be reserved for inhabitants of Srebrenica. As Dušan before him, Almir stresses the common good of all people in Srebrenica, both for Bosnjaks and Serbs. Given that a short while ago Serbs had massacred in a gruesome way a huge number of Bosnjaks, it is

⁹ For the principle of reciprocity see Jane Mansbridge, „The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in Deliberative Democracy,” *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 18, 2010.

remarkable that Almir as Bosnjak acts in such a deliberative way. One should also note, however, that Almir neglects the common good of people in neighboring communities in excluding them from new jobs created in Srebrenica. Ideally, good deliberative actors should have the global common good in mind to which they would subordinate the common good of smaller territorial entities like countries and local communities. But even Jürgen Habermas acknowledges that the ideal of deliberation is as rare as “islands in the ocean of everyday praxis.”¹⁰ Therefore, we should not take the ideal as our standard, but what Robert E. Goodin calls “good enough” deliberation for a particular context.¹¹ And according to my interpretation it is good enough that Almir is concerned with the common good of the entire community of Srebrenica. Thus, the level of deliberation remains high.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Of jobs and donations for people from other municipalities than Srebrenica. They are given to people who do not live here.

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

(Almir, as note taker, begins to write down what should be sent to the High Representative with regard to the job situation in Srebrenica. He says aloud what he writes. Dušan helps him with some formulations. The two others, Nada and Dragan, accept tacitly what is written. The critique of the current situation reads as follows: “Employment is given to people who live in Tuzla, Sarajevo, Bijeljina, Zvornik and others who do not live in the area of Srebrenica.” It was quite a struggle to arrive at this formulation, but the struggle was done in a very interactive way where all four participants listened to each other and attempted to come to a consensus. From a deliberative perspective it is remarkable that a consensus could be achieved. After all, Almir as Bosnjak could easily have made the argument that Bosnjaks should be privileged on the job market as compensation for the massacres that they had suffered from the hands of Serbs.)

Dušan, Serbian (code 1):

Do we want anything else?

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Will we add something about the cultural and sports activities, you know, the situation is bad.

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

¹⁰ Jürgen Habermas, *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996, S. 323.

¹¹ Goodin, „Talking Politics.”

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Let's write first this about subsidies. We all know how it goes for housing and assistance.

Justification of code: Dušan respectfully disagrees with Dragan and proposes that they turn next to subsidies handed out by the municipal government of Srebrenica. Dušan justifies his proposal with the argument that they are all familiar with this issue. Dragan does not object and tacitly accepts the proposal of Dušan. For the second time in the discussion, a procedural conflict is resolved by silent acceptance of one of the proposals. Again, we think that such a behavior is compatible with good deliberation. After all, no deep values are involved but merely the issue what topic should be discussed next. Dušan does not say that cultural and sports issues should not be discussed, he only says that the question of subsidies should come first. So it seems quite reasonable that Dragan does not insist on his procedural proposal. It would be a very different matter, if deep values would be involved, where it would be good from a deliberative perspective that actors insist on their position, because otherwise important value positions may be suppressed.¹² Theoretically, it is important to note that it depends very much on the context whether insistence on one's position is desirable from a deliberative perspective. In the present case, it was reasonable of Dragan to tacitly accept the counter proposal of Dušan, so that the discussion could easily continue to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, and for grants.

Justification of code: Nada agrees with Dušan that subsidies from the local government are an important issue and adds as a special case the distribution of grants. Deliberation remains at a high level of deliberation.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Differences in humanitarianism ... Wait, how could I formulate that? To put something like "Municipal Commission permanently gives aid to the same people".

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, yes, yes.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Scholarships are received only by children of those people who work in municipality.

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

¹² Bächtiger, "On Perfecting the Deliberative Process."

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

And excursions

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

And excursions, and free books.

Justification of code: Dušan agrees that aid for excursions is unevenly distributed and adds the distribution of free books as still another example. It is remarkable that at the grass root level of this group there is uniform critique of corruption in the municipal government, irrespective whether people in the local government are Serbs or Bosnjaks. Deep division seems to be less between ordinary Serbs and ordinary Bosnjaks than between ordinary citizens in general and the local authorities. Deliberation in the group remains high.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

We need to write it nicely. What is the first to write? Grants or...

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 2)

Then the various committees that are elected by the municipal committee...

Justification of code: With this contribution of Dragan the discussion loses its direction and gets off-topic. It is therefore transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation. The topic should be the uneven distribution of local subsidies, yet Dragan refers to the appointment of the various local committees. There might be a linkage between the appointment of these committees and the uneven distribution of local subsidies, but Dragan does not make this linkage. Thus, his contribution is hanging out somewhere. To formulate a critique of the distribution of local subsidies is intellectually not an easy task. Up to now some illustrations of various fields have been mentioned. The task now would be to put these illustrations into a coherent critique. Dragan feels that the problem may have to do with how the various local committees are appointed but does not know of how to make the linkage.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

Municipal committees, sure, municipal committees...

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Grants, committees...

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, that's it... distribution of aid, scholarships... Huge, irregular distribution of aid, scholarships, grants for home repair. Some get 3, 4, 5 donations and some none.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Machines. Various machinery.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Agricultural Mechanization, livestock

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, yes, yes.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

Agricultural mechanization, livestock, incentives for economic development.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

It would be good if he reads this.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

We need to say what we think even if...

Justification of code: Dušan encourages the group to be truthful in what they want to write to the High Representative. But this appeal to the deliberative criterion of truthfulness¹³ is not enough to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation, since it still remains

¹³ Jürgen Habermas, *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1983, p. 98.

unclear what participants should be truthful about. Thus the discussion is not moving ahead and stays at a low level of deliberation.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Various machines, agricultural equipment, livestock, and so on (he is writing)

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Those from the top are worst...

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

and so on..

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Well now, whether we get a little touch of life in Srebrenica, what concerns ... we cannot organize our lives ... There are no cultural and sport events.

Justification of code: Dragan makes an effort to move the discussion forward in coming back to his earlier demand that there should be more cultural and sports activities. But he does not sufficiently justify this demand to be able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Dušan, Serbian (code 4)

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

Justification of code: Dušan picks up in an interactive way the suggestion of Dragan, and as a deliberative leader he is able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. He argues that it is not enough to offer theater performances, that one must also have the necessary money to buy theater tickets. In an effective way, he brings his personal story into play in telling the group how little money he earns. He knows what could be played in the theater but for lack of money he is obliged to sit at home and to worry how he will be able to send his child to college. In these few sentences, Dušan brings in an emotional way the issue of poverty to the attention of the group. Dušan uses his personal story as advocated by Sharon R. Krause when she writes: „By allowing informal, symbolic, and testimonial types of

deliberative expressions, it can enrich citizens' reflection on public issues and thereby improve public deliberation."¹⁴

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

yes...with 300 KM.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Do we want to write like this, that these individuals who own companies which exploit people ... I mean...

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, yes, yes.

Justification of code: The widespread poverty unites the participants across the ethnic divide, so that Dragan as Serb easily can support Almir as Bosnjak. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

In terms of salary. They open a company, hire 10 people, give them the three hundred marks salary...Can you understand? And keep workers 12 hours at work.

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

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Yes...and also that

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

There are no workers' rights. They don't understand that workers also have rights.

¹⁴ Sharon R. Krause, *Civil Passions: Moral Sentiment and Democratic Deliberation*, Princeton University Press, 2008, p. 122.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, just, tell how to begin a sentence.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Well, I just put it ... This is an item ... disrespect for workers' rights and defining them. They give you minimal salary and you need to work 12 hours and on Saturdays too.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

There are no workers' rights (*he is writing down the sentence*)

Justification of code: As note taker Almir summarizes the main conclusion of the discussion. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

They even do not give you minimal wages.

Justification of code: The discussion continues at a very interactive level with a quick back and forth of the speech acts. Dušan seems to remember that the concept of minimal wage has a legal meaning, according to which employers are required to give to the employees at least a certain amount of money. He now reminds the other participants that this legally required minimal wage is not paid, an important information, which reinforces the critique of the wage policies of the employers. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Should we first put issue of salary or what ...

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Just to mention what we mean by that...

Justification of code: Dušan continues the discussion of the editing of the text concerning poverty. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Workers work...

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Workers work an average of 10 to 12 hours a day, 6-7 days a week, at the minimum salary of the Republic.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

...there is no...

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

For the minimal wages of 200 Euros.

Justification of code: Almir also reinforces the general argument in expressing the low wages expressed in Euros. Deliberation remains at a high interactive level.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

yes, that is

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

it means exploitation...

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

They are not entitled to sick leave because in two days you lose your job.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, yes, yes...They have no holidays.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Whatever the reason, two days of absence from work and you are fired.

Justification of code: Dušan adds still another aspect of exploitation. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, that's true.

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

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Women also are not entitled to maternity. The aim of the state is to increase the population but a woman cannot be on maternity.

Justification of code: After helping Almir to write down on what the group has agreed upon, Dušan mentions still another example of exploitation. This time he gives not only an illustration but points out a contradiction in the governmental policies that on the one hand population should be increased but on the other hand women do not get maternal leave. To point out such a contradiction has a high deliberative quality. Thus, it is clear that deliberation continues at a high level.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, however we know it all, but what about...

Justification of code: Almir expresses that the group is aware of all these aspects of exploitation of the workers and tries to move on to other topics. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

What else?

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Work of police. For the poor they implement a law but for rich...Let's write that too.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Work of the police and institutions that are in charge.

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

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Well, whoever has some problems now the time to say it.

Justification of code: Nada, who did not say much until now, takes a leadership role in encouraging the group that this is the time to raise problems that they still may have. With this

statement, Nada makes the group aware that the discussion will soon come to an end, so that they should not miss the opportunity to raise remaining issues. With this procedural statement, Nada keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Sure.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Work of the police... let's put that they implement laws and punishments only for poor... we cannot put "poor"

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

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

(shy laugh)

Justification of code: The video tapes show that she finds it funny that one is not allowed to use the term "poor." Her laugh brings a light moment to the discussion, which is compatible with good deliberation. As Sammy Basu puts it, "humor provisionally suspends decorum, putting the mind at liberty to hear all sides."¹⁵ Therefore, the laugh of Nada does not disrupt the discussion but rather allows the level of deliberation to remain high.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Person in need?

Justification of code: Dušan comes to the help of Almir in suggesting an expression that is politically more correct than "poor". Deliberation remains at a high level.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

Large firms do money laundry, no one is controlling their job, and no one has the right to check their operations.

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

¹⁵ Sammy Basu, „Dialogic Ethics and the Virtue of Humor," *Journal of Political Philosophy* vol. 7 (1999), p. 385.

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

It should be underlined.

Justification of code: Almir is obviously grateful that Dušan offers still another example of how laws do not apply to the rich and powerful. It becomes increasingly clear that the divide is not between Almir as Bosnjak and the three Serbs in the group but between the four participants as ordinary citizens on the one hand and the powerful in politics and business on the other hand. Good deliberation is easier under these conditions since the group discusses issues where they have wide agreement. The situation would most likely be different if they would discuss issues more sensitive to the ethnic dimension, for example whether the Serb part should split from Bosnia-Herzegovina. It may be the wisdom of ordinary citizens that they do not address such sensitive issues. It may also be that questions of poverty and injustice are more burning issues for ordinary people like Dušan, Nada, Dragan and Almir, whatever their ethnic background.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

In principle...

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

It's true.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Will we write anything good?

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

There is something good. You have mentioned the culture and we'll write that.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Culture, and sports...

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Just write a few cultural activities.

Justification of code: As note taker, Almir is ready to write something about cultural activities. He does not pick up from Dragan that the group should also write something about sports. This, however, is a harmless omission since earlier in the discussion Almir himself

wanted to write something about sports. Thus, not mentioning sports in the present context can be considered as a shortcut since earlier in the discussion culture and sports were sometimes lumped together. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

We don't have enough cultural and sport events.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

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

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

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Ok, can be written down in brief terms.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

What else? ...Culture...Minimal motivation of youth, lack of sport and cultural activities. The manifestation "Days of Srebrenica" was very bad during the past years.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Municipality is responsible for that. They work very badly and that's it.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, very badly.

Nada, Serbian (code 1)

Yes

Justification of code: The two other Serbs also agree that the municipality at large was responsible for the bad organization of the “Days of Srebrenica”. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

What else? There is so much of that, but we can't write everything.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

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

Justification of code: In this statement Dušan touches on two elements that are vividly discussed in the deliberative literature. He applauds that the group was able to agree on some general problems. This is in the spirit of Jürgen Habermas, who hopes that good deliberation leads to consensus. Yet, there is also the argument in the deliberative literature that the pressure to reach consensus may lead to the suppression of important conflicts.¹⁶ Dušan also stresses the importance of personal stories, an aspect much discussed in the newer literature on deliberation.¹⁷ Dušan adds the intriguing question whether personal stories can be held against the story tellers, when he assures the group that they do not have to sign the letter to the High Representative. Obviously, Dušan is worried that the High Representative or someone in his office may take action against someone who told a story that they do not like. This is a worry that we have not found in the literature. This example shows how in-depth empirical work can help to nuance abstract theoretical arguments. With this sophisticated intervention Dušan keeps the discussion at a very high level of deliberation.

Dragan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, yes.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 1):

Whoever you meet on street will say the same things. Understand? Only those who have a job won't agree.

Justification of code: Almir tells a personal story and claims that opinions expressed in the group are shared by people who are unemployed in the streets but not by those who have a job. In this way, Almir expresses solidarity with the unemployed. With this personal story, Almir opens the view to the outside world and thus keeps the discussion at a high deliberative level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 1)

¹⁶ Jürg Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy. Empirical Research and Normative Implications*, Cambridge University Press, 2012, Chapter 6.

¹⁷ Steiner, *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy*, Chapter 2.

When you ask those people they say: ‘‘It’s good’’

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

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 2)

There are people from Milici who work here. I knew them before and when I meet them and ask what brings you here they say: ‘‘I work’’. Ooooooh! I also know to drive car, maybe I don’t have a diploma but... It’s always the same.

Justification of code: Almir continues with another personal story, but this time he transforms the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. That Srebrenica has people from outside who work here, was fully discussed earlier, and the group arrived at the conclusion that such outside work should be restricted. For Almir to bring up the issue again with a personal story disrupts the flow of the discussion. He appears to be off-topic with his remarks that he knows how to drive a car but has no diploma. Actually he works as a taxi driver, so he is referring to his personal story; but the sentence is not clearly formulated to be understandable by other participants. When he finishes his statement that it is ‘‘always the same’’, it is unclear what exactly he means. From this speech act it is difficult for the other participants to let the discussion continue to flow at a high level of deliberation. As we see below, there was indeed nobody who reacted to this intervention of Almir. The phone call of Dragan had brought the discussion to a standstill from which it was difficult for the group to recover. Dragan expressed a certain *fatigue* with the discussion when he took the call. He already has expressed this fatigue when a short while ago he has said that they cannot write everything. Obviously, he has enough of the discussion and would like to leave shortly. Confronted with this atmosphere that the discussion will shortly come to an end, Almir did not feel bound to continue the discussion in an interactive way so that he permitted himself to make some random remarks. Theoretically it is important to note that people have only a limited attention span, so that the dynamic of a discussion may change as it gets longer and longer.

Nada, Serbian (code 3)

Should we say something positive?

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

What can we say positive? Nothing...

Justification of code: Although in a previous statement Dragan has mentioned sport and culture with a positive potential, he now says that there is nothing positive to be said about life in Srebrenica. It seems that he has enough of the discussion indicating with his statement that there is nothing more to be said. Fatigue has set in. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

You know what else, there are hundreds of firms opened but there is no employment. It’s all fictive.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

I know that but how to start back with that?

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Our municipality serves for a huge money laundering.

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

...for money laundering.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, for money laundering...

Justification of code: Dragan repeats what he said before. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

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

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

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Social system...

Justification of code: It is incomprehensible what Dragan wants to say. Deliberation continue to be low.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

Well, now you want to write something about the culture? What are you saying? Did you have something on your mind?

Justification of code: With this intervention Dušan does not move on the discussion on culture. He merely repeats an earlier question. Deliberation remains low.

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Put only culture. Cultural life in Srebrenica is reduced to a couple of days in which some events are organized...

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Cultural life Srebrenica is reduced to seven days...

Justification of code: With this statement Almir keeps the discussion still at a low level of deliberation. He only repeats earlier criticism that Srebrenica has a poor cultural life, but does not make any suggestions of how it could be improved. With the seven days he refers to the event “Days of Srebrenica”.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

...to seven days poorly organized event Days of Srebrenica...

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

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

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

And you know what else, our municipality have, perhaps with the villages approximately 9000 inhabitants. In the municipality institution there are about 100 of them who do nothing. Rather than create new jobs they only expand and open new departments in the municipality.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

She recorded it and she can take everything from this.

Justification of code: Almir recalls to the group that the moderator audio and video tapes the discussions. It is not clear, however, what point he wants to make with this statement. The conversation drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

Are we going to write something good?

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

Everybody (code 3)

We don't have anything good! (general laughing)

Justification of code: Despair really is setting in. It seems to be a nervous laughter. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Dušan, Serbian (code 3)

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

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

And they give all to the same people. Try to remember when they called you, me, him. Each foreign organization, group that come to share any of the assets, they give it to the same people.

Justification of code: Almir interrupts Dušan to say that no matter what the Austrians could have done, the benefit of their action did not address any of them. In this way he extends the general critique of „unfair distribution of subsidies“ to the foreign aid givers, thus reinforcing the despair in the group. Deliberation stays at a low level.

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, you're right.

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

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

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

Bribery and corruption. (noise)

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

Almir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Admittedly I have not applied but I know people who just needed it but they did not receive.

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

Dragan, Serbian (code 3)

That's it, we won't write anymore.

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

Group 2 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica¹⁸

Participants

Emina, Bosnjak, 50 years old, cook

Svetlana, Serbian, 51 years old, guesthouse keeper, retired

Vladan, Serbian, 27 years old, unemployed

Milena, Serbian, 37 years old, housewife

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

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

To have a better education and kindergartens for children, where they can play. Here in our example, they open private kindergartens and you have to pay 2KM¹⁹ for one hour, and the child starts to scream and cry when the clock runs out because they want to stay. These kindergartens are private. And we do not have such a playground to bring a child to play and to go somewhere out. As I see it, here conditions don't exist because it is very dirty around the school. I do not know what the conditions at school are, but ... I'd really like from them to pay attention mostly on children. Those conditions for children must be improved.

Justification of code: Milena begins the discussion at a high level of deliberation. She makes a coherent argument, supported by her personal story, that public kindergartens should be improved to the level of private kindergartens, which are too expensive for people like her.

Vladan, Serbian, (code 1)

Do we write sentences?

Justification of code: Vladan asks a relevant procedural question.

Svetlana, Serbian, (code 1)

Yes, write.

¹⁸ The participants in this group were selected by random walk of the adult population in the town of Srebrenica, see Chapter 1.

¹⁹ About 1 euro

Justification of code: Svetlana is interactive and answers the question of Vladan in a positive way.

Milena, Serbian, (code 1)

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

Justification of code: Milena elaborates on her earlier proposal that there should be better public kindergartens. Again she support her proposal in an effective way with a personal story.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

And school program to improve a bit.

Justification of code: In an interactive way Emina as Bosnjak supports the two Serbs concerning the need to improve public schools. She expands the discussion from kindergarten to public schools in general. A common life world develops between Serbs and Bosnjaks in the group. .

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

I do not know that because I do not have school children.

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

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

There are some things that are improved.

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

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Oh, the math is hard for them.

Justification of code: Milena stays interactive and addresses a specific issue in the school program.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Some courses still have it.

Justification of code: Emina stays on topic and takes up the issue of math raised by Milena

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Now, since my children have finished the school it is time for them to find some employment. For instance, my son went to Serbia to look for a job. He graduated from high school and now he work in construction and cannot find a job here.

Justification of code: Svetlana expands the discussion to what happens after school and with the help of a personal story he shows how difficult it is to find a job in Srebrenica.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, that's it.

Justification of code: Milena stays interactive supporting Svetlana with regard to the poor job situation in Srebrenica.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

The program and lessons in schools must be the same and not different for each nationality whether they are Serbs, Croats or Bosnjaks. We need to have one program in the whole territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in order to bring some sort of mutual agreement. We don't have other options then to live one next to each other, and separate programs in schools will just make it much harder.

Justification of code: Emina turns the discussion from the local level of Srebrenica to the country at large and makes the very deliberative proposal that the three ethnic groups should all have the same school programs. She justifies her proposal in stating that it will help the three ethnic groups to live together. This speech act could come from a textbook on deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 2)

I do not know what to say, I swear. ..I'm just worried about these little children, what kind of future they will have.

Justification of code: Emina as Bosnjak had opened wide space to address the basic problem of the relations among the three ethnic groups. But Milena as Serb is not willing to enter this discussion, which seems to be sensitive to her. Instead, she returns to the school issue in Srebrenica. In this way, she uses a strategy of conflict avoidance. She also does not add anything to the school issue, so the discussion is transformed from a high to a low level of deliberation.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Well as soon as they begin to learn and we separate them ...

Justification of code: Emina tries to come back to the issue of separated school programs but is interrupted by Milena, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

Milena, Serbian (3)

That's why I say, that if only they could have a better future, to live better, to think and to socialize, not to fight.

Justification of code: Milena still does not address the question of separated school programs for Bosnjaks, Croats, and Serbs and thus continues the strategy of conflict avoidance. Instead, she makes a general statement of a better future not giving any specifics, so that she does not open space for the discussion to return to a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (3)

If parents find a job everything would be better.

Justification of code: Svetlana returns to the job issues, but does not add anything new, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, that's true.

Justification of code: Milena is interactive, supporting the statement of Svetlana, but since this statement did not move the discussion forward, neither does the support of Milena.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

If you have work, you would pay those 2KM for private kindergarten.

Justification of code: Svetlana comes back to the high costs of private kindergarten and links it with the job situation. Although this link is clearly formulated, it does not bring any new aspects into the discussion, so that deliberation stays at a low level.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Yes, that is ...

Justification of code: Emina does not know how to continue the discussion and does not finish the sentence. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yes. To provide employment for the youth, so that when they finish college they can get a job. How many are without the job, sitting at home. Parents were encouraged to educate them and later... nothing.

Justification of code: Milena does not add anything to the discussion about the job situation and expresses despair, which is not opening new space to move the discussion ahead.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 4)

They employ them on political party lines, or family relations.

Justification of code: Emina brings a new aspect into the discussion claiming that jobs are given out based on political party affiliation and family relations. She tells this as a story with which she gives the impression to be familiar with. In this way she opens space of how the job market could be made more open. The discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Yeah, that child who is trying and studying...

Justification of code: Milena picks up from Emina and finds now a reason why many children who study hard are discriminated on the job market. While in her previous statement, Milena expressed diffuse despair, she gets from Emina the idea that you only get jobs when you have good party and family relations. It is the essence of deliberation that actors learn from each other.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Actually ... that is corruption.

Justification of code: Emina makes it now very explicit in what direction she wants to argue; giving privileges on the job market based on party and family relations is pure corruption. In this way, she sets the issue of corruption squarely on the agenda.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Yes! This is his uncle who is her cousin, a friend of his, and so they employ one after another.

Justification of code: Milena gives a vivid illustration of how such corruption works. It is remarkable that she as Serb agrees with Emina from the Bosnjak side on the problem of corruption.

Svetlana, Serb (code 1)

In former times, employers used to search for trained people...

Justification of code: Svetlana joins in to agree that there is wide spread corruption on the job market. He makes the current situation all the more dire in referring to former times when there was no corruption on the job market since employers hired the most trained people.

Milena, Serbian (code 2)

There are those who have completed school and get nothing, they went to school in vain. Although he is educated, he began to work in a pizzeria. If a child wants to learn we need to provide conditions. Better conditions for children is the most important. Although, there is nothing we can demand. Nobody listens to us...

Justification of code: Milena does not address the question of how corruption on the job market could be overcome. In great despair, she says that nobody will listen to their demands. Since mutual listening is key to deliberation, Milena gives to the group the message that it is pointless to continue the discussion since neither the High Commissioner nor anyone else will listen to what the group proposes. She transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation, closing space for improving the situation with regard to corruption. .

Jumbled speech acts (code 3)

Justification of code: Everyone in the group speaks at the same time, agreeing with Milena that nobody will listen to them. On the audio, it is not understandable what everyone says. The discussion seems to have come to a real deadlock with regard to the question put by the moderator how Bosnia-Herzegovina can arrive at a better future.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

I do not even know anything about the donations, assistance, scholarships; I didn't get anything in life. Now I need to say that someone helps me with school, job... never and nothing.

Justification of code: Svetlana confesses that she has no knowledge of how to get any public help. Such lack of knowledge is very detrimental to good deliberation, because there is no factual basis on which to build an argument. Her diffuse cry that someone has to help her does not advance the discussion, so that deliberations stays at a low level.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

We are not speakers.

Justification of code: Following Svetlana, Milena also acknowledges that it hard for the members of the group to participate in such a discussion, because they are not accustomed to speak up publicly. She refers to a basic problem of the deliberative model, the lack of public speaking skills of many people.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

Oh, this is enough.

Justification of code: Svetlana indicates that she enough of the discussion, fatigue sets in. Discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Quite, four sentences....What have you written?

Justification of code: Milena agrees with Svetlana that the discussion should come to an end and asks Vladan, the note taker, what he has written up to now. Discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3) (smiling)

Everything you have said. I was secretary. They said only a few things.

Justification of code: Vladan expresses with his smile that he does not take very seriously his task as note taker. He claims that he has written down everything that was said but does not actually say what he has written down. If Vladan would have presented to the group what he has written down, this may have transformed the discussion back to a high level of deliberation with people agreeing or disagreeing with the note taker. But since Vladan did not say what he has written down, the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Let me tell you, I am only interested in children. Before the war we didn't have anything we wanted but it was ok. We could go to school normally, now only if mom and dad have money they can go.

Justification of code: Milena comes back to the school issue and in a nostalgic way says that in former times things were better, which does not help to move the discussion forward.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Right there you can mention corruption, to reduce it a bit if it's possible.

Justification of code: Emina instructs Vladan as note taker that he should write down that corruption should be reduced. Emina has mentioned corruption before, so that in the present context he does not move the discussion forward.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yeah. You cannot even visit the doctor, nothing.

Justification of code: Milena gives just another example why she is despairing. Since she does not make any argument how things could be improved, deliberation drags on at a low level.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

None. Look how much corruption and bribery exist. We need to work on it a little.

Justification of code: Emina repeats her story about corruption and bribery and brings some optimism into the discussion in stating that they need to work on corruption, but since she does not give any hint how this can be done, she is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, look how many children are good students and do not have money to go to college. A bad student who has rich mother and father goes to college, while good students are not accepted. Mom, Dad, or whoever needs to intervene to receive it. Bribery is everywhere, so you cannot even go to a doctor without paying a bribe.

Justification of code: Milena becomes increasingly repetitive that poor people cannot go to good schools or go and see a doctor. This is an issue that obviously goes to the heart of Milena, but in continuing to make the same point, she does not open space for the discussion to move on how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

We can't take medical checks without the money.

Justification of code: Emina is interactive picking up the point from Milena that without money they cannot see a doctor. Such interactivity is good from a deliberative perspective, but since the discussion turns in circle, it does not move forward in answering the question put by the moderator to the group. The discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Or if you do not have a connection. Only if you say that someone sent you everything then will be cool. The worst thing for me is that my child sees that.

Justification of code: Milena repeats the complaint about corruption. As a personal story she brings in her child who supposedly suffers from seeing all the corruption. Although this is emotionally an effective story, it is not enough to move the discussion forward because no new issue or argument is raised.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Yes, that is if you do not have money...

Justification of code: Emina remains interactive supporting previous speakers, but not moving the discussion forward.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, if you do not have money, as you said.

Justification of code: Milena is also interactive, but not moving the discussion forward.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

You have to pay and that's it.

Justification of code: Emina repeats in other words what she said before. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3)

I do not have to write all the details, everything is recorded anyway.

Justification of code: Vladan as note taker finds an excuse for not writing down too much. His excuse is that the discussion is taped anyhow. Already in an earlier intervention, Vladan gave the impression that he does not take very seriously his task as note taker. In group 1 in Srebrenica, note taking was taken seriously, which sometimes led to high level deliberation about what should be written to the High Commissioner. This was not the case in the present group, so that the interventions of Vladan about his note taking did not transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. Following our research design, the moderator let the discussion go wherever it went including how the note taker exercised his task.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Yes.

Justification of code: Emina seems to agree with Vladan about the way he takes notes.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, yes.

Justification of code: Milena also seems to agree with the note taking of Vladan, although for here, too, it is not clear what she is referring to with her “yes, yes” . .

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

It's just a huge problem.

Justification of code: When Emina refers to a huge problem, it seems that she is no longer talking about note taking, and it is unclear what she is referring to. The discussion continues to meander along without direction, far away from the question of a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina assigned to the group.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3)

We wrote a little but we have said enough, so I can write it in details later

Justification of code: Vladan intervenes again as note taker and states that he has written enough and that he can write it down after the meeting more in detail. With this statement, Vladan wants to come to an end of the discussion and not to transform it back to a high level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

OK, write it all nicely.

Justification of code: Milena agrees with Vladan that the discussion should come to an end.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Say if you have something else.

Justification of code: Emina acted often as deliberative leader, and in this role she wants to make sure that the group agrees with Vladan and Milena that the discussion should come to an end. Emina herself seems to agree with this conclusion and does not raise any other issue. So it seems at this point that the discussion will no longer go back to a high level of deliberation.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3)

Nothing else.

Justification of code: Vladan reaffirms his earlier statement that the discussion should come to an end.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

I do not know... We've said for employment, we said almost everything in brief; all what we are interested in.

Justification of code: Milena agrees that there is nothing else to be discussed.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

We said the most important - work. Yes if you and your husband work in some firm you would not have a problem to pay 2KM for private kindergarten.

Justification of code: Svetlana also agrees that they finished talking about what is important.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

True, although I'm still sorry for children who do not have what they need. It's not that we have ...

Justification of code: Although there seems to be agreement that the discussion has come to an end, Milena still repeats how she is sorry for the children, without moving the discussion in a new direction.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

The point is not that only you should work. Everyone should work.

Justification of code: Svetlana also insists on the work issue mentioned often before, without introducing any new aspects.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

I'm sorry to see children who are not able to work.

Justification of code: Milena repeats almost with the same words what she said several times before.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 4)

It does not matter who is which nationality, while we have a job. Let factories work.

Justification of code: Finally, Svetlana brings a new aspect to the discussion that is highly relevant for the peaceful relation between Serbs and Bosnjaks in a town like Srebrenica. She is not only asking for new jobs but demands that neither Serbs nor Bosnjaks should discriminate each other. In this way, Svetlana opens space to discuss the relations between the two ethnic groups.

Milena, Serbian (code 2)

So that everyone has money for its own purposes. Private employers only exploit their workers.

Justification of code: Milena does not use the space opened by Svetlana and only repeats what was said many times before. The discussion is immediately transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

Either the political party or government. For whom you voted, he will give you a job. Well I do not give voice to anyone. Am I not right?

Justification of code: After Svetlana had expressed in her previous statement the need for Serbs and Bosnjaks not to discriminate each other, she now expresses frustration with the corrupt political parties, who give jobs only to their own people. She tells the group that she will abstain in elections, but does not argue how such abstention could bring Serbs and Bosnjaks closer together. Thus, the discussion does not get any new impulses and stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 4)

If you don't vote for anyone, those votes will help the current authorities.

Justification of code: Milena is interactive and offers Svetlana an argument why abstention in elections may be counterproductive in helping the current authorities. This argument is based on good knowledge of how elections work. Milena transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in opening space to discuss of how to use elections in an effective way.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 2)

No one lasts eternally. I had to take a loan for my kid to go to school.

Justification of code: Svetlana does not use the space opened by Milena to talk about using elections in an effective way. It is unclear what she means that no one lasts eternally. Does she mean that the local authorities will not last eternally? But who would replace them? Svetlana does not address such questions; instead she come back to the dire situation of people like her. The discussion is transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Most of the people do that.

Justification of code: Milena is interactive and supports Svetlana that most people have to take a loan to send their children to school. It is understandable that the participants come back times and again to their dire economic situation, but just complaining without making any suggestions of how the situation can be improved does not move the discussion forward on a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

I do not know anything about the scholarships or something else, the state took everything.

Justification of code: Svetlana continues to complain about the state, without making any suggestions of how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Some cannot even matriculate in school. I know a woman whose father could not pay for her to go to school. She finished it after she got a child.

Justification of code: Milena's personal story does not help to transform the discussion to a high level of deliberation, because the story is not used to make an argument of how Bosnia-Herzegovina could have a better future.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3) (looking at the moderator and smiling)

I think this is enough, we have enjoyed it, we have written and printed everything.

Justification of code: Now Svetlana has really enough of the discussion, which should have come to an end already a while ago but still continued. Svetlana gives the impression that enough has been said, so that she is not willing to transform the discussion back to a high

level of deliberation and to address still other issues about a better future for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

These are the most important things we put. Children, youth, business, corruption.

Justification of code: Milena agrees with Svetlana that the discussion should come to an end and summarizes the main points, without adding anything new.

(They give the paper to the moderator, who asks if it was possible to go deeper for each point).

Emina, Bosnjak (code 4)

We have not yet put down the issue of visas... and how necessary it is to regulate it so that youth can travel.

Justification of code: It was in line with the research design that the moderator encouraged further discussion but did not intervene in any substantive way. Emina picks up on this suggestion and is able to bring a new aspect into the discussion, transforming it to a high level of deliberation. For a better future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, it is indeed highly relevant that the visa problem is solved so that young people can travel abroad and come back with new ideas. The context is that as a non-member of the European Union, Bosnia-Herzegovina has a difficult visa regime.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

That's true. It's important for young people, to socialize and see something, to learn about different culture.

Justification of code: In an interactive way, Milena follows up on the visa idea of Emina and elaborates on the advantages for young people to go abroad. The discussion is kept at a high level of deliberation.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Not to be trapped in bags.

Justification of justice: In a humorous way Emina is looking forward for young people to travel with the necessary visa abroad and hopes they will travel lightly. As Sammy Basu correctly argue, humor can help deliberation.²⁰

Moderator

Is there anything else? Is there anything that is specifically related to Srebrenica, anything positive, something that functions well?

Emina, Bosnjak (code 2)

²⁰ Sammy Basu, "Dialogical Ethics and the Virtue of Humor", *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 4 (1999), 378-403.

No.

Justification of code: Although a moment ago, Emina has shown some optimism in proposing that young people should be better served with visas, so that they can go abroad and come back with new ideas, she now does not see anything that is positive in Srebrenica and functions well. Expressing such hopelessness and despair, she transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

I don't see anything positive here.

Justification of code: Svetlana joins into this hopelessness and despair.

Milena, Serb (code 3)

Can we say just how it is.

Justification of code: When Milena says that they should say how it is, obviously means that she agrees with the preceding speakers that there is nothing positive.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

All breaks down in Srebrenica; depending from which side they come, everybody takes and does nothing for Srebrenica and people who live here. For the citizens of Srebrenica little is done. For nobody, no matter which nationality they are. Politicians speak so much about Srebrenica, but when it's about the work, they do not do anything.

Justification of code: Emina expresses once more the frustration of the group with the political authorizes in Srebrenica.

Milena, Serbian (code 4)

Let us speak about the spa here. Before a lot of people from Serbia and even from Croatia came here to visit this spa. And now no one mentions it. I just know some people who are still talking about it, praise the spa, and it still remains unused. It was known in former Yugoslavia, and perhaps abroad. I wonder why they do not reconstruct the spa, to take advantage of its potential. People could find employment here. We have medical and physiotherapy schools, and people could work in the spa. They now do not work for what they are taught. The other day I read that about 100 doctors are necessary.

Justification of code: In an unexpected turnaround, Milena overcomes her despair and talks with great enthusiasm about the benefits for Srebrenica, if the spa would again be opened. This is a very concrete project that the group could talk about, although it is already very late in the discussion. Nevertheless, Milena manages to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation, opening space for a discussion about a better future.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Well, they are needed in our hospital too. If you want to heal you have to go to Zvornik.

Justification of code: Svetlana is interactive and favors the spa idea, adding that the many new doctors would also be helpful in the hospital.

Milena, Serb (code 1)

What about the ‘‘Argentarija’’ hotel? It might be that people could also work there. And it made me hope for a spa, it is the health resort.

Justification of code: Milena gets more and more enthusiastic about her spa idea and adds another argument that guests of the spa will bring new business to a local hotel, which in turn would hire more people. Space is now wide open how the spa could be opened again and attract guests.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

I wonder whether it (the spa) is not in the interest of current political power holders. I have this feeling that they work only in reducing everything to a minimum and not to reconstruct or use our resources.

Justification of code: Emina is interactive with Milena and supports the spa idea, but warns that the local power holders may not be interested in the idea. This is valuable information that keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Before the war this was really nice town, friendly, and now nobody does anything. And the silver mine; I do not know how it works. As I know, they do not employ neither.

Justification of code: Milena agrees with Emina that it is difficult to convince the local authorities to do anything positive for the town, but she still has another idea, to open again the local silver mine.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Oh, nothing. As I heard it (the silver mine) is ruined too.

Justification of code: Emina adds the relevant information that the silver mine is also ruined. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation on ideas to revitalize the town, although the prospects do not seem good. But, at least, Milena and Emina make an effort to think about new ideas.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Well, someone buys it (the silver mine) and destroys it completely.

Justification of code: Milena continues to elaborate on her idea of the silver mine and suggests as a first step that it should be completely torn down. She does not say who should do this and how the silver mine should be reconstructed again, but at least she offers a first step.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

People are dissatisfied; only a few are working.

Justification of code: Emina again supports the ideas of the spa and silver mine, since there are so few people in Srebrenica who have work.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

Just a little is invested in firms. They need to enable and reconstruct those factories so that people can work.

Justification of code: Milena expressed so much hopelessness and despair earlier in the discussion; so it is amazing how all of a sudden she has ideas how Srebrenica could have a better future. Now she suggests that local factories need new investment so that they can be reconstructed. To be sure, Milena does not say how this could be done, but she puts also the issue of the local factories on the agenda of the group.

Vladan, Serbian (code 2)

You have said everything.

Justification of code: As twice before, Vladan wants to end the discussion. He is not willing to take up the issues of the spa, the silver mine and the factories. The discussion is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serb (code 3)

I'm not old neither young but I see that children are unhappy. They can meet someone on the computer, but they can barely find some important information there. That internet is not helping them much.

Justification of code: Milena yields to Vladan and does not insist that the issues that she has brought up are further discussed. Instead, she comes back to her worries about the children in Srebrenica but does not offer anything new, except to say that the internet is not good for the children, without making any suggestions how the situation with the internet could be remedied. Thus deliberation stays at a low level.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3) (laughing)

I am not young either.

Justification of code: With his off-topic remark the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

But I'm older than you. I saw that there are those children who have gone, I do not know by whom, to the sea. And small children went too.

Justification of code: Milena continues to express her concern about the fate of children in Srebrenica. This time she seems to refer to small children, who are given away abroad to be adopted because of the dire situation in Srebrenica. Again, she does not offer any suggestion of how the situation could be improved, so that the situation stays at a low level of deliberation.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 4)

The only people who work something are NGO's. And it's not much, they can't do as much as the local government should do. If something is done, it is done by some NGO. The government just separates people; frightens one side against the other, says that we do not need to live together, so that they can rule us. They want to prolong their time.

Justification of code: This is an important contribution of Emina, when she makes the statement that the local government wants the two ethnic groups to be separated so that it keep its power. The message of this statement is that ordinary citizens of both sides have to begin to work together to get rid of the corrupt local politicians. Thereby, she expresses hope that perhaps some NGO's may be on the side of ordinary citizens, although Emina acknowledges that NGO's have little power. This statement could be out of a textbook on deliberation with its emphasis on citizen deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 2)

Will we sign?

Justification of code: There is a strange group dynamic in the sense that several times it is proposed that the discussion should come to its end, and then it continues nevertheless. Now it is Svetlana who does not want to talk about the suggestion of Emina about citizen activities across the ethnic divide but prefers that they sign the letter to the High Commissioner. In this

way the discussion is transformed again to a low level of deliberation. Yet the proposal of Emina would have been crucial for a discussion about a better future, if it would have been made earlier in the discussion. Now fatigue is increasingly setting in.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3)

Right at the top.

Justification of code: Vladan agrees that the discussion has come to an end, and as note taker he indicates that they should sign the letter to the High Commissioner right at the top.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

And this is what we will send to the High Commissioner.

Justification of code: Svetlana reinforces her position that the discussion should end in stating categorically that they have now what will be sent to the High Commissioner.

Milena, Serbian (code 4)

What is needed is a language school for children to learn. Especially English they need to learn more in school. They learn, I think German and English. But most of the children should learn English. They need to have opportunity to learn it. All items are in English, and on those computers. It would be easier for them to communicate with everyone. That's just necessary. I understand it well but I am not able to speak it.

Justification of code: According to the research design it is up to the participants and not the moderator to bring the discussion to an end. Although Vladan and Svetlana have stated categorically that the discussion has ended, Milena continues the discussion and even manages to transform it back to a high level of deliberation in putting more English language training on the agenda. This proposal goes together with her earlier suggestions that young people should get easier visas to go abroad to learn about new ideas. And for this, Milena continues now, learning English is essential.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 1)

I can understand some occasional word.

Justification of code: Emina stays on topic in giving her personal story of understanding English.

Milena, Serbian (code 1)

And at school we must pay.

Justification of code: Milena also stays on topic in regretting that they have to pay for English language lessons.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 2)

Have we finished?

Justification of code: Svetlana gets impatient and definitively does not want to address still another issue. With this refusal she transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

Do we have anything that is positive? We need to put one point at least.

Justification of code: Milena yields to Svetlana and does not insist that the discussion on English language training continues and seems now also ready that the discussion comes to an end. She suggests that in the letter to the High Commissioner at least one positive item should

be put. But since she does not say what this positive item could be, the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Vladan, Serb (code 3)

We have written nongovernmental organizations.

Justification of code: Vladan reminds Milena that they have already written down the positive role that some NGO's play. Nothing new enters the discussion, so that it stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

If at least someone does something for these children; to help them to socialize and travel. It does not matter where you go ... just go...

Justification of code: Milena expresses once again her concern for the children. As André Bächtiger argues, it is compatible with good deliberation to insist on an argument,²¹ but Milena has now expressed her concern for the well-being of the children so many times that it becomes tedious. Deliberation stays at a low level.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

I am a member of the association "Strength of women" from Tuzla, and they have sent some children from Srebrenica somewhere outside.

Justification of code: The discussion is still not at the end with Emina being interactive with Milena giving her an information what her organization does with children from Srebrenica. This information, however, does not bring any new aspect about a better future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, so that the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

There are children who cannot afford to travel, so at least in this way they can go to seaside. There they meet other people, learn something, have a contest, just great. It was on the television once. Children ... and there are a few of them. Now there is only one class from school. Before it were the 4-5 grades.

Justification of code: Milena still expressing her concern about the well-being of the children.

Emina, Bosnjak (code 3)

People are leaving this place.

Justification of code: This is a relevant information, but since Emina does not say how this exodus from Srebrenica could be stopped, the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Milena, Serbian (code 3)

That's it. You don't have a job, so you have to go somewhere else. I don't think that we can add or say anything more.

²¹ André Bächtiger, Shawn Rosenberg, Seraina Pedrini, Mirjam Ryser, and Marco R. Steenbergen, "Discourse Quality Index 2: An Updated Measurement Instrument for Deliberative Processes," Paper Presented at the 5th ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, September 10-12, 2009.

Justification of code: Milena summarizes the main point of the discussion that since there are no jobs, people have to leave, but even she wants to bring the discussion to an end.

Vladan, Serbian (code 3)

That's all (handing to the moderator the letter to the High Commissioner)

Justification of code: It is by agreement of the group that the discussion should come to an end.

Group 3 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica²²

Participants

Tarik, Bosnjak, 48 years old, keys manufacturer

Ana, Serbian 33 years old, book store attendant

Mira, Serbian, 47 years old, economist

Emir, Bosnjak, 48 years old, works in metallurgy factory

Milan, Serbian, 44 years old, train controller

Mina, Bosnjak, 52 years old, housewife

Amela, Bosnjak, 31 years old, interpreter

Svetlana, Serbian, 30 years old, no information on employment

Moderator

What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina; your responses to be delivered to the High Representative?

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

I take a key problem. Someone should try to push through a law on the protection and welfare of animals that would, for example, shelter dogs, cats and others. I cannot send my child to walk to school, I have to drive it.

Justification of code: Emir begins the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Based on his personal story he proposes a law that would protect children from stray dogs. His story is that stray dogs are so dangerous for children that Emir must drive his child to school.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

²² The participants in this group were selected randomly among parents participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center, see Chapter 1.

That is so.

Justification of code: Already at the very beginning of the discussion, the issue of stray dogs is something on which agreement emerges across the ethnic divide in the sense that Milan as Serb supports Emir as Bosnjak.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

That is exactly the problem... That law. It was better before, when we did not have it.

Justification of code: Mira is interactive and stays on the issue of stray dogs. In a respectful way she tells Emir that there is already a law concerning stray dogs and that this law did only make things worse. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, but this law that we have now is not complete, can you understand?

Justification of code: Milan continues the discussion on the law concerning stray dogs and argues that the current law should not be abolished but made more complete. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Some partial laws were adopted.

Justification of code: The discussion continues in an interactive way to understand the current legal situation with regard to stray dogs. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

The new law says that you are not allowed to kill them but nobody knows what to do with them (stray dogs).

Justification of code: Emir clarifies what the current law says. But in his view it does not say what should be done with stray dogs. In an interactive way, the group is able to understand what the problem is with the current law on stray dogs. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Law must be changed.

Justification of code: Having listened to the others, Mira changes her position and no longer wants to cut the law but agrees that it should be changed. Good example of the force of the better argument. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

I thought that they still don't know how to finance the implementation of that law.

Justification of code: Emir brings a new aspect to the discussion that it is not only the content of the law but also the finances for its implementation. It is in a highly deliberative way how the group attempts to come to terms with the current situation with regard to stray dogs. Good deliberation also means to create a good informational basis, which the group does.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes.

Justification of code: The issue of stray dogs is of interest to both ethnic groups, so that Milan as Serb has no problem to agree again with Emir as Bosnjak

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

It seems to me that after the enactment of the law, within a year each municipality must have a refuge for dogs.

Justification of code: The discussion moves quickly forward with Emir making a concrete proposal of how to handle the problem of stray dogs that every municipality must have a dog shelter.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

That's ok, but who is going to finance all of that?

Justification of code: Good deliberation means also to raise questions, which Mira does putting on the agenda who will finance such dog shelters.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

That is what I am speaking about. If this letter (to the High Commissioner) cannot help us we need to seek for some alternatives, for sure.

Justification of code: Emir is interactive in responding to Mira that the letter to be sent to the High Commissioner may help to finance a dog shelter. Emir, however, acknowledges that this may not work, so that they have to look for another solution. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Who is responsible for that (stray dogs)?

Justification of code: Milan stays on topic in putting still another question on the agenda, who in the municipality is responsible for stray dogs. The implication is that one has to know the answer in order to be able to proceed in an effective way with the proposal of a dog shelter.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Who of us is in charge for that? We cannot abandon the animals, leave them on the streets.

Justification of code: Mira insists on the necessity of a dog shelter. Thereby, she brings a new argument into the discussion that not only the wellbeing of school children is involved but also the wellbeing of the dogs. The discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

You cannot keep a dog in the house, but you are not allowed to leave it outside.

Justification of code: Apparently speaking from his own experience, Milan justifies why a dog shelter is necessary.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes.

Justification of code: The issue of the dog shelter makes it easy for the group to reach agreement across the ethnic divide. Thus, Emir as Bosnjak has no problem to give support to what Milan as Serb has said.

Amela, Bosnjak (code 1)

You can find a lot of them in front of school.

Justification of code: Amela speaks for the first time and confirms what Emir said at the very beginning of the discussion that stray dogs are a particular problem in front of the school.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Yes

Justification of code: Consensus across the ethnic divide continues with Mira as Serb agreeing with Amela as Bosnjak on the problem of stray dogs in front of the school.

Ana, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, they are on the street.

Justification of code: Ana as another Serb agrees with Amela across the ethnic divide that stray dogs in front of the school are a problem.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

This is still ok, wait until the snow falls, and then it will be much worse.

Justification of code: Milan adds the relevant information that when the snow comes, the problem with stray dogs will be even more severe. Up to now the discussion flows nicely with everyone contributing at a high level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 2)

What happened with that dog in front of the supermarket?

Justification of code: Ana stays on the topic of stray dogs, but asking for the fate of a specific dog she takes the discussion off-topic, transforming it to a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, that one with a broken leg.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Husky?

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

I saw it near bus station.

Ana, Serbian (code 3)

It's an ugly dog.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

No, it's not, that's a very nice dog.

Ana, Serbian (code 3)

That's a great dog, a very determined dog, but it scares you when you pass near it. Well, that is a very nice Siberian dog but it's still not right to leave it to walk on streets just like that.

Justification of the code of the seven preceding speech acts: The discussion of a specific dog is clearly off-topic, leading the discussion nowhere. Whether this dog has a broken leg and how ugly it is, does not help to come closer to a solution about the dog shelter.

Emir, Bosnjak (4)

I think that we have a problem now. It looks like all responsible people from our municipality including the Major do not see those dogs. I believe when people catch dogs in some local communities like Skelani, Jadar, Podravanje, Sase, Potočari etc. that they bring them here to town because they are so upset.

Justification of code: It was Emir who initially brought the issue of stray dogs on the agenda. He attempts now to get away from the discussion of a single dog and to discuss again the issue in general terms. He does this successfully with the story that the responsible people in the municipality have never seen the stray dogs, presumably because they live in better neighborhoods. Emir also tells the story that people from neighboring communities take their stray dogs to Srebrenica. With these stories Emir transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Wait, you said that Husky is well known but still when they organize some actions for catching the dogs it still remain on the streets. Why do they organize those actions at all?

Justification of code: Mira now uses the example of Husky to make the general point that the actions of the municipality to catch stray dogs are not successful. The discussion is interactive and remains at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Last time Janjić (*a man from the vet station who is in charge of the municipality to catch dogs*) caught about one hundred dogs as I remember. They allowed that number and he caught that number. You remember when those people from Sarajevo also came?

Justification of code: The discussion remains interactive with Emir telling Mira that the dog catcher of the municipality is successful in catching exactly the number of dogs that the municipality allowed him to catch. Emir corrects Mira in a very respectful way although they come from opposite ethnic groups. The discussion continues at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, yes.

Justification of code: Mira accepts the correction of Emir without problem. If the group would discuss an ethnically more sensitive issue, it might be more difficult to reach such an agreement on the factual basis of the discussion. By contrast, the issue of stray dogs cuts so much across the ethnic divide that a common life world easily develops among the participants.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 2)

And those people from the municipality hid Husky in a garage.

Justification of code: Emir returns to the fate of Husky, getting in this way again off-topic. The discussion is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

They believe that they can sell it somehow.

Justification of code: Milan continues on the Husky story.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

And that somebody will buy it.

Justification of code: The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation on the the question what happens to Husky.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

So we cannot do anything with this.

Justification of code: Milan realizes that the discussion on the fate of Husky is leading nowhere, but he does not make any suggestion where the discussion should go next, so it still remains at a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 4)

What else can we do, concretely, for our city? It would be good if the Guber spa starts to work again. It's not a problem that it is privatized, but with each privatization there are some conditions what and how to do it.

Justification of code: Emir acts as deliberative leader. He has brought the question of stray dogs on the agenda; now he finds that one can move to another issue and proposes that the local spa should be opened again. The spa was already on the agenda of the second group in Srebrenica. Emir informs the group that the spa is in private hands, which in his view is not a basic problem, but if the spa has to be opened again one has to consider that it was privatized. This is a rational presentation of the issue. The discussion is transformed to a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Let's do it.

Justification of code: Not only on the issue of stray dogs but also on the spa issue there is cross-ethnic agreement with Milan as Serb supporting Emir as Bosnjak. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Can we read? ”Mister High Commissioner, we send you this letter that contains basic needs of Srebrenica’s citizens and our local community, so that we can organize and create better conditions in this area for a better life for all of us. These needs are reflected to the real problems that we deal with each day and resolving these problems would definitely make our lives better. Our problems and needs are...” and then we just name them. Is that ok?

Justification of code: With the discussion changing from the issue of stray dogs to the spa issue, Svetlana reminds the group that they have to write the letter to the High Commissioner. This is an important procedural matter, which keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation. Svetlana reads what she has prepared as introduction of the letter and suggests that they add now one proposal after another that the group decides.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

That’s ok.

Justification of code: Also on this procedural matter there is inter-ethnic agreement with Emir as Bosnjak supporting Svetlana as Serb. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

First we need to start with the economy. We need to know that we cannot live only from walls, grass or whatever... We need money.

Justification of code: Tarik speaks up for the first time, and in an interactive way states that the economy should be the first issue to be addressed to the High Commissioner. From his personal experience he tells the group that he suffers from poverty and needs money one way or another. He opens space to talk about how to improve the economic situation, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnian (code 1)

That’s true.

Justification of code: Emir agrees with the demand of Tarik keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak /code 1)

We live thanks to money. Not from walls. This building is nice but if you don’t have money to buy something to eat or drink in it, we don’t need it. So first, we need to develop the economy. How to regulate that? We need to force our politicians.

Justification of code: Tarik repeats his argument making it even more vivid saying that even having enough to eat and drink is a problem. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

There are a lot of projects that aim at economic development.

Justification of Code: Svetlana stays on topic in offering the information that there are already some projects to help economic development. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yeah. Here we have as much resources as you want but nobody takes them. Here is an example. They sold the transportation company. It was said that they will hire 200 workers. After three years four years it is just wasted.

Justification of code: Tarik stays on topic and gives a reason for the bad economic situation, the waste of resources. As example he gives transportation. Tarik keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

You're right there, but you know we have to force it all.

Justification of code: Emir stays interactive, agrees with the analysis of Tarik, but sets a somewhat more optimistic tone in telling the group that they have to take actions.

Tarik, Bosnjak code 1)

Yes! Yes, to force it all; but who is responsible?

Justification of code: Tarik stays interactive agreeing with Emir that people have to take action. He then raises the relevant question of who is responsible. The answer is needed, so that they know against whom they have to take actions. Tarik keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

So let's then put down: "the need for projects for the economic empowerment."

Justification of code: Svetlana summarizes and writes down nicely what emerges as a consensus in the group. It is remarkable that Svetlana as Serb agrees so much with the two Bosnjaks Tarik and Emir. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

To make accountable the people who have privatized the company (of transportation).

Justification of code: Emir answers the question of Tarik of who is responsible for the bad economic situation and states that it is the people who have privatized the transportation company. With the issue of privatizations Emir broadens the discussion about economic matters. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes

Mina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes

Justification of two preceding codes: Milan and Mina agree both with Emir that privatizations are a problem. Agreements between the two ethnic sides continues. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

To meet obligations under the Privatization Agreement is a basic question.

Justification of code: After Emir gets support from Milan and Mina, he insists on his argument that how the Privatization Agreement is implemented is a basic problem. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

The basic question.

Justification of code: Tarik gives further support to the argument that privatization is a basic problem. The discussion remains interactive at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Can we say it like this: We should have an impact on privatized companies?

Justification of code: Svetlana keeps up conscientiously her role as note taker and summarizes well what was said about the problem of privatization. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

To bring about responsibility.

Justification of code: Tarik wants to have the term of responsibility in the letter to be sent to the High Commissioner. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Entrepreneurs?

Justification of code: As note taker Svetlana asks the group whether they should refer to the responsibility of the entrepreneurs. The discussion stays in an interactive way on topic.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

The Privatization Agency has an obligation to bring privatization to an end.

Justification of code: Emir makes a very concrete proposal how the question of privatization should be dealt with, the responsible governmental agency should cut all future privatization.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 2)

Have an effect on the owners.

Justification of code: The proposal of Emir that the Agency of Privatization should stop all privatizations is now on the agenda and calls for the opinions of the other participants. Svetlana, however, does not follow up and makes a general remark that is not related to what Emir had proposed. In this way she gets off-topic to what is now on the agenda and transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

To do a revision.

Justification of code: With this remark, Emir does not help the group to get a handle at what he proposed before with regard to privatization. It is unclear what he means by a revision and who should do such a revision. Emir is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

It will not help the audit.

Justification of code: It is unclear what Milan means with this statement. To what audit is he referring to? And what will not help in such an audit? Milan keeps the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

Amela, Bosnjak (code 3)

The revision of privatization.

Justification of code: Amela, who has not spoken for a long time, attempts to define the topic under discussion. But she only repeats that privatization should be revised but does not add anything new so that the deliberation remains at a low level of deliberation.

Mira, (Bosnjak (code 3)

What is it?

Justification of code: Mira seems lost where the discussion stands. She is not able with her question to transform it back to a high level of deliberation because she does not bring any new elements into the discussion.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

That means: "You bought and you have in the contract that ..."

Justification of code: Emir attempts to explain how the contract of privatization works, but he is not able to make clearer how one should go about to cause the Authority of Privatization to stop all future privatizations. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

It has already been done and still nothing.

Justification of code: Mira is incoherent in what she wants to say; she does not make clear what has already been done and in what sense nothing has occurred. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation without clear direction.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

We do it with "I to you, you to me" way.

Justification of code: Emir makes another effort to spell out what he has in mind with his proposal with regard to privatization; but again he is not successful in not making clear with whom he wants to negotiate according to the saying "I to you, you to me." The discussion still drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 3)

How can we say that? What you said just now is that these private owners actually have to fulfill ...

Justification of code: That the discussion continues to be confusing is seen with the question of Svetlana as note taker. It is apparent that she does not understand what Emir means with the saying "I to you, you to me." The level of deliberation stays low.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Well, revision of privatization, and the privatization agency to conduct their purchase contracts ... privatization purchase contracts because they are bound and obliged.

Justification of contract: Emir is still not able to express clearly what he has in mind with the privatization contracts. It is not clear who is supposed to be bound and obliged. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 4)

No, I was thinking more of the obligation of the employer to the worker.

Justification of code: After the incoherent statements of the previous speakers, Svetlana formulates a clear sentence expressing what the issue should be on the agenda. She proposes that the fundamental question should be the obligations that employers have towards the workers. Svetlana opens space for the discussion to continue at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, but who will still force the employers to do that? It must be the Agency for Privatization. In the contract they have written that they (the employers) have to keep the existing number of workers, and in the period of three to five 5 years they need to invest some amount of money and they need to employ more workers.

Justification of code: With her clear statement Svetlana has helped Emir to clarify for himself what he wants to propose. He agrees with Svetlana that the basic issue is the obligation that the employers have towards the workers. He changes now his position and is no longer insisting that the Agency for Privatization should stop all privatizations. In broader terms, Emir wants the agency to make sure that the contract of privatization is correctly implemented, in particular that the existing number of workers is kept and that investments are made so that the number of workers can even be increased. This is a good example of how the force of the better argument made Emir change his mind. In setting in a clear way the issue to be discussed, Emir took a new perspective. The discussion has now gone back to a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

The most dangerous is that when they sell the company and then you don't have neither employees nor employers. Not even known who the authorities are, or who worked there.

Justification of code: Tarik refers to the problem that after privatization the companies disappear so that it is impossible to hold anyone responsible. This is a relevant information to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Let's see. We said, "economic empowerment, implementation and revision of privatization." I also do not know how to say it, to include certain social groups of the population.

Justification of code: As a conscientious note taker, Svetlana continues to do a good job to summarize the essence of the ongoing discussion. In a deliberative spirit she asks the group how to refer to the various societal groups mentioned in the discussion. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Regarding the social problems, mineral and material wealth should be returned to the local level. That was before the war. The state must give over to the local level.

Justification of code: Emir brings still another relevant issue on the agenda that the control of mineral wealth and of material wealth in general should be brought back to the local level. This is an important policy issue for Bosnia-Herzegovina, which has the potential to broaden the discussion.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Now we have something else. Mining, forests.

Justification of code: Once again we have agreement across the ethnic divide with Mira as Serb supporting Emir as Bosnjak that minerals are an important topic. As an example of other material wealth Mira adds forests. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

We have as another example the Drina River. How much (money) are we seeking?

Justification of code: Emir adds as another example of material wealth the Drina River, which passes Srebrenica. Emir becomes more specific and asks how much they charge the state for all the material wealth at the local level. The discussion is very policy oriented and thus stays at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

We cannot make them pay.

Justification of code: Mira stays interactive, answering Emir that Srebrenica will not be able to make the state pay for the material wealth at the local level. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

We cannot, but let us say that the local authorities charge something and give a percentage to Banja Luka, for example, or to some other local community. That's how it worked before the war.

Justification of code: Emir agrees with Mira that it may be hopeless that Srebrenica gets state money for its local material resources and proposes that the local authorities collect some money and shares it with other local communities, a solution that worked before the war. The discussion is now on very specific policy matters, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

The forest charges do not go to Banja Luka, and the problem is that they are paid irregularly.

Justification of code: It is remarkable how ordinary citizens of both sides of the ethnic divide are willing to talk about minute policy issues. Mira gives further information about the money from the local forests are allocated. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, that is it.

Ana, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, sure

Justification of two preceding codes: Svetlana and Ana have listened to Mira and support what she has said. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Do it our way. Say it our way that everybody understands us. Rustic language is best, and the High Commissioner understands the peasants. He understands them well. The peasant, when he says that there is no bread to eat, he says it very clearly.

Justification of code: Tarik moves away from the detailed policy discussion and makes a general remark of how the letter to the High Commissioner should be written. He proposes that the group should use a simple language, the language of the peasants, and he assures the group that the High Commissioner will understand such language. Since writing this letter is what the group is expected to do, the remark of Tarik is relevant and not off-topic. Therefore the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Well, then tell us what to write.

Justification of code: Milan in a respectful way reacts to Tarik and asks him what he would write in the letter to the High Commissioner. How the discussion develops one does not notice who comes from the Serb side and who from the Bosnjak side. In this way the discussion is not disrupted with sniping remarks across the ethnic divide.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

I have some other suggestions. For example the Guber Spa. You have the economy and some other problems that will cost us a lot. I am saying that for a least 5 years. I spoke to a former Mayor, and to current one. The river bed should be cleaned urgently.

Justification of code: Tarik answers Milan and comes back to the spa, supporting other participants who earlier in the discussion advocated that it should be opened again. Tarik also brings the cleaning of the Drina River on the agenda. Furthermore, Tarik makes some general remarks about the bad situation of the economy and mentions as a personal story that he has spoken on the economy with the former and the current majors. With this elaborate statement he keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Ecology.

Justification of code: Emir follows up Tarik's proposal that the Drina River should be cleaned broadening the agenda mentioning the ecology as a general problem.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

So, ecology.

Justification of code: Tarik agrees with Emir that the cleaning of the Drina River should be seen in the context of the ecology at large. The discussion continues to flow in an interactive way at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Purification of the sewage in order to protect the environment.

Justification of code: Svetlana picks up the issue of the dirty river and the environment in general and puts as a particularly urgent matter the purification of the sewage. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

The river bed is so dirty and so messy.

Justification of code: Tarik reinforces his proposal that the river needs to be cleaned in describing in vivid colors its current messy state. The discussion stays on topic.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

We have cleaned it.

Justification of code: In a respectful way Mira informs the group that she has helped to clean the river.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, but they cleaned only parts.

Justification of code: In an equally respectful way Tarik adds to the statement of Mira that they have cleaned only parts of the river.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

People throw trash, throw all the garbage. So, first we need to educate the people and then clean the river bed.

Justification of code: It is amazing how Serbs and Bosnjaks address the cleaning of the river not in a partisan way but for the common good. Milan as Serb does not claim that it is Bosnjaks who throw garbage into the river but refers to people in general. This statement is very much in a deliberative spirit.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

When they clean the river bed they need to clean everything, not only some parts. I walk there every day. One willow fell in the river bed. And people throw everything ... sofa, trash, garbage...

Justification of code: Tarik insists how dirty the river is, adding his personal story that he has even seen sofas. The discussion remains on topic at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

You know, the problem is garbage.

Justification of code: Mira agrees with previous speakers that garbage in the river is a problem. The discussion stays on topic.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Junk is the biggest problem.

Justification of code: From both sides of the ethnic divide, they continue to agree that garbage in the river is a great problem. The discussion remains interactive.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Hey Mira, you are defending the municipality!

Justification of code: For the first time in this group there is a sniping remark across the ethnic divide. Tarik as a Bosnjak addresses directly Mira as Serb and criticizes her that she is defending the municipality. He seems to refer to an earlier statement of Mira that she helped to clean the river.

Mira Serbian (code 1)

No, (smiling) but it should be my profession.

Justification of code: Mira does not let herself be provoked from the other side of the ethnic divide and simply smiles. Jokingly she adds that cleaning the river would be a good profession for her.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

With your story, you defend the municipality. When they cleaned it near that butcher, down the playground, they cut willows and left all branches. I asked Kiko (former mayor): "Kiko, what are they doing down there?". He said: "We clean a river bed." I told him not to clean a river bed like that, the branches need to be pulled out and not left like that.

Justification of code: Tarik insists that Mira defends the municipality and spells out what goes wrong with cleaning the river. He goes in minute details what should be done differently. To give to his story more credibility he tells the group that he brought his complaint to the mayor himself. Tarik stays on topic, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation. .

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Just to say that this is not done by the municipality. That was done by a donation.

Justification of code: For good deliberation it is important that participants have a common basis of facts. Mira corrects Tarik that the cleaning of the river was not done by the municipality but thanks to a donation. She makes this correction in a respectful way, so that the discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

I do not know, but they should cut and remove all branches from the bed. We all agree.

Justification of code: Tarik yields to Mira in acknowledging that he does not have knowledge who did the cleaning of the river. He does not apologize to Mira but extends a palm branch to her in stating that they all agree, which may also refer to the correction that Mira has made, although it may just refer to what should be done with the branches in the river. Such ambivalence is sometimes good for deliberation, as is the case with the exchange between Tarik and Mira. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

What we said for the letter? In addition to the other things, realization of projects in order to protect the environment.

Justification of code: Svetlana continues to be a conscientious note taker and adds to the letter for the High Commissioner that projects should be undertaken to protect the environment. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 1)

Infrastructure.

Justification of code: Ana wants to make sure that infrastructure is mentioned in the letter, an issue that was addressed earlier in the discussion. The discussion remains very interactive with participants listening to each other. Thus, in the current case, Ana was attentive when Svetlana made suggestions what should be contained in the letter and chose the right moment to make sure that the infrastructure as an important issue was not forgotten. .

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Underline here that as soon as possible, within our ability, to do the sewer in the city. Soon we will be in a situation that I, for instance, I have to make a septic tank that I have nowhere to put. The whole of Srebrenica has this problem.

Justification of code: Emir comes back to the issue of the sewer and reinforces its urgency with a personal story. Participants have the impression that the discussion comes soon to an end, so they want to make sure that all items discussed so far are included in the letter to the High Commissioner. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Should we write "investment in municipal infrastructure, resolving the problem of sewage network"? We cannot say "resolve the problem of stray dogs" because by the law those animals are protected but they did not find a way how to care for them.

Justification of code: Svetlana as note taker becomes increasingly important in the discussion. She summarizes well the issue concerning the sewer problem. With regard to the stray dogs she expresses uncertainty about the proper formulation. To express uncertainty and to ask others for advice is very much in a deliberative spirit.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes.

Justification of code: Emir acknowledges that the formulation with regard to stray dogs is a problem.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Construction of dog shelter, then?

Justification of code: Encouraged by the support of Emir, Svetlana offers herself a formulation with regard to the stray dogs, and this in the form of a question, which is in a deliberative spirit.

Milan, Serbian (1)

Taking care of stray dogs? For us the problem is that the laws are made in accordance with European standards, and we do not have the conditions for it.

Justification of code: Milan gives the relevant information that the laws concerning stray dogs are made in accordance with EU standards and that Bosnia-Herzegovina has not yet the conditions for the implementation of such laws. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

This is European Union (laughing).

Justification of code: Mira mocks all the regulations that come out of Brussels, which causes laughter by the group.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

We definitely do not have conditions for this.

Justification of code: Milan insists that they not have the conditions to have a law for stray dogs according to EU standards. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation. The group continuous to struggle in a serious way what to do with stray dogs.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Not even they had the law on protection of animals in 1948, 1949, 1950. That means that first we must build a state, to raise the standard of living.

Justification of code: Emir continues in a sophisticated way the discussion about the application of EU laws to Bosnia-Herzegovina. About half a century ago, Western European countries did not have either laws for the protection of animals according to their current standards. Bosnia-Herzegovina is where Western Europe was half a century ago. Therefore, it must develop its state and its standards of living before it can have animal protection laws according to EU standards. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 2)

How to build a dog shelter, when we do not have anything to eat, and we need to give to dogs?

Justification of code: Milan expresses despair and hopelessness with the general situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where people do not have enough money to eat and should pay for dogs. After the long discussion about stray dogs, the discussion seems to be at a dead end, being transformed to a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

There is castration?

Justification of code: In a tentative way, Mira mentions castration as an option, without actually supporting it and not saying how such a program could be done with stray dogs that are difficult to catch. The deliberation stays at a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Yes, castration.

Justification of code: Emir confirms that castration would be an option, but without saying how this option would work. The discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

Everything is regulated, but you will only reduce the number of dogs and then let them again go, understand?

Justification of code: Milan states why castration is not an option. Mira and Emir do not insist on the option, which shows that they never stood behind it but only mentioned it because no other options seem in sight. The discussion about stray dogs drags on at a low level of deliberation without any direction.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

It is gradual. It's going slowly. Everything should be resolved in the period let's say of 10-15 years.

Justification of code: It is not clear whether Emir is still referring to the stray dogs, or whether he refers to the general situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Whatever the reference, this vague long term perspective does not move ahead the discussion about a better future. The level of deliberation remains low.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

The largest problem is that no one has obligations. Everyone has rights and no one has obligations.

Justification of code: After the group had discussed for some time without success what should happen with stray dogs, despair and hopelessness sets in. Emir as previous speaker

acknowledged with resignation that not much will happen in the near future. Now Mira complains with equal resignation that nobody wants to take over any obligations. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Amela, Bosnjak (code 3)

And what about the wild pigs that come down into the city?

Justification of code: To make the problem with stray dogs worse, Amela brings the wild pigs into the discussion that come down from the mountains surrounding Srebrenica. Since Amela does not make any suggestion of how the problem of the wild pigs can be solved, the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 3)

Here's a hunter, let him solve the problem. One night one came down and was stuck in the fence.

Justification of code: Ana tells a story illustrating that the wild pigs are indeed a problem. Referring to a hunter in the group to solve the problem is more meant as a joke. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Down in Black River, one wild pig literally came in the courtyard.

Justification of code: Emir tells another story about wild pigs, but the story does not say anything of how the problem could be solved so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 1)

Pigs also wants to learn a little culture here (laughter).

Justification of code: Ana brings some humor into the group lightening up the atmosphere of despair and hopelessness. The discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Or this where we live is also wilderness, so for them it is all the same (more laughter).

Milan picks up on the subtle humor of Ana. They both can laugh about the lack of culture in Srebrenica. It is a kind of black humor. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Is it banned hunting them?

Justification of code: After humor had relaxed the atmosphere, Mira goes back in a serious way to the question of hunting wild pigs that Ana had raised earlier more like a joke. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, but if they make a mess you have a right to kill them on your property.

Justification of code: Milan gives Mira a relevant information, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Can we say "adaptation of the law about the Animal Protection considering the real capabilities of the local community"? It means to adjust enactment of laws and not to bring any abnormal ones.

Justification of code: Svetlana acts again as conscientious note taker and proposes a formulation that would encompass both stray dogs and wild pigs. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, we can do it like that. They need to think also about our capabilities.

Justification of code: Mira agrees with the formulation of Svetlana. The discussion continues to be highly interactive and stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

The maximum penalty is precisely in this sector. Regarding the Law on Animal Protection and Welfare they can punish you with 200 000KM. And to do any kind of misconduct in the field of economy is not consider as such a big crime.

Justification of code: Emir broadens the discussion from stray dogs and wild pigs to the issue of penalties. He finds it wrong that the penalties are lighter for misconduct with economic matters than with ill treatment of animals. In this way he raises a fundamental question of the penal system, which would open space for a wide ranging discussion.

Amela, Bosnjak (code 1)

But on the street, you cannot walk normally because of the dogs.

Justification of code: Amela seems to disagree with Emir and insists on high penalties for violations of the law on the protection of animals. As reason she mentions her personal problem with dogs on the streets. She expresses her disagreement with respect so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

We have a problem going into retirement. They increased the length of working years and now it is 65 years. When young people come and want to work.

Justification of code: Svetlana addresses another issue that is topical for a better future. She criticizes that the retirement age will be raised to 65. She gives a reason for this objection that young people will not find enough jobs. Svetlana keeps the level of discussion at a high level in inviting the group to still address another important issue.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

They will never come in line. They go with the EU standards.

Justification of code: Emir reminds Svetlana that as with stray dogs for retirement age, too, Bosnia-Herzegovina follows EU standards. This is relevant information, so that deliberation remains at a high level.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

What shall we write more?

Justification of code: Milan takes over role as moderator and asks in a neutral way whether the group wants to add anything more to the letter for the High Commissioner. At this late stage of the discussion this is a relevant question, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 1)

Write, it really hurts me personally, infrastructure in Srebrenica more than dogs.

Justification of code: In an interactive way, Ana answers to Milan not adding more issues but proposing that the emphasis in the letter should be more on infrastructure than on stray dogs. She keeps the discussion on topic.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, that's right.

Justification of code: Milan supports Ana that the emphasis should be more on infrastructure than dogs.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

"The development of infrastructure in rural areas" (she is reading what she wrote).

Justification of code: As note taker Svetlana reads aloud what she wants to write about infrastructure. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Oh, everywhere.

Justification of code: Milan is attentive to what Svetlana proposes and wants that it is written that infrastructure is a problem not only in rural areas but everywhere.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

So, "strengthening the infrastructure."

Justification of code: It is remarkable how the group takes seriously how the letter should be written. Svetlana yields to Milan in a respectful way. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes but to build the entire city rather than for one part to have everything and others, for instance Petriča, nothing. In the recent ten years I saw only three programs.

Justification of code: Tarik stays on the topic of infrastructure and wants that all parts of the city should have their infrastructure improved. To reinforce his argument he mentions one part of the city that he fears will get nothing. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

This is it in essence. Add only "communal infrastructure and solving the sewage network".

Justification of code: The group takes great pain to find the right formulation with regard to the infrastructure. Here Svetlana brings back in the sewage issue that was discussed earlier.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

That's it. We will be great when they do this.

Justification of code: After in an earlier part of the discussion despair and hopelessness had prevailed, some optimism has returned, and the group discusses in great detail what it should write about infrastructure. This optimism is now expressed by Milan who hopes that some of their proposals will be accepted. It is remarkable how the group dynamic of a discussion can change from hopelessness to hope.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

Education? We didn't put anything.

Justification of code: It is not yet the end of the discussion, and again it is Svetlana who brings still another issue on the agenda. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

Look at Kasipović (Education Minister), what he was doing, my dear God, How much money he turned to the other side.

Justification of code: Tarik is interactive and supports Svetlana that education also needs improvement. The discussion flows at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Welfare?

Justification of code: Milan adds still another issue that is relevant for a better future.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 2)

I've said just now. Here I am, for example, I as a single mother I'm not protected by any law. I thought of that. No law. I had a problem, I faced the first 3-4 years, and whomever I spoke to told me that there is no law.

Justification of code: After the discussion went smoothly between the two ethnic groups, Svetlana seems comfortable enough to talk about her problems as a single mother. She does not say what her problem is but expresses despair that single mothers are not protected by any law. With this despair she transforms the discussion down to a low level of deliberation. Earlier in the discussion, Svetlana was quite optimistic, but now telling her personal story, the surface falls and she reveals to the group her real feelings.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 3)

What do you think madam that I am protected from? I am a male. By neither women nor men are protected by laws. Neither you nor me. So, there is no law. For those who survived, there is no law.

Justification of code: Finally someone is referring to the war, when Tarik talks about those who survived. He enlarges the point of Svetlana that not only women, but men, too, are not protected by any laws. So he reinforces the despair of Svetlana keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

There is no law for anybody.

Justification of code: Milan follows the two previous speakers in expressing despair that nobody is protected by any law. It is remarkable that this despair is expressed from both sides of the ethnic divide. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

Old laws were better – bring them back to us.

Justification of code: In a nostalgic way, Mira wants to bring back the old laws, but does not say how this could be done, so the level of deliberation remains low.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Protection of workers.

Justification of code: Emir repeats that workers should be protected without adding anything that was not said before, so the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 3)

Protection of workers! We now try to install 90% of the laws that we had before, and they worked well.

Justification of code: Tarik claims that attempts are made to reinstall most of the old laws, but he does not say who is doing that. The discussion stay at a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

They are not trying.

Justification of code: Emir contests that the authorities try to reinstall the old law. He does not give any evidence for this statement, so that the discussion stays at a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

They're trying.

Justification of code: This exchange of unsupported claims does not move the discussion forward.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

Who is trying? You and me?

Justification of code: Emir continues the fruitless controversy whether anyone is trying to reinstall the old laws.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 3)

For example, they abolished free schooling.

Justification of code: Tarik mentions free schooling as an example of a law that was abolished. The implication seems to be that he wants again free schooling, but he does not say this explicitly and does not offer an argument why free schooling would be a good policy. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

I work 14 hours for 400KM. I do not have any kind of insurance, nor any other rights.

Justification of code: Emir repeats the old complaint that people like him have no rights, which does not move the discussion forward.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

They sit in the government and shaping the laws that suits them.

Justification of code: Milan expresses hopelessness that people like him have any influence on the laws since the authorities shape the laws according to their own interests. If ordinary people like Milan have no influence on the laws then it is pointless for the group to make suggestions for a better future, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 3)

They bring laws when they need them. Look how unanimous are when they want to increase their wages.

Justification of code: Ana shares the hopelessness of Milan that ordinary people have any influence on the laws, and she gives a specific illustration for her claim. The discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

No law longer protects workers. The courts are the courts, but you cannot get anything from them.

Justification of code: Milan extends his hopelessness to the courts. The level of deliberation stays low.

Mira, Serbian (4)

And the local community failed a little. They have a law that protects them but there are no control institutions that are working.

Justification of code: Mira is more positive than the previous speakers in correcting them that laws exist to protect the people. She acknowledges that there is a lack of institutions to enforce the laws. To correct this situation she refers to the local community at large, opening space of how the local community could become active. With her less hopeless statement Mira transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 2)

And you know why they are not working? Because people are not protected from those of whom they should. Here's a case that I had in Potocari before July 11 last year. Six policemen and some of us were there. One man pulled out the gun on us without any reason. The police did not react. Not to mention that the Mayor said "oh, kill him". That's it; the laws exist, but only on paper.

Justification of code: Emir immediately rejects the hope of Mira that institutions can be installed that make sure that laws are implemented. To support his claim he tells a personal story where the police did nothing to protect him against a gunman. With such expression of hopelessness, the discussion is again transformed back to a low level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 3)

Yes, that is it.

Justification of code: Overwhelmed by the powerful story of Emir, Mira does not insist on the option that the local community should make sure that laws are enforced. Instead she agrees with Emir that laws exist only on paper. Again, we have agreement across the ethnic divide on an important issue.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

You have nowhere to complain.

Justification of code: Milan continues on a tone of despair, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 3)

You don't, yes.

Justification of code: Tarik agrees with Milan across the ethnic divide that ordinary citizens have nowhere to complain, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 3)

How the laws function you can see from the greater number of charges in Strasbourg. People are increasingly complaining there because they cannot do it here.

Justification of code: To reinforce his point that laws are not enforced in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Emir tells another story, this time not linked to a personal experience. Apparently he has heard that more and more people from Bosnia-Herzegovina turn to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. He interprets this as a sign that people are not satisfied with how laws are enforced in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He does not express hope that the European Court of Human Rights will have an influence on law enforcement here, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

They brought us in the position without any way out; you have to do everything they say.

Justification of code: Milan continues in a hopeless tone that there is no way out of the current situation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 4)

Should we write something about the education? Investing in education?

Justification of code: When Svetlana spoke last, she told her story as single mother, expressing utter despair about her situation, claiming that she has no rights at all. She has remained silent for quite a while, but seems to have recovered and proposes investment in education. Given the low level of deliberation before she speaks, this is a relevant proposal for a better future. She transform the discussion to a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (2)

There is a lot of investing in education. When you start reading, use the internet or something else, large amounts of money are invested, you really get a headache from such big numbers. Here's one example: last night I listened and watched, (education minister) Kasipović, and I do not know why the state gives him 160.000 KM.

Justification of code: Tarik is not at all receptive to the proposal of Svetlana to invest more in education. As an example he gives the salary of the education minister, whom he criticized already in an earlier statement. Tarik does not give any rational argument against more

investment in education. It is pure sarcasm that he gets a headache when he hears about the already high investment in education. He transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation, being unwilling to discuss the proposal of Svetlana in a serious way.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 4)

This is his problem, but let's say we have a chemical or some other professional schools and they are professional only on paper, because they do not have laboratories. How many microscopes, computers those schools have?

Justification of code: Svetlana does not yield and insists on more investment for education. She does give reasons for her proposal. She also does not continue the polemic begun by Tarik. In this way, she transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes, that is it.

Justification of code: Emir support Svetlana that more investments for education are needed. The discussion stay on topic and at a high level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 1)

And why don't they have the money? Because those 160.000 KM are given for other purposes.

Justification of code: Tarik is interactive and stays on topic. He comes back to the salary that is paid to the minister for education, whom Tarik does not consider worth it. He has given up his sarcasm and is no longer for new investment in education but wants to fight against waste in education. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Milan, Serbian (code 1)

Our primary school here does not have gym premises. There is one but it's not usable.

Justification of code: Milan supports Svetlana that the schools need more investments, using as an illustration no usable gym. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (code 1)

I wrote the equipping of schools and the gym to gain practical work. Will we write dedication to him?

Justification of code: Svetlana as note taker summarizes what has been said about education. She then asks whether the letter should be dedicated to the High Commissioner. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Mira, Serbian (code 1)

That's good.

Justification of code: Mira seems to agree that the letter should be dedicated to the High Commissioner, keeping the level of deliberation high.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 2)

We can write what we want but if he does not implement what we write there is no sense.

Justification of code: Tarik doubts that the High Commissioner will implement anything contained in the letter- Therefore he objects that the letter is dedicated to the High Commissioner. With this statement Tarik expresses the view that the whole discussion was pointless, which transforms it to a low level of deliberation.

Ana, Serbian (code 3)

There is nothing that will be implemented. This is a dead letter.

Justification of code: Ana joins Tarik in his negativism, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation.

Tarik, Bosnjak (code 3)

I doubt anyone will read this.

Justification of code: Tarik goes even further in his negativism, expressing doubt whether anyone will read this letter. H

Milan, Serbian (code 3)

Let's write and maybe a miracle will happen. Write "grateful citizens of Srebrenica."

Justification of code: From the context, Milan's reference to a miracle and grateful citizens sound more like sarcasm, which keeps the level of deliberation low.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 4)

And ask him to visit us here for a public hearing in the Cultural Center. Not to visit the local authorities but common people.

Justification of code: Emir makes it as a serious proposal that the High Commissioner should come and visit ordinary citizens, bypassing the local authorities. This proposal corresponds very much to the deliberative criterion that democracy should start from below. With this proposal Emir transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Svetlana, Serbian (1)

"If you can find any possibility to implement some (or all) of the foregoing requirements we can create better quality and a more beautiful life for all. Thank you in advance. We invite you to participate in a public hearing"

Justification of code: As note taker Svetlana reads how she includes the proposal of Emir into the letter to the High Commissioner. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Emir, Bosnjak (code 1)

"It would be our great pleasure if you can find time to visit us, but only the citizens and not the local government. Sincerely, citizens of Srebrenica."

Justification of code: Emir insists that the letter should say that the High Commissioner visit only the citizens and not the local authorities. There is no objection and the discussion comes at a high tone of deliberation to an end.

Group 4 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica²³

Participants

Mevlida, Bosnjak, 27 years old, teacher

Esena, Bosnjak, 27 years old, teacher

Aida, Bosnjak, 27 years old, teacher

Božana, Serbian, 47 years old, teacher

Andjela, Serbian, 34 years old, teacher

Sabina, Bosnjak, 27 years old, teacher

Katarina, Serbian, 53 years old, teacher

Snežana, Serbian, 58 years old, teacher

Moderator

What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina; your responses to be delivered to the High Representative?

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

I suggest that we first discuss and then write on one paper... we should be economical and not use eight papers but only one.

Justification of code: Katarina opens the discussion on a procedural matter, which seems appropriate. She proposes that the group should first have the discussion and write the letter to the High Commissioner only afterwards. She does not wish that notes are taken during the discussion. The justification is that this method to proceed is more economical.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Will we have anything from writing this?

²³ The participants in this group were selected randomly among teachers participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center, see Chapter 1.

Justification of code: Sabina asks the fundamental question whether writing the letter will have any consequences for the people in Sarajevo. This is a very relevant question given the general frustration with the political leaders, as we seen in the other discussion groups. So it is understandable that Sabina at the very beginning wants to know whether it is worthwhile to have the discussion at all. With this question, Sabina keeps the level of deliberation high, opening space for the group to discuss whether ordinary citizens have any influence at all. If this question would be answered in the negative, it would be pointless to have the discussion.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

Yeah, will they fulfill that we write?

Justification of code: Božana as Serbian reaches over to Sabina as Bosnjak and also expresses doubts whether the letter to the High Commissioner will have any effect. It is important that at this very beginning of the discussion there is a common view expressed across the ethnic divide, indicating that at the grass root level people from both sides may have similar life worlds in the sense of Habermas. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

So that we do not write this in vain.

Justification of code: When Katarina in her earlier statement proposed how the discussion and the writing of the letter should be organized, the implication was that the letter would have purpose. Now Katarina reacts in an interactive way to Sabina and Božana and shares their concern that the letter may have no impact. It makes sense for the group to address the question of whether writing a letter to the High Commissioner will have any effect. This is an issue that is also widely discussed in the deliberative literature with the worry that discussions in mini publics may have no policy impact. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

Who will fulfill this? All of them work for their needs. And we are just material, as this letter.

Justification of code: Snežana shares the doubt that the letter will have any policy impact. As justification for her doubts she claims that political leaders look only for their own needs, misusing ordinary people as non-human material for their own purposes. Thus, Snežana claims that political leaders have no interest in involving ordinary citizens in a deliberative manner. The discussion is already at the heart of politics in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Shall we begin?

Justification of code: Begija intervenes for the first time and proposes that the discussion on the letter to the High Commissioner should begin. Without stating it explicitly, she seems to be of the opinion that it makes sense for the group to write a letter to the High Commissioner. With this procedural proposal, she opens space to put aside the doubts of the previous speakers and to address the question assigned to the group how life in Bosnia-Herzegovina can be improved. With this statement, Begija takes on a deliberative leadership position, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

What to write in this message? Let's think about

Justification of code: Katarina agrees with Begija that despite all the doubts about the effectiveness of the letter to the High Commissioner, the group should begin with the substantive discussion. She urges the group to think about what should stand in the letter. It is in a deliberative spirit that she wishes to hear what other participants have to say. The level of deliberation stays high.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

To send our message to him.

Justification of code: Snežana, too, overcomes his doubts about the effectiveness of the letter and now agrees that the group should send a message to the High Commissioner. In his earlier statement, Snežana claimed that political leaders only care for their own needs and treat ordinary citizens as non-human material. It is remarkable how Begija could change the group dynamic when she proposed that they should begin with the substantive discussion. Now even Snežana, who had expressed the most doubts about whether the letter will have an influence turns around and wants to send a message to the High Commissioner. Deliberation continues at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1):

What shall it all be?

Justification of code: Katarina asks again the other participants what they shall put into the letter. She tries to stimulate ideas to be expressed, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1):

Oh, we need so much.

Justification of code: Snežana states in a general way that there are so many needs. With this formulation she encourages the other participants to articulate specific needs. Deliberation continues at a high level.

Mevlida, Bosnjak (code 1)

I need everything, I have nowhere to live.

Justification of code: Amela speaks up for the first time. In an interactive way, she follows up what Snežana said and agrees with her that there are many needs. Amela becomes specific and tells her story that she has nowhere to live. Presumably she lives with family or friends. Amela is the first to articulate a specific need, thus opening space for others also to become specific. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Me too.

Justification of code: The discussion flows in an interactive way with Katarina having listened to Amela and adding her own story that she has nowhere to live. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

First, let's start from that, I have no job, I have nothing

Justification of code: Sabina adds her own story telling the group that she has no job. She even adds that she has nothing at all, expressing in this way utter despair. With the stories of Amela, Katarina and Sabina a basis is set to discuss how life in Srebrenica can be improved. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

OK, they said to do this in the form of theses. First housing, then my job, and car.

Justification of code: Snežana attempts to bring order into the discussion. She reminds the group that the moderator and her helper demanded that the letter to the High Commissioner should be written in the form of theses. Having listened to what was already mentioned, Snežana lists housing and jobs, and adds cars as unfilled needs. Deliberation continues at a high level.

Esenja, Bosnjak (code 1)

Wait, I did not understand, do they think about us in person or something else.

Justification of code: The discussion continues in a serious way with Amela raising the procedural question whether they should deal with personal matters or with something broader. It is in a deliberative spirit that Amela acknowledges that she has not understood what is expected of the group and asks other participants to clarify for her. Articulating such a question corresponds to the key deliberative criterion of reciprocity, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

I cannot put a shoe on another shoe, while I am barefoot. What should I do?

Justification of code: Katarina uses a metaphor to answer Amela. She argues that one cannot discuss general matters when the most basic personal needs are not fulfilled. If one is barefoot, one cannot talk about shoes. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Mevlida, Bosnjak (code 1)

I thought about us, not only me.

Justification of code: Now Amela gives her own answer to her earlier question and proposes that they should discuss matters that concern all in the group. Again Amela refers to the principle of reciprocity that all in the group should listen to each other, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

I think of all of us, too. We are all the same. We all have the same needs.

Justification of code: Katarina agrees with Amela that the group should discuss common problems. As justification she states that they have all the same needs. In this way Katarina creates a common life world, which according to Habermas is an important precondition for deliberation. Katarina follows up on the metaphor in her earlier statement that when all are barefoot they have the same needs. The discussion flows nicely at a high level of deliberation with the participants building on each other's contributions with no hard edges across the ethnic divide between Serbs and Bosnjaks.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

Let's put the economy. Economy, because it's the most necessary.

Justification of code: Božana stays on topic and adds the economy to the list of great needs. Her justification is that the economy is the most important issue to be resolved. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

First, employ people, and then children will be born, everything will be just good.

Justification of code: Sabina as Bosnjak agrees with Božana as Serbian that the economy is the most important issue. It continues to be remarkable how easily it is for the group to reach over to the other ethnic side. Sabina justifies the importance of the economy that its improvement will allow families to have children and care for them. It should be noted that in the culture of Srebrenica to have children and to be able to care for children is of great emotional value. If it would be easier to have children, Sabina sees a bright future over all. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

To bring back people. The first thing is that people are moving out of here. There is no single person on the streets in the evening. This is horrible. I live here, and swear to God, as years are passing by it is worse and worse.

Justification of code: The discussion flows nicely at a high level of deliberation. In her earlier statement Božana claimed that improving the economy is the most important task. Now she justifies this claim. Her argument is that due to the bad economy people leave Srebrenica, which can be seen in the empty streets in the evenings. Božana uses emotions to underline her point. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes it is.

Justification of code: Again there is agreement between Sabina and Božana across the ethnic divide. Sabina agrees that the situation gets worse and worse. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

And still everybody speak about donations.

Justification of code: Božana gives a further justification why the economic situation is so bad. She refers to donations that people speak about but that never arrive. Deliberation stays high.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

That's true.

Justification of code: Once again Sabina agrees with Božana across the ethnic divide. The two women develop increasingly a common life world between themselves. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 2)

I think also to leave. It's so empty. At night you can only meet dogs.

Justification of code: Andjela speaks up for the first time, and with her expression of despair and hopelessness she transforms the discussion from a high to a low level of deliberation. Sabina and Božana already began to express high dissatisfaction with the current situation in Srebrenica. Andjela now makes a step further in telling the group that she plans to leave Srebrenica. As justification she picks up from Božana that at night there is nobody on the streets. Andjela brings in the additional aspect that one meets only dogs in the streets. From other discussion groups we know that stray dogs are a big problem in Srebrenica. So when Andjela refers to dogs, she must have these stray dogs in mind. With her statement Andjela does not open space how the situation in Srebrenica can be improved. She prefers an exit strategy to a voice strategy in the sense of Albert Hirschman.²⁴ So for her it seems pointless to discuss means to improve the situation in Srebrenica.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

I also say, it's like a horror movie. I really do not know why it is like that.

Justification of code: Sabina is now also completely overtaken by despair and hopelessness, keeping deliberation at a low level. She uses the metaphor of a horror movie to describe the situation in Srebrenica. It is interesting how she addresses the question of how the situation can be explained. Since she does not know herself the explanation, in a deliberative spirit she should have asked the other participants to help, which would have corresponded to the principle of reciprocity. But Sabina speaks to herself acknowledging that she does not know why the situation is like it is. With this self-centered statement she gives expression to her helplessness.

Snežana, Serbian (code 4)

But if we have economy developed...

Justification of code: Snežana breaks the cycle of despair and hopelessness and transforms the discussion back to a high level of deliberation. She expresses hope that if the economy could be improved the situation in Srebrenica could become better. Snežana takes up a thread that

²⁴ Albert Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, Harvard University Press, 1970.

was developed earlier in the discussion and that was lost with all the talk about how awful the situation was. From a group dynamic perspective it is remarkable that it is Snežana who brings new hope to the discussion since in her first statement she expressed disgust about the political leaders who looked only for their own needs and who treated ordinary people as mere material. The example of Snežana shows how attitudes may change over the span of a discussion.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

At least a couple of factories that people can work.

Justification of code: Katarina is interactive with Snežana and becomes specific how the economy could develop, suggesting that opening a few factories would give people work. She keeps deliberation at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Srebrenica was an industrial city before. Here we can launch an appeal to the High Commissioner to take a part and help in the reconstruction of some companies.

Justification of code: Aida has established herself as a deliberative leader early in the discussion. She had not spoken for a while and takes now again a leadership role in spreading optimism to the group. She begins with a look back into the history of Srebrenica and reminds the group that it was once an industrial city, so that this tradition could be taken up again. She sees the letter to the High Commissioner as a possible way to make progress in bringing back some companies. The group dynamic is now far away from the beginning of the discussion when other participants expressed severe doubts whether such a letter could have any impact. Begija keep deliberation at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Spa? Factories?

Justification of code: Katarina adds to factories a spa that could be reconstructed. Before the war Srebrenica had a flourishing spa for tourists. In a deliberative spirit following the principle of reciprocity Katarina asks the group whether they agree that these two items should be put into the letter to the High Commissioner. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Mevlida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes. Write that.

Justification of code: Amela was attentive to what Katarina proposed and is supportive that the reconstruction of factories and the spa should be put into the letter to the High Commissioner. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

This is probably the potential with the least investment. You have water, you have the nature.

Justification of code: It was Snežana who had transformed the discussion back to a high level of deliberation when in her last intervention she claimed that progress in the economy was possible. Now he gives good justifications for her earlier claim. Speaking in economic terms, she argues that reconstruction of factories and the spa could bring the highest effect with the

least amount of investment. She continues that for the running of the factories Srebrenica had enough water and nature would help to attract tourists to the spa. This was up to now the most sophisticated justification offered by any member of the group. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

These industrial zones that exist only need to be restarted. Or at least to open the spa.

Justification of the code: It is remarkable how the group dynamic develops. When Božana last spoke she expressed utter despair and hopelessness characterizing the situation in Srebrenica as horrible and getting worse and worse. Now with Snežana, Katarina, Begija, and Amela offering ways how the economy could be improved, Božana also becomes more optimistic and sees chances that factories and the spa could be reconstructed. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

At least one factory that can employ young people.

Justification of code: Katarina shows empathy. If at least one factory would be reopened, jobs should go to young people. Earlier in the discussion Katarina told the group that she is very needy having nowhere to live and this at the age of 53. Yet, she wants to give the first jobs available to young people. Such empathy is in keeping deliberation at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Now we will put down the theses and we will explain them later.

Justification of code: Sabina is also influenced by the more optimistic group dynamic. While in her last intervention Sabina compared the situation in Srebrenica to a horror movie, she is now willing to help to work on the letter to the High Commissioner, which means that she sees ways to get out of the horror movie. She makes a procedural proposal that they should begin the letter to the High Commissioner in the form of theses that will then be explained later in the letter. So Sabina is no longer so despairing and hopeless as earlier in the discussion when she brought down the discussion to a low level of deliberation. This time she is able to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Božana, Serbian (code 1)

We have "Feros" (Factory in Potocari) and it's still closed.

Justification of code: Božana gets even more specific and mentions a factory that could be reopened. With this information, she opens more space of how to go about to develop the economy. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 1)

People come from other places and work here and those who live here have nothing. Write down that we need to be a realistic.

Justification of code: Andjela raises another issue but stays on topic. In order to get more jobs for the people living in Srebrenica, she wants to limit the access of people from the outside to the local labor market. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

It is true. Maybe we should write that we need to change the current structure of employment in Srebrenica and indicate that the problem is that more people who work here are from the outside. How did I express that? It is easier to express verbally, but when it comes to writing.

Justification of code: Aida supports Andjela that the local people should be privileged in the local labor market. It is remarkable that she is unsure of how to express this idea in writing. In a deliberative spirit, she asks the other participants whether she expresses it well. Her statement is a good example of how ordinary people are often unsure of how to express their arguments, not only in writing but also in oral form. Acknowledging such difficulty corresponds to a key idea of deliberation in the sense that reciprocity is easier when actors are not too sure whether they choose the right words to express an idea. Other actors can then step in with suggestions about the right words. With this statement Begija keeps deliberation at a high level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 1)

You write, you have the best handwriting.

Justification of code: Andjela asks Aida to write down the proposal about the restriction of outsiders to the local labor market. In a light hearted manner, she gives as justification that Aida has the better handwriting. With this procedural proposal the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

You speak and I will write.

Justification of code: Aida accepts to do the writing but Andjela should dictate her, what to write. Here again there is an instance of an easy going pattern across the ethnic divide, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

Give me some juice, I'm thirsty.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

What do you want? Tea? Coca Cola?

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

Give me a tea.

(Sabina and Katarina giving drinks also to others)

Justification of the codes for this sequence: In the deliberative literature it is often mentioned that having drinks or even a meal together relaxes the atmosphere and helps deliberation. Here is a good example. Serbians and Bosnjaks are sufficiently comfortable to serve each other drinks. The main serving is done by Sabina as Bosnjak and Katarina as Serbian. Although talking about who wishes what drinks is not on the topic assigned to the group, it keeps the general atmosphere at a high level of deliberation and makes it easier to continue the discussion at this high level. .

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

What did you write?

Justification of code: After this short break, Sabina wants to know from Begija what she wrote down about the limits for outsiders on the local labor market. Thus the group has no problem to stay on the issue discussed before the break, so that deliberation stays at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Determine the structure of employment; in our local community more people work who come from the outside.

Justification of code: As asked by Sabina, Begija reads what she wrote about people from the outside working in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

First we need to start with the economy.

Justification of code: The group now goes into the details of the theses with which to begin the letter to the High Commissioner. Snežana proposes that the economy should be at the top of the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1):

We already wrote that.

Justification of code: Aida as note taker answers Snežana that the economy is already at the top of the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Starting with the economy. Running the spa "Guber".

Justification of code: Sabina agrees that they should begin with the economy. She then suggests the restoration of the spa as another item to be put on the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

We will write it down now.

Justification of code: Begija agrees that the economy and the spa should be the two top priorities on the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Definitely, that spa is very important.

Justification of code: Katarina also wants to put the spa on the list but does not object that the economy should top the list. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Will you explain it later in the paper?

Justification of code: Aida comes back to the procedural proposal made by Sabina earlier in the discussion that the theses should be explained only later in the letter to the High Commissioner. Aida asks Katarina whether she would do this with regard to the spa. Deliberation continues at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Perfect.

Justification of code: Katarina agrees to take over this task. With a quick back and forth the discussion is very interactive with the participants being seriously engaged with what to put in the letter to the High Commissioner. This sequence is in a stark contrast to the beginning of the discussion when severe doubts were expressed whether such a letter made sense at all. The discussion continues to flow at high level of deliberation.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

Implement projects that will help young people in this community. Young professionals.

Justification of code: As a third item to be put on the list, Aida mentions projects that help young people, in particular young professionals. She picks up a proposal that was already made by Katarina earlier in the discussion. Here is another example of an agreement across the ethnic divide with Katarina coming from the Serbian side, Aida from the Bosnjak side. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Young professionals, housing allocations. What can you do if you don't have a flat? A flat is a base from which you can move on.

Justification of code: Katarina is glad that Begija has picked up the issue of young people, and she agrees that the emphasis should be on young professionals. Katarina adds as a fourth item to be put on the list allocations for housing. Her justification is that having a flat is the basis from which you can move on. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 1)

Yeah, sure.

Justification of code: Snežana agrees that it is essential to have a flat. Earlier in the discussion Katarina stated that all participants have the same needs irrespective of their ethnic background. The ensuing discussion increasingly shows that she was correct in her evaluation, since up to now no disagreements emerged on what to put on the list for the High Commissioner. Here again, Snežana spontaneously agrees with Katarina that housing is a key demand to be forwarded to the High Commissioner. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Esena, Bosnjak (code 1)

Young people are not getting married because they don't have their own apartment.

Justification of code: Amela agrees that housing is a crucial demand and offers as justification that lack of housing prevents young people to get married. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

You cannot give birth to a child because you need to give him something to eat.

Justification of code: Sabina in an interactive way follows up Amela about the problem to get married and mentions as a further problem besides lack of housing that some young people may not even have enough food to raise children. Amela and Sabina, both young women, use the problems of young people to get married in an effective way to draw the attention of the group to the dismal situation in Srebrenica. Increasingly a common life world in the sense of Habermas is created in the group. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

The High Commissioner in accordance with his mandate should influence that more young people take a part in public institutions and authorities.

Justification of code: Aida stays on the topic of young people and wants to give them more of a say in public institutions and authorities. In a general way, she expresses optimism that the letter to the High Commissioner could have an influence on the situation of young people in Srebrenica. With such optimism, Aida keeps deliberation at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

And educate them too, not like us who are now old and uneducated. They really make me so nervous.

Justification of code: Sabina in an interactive way stays on the topic of young people and adds that they need to be better educated. To justify her argument she tells the story of her generation that although they are only in the late 20's are uneducated. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Božana, Serbian (code 2)

How is Draze?

Justification of code: Božana addresses Snežana about how her son is doing. This question must have been stimulated by the general discussion about how to help young people. The question, however, comes out of the blue and is not linked with the previous discussion. Therefore, the flow of the discussion is disrupted, and deliberation is transformed to a low level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 3)

Well, he is good. He opened the gym.

Justification of code: Snežana answers the question at a personal level without any link to the general discussion.

Božana, Serbian (code 3)

So he is good?

Justification of code: Božana also continues at a personal level without any link to the general discussion.

Snežana, Serbian (code 3)

Oh, no, there are no visitors.

Justification of code: Snežana corrects the story of her son that indeed he is not doing so well, since he has little business in his gym. This would have been an opportunity for Snežana to make a general argument about the situation of young people in Srebrenica, but she remains at a purely personal level, so that the level of deliberation stays low.

Božana, Serbian (code 3)

There will be... He should hope.

Justification of code: Božana gives hope to Snežana that her son will soon do better, but she does not make any argument why his situation will improve. This sequence between Božana and Snežana would have been a good occasion to use the example of the son of Snežana to discuss why young people have so many difficulties to find work and what could be done about it. But because the dialogue remained at an idiosyncratic personal level it had no relevance for the general question assigned to the group of how life could be improved in Srebrenica. This is a good example that sometimes personal stories are so much off topic that they are of no help with deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

The legislative on executive powers.

Justification of code: Katarina is taken aback by the personal exchange between Božana and Snežana and is at a loss of how to continue the discussion at a more general level. What she says about the legislative and executive branches of government does not make sense, keeping the discussion at a low level of deliberation. This is also the position of John S. Dryzek for whom personal stories are only relevant for deliberation when they are connected to general issues.²⁵

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

Is there anything else?

Justification of code: That the flow of the discussion is interrupted by the story of the son of Snežana is also made clear when Aida raises the question whether there is anything else to be discussed. The implication is that perhaps the discussion has come to an end. With her question Aida does not transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

Put it under the theses also.

²⁵ John S. Dryzek, "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building," *Comparative Political Studies*, 42 (2009).

Justification of code: Andjela is unclear what should be included among the theses to be sent to the High Commissioner. The discussion has lost any direction dragging on at a low level of deliberation.

Snežana, Serbian (code 3)

Let's not write just about young people but put something more concrete about the economy.

Justification of code: Snežana wants to include something more concrete about the economy but does not say what this could be. With this vague suggestion she is not able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

Have we mentioned the economy, the spa?

Justification of code: Katarina picks up the issue of the economy but does not follow up the suggestion of Snežana to include something more concrete. She also refers to the possibility to run again the spa but does not add anything new to what was already discussed earlier. The discussion continues to drag on at a low level of deliberation.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

We have it as first to run the economy.

Justification of code: Aida repeats what was already decided that the economy should be mentioned first in the letter to the High Commissioner. The discussion becomes repetitive keeping the level of deliberation low.

Božana, Serbian (code 3)

We need to continue to run the industry that we have.

Justification of code: Božana is also repetitive, restating that the industrial development should be based on the factories that already exist. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

Improving the economy and industry in order to developed community and employ people.

Justification of code: Aida also says nothing that was not said before. So the discussion still does not get any new impulses to be transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

Božana, Serbian (code 3)

There are already facilities, which are just empty.

Justification of code: Božana simply repeats what she said in her previous statement. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

If we wait for another couple of years we will not have anyone to hire.

Justification of code: Sabina expresses utter despair anticipating that in the coming years most people will have left Srebrenica so that the problem of hiring becomes moot for lack of

people to be hired. Whereas in the sequence before Sabina spoke, the discussion suffered from repetition, with the statement of Sabina it turns to despair and hopelessness. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

People are leaving. No one can hold out on the bare turf. This everyone knows.

Justification of code: Katarina joins Sabina in despair that there is no future in Srebrenica so that people are leaving. Deliberation stays at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

Right. What else should we discuss?

Justification of code: Aida also joins into the despair and hopelessness. With her question whether there is anything else to be discussed she implies that all has been said. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian code 3)

They also know what we need. So many of them come and go and do not do anything. I'm so sick of all those empty talks.

Justification of code: Katarina also wants closure of the discussion. She refers to political leaders, presumably also to the internationals from the European Union and NGO's. According to Katarina, they know the needs of the people but do nothing about them. The implication is that it is pointless to continue the discussion about the letter to be sent to the High Commissioner. Such doubts about the value of sending the letter were already expressed at the very beginning of the discussion. In between there were some more hopeful sequences, but with the statement of Katarina the old doubts have reemerged. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Snežana, Serbian (code 3)

Also, no one is trying to see where all invested money went.

Justification of code: Snežana touches on the issue of corruption criticizing that nobody investigates where all the allocated money disappears. Since Snežana does not make any suggestion of how such an investigation could be started deliberation remains at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

Everybody speaks about investments and the poor are getting worse and worse.

Justification of code: Katarina repeats her complaint that all the talk about investments is just empty talk, while the situation of the poor people gets worse and worse. Implicitly she supports Snežana that corruption is wide spread. The discussion has now taken a turn where space is closed to come up with proposals of how life in Srebrenica could be improved. Thus, deliberation remains at a low level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

They say a lot of money is invested in water and steam and we still do not have permanent water supply.

Justification of code: Andjela expands on the issue of corruption and gives as an example the water supply where it is claimed that money is invested but no results are seen, so that somewhere this money disappears. Andjela, too, does not offer any solution to such corruption so that deliberation remains at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 4)

Investigate once again in which part of our local community funds were invested. For example, people who live in some buildings still do not have water supply and no one is informed. It has no logic; you need to inform people to prepare and to have a water tank close to those buildings.

Justification of code: Aida makes a concrete proposal how life could be improved with regard to the problem of water supply. After all the expressions of despair, Aida opens some space to come back to the topic assigned to the group of how life in Srebrenica could be improved. The discussion is transformed back to a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 2)

Irresponsible people. It is pure contagion.

Justification of code: Katarina does not use the space opened by Aida and comes back to the issue of corruption. She claims that corruption is contagious making people more and more irresponsible. The implication is that nothing can be done against such contagion. With the expression of such despair and hopelessness Katarina transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

It is only here that people use their conscience so little when they make some conclusions or laws.

Justification of code: Aida does not pursue her proposal of how the problems with the water supply could be solved but follows up Katarina about the desperate situation in Srebrenica. Aida goes so far as to claim that there is no other place where people lack so much conscience so that corruption is so high. With such a statement Aida keeps deliberation at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

And citizens are not informed about anything.

Justification of code: Katarina continues to complain about political leaders who keep ordinary people in the dark. With this statement Katarina reinforces her claim that corruption is spreading more and more with the consequence that there is no transparency of what goes on among the corrupt leaders. Deliberation drags on at a low level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

You have to quarrel with them (laughing)

Justification of code: Sabina tells Katarina that she should quarrel with the political leaders. From the laughter that she gets from this statement it is clear that Sabina means this as a sarcastic joke in the sense that political leaders would not be impressed if Katarina would confront them. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

Recently we applied for internet connection and we have waited one month. First we were refused to sign. After, they usually postpone their obligations. When I call them they say: "Well we'll try to provide you", I said: 'I do not know how you do when you do not try?'"

Justification of code: Aida gives another example how things do not work in Srebrenica, reinforcing the atmosphere of despair and hopelessness in the group. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Well, that's it?

Justification of code: Sabina gives a sign that the discussion has come to an end. Deliberation stays at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

Oh my God, we wrote a lot to him, I doubt he will read all of this. Does he know how to read this at all? (the letter is written in Serbo-Croatian).

Justification of code: Katarina comes back to the doubts expressed already at the beginning of the meeting whether the letter to the High Commissioner will have any effect. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

I am interested in how much is his salary.

Justification of code: Aida gets off topic addressing the salary of the High Commissioner. Deliberation drags on at a low level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

I do not care, I have nothing of it.

Justification of code: Sabina stays off topic keeping deliberation at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

I'm just interested. I heard that one man in Bijeljina has a salary of 166 000KM.

Justification of code: Katarina stays off topic. This discussion about high salaries reinforces the despair and hopelessness of participants who are all ordinary people. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

Where he works?

Justification of code: Andjela stays off topic keeping deliberation at a low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

In the bank.

Justification of code: Katarina still remains off topic, keeping deliberation at low level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

Maybe it's his bank?

Justification of code: Andjela continues with the off topic issue of high salaries. Deliberation remains at low level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

Well I do not know that. Man, 166 000KM monthly salary!

Justification of code: The question of high salaries is of great interest to the group but does not help to come up with proposals of how to improve the general situation in Srebrenica. Discussing high salaries would only be relevant if the group would come up with proposals of how to arrive at a more equal salary structure. But since no such proposals are made, deliberation drags on at a low level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

Oh, I'm not going to earn that much in my whole life.

Justification of code: This discussion of high salaries is just contributing to the despair and hopelessness in the group. When Andjela claims that she will not make as much as the banker in her entire life, she does not suggest any ways how this could be changed so that deliberation stays at a low level.

Mevlida, Bosnjak (code 3)

He has 250.000 euros monthly salary (laughing)

Justification of code: Still the salary issue, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 3)

What you should do with that money, ah?

Justification of code: Still the salary issue, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Mevlida, Bosnjak (code 3)

I have no idea (laughing)

Justification of code: The laughter shows that the participants begin to joke about the high salaries. This is a well-known mechanism of tension release in a bad situation. The laughter also reinforces the common life world of the group that we have already seen earlier in the discussion. But it is already too late in the discussion that the awareness of the common life world helps to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 3)

When you look what some individuals own. It's horrible.

Justification of code: Katarina stays with the issue of great inequality but she does not make any suggestions of how one could get at more equality, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 3)

I think we were recorded all the time.

Justification of code: Andjela is worried that all this discussion about high salaries was recorded. This worry shows that Andjela is reluctant to express her critique of the people higher up. Such worries are not conducive to a free flow of deliberation, which remains at a low level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 3)

Yes we were.

Justification of code: Sabina confirms that the tapes were always. Deliberation stays at low level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 4)

We should put this in some frame? "Dear Mr. Minister ...".

Justification of code: Despite all the doubts expressed about the usefulness of writing the letter to the High Commissioner, Aida acts again as deliberative leader and proposes the format in which the letter should begin. She is able to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Let us define it.

Justification of code: Earlier on Katarina had expressed doubts on whether the High Commissioner will read the letter at all. But now she yields to the leadership of Begija and wants to help on how the High Commissioner should be addressed. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

If I was smart I would have done something with my life. Put the title as follows: "Dear Mr. High Commissioner."

Justification of code: The first sentence of Sabina is interesting in the context of the discussion. Up to now participants put the blame of the bad situation in Srebrenica on others. Now Sabina acknowledges that she could have done herself something more with her life. This acknowledgment brings some optimism to the group in the sense that everyone is to some extent also responsible for his or her life situation. Given her first sentence Sabina is now willing to actually write the letter to the High Commissioner and proposes of how he should be addressed. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

How do I write that?

Justification of code: As note taker, Aida asks for advice how to write what Sabina proposes. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Write as you will; however she (the moderator) will type it later. If I write she won't be able to read it.

Justification of code: Sabina is seriously involved in how to write the letter to the High Commissioner. In practical terms, she tells Aida to do the writing since her own hand writing is not readable. She reminds the group that the moderator will type the letter afterwards, so that she needs a readable version. Deliberation continues at a high level.

Katarina, 53 years old, Serbian (1):

She will if she really wants to.

Justification of code: Katarina agrees with Sabina that the group should leave it to the moderator to type the final version of the letter. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

What should we do next?

Justification of code: Begija keeps up her leadership role and ask the group what still still has to be done. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Nothing, just write this.

Justification: In an interactive way Sabina responds Aida that the group has finished the work so that the letter can be finished. According to the research design, the moderator did not intervene, and it was up to the group to decide when to come to closure. Aida and Sabina took over this task in a concise way with Aida putting the question and Sabina giving the answer. On this procedural matter, deliberation was kept at a high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

We need to finish this letter. I hope that we will accomplish at least something.

Justification of code: It is remarkable how group dynamic has changed again. While Katarina earlier was doubtful whether the High Commissioner will even read the letter, she now expresses hope that the group has accomplished something. It seems that the leadership of Aida and Sabina pushing the group to come to closure and to finish the letter had an effect on Katarina. Deliberation continues at high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

We will do that at the end. "In today's discussion ...", so, make a little introduction. "We concluded the following and then take all this and we will eventually put what we said.

Justification of code: Aida is at the core of her leadership role proposing to the group the structure of the letter to be sent to the High Commissioner. She keeps deliberation at high level.

Sabina, Bosnjak (code 1)

What we concluded is the best for our local community.

Justification of code: Sabina keeps up the optimistic tone keeping deliberation at a high level.

Aida, Bosnjak (code 1)

The economy, industry, employment, retention of young, developing our community, determining the structure of employment, participation of young and educated people in local government and authorities, review the funds invested in our local community, because we who live here do not see where all the funds that are often mentioned in the media are invested. We still live in a city that is ruined and not functional for life. That is the frame.

Justification of code: This is a succinct summary of the discussion, keeping deliberation at high level.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

Put this also: ‘We hope that all this will not remain only on paper. We expect your positive attitude and we send you our warm regrets. We wish you good health and successful career. Srebrenica, 19/08/2010.

Justification of code: Katarina is now definitely in a different mood, raying optimism that the letter will have a positive effect. Deliberation continues at high level.

Andjela, Serbian (code 1)

She (the moderator) will type this later.

Justification of code: Andjela wants to make sure that the moderator will type the letter so that the High Commissioner does not have to decipher unreadable handwriting. Deliberation stays high.

Katarina, Serbian (code 1)

We have finished.

Justification of code: Nobody objects to the summary of Aida, so that the discussion ends at a high deliberative note with Katarina declaring the meeting finished. .

Group 5 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica²⁶

²⁶ The participants in this group were selected randomly among students participating in activities of the Norwegian NGO Nansen Dialogue Center, see Chapter 1.

Participants

Laila, Bosnjak, 13 years old, student

Samir, Bosnjak, 13 years old, student

Goran, Serbian, 14 years old, student

Zoran, Serbian, 14 years old, student

Jovan, Serbian, 13 years old, student

Azmina, Bosnjak, 14 years old, student

Marijana, Serbian, 13 years old, student

Ermina, Bosnjak, 14 years old, student

Moderator

What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina; your responses to be delivered to the High Representative?

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

Should we put "more fun for youth"?

Justification of code: As a teenage girl Marijana begins the discussion at a light note proposing in a general way more fun for young people. Knowing the dismal situation in Srebrenica, this is a relevant demand. Marijana opens space to continue the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

We need him to send us one liter of Rakia.

Justification of code: Goran continues at a light note. He refers to the High Commissioner, who should be asked to send to the group the well-known local spirit Rakia. This demand is, of course, meant as joke, especially among a group of teenagers. From a deliberative perspective jokes may have positive and negative effects. Often the effect depends on the context. In the present context at the beginning of a meeting between Serbs and Bosnjaks such a light hearted joke helped to loosen up the atmosphere, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

C'mon get serious.

Justification of code: As a Bosnjak, Ermina responds to Goran in a respectful way. She has understood the joke and does not mind its light hearted manner. With a relaxed atmosphere having been established in the group, Ermina suggests that a serious discussion should now begin. With her statement she keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

Sure, to build a new park, bus station.

Justification of code: Marijana comes back into the discussion and in an interactive way takes up the suggestion of Ermina to get serious and make substantive suggestions of how life could be improved in Srebrenica. The proposal of Marijana to build a new park and a new bus station opens space for further discussion keeping deliberation at a high level.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

And also to reconstruct some parts of Srebrenica, for example the Argentarija Park.

Justification of code: After Ermina asked in her first statement that the discussion should become serious, she makes now a substantive proposal herself postulating that parts of Srebrenica should be rebuilt, referring in particular to a park. With this statement, Ermina as Bosnjak supports Marijana as Serb that some new constructions are needed in Srebrenica. The discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

Also a brand new container should be bought.

Justification of code: Goran stays on the issue of a better infrastructure and proposes that the town needs a new garbage container. After the light hearted beginning, which allowed relaxing the atmosphere between the two ethnic groups, the discussion now flows at a high level of deliberation with more concrete proposals to improve life in Srebrenica being made.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Put all that down, and we also need a reconstruction of the Guber spa.

Justification of code: Ermina remains active bringing another infrastructure item into the discussion. She proposes that the local spa should be reconstructed. Before the civil war, the spa was a tourist attraction. In proposing that the spa should be reactivated, Ermina shows optimism in the future of Srebrenica, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

Stadium also.

Justification of code: Goran is interactive and stays on the issue of infrastructure proposing that Srebrenica also needs a new stadium. It is in deliberative spirit that at the beginning of the discussion the group stays on the same issue and establishes a list of potential improvement proposals in the infrastructure of Srebrenica. Discussion remains at a high level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

Get serious, they're recording this. Restore those buildings near gas station for socially vulnerable persons.

Justification of code: Marijana finds the proposal of Goran to build a new stadium as not serious in the dire situation in which Srebrenica finds itself. She makes instead a proposal that

is more affordable, to restore buildings in a poor neighborhood close to a gas station. Does Marijana show disrespect for the stadium proposal of Goran? Should she have justified why from a cost perspective building a new stadium is exaggerated? It would have been better if she would have done so. But it must have been obvious to the other participants that a new stadium would cost too much for Srebrenica so that Marijana took a shortcut in expressing her disagreement. With her own proposal, she gave an implicit justification what Srebrenica could afford and what not. Overall, Marijana was able to keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

We need brand new buildings. There is nothing to reconstruct.

Justification of code: Goran remains interactive and now goes into specifics with regard to the issue of the infrastructure. He argues that it is not worthwhile to renovate old buildings that the better solution is to construct new buildings. With this statement he moves the discussion forward, keeping it at high level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

This is adding another task.

Justification of code: Ermina as Bosnjak supports Goran as Serb that constructing brand new buildings is a worthwhile further task. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1) We should force the government to listen to the people. When they want something to say, it should not be dismissed.

Justification of code: Marijana makes a statement very much in deliberative spirit. It is a key aspect of deliberation that actors listen to each other. Thereby it is of particular importance that the government listens to the grievances of ordinary citizens. Dania expresses this key element of deliberation in simple language that everyone can understand. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

Let's get serious ... Change the authorities.

Justification of code: Goran follows up on Marijana and shares her concern that the political authorities do not listen to what ordinary people want to say. He makes the radical proposal that the current authorities should be thrown out. While up to now the discussion dealt with questions of improving the infrastructure, Marijana and Goran now have given it a critical political turn, keeping it at a high level of deliberation..

Azmina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Help people in surrounding villages.

Justification of code: Azmina speaks for the first time and broadens the discussion in being concerned about the surrounding villages of Srebrenica, which also need help. This proposal corresponds to deliberative spirit in the sense that Azmina cares also for the well being of others, which keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Zoran, Serbian (code 1)

I will vote for you at the next election.

Justification of code: Zoran also speaks for the first time. Jokingly he says that at the next election he will vote for Azmina. Thereby, it is noteworthy that Zoran and Azmina come from the opposite sides of the ethnic division in Srebrenica. Thus, the good natured joke further relaxes the atmosphere across the ethnic divide, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Azmina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Thank you.

Justification of code: Azmina understands the joke across the ethnic divide and reacts in a friendly positive way. This exchange means that relations in the group between Serbs and Bosnjaks are ok, which keeps deliberation at high level.

Zoran, Serbian (code 1)

Of course, first you need to become a candidate.

Justification of code: Zoran continues with the joke, which is not yet too distractive for the flow of a high level deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

I am the only realistic candidate here Increase the number of employees in the police and reduce crime.

Justification of code: Marijana briefly continues the joking but then quickly comes back on topic proposing that life could be improved if crime was reduced. She also has a suggestion of how this could be done in increasing the police force in Srebrenica. The discussion again continues substantively at a high level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

That's right.

Justification of code: Once again there is agreement across the ethnic divide with Ermina as Bosnjak supporting Marijana as Serb that the police force should be reinforced to get more control over crime.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

Write that. Criminals have bigger incomes than our authorities.

Justification of code: Marijana continues the discussion on crime and claims that criminals have higher incomes than the political authorities. Although Marijana does not give evidence for this claim, it opens space to discuss further the situation of criminals in Srebrenica. The level of deliberation stays high.

Goran, Serbian (code 1)

Ermina! Write that we need our own FBI! (laughing)

Justification of code: Goran stays on the topic of crime. When he demands that Srebrenica needs its own FBI, he means this as a joke. Given the context that participants are teenagers, such a brief joke does not disrupt the flow of the discussion, so that deliberation remains at a high level.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

And also build a new police station.

Justification of code: Marijana stays on the topic of crime and the police and suggests that a new police station needs to be built. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (2)

That's not... (interrupted)

Justification of code: Goran is interrupted by Marijana, so that he can not say what he wanted to say. Such interruption is against deliberative rules and disrupts the flow of the discussion, which is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 3)

You cannot force a man to become a cop.

Justification of code: With her interruption of the previous speaker, Marijana has violated a basic deliberative rule, so that the discussion is now at a low level of deliberation.

Zoran, Serbian (code 3)

Say again something funny (laughs)

Justification of code: The flow of the discussion has now really been broken with Zoran getting completely off-topic asking that something funny should be said. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Goran, Serbian (code 3)

Provide new containers.

Justification of code: Goran attempts to bring the discussion back on topic but only repeats what he said before that new garbage containers are needed. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Marijana, Serbian (code 4)

Provide funds for the renovation of sewage.

Justification of code: This time Marijana does not interrupt the previous speakers and makes an effort to bring the discussion back on topic. She is successful in doing so because with the demand for a sewage renovation she broadens the list of how life in Srebrenica can be improved. After Marijana with her previous speech act transformed the discussion to a low level of deliberation, she is now able to bring it back to a high level.

Azmina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Expand the market square

Justification of code: Azmina has still another proposal of how life in Srebrenica can be improved, which keep the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

Funding is needed for new instruments for musicians in Srebrenica.

Justification of code: Ermina turns to a cultural aspect, which has not yet been addressed up to now. She keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Laila, Bosnjak (code2)

We have five tasks.

Justification of code: Laila speaks up for the first time. She is not interactive in not taking position to any of the proposals on the agenda. Instead she says something that does not make sense. It is unclear to what five tasks she is referring to. With this confusing statement, Laila transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 3):

Provide funds for maintenance of sanitation.

Justification of code: Marijana repeats a proposal that she made before when she referred to sewage problems.

Laila, Bosnjak (code 3)

What's that?

Justification of code: Now Laila speaks for the second time and raises a question, but again it is unclear what she has in mind. Does she not understand what sanitation means or is she unclear what maintenance of sanitation means? The level of deliberation remains low.

Marijana, Serbian (code 3)

That's it, write more street lighting.

Justification of code: From a deliberative perspective Marijana should answer the question of Laila, or if she has not understood she should ask Laila to clarify her question. But Marijana is not interactive but exclaims "that's it", which seems to mean that for her the discussion should be over. But then she still adds another item to be put on the list for improvements in Srebrenica. Given the context of the statement, deliberation remains at a low level.

Zoran, Serbian (code 3)

Do you have anything more?

Justification of code: Zoran agrees with Marijana that the discussion should come to an end and does not make any effort to transform it back to a high level of deliberation.

Jovan, Serbian (code 3)

Read it.

Justification of code: Jovan has not said anything up to now and is agreeing with Marijana and Zoran that the discussion should come to an end. Turning to Ermina as note taker, he asks her to read what she has written for the letter to the High Commissioner. From a deliberative perspective it is not good that Jovan, and also Laila, did not intervene in a substantive way into the discussion. Perhaps both were not comfortable to speak up in an ethnically mixed group. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 4)

To update some parts of Srebrenica, for example the spa "Guber" and the park, that authorities do not remain deaf for the voice of the people, to help homeless people, increase the number of employees, rebuild roads in the surrounding villages, provide funds for maintenance of sanitation, and also to provide mechanization for agriculture.

Justification of code: Ermina has done an excellent job in listening to the proposals made in the group and to put them in writing. In this way, she opens once more space for the participants to say whether they agree with her summary, transforming the discussion to a high level of deliberation.

Marijana, Serbian (code 1)

What else should we put?

Justification of code: Whereas in her previous intervention Marijana gave the impression that she had enough of the discussion, now she seems open if someone adds to the summary of Ermina. The level of deliberation stays high.

Zoran, Serbian (code 1)

Reconstruct our old hotel. Tourists have nowhere to sleep.

Justification of code: Zoran in an interactive way takes up the invitation of Marijana to still add something to the summary. He also gives a justification why the old hotel should be renovated.

Jovan, Serbian (code 1)

We could put something about tourism.

Justification of code: Now Jovan seems comfortable enough to say something substantive in agreeing with Zoran that tourism should be developed. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Zoran, Serbian (code 1)

Yeah, yeah, we can reconstruct and repair our fortress so that people can see what Srebrenica had.

Justification of code: Zoran pursues the topic of tourism in proposing that the fortress should be reconstructed and renovated. With this statement he also expresses a certain pride about the history of Srebrenica. He keeps the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Ermina, Bosnjak (code 1)

That's it.

Justification of code: With the positive optimistic note of Zoran, Ermina as note taker brings the discussion to an end at a high level of deliberation.

Group 6 of Serbs and Bosnjaks in Srebrenica²⁷

Participants

Nino, Bosnjak, 18 years old, student

Elvir, Bosnjak, 20 years old, student

Ilija, Serbian, 18 years old, student

Mirijana, Serbian, 19 years old, student

Pero, Serbian, 19 years old, student

Igor, Serbian, 21 years old, unemployed

Miloš, Serbian, 25 years old, electrician

Midhat, Serbian, 19 years old, unskilled worker

Moderator

What are your recommendations for a better future in Bosnia-Herzegovina; your responses to be delivered to the High Representative?

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Let us put positive and negative facts, from any area. We can also put theses, the first thesis, and so on. This means we would agree on this and that. For this we need some 40 minutes. So we just put theses; nothing more.

Justification of code: Mirijana makes a good effort to give structure to the discussion. She offers two ways of how the letter to the High Commissioner could be written, either by positive and negative facts or by theses. She prefers to do it by theses. Starting with this relevant procedural topic, Mirijana manages to begin the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Miloš, Serbian (code 2)

Turn this off so that we can play.

²⁷ The participants in this group were selected by random walk of the youth population in the town of Srebrenica, see Chapter 1.

Justification of code: Miloš does not follow up on the proposal of Mirijana of how to organize the letter to the High Commissioner, but tries to be funny in demanding that the tape recorder is turned down, so that they can play. Sometimes humor can help deliberation but what Miloš says is sarcasm raising doubts whether the whole discussion has any value at all. In this way he transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 4)

I will write.

Justification of code: Mirijana disregards the sarcastic remark of Miloš and continues with procedural matters in offering that she will take over the task of note taker. Disregarding the remark of Miloš was a good device of Mirijana to transform the discussion back to a high level of deliberation in going back to procedural matters, which are relevant at the beginning of a discussion.

Miloš, Serbian (code 2)

What do I need? To start with, I need a loan of 20 000KM.

Justification of code: Miloš disrupts the discussion again. His demand that he needs a loan of 20 000 KM is not justified in any way and seems to be meant as another sarcastic remark, which transforms the discussion once again to a low level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 4)

C'mon get serious. The sooner we finish, the sooner we can leave. Just think about it, you will get money if you go home.

Justification of code: Mirijana does not take seriously the demand of Miloš that he wants a loan and scolds him for not being a serious participant in the discussion. Mirijana is herself committed to really begin the discussion in a serious way transforming it back to a high level of deliberation.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

What?

Justification of code: Miloš becomes now interactive and wants to know from Mirijana what she means by her remark that he will make money when gets home. Thanks to this pattern of reciprocity deliberation stays at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

If you work you will get money.

Justification of code: Mirijana clarifies her remark telling Miloš that if he works he will get money. Reciprocity continues so that deliberation remains at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

Well, I work.

Justification of code: Miloš is no longer joking but informs Mirijana that he is actually working. Reciprocity between Miloš and Mirijana continues keeping deliberation at high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 2)

OK, just be silent.

Justification of code: Now Mirijana loses patience with Miloš that he is holding up the discussion and tells him in a rude way that he should shut up. This lack of respect transforms the discussion back to a low level of deliberation.

Midhat, Serbian (code 3)

You don't need to draw, just write.

Justification of code: Mirijana as note taker does some drawing on her note pad. Midhat reprimands her telling her that she should better write down what is said. This is also not a respectful statement, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 3)

Come on, I will write and you tell.

Justification of code: Is annoyed at the order she gets from Midhat. The discussion has gotten an unfriendly tone and does not make any headway to finally begin to address the topic assigned to the group of how life can be improved in Srebrenica and in Bosnia-Herzegovina at large. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Midhat, Serbian (code 3)

This has become your standard answer.

Justification of code: Midhat complains that Mirijana always gives the same answer. The unfriendliness continues and the discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 3)

Well, nothing but repeating.

Justification of code: Mirijana insists that her task as note taker is simply to repeat in writing what people say. There is still no effort to enter the discussion in a substantive way. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 3)

Well, since you know it, just copy.

Justification of code: Nino tells Mirijana simply to copy what people say, which does not add anything new to the discussion that remains at a low level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 3)

Copy and paste, copy and paste.

Justification of code: Using computer language, Mirijana defines her role, but nothing is new, so that deliberation remains at a low level.

Midhat, Serbian (code 3)

You know that I was copying and cheating in school, too.

Justification of code: Sometimes personal stories can help deliberation, but the story of Midhat is irrelevant for the topic assigned to the group. Perhaps the story loosens up a little the tense atmosphere in the group but not enough for the discussion to be transformed back to a high level of deliberation. There is no laughter as reactions to the story of Midhat, so that deliberation stays at a low level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 4)

Shall we put something about education.

Justification of code: Finally the discussion turns to a substantive issue with Mirijana proposing that the group should discuss questions of education. Mirijana has already twice raised the level of deliberation and thus emerges as deliberative leader. An active moderator would have a long time ago directed the group to begin to talk about substantive issues. But since our research design did ask moderators not to intervene, it was up to the group to set the agenda. For this group it took a long time for someone to set a substantive issue on the agenda. But finally Mirijana took a leadership role. If the moderator would always act as leader, we could not establish how deliberative leaders emerge out of the group.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, one of the problems in Srebrenica is education.

Justification of code: Igor speaks up for the first time and is immediately interactive supporting Mirijana that education is a problem in Srebrenica. The ice seems to be broken, so that the discussion gets momentum, keeping it at a high level of deliberation.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

Training of youth, something like that. Here you see these two men, they failed last two years.

Justification of code: Mirijana and Igor get support across the ethnic divide with Nino as Bosnjak agreeing that training of young people is an important issue to be discussed. He supports his view with a relevant story referring to two group members who failed their

exams. A common life world begins to develop across the ethnic divide keeping deliberation at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Do we have to explain a little bit each thesis or can we just list it?

Justification of code: Mirijana as note taker raises the important procedural question whether the proposals of the group shall only be listed as theses or whether they need to be explained to some extent. Mirijana continues in her leadership role, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Moderator

Being asked directly by Mirijana, the moderator breaks the rule of not intervening and gives the following answer: “You do not need to explain, but if you want to and if you have something to say, then do it.” In the spirit of the research design, this answer leaves it up to the group of how to proceed.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

I'll write in parentheses to include teaching, we cannot run an all-inclusive education in our schools. Let's continue. And employment?

Justification of code: Mirijana gives the implicit answer that listing of the theses is sufficient and gives as example how she will write down the thesis about education. Then she puts issues of employment of the agenda. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Pero, Serbian (code 1)

Yes, bravo, I do not even work with books.

Justification of code: Pero speaks up for the first time and tells her personal story that in her work she is not able to work with books. With this story she support the previous speakers that education is a problem in Srebrenica. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

Put in parentheses how people coming from other cities to work here. Write that with capital letters.

Justification of code: Miloš after a long pause comes back into the discussion. While at the beginning of the discussion, he was disruptive trying to be funny, now he refers to a relevant problem that people from other cities come too often to Srebrenica to work here. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Put down that even those who have jobs do not want to work.

Justification of code: In an interactive way, Igor reacts to Miloš in criticizing that there is lack of work ethics among the people in Srebrenica. So the problem would be less that people coming from the outside work in Srebrenica. Igor expresses the disagreement with Miloš in a respectful way, so that the discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

The reason is that the government representatives are from the other cities. Just put it that way.

Justification of code: Miloš enlarges his point why people of Srebrenica are discriminated on the job market. Not only are they invaded by workers from the outside, but government representatives mainly come from other parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Thus, Srebrenica is put into the context of the entire country giving breath to the discussion, which stays at a high level. .

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

The High Representative will go mad (laughing).

Justification of code: Nino reacts to the criticism of Miloš that Srebrenica is in a discriminated position within Bosnia-Herzegovina and expresses fears that the High Commissioner will be upset. Implicitly, Nino makes the suggestion that the group should be more cautious in what it puts into the letter to the High Commissioner. This is a relevant concern keeping deliberation at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Third, following the theses - check loans.

Justification of code: Mirijana as note taker keeps track of the discussion and wishes to add loans as a third thesis. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Elvir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Write no potable water, electricity is expensive, no cheap tariffs, sewage is bad ... my washing machine almost stopped working.

Justification of code: Elvir enters the discussion for the first time and helps to move it forward with his personal story with his washing machine. The story shows that problems with water and electricity hit home in a very concrete way. The discussion is very active across the ethnic divide with both sides sharing the same problems. Deliberation continues to flow at a high level.

Mirijana, Serb (code 1)

Shall we put something related to cultural events or anything like that?

Justification of code: Mirijana adds the lack of cultural events to the discussion, which gains more and more substance, keeping deliberation at high level.

Elvir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Regarding to that, we have only Dane Srebrenica.

Justification of code: Across the ethnic divide Elvir supports Mirijana that there is a lack of cultural events. He gives substance to this claim in mentioning that Srebrenica has only a single cultural event. Both Mirijana and Elvir do not ask for separate cultural events for the

two ethnic groups but have common events in mind, which indicates of much they share a common life world, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Ilija, Serbian (code 1)

Write a lack of cultural and sporting activities and events.

Justification of code: Speaking after Elvir as Bosnjak, Ilija as Serb also supports more cultural events and adds the need for sport events. Deliberation stays at a high level of deliberation with no animosities between the two ethnic groups. .

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Oh, what lack of? You have a playground and run each day if you want.

Justification of code: Mirijana as Serb disagrees with Ilija also of the Serb side that there is no need for more sport activities and gives a justification for this disagreement. From a deliberative perspective it is helpful if there are also disagreements within the individual group because this makes the discussion more open ended and less focused as a confrontation between the groups. Mirijana expresses her disagreement with Ilija in a respectful way, so that the discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Pero, Serbian (code 1)

Well, this is all recorded, have you forgotten?

Justification of code: Pero reminds the group that the discussion is recorded. The implication is that the participants should be more cautious in what they say. She wants to make sure that the group members will not get any negative repercussions when the High Commissioner reads the letter of the group. With this expression of caution, Pero shows solidarity with all group members from whatever ethnic side they come. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Elvir, Bosnjak (code 1)

So what! Let them record. You continue to write down on your papers.

Justification of code: Now we have a disagreement across the ethnic divide. This disagreement, however, has nothing to do with the ethnic divide and is also expressed with respect. Elvir is simply less worried about negative repercussions of what they write to the High Commissioner. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

What else can we write about these things?

Justification of code: Mirijana attempts to move the discussion forward in asking for more problems to be added to the list to be sent to the High Commissioner. Given our research design, it was not up to the moderator to move the discussion forward but to let members of the group take over this task. Mirijana, who emerges increasingly as deliberative leader, takes over this task in the present situation, keeping deliberation at high level.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

It is bad sanitation. Pollution of the city is huge. Just write.

Justification of code: Nino follows up on the suggestion of Mirijana and adds the bad pollution to the list of problems. The discussion continues to flow at a high level of deliberation.

Ilija, Serbian (code 1)

Write that we do not have trash cans.

Justification of code: Ilija also follows up on Mirijana to add more problems to the letter for the High Commissioner. He mentions the lack of trash cans, which is related to the problem of pollution because without trash cans people may throw away trash contributing to pollution. The discussion remains interactive with an effort of the participants to stay on topic. The level of deliberation remains high.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Will we mention lack of organizations and facilities for young people, something like that?

Justification of code: Mirijana still adds to the list mentioning as a problem the lack of organizations and facilities for young people. Deliberation flows at a high level.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Oh, we don't need that; we have youth organizations in Srebrenica more than enough. Write that we need some fun. Although, this all goes in some bucket.

Justification of code: Igor objects that there is a need for more youth organization and activities. The debate becomes quite spirited but respectful so that deliberation remains at a high level.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

But let's write something positive, too.

Justification of code: Nino suggests that the group should write also about positive things in the letter to the High Commissioner. With this suggestion, Nino keeps an optimistic tone, keeping deliberation at a high level.

Pero, Serbian (code 1)

What is positive?

Justification of code: Pero is interactive and asks Nino what he thinks is positive in Srebrenica. She seems to be really curious to get an answer. It is remarkable to have this reciprocity across the ethnic divide with Pero as Serb asking a serious question to Nino as Bosnjak. Deliberation remains high.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

The positive thing is that we love this city and it's cheap to live here. Write that we need a loan.

Justification of code: Igor steps in and answers that it is cheap to live here. It is striking that despite all the problems mentioned in the discussion, Igor declares that they love to live here.

He speaks in the plural for the entire group, creating a common life world. He also comes back to the demand for more loans. Deliberation remains at high level.

Pero, Serbian (code 1)

We do not need it, do not write.

Justification of code: Pero does not agree that they need more loans. As in all previous cases of disagreements, here, too, it is expressed with respect so deliberation remains at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

Like the one who wrote and got a loan and all spent all at Cindo's bar.

Justification of code: Miloš agrees with Pero that they do not need more loans. He supports his position with a relevant story of someone who misused loans. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Pero, Serbian (code 2)

Hey, let's finish.

Justification of code: In an abrupt way Pero wants to finish with the discussion altogether, although several issues are not yet fully discussed. In this way she transforms the discussion to a low level of deliberation.

Ilija, Serbian (code 3)

How many do we have?

Justification of code: Ilija wants to know how many theses already have been written down. This purely informative question does not give to the discussion a new impulse, so that it remains at a low deliberative level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 3)

Four theses. Let's write something positive.

Justification of code: As note taker, Mirijana answers Ilija that she has written down as yet four theses. Mirijana then disagrees with Pero that the discussion should stop now and suggests that something positive should be added, but this aspect has been covered before, and Mirijana does not add anything to what has been said before, so that the discussion remains at a low level of deliberation.

Midhat, Serbian (code 3)

Pollution, did you put it? That is positive.

Justification of code: Midhat adds pollution and claims that this is something positive, but does not give any justification how pollution can be seen as something positive. The discussion drags on at a low level of deliberation.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 3)

It is better that you write, you know that?

Justification of code: Nino asks Mirijana as note taker that she should write but does not say what more should be written. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Ilija, Serbian (code 4)

Write that we have a lot of touristic locations.

Justification of code: Ilija makes an effort to continue the discussion in proposing that tourist attractions should be better used. This is a new proposal that has the potential to improve life in Srebrenica. So Ilija is very much on the topic assigned to the group. With this intervention Ilija opens new space for the discussion to continue, transforming deliberation back to a high level.

Pero, Serbian (code 1)

And the internet?

Justification of code: Pero, who a short moment ago wanted to finish the discussion, is stimulated by Ilija to come back into the discussion suggesting better internet connections. In an interactive way, this demand is linked to the tourist issue, since tourism depends on good internet connections for hotel reservations and the tourists themselves. The discussion stays at a high level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

We'll put bad infrastructure. Shall we also put that we have natural resources, which is positive but negative is that there is no one to use them.

Justification of code: Mirijana continues in an interactive way with the issue of tourism and demands that the given natural resources should be better used. She keeps deliberation at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

There is no market.

Justification of code: Miloš asks for the establishment of a market, which may also be an attraction for tourists. So Miloš stays on topic keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

The government does not care about it. Each day I can bring 15 liter of Guber water and sell it here.

Justification of code: Igor supports Miloš that Srebrenica needs a market. With a personal story he shows how a market could work. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

Put the corruption, too.

Justification of code: Nino adds corruption as a problem to be solved. Deliberation remains high.

(Participants talking to each other, drinking juices and eating biscuits, laughing, friendly atmosphere.)

Nino, Bosnjak (code 1)

Write as a positive thing that we, Serbs and Bosnjaks, agree with each other.

Justification of code: Nino uses the increasingly friendly atmosphere in the group to suggest as a positive thing to be sent to the High Commissioner that Serbs and Bosnjaks agree with each other on the needs in Srebrenica. This is a crucial statement that reaches across the ethnic divide.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

One of the positive things in Srebrenica is that young Serbs and Bosnjaks are in good relations and are willing to work together in our interest.

Justification of code: Mirijana as a Serb agrees with Nino as a Bosnjak that among the young people there are good relations between the two ethnic groups and that both groups are willing to work together for the common interest. It is almost too good what highly deliberative turn the discussion has taken. Perhaps young people are more willing to open to the other side. It is remarkable that this deliberative turn has come without prodding of the moderator. Deliberation is now really at a very high level. Both groups have found a common life world where they share the same problems and the same ambitions for the future.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Do we have something else to put down? It is a disgrace that we wrote only on half of the paper.

Justification of code: Igor wants to continue the discussion using forceful language to encourage the other participants to do so. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 2)

We have finished.

Justification of code: Mirijana disagrees with Igor that the discussion should continue. In this way she blocks space to further deal with still hanging issues like corruption. The discussion is transformed to a low level of deliberation.

(**Moderator** states that discussion should continue for another 15 minutes.)

Igor, Serbian (code 3)

Will talk another 15 minutes. We'll lie about something.

Justification of code: Igor makes fun of the demand of the moderator that the discussion should continue for another 15 minutes, keeping deliberation at a low level.

Noise

Mirijana, Serbian (code 3)

So what does he want now?

Justification of code: Mirijana is annoyed by the sarcastic remark of Igor. Deliberation remains at a low level.

Igor, Serbian (code 4)

You know what would be good? They need to organize during the winter.

Justification of code: Igor gets away from his sarcastic mood and makes a relevant proposal. He states that winter is a problem for young people in Srebrenica, so that during this time something needs to be organized for them.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

There is no place to hang out.

Justification of code: Mirijana is no longer annoyed with Igor and supports him that in winter young people need places to hang out. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

No, and that investment money goes to the municipality, rather than us.

Justification of code: Keeping up his active role, Igor complains that the local authorities keep the investment monies for themselves instead of actually helping ordinary people. In this way, Igor comes back to the corruption issue that was raised earlier by Nino. It is remarkable that Igor as Serb agrees with Nino as Bosnjak that corruption is a problem in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

We have mixed up all good and bad. We need first to put the good and then bad things.

Justification of code: Miloš makes a relevant procedural proposal of how to organize the letter to the High Commissioner. On a positive note, he wants first to put the good things. Early in the discussion, Miloš was not at all serious making all kind of funny disrupting remarks. Group dynamics has helped him to take the discussion seriously getting involved in the minute details of how the letter should be formulated. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

We'll put the lack of places to hang out, bars, pools, sports and recreation halls.

Justification of code: Mirijana comes back to her earlier claim that there are no places to hang out and specifies the places where young people would like to hang out. This is a relevant specification to what she said earlier keeping deliberation at a high level.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

How it started, Potocari will soon be the center of town. (Potocari is the cemetery of genocide).

Justification of code: This is the first time that the genocide is mentioned, and it is noteworthy that it is done by the Serb side. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

Do you have sport center on Potocari?

Justification of code: The discussion gets a very serious note, staying with the place of the cemetery of the genocide. Miloš as Serb asks the Bosnjak side whether the place has a sport center. The question indicates that Serbs and Bosnjaks live separated in Srebrenica so that Miloš does not know the answer. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Elvir, Bosnjak (code 1)

Yes we have.

Justification of code: Elvir from the Bosnjak side answers matter-of factually that yes, indeed, there is also a sport center at Potocari.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

So you have everything, mosque, sport center. Also a restaurant?

Justification of code: This is an amazing exchange that continues between the two ethnic sides. Again in a matter-of factual way, Miloš asks whether there is also a mosque close to the genocide cemetery. This is a sequence in the discussion that easily could have erupted into hostility between the two sides with strongly different interpretation of what happened at the massacres in the 1990's. Perhaps with the participants being young, the atmosphere remained calm in the group, which the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Elvir, Bosnjak (code 1):

Yes five.

Justification of code: Again in a calm way Elvir answers that there are five mosques. He does not give any comments which could have enflamed the discussion, which remains at a high level of deliberation.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

Oh we see.

Justification of code: In a polite way, Miloš appreciates the answers of Elvir, keeping the discussion at a high level of deliberation.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

So, will I write anything more?

Justification of code: In an earlier intervention, Mirijana had demanded in an abrupt way the end of the discussion, transforming it to a low level of deliberation. Now she asks politely whether as a note taker there is anything that she had to write down. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Wait a second. Put that we do not have a library.

Justification of code: Igor keeps up his active role, adding still another issue to be added to the list to be sent to the High Commissioner. Deliberation remains at a high level.

Miloš, Serbian (code 1)

How many theses do we have now?

Justification of code: Miloš who was so disruptive at the beginning of the discussion, continues to be interested in how the letter to the High Commissioner will exactly look like. Deliberation stays at a high level.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Eight.

Justification of code: In an interactive way, Mirijana answers as a note taker that she has written down eight theses. Deliberation stays high.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

Write something like; we have a lot of talents in Srebrenica and do not have the money to finance them.

Justification of code: Igor still keep up his activity and suggests a positive statement about the talents in Srebrenica, telling the High Commissioner that they need more money to be developed. Deliberation stays high.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Should we put scholarships in high school for those who live in the villages?

Justification of code: Mirijana as note taker adds herself another issue that is particularly deliberative because it concerns people who do not live in Srebrenica. Deliberation stays high.

Igor, Serbian (code 1)

We will not write more.

Justification of code: Now even Igor gives the signal that he has nothing more to add. At this point of the discussion, it is helpful for the group to hear this signal from the very active Igor. Deliberation stays high.

Mirijana, Serbian (code 1)

Ecological problems - pollution of water and soil, the problem of employment, a lack of cultural and sport events, unused economic resources, then the lack of sports and recreation center, the inability of education. That's it. We have finished.

Justification of code: Having heard the signal of Igor, Mirijana nicely summarizes what she has written down. So without intervention of the moderator, the group manages itself to bring the discussion smoothly to an end, at a high note of deliberation.

.