Editorial

The studies presented in this volume of *Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology* came into being as a result of research within the project entitled *Eastern Enlargement – Western Enlargement: Cultural Encounters in the European Economy and Society after the Accession*, otherwise known as *Project Dioscuri*.

The Project was implemented within the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Commission, and was subcategorized among the Specific Targeted Research Projects (STREP), 7th Priority: Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based Society. It lasted for three years, starting from June 1st 2004, and ending on May 31, 2007. The coordination of the project was provided by the Center for Policy Studies of the Central European University, Budapest, headed by Violetta Zentai. It was also supported by the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM) in Vienna, and their principal researcher, János M. Kovács. Assistance was provided by the Advisory Board, which comprised of Georg Fischer (European Commission, Brussels), Jane Lewis (London School of Economics and Political Sciences, London), Claus Offe (Humbolt University, Berlin), Hans-Jürgen Wagener (Europe University – Viadriana, Frankfurt/Oder), and David Stark (Columbia University).

The objective of the project was to explore the dynamics of cultural exchange between "East" and "West" in the European economy and to assess its impact on social cohesion in and between the old and new member states of the European Union. The project thus encompassed eight countries, four out of which had most recently entered the EU (Hungary, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia), and four which at the time remained outside (Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Serbia and Montenegro).

The project envisaged research of economic culture exchange in three fields, namely in entrepreneurship, governance (institution building and reform), and economic knowledge. Dioscuri resulted in a set of field reports, case studies and country studies as well as in comparative analyses. In addition, it provided policy recommendations for future rounds of EU enlargement on how to facilitate a mutually beneficial relationship between existing member states and new entrants.
All the phases of the project approach and research procedures had been
developed in joint collaboration between the principal coordinators, the
national team coordinators, and national team field coordinators in subsequent
phases. For that purpose, four workshops were held in Vienna and Budapest.
Research methodology was developed on the bases of results of the Project
Access,¹ which preceded Dioscuri, but was much more quantitatively
oriented. Within Dioscuri, however, a qualitative approach was given primacy
over a quantitative one, with the expectation of producing case studies. These
studies presumed multi-layered understanding of modes of intercultural
communication in well-determined business contexts, those common for
transitional economies in general, and for specific national constituencies.
Different research techniques were recommended, thus in depth interviews,
focus group discussions, observation with participation, content analysis of
texts produced within the organizations/institutions under scrutiny or by
different media, were applied. The respective target groups for interviews
were businessmen, civil servants and economists, in other words, principal
producers of economic culture. More precisely, the interviewees were
managers and employees from all levels of hierarchy in entrepreneurial
establishments, state officials and administration participating in the EU
projects as well as representatives of EU organizations, and economic experts
who were employed in academic and research institutions and
nongovernmental organizations.

In the entrepreneurial field, the aim was to study three different kinds of
economic environments, such as a large international bank, preferably
Raiffeisen, a large national company bought out by a multinational one, and a
small national company founded by a repatriate. In the field of economic
governance, an EU project in agriculture (Sapard or Twinnings) and one other
large project were to be considered. In the field of economic knowledge,
academic institutions and civil sector organizations were recommended for
research, focusing on the degree of transfer of neo-institutional economics.
Lastly, a study on the reception of multinational companies or the EU in
national media was expected.

The national team of Serbia and Montenegro comprised nine members,
coming from the disciplines of anthropology, sociology and economics.
Within the entrepreneurial field, Jelena Pešić made a study of the central
office of Raiffeisenbank in Belgrade, Ildiko Erdei of Pančevo Brewery, taken

¹ Project Access, entitled An Asset or a Liability? Eastern European Economic Cultures in
the EU, lasted for two years (January 2002-December 2003). It was coordinated by the Institute
for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna, and was supported by the Bank of Austria, Austrian
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Austrian Development Agency. Part of the studies produced
by the Serbia and Montenegro national team was published in the journal Sociologija 44.3
(Belgrade 2003).
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over by Efes, and Vesna Vučinić-Nešković of Hauzmajstor, a repatriate founded start up real estate maintenance firm from Belgrade. In the field of governance (institutional building and reform), Mladen Lazić studied the implementation of the Topola Rural Development Program, conceptualized and financed by the Swedish Development Agency (SIDA), and Slobodan Naumović of the Agricultural Twinning Project within the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management of the Republic of Serbia. In the field of economic knowledge, Vladimir Vuletić looked at the transformation of the Faculty of Economics of the University of Belgrade induced by the Bologna Process, Aleksandra Jovanović and Aleksandar Stevanović compared the Department of Law and Economics of the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade and the Faculty of Management of BK University, while Sreten Vujović looked into the economic ideas in the Center for Liberal-Democratic Studies (CLDS), an NGO based think-tank of Serbia’s most prominent neo-liberal oriented economists. Within the last topic, that of media analysis, Vladimir Miokov (with the assistance of Vesna Vučinić-Nešković) produced a study on the image of multinational companies in domestic media, in the case of Knjaz Miloš privatization.

In this volume, the case studies from two fields, those of entrepreneurship and the transfer of economic knowledge, as well as the media analysis, will be presented. The reason for this reduced selection is that some of the studies will be published elsewhere, and in other cases, the authors felt the need to revise them at some other point in time. It is also worth noting that the texts that appear here are not the original versions of the reports submitted at the end of the project period, but revised ones. Also, it should be kept in mind that the research was performed during the 2005-2006 period, with the reports rounded up in 2006, thus the analysis and conclusions pertain to this period.

Now, a few introductory words about each text published in this volume. The first three texts deal with the theme of business and organizational culture within different entrepreneurial environments in Serbia. Jelena Pešić in her text Cultural Encounters in the Banking Sector of Serbia: The Case of Raiffeisenbank aims to examine the existence of cultural shock and differences appearing inside Raiffeisenbank in Belgrade, between parties belonging to two national cultures, Austrian and Serbian. The focus of the
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research was on elements of organizational culture, such as horizontal and vertical relationships, the type of leadership, the extent of formalization of procedures and work tasks, types of motivations of different parties, but also on certain elements of work cultures. *What’s in a Beer? Cultures that Interact in a Brewery Privatization*, the text by Ildiko Erdei, tells of how Pančevo Brewery, a local beer factory, had been privatized by a large international producer, the Efes Group. In this study, the field of economic change was observed as an area of cultural transformation, where business, organizational and working cultures of "socialism" and "capitalism" met and influenced each other, both on institutional and personal levels. In her text *Negotiating Partnership: How Serbian Hauzmajstor Established a Business Relationship with Austrian Rustler*, Vesna Vučinić-Nešković gives an account of how a small real estate maintenance firm, founded by a Serbian repatriate in 2004 negotiated and entered partnership with a seventy year old Austrian real estate firm. If offers a detailed description and analysis of the Hauzmajstor insiders’ experiences with Rustler, first as a potential, and later as an actual partner, but also the perceptions of Hauzmajstor by the Rustler Group area manager, the principal negotiator on the Austrian side.

The following two texts deal with theoretical economic knowledge in Serbia, in the academic and non-governmental domains. The *Transfer and Reception of New Institutional Economics: An Example of Two Universities in Serbia*, written by Aleksandra Jovanović and Aleksandar Stevanović investigates whether and how the transfer and reception of Western ideas and economic theory, particularly New Institutional Economics is affected by the difference between two high educational institutions, the Department for Law and Economics of the Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade, an institution with a two hundred year tradition, and the Faculty of Management of the BK University, a newly established ("greenfield") institution. Sreten Vujović in the text on *The Center for Liberal-Democratic Studies as an NGO Promoting Economic Neoliberalism in Serbia* established the similarities and differences in the economic ideas of the Center’s members as well as their experiences of contacts with foreign colleagues and financial experts from the West.

Finally, Vladimir Miokov and Vesna Vučinić-Nešković, in their text *Will Knjaz Miloš Belong to Foreigners? The Privatization and Image of Multinational Companies in the Serbian Media (2000-2005)* analyse the media coverage of the privatization of Knjaz Miloš, the most famous Serbian mineral water factory, as well as the manner in which multinational companies were presented in this process. The focus of the paper is on the media presentation of conflicts between major stakeholders and their inherent interests.

As the coordinator of the Serbia and Montenegro team within the Dioscuri project, I would like to thank all the participants in the project, starting with
Violetta Zentai and János M. Kovács, the Advisory Board members, the other national team leaders and their team members. I am especially grateful to the Serbia and Montenegro team members, with whom I had wonderful cooperation and professional and human understanding. During this project, which was very demanding in terms of decision-making, precise planning, keeping to deadlines, administrative and financial responsibilities, I learned a lot about how a grand scale project is implemented. My team members had lots of patience with me, and vice versa, and I think we can say we are all appreciative for this enriching experience.

I would also like to express my thankfulness to Dragana Antonijević, the Chief Editor, and the Editorial Board of the *Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology*, who were ready to indulge in the business of preparing this thematic issue, in which large part of the Dioscuri project results are presented.

**Vesna Vučinić-Nešković**
Coordinator of the Serbia and Montenegro Dioscuri Project Team

In Belgrade, December 28th, 2010.