

English language and literature in the post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina: Challenges and experiences of a transcultural academic adaptation¹

MUSTAFA BAL

TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Türkiye

ABSTRACT: This paper presents an account of the author's firsthand experiences between 2006 and 2010, relating to his involvement in the establishment of the English Language and Literature department at the International University of Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and of the difficulties and challenges of the venture in the post-war country, whose higher education system needed urgent reforms. The focus of the study is on the cultural diversity found in an English language (a unifying global language) education setting established in a country which, despite the present estrangement, once hosted a common culture for the Bosnian and Turkish students of the department. Clustered mainly around this issue, the paper further elaborates on the transcultural dynamics of English education aimed at a variety of students that came from different educational backgrounds.

KEYWORDS: English language and literature, post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina, higher education system, cultural diversity in higher education, transcultural interaction in higher education

INTRODUCTION

Writing implicitly on the forthcoming tragic fate of the region and in a rather prophetic narration, Ivo Andric tells us the following in his classic novel *The Bridge on the Drina*:

Perhaps even in those far-off times, some traveller passing this way, tired and drenched, wished that by some miracle this wide and turbulent river were bridged, so that he could reach his goal more easily and quickly. For there is no doubt that men had always, ever since they first travelled here and overcame the obstacles along the way, thought how to make a crossing at this spot, even as all travellers at all times have dreamed of a good road, safe travelling companions and a warm inn. Only not every wish bears fruit, nor has everyone the will and the power to turn his dreams into reality. (Andric, 1977, p. 22)

Dreams came into reality, and upon the order of the Grand Vizier Mehmet Paşa Sokolovic, a stately bridge was built on the river Drina in 1577 by the famous Ottoman architect Sinan.

Evliya Çelebi², on the other hand, in his *Seyahatname*, portrayed the land with the following words:

¹ Some of the ideas in this paper were first worked in my conference presentation at the 6th Annual Association of Adaptation Studies Conference called "The Intellectual Silk Road: Cross-Media and Cross-Cultural Adaptations", September, 29-30, 2011, Istanbul, Türkiye.

² UNESCO declared 2011 as the year of Evliya Çelebi, an important Ottoman travel-writer.

Mezkûr kal'a-i bâlânın cânib-i şimâlinde ve semt-i yıldızında ve taraf-ı garbında bir dereli ve depeli zemînde Nehr-i Mileçka'nın yemîn ü yesârında topraklı bayırlar üzre birbirinden âlî kat-ender-kat bâğlı ve bâğçeli ve her hânedânı âb-ı revânlı tahtânî ve fevkânî ekseriyyâ kiremit örtülü ve ba'zısı şindire tahta örtülü bacaları mevzûn hâne-i zîbâlardır³. (*Evlîya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 2007, p. 223)

Such an account I myself as a Turk could hardly understand, in a language that now sounds poetic because of its obscure form, and deciphering what it said added up other reasons for my cultural exploration around Sarajevo.

Therefore, having read *The Bridge on the Drina* and lived my adolescence seeing and hearing all the atrocities in the region between 1992 and 1995, and with some curiosity for a cultural search within a past I was not able to access from my homeland, I could easily take a decision to resign from my position at a Turkish state university and become “the dreamy traveler” Andric imagined in his novel when I received a job offer from a university project in Sarajevo. After all, the city, the country, and the whole region embodied some untold and untaught but shared history and culture that made it a place of wonder for a Turkiye-born-Turk. Nowhere else in the world other than Bosnia displayed a stronger dichotomy of feelings of love and hatred at the same time for the same nation – Turkey – and I wanted to experience it directly.

In this sense, what follows presents an account of my firsthand experiences relating to my involvement in the establishment of the English Language and Literature department at the International University of Sarajevo (IUS), of the difficulties of the venture in the post-war country whose academic systems needed urgent reforms, and of transcultural dynamics of English education aimed at a variety of students that came from different educational backgrounds.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SETTING IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA IN THE YEARS 2005 AND 2006

The Bosnia-Herzegovina I went to first for a visit in 2005 and later for work in 2006 was a post-war country. The Dayton Agreement, ending the war in 1995, was what one could easily call a postmodern treaty as it officially supported, though intentionally positive, the commotion of everything in the region, ending the war as well as all systems, and bringing nothing anew to stabilise the country and rehabilitate peoples there. It only ended the war with weapons but strengthened the fragmentation and nationalism as it officially recognised the establishment of a country within a country, the Republika Srpska, which was the major reason of conflict to start the war. Governmentally, the new federation included Bosnian Muslims, Catholic Croats, and Orthodox Serbs, each represented by a president in the parliament, and no laws could be put into effect before earning the consent of all these three presidents. Considering the totally detached benefits and goals of these three separate nations in the same country, law-making or enforcing law were always chaotic processes. In addition, the federation of presumably three and a half million people was divided

³ This extract in Old Turkish gives some details about the location, environmental features, and architectural characteristics of Sarajevo during the 17th Century.

into ten cantons, each with their own parliaments, ministries, and other related organisational units. Added to these parliaments, which were supervised by the Federation Parliament, was at the top a European council called Office of the High Representative (OHR), overseeing all administrative acts in the country.

Therefore, governmentally, the country was extremely divided. (Both Ivo Andric and Evliya Çelebi would need three times longer lives to be able to narrate the region in its present form.) In a nutshell, being a country in the making, Bosnia and Herzegovina during the first half of the first decade of the new millennium was a country which was torn into many pieces, whose administrative bodies and laws were being formed, and it has ever been formed and reformed up to this day, and in direct effect, making it difficult for our establishment of a university as well as an English Language and Literature department as one of its programs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IUS

In order to have a better understanding of the transcultural adaptation of an English program we undertook to maintain in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is necessary to visit the establishment process and the educational context of the country. The establishment of both the university and its English program faced major challenges and obstacles. These challenges and obstacles we were confronted with while establishing a higher education institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a part of former Yugoslavia, were many and diverse. While bureaucratic difficulties such as extremely slow processes of appointments to positions, of endorsement of working and residency permits, and of diploma accreditation could still be bearable, academic challenges posed invincible obstacles for us.

The primary challenge lay in the differences of perspectives and paradigms on university education. We were confronted with a stark clash of educational cultures between how we knew it in Türkiye (with her rather American model universities) and how it was back then in the host country (where there was a strong educational tradition of one-time Soviet socialist countries). Such a clash of educational cultures materialised first in the absence of “private university”, “Foundation University”, and “campus university” concepts in 2005 in Bosnia.

Overview of the Higher Education System in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the years of 2004 and 2005:

The organisation of higher education in Bosnia and Herzegovina suffered from duplication of teaching and administrative staff, inefficiency, and outdated methods of instruction and assessment. Each university was actually an association of almost totally independent faculties. The high degree of autonomy exercised by each faculty created a decentralised structure and resulted in a very expensive duplication of teaching and administrative staff, as well as great inefficiency in data handling. Because of this fragmentary structure, students of the same university could not even take courses from a different faculty. The students remained in the university system for a very long time. Only a small percentage of students were able to graduate from an undergraduate program in four years. There were large classes, attendance was not compulsory in most cases and assessment was neither transparent nor controllable

primarily because of the oral nature of final exams. Therefore, the system was neither student- nor learning-centred.

The “Overview of Higher Education System in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, a report that was announced in 2005 by the Ministry of Education of Bosnia and Herzegovina, officially declared the reform-needy character of higher education in the country: “[No] legislation or procedural mechanism ensures the homogeneity of academic standards or allows for the comparative assessment of the performance of academic institutions. Such a situation means that higher education in BiH faces unresolved issues of governance at the levels both of coordination and the management of institutions” (Ministry of Education of B&H, 2005, p. 1). The report clearly shows the intrinsic administrative constraints which were leading higher education to an impasse.

Another striking and earlier (2004) report prepared by the European University Association (EUA) highlighted the same poor conditions of higher education we witnessed firsthand:

It is not easy to be a conscientious, hard working and ambitious student in BiH at the moment. The current structure of academic programmes and examinations makes it almost impossible to study correctly, pass examinations and graduate within the normal timeframe. Curricula are overloaded and based heavily, if not exclusively, on *ex cathedra* teaching and rote learning. Academic courses tend to be too specialized and rigid, with many overlaps and incoherencies, thus denying students the flexibility needed to face the future....Theoretical knowledge predominates over practical learning. Timetabling is poor, resulting in many hours lost for the students, without adequate library or other independent learning facilities. All these mean that there is a generalized and urgent need for a learning-oriented approach across all universities, where the student is at the centre of the process, rather than an accidental element on the periphery. (EUA, 2004, p. 18)

Among all this academic inadequacy (even at the level of undergraduate education), universities naturally could not allocate enough resources for more serious higher education activities such as research. The national report, “Education Development in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, prepared by the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2004, draws attention to this situation: “The scientific and research work within education process is being neglected and no State level legal framework of regulations on this important issue is in place” (Ministry of Civil Affairs of B&H, 2004, p. 6).

Mission of the IUS

The International University of Sarajevo project, which started in 2004, was the first major external positive response to the “generalised and urgent need” for reform the EUA called for in its report. The founding rector of the university, Professor Dr. Erkan Türe, knew that in order for a substantial reform to take place in such a chaotic country, any investment in its higher education should aim to develop functional expertise in fields at the forefront of modern sciences and economic development, including information sciences and entrepreneurship. By creating centres of functional expertise in these fields, Bosnian youth could be equipped with skills with which they could create their own jobs and economic ventures, thus contributing to both short-

and long-term economic development, as well as peace and prosperity in the region. In theory, such progress might be facilitated in the first place by a different university concept for the country (a private/foundation/campus university), which was what IUS aimed to introduce.⁴

However, considering the above-cited reports about the outdated and stagnant modes of the higher education in the country, it was obvious from the beginning that the University, with such a mission and perspective for change, would face strong resistance. As opposed to the above-stated, prevalent higher education practices, IUS introduced into its courses a multiplicity of assessment components instead of one oral final exam, adopted interactive and technology-assisted learning environments, and interdisciplinary programs whose curricula allowed minor or double major programs. It would be the first time for the region that a privately funded university was able to invite students from all over the world, giving generous scholarships to students that are comparatively more successful while charging others with expensive tuition fees. This meant giving options for diverse groups of students. Additionally, being a student- and learning-centred institution, with continuous assessment, application-oriented teaching with projects, team works, presentations, and extensive use of computers and software and other related technologies, IUS certainly had the potential to serve as a role model to the universities in the whole region.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND METHOD OF INSTRUCTION FOR THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT AT THE IUS

In such a politically tense, administratively chaotic, and academically stagnant atmosphere, in 2006, I joined a team of professors in order to establish a private university in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Together with another experienced lecturer, I was responsible for initiating and maintaining an English language and literature program at the IUS⁵. I felt committed to teaching in English since, throughout my education, it had been through the English language that unknown and the unfamiliar knowledge were revealed to me. English was the language of the globe and of science, and even the nations that once built the parts of a common culture but were now separated could be made familiar through English. Bosnian culture – one time sharing a common culture with Turks – could now be revealed and restored to me, and mine to them, by means of English. English, in this sense, was more than a foreign language but an indispensable tool for the (re)discovery and understanding of a common cultural past and an estranged present. Moreover, English literature – considering the all-encompassing nature of literature in the formation of a universal

⁴ In order to accomplish this mission, the university was established by the Sarajevo Education Development Foundation (SEDEF), which was founded by the Turkish businessmen and Bosnian intellectuals in 2001 to “seek and create academic, material and legal conditions for the advancement of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina” (See <http://www.ius.edu.ba/Default.aspx?tabid=29>). The Foundation established the IUS in 2003 as an international institution for education and research, therefore English language was chosen as the medium of instruction and communication. English Language School, thus, began instruction in 2004 with a small batch of students from four countries.

⁵ In due course, I was given some other duties such as coordinating Freshman English courses, founding and editing the first and only academic journal of the university called *Epiphany*, redacting the monthly university bulletin, supervising the SAT tests at the university facilities, and chairing diploma accreditation committees.

human culture – contributed considerably to my commitment, since the analysis of English literary texts in class (through the study of themes, social and cultural backgrounds, literary history, biographies, thoughts and feelings, and so on) provided a proper platform for me and my students in this rather mutual learning process.

The first task we undertook was to prepare a curriculum that would embrace student profiles coming from different écoles with different backgrounds, meet both theoretical needs of English philology as well as helping with practical skills such as correct and efficient use of English, presentation making, lexical development, oral composition, translation, and academic research and writing. According to the general academic structure of the university, students accepted for any of the departments needed to qualify at a certain level of English through institutional-based or internationally accredited English proficiency exams. Having the required scores, all freshman year students, then, took the same courses such as “History of Civilizations” or “Calculus”. When they became sophomore students, they took faculty courses. It would be only in their third and fourth years that they would mainly choose departmental courses. The curriculum we prepared, thus, was formally shaped according to this flexible academic structure. In terms of content, on the other hand, it was comprised of mainly English literature courses. In preparing and integrating the courses into the curriculum, we adopted a chronological structure rather than a genre-based perspective. We categorised the courses as required: core, elective, and free elective courses.

Our philosophy of teaching English courses were suited to the methods and principles of the communicative approach and intercultural communicative competence (ICC). We valued interaction above all as we were to educate groups of students that were mostly ideologically and culturally distanced from the English-speaking world. A combination of these approaches were seen as establishing the potential for melting the ice between our students and the language and culture of the Western world with which they were rather unfamiliar.

Using literature to familiarise our students with the cultural and ideological differences of the studied language to inspire enthusiasm for the language as well as develop feelings and artistic perspectives, in other words, the “Cultural Model” of teaching English through literature, as suggested by Carter and Long in their book *Teaching Literature*, would not work with our students as they, in their first years, would be culturally defensive and unwelcoming. Additionally, the “Language Model” – using literary texts as tools to teach students the structures and vocabularies – could not alone be the unifying purpose of our program. It was rather the “Personal Growth Model”, through which literature could be seen as a provider of necessary reading materials for our students to mature in terms of understanding and appreciation of cultures both of their own and of the language they studied (Carter and Long, 1991, pp. 2-3).

Moreover, due to the fact that Bosnia-Herzegovina, though it was a multicultural land, was not a country where our English department students would be able to have contact directly with many native speakers of English, we hoped that English literary texts could “provide a short-cut to the extensive experience of linguistic items in context that native speakers acquire by direct exposure” (Enkvist, Spencer & Gregory, 1964, p. 5). All in all, what we had in mind, and what our mostly Turkish and Bosnian

students would expect from our English curriculum at the newly opening International University of Sarajevo could be summarized in Chamber's and Gregory's following note:

Among the many different ways that the Humanities search for meaning, deploying our resources for reading literature well and teaching it effectively must be among the most important resources we can deploy in general, not just for disciplinary purposes but for the more broadly educational purposes of preparing our students for their overall lives, for their careers, for parenthood, for civic responsibility and for moral and ethical thoughtfulness. (Chambers and Gregory, 2006, p. 2)

Apart from this philosophy of education we adopted while setting up the fundamental components of the program, we also diversified the curriculum by adding to it two somewhat different pathways for the sake of professional variety for our future graduates. One of these pathways concentrated on translation studies, and its main objective was to provide students with necessary courses to make them professional translators. The other pathway was the English language-teaching pathway, the objective of which was to give students courses in English language teaching pedagogy. All in all, it could be easily claimed that the curriculum we prepared for the English Language and Literature program at the IUS arose from work that considered many primary cultural and pedagogical factors in high-quality, higher education.

CULTURAL CHALLENGES

What I have occasionally mentioned up to now in this study may mainly be considered as external obstacles to our determination to run an English language and literature program in Sarajevo. There were more complex challenges, too, which were born out of intercultural dynamics of the setting and context the students found themselves in.

One such problematic intercultural dynamic could be observed in relation to the general student profile in our department. The university accepted students from all over the world but the majority of students came from Türkiye, primarily because the whole financing of the institution was from this country and also particularly because back then in 2006, female students with head scarves were not allowed to attend higher education institutions in Türkiye. Sarajevo, due to its Ottoman-Islamic-Turkish background and to the freedom of clothing for all, provided a safe haven for such students. In terms of teaching English literature, this resulted in a once-in-a-lifetime, cross-cultural challenge and experience.

These Turkish students, most of whom were female students as is the usual case with all other English programs, had religiously oriented high school education, Arabic being their foreign language, and with an educated tendency to resist what belonged to the West. This was in stark contrast with what John Corbett claims when he writes that "[the] intercultural element of...second language education...requires teachers and learners to pay attention to and respect the home culture and the home language" (Corbett, 2003, p. 4), as our mostly Turkish students (who had already, in their countries, been caught between the Westernization and a hybridity of Turkish Republican-Eastern-Ottoman roots and traditions) with their rather religious

backgrounds, seemed confused about defining “home culture” and “home language” in a Turkish university in Bosnia – a post-war country divided into many political and cultural fragments with Islamic, Ottoman, Orthodox and Catholic multiculturalism.

Added to this complex milieu of learning were elements of the culture of the English-speaking world, without which, full acquisition of the English language would be premature, posing another difficult challenge for our highly multicultural students. These elements, as Gillian Lazar observes, were

Objects and products that exist in one society, but not in another...Proverbs, idioms, formulaic expressions which embody cultural values...Social structures, roles and relationships...Customs, rituals, traditions, festivals... Beliefs, values, superstitions... Political, historic, and economic background...Institutions...Taboos...Metaphorical, connotative meanings... Humour...Representativeness – to what slice of a culture or society does a text refer?...Genre – how far do different genres translate cross-culturally?...The status of the written language in different cultures and the resulting strategies for reading a text. (Lazar, 1993, pp. 65-66)

As Liliana Piasecka points out, “[l]earning a second/foreign language entails the learner’s contact with another culture which may evoke doubts and uncertainty about both the first and second language cultures, especially when the values, beliefs, and attitudes are dissimilar” (Piasecka, 2011, pp. 24-25).

In our case, it was easily observable that our students felt such “doubts and uncertainty”. Undoubtedly, the students experienced an extraordinary acculturation process. A proper and regular acculturation would take place when the students were in a foreign country for education, whose culture would be distinctly unfamiliar to their own. In this case, they would pass through four stages of acculturation: tourist stage, survivor stage, immigrant stage, and citizen stage, respectively (Acton & Walker, 1986, p. 21). However, in Sarajevo, they never felt like a tourist but rather like a late-returnee to a land where their forefathers lived happily for a long time; neither did they have to act like a survivor, since many Bosniaks already knew Turkish and Turkish customs; the immigrant stage would be out of question as the university project they were part of enriched the city rather than adding new stress on its already poor conditions; and they would not opt for the citizen stage, though they adored the city, because the cultural capital to which Sarajevo still felt attached was Istanbul, the city whence the majority of the students came. Facing this mixture of acculturational and intercultural challenges, the students in English Language and Literature program still, however, wanted to learn and be engaged with jobs related to the English language.

During the initial stages of their education, the students tended to be linguistically so self-enclosed and so conservative that they would seldom use words outside a special jargon, filled with their own cultural, national, or religious expressions, like the expressions “inşAllah”⁶ or “yani”⁷, which would occasionally seep into their statements. In other words, in terms of the language ego, they might be characterised as insular. It was quite normal to observe that the Turkish students with previous Islamic educational background went through a stage of familiarisation, if not

⁶ It means “Godwilling” in English.

⁷ It means “in other words” in English.

resistance, with English as the language of the West. For these students, it might be a subconscious clash of civilizations in a historical sense: English, the imperial language of the West taking the upper hand against the last greatest imperial power of the East. A similar, yet rather postcolonial, case could be observed in Malaysia. Ratnawati Mohd-Asraf analyses the situation in Malaysia as he writes:

Malay identity was closely related to the use of the Malay language. However, with the increasing realization of the importance of English, of the fact that fewer opportunities are open to those who are *not* proficient in English – not only in terms of employment but also in terms of career and social advancement, and given the fact there has been continual emphasis, by the Malaysian government, the Ministry of Education, and the media, on the importance of English and the need for Malaysians to be proficient in English, many Malays see the need to learn, and want to learn the language. (Mohd Asraf, 2005, p. 113)

English language and literature courses, however, demand some “willing suspension of disbelief” in Coleridge’s terms (Coleridge, 1965, p. 6). It requires openness to secular perspectives and a degree of liberalism, also. As Dagmara Galajda also claims, “while learning a FL, learners tend to recreate their cultural identity and develop a new FL identity” (Galajda, 2011, p. 50). Therefore, the greatest task of the students was to leave aside prejudices and open up their minds to the literature and culture produced in English. Introduction and background courses, thus, were always the most difficult ones to teach.

Classical Mythology course, for example, came as a shock, not because of the plurality of myths but the display of the mythological characters during lectures, which were mostly represented in nude forms, as well as the large number of myths that depicted sexual relations. The most difficult times of my teaching career took place while I was trying to be unendingly euphemistic and politically correct in narrating to my conservative students the myths that described in how many different forms – as himself, as a swan, cloud, and so on – Zeus coupled with, violated, raped, and had sexual intercourse with his victimised male and female partners.

Another example arose in the Survey of English literature course. Studying John Stuart Mill’s “On Liberty”, analyzing concepts like the wisdom behind one’s individuality, freedom of choice against the suffocating orders of custom, and self-control as opposed to the control by the community were as difficult to teach to a group of students, who believed in the superiority of the community over the individual, as the voluptuous content of the mythology course. However, it should be noted that, in due course, there appeared clearly observable progress in the students’ perspectives and attitudes, and they turned out to be English language and literature students that had basic knowledge of the cultures of both ends of the world. By their final year, in one of their novel courses, they found themselves reading and discussing a novel with homoerotic scenes.

CONCLUSION

In 2009, obstacles that came from the outside and those from the inside were mixed, and some combined antagonistic forces came to the stage. The university

administration decided to close the English language and literature program in order to replace it with an English language-teaching program. The only reason for this was that Turkish students needed a certificate of pedagogy to be appointed as English teachers in Turkish state secondary and high schools. Although all of those certificate courses were given to the students as area elective courses by the department, still it was not accepted as such, merely for the reason that it was not titled as a “certificate course”.

The problem had another dimension that made it more complex: students from Bosnia and other parts of the world did not need such a certificate to become an English teacher in the institutions run by their states. Many students and professors of the department were demoralised, many arguments and debates were held, but eventually the department was not repealed, and has survived to this day.

The whole experience in Sarajevo for about five years can be summarized as *continually assertive attempts to counterbalance clashes of diverse cultures in order to run an English language and literature program*. There were multi-clashes of multi-cultures in the university: Euro-Asian culture clashed with Balkan culture; contemporary Turkish culture clashed with contemporary Bosnian culture; contemporary Turkish youth culture clashed with contemporary Bosnian youth culture; contemporary conservative Turkish youth culture clashed with contemporary conservative Bosnian youth culture⁸; non-conservative/secular Bosnian youth clashed with their opponents; a minority of international students from Malaysia, Sudan, Indonesia clashed with all the rest of the majority student groups; private university culture clashed with unreformed state university culture; the Croats clashed with the Serbs; the Serbs and the Croats together clashed with the Bosniaks; the European Union clashed with Türkiye and the United States for domination and power over the land; university regulations imported from Turkish universities clashed with the Bosnian higher education regulations. And in such a peaceful atmosphere, we were trying to set up and run an English language and literature program. However, it should be noted that all these oppositions could be turned to positive interactions and melted into educational richness by the unconquerable energies of the university students themselves.

To conclude, it would be proper to state that educational cultures evolve through time and adapt themselves to the temporal and spatial contexts they are produced in. When the English language and literature departments were opened in British universities, they must have aimed at the study and transfer of the language and what it added to the culture of current and subsequent generations. When the English language and literature department was opened at Ankara University in 1936, it aimed to contribute to the Turkish Enlightenment of the new republic. Yet Turks founding an English language and literature program in a conflict region in the West Balkans in a war-worn country that was confronting its recent painful past, a country with religiously tripartite nations of the same Slavic origin, a small country where Islam, Orthodox and Catholic Christianity, Judaism, Ottomans, Austrians, a short-lived Nazi

⁸ It is a normal scene in Bosnia, for example, for a very urban Bosnian woman in make-up to carry a scarf in her bag and wear it just before entering a mosque to pray only to put it off again after the prayer, and secondly, Bosnians are also very social people and conservative Bosnian male students found it hard to understand why the conservative Turkish female students did not chat or socialise with them.

occupation, Socialism, and the most recent post-war period prevailed and interpenetrated each other's culture, with mostly Turkish and conservative students and students from thirteen other countries, war-time Bosnian kids then being our university students and their war-shaped personalities due to firsthand witnessed atrocities, with limited resources, and pointless bureaucracy was truly a multicultural experiment and an eye-brow raising adaptation.

REFERENCES

- Acton, W. R., & Walker de Felix, J. (1986). Acculturation and mind. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (pp. 20-32). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Andric, I. (1977). *The bridge on the Drina*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carter, R., & Long, M. (1991). *Teaching literature*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Chambers, E., & Gregory, M. (2006). *Teaching and learning English literature*. London, England: Sage.
- Coleridge, S. T. (1965). *Biographia literaria: Volume II*. (J. Shawcross, ed.). London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Corbett, J. (2003). *An intercultural approach to English Language teaching*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Çelebi, E. (2007). *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*. (Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, İbrahim Sezgin, eds.) İstanbul, Turkey: YKY.
- Enkvist, N. E., Spencer J., & Gregeory, M. (1964). *Linguistics and style*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- European University Association (EUA). (2004). *Institutional evaluations of seven universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. (A. Sadikovic, Trans.). European University Association. Retrieved November 18, 2011, from http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/BiH_cross_cutting_report.1096645273680.pdf
- Galajda, D. (2011). The contribution of FL learning experiences to the development of multicultural identity. In J. Arabski & A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (pp. 49-62). London, England: Springer.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2004, August). *Education development in Bosnia and Herzegovina: National report*. Retrieved November 18, 2011, from <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE47/English/Natreps/reports/bosniaher.pdf>.
- Ministry of Education of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2005, September). *Overview of higher education system in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Retrieved November 12, 2011 from <http://www.international.ac.uk/resources/Overview%20of%20Higher%20Education%20System%20in%20Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina.pdf>
- Mohd-Asraf, R. (2005). English and Islam: A clash of civilizations? *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 4(2), 103-118.

Piasecka, L. (2011). Sensitising foreign language learners to cultural diversity through developing intercultural communicative competence. In J. Arabski & A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (p. 21-34). London, England: Springer.

Manuscript received: October 17, 2011

Revision received: March 3, 2012

Accepted: December 24, 2012