

Justyna Pilarska

University of Wrocław

ORCID: 0000-0002-5646-597X

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35464/1642-672X.PS.2019.4.13>

The city as a subject of pedagogical reflection Sarajevo reminiscences

ABSTRACT: This text is devoted to theoretical reflections that build a narrative around places as a pedagogically significant category. Contemporary mobility and the nature of social transformations of the 21st century assign to the category of place a significant status in co-creating educational references in the process of upbringing and socialization. This is particularly important in the case of culturally diverse societies such as Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the text, the author, based on her year-long research experiences in Sarajevo, discusses the importance of the city and places for the creation of local identities, but also introduces some approaches and methods of empirical explorations concentrated on city and the human-place relation.

KEYWORDS: Pedagogy of place, city, space, qualitative methods, Sarajevo.

Introduction

In post-modern, thoroughly interdisciplinary pedagogical reflections, we cannot forget about reflection on the place. As Maria Mendel writes, “the place is always significant. ‘Everything’ has its place” (Mendel, 2006, p. 21). This results not only from the ephemerality of contemporary societies, but also from the individual trajectories of life, which make us mobile nomads searching for their place-space. Nevertheless, despite the variability, fragmentation and transience of contemporary cultural and social reality, in our journeys “we organize space; we occupy it through intimate experiences [...] to make it subject to our social and physical needs” (Brady, 2009, p. 487). As Tuan writes,

“space and place are familiar words denoting common experiences [...]. Place is security, space is freedom: we are attached to the one and long for the other” (Tuan, 1987, p. 13). As a consequence, space and places are subject to transformation and taming, often taking on the idiographic characteristics of the communities that constitute them.

My long-term observations of the exceptional space, the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina – Sarajevo, show that there is an extraordinary relationship between human and place, dialogical in its nature and dynamics, in the spirit of topographical turn (Soya, 2009). When conducting research in the capital of Bosnia (not directly related to the place itself), I have noticed over the years¹ how the place shapes attitudes of openness to difference, generates a specific culture of community at the meeting point, urban lifestyle combined with cultivating the memory of Sarajevo as a legendary mosaic of cultures. The question can be asked here: what is the reason for the specificity of this place and what could distinguish this city from other European capitals? Well, Sarajevo is a city that is complex in its multiculturalism, despite its significant demographic change, after the end of the civil war and the abolition of the city blockade in 1996². As an “European Jerusalem”, it still symbolically gathers believers of all monotheistic religions (Orthodox, Jews, Catholics and Muslims), and their temples can be found in the Old Town within a radius of a square kilometer. As a historian from Sarajevo writes, “although there are walls in Jerusalem separating the Wailing Wall from the Al-Aqsa and Al-Quds mosques, there are no walls in Sarajevo, temples and architecture reflect an understanding of the concept of a human. Their existence and survival confirm the unity of religious contrasts, which was unimaginable, especially in the Middle Ages” (Koštović 2001, p. 5).

On the other hand, this city, like hardly any other in Europe, has become a symbol of a bloody conflict, breaking up the diverse ethnic communities, leading to the break-up of Yugoslavia and the longest lasting siege in the

¹ I implemented my first empirical project there in 2001 as a member of a non-governmental organization working for human rights.

² After 1425 days of the siege, on 29 February 1996, the city was unblocked. Pursuant to the Dayton Agreement (1995) Bosnia and Herzegovina was divided into two entities: Republika Srpska and the Croat-Muslim Federation. As a result of ethnic conflict and mass expulsions, as well as the provisions of the truce, Sarajevo’s ethnic-religious structure has undergone a significant change. The first census after the war in 2013 revealed the scale of this demographic reshuffle – there are 83.8% of the Bosniaks (compared to 50.8% in 1991), 3.2% of the Bosnian Serbs (27.2% in 1991) and 4.2% of the Bosnian Croats (7% in 1991). <http://www.statistika.ba/#link7> accessed: 10 February 2019

modern history (of cities). It is here that more than 7,000 children lost their lives during the war (siege), or where the legendary “Sniper Avenue” runs, which for more than five years was systematically fired at by Bosnian Serbs from the surrounding hills, aiming at civilians, old people, children, youth and women. It is, however, a city that is still surprisingly coherent – in its uncompromising attitude of openness, tolerance, building (intercultural) bridges in the abyss of historical resentments and animosities (cf. Pilarska 2016, 2017a). Referring to the terminology of a semiotician of culture, Yuri Lotman, the Sarajevo semiosphere (i.e. a special continuum of a specific organization) is a dialog (cf. Lotman 1999, p. 15), which is “a universal [...] law determining the manner of existence of the semiosphere” (p. 17)³.

Sarajevo as a borderland space continues to exist despite epistemological complexity, ontological contradictions as well as troublesome and painful history, creating a unique *genius loci*, which is at the same time a space for informal intercultural education. This is a space that resists religious fanaticism (e.g. Wahhabi movements), refuses separatism and political radicalization, and creates its own microcosm (Karahasan 2018). It is here that the centuries-old relations between various ethnic groups have been marked by dynamics, certainly – tensions, but also by mutual tolerance based on daily interactions⁴.

All experiences, including social and cultural ones – especially important for creating identity – are anchored in a defined space, often evoked, dynamized and profiled by it. This paper is devoted to reflections on the values of space, inspired by Sarajevo. Although it is inspired by empirical experiences, it is theoretical in nature at the same time outlining certain, seemingly important, methodological themes, which are inscribed in the discourse of pedagogy of city. Referring to Maria Mendel’s thesis (2006, p. 22) that places are

³ At this point, on the margins of the semiotic issue of culture as a text – a city as a text of culture (which needs to be read), it is worth to note the fact that the “relation between the ‘writing’ of the city [...] and the activity (in) the city was unequally represented in the urban literature, as a hierarchy, in which “writing” has always been the leading concept” (Solga, Orr, Hopkins, 2001, p. 4). This finding could also serve as a research inspiration and encouragement to make educational researchers more open to what a space in which cognitive, educational and social acts take place can offer in empirical terms. This optics also corresponds to Michel de Certeau’s anthropological “walking around the city” inscribed in the linguistic and textual perspective (cf. de Certeau, 2008).

⁴ Catholics, Orthodox, Muslims and Jews shared trading places and networked, especially in urban areas, willing to hold on to cooperation and help each other in time of need. They also often participated in each other’s religious ceremonies specific to one religious group (cf. Karahasan 2018).

pedagogical, this paper illustrates the reflections presenting the approach to the category of place (and city) in pedagogy in a partial reference to Sarajevo.

Between place and space

Regardless of whether the place is discussed from an architectural, urban or sociological perspective, this discourse hides a certain poetics resulting from the intimacy of the experience of space by individuals as well as communities. Not only the inhabitants of Sarajevo often talk about “their” place – “this is my city”. This relation, which everyone personally establishes with the space of their everyday life, is rooted “in our tendency to give a meaning to material and imagined experiences through the projection of being-in-world” (Brady 2009, p. 486). This projection, in turn, is crucial for the processes of conceptualization of personal, cultural and social identity. The saying “I am from Sarajevo” projects the image of a certain ethical formation and attitude towards cultural difference. It is a projection of openness, respect for differences and cognitive curiosity towards what is “different” and what is revealed in space (architecture) and its users (attitudes, cultural behaviors). The space, through its indigenous, original nature becomes a space for creation of a personal *self*, as well as the relation of this *self* with its surroundings. If it is a space of cultural borderland, then the creation of identity in a dynamic way is enriched with culturally diverse content. However, contact with these contents takes place in a specific space, which itself is of a borderline, eclectic and heterogeneous nature (such as the Old Town in Sarajevo with its numerous sacral buildings of various rites). Therefore a city is a specific *locus educandi* (Męczkowska 2006), a real form that we give to our biographies and interactions with others and the inanimate world. It becomes our personal space, which “as such is the center for gathering experiences and constructing identities, both individual and collective, it is the center for memories that can be stored and shared with others in different ways by telling stories about life as it is lived” (Brady 2003, p. xiv–xv from: Brady 2009).

As a carrier of such important psychological, sociological and pedagogical contents, the city (and more broadly – space and place) should retain its status as one of the key categories in social pedagogy. The Maria Mendel’s concept of *modi co-vivendi* seems to be extremely valuable as a point of reference for this reflection. It deals with “ways of understanding a socially shared life (coexistence) which characters are mutually accepted, leading not only to the feeling that “it is possible to live together”, but that “it is possible to live well together” (Mendel 2015, p. 16). The idea of *modi co-vivendi* em-

phasizes the important role of (intercultural) mutual contact in a given space, through which there is an opportunity to develop “a satisfactory *modus co-vivendi*, in which the cultural diversity of the city, now seen as a disadvantage, would become an advantage” (Mendel 2015, p. 17–18).

In other, extremely interesting studies by Maria Mendel (2017), which fit into the interdisciplinary discourse of the pedagogy of place, the researcher attributes an important role to the relationship between places and subjects, emphasizing the role of the former in the processes of socialization, upbringing and broadly understood education, considering them as an area of educational activity, interventions and personality-forming interactions. This view corresponds to my observations from Sarajevo on the informal intercultural education that takes place “incidentally” in the Sarajevo space marked by difference and ambiguity, where cultural diversity is not considered as a threat, but as a stimulating value in the understanding of a human and the world, helpful in its interpretation. The specificity of *genius loci* results in the fact that during the Christmas period Bosnian Muslims come to the Sarajevo Cathedral to listen to carols accompanied by an ecumenical choir, and during the Kurban Bajram Christians give sweets to their Muslim friends⁵. Such a state of affairs seems to be accompanied by theoretical observations that the pedagogy of place must be “of necessity an area of educational dialog, which by strengthening the identity of the individual through cognition of their environment and closest culture will teach to perceive and respect ‘otherness’ and encourage to search for ways of mutual communication” (Copik 2013, p. 188). This way is searched for, every day and tirelessly, contrary to ethnonationalistic demagogues and unfavorable economic and political circumstances in Bosnia, by the inhabitants of Sarajevo – a city that generates a local, unique identity of a borderland man (cf. Pilarska 2010). Thus Sarajevo becomes for its inhabitants a local identity, since the locality itself “is [...] treated as a life-giving cultural space, providing an identity offer to its inhabitants” (Męczkowska 2006, p. 44)⁶.

⁵ One can of course claim that there is nothing extraordinary in such interpersonal gestures of kindness, but given the ethnic and religious conflict in Bosnia (and in the Balkans) that happened only two decades ago, such (inter)cultural opening to the Other takes on a specific dimension, which cannot be found in other places in Bosnia on such a scale (cf. Doubt 2014).

⁶ In the context of these considerations, it is worth to emphasize that locality is one of the pedagogically important spatial frameworks of social activities and cultural contents, and thus it becomes a specific space for the distribution of specific methods of action and specific cultural (axiological) content. Interestingly, from a sociological perspective, places and locality often become related concepts. As Anthony Giddens writes, the place is what is “local, which means

The distinction between space and place is made in the spirit of different paradigms and perspectives by urban planners, architects, social geographers and social educators, which proves the ambiguity of this terminological field. For example, when distinguishing between space and place, the American social anthropologist Ivan Brady concludes: “space is a transparent, ethereal, unrealistic space abstractly noticed by the corner of the inner eye as an empty geometry. It is like a cognitively and culturally defined container into which concrete and meaningful things can be put or in which they can appear (Brady 2009, p. 491). Such a view of space implies its flexibility towards the user, i.e. space can be processed, transformed, created, and at the same time saturated with axiological, educational and pedagogical content. It can be a platform for a meeting, dialog and intercultural communication. On the other hand, bearing in mind that, as the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre stated, since space is a social product (1991), it is possible to give it a socially and culturally inclusive form within the framework of educational influences (formal and informal). There is a clear correlation between social life and the space where the latter, transformed into a place, is an important property of the social and cultural life. An interesting example of such inclusive practices is the interfaith Pontanima choir from Sarajevo, founded in 1996 by the Franciscan Ivo Marković from the association “Face to face interreligious service”⁷. The choir, whose members are Muslims, Protestants, Jews, Orthodox, Catholic and even agnostics, has in its repertoire Muslim Ilahians, Gregorian, Sephardic and Catholic chants that they present to their audience in churches, cathedrals, mosques and other spaces of the separated sacrum and profane.

Sarajevo’s space is in fact two worlds, sometimes interweaving and sometimes mutually exclusive – the Orient with Islamic architectural and urban art, Ottoman architecture, and Muslim burqa that Bosniak women wear, as well as the Occident – with a Catholic cathedral, an Orthodox church, street elegance of women, Habsburg and socialist architecture⁸. In the context of

geographically located, physical environment of human interactions” (1990, s. 18). A place, however, does not necessarily have to be a closed area with clear and permanent boundaries, as these are in fact points of intersection of different influences and impacts on the cultural borderline.

⁷ A friar who was injured during the war and the siege of the city and lost his father decided to make the choir a form of therapy and a tool to rebuild religious, national and cultural dialog.

⁸ In Sarajevo, several layers can be seen in terms of architecture and urban planning – medieval, Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, Yugoslavian (in two versions – pre-war and communist) as well as contemporary, postmodern.

this specific social and cultural life in this city, there is also a “third” culture that appears – culture not so much of the Balkans, Bosnian, but the Sarajevo culture of everyday life, respect for diversity, respect for the common, yet difficult, cultural heritage. This Sarajevo culture resonates with the polyphony of architecture and the cultural values behind it. Therefore, the inhabitants of Sarajevo, free from xenophobia and megalomania, look at its diversity, are curious about it, and thus exclude cultural isolation (impossible also due to the spatial arrangement of the city), creating a space for confrontation, clashing and axiological negotiation within a cultural borderline (like the Pontanima choir). Experiencing such a diverse city and entering into a relationship with it brings us closer the perspective in which an individual, somehow involuntarily, enters the area of the axiological borderland, negotiating ontological and epistemological orders of cultures at the borderline. In this heterogeneity they define themselves, drawing on various axiological orders. Thus, there is a dialog with the landscape, which is a readable text (Lotman’s culture, which is a text), interpreted and analyzed by the recipient, bearing in mind that the process of socialization (social creation and organization) of space is conditioned by, among others, cultural ideas and methods of valuation. This image is also expressed in the memory of a place, so it is “an ontological category; it is, among others, a material, spatial, physical location in our past existence. The memory of the heart is a sophisticated world of imagination, evaluations and emotions, transformed by sentiments. These are two worlds of being and emotions, yet closely interrelated and interdependent” (Pilch, 2016, p. 38). Sarajevo becomes such an area of emotional memory and imagination for its inhabitants, expressing the plural essence of *modi co-vivendi*.

A place is a social space, shaped by various spatial practices, cultural ideas and forms of organization of social relations. Cooperation, opposition, refusal to cooperate and cooperation of separated identities – all these variants of interaction between different cultural orders that take place in Sarajevo constitute at the same time the foundation of action in the process of cultural interactions that create a collective identity of Sarajevo (cf. Pilarska 2017a). It is worth remembering, however, that shaping identity in multicultural and intercultural conditions, i.e. on the borderland, is a much more complex process than in homogeneous, closed cultural and social circles (cf. Nikitorowicz 2001). Individuals are subject to a specific inculturation resulting from both structural conditions and those related to the dimensions of human functioning. The elements of both multi- and intercultural socialization in post-modern conditions are also specific. These in turn result to a large extent from factors dynamizing social relations in such environments, in a defined space.

Identification with the local community, which, by nature, is marked by cultural differences, makes an individual, building his or her identity, acquire new areas of thought and reflection, having the opportunity to exchange various values, in the spirit of the conviction that informal education based on daily interpersonal contacts is not about reducing differences, but rather about the awareness of their existence.

The relation between a human being and a place often refers to the memory, where “the memory of a place is an embodied memory, characteristic for people living in a given place for a long time and experiencing it individually, emotionally, ‘from the inside’” (Pilch 2016, p. 38). In Sarajevo, the process-oriented relationship between a city and a person is expressed in a strong emotional memory that binds individuals to their local tamed places, such as the kafanas numerous in this culture, which are the meeting places of local residents over Bosnian coffee, in the surrounding of neighbors. Such inconspicuous conditions can become a valuable tool for pedagogical and educational design oriented on cultural difference and dialog, which always takes place ‘somewhere’ in the public space. This is particularly important in Sarajevo, where the urban layout is unusual – the city is longer than wider – the most important mains run along the city line from east to west along the Miljacka River. It is also surrounded by the Dinaric Alps and located in the valley of the surrounding hills. Paradoxically, at the end of this longitudinal topography, the center of the city – *Baščaršija* – or “old town” – is located, composed of Ottoman stalls and craft workshops surrounded by numerous kafanas, restaurants with local cuisine, shops with handicrafts and folk art. This city center, surrounded by mountains and *mahalas*, i.e. settlements historically separated according to the pattern of ethnic and religious structure, is the point of contact for all cultures that individual mahalas present. It is in the center of the old town that universal values, solidarity, the need for communication, cultural exchange and intercultural contact, without which it is impossible to talk about *modi co-vivendi*, can be realized, thanks to this common space. A place that is “filled with space, tangible, substantive, living, that can be moved along, defined [...]” (Brady 2009, p. 491), thus becomes a material space filled with awareness and subjectivity of the cultural difference manifested by the inhabitants of Sarajevo. This is where Heidegger’s constructive reflection on the person-place relationship happens, as the place is a phenomenon that constitutes “being-in-the-world” (Heidegger 1994, p. 76 et seq.).

Being-in-the-world, being in the place or finally ‘being in the city’ are extremely educational and pedagogical potential categories that can provide a framework for activities that open up to the differences, diversity and he-

terogeneity of the cultural landscape. “Cultural activities – apart from constituting the production and processing of meanings – can also change the city [...], have the power to transform what exists” (Skórczyńska 2014, p. 405). Such educational potential of the city can therefore be included in a broader framework of objectives related to intercultural education, i.e. the shaping of “the need to go to cultural borderlands, arousing cognitive and emotional needs, such as [...] discovery, dialog [...], exchange of values, tolerance” (Nikitorowicz 2001, p. 126). In this context of opening and “going beyond borders” it is also worth remembering that the perception of the place based on “historical references, on one’s own and ancestor’s memory [...] is changing” (Danilewicz 2016, p. 82). We, researchers, pedagogues, educators, urban activists, members of associations and NGOs, but also members of the urban community, can make this change.

One of such examples of animation and transformation of space in the spirit of multicultural dialog by the local community in Sarajevo is the unique War Childhood Museum established in 2017 by the initiative of an initiator, Jasminko Halilovic, by a group of Bosnians (of all faiths) who were growing up during the siege of the city and the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This facility, as the only one in the world, documents the experience of childhood during armed conflicts by giving voice to people who grew up during war (besieged Sarajevo). While experiencing the reluctance of some political circles oriented towards separatism and cultural exclusion, the museum was created thanks to the grassroots lobby and the support of local community members. Thus, the museum as an institution becomes in the city a space of dialog, communication and often a place of direct meeting of representatives of religious groups, who do not have the opportunity (and sometimes also the willingness) for such (inter)cultural confrontation on a daily basis. This initiative definitely changes the city, its image and its inhabitants. It is thanks to their involvement that this institution was established, at the same time changing the narrative referring to the conflict and post-war discourse of the Us-Them dichotomy (cf. Pilarska 2018). The project of recreating the biography of children in the background of a besieged city is also one of the examples of how to enter into a dialog with the urban discourse on the educational level, how to show the potential of the place and space that fill the trajectories of individual biographies, at the same time being an important element of collective memory⁹. In order to manifest an attitude of dialog and openness in the

⁹ The interculturality that emerges in such activities leads to a specific type of intercultural closeness, whether in a broader perspective of coexistence or individual tolerance and respect.

spirit of interculturality, the accumulation of knowledge or conversation with everyday life is insufficient. Dynamic interaction occurring in space is required, so that the latter can be given some features that facilitate heterogeneity. Moreover, such space itself can generate intercultural *genius loci* in relation to its symbolic aspect (like the discursive War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo).

As Yi-Fu Tuan writes, “closed and humanized space becomes a place” (Tuan 1987, p. 75). According to this American geographer of Chinese origin, space is an area of human freedom, while a place is a synonym for stability and security (*ibidem*). However, a place may become a state of social life and a mirror of complex social and cultural processes, subject to research. Still, the question remains – how to study the city, how to “talk” to it, thus discovering the dynamics of local identities shaped by *genius loci*¹⁰. This question is justified in the place of these theoretical considerations because it inclines us towards methodologies that facilitate the process of cognition of local methods of constructing identity, which trajectories occur in a specific tamed space.

Methodological dialectic human-place

Bearing in mind the above statements, i.e. assuming that the city is an unusual space, a place of biographical trajectories and identity narratives reflecting the unique characteristics of the specific social and cultural spaces, it is worth to focus on the methodology at this point. It is the assumed paradigm, methods and ways of working with field data that determine the quality and accuracy of the reconstruction of the human-city, human-space relationships.

In their book “The Social Construction of Reality”, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1983) stressed in the spirit of social constructivism that “social order is the product of human activity and not part of the ‘nature of things’” (p. 93). Therefore, a dialectic process takes place between a human as a subject and the events and material forms that surround them, because it is individuals who create social realities, while acknowledging the objectivity of this reality. This is accompanied, in turn, by “the reverse effect of the objectified social world on the behavior of individuals” (Berger, Luckmann 1983, p. 106). This objectified social world is also space, or in the case of these re-

¹⁰ One can refer to it as poetically as a playwright and writer from Sarajevo, Dževad Karahasan, does when he writes about his own creative method “to tell about ‘Sarajevo’s inner self’, which means the things we want to express (rationalize), talking about the atmosphere of the city, the sense of humor of its inhabitants and how one spends there one’s youth and how the old age” (Karahasan 2018, p. 147).

flections, a city – a place characterized by significant social, cultural and economic dynamics. The city as a (personality-creating) space for social activities and relations is an intriguing subject of research, which does not have to directly concern individuals and communities, and yet can reproduce, to an often surprisingly deepened degree, the dynamics of groups and individuals. Thus, following the so-called spatial (topographical) turn, present in social and humanistic discourse, I assume that the space in which people live and work is not an objective fact, but a social and socially constructed one. As a consequence, also spatial terms are perceived in a constructivist way, which on the one hand are formed by human activity, and on the other hand also affect a human (Soya 2009, p. 12).

As we read in one of the works from the field of social pedagogy devoted to space, “current research on the place is increasingly of interdisciplinary character, resulting in the expansion of the existing areas of research on the environment in which people live” (Danilewicz 2016, p. 82). Bearing in mind the discursive and at the same time constructivist character of the human-space relationship, exploring this dynamic by means of qualitative strategies, it becomes possible to discover and reach beyond what is objective and measurable (also in terms of space and material), towards what is intuitively experienced at the level of personal relation with a place. The qualitative research approach enables the reconstruction of the personal life perspective and reflection of the interlocutor, and allows the researcher to get closer to the nature of the experiences of the local user of the space. The question remains, however, which tools should be used by a skillful and reliable, empathic researcher in order to capture this sensitive, ephemeral and at the same dynamic human-city relationship.

At the stage of designing the research procedure, it is worth considering the concept of psychogeography of the American humanistic geographer, Steve Pile (2005), who distinguished the emotional, behavioral, imaginative and cognitive as well as ontological dimensions of the city. These dimensions can be used to reflect on research questions by determining the field of discourse that will arise during qualitative interviews (and subsequent analysis of qualitative data). Taking into account these psychogeographic dimensions provides the researcher with tools with which they can reach the senses and meanings given to the space by its users, opening the city (and more broadly – the place) to the multidimensionality of such research and reality that they can potentially recreate.

Psychogeography, in other words, means creating a personal map of a given place or district, recreating emotions, imaginations, memories and even

attitudes towards certain events, people or places themselves, discovering the latter anew. Pile suggested that in such explorations one should rely on the “free drift” technique (2005), based on de Certeau’s “walking around the city”, following streets, avenues, and different neighborhoods¹¹. Such drifting in everyday life was meant to expose the impact that the urban space has on everyday life (de Certeau 2008). Therefore, assuming Pile’s dimensions and taking the above into account, it is worth considering the following issues when preparing a research project:

- Emotional relations with the city: space connected with the sense of security, places that are relaxing, places that are inspiring, favorite places, places of special memory, sacred and profane areas, places that are exclusive, depressing, marginalizing;
- Imagination and cognitive: images of the city, its role in the biography of individuals, history, role in the region, knowledge of the city in the context of history, urban legends, myths, specifics of given districts¹² – shopping districts, entertainment districts), places of family recreation, images of the city – the image created in memories, stories towards people “from outside”, the way of building a narrative about the city, etc;
- Behavioral: spatial behavior – the way of “using” space in everyday life, frequently visited places, daily rituals (social, community), habits connected with using public transport, the way of moving around the city (reflectiveness of this movement), behavior in verbal and non-verbal communication in space;
- Ontological: ontological aspects of the meaning of being-in-the-world, the way of understanding the structure of reality (material), the essence of existence (of the city), the meaning of life in a given place, causality and cause-effect relationships in a given space that rule the given space.

It is also worth emphasizing that qualitative research projects embedded in urban space should, by nature, be emic¹³ projects. The perspective of an internal observer, and sometimes a participant of certain events in urban spa-

¹¹ Also the postulates of the situationists, who noticed the importance of seemingly disordered, accidental and undirected activities (such as a walk around the city), are maintained in this spirit.

¹² In the case of Sarajevo, these are the previously mentioned mahalas.

¹³ Some intercultural researchers call for combining the emic and ethic orders within the framework of the triple-resonance principle (Helfirch 1999) or the derived etic model by W.J. Berry.

ce (organized, spontaneous, formal or informal) allows us to understand how to construct and experience a given culture of which the city is a key part. We can also better understand motives of human actions and behaviors, since the researcher not only researches, but also experiences certain phenomena, so that “tacit knowledge – “knowledge in action” – is created, as it is not passed on verbally, but also experienced by people” (Kostera 2003, p. 28)¹⁴.

In-depth research of urban space are, by nature, of an idiographic nature and challenge the researcher in so far as they require a look at the surrounding social and cultural world through the prism of the local characteristics of the „bearer” of such culture, which brings to mind the Franz Boas’ anthropological concept of cultural glasses (*Kulturbrille*), by which each of us assigns values and refers to the observed and experienced phenomena. With a view to visualization of social memory, photography as a research method may be one of the forms of focusing these experiences (cf. Sikora 2004). Photographic images accompany people throughout their lives; they perpetuate or even rescue the memory of places, events, people, traditions and customs (Sikora 2004). As a consequence, the photographic interview is the recognition of a photograph not only as a documentation of the studied issue, but also as a means of expression that reflects lifestyles, cultural patterns and identity behaviors, significantly deepening the context of data obtained during individual interviews. The importance of photography was noticed already in the 1960s when “Visual Anthropology – Photography as Research Method” by Collier (1986),¹⁵ a pioneering textbook for the use of photography and video in ethnographic research with photography as a form of interviewing, was published. Sarah Pink, an anthropologist of design, also notices the important role of visualization and Geertz’s thick data when she writes that “research with the use of photography or an attempt to present the surrounding environment, objects, events or representations may be a part of reflective ethnography” (Pink 2001, p. 99). Photographs in city research are not, therefore, an addition or illustration to the collected data, but are an important form of combining verbal narratives with the social construct of experience (Anderson-Cederhorn 2004), triangulating the data. Although photography can be treated as the third party of the interview (Pink 2001), it has its limitations

¹⁴ It is precisely because of a certain intersubjectivity of the human-place relationship that in “Phenomenology of Perception” (2001), Merleau-Ponty distinguished “geometric space” from “anthropological space” because the latter, as an existential space, is a place of experiencing relations with the world in relation to a specific environment.

¹⁵ Edition revised with Malcolm Collier (1986).

because of its immanent fragmentation, but in relation to the content of the interviews it complements the whole, significantly consolidating the subjective discourse of the interlocutor¹⁶. During such photographic interview-walks it is worth giving a camera to the local interlocutor's hand so that through the lens of their own *Kulturbrille* they can capture in the frame the fragment of reality which in the idiographic, emic reading of the interlocutor best presents a given issue or a social and cultural phenomenon or human-place relationships (taking into account, for example, Pile's psychogeographic categories). Using such methods as in-depth interview, participatory observation, or visual anthropology (photographic interview) we can learn how the users of a given social and cultural space create their Bourdieu, and to be more precise Panofsky (1971) habitus – i.e. the disposition of a specific way of action, creation and cognition, entering into dialog with space, places of cultural borderland.

To sum up, by exploring the city we discover not only the dialectic relations between individuals and the places they create and by which they are created, but we also access the perspective of experiencing relations with the outside world at different levels. This reveals an extremely valuable — in educational terms — picture of everyday life, where the cultural difference is “tamed” in the current of everyday life, enriching communication at the intersection of cultures and exchange of values in given spatial conditions.

Conclusions

Drawing research attention to space, the place or the city is pedagogically (and educationally) important because no culture (and its personality-creating content) exists in a closed and uniform form, but resonates in a specific space that affects its character. Thus, reading space helps in reading local culture. As nobody is a member of only one isolated group and their identity is defined in relation to members of other groups, the process can actively involve a space that does not have to be a background, but can become an important subject of urban activities such as activation of different social groups, local educational projects, intercultural urban games, city walks, local charity, local discussion groups, etc. The place reveals its animation potential

¹⁶ In visual anthropology, the role of photography is in fact defined by its usefulness as a Collier's can opener (Collier 1986), a pick and a golden key (Kosela 1989), or “an object that pulls the memory” (Schwartz 1989), while redefining the relationship between the researcher and the researched, enriching the analysis of individual meanings in the light of personal interpretation.

to an attentive and insightful observer, participant or researcher (cf. Mendel 2006) and it can be found in many cities, but these reflections were inspired by certain aspects of the wealth of spatial references to local culture with the example of Sarajevo. The sense of identity allows an individual to function in the community with a subjective conviction of one's own individuality and uniqueness, and in the case of Sarajevo this takes on a very specific form. Local Sarajevo identity is "a phenomenon that expresses itself in the multicultural dimensions of functioning in the city, associated with the lack of identification with a national or ethnic group and a slight reference to religion or nationality as determinants of the sense of cultural belonging" (Pilarska 2010, p. 117). In this city, an individual seems to function, in terms of identity, based on a flexible formula of cultural modification of the dimensions of their identity, adjusting to the given, current cultural context. This is manifested, among others, by the ability to use dialect, jargon, knowledge of cultural codes different from the native provenience such as (respectively) Muslim customs, the calendar of Christian holidays, awareness of, and ability to read cultural behaviors in a contextual way, etc. The city, regarded as the center of social, political, economic and educational life, hides research potential which, although directed towards material space, can reveal many pedagogically valuable contents, including the trajectory of personal, cultural and social identities created in, towards and in relation to the place. The place (the city) is a catchy and potentially rich in axiological content category, which can be used in various educational projects and in pedagogical design in general. Thus, the place can become not only an object and context for actions, but also their essential platform and a tool that facilitates research. The current perception of a place as a limited and closed space is changing not only in the sociological or urban perspective, but also in the social one – more and more often, according to the topographical turn, one sees social, educational and axiological properties in space. Places are always "someone's" – they are emotional and spiritual in character, they upbringing and should be identified with upbringing (Mendel 2006).

Space is an integral part of culture, which in turn is an integral part of human behavior, so it is worth remembering about it in research seemingly unrelated to the pedagogy of place (or city), as it hides empirical potential enriching the discourse with new, emic and local interpretations of contemporary forms of experiencing social and cultural reality, also on cultural borderlands. A borderland human (cf. Nikitorowicz 2001) is an individual open to cultural difference, axiological heterogeneity and intercultural daily negotiations. This openness results from the creation of the subject, which is car-

ried out through places, therefore there is a pedagogical potential in space, which can cover the area of formal (school) education, as well as social animation and local activation within the framework of informal education. This subject matter is therefore a vast field for theoretical and empirical exploration, which can be helpful to contemporary pedagogues and educators, practitioners and theoreticians.

References

- Andersson-Cederholm E. (2004), *The Use of Photo-elicitation in Tourism Research – Framing the Backpacker Experience*, “Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism”, 4(3), 225–241.
- Berger T., Luckmann T. (1983), *Społeczne tworzenie rzeczywistości*, trans. J. Niżnik, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Brady I. (2009), *Poetyka dla planet. Rozprawa o niektórych problemach związanych z miejscem*, [in:] N.K. Denzin, Y. Linclon (eds.), *Metody badań jakościowych*, Vol. 2, trans. K. Podemski, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Certeau M. de (2008), *Wynaleźć codzienność. Sztuki działania*, trans. K. Thiel-Jańczuk, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Collier J. Jr., Collier M. (1986), *Visual Anthropology: Photography as a Research Method*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Copik I. (2013), *Pedagogika miejsca – kultura lokalna a kształtowanie się tożsamości współczesnego człowieka*, Prace Naukowe Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie, *Pedagogika*, Vol. 22, 179–189.
- Danilewicz W. (2016), *Doświadczenia miejsca w przestrzeni globalnej – perspektywa pedagogiczna*, „Pedagogika Społeczna”, R. 15, nr 1(59), 81–93.
- Doubt K. (2014), *Through the window. Kinship & Elopement in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, Budapest–New York: CEU Press.
- Giddens A. (1990), *The Consequences of Modernity*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Helfrich H. (1999), *Beyond the dilemma of Cross-Cultural Psychology: Resolving the Tension between Etic and Emic Approach*, “Culture & Psychology”, Vol. 5(2), 131–153.
- Karahasan Dż. (2018), *Opowiadać miasto. Rzecz o Sarajewie*, „Przegląd Polityczny”, 151/152, 138–148.
- Koseła K. (1989), *Wywiad z interpretacją fotogramów*, [in:] A. Sułek, A. Wyka (eds.), *Poza granicami socjologii ankietowej* (pp. 167–182), Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Kostera M. (2003), *Antropologia organizacji. Metodologia badań terenowych*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Koštović N. (2001), *Sarajevo. Evropski Jeruzalem*, Sarajevo: Bravo Public Team.
- Lefebvre H. (1991), *The Production of Space*, tłum. D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Łotman J. (1999), *Kultura i eksplozja*, tłum. B. Żyłko, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Mendel M. (2017), *Pedagogika miejsca wspólnego. Miasto i szkoła*, Gdańsk: WN Katedra.
- Mendel M. (ed.) (2006), *Pedagogika miejsca i animacja na miejsce wrażliwe*, [in:] *Pedagogika miejsca* (pp. 21–37), Wrocław: Dolnośląska Wyższa Szkoła Edukacji TWP.
- Mendel M. (ed.) (2015), *Wspólny Pokój Gdańsk. Miejskie modi co-vivendi w badaniu metodą Krytycznej Historii Miasta*, [in:] *Miasto jak Wspólny pokój. Gdańskie modi co-vivendi* (pp. 11–46), Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Instytut Kultury Miejskiej.

- Merleau-Ponty M. (2001), *Fenomenologia percepcji*, trans. M. Kowalska, J. Migasiński, Warszawa: Fundacja Aletheia.
- Męczkowska A. (2006), *Locus educandi. Wokół problematyki miejsca w refleksji pedagogicznej*, [in:] M. Mendel (ed.), *Pedagogika miejsca* (pp. 38–72), Wrocław: Dolnośląska Wyższa Szkoła Edukacji TWP.
- Nikitorowicz J. (2001), *Pogranicze – Tożsamość – Edukacja Międzykulturowa*, Białystok: Trans Humana.
- Panofsky E. (1971), *Studia z historii sztuki*, trans. K. Kamińska, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Pilch T. (2016), *W kalejdoskopie miejsc i życiowych doświadczeń*, „Pedagogika Społeczna”, R. 15, nr 1(59), 37–51.
- Pink S. (2001), *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*, London: Thousand Oaks.
- Pilarska J. (2010), *Sarajewo. Miasto – idea konceptualizująca tożsamość wielowymiarową*, [in:] K. Kamińska (ed.), *Miejskie opowieści. Edukacyjne narracje przestrzeni* (pp. 113–124), Wrocław: ATUT.
- Pilarska J. (2016), *Różnica kulturowa w obiektywie: o międzykulturowym potencjale przestrzeni miejskiej na przykładzie Sarajewa*, [in:] W. Jakubowski (ed.), *Pedagogika kultury popularnej: teorie, metody i obszary badań* (pp. 241–256), Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.
- Pilarska J. (2017a), *Locus educandi: miasto jako przestrzeń nieformalnej edukacji międzykulturowej*, „Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne”, t. 30, 154–166.
- Pilarska J. (ed.) (2017b), *An Introspective Approach to Women's Intercultural Fieldwork*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo APS.
- Pilarska J. (2018), *Jasminko Halilović: War childhood: Sarajevo 1992–1995*, „Society Register”, 2(2), 163–166.
- Pile S. (2005), *Real cities. Modernity, space and the phantasmagorias of city life*, London: Routledge.
- Schwartz D. (1989), *Visual Ethnography: Using Photography in Qualitative Research*, „Qualitative Sociology”, 12, 2, 119–154.
- Sikora S. (2004), *Fotografia. Między dokumentem a symbolem*, Izabelin: Świat Literacki, Instytut Sztuki PAN.
- Skórzyńska A. (2014), *Badania w działaniu*, [in:] E. Rewers (ed.), *Kulturowe studia miejskie. Wprowadzenie* (pp. 335–373), Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury.
- Soja E.W. (2009), *Taking space personally*, [in:] B. Warf, S. Arias (eds.), *The spatial turn. Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 11–35), London–New York: Routledge.
- Solga K., Orr S., Hopkins D.J. (eds.), *Performance and the City*, London: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Tuan Y. (1987), *Przestrzeń i miejsce*, trans. A. Morawińska, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.