**Dear friends, dear friends, with me in the company of our friend Jasna Kovačević, assistant professor at the Department of Management and Organization, Faculty of Economics, University of Sarajevo. If I have stated all these facts well, have I?**

Yes, yes, good afternoon!

***Thank you, Professor, for taking the time for the Sermon, for me, to talk about this important matter for education.***

Thanks for the invitation, it's always a pleasure to respond to my friends from Step, it's really a great pleasure.

***Where did you come from in this education, Jasna?***

My path in education has been somehow determined since first grade when I started school. I fell in love with some new insights, discovering the world, and I was a very curious girl even when you read a book and get some new ideas, then those ideas deepen some of your thoughts and then you move on to search for education. I realized that when I finished economics, that maybe I should go in a slightly different direction, not focus on economics and management in that classical sense, but try to see how different organizations actually work. Not everything is based on economics and business management, we deal with the public sector, we also deal with organizations such as schools, colleges, cultural, artistic institutions, so I really think we can contribute a lot to sharing some knowledge that can be contextually adapted to specifics. of each institution. So I realized that I can't really deal with classical economics and management, and that I have to find a way to help educational institutions become better, more efficient, more productive, all for the benefit of children, children and youth. That's my vision.

***How I am afraid of all those terms that you utter, you know as someone who comes from a completely different world, all terms like efficiency, the market, to me they throw everything at the worst in the economy, and it doesn't have to be that way, right?***

It doesn't have to be that way, I belong to a camp of critics of the neoliberal paradigm and a management that is based on that very productivity and efficiency, so I am a critical current that finds more inspiration in the teachings of social justice, equality, diversity and inclusion, and in fact I am not essentially dealing with these professional commercial organizations, but I am dealing with educational management, educational leadership and how to get the best out of every school, from every educational institution.

***And you shouldn't be afraid of that, right?***

Absolutely not! All this knowledge from the leadership and management of the organization can be very nicely contextualized. Sometime as early as the 1960s, there was talk of educational management and leadership as a separate discipline. So my expertise in that area is educational leadership and management and we shouldn’t be afraid of those some strict names and some terminology that might lean towards that neoliberal paradigm.

***Or more connotations that we have given to these terms, but I want to start with you from this question: education must serve the labor market, myth or truth?***

Myth.

***Why?***

Maybe my colleagues will criticize me now, who may be in similar fields as me, but my paradigm, when it comes to education, is a transformative paradigm. I see education as something that does not necessarily have to be tied to the labor market, and when we talk about education, my personal logic and philosophy is to ask ourselves the question - are we a product, or - are we capital, or will we humanize our souls. I think we need to go more to this side that talks about humanizing, because the job market is just one side of the social story. We are much more than that, we are much more than commodities, we are much more than those some classic skills. We have a lot to offer, so I always say, I point out, that I like to criticize this concept, which is based exclusively on the labor market, because we are moving away from some things that are very valuable and that are of fundamental value for education.

***What makes it so difficult to accept criticism, Professor? We are not talking about the criticism that is for the sake of criticism, just to distance myself. You have, for example, very thoroughly given some of your views. What about our society, I don’t like to generalize, but what’s so hard?***

Well people generally don’t like to be moved out of their comfort zone. Every criticism you make leads those people who want to accept the criticism, it makes them think that they need to think about themselves, about how others see them. So when you make well-meaning criticism to someone it makes people think that maybe they should change their modus operandi, the way they work, so very often well-meaning criticism is accepted as malicious criticism. We have to get used to those things, because criticism can really contribute.

***And especially for public education what is education like?***

Precisely because it’s something that really needs to be worked on continuously. Without appreciating these some constructive criticisms we will just tap into place and be in some status quo, we won’t do much.

***I would like to talk to you about two very important topics. One is the whole issue of reform, all the logic that comes out of it, and the other is leadership, that is, management within the school. So those are kind of two topics to me. But let's start with this perhaps reform. Our mouths have been full of education reforms for years. How do you see it in general, since everyone has an opinion about the reform. You have written a lot about it, you are very productive in that sense and I invite even those who watch the sermon to the force of good papers, articles, articles you have written, books, including your doctorate, which later spoke about leadership. What is it to you, why do you deal with rhetoric, the logic of education reforms at all?***

Well, basically everything starts with education reforms. It's that top approach, we have to start by analyzing what those at the very top are telling us, in that kind of hierarchical form of the education system, to understand how schools work, to get to the point of dealing with school, and culture. , and the climate, and teachers, and principals, and principals, we need to see what lies in context, and reform creates context. Reform activities and some changes in education are creating the context, it is up to us how we will react to that. So when I enrolled in this doctorate, I saw that I could not exclusively deal with school, but that I had to peek into that context and find out why schools do not react to changes that are imposed from outside, which are predominant, and come from that area. educational policy. So why is there this disparity between what policymakers want to be implemented and why is it not implemented in schools, we have been playing deaf phones on that route for many years. And then I started studying a little more detail about educational reforms and I was actually amazed by what I learned. Educational reforms are actually a product of policies that have been on the scene in a certain period and what is interesting is that we can already view reforms as reforms through 4 different waves of these reforms. This first wave occurred from the Second World War until some seventies, and even then a debate began in political circles about education, the position of education, the social system in general and what should be done. So in general there are some 4 waves of social reforms in general and they were influenced by political ideologies, first of all, which indicates the political nature of the issue in education, so social reforms have always initiated reforms in education and here we have some conditional 4 waves. The second wave was roughly imitated in the 1980s, and that was the era of that neoliberalism that crept into education, which we can't get out of education now. It’s time to change some things. These waves of reform have definitely left a lot of mark on what we are doing today and some practices have become so ingrained that it is difficult to change now, because people are used to this way of working and therefore find it difficult to accept criticism.

***You're referring to that, in fact, you've questioned that approach called top-down, but top-down. What is the essential problem in that?***

Well the essential problem is that there is a disconnection between what is happening in the real world and policymakers who are very often far from the real context, they are far from the reform implementers. When I say implementers I mean principals and teaching staff, so very often there is some kind of cacophony between these two, conditionally speaking, camps in education, and then we don't understand, we don't speak the same language, so very often policymakers have very little knowledge, very little competence and charisma needed for the messages they send to be adequately understood at the school level in school collectives so that people are motivated to apply change, to apply innovation in their practice. Another problem is that this neoliberal logic and the story of the market where we are trying to reduce education to self-commodity in some way has crept in. In my opinion, that story begins sometime in the eighties with Margaret Thatcher and the educational reform that she proposed. Margaret is specific in that she pursued her policy in a specific way, favoring the free market, a story that stimulated private business, monetarism, and then with the adoption of one such policy called ERA in the 1980s, this business neoliberal paradigm crept into education. Reagan will do the same, since Reagan was a big fan of Margaret Thatcher, then he managed to apply that in America. So in the UK we had Thatcherism, and in the United States we had Reganomics, and then those social policies were deeply rooted in education and it’s still with but the rest of history - these policies have spread like a forest fire and such paradigms have created the preconditions to talk about competition between schools, they have started talking about school autonomy, parents have been given a lot of opportunities to choose which school their child will attend, so teachers, principals, have been brought into an unenviable position in which it is very difficult to respond to the large number of requests coming from the external environment.

***You have disturbed me now. I had the right question, but I'll get back to it. Now I have to build on that. You concluded in one of your papers that it is precisely this dose of autonomy of self-organization, trust, responsibility at the school level that is necessary for the reform to succeed. Did I understand that well?***

Autonomy is good. Autonomy provided that you have people who really are experts in their work, principals who have the appropriate competencies, knowledge, expertise to run schools, autonomy is necessary for each school to grow in its own way. Every school is different, every school has its culture, it has its climate, it has its dynamics. No school is the same - and in that sense there should be that autonomy in order to reduce that centralizing pressure that is imposed from the top of the education system, that is, from the policymaker. So there has to be that autonomy, but you know what the problem is essentially !? When autonomy was given to schools, then a huge pressure was created for principals, because they were now the focus of the story and they held themselves accountable for everything that did not work, so autonomy gives free rein, and at the same time puts you in a very an unenviable situation. You are the culprit on duty when everyone points a finger, and teachers are practically in the same situation as principals.

***I almost said, "My God."***

So let's come to terms with that situation.

***When I look at some, since PISA is a very fun topic for you, we found Estonia interesting - purely because there are some internalities that are very similar to our Bosnian society, including the unfortunate, invisible and visible conflict there. I realize that what they think is the secret to the success of the Estonian system, that it is not the Finnish system every time, is precisely the autonomy that schools get: both in terms of adapting curricula to the context, and in terms of accountability - you said that very well, they attribute the success of their system precisely to the autonomy of the school which nevertheless carries all that it carries with it.***

Well, that's where the balance needs to be struck. The question is what should be centralized and what should be decentralized - to give autonomy, where to give autonomy to schools. What good experiences have shown, successful experiences from around the world, is that curricula need to be centralized. Education policy should address this, and the school management process should be decentralized - principals should be given a free hand to pursue a policy of potential so that they have more influence on teachers to apply adequate motivational techniques, to build culture and climate in some way. a school that is the DNA of every school, because every culture is different - from school to school we have different norms, different values ​​that are nurtured, and in that sense autonomy should be observed. Accordingly, responsibilities should be delegated and people should be held accountable for the part of the work they can perform. This is how it sometimes seems to me that perhaps excessive pressure is put on principals, and even the teaching staff, that they are to blame for absolutely everything that happens in the education system, and what is bad. There must be a middle ground where we can talk together in the best possible way, and from a policy level - from above, but also to the professional learning communities, both teachers and principals, to share these good practices, because we have basically all one goal - and that is for children to be happy, to be satisfied, to instill in them that spark of knowledge and that when they go out into the world they are first of all good people who base their actions on humanistic values, and to build themselves as experts and experts.

***You say in the introduction that reforms often fail due to insufficient time for implementation, so you said that there are too few charismatic leaders, then the influence of the previous culture, then the inability to understand the complexity of the education system. You put a lot of time into one work. Is it true? Did you manage to prove it?***

The research I've done shows that there is a chronic lack of charisma at all levels and it shows a fundamental ignorance of how the education system works. The education system is essentially what we are, it is a mirror of ourselves. The education system is a very complex system. When we talk about education policy, decision-makers very often want to control such a system, which is practically impossible - because it is a specific system that is inherent in itself. It is one sygenetic kan category not similar to any other system. So here we have this chronic lack of good leadership first of all, on the other hand we have people who very often do not have enough knowledge, enough competencies about the functioning of the education system or schools in general. If we bring this down to the level of a school as a micro-environment, micro-organizations and in that context misinformation arises and very often the wrong rhetoric is directed in the wrong ways to communicate to teachers, principals, principals, so we have collectives in schools across our country, region and world. , that people just don't understand those policy messages and don't know what to do. On the other hand, the system very often produces a lot of educational initiatives that are unrelated to each other, so teachers are really overwhelmed by a large number of initiatives, and ultimately when you have 15 priorities it’s like you don’t have any. It is better to focus on one or two priorities and then we will tell a nice story about it and we will try to detect the problems that exist, and if you have 15 different initiatives I think that is a bad option for reform.

***You have patented, protected one term, and I will try to remember it - initiative. Was that it?***

And that's it. It's not me, I have to pay tribute to Professor Michael Fluon. Professor Fluone defined this initiative, and I may have just translated it into our languages ​​and somehow rooted it in this educational practice of ours.

***Thank you for that!***

When I was doing the analysis, that is. the state of reform in the canton of Sarajevo, high school reforms, simply in the research it turned out that we are victims of initiative. That we have a lot of initiatives that are imposed on schools and teaching staff. That these initiatives are unrelated to each other, that they are not bound by that unique logic. When you have such conditions where you are often bombarded with some new things that you do not understand then you have inert teaching collectives, you have a collective in which deliberate resistance is offered - although people understand they do not want to implement it because schools are loosely connected systems. These are professional organizations that function in such a way that when a teacher is locked in his or her classroom with children, policies, or educational policies, are very often pushed out of those classrooms. So, in principle, decision-makers need to find common ground with the implementers of these policies and ask them for their opinion. You rightly mentioned the example of Estonia or some other successful countries, the key to their success is, among other things, autonomy and finding that common language between decision makers and people in practice. That's what we miss.

***What prevents us from doing that?***

It prevents us a lot. Bosnia and Herzegovina as a political system is very complex. We have a lot of levels in decision-making, a lot of information is lost at those levels, education is quite ruined, our education system is quite complex, so we can partly attribute our failure to that. On the other hand, there have been attempts to apply some successful imported education policies into our context. This is what I am warning about, and in the research I do, and wherever I get the opportunity I say how dangerous it is to apply an educational policy without giving it that context, because Finland is Finland, Germany is Germany.

***That's right.***

We are us. We nurture a different tradition in education, we also have a different cultural background, so the contextualization of the reform is something that is necessary and in that context PISA can be a big problem, ie the recommendations we get.

***But that still doesn't mean that some exceptional practices that have succeeded elsewhere should not be rewritten***?

You don't have to invent hot water. I say that very often - we should listen to people who did it smarter than us, but adapt.

***What does the illusion of control mean, while we are still on this topic, have you already mentioned it?***

Tough question, Nedime. We all get into a situation where we have that perception - illusory, to control things. This happens very often to education systems, decision makers. It is this feeling of controlling the system - that if you give a lot of bureaucratic tasks to teachers, from the tables they need to fill in, you will control the system. It’s a situation where you introduce external knowledge tests, internal knowledge tests, so you have a sense of controlling what’s going on in the classrooms. You have a sense of controlling how well teachers are doing their job. So I like to openly criticize external knowledge tests, internal knowledge tests as a control mechanism, because those mechanisms create that illusion of control for that decision-making when we talk about education policy. These tests don't say much about how good our schools are.

***Did they mean that in PISA as well, in fact, non-comparative research, right?***

Yes, so PISA is one of those external tests, because it comes from outside, some entity comes from outside and tests our children, that is, the test in principle, teachers - how well teachers do their job as principals. However, PISA has some fundamental problems and has been widely criticized recently. Recently, an article was published in one of the leading scientific journals in the field of educational policy, entitled: "Two decades of desolation". A very critical review of PISA, what PISA is and what PISA is not. What I would like to refer to when it comes to PISA is, to go back to what I just said, that some neoliberal logic that has crept into an education that we can in no way drive out, or if anything to reduce that impact. Behind PISA is the Organization for Economic Corporation and Development. So it is an international organization whose basic fundamental mission is to stimulate economic development and international trade, so that fact alone can shed light on a lot. Many critics of PISA, I like to join this camp, will share the view that PISA looks like some great Houdini, some magician in education, because it created the illusion of quality education, because it somehow created some false role models in education and the message went to the world, the message went to the air, so I very often say that PISA is a great case study for marketing students.

***Does that now mean that you do not believe in the results of this last PISA in Bosnia? I think it's the last one.***

We still don't know anything, we don't have adequate information.

***First and last.***

That concept of testing is a good thing. Something when you can quantify, something when you can measure, that something can help you make some decisions. However, the question is how are we going to use that data !? We were not surprised. I believe that there is no person in Bosnia and Herzegovina who is surprised by the results of PISA. We are aware of the chronic problems in BH education and the results of PISA have only confirmed something we already knew before. However, there are countries that systematically participate in PISA tests and there are some trends, but it is possible for certain countries that have participated in all the cycles that have participated for many years, certain trends can be seen whether progress, backward, etc. However, what practice has shown, say some research that has tried to compare the state of economic development of a nation and the results of PISA tests, there are no definite indicators that PISA improves the state of economic development. So we still don’t have concrete empirical evidence that this is indeed the case. What concerns Bosnia and Herzegovina is that PISA was a nice call for us, a wake-up call, at least for those who want to talk about it. So, in that sense, PISA in the context of BiH can be a good signal. However, what is a problem with PISA is that it creates the illusion of some quality education that arose on the premise of the west-centric education system, because we must not forget that the OECD includes 36 countries, most of which are the richest countries in the world. By imposing these some practices that arise on impartiality (28:05) by some methods from these countries brings us to that eternal problem of how to contextualize those practices. And that is one of the great challenges.

***Well, so I see that you have both this positive and negative side. I am for questioning anyway, but it was important to me for some reason. She was important to me as the first of its kind. I also don’t take things for granted. Neither PISA is the last nor the last such comparative study. It is neither the best nor the worst. But it shows roughly when everyone understands it, if they understood it the way we might understand it, they would take it as an indicator. So it is certainly not definitive, nor do I believe in external validation ever to have such very clear umfus, I think it guarantees a 100% result. But a warning for sure.***

Absolutely. The results of the PISA test correlate with the results of the teams and peirles. In essence, PISA has not given us anything so new. It is just a well commercialized product. I like to say that from this management perspective. I completely agree, Nedime, with you, because data is a really useful tool for decision-making in the context of the education system, and schools, and business, and whatever you want. However, I ask one question here, and that is: how are we going to use, interpret them !?

***Yes.***

Well, there's a problem with that. So, especially if we take into account the availability and quantity of this information. You have a situation that as that pull of data grows in the performance of male and female students and schools, the likelihood increases that this same data will be used selectively. So there is a certain fear that the information does not give a complete picture of the quality of education around the world, or countries around the world, because it is only part of the puzzle. Let's say - PISA testing does not take into account the humanities, does not take into account history, does not take into account world languages, etc. So, something that definitely affects the quality of education, very little is said in the context of inclusion, inclusive practices. So these are some premises on which the qualities of education are based.

***The first next podcast I will connect you and Dženana Husremović. That will be fun.***

Oh, wonderful. Greetings to the professor this way!

***I think I understand what you mean. It’s not that I haven’t read the reviews on PISA, but let’s put PISA aside. I have something, more fun for me, that I want to hear. If there are chronic diseases in the education systems of Bosnia and Herzegovina, don't we want to see them, don't we want to go to the doctor, are we afraid of information or have we gone to the doctor and again we don't understand what the problem is? And why don't we get treated?***

I think we went to the doctor and we didn't understand what the doctor told us about our education. There is so much beautiful in Bosnian education, so much! I have met so many enthusiastic people, both in Step and in schools, that I just sometimes ask myself: is it possible that we got into this situation !? Why do we have so many problems in education? Is it possible that we have been pushing something under the rug for so many years and ignoring that such a thing does not exist when we talk about problems in education. So I see this pandemic crisis as an extraordinary chance for all of us in education, to have that one critical self-reflection and to try now, under a magnifying glass, to detect what the biggest shortcomings of our system are. Because this crisis has exposed everything we knew, in fact it has exposed even those who did not know that our education is in this situation. I had a fantastic talk with Mr. Dejan Ilic and he gave an excellent history of the problem when he said that first when the crisis started and we had that phase when we were all lost, so we didn't know what to do, and then there was a phase delight when we saw that we handle technology well, and that we can adapt the headlines to the online environment and now the sobering phase is coming, and the sobering phase is coming when we need to start giving grades and bringing the year to an end.

***And grab your head and say, "Mother, what did I do?"***

That says how much the education system has boned and how unprepared it is for the innovation of teachers. So we have to do something about structures. The education system is too bureaucratic and a little more freedom must be given. Some things really need to be loosened and policies defined in a way that allows people to be creative.

***This notion of politics, political, is very much connected, does it have the epithet education, is there anything political in education and what is it that is political in education?***

Always. In fact, I keep coming back to that neoliberal logic, but it’s where it is. We have to accept either that she is there, or try to do something with her in education. Education has always been a political issue, from the very beginning, when these waves of social reforms started, education has always been, although we look at it through the prism of critical pedagogy which is to some extent influenced by Maxist teachings, and it is criticized by this deviation. Difficult topics, Nedime, for today.

***They are not difficult topics, but I am burning with the desire to say something, to show something. But, you know, Jasna, they attacked me a lot for Besjede and said: "You are very suggestive. You are very subjective. You agree with people. ”So I can't do anything to you. I wanted critical pedagogy, etc., so I will be objective to the end and let them evaluate me after this sermon.***

Well, well, well. I mean, criticism is always a good thing. I say that it can be a very good input to move forward or backward, it depends from what perspective you look at it. So we have to really work on ourselves. Here is this crisis for us now, I think, it showed us all our weaknesses, it showed us what we can do, and in what we can be great, and in what we can be really great.

***During my schooling, the principal was someone with whom those teachers were terrified. I never understood the role of the principal in the school until I started doing education. Well then again I don’t deal with principals I deal with teachers, and again I don’t understand them until we started working with principals. I discover a completely different world. I must honestly admit that I had a lot of my prejudices and attitudes related to that, and you took the research seriously on that topic. What about principals, what about management, and what is important in the context of education, the functioning of one school, that is - the only one?***

Why is it important for a school to function well !? It is important for the reason that if we disorganize well everything falls into the water. They usually say, there is that kind of phrase, as a good organization is half the job. I would say more: when you have a well-organized household, when you have a well-organized group of friends, when you have a well-organized school, then the children are motivated to learn more, then the teaching staff is motivated to give more than themselves, to show their potentials to a greater extent. And I really liked how you started this story with the directors and that kind of their role. When they talk to me, say with directors, when they ask me: "So what do we need to do? How should we run the school? ”I tell them, I know all the theories, it is a special field of educational leadership that is very complex, but not to bother people with complex terminology. The source comes down to two options. I tell them that principals can choose to either be a good school spirit and set a good example to others by their own behavior, to teach others about values, or they can be demons of school hallways. So, do everything that is wrong, that is, do not motivate people, send reprimands to all sides, get angry at the teaching staff, criticize the ministries. So, whatever energy you emit, it will return to you. In principle, this is what the theory of school leadership says all the time. Try to emit positive energy, it will come back. Because people, especially the teaching staff, are crucial in giving that positive shift when it comes to student success, and research has clearly shown that, without the cohesion of the teaching staff, without the existence of collaborative cultures in which people are free to exchange opinions, to critically question the problems at school, here, we don't have to talk about the education system, but our problems at home, where we talk openly without some figs in our pockets, a completely different environment is being built there. An environment in which money is not so important, that is, salaries are not so important to that extent. Sometimes people are ready to work in a much more positive environment no matter how much they are paid, because your peace, your peace of mind is the quality of mental health. It ultimately determines how productive you will be in the workplace.

***Is there an archetype of principals here with us?***

Well, I think so. We somehow inherited that from socialism. Socialism as socialism was as it is and was a hierarchical system and command responsibility.

***I even speak in the masculine gender. Sorry***.

Yes. So maybe we have that some archetype of directors and directors that definitely needs to change. As far as I am concerned with the theory of school leadership, I have met fantastic principals, that you simply cannot believe that people are so advanced in their thinking, taking into account our context and the problems we face. However, what is the problem of fantastic directors? That there is very little space for mutual cooperation and exchange of good experiences. These platforms definitely need to be built urgently to put that label "under urgent". Because the exchange of these good practices that are contextualized in the BH environment can be very, very useful for the school management, as well as for the teaching staff. So these professional learning communities are one of the keys to how to get to a better education system, and on the other hand they are not a sufficient prerequisite to make a change. However, we need an education policy that places these professional learning communities in the focus of education reform. You cannot make changes in education if you ignore teaching staff and principals. There is nothing of that.

***I'll skip it. Look how nice I am, I don't comment on anything. I'm just asking questions. And you add to that all the terms called climate and culture in school. Now what?***

Well, that is the most important task of the director. Shaping the climate and culture, and I tell you that school culture and climate, that is the DNA of the school. Everything that we are as individuals, our personality, our character, what is the culture of the school. Each school has its own culture, its own rules, its own behaviors. But what I like to point out every time I talk about culture and climate is to go back to the role of director and their essential choice: will I be a good spirit or will I be a demon. Because directors are the ones who create that ambience. What is specific about the culture of the school is that it is a hierarchical category. It is imposed by the management, it is not imposed democratically, or from the classrooms by students, and teachers, but principals must understand how important they are in that process and how much they are under scrutiny. People will behave the way you do. They see you as role models in schools, so if principals set a good example by their behavior, if they nurture two-way communication, if they promote critical thinking, allow teachers to be autonomous, support their creativity, then those values ​​will begin. spread like wildfire and then beautiful things happen.

***Is there, now I can't remember exactly, Balkanization or Balkan, is there such a culture?***

Balkanized.

***Balkanized, what does that mean at all?***

Balkanized school culture is a culture in which you have a lot of teacher groups that are unrelated to each other. These groups are called subcultures. In ordinary education, teacher subcultures are based on belonging to a particular asset. So that people are grouped by some of their similarities. Then very often these unnatural antagonisms appear in schools, these linguists, so we have artists, etc. There is some common language within these subcultures. In Balkanized school cultures, the problem is when one dominant subculture of teachers takes over these cultural values, attributes them as itself and does not have a unique school culture. So, these are actually cultures, that is, schools, in which there is very little cooperation. People are isolated. From asset to asset, there is cooperation, there is no cooperation between assets, no critical thinking, no positive criticism. People are afraid to express their opinion because they are afraid to condemn the subculture to which they belong.

***What climate and culture should we support then?***

Collaborative, no doubt. Associate.

***What does she mean?***

The collaborative culture is almost the essential opposite of the Balkanized culture. In a collaborative culture, there are no such strong subcultures, and no strong subgroups of teachers that influence these common values. So in collaborative cultures, people empower each other. Criticism is something that is generally accepted and something that is desirable. Of course, if we are talking about some constructive conflict, constructive criticism, and in such cultures ad hominem criticism is forbidden, criticism against you personally, but we are talking about expertise, we are talking about what we do or do not do well in classrooms. So, only in such an environment can we all progress together, both individually and as a collective. When we exchange these good practices and when it becomes some of our daily practice, then people become much more honest with each other and with themselves.

***And all because of the children.***

Of course, of course. We always have to ask ourselves what the final outcome is and why we are in schools. And I think that all of us, both teachers and school management, should ask ourselves deeply and honestly: “What is my moral purpose in schools? What is my philosophy of education? ”What values ​​are I guided by, you guided by everyone who looks at us? Because that is the key for us to thoroughly re-examine ourselves and our previous practices and to put our finger on the forehead and think about where we can improve both as individuals and as a collective.

***Is that also a message for our teachers?***

Of course. Working on yourself is something that is invaluable, because all those who accept to work continuously on themselves and to think critically about themselves and the environment in which they find themselves are actually people who will stay young forever.

***In that name, eternally young!***

***Dear friends, dear friends, this podcast, if we didn't have any format, if we had some format, could have lasted for three days. But I thank Jasna Kovačević from the Department of Management and Organization of the Faculty of Economics from the bottom of my heart. Thank you, Jasna, for everything, thank you for the wonderful words. I am not given the right to conclude, so I will invite teachers to get the best out of this conversation, as well as the principals. Thank heavens!***

Thank you for the invitation and greetings to all.