

# Story of Chris Wolfe's

Zachar Podolinská, Tatiana  
Popelková, Katarína

ETHNOLOGICAL STUDIES 57

The publishing of this book was supported with a financial contribution from the Slovak Academy of Sciences upon recommendation by the SAS Editorial Board.

Authors:

© Tatiana ZACHAR PODOLINSKÁ  
Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS  
in Bratislava, 2023

🌐 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6164-5740>

© Katarína POPELKOVA  
Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS  
in Bratislava, 2023

🌐 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8163-4800>

Reviewers:

Elena MARUSHIAKOVA  
St Andrews University, St Andrews, Great Britain, 2023  
Zdeněk UHEREK  
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences,  
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, 2023

Translated by: © Judita TAKÁČOVÁ

Language proofs: © Michael SABO

Design and Layout: © Matúš HNÁT

Published by VEDA, Publishing House of the Slovak  
Academy of Sciences, Centre of Operations of the SAS,  
Dúbravská cesta 5820/9, 841 04 Bratislava in 2023  
as its 4704<sup>th</sup> publication, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 432 pages.  
[www.veda.sav.sk](http://www.veda.sav.sk)

Published by the Institute of Ethnology and Social  
Anthropology SAS as Ethnological Studies  
publication no. 57.  
[www.uesa.sav.sk](http://www.uesa.sav.sk)

© Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology  
SAS, Bratislava 2023

© VEDA, Publishing House of the SAS, Bratislava  
2023

Printed by Finidr, s. r. o., Český Těšín, Czech Republic

ISBN 978-80-224-2022-8

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2023.9788022420228>



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0  
International License.

# Story of Cohesion

## On the History of an Academic Institution

# Table of Contents

8 Introduction

## 12 The Generation of Founders (1950s and 1960s): Between Functional Structuralism and Historical Materialism

16	Sovietisation of the Academy and Ideologisation of Research	21	From an Ethnographic Cabinet to an Ethnographic Institute
18	Fight against Bourgeois Nationalism and Reactionary Ideologies	23	Scientific Programme in the 1950s and 1960s
19	Ideological Punishment—The Loss of Sovereignty		

## 34 The Generation of Builders (1970s and 1980s): The Normalisation Period and Real Socialism

38	Scientific Programme in the 1970s	53	Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia and Central Plan of Basic Research
41	Establishment of a New Journal—Platform for Discussions and Information Sharing		
45	The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia—The Era of Large Syntheses and Collective Works	58	International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region and in the Balkans

59	Basic Communist Party Organisation (1970s and 1980s)—Memory Reflections of the Witnesses
66	Collective Energy and Willingness to Spend Time Together

68	Continuity in the Macro-Change
70	The 1990s as a Post-Scriptum in the Life of the Generation of Builders

## 74 The Transformation Generation (1990s and 2000s): The Post-Socialist Transition Period

77	Liberalisation of Scientific Research and Restructuring of the System of Support	137	Management and Restructuring of the Institute during the First Transformation Decade
82	The First Transition Decade—Post-Socialistic Restructuring	143	Teambuilding and Spending Time Together
82	'The Velvet Revolution' within the Institute—Ruptures in the Micro-Picture	152	The First Transformation Decade—Continuity, Search, and Experimenting
87	Freedom of Scientific Research—Discussions and New Horizons	156	The Second Transition Decade—Anthropologisation and Internationalisation
91	The Scientific and Research Programme during the First Transformation Decade	157	The 'Struggle' for the Scientific Concept and for the Way of Managing and Directing the Institute
98	Journals' Policy in the Transformation Period	163	The Scientific Concept of the Second Transformation Decade—Anthropologisation of the Institute
100	Transformation of Fundraising—Project and Publication Activities	167	Internalisation of External Milestones—Self-Reflection
107	New Horizons: International Cooperation, Project Writing	170	Internal Consolidation of the Institute and Performance Evaluation
114	Transformation of the Support of Science—Amateur Fundraising	173	Personnel and Qualifications Structure of the Institute
117	The Willingness to Do Things Together—Transformation of the Style of Work and Leadership	177	Journals Published by the Institute during the Transformation Period
121	Computerisation of the Building of Scientific Collections	183	PhD Studies, European Doctorate, and Pedagogical Activities
125	Relocation, Funds Reduction, and Restructuring of the Institute	190	Financial Resources in the 2000s
131	Transformation Exchange and the Overlapping of Generations	192	International Projects and Cooperation
135	The Clash of Generations—Discussion Platforms and Dialogues	197	The Most Important National Projects

200	Digitisation and Electronic Archives	222	The Case of 'Rómsky dejepis'—The Power of Cohesion
201	The Cultural Heritage Topic and Its Application	228	The External Perspective—Accreditations in the Second Transformation Decade
204	Research Trends in the Second Transformation Decade	239	Implementation of Accreditation Recommendations
211	Religious Studies—the Rising Star of the Second Transformation Decade	242	The Willingness to Work and Spend Leisure Time Together
214	Infrastructure	245	Successes and Challenges of the Second Transformation Decade
215	Information and Documentation Section		
218	Start of Applied Research and Engaged Anthropology		

## 250 The Generation of Innovators (2010s): Completing the Building of Social Anthropology, Returning to Qualitative Ethnography

256	Competition for the Post of Director in 2012—The Reconciliation of the Generations and the Beginning of the Innovation Period	304	Reviewing the Proportion of the Teaching Workload
261	International Accreditation of the Institute 2012	306	The Institute's Doctoral School during the Innovation Decade
263	Results of the 2012 Accreditation	310	Innovations in the Personnel Policy: Generational Change without Ruptures and Reduced Performance
269	Major Management Innovations	315	Internal Structure
272	The Long Decade of the Unsuccessful SAS Transformation	319	Anthropological Turn: An Attempt to Achieve Exclusivity of the Cognitive Approach at the Institute
281	The Scientific Concept of the Innovation Decade	323	First International Accreditation 2016—An External Mirror and Strategic Navigation
285	The Jubilee Year 2016: 70 Years of the Institute	327	The 2020s: Change of the Financial Ecosystem—Performance Evaluation, Wage Reform, and Change of the Legal Form
289	Internal Challenges: Dislocation, Reconstruction, Rescue of the Collection and Library Stocks	335	Strategic Planning and Performance Evaluation—Innovative Internal Formats
293	Innovations in the Information and Documentation Unit, Digital Humanities, and European Infrastructure	341	Research, Thematic Integrity, and Innovations
300	Transformation of the Slovenský národopis Journal into an International Registered Journal	344	Increase of Grant Resources and Slovak Research and Development Agency Projects

347	Strong Emphasis on Popularisation—Continuity with Previous Generations	386	Conclusion— <i>Laudation</i> to the Institution and Generations
348	Entering Europe—International Projects and Networking	396	Post-Scriptum: Story of the Story of Cohesion
353	Romani Studies: A Supernova of the Innovation Decade	402	References
356	Promotion of and Innovations in Applied Research	426	Personal Index
361	Election of the Director 2016 and 2020—The Clash and Communication of Generations	430	List of Abbreviations
365	Scientific Concept 2021–5		
369	International Accreditation 2022		
375	Verification of Excellence in Research—New Central Evaluation of Science and Research		
377	Spending Time Together—The Internal Power of Cohesion		
382	Innovation Decade—Summary and Evaluation		

# Introduction

The aim of this work is to offer a paradigmatic analysis of the development of the discipline, which was in the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Slovakia predominantly referred as *ethnography* and *ethnology*. During the earlier half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the name ethnography prevailed, becoming an umbrella term for *ethnography* and *folklore studies* after World War II (Melicherčík 1945; Horváthová 1973a, p. 168; Botík 1987, p. 6). In the 1990s, the term ethnology commenced to be used as an umbrella term for this scientific discipline (Leščák 1991a). Ethnography is perceived rather as a qualitative approach and research method (Apáthyová-Rusnáková 1981; Zajonc 2016, p. 21), while folklore studies are regarded as a sub-discipline of ethnology (Kiliánová 2002, p. 277).

This work observes the paradigmatic development of the discipline in the background of one of the key institutions where research with this focus has been carried out in Slovakia. The term *institution* refers to the organisational body of an establishment that carried various institutional names in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries—the Ethnographic Institute

of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts; the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences; the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences; and the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The ambition of this book is to not only function as a summary of history with a list of personalities, research works, projects, and publications, but can be viewed also as an implicit *Laudation* on the occasion of the 77<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of this institution. The book seeks to follow and extend the line of the publication *70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution* (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016) as well as works published for the previous decennial anniversaries of the Institute's existence (e.g., Podolinská and Potančok 2017; Kiliánová and Vrzgulová 2006; Kiliánová 2002; Horváthová 1973a; Podolák 1955a).

The changes in the scientific paradigms during the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, as well as the noticeable inclusion of the terms *social* and *cultural anthropology* have been illustrated already by the history of the institution's name itself: the Ethnographic Institute—initially within the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts (EI SASA, 1946), later within the Slovak Academy of Sciences (EI SAS, 1953), the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (IE SAS, 1994; *Zriadovacía listina...* 1994; *Doplňok...* 1994; *Zriadovacía listina...* 2003), and, since 2018, the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology (IESA SAS, 2018), all of which form the subject of this work.

The history of institutions can be explored, for instance, from the perspective of understanding the institution as an actor with its own agenda, and the potential for self-construction and self-constitution outwards by means of various social self-presentations (Barker 2001). Or, we can observe the internal constitution processes and success of inter-generational transmission, as well as the methods of constructing an institutional auto-narrative. It is equally interesting to observe *how* such presentations and constructions are taking place.

An institution can be explored from the de-essentialised perspective too, by applying the *non-groupist approach* as proposed by R. Brubaker, who suggested to examine institutions based on 'practical categories, cultural idioms, cognitive schemes, (...) organisational routines and resources, discursive frameworks, (...) political projects and conditions, as well as random events...' (2002, 2003).

In addition, applying the theory of *social field*, an institution can be viewed from the procedural perspective as a social, cultural, and political project (Bourdieu 1994) that exists within broader lines of forces of the overall power field (Foucault 2004) that consequently needs to adapt to systemic organisational rules (e.g., Kiliánová 2019), react operationally to changes in the setting of the algorithm of success and social prestige, as well as to changes in the structure and distribution of financial resources in particular.

Or, we can focus on the exploration of unwritten rules of the game, such as the level of solidarity, integrity, and cohesion, as well as the intensity and quality of interpersonal relationships at the collective level, which includes individual activities and inputs by specific personalities who set the rules at the micro-level and thus jointly adjust the climate within specific collectives (institution as *communitas*) (e.g., Turner 2012; Esposito 2010; Rabinow 1996; Turner 1974).

In our case, it is remarkable how flexibly—in a relatively short time of its existence—the institution under study responded to the changes in political regimes and discursive paradigms. The changes in external settings forced it to interact and intervene, which was manifested by various forms of internal reorganisation, strategical and conceptual changes, etc. On the other hand, we can observe a high degree of resilience that allowed the institution to maintain its identity and internal consistency of its processes. In this case, we can speak rather of 'micro-historical temporalities' (Tomich 2011), which are measured approximately by the period of individual decades in the background of more general *longue durée* processes (i.e. long-

-lasting and global historical changes) (i.e. Labrousse [1933]1984; Braudel 2009) with considerable involvement of research teams in the sense of *communitas*, particular personalities in leadership positions, as well as the external ecosystem.

The aim of this book is to outline how internal scientific and organisational paradigms and structures of the current Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences have changed in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and initial decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In the context of the evolution of the external ecosystem (legal, political, economic, and other relevant circumstances), the publication also observes the life and *modus operandi* of four important generations within the institution, referring to them—at the level of the metaphoric discourse—as the *Generation of Founders* (1950s and 1960s), the *Generation of Builders* (primarily the 1970s and 1980s), the *Transformation Generation* (primarily the 1990s and the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century), and the *Generation of Innovators* (second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century).

# The Generation of Founders

(1950s and 1960s)

Between Functional  
Structuralism and Historical  
Materialism



The history of the Institute dates back to the beginning of 1946 when it launched its activities as the Ethnographic Institute (EI SASA) within the then Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts (Horváthová 1973a, p. 170). Its composition had been approved by a conference of the scientific institutes of the Academy back in December 1945 (Zajonc 2016, p. 23; Kubová 2006, pp. 83–4); however, it did not begin to function until March 1, 1946, when Rudolf Žatko was appointed as the Institute's Director (Zajonc 2016, p. 24). The establishment of the academic institute was a key event for the post-war process of emancipation of ethnography as a scientific discipline in Slovakia. In 1947, this was followed by the restoration of the teaching of ethnography at the Faculty of Arts of the then Slovak University (later Comenius University) in Bratislava, where the Ethnographic Seminar had been founded as early as in 1921 (Horváthová 1973a, p. 170; Zajonc 2016, p. 21). The third step was the launch of the specialised scientific journal *Slovenský národopis* [Slovak Ethnography] in 1953 (Slavkovský 2006, p. 18).

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the collection and examination of documents on the traditional culture of rural communities began to form the main subject of interest of emerging ethnography in Slovakia. As a consequence of the subsiding national emancipation movement, ethnographers sought to find evidence of maturity and sovereignty of the Slovak nation and its main component—the *people*. Nevertheless, during that period, Slovak researchers also obtained many new theoretical impulses from historical, linguistic, archaeological, and folklore studies that influenced the shaping of ethnography as a modern scientific discipline in Europe. This happened thanks to university studies abroad, as well as through contacts with Czech researchers, who had conducted their field research as early as the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, organised collections, published their works, and also began university lectures of ethnography in Bratislava (Zajonc 2016, pp. 22–3).

The discursive orientation of the Institute during the 1950s was largely influenced by Andrej Melicherčík, one of the principal representatives of ethnography in Slovakia and a key figure of the

Generation of Founders (see Hlôšková 2021a). In his book *Teória národopisu* [The Theory of Ethnography], published in 1945, he defined the theoretical sources of the discipline in the so-called *functional-structural method* with a reference to his teacher, Piotr G. Bogatyriov (Bogatyrev 1935). The young Melicherčík, who emphasised the importance of field research, saw the role of ethnography in capturing the forms and functions of 'current folklore facts' without considering them to be strictly tied to the rural population. Melicherčík regarded *folklore nature* to be the 'essential characteristic of ethnographic phenomena' which, according to him, had a special 'social being' (1945, p. 99 and ff.). The role of the researcher was to capture the studied phenomena in the field from a *synchronous perspective*, that is, from the point of view of the researched community.

In this context, Melicherčík attempted to operationalise the conceptual innovation within the Slovak environment in the phase of the constitution of the discipline. He defined ethnography as a *social science discipline* that was to explore the current processes in society using the qualitative method, without being limited to research on traditional folk culture in the rural environment. Ethnography thus sought to break the prevailing homeland studies and historical conceptualisation which oriented ethnography on the study of the (traditional) folk culture of rural communities.

Beside Melicherčík's definition of ethnography, the preference of the *historic-genetic principle*—the search for relics and the use of the *diachronous perspective*—along with the ethnocentric principle was promoted, thus ranking ethnography among the nation-building studies and auxiliary *historical sciences* (Bednárik 1942). As a discipline exploring *people* and *folk traditions*, this conceptualisation of ethnography enabled its fluent harmonisation with the Communist regime's ecosystem by politically promoted *folkishness* (Danglová 2021). In addition to basic research, ethnography was also meant to serve for political purposes and play an important role in the legitimisation of the existence and autonomy of the Slovak nation (Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 413).



Nevertheless, during the 1940s and 1950s, we can also detect other influential scientific orientations that formed ethnographic research in Slovakia: *functional structuralism* (the theses of which were advocated by P. G. Bogatyriov; Danglová 2021); the *positivist ethnographic school* (presented by Czech professor of Slavic and general ethnography, Karel Chotek); the *cultural-historical school* of the Sudeten German philologist and ethnographer lecturing at the Slovak University in Bratislava, Bruno Schier; and the Hungarian ethnographic school (Zajonc 2016, p. 40).

From the organisational perspective and within the wider discursive framework, the establishment of the institution should be viewed in the context of the new Act on the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts, which was adopted in 1946, according to which the Academy was to be built as an 'autonomous, apolitical and free institution, carrying out scientific and artistic activities at the European level' (*Ibid.*, p. 23). However, after the installation of the Communist regime in the country in 1948, the fulfilment of the requirements for the autonomy, apoliticism, and freedom of the Academy was in stark contrast with reality (Hudek 2014a, pp. 70–3).

### Sovietisation of the Academy and Ideologisation of Research

After 1948, power began to be monopolised and centralised, which was also manifested by the formation of a single political programme and a single-coloured ideological macro-discourse. In this context, social and historical sciences as well as nation-oriented studies were affected the most, since the official state ideology had begun to be overwhelmed by Marxism-Leninism as the only correct theoretical and methodological framework. *Sovietisation* was also manifested by the introduction of collectivism and central planning (Zajonc 2016, p. 25). In this respect, the ecosystem of the Academia was thus expected to get as close to the Soviet model as possible.

According to some opinions that had emerged at the beginning of 1949, ethnographic research was to be shifted from Bratislava to regional ethnographic institutions. There was also the threat of

relocating the Institute to the city of Martin, where it was expected to operate as part of the awareness-raising and educational society Matica slovenská. There were also plans to detach the Institute from the ground of the Academy and establish a Slovak Ethnographic Institute as a new top ethnographic institution. Eventually, the Institute remained an integral part of the Academia (*Ibid.*, pp. 25–6).

Despite certain institutional uncertainty, the Institute experienced a growth in human resources during the period 1949–51 (Horváthová 1973a; Zajonc 2016, pp. 26–7). It is interesting—from the organisational perspective—that, during that period, scientific institutes within the Academia were managed by two senior officials: one in the position of the Chairman, who took care of the scientific and research field (in the Institute, it was Andrej Melicherčík since 1948 or 1950) and the other one in the position of the Administrative Director, who was responsible for scientific and organisational activities (Rudolf Žatko since 1946 and Ján Mjartan since 1949) (Kilánová and Popelková 2010, p. 415). In 1950, there was a further temporary staff growth of the institution with the establishment of a branch in Košice with two employees (e.g., Horváthová 1973a, p. 170; Zajonc 2016, pp. 37–9).

Simultaneously with the building of the Institute and formation of the discipline at the micro-environment level, the ideological line of Marxism-Leninism took a leading position within the macro-environment at the national level, to which the representatives of the key ethnographic institutions had to react. In mid-1949, the *9<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia* set out a general line for the building of socialism, which prioritised the role of education among the intelligentsia formed by Marxism-Leninism (Hudek 2014a, pp. 81–2). An important milestone for the direction of ethnography within the EI SASA during that period was the *1<sup>st</sup> National Conference of Czechoslovak Ethnographers* in Prague (1949), which postulated ethnography as 'science about the people, serving people's needs' (Podolák 1955a, pp. 429–30) and made a commitment to develop the Marxist-Leninist methodology (Slavkovský 2006, p. 18).

## Fight against Bourgeois Nationalism and Reactionary Ideologies

During that period, the SASA adopted measures to ensure an ideologically loyal generation of scientists in the form of an 'education or re-education programme to increase the number of socialist scientists' (Zajonc 2016, p. 25). According to the SASA resolution, the primary role was to fight against *bourgeois nationalism*, which 'preferred Slovak national interests over the class interests of the proletariat in a false way' (Hudek 2014a, p. 82).

Under this programme, the Ethnographic Institute also had to declare Marxist political engagement, reviewing in this sense the *Plan of the Institute's Tasks and Work for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter of 1950* (Zajonc 2016, p. 27). At the same time, the work programme of the Institute was drafted, considering as its principal task the 'fight against bourgeois nationalism and reactionary ideologies', in particular with the 'migration theory', 'influentialism', 'functional structuralism', and 'idealistic evolutionism' (*Ibid.*, p. 28). In addition, the Institute organised a series of discussion seminars on the manifestations of *bourgeois ideology* (Podolák 1955a, p. 430). For instance, the symbolic meaning encoded in the objects of folk art, which was associated with the national identification line promoted by the patriotic movement *Svojráz* [Peculiar] during the interwar period, began to be reconsidered. In addition to its national orientation, the movement's 'bourgeois' approach to the application of folk art artifacts was also criticised (Danglová 2021).

After 1948, the former Avant-guard scientific direction of the major theorist of the discipline—Andrej Melicherčík—was heavily impacted by the severely established Communist regime. The most important motive for this radical change of theoretical orientation was his willingness to save the institution. He joined the Communist Party and advocated the related tasks in the Party's political spirit (*Ibid.*). After his communist turn, he wrote several key works that defined the tasks of ethnography in the process of building of socialism (1950a), while clearly defining a pro-Soviet orientation according to the research topics and methodology used (1950b, c; 1952a). His focus on the research on folklore with

robber/Jánošík themes (1952b) and the collection of *partisan folklore* satisfied the Marxist requirement for the need to explore the phenomenon of the social forms of class struggle from the evolutionary perspective (Leščák, Kovačevićová, and Michálek 1997, pp. 81–2, 84; Hlôšková 2018, 2021a).

After the Communist coup in 1948, the *Soviet ethnographic school* began occupying a dominant place in Czechoslovak ethnography (Tokarev 1951; Tolstov 1951), involving references not only to the works by Marxist philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, but also by Vladimir I. Lenin and Joseph V. Stalin. Three volumes of the former publishing platform of the Ethnographic Institute—*Národopisný sborník SAVU* [Ethnographic Almanac of the SASA]—were used for publishing the works of the Soviet ethnographic school (Zajonc 2016, p. 52).

According to the instruction by the SASA Administration, the 1951 work plans of the organisations had to contain an ideological part (*Ibid.*, p. 28). The work plan of the Institute for 1951 was prepared by Andrej Melicherčík and Ján Mjartan (Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 417). Melicherčík, as Chairman of the Basic Organisation of the Communist Party of Slovakia at the Ethnographic Institute SASA, was in charge of conducting self-criticism of the Institute employees by decision of the SASA Administrative Body (Klačka 1994, p. 44). After several months of background checks, 14 scientists were dismissed from the SASA in 1951, including two staff members of the Ethnographic Institute—Mária Kosová and Soňa Kovačevićová (Zajonc 2016, p. 29). The reason was their 'bourgeois origin' (Danglová 2021).

## Ideological Punishment—the Loss of Sovereignty

In 1951, despite intensive declarations of full identification with the established methodological and ideological paradigms of the Communist regime, as well as a critical reflection on *bourgeois ideologies*, the Ethnographic Institute was labelled a 'bourgeois-nationalist institution' and became the only SASA institute whose autonomy was removed.

Lev Hanzel, Chairman of the SASA Administration, informed the EI SASA by letter dated August 21, 1951, that he had relieved Ján Mjartan from the office of the Administrative Director, and Andrej Melicherčík, who had also been deprived of his membership in the Communist Party, from the position of the Institute's Chairman (Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 417). He mentioned 'organisational and personnel changes in the SASA' as the official reason. The preserved draft of his letter, as revealed by archive research, contains a more detailed explanation, suggesting concerns that 'there is no perspective in the near future of obtaining new scientists who would be able to conduct scientific research in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism' (Zajonc 2016, pp. 29–30).

A small fragment of the original Institute, called the Ethnographic Section, became part of the Institute of History (IH) of the SASA on September 1, 1951 (Horváthová 1973a, p. 170; Zajonc 2016, pp. 38–9). At the same time, the headcount was drastically reduced (from 10 to 5). Andrej Melicherčík, who was in charge of managing the Ethnographic Section, worked as the subordinate of the IH Director and Chairman (*Ibid.*, p. 30). In 1952, he left the SASA to work at the Faculty of Arts of the Slovak University in Bratislava and was replaced by Ján Mjartan (*Ibid.*, p. 32).

One of the Institute's staff members, Ján Podolák, attributed the act of cancelling the Ethnographic Institute to the 'SASA liquidating management' (1955a, p. 431). Two decades later, another member of the Institute, Emília Horváthová, called it a misunderstanding and 'insensitive intervention' by the 'then responsible SASA staff who (...) considered research on ethnic specificities an expression of bourgeois nationalism' (1973a, pp. 170–1). According to the published memories of Ján Mjartan, the Ethnographic Section within the IH SASA maintained considerable autonomy (Slavkovský, Ed. 2006, p. 222), not only in the preparation and fulfilment of tasks, but also in the preparation of draft budgets. During this period, the headcount of the institution grew to seven employees (Zajonc 2016, p. 31).

Within the institution, at the beginning of the 1950s, the influence of the Marxist paradigm manifested also in its

organisational units, which reflected the work plans and focus of the specific working committees. In 1952, for instance, the Ethnographic Section set up a special 'Committee for research on the culture of cooperative village and on the life and culture of the working class' (*Ibid.*, p. 35). During this period, stronger orientation on research on folklore can also be observed, with the regime ascribing to it an important role in advocating its ideological objectives (*Ibid.*, p. 36).

### From an Ethnographic Cabinet to an Ethnographic Institute

The institution gained back its organisational independence at the end of 1952 with the establishment of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS), when it was detached from the IH and became an autonomous part of the SAS Social Sciences Section as Ethnographic Cabinet (*Ibid.*, p. 32; Kiliánová 2016a, p. 59).

The political thaw—connected with the death of the key Communist official, J. V. Stalin, in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), followed by the death of Klement Gottwald in the Czecho-Slovakia in March 1953—certainly contributed to further positive developments within the institution (Danglová 2021). However, the Ethnographic Cabinet (1952–5) had only five core staff members during that time: in addition to Director Ján Mjartan, who had been appointed on November 9, 1953, there were two researchers and two scientific assistants. In the course of the next three years, the institute grew by 13 new staff members (4 scientists, 8 specialised staff members and 1 administrative employee), and all tasks began to be systematically implemented through its departments (Podolák 1955a, p. 434; Zajonc 2016, p. 35). In addition to the Material and Spiritual Culture Departments, a Documentation Department was set up in 1953 (Danglová 2021). The task of this department (later called the Scientific and Documentation Department) was to prepare bibliographies, and this department was also responsible for the Archive of texts, drawings and photographs and the Library (Podolák 1955a, p. 434). The archive documents corpus grew exponentially thanks to the emphasis that

the Institute placed on field research (Danglová 2021). The basis of this department was formed by the Bibliographic Committee (which functioned since 1949) and the Documentation Unit (since 1950) (Zajonc 2016, pp. 32–3; Popelková and Zajonc 2008, pp. 445–6). The Documentation Department was for many years managed by Elena Prandová (Danglová 2021).

Given the staff growth and achievements, as a Cabinet, this scientific centre changed its organisational form to become an Institute in 1955, and was renamed the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (EI SAS, 1955–93). At the time of its consolidation in 1955, the Institute not only disposed of extensive archive collections, but it also laid the foundations of a collection of books (the EI SAS Library contained over 1,000 volumes of publications), while intensively working on a bibliography of Slovak ethnographic literature of the years 1901–53 (Kubová 2006, p. 83). Between 1954–9, the bibliography was prepared by Rudolf Žatko (Stano and Žatko 1989). In the period 1957–86, the Library was under systematic administration by the librarian Milada Kubová. In addition, she compiled annual bibliographies, usually published in the last issue of the *Slovenský národopis* journal's annual volume. The first ethnographic bibliography of the years 1954 and 1955 was published in the 5<sup>th</sup> annual volume of *Slovenský národopis* in 1957. From 1960, it was compiled by Milada Kubová and published in book form, with a total number of five volumes released by 1990 (Kubová 2006, p. 83).

The growing centralisation within the scientific ecosystem in Slovakia was manifested, among other things, by amendments to the Acts on the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (CSAS) (1957) and the SAS (1958), by which the subordination of the SAS to the CSAS increased (Klačka 2014, pp. 124–6).

The suppression of the Hungarian 'counterrevolution' in 1956 triggered another wave of political checks with the aim to reveal the 'sources of opportunism, revisionism, reformism, and liberalism'. During the first half of 1958, 'checks of class and political reliability' were conducted within the SAS, as a result of which over 100 scientists were forced to leave the Academy (Hudek 2014b, pp. 117–8). In this situation of 'hunting for white collars', the position of the

EI SAS was definitely not helped by writer Vladimír Mináč's invectives on the 'predominance of folklore' in public life (Danglová 2021). As far as the EI SAS is concerned, in 1958, all employees passed the check (Ester Plicková passed conditionally); however, in 1960, Soňa Kovačevičová was fired from the Academy, again for political reasons (Kiliánová 2016a, p. 59; Danglová 2021).

In 1958, the Institute's management changed, and the position of the Director was taken over by Božena Filová, who remained in this post for several decades (1958–89). Thanks to her social capital and the positive attitude of the Director of the Slovak Institute of Conservation and Nature Protection, Soňa Kovačevičová was not forced to leave for the production sector, but rather was integrated in this institution as its staff member. The period 1960–7, during which she worked there, extended her research focus to folk architecture and settlement forms. Through these topics, she tested the cartographic method, which had been widely used throughout Europe at that time, and utilised it fully after her return to the Ethnographic Institute SAS in 1968 (Danglová 2021).

Under Filová's leadership, the Institute's headcount grew considerably, with eleven new researchers during the 1960s (Kiliánová 2016a, pp. 61–2). And so, a solid basis of the Generation of Builders was formed within the institution.

### Scientific Programme in the 1950s and 1960s

In 1946, the Ethnographic Institute SASA set out the following principal tasks in its scientific programme: (1) to compile a bibliography of works on Slovak ethnography; (2) to systematically collect and describe all outputs from Slovak folk culture; (3) to process and publish the collected material; (4) to create a synthesis of Slovak folk culture; and (5) to prepare materials for the atlas of Slovak folk culture (Zajonc 2016, p. 41). The plan, which had been agreed at the general meeting of the Institute in 1949, sought to focus primarily on research on Slovak folk culture for use in the preparation of the synthesis of the Atlas of Slovak Ethnography (Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 415).

According to O. Danglová (2021), 'folk culture' was perceived comprehensively under the emerging concept, and ethnography was therefore expected to focus on exploring the 'material, spiritual, social, and artistic culture of the people'. Such perception is evidenced, for instance, by an assignment for S. Kovačevićová by the then Director of the Institute, J. Mjartan, to develop a research project on the (still alive and flourishing) varieties of regional forms of clothing in Slovakia. In line with the project, several richly illustrated monographs were published in the 1950s, combining ethnographic records with visual testimonies. One of the project results was the monograph *Ludový odev v hornom Liptove* [Folk Clothing in the Upper Liptov Region] (Kovačevićová 1955). The clothing theme and, in particular, its decorative aspects, were close to reflections on its aestheticising artistic component and naturally led to increased interest in expressions of folk art and creativity. Namely, in the case of S. Kovačevićová, her interest was associated with her deep knowledge of the contemporary events in fine arts. This topic fascinated her throughout her active academic life, as proven by her contributions in *Slovenské ľudové umenie I* [Slovak Folk Art I] (1953) and *II* (1954), *Ludové plastiky* [Folk Sculptures] (Kovačevićová and Schreiber 1971), and publications *Lidové výtvarné umění. Slovensko* [Folk Fine Arts. Slovakia] (1974a), *Knižný drevorez v ľudovej tradícii* [Book Woodcarving in Folk Tradition] (1974b), *Človek tvorca* [Man Creator] (1987), up to her last book *Človek a jeho svet od stredoveku až na prah súčasnosti* [Man and His World from the Middle Ages until the Threshold of the Present] (2006).

In the 1950s, the new line that crystallised within the Ethnographic Institute understood ethnography as a historical discipline with primary focus on research of folk culture. During this period, A. Melicherčík (re)defined ethnography as a historical discipline that needs to programmatically apply *dialectical historical materialism* in the study of human society and concentrate on the history of the settlement of the territory, ethnogenesis, the issue of nation and ethnic groups, and the study of the elements of 'democratic and socialist culture' (1950a, pp. 33–5).

Under the influence of the conclusions of the ethnographic conference in Moscow (1951), the resolution adopted by Czech and Slovak ethnographers, formulated by the participants of the 2<sup>nd</sup> *National Conference of Czechoslovak Ethnographers* in Prague (1952) (Zajonc 2016, p. 46), proclaimed orientation on field research of contemporary culture within both the rural and urban environments. According to the resolution, the task of ethnography was to explore the 'relicts of the past', observe the 'historical transformation of folk culture', and to 'create a new socialist culture' (Podolák 1955a, pp. 431–2; Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 418). In line with the desired effect of methodological and ideological *Sovietisation* of Slovak ethnography, several translations of works by Soviet ethnographers were published in *Národopisný sborník SAVU* in 1950–2.

The Ethnographic Institute set out the following themes as its principal research tasks for the years 1953–5: (1) study of culture and of the way of life in a cooperative village, (2) study of the way of life and culture of the working class (Podolák 1955a, pp. 436–40), and (3) research of ethnic minorities—Roma, Ukrainians, and Hungarians (Kiliánová 2016a, p. 72).

The research on the cooperative village focusing on the Horehronie region (led by J. Podolák) can be mentioned as an example of the way such research was conducted within the first research task (Mjartan 1953; Podolák 1955a, pp. 436–7; 1955b, pp. 268–77). The declared purpose was to primarily document contemporary social changes and their reflection in housing, rituals, and the organisation of family life. After some time, the empirical data from the research was finally summarised in the form of a three-part monograph entitled *Horehronie I–III* (Podolák, Ed. 1969; Mjartan, Ed. 1974; Gašparíková, Ed. 1988), which represents a synthesis about the traditional way of life and culture in a specific region. Eventually, the project of studying the socialist village was completed with a very traditional ethnographical description of the phenomena of traditional culture in a rural environment.

A member of the research team in Horehronie region, Daniel Luther, commented on the research design as follows:



‘The Horehronie region was supposed to be a demonstration of the transformation of a peasant village into a socialist one. Our people conducted research there, however, they found nothing like that. To prove the research outcomes and the use of funds, they redirected the project towards three traditional monographs’ (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 145).

O. Danglová (2021) commented on the failure of the original research orientation from a different perspective as well: ‘One of the reasons for failing to fulfil the original intention was the fact that the social change accompanied by socialist modernisation and collectivisation of the countryside could not have been reported in its complexity, with, for example, all the negative elements accompanying the establishment of cooperatives. The phenomenon of *rozkulačovanie*—targeted fighting of the regime against rich village farmers, called *kulaks*, from Russian—could not have been studied at all, even though it was not only about collectivisation and the nationalisation of the property of “rich people”, but primarily a violent disruption and liquidation of the traditional vertical organisation of the authority and power in local structures. At the same time, local people on the margin, who had opportunistically taken advantage of their entry in the Communist Party to obtain social capital and power at the local level, came to the fore often in artificial and violent ways. To publish this type of field data would have been suicidal and liquidating for the institution, as well as for the scientific discipline in that period. In addition, it should also be considered that the contemporary generation of researchers preferred traditional, historically and ethnographically-oriented research, targeting primarily the disappearing socio-cultural phenomena tied predominantly to the rural environment. In the Slovakia of the 1960s and 1970s, it was still an environment that largely differed from the urban one. Similar to anthropologists of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, its exploration represented a wandering in search of *cultural otherness*’.

The monographic works on regions such as Horehronie and later Hont (see Botík, Ed. 1988) were based essentially on team research. According to O. Danglová (2021), they can be considered important

outputs of Slovak ethnography, even though they represented the ‘collection of a wide range of empirical data captured in the framework of the positivist programme, which is looked at through fingers today, because it is too descriptive and slightly analytical, self-enclosed, and separated from the informal logic of real life. These works were of high quality and their input is indisputable, because the chance to ethnographically capture the picture of the regions, the specificities of the regional phenomena, particularly phenomena of material culture embodied in production, buildings, or clothing, gradually dissolved in the liquid present’.

As a participant to the regional research on the Hont region, O. Danglová (2021) recalls it as follows: ‘I have sentimental memories of the lowland, the ethnically and religiously diverse Hont, which was chosen as a counterpart to the mountainous Horehronie region. It happened certainly also because it was my initiation research after joining the Institute. We passed through the beautifully-coloured, autumn landscape of the Krupinská Vrchovina hills by car, from village to village, together with A. [Adam] Pranda and S. [Svetozár] Švehlák. Both of them were heavy smokers, which made me feel completely nauseated in the smoke-filled car interior. Other pitfalls lurked in our frequent and hard-to-refuse breaks with *slivovica* [plum spirit] or *samorodé* [native] wine toasts. They undoubtedly supported our interlocutors’ openness and their growing willingness to share. The benefit of working in the field at that time was that the researcher could move around freely. The houses were without fences, the gates were open. The house was usually entered unannounced, and the interlocutor could be talked to on the spot. When carrying out my research at the Hrušov hillsides during the 1970s, I was more afraid of being bitten by a dog that might have run out from an open yard, rather than of not being able to make contact with interlocutors. The greater openness of the rural environment and people was probably due to the lower level of the cultural significance of intimacy and privacy within the contemporary village environment’.

From the point of view of the Institute’s scientific concept of that time, the partial implementation of the second principal task,

i.e. research of *socialist culture*, can be observed in folklore studies where the topic of *new folklore* accompanied by the building of socialism within the Institute was continued by Božena Barabášová (later Filová) (Barabášová 1952); the so-called new creations with respect to songs (e.g., *častušky*, cooperative songs and others) were reflected by Soňa Burlasová (1964). She quickly identified the problematic points of research on the new forms of folklore which, in her opinion, lied both in the insufficient ‘theoretical preparedness’ as well as in the missing ‘necessary time lag’ (1964, p. 8). The studied new socialistic forms and genres were difficult to grasp for the researchers, who were used to apply traditional research methods, not to mention the genre typology built on traditional folklore. Even the mapping of *workers’ culture* within the Institute SAS ended up as research on the mining (peasant) village of Žakarovce (Mjartan, Ed. 1956).

In the 1950s, on the initiative of A. Melicherčík, the research of the *Jánošík tradition* was launched (Melicherčík 1952b) by exploring so-called resistance folklore. Attention began to be paid to the history of the discipline and ethnic groups as well. As part of the Institute’s task to conduct research on ethnic groups, research of the Roma [that time *Cigáni*, Gypsies] also emerged. In contemporary political contexts, this type of research was interpreted as a way of ‘revealing the reasons of the low standard of living of this ethnic group’ (Podolák 1955a, p. 439), existing under the conditions of *ethnic diaspora*, some groups of which were perceived as ‘extremely anti-social’. It was expected that the research should contribute to the solution of the so-called *cigánska otázka* [Gypsy issue] (Slavkovský, Ed. 2006, p. 236), thereby acquiring a political-applied nature.

During this period, along with the ‘Founders-Fathers’—prominent male representatives of the post-war period of the theoretical and institutional emancipation of the discipline—women began to gain a stronger position in academic ethnography. The strong female generation group—‘Founders-Mothers’—later included important Slovak ethnologists, Viera Nosáľová, Jarmila Paličková, and Emília Horváthová. At the time of their initial years

at the Institute, they were students of ethnography. The strong women’s generation group was later joined by Ester Plicková and Viera Urbancová and, in the 1960s, by Ema Drábiková and Viera Valentová (Danglová 2021).

Let us specifically mention one of them, E. Horváthová, who came to the Institute after completing her studies with an intention to conduct research of indigenous communities in one of the unexplored corners of Africa, focusing thus on the fulfilment of the scientific task related to the study of ethnic groups. In the situation when Czechoslovakia was isolated from the surrounding world by the Iron Curtain, she had to radically change the object of her interest, starting to deal with the research of the way of life, culture, and history of the Roma in Slovakia—a topic that was unequivocally ‘exotic’ in contemporary Slovak ethnography. Within the Institute, she also had the opportunity to apply her organisational skills. She was involved in the management of the Institute; since 1960 as deputy to the Director, B. Filová, as well as the head of the Spiritual Culture Department (later on, the Ethnography Department). Similarly as the Director of the Institute, B. Filová, E. Horváthová also became a politically engaged woman and a member of the Communist Party. However, in the 1960s, while completing her research from the 1950s and 1960s into a lately classic monograph on the Roma in Slovakia (1964), she hit a political barrier and faced harsh criticism by the ideologists of the Communist regime. Her work—in which she applied comparative and the required ‘historical method’ of that time, applying the evolution theories of the research on culture—was to be an expression of her ‘romantic admiration of the Roma’ and a source of ‘unrealistic proposals’ for how to deal with the ‘Gypsy issue’ in Czechoslovakia. In this situation, E. Horváthová modified some of her opinions and substantially reviewed the concluding part of her book. In the last chapter, she declared, to a certain degree, her consent to the assimilation and repressive government policy on the Roma. She formulated the opinion, which she held until the end of her professional carrier, that the form of an exterritorial, socially differentiated group in a different ethnic environment prevents the Roma from attaining the status of a national minority, despite



preserving their cultural features (for more details on E. Horváthová, see: Kiliánová and Popelková 2008).

The orientation of the Ethnographic Institute on research of the traditional culture of Slovak minorities abroad, particularly in Central and Southern Europe, became stronger only in the second half of the 1950s after the Institute concluded a bilateral agreement with its counterpart in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1956 (Benža 2006, pp. 48–9). Under this agreement, the EI SAS concentrated on research of the way of life and culture of Slovaks in Hungary, in the municipality of Tótkomlós, and the Hungarian colleagues—reciprocally—on research on Hungarians' culture in the Gemer region in Slovakia. The field research of Slovak minorities abroad was also translated into several publications (Švecová 1956; Podolák 1958a, b; 1959; Filová 1959; Žatko 1959; Burlasová 1960).

In 1960, B. Filová, who was at that time the EI SAS Director, defined the object of study of ethnographic research by the category *people*, as a 'sum of social groups and classes' (1960, pp. 180–1). She perceived ethnography as a historical discipline which was to focus primarily on the observation of 'developmental changes in folk culture' (*Ibid.*, p. 184).

The warming of the social climate in Czechoslovakia in the latter half of the 1960s was welcomed by young scientists of the Institute, who called for creating a more liberal space in expert discussions (Kiliánová 2020, p. 14). The formerly established scientific programme thus became an object of criticism. The younger generation of researchers had begun to call for more innovative methods of field research, the application of quantitative methods, and questionnaire surveys (Droppová 1966; Leščák 1966). The theoretical doyen and leader of Slovak ethnography, A. Melicherčík, hit the heart of the discipline by relativising its key term—*traditional culture* (1966). There were also discussions about broadening the borders of the ethnographic analysis field from an originally traditional rural environment to a wider socio-cultural space (Danglová 2021).

In this context, the philosophical and methodological seminar entitled *The Impact of Industrialisation on Folk Culture* (March 1966, Smolenice) marked the beginning of the imaginary 'breaking

of methodological and discursive ice'. With the involvement of Czech and Slovak ethnographers and experts in folklore studies, the ethnographic research programme was formulated as the 'observation of changes in different ethnographic phenomena, evaluation of their extent and quality, and exploration of the process of changes' (Filová 1966, p. 506).

A special issue of *Slovenský národopis* was dedicated to the papers presented at this seminar. In this issue, Adam Pranda defined contemporary research as 'research on the impacts of industrialisation and socialist collectivisation on folk culture' (1966, p. 511). Through the example of his own research on humourist narration in three Spiš villages, Milan Leščák highlighted the importance of the situational narrative context and also reflected on the advantages of stationary and recurrent field research (1966, pp. 571–7).

At the seminar *The Perspectives of the Development of Ethnographic Science*, which was held in Smolenice at the end of the 1960s (December 1968), M. Leščák openly and critically reflected on the state of Slovak ethnography and pointed out the need for its reconstitution on more modern principles. He understood ethnography as science 'on the cultural evolution of the Slovak ethnic group', which was to move away from its homeland studies nature and prefer the exploration of 'man as the creator of culture' instead (1969, pp. 370–7; see also Kiliánová 2020, p. 15), thus clearly including ethnography in the category of social science disciplines.

In her reflections, Rastislava Stoličná offered an illustrative memory of the overall warming climate and activities of the Institute's staff as university teachers at the Comenius University in Bratislava: 'In 1968, when the political situation in Czechoslovakia eased, SAS researchers were also allowed to lecture. In the third year of my studies, Dr. Soňa Kovačevičová lectured on the history of clothing culture for two semesters. It was literally a "revelation" to me; not only were her lectures erudite, supported by a lot of iconographic materials, but she herself was beautiful, pleasant, and inspiring. I thought, this is what a university teacher should look like. (...) In 1969, Adam Pranda, another staff member of the Institute, was one of our lecturers, too, who introduced us to the topic of

traditional non-farming jobs of which we had not heard anything at the department previously' (2021).

With hindsight, the people remembering this period mention two main tendencies that also were visible in the formation of the scientific discourse and in defining the research programme of the Institute: 'revolutionary romanticism and external political pressure' (Slavkovský 2006, p. 18). They noticed that the scientific community was being polarised into those 'who founded socialist realism and pursued historical and dialectical materialism and Marxism in science, and those who remained silently faithful to artistic and scientific modernism' (Leščák, Kovačevičová, and Michálek 1997, p. 84).

However, they also noted that ethnography (unlike many other social science fields) demonstrated considerable *resistance* and was able to defend *scientific autonomy*, largely independent of the prevailing Communist ideology (Langer 2005, pp. 338–440; Slavkovský 2006, p. 18). As Gabriela Kiliánová and Katarína Popelková stated, 'at the beginning of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Marxist ethnography forced ethnography to become a politically engaged discipline, yet without any clear theoretical framework or clear use of terminology' (2010, p. 421).

O. Danglová does not agree with designating Slovak ethnography at time of socialism as a 'politically-engaged discipline'. She rather points to the tendency of 'formal discursive politicisation' of the discipline as follows: 'Rather, what happened was that in order to defend the discipline, as a compulsory element, one could often find in ethnographic works fewer interpretations and more inserted citations or phrases aimed at convincing people that the discipline stood on the right side ideologically' (2021).

According to Michaela Ferencová, the formation of a methodologically 'certain form of Marxism' can be observed only after certain stabilisation and liberalisation of the situation in Slovakia in the 1960s (2006, p. 105). The specific and somewhat paradoxical phenomenon of the return of Slovak declaratory Marxist ethnography of the 1950s and 1960s to the state after the end of World War II can be evaluated as the result of political pressure (Kiliánová and Popelková 2010, p. 422).

It can also be perceived as an expression of *resilience* or an attempt to continue the conservatively formulated mission of ethnography in the 1940s (i.e. orientation on rescue collections and traditional rural, peasant-shepherd folk culture as a symbolic reservoir of the last relicts of the vanishing pre-modern world).

Compared to its neighbours, Slovakia did not dispose of any empirical basis in the 1950s, which logically resulted in hunger for research on traditional (peasant) culture and for an atlas- and encyclopaedia-type of holistic syntheses (B. Filová in: Bobáková and Tužinská 2006, p. 211). In this context, it is important to state that the absence of Slovak researchers in the field of ethnography in Slovakia from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was partly substituted by Hungarian (Dezső Malonyai, Kornél Divald) and Czech researchers (Karel Chotek, Drahomíra Stránská, Vilém Pražák) (Danglová 2021).

Witnesses appreciate the fact that despite the attempts to centralise and politically supervise the scientific direction of the institution, the Institute did not suffer from a lack of funds after its consolidation in the second half of the 1950s. Thanks to its good organisational condition, the managerial skills of its leadership, and support from central resources, the Institute was able to assume in the 1960s the coordination of the individual tasks of both Slovak and Czech ethnographic and folklore research (Slavkovský 2006, p. 18), conduct large-scale field research, and complete its documentation department which was systematically processing materials from field research.

While in the 1950s, the research results were presented in the *Slovenský národopis* journal and in a series of expert monographs, in the 1960s, the Generation of Founders opened a 'period of syntheses' in the history of the institution. During this period, the article *Slovaki* was published in the Soviet edition of *Narody mira* (*Čechi i Slovaki* 1964), as well as the Slovak part dedicated to Slovak Folk Culture of Volume 3 of the work *Československá vlastivěda, III* [Czechoslovak Homeland Studies, III] (1968), which was awarded the 1<sup>st</sup> international *Giuseppe Pitre Prize* in Italy (Kiliánová 2016a, p. 69).

# The Generation of Buijders

(1970s and 1980s)

The Normalisation Period  
and Real Socialism

In the first half of the 1960s, the SAS commissioned an analysis of the state of scientific research within the Academy, which stated the favouring of applied research over basic research, the insufficient qualification of researchers, as well as a completely unsatisfactory work infrastructure (up to a third of researchers had to work from home) (Hudek and Klačka 2014, p. 139). The liberalisation trends in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSSR) during the second half of the 1960s were manifested in the academic sphere by intensive preparation of a new, more democratic Act on the SAS. However, the legislative process was halted in the autumn of 1969 by intervention of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the consequences of *normalisation* began to be manifested in the SAS (Hudek 2014c, pp. 153–6).

In April 1970, the draft Act on the SAS was adopted, eliminating most self-governing elements of the Academy (Kiliánová 2016b, p. 82). In the second half of 1970, within the new wave of political checks, the new SAS management removed from office all 59 directors of the SAS institutes, retaining only 35 in office. The scientific editors of the SAS journals were checked in a similar manner—21 out of 32 remained in office. The checks also brought a new form of employment relationships; by the end of October 1971, the contracts for an indefinite period of all employees were terminated and fixed-term contracts were concluded with all SAS employees (*Ibid.*, pp. 83–4).

In June 1970, the EI SAS was under the threat of another liquidation. The SAS Chairman received a letter from the Minister of Construction and Technology of the Slovak Socialist Republic with a proposal to cancel the Institute due to the 'reorganisation of universities', calling for a 'review of the Institute's research basis'.

This attack can be viewed in the context of the contemporary process of checks of the research basis in the state. It was carried out by the CSSR government on

the proposal of the joint committee of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and of the Ministries of Education of the two republics (*Ibid.*, p. 86). It is unknown to what degree the 'organisational reason' was only vicarious and whether there were again concerns about the political and ideological profile of the Institute. Nevertheless, the proposal for its cancellation met with a turbulent wave of resistance by the academic, university and museum circles, and the SAS Presidium faced an avalanche of support and protest letters from both home and abroad (*Ibid.*, pp. 86–7). Thanks to her contacts and diplomatic behaviour, the Director of the Institute, B. Filová, largely contributed to rescuing the Institute (Danglová 2021).

The ethnologist, P. Slavkovský, commented on the situation as follows: 'There is one more thing I realised. Unfortunately, we are not to prove it. In the unsuccessful attempt to cancel the EI SAS in the 1970s, a great role may have also been played by the fact that scientific life in the USSR was also organised within the Academy, which was regarded as a top scientific institution with a great political and civil credit. Today, it is hard to verify how many letters and phone calls with a request for support were addressed from Slovakia to the colleagues in Moscow. (...) It is sometimes good to have a *Big Brother*. (...) We had great friends there: Yulian Bromley, Director of the Ethnographic Institute, and Solomon Bruk, Head of the Cartography Department. Well, only Božena Filová and Adam Pranda would be able to talk about it. I experienced the kindness of Solomon Bruk during my stay in Moscow. Those people over there may have helped us a lot. Unfortunately, we're unable to prove it today!' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 149).

The Institution thus avoided its liquidation and, in 1971, the Ethnographic Institute celebrated twenty years of its existence. The institution was personally and professionally well-established, composed of 22 researchers and 11 specialised staff members (Kiliánová 2016b, p. 87).

## Scientific Programme in the 1970s

In the 1970s, the scientific programme of the Institute concentrated around two principal lines: (1) historical research of traditional culture and (2) the current state of culture and its changes. The crucial role in elaborating the plans for the *research of the present* was played by A. Pranda (1970) and M. Leščák. In 1972, they organised an international conference on this topic by presenting the research objectives for the next period (Pranda and Leščák, Eds. 1977).

The laudatory paper by E. Horváthová from 1973, who—as the then Deputy Director of the Institute—wrote a summarising study for the *Slovenský národopis* journal (1973a), already contains clear signs of fear, so typical of the normalisation period. In the introductory part of the *Laudation*, she linked the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the Institute to the 25<sup>th</sup> jubilee of the ‘February victory of the working people’; while the anniversary of the institution remains in the shadow of this ‘major’ anniversary. In the first footnotes, Horváthová cites the document *Lessons from the crisis development in the Party and society after the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia* (1973a, p. 169, note 1) and subsequently the *Selected Writings of Marx and Engels* (*Ibid.*, note 2). By ostentatiously declaring the indisputable political correctness of her study, the author indirectly engaged in ensuring protection and legitimacy for the jubilating Ethnographic Institute.

In the same year (in the next issue of *Slovenský národopis*), E. Horváthová defined ethnography as a historical and social science discipline, regarding the ‘exploration of the inherent laws of the development of human society’ by *primarily* applying the ‘historical method’ as the principal purpose of ethnography (1973b, pp. 312–4).

In the wider institutional context of the Institute, such definition of methodology may be linked to the fact that, even after gaining independence and being detached from the

Institute of History SAS, the Ethnographic Institute was—in terms of its professional work and political background—for some time ‘under the strong influence of historians, as a result of which the inclination to the historical method was inevitable’ (D. Luther in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 149).

Oľga Danglová (2021) adds a broader contextual commentary: ‘It is possible to speak about historians’ influence, but I wouldn’t say it was strong. What played a role instead is the fact that the husbands of both prominent women of Slovak ethnography (E. Horváthová, V. Urbancová) were historians, while specifically Urbancová often worked in tandem with her husband.’

According to E. Horváthová, the subject of ethnographic research is ‘that part of traditional culture whose bearers are the popular layers of society’ (1973a, p. 171). She further detailed the expert scientific and research programme of the EI SAS in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in five thematic areas: (1) the development of folk culture in Slovakia, (2) the impact of industrialisation on traditional culture, (3) folk culture in the Carpathian region, (4) the culture of Slovak enclaves abroad and the culture of non-Slovak ethnic groups in Slovakia, (5) the history, methodology, and theory of ethnography and folklore studies (*Ibid.*, p. 172).

As far as the development of new directions within the discipline is concerned, it can be concluded that the second thematic area was fundamental for the Institute, forming part of the central *State Plan of Basic Research*. As noted by Daniel Luther, in Slovakia, it was oriented primarily on the research of the present (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 150). Despite the intensification of the external pressure of the regime and implicit expectation regarding a more ideologically rooted research orientation, the institution’s programme is rather characterised by a declining fulfilment of the task to explore the working-class culture and socialist folklore. In the programme, a comparative dimension and a focus on the study of the culture of Slovaks living abroad and of other ethnic groups are accentuated instead.

In the 1970s, the Institute continued its internal reflective discussion on the subject and methods of ethnographic research. Paradoxically, during the harshest normalisation period, explicitly provocative works were produced within the institution, which openly claimed being inspired by the streams formerly classified as 'bourgeois theory and methodology'. For example, the theoretically oriented study of M. Leščák (1972) on the state of folklore studies in Slovakia is rich of references to the English anthropological school, the French sociological school, functionalism, positivism, semiology (Roland Barthes), and the linguistic school (Ferdinand de Saussure).

In the same period, the *Slovenský národopis* journal also published a study by Mária Kosová (1973), who applied the method of semiological analysis to an imitative magic act (namely, 'killing at a distance'). This work contains references to the linguistic school (F. de Saussure) and French structuralism (Claude Lévi-Strauss). Another article by Oľga Danglová (1976) brings an attempt to make a semiotic analysis of painting expression in the Záhorie region. At the end of the 1970s, Zora Apáthyová-Rusnáková wrote a study which interpreted the seating arrangement in churches as a system of signs. However, the study was not published until the end of the 1990s (1999). During the normalisation period, the *Slovenský národopis* journal provided space to Czech ethnologists who were not allowed to publish in Czechia, such as Josef Kandert or Soňa Švecová. Paradoxically, the journal was rich in quality and ideologically unorthodox articles during the normalisation period (Uherek 2004).

In addition, the researchers began to increasingly reflect on the fact that the traditional subject of ethnographic research was changing in front of their eyes (e.g., Melicherčík 1966; Pranda and Leščák, Eds. 1977, 1978). In the paper mentioned above, M. Leščák was critical about the folklore research of the 1950s and 1960s. As an undisguised admirer and student of A. Melicherčík, he noted the need for research of the present (Leščák 1972, p. 190) and use of the *synchronous method* (*Ibid.*, p. 191). In this period,

Leščák formulated the thesis on the non-disappearance of traditional culture phenomena, as well as on its natural and dynamic development within major cultural units (*Ibid.*, p. 193).

The research focus on the present within the Institute was also incorporated into the *State Plan of Basic Research* for the years 1976–80 in the form of a project named after one of the Slovak municipalities—Sebechleby—which was to map the transformations of the cooperative village. The project leader, A. Pranda, defined a 'complex analysis of the process (...) of change, innovation, modernisation, and formation of special features of the current way of life and culture' as the principal research objective (1979, p. 219). The research coordinator also sought to apply the innovative questionnaire research method within comprehensive socio-demographical mapping of the locality (family structure, education, socio-economic status, employment) (*Ibid.*, p. 221).

#### Establishment of a New Journal

##### —Platform for Discussions and Information Sharing

Besides the flagship journal of the Institute, *Slovenský národopis* (SN), established in 1953, at the end of the 1960s there was an initiative to establish a new official communication platform in order to foster the expert discussions and stream information important to the development of the internal integrity of discipline.

The beginnings of the initiative to establish the newsletter *Národopisné informácie* (NI) [Ethnographic Information] date back to 1969. One of its founding members was M. Leščák; its first editorial boards included staff from the Institute as well as the Slovak National Museum in Martin—Jozef Ušák, and was also supported by the directors of both institutions, B. Filová and Štefan Mruškovič (Leščák 1985, p. 4).

The idea of creating a newsletter to reflect on the activities of the ethnographic institutions in Slovakia and, simultaneously, the conditions for publishing translations, the outcomes of



experimental research, bold articles, and discussions originated in December 1968 during 'passionate disputes over the focus of scientific work' at the conference on the *Perspectives of the Development of Ethnographic Science in Slovakia*, which was held in Smolenice (*Ibid.*, p. 1) (for more details, see SN 1969(2-3)).

During the first four years of its publishing at the Institute (1969-72), *Národopisné informácie* acted as an internal newsletter of Slovak ethnographers, a platform for presenting current opinions, and a space for publishing translations of progressive foreign works, without having any clear concept or system of stable sections, or even a single format and cover.

In 1972, the editorial board decided to stop publishing *Národopisné informácie* and leave the duties and tasks of the newsletter to the committee of the *Slovak Ethnographic Society at SAS (SES)*. The members of this scientific society were, in fact, all professional ethnographers in Slovakia, including researchers of the Institute. The *SES* Committee, which was managed by A. Pranda, was 'not only overflowing with activity and resolutions, but, above all, it disposed of a better financial base for publishing a bulletin' (*Ibid.*, p. 2).

Between 1973-5, when the editorial team was managed by A. Pranda, three issues of *Informácie Slovenskej národopisnej spoločnosti pri SAV* [Information of the Slovak Ethnographic Society at SAS] were published; these, however, did not follow up on *Národopisné informácie*, but rather informed the members and the wider public about the texts of important documents and events organised by the *SES* (*Ibid.*). The association *Matica slovenská* was also involved in its publishing; however, obstacles of organisational and technical nature on the side of the *SES* prevented its further existence (Beňušková 2019, p. 42).

In 1977, *Národopisné informácie* resumed publishing again by the Ethnographic Institute SAS due to the launch of extensive work on the *Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia* and coordination of scientific and research activities related to the *State Plan of Basic Research*. The informative section was restored, and issues with translations and project results were published.

The magazine was internal in nature and not for sale, since it did not have a formal editorial board and consisted of several anonymous teams and individuals as its editors. The youngest generation from the *Basic Organisation of the Socialist Youth Union* and participants to the special internal seminar for young researchers were also actively involved in its creation (Leščák 1985, p. 3).

The Ethnographic Institute SAS and *SES* joined their editorial forces again in 1979, and the journal was published in collaboration with the *SES* until 1988. The new editorial board, managed by M. Leščák and composed of the representatives of both institutions, decided to place emphasis not only on typography and layout, but also on its contents: preference was given to materials and material studies, sets of articles on the implementation of the *State Plan* tasks, and important papers from seminars and conferences. The journal faced increased interest in publishing texts, and the group of contributors expanded, even though their articles were not remunerated at all. The entire editorial and organisational work remained on the shoulders of the small editorial team and voluntary colleagues from the *Basic Organisation of the Socialist Youth Union* at the Institute (*Ibid.*).

In 1982, the number of issues published annually (one to four issues were published irregularly) became stabilised at two, and the number of not-for-sale copies was between 150 and 250. M. Leščák remained the Editor-in-Chief, and the posts of executive editors were held by R. Stoličná, Z. Profantová, and D. Ratica; however, from the very beginning, various other staff members of the Institute were actively involved in the works (Ján Botík, Ema Drábiková, Viera Feglová, Naďa Knausová, Mária Kosová, Ingrid Kostovská, Daniel Luther, Arne B. Mann, Adam Pranda, Zuzana Profantová, Peter Salner, Edita Vrátna, and others) (*Ibid.*, p. 4).

P. Salner, whom M. Leščák entrusted the journal, remembers his time working as the executive editor of *Národopisné informácie* in the late 1970s as an encounter with an unpleasantly



harsh editorial reality. It was necessary to not only look for articles of appropriate quality and within the set deadline, learn to work strategically with potential authors, but to also ensure the copying of the obtained and edited texts without any help. This was done by transcription into stencils [pieces of paper with a wax or metal layer], from which document copies were created on a mimeograph machine. 'During the normalisation period, the regime strictly checked any forms of text copying. There were few "official" stencils; they were numbered and strictly registered. They were assigned exclusively by thoroughly cleared (and properly annoying) persons who released them with a bleeding heart and against a signature only to designated persons. In principle, we received less of them than the planned number of pages, and so we collectively tried to get more from other sources' (in: Beňušková 2019, p. 52). Eventually, a copy of the journal was put together manually by thorough sorting of the pages reproduced by a mimeograph. This took several hours and was performed not only by the editorial team but also by 'Socialist Youth Union members and any voluntary helpers'. The binding was the only task entrusted to a professional bookbinder (*Ibid.*).

The thematic issues published in the course of the 1970s suggest not only that the members of the Institute's basic *Socialist Youth Union* organisation made up the editorial team (*NI* 1978(1)), but also that the staff participated in competitions to win the 'Socialist Work Brigade' title (Department of Ethno-Cartography (*NI* 1977(4)) and that the Institute organised seminars on contemporary issues of Marxist ethnography and folklore studies (*NI* 1977(1-2)). The imprints also show that an *Anti-Bourgeois Ideology Commission* was active within the Institute, the head of which, Mária Kosová, participated in the publishing of several issues (*NI* (1978(1); 1979(1); 1980(1)). However, the imprint of *NI* 1980(1) does not state in connection with the cooperation by M. Kosová that she was the head of that commission. According to the recollections of young scientists back then (like the above-cited P. Salner), it was,

paradoxically, M. Kosová who, at her lectures, informed about structuralism and other 'Western' theories that were normally inaccessible (*Ibid.*).

In the 1980s, along with M. Leščák, the posts of executive directors were also held by V. Feglová, P. Salner and, from 1987, J. Podoba. In the early 1980s, according to M. Leščák, *Národopisné informácie* outgrew, thanks to increased content quality, the level of a newsletter and acquired the character of a professional journal (1985, p. 1).

## The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia

### –The Era of Large Syntheses and Collective Works

Despite the reflective approaches and expansion of the theoretical and methodological horizons, the Institute did not lose the aspirations of the Generation of Founders to generate large-scale, comprehensive ethnographic syntheses. In 1969, the ambitious project *The Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia* was produced (*EAS*; Filová and Kovačevičová, Eds. 1990). It was a cross-sectional ethnographic project prepared by several ethnologists from various institutions in the country: Mojmir Benža as a new staff member of the Slovak National Museum in Martin, S. Kovačevičová from the EI SAS, and J. Podolák from the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University (Slavkovský 2006, p. 20). S. Kovačevičová was the key figure entrusted with the management of the whole project after her return to the Institute in 1968 (Danglová 2021).

The methodological concept of the *EAS* was consulted with foreign partners. Important methodological feedback and help was provided by Polish, Hungarian (P. Slavkovský in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 151), and Austrian colleagues (Danglová 2021). According to O. Danglová, 'one of the strong leitmotifs of awarding the Herder Prize in 1982 [to S. Kovačevičová], which was granted for bridging the East and West in the field of social sciences, was the international contribution of the *EAS* and its importance within the European scene, to which Soňa Kovačevičová contributed with a lion's share' (*Ibid.*).

The origin of the *EAS* project was largely conditioned by external factors, in particular the contemporary orientation of European ethnography to create an Ethnological Atlas of Europe (Stoličná 2021). In the 1960s, Poland, Hungary, Austria, Switzerland, as well as the then Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union tended to use cartographic methods. As contextually commented by P. Slavkovský: 'It was an ideological bit of luck that the cartographic method was accepted by the Soviet ethnographic school' (2006, p. 20). The first phase was the *EAS* Project created by S. Kovačevićová and an extensive questionnaire containing 170 thematic areas related to the material, social, as well as spiritual phenomena of traditional culture, including areas of art culture and folklore. According to the Introduction to the *EAS*, the ethnographic research can be considered a 'new scientific research method aiming at the space-time systematisation of the concentrated folk culture phenomena' (Kovačevićová and Matula 1990, p. X).

In the course of the 1970s, three departments were gradually established at the EI SAS, reflecting the growing agenda of the Institute. At the beginning of 1970, the *EAS* Centre (later Department of Ethno-Cartography) at the Institute was created, which was led—despite her ideologically inappropriate personnel records—by the re-admitted S. Kovačevićová. The first researchers at the Centre included O. Danglová and R. Stoličná, later Z. Rusnáková, P. Slavkovský, V. Feglová, E. Drábiková and M. Benža. These scholars (together with J. Podolák) became the leaders of the *EAS* thematic groups, bearing responsibility for their contents and also managing other authors of maps and commentaries (Stoličná 2021). P. Slavkovský became the deputy and secretary of the Department of Ethno-Cartography (Slavkovský 2006, p. 20). R. Stoličná comments on the staff and working atmosphere at the Institute as follows: 'Several colleagues had been working at our department [Department of Ethno-Cartography] after my return [from maternal leave in 1973]. (...) A third research department focusing on the preparation of the *EAS* was thus created. In addition, there was the Ethnography Department and the Folklore Studies Department. The following colleagues worked at the Ethnography Department:

Viera Urbancová, Emília Horváthová, Viera Nosáľová, Ester Plicková, Jarmila Paličková, Viera Valentová, Adam Pranda, and Ján Botík; and the following ones at the Folklore Studies Department: Viera Gašparíková, Soňa Burlasová, Mária Kosová, Milan Leščák, and Svetozár Švehlák. Dr. Božena Filová was the Institute's Director, holding a protective hand over S. Kovačevićová as well as over the entire *EAS* project. With hindsight, I admire the courage of these two ladies who gave confidence (except for E. Drábiková) to the young researchers with almost no experience—and in my case no experience at all—in scientific work' (2021).

During the first half of the 1970s, large syntheses continued to be produced within the Institute, of which we can mention as a selection the work *Die Slowakische Volkskultur* (Horváthová and Urbancová, Eds. 1972). Nevertheless, the institution invested most of its internal research capacity in field research for the purposes of the *EAS* and, in addition, it mobilised all its forces and contacts within external social networks of the nationwide community of ethnologists.

In this regard, the cooperation with the Slovak National Museum in Martin proved to be particularly effective, mainly at the questionnaire stage of the preparation. Thanks to the support of its director, Štefan Mruškovič, an impressive number of museal employees was involved into the field questionnaire action.

Along with the Institute workforce it secured the synchronicity of collected data. This unique endeavour had no counterpart in similar European projects. Showing respect to the managerial skills of his colleagues, P. Slavkovský noted that 'Božena Filová and Soňa Kovačevićová managed to get back on feet almost the entire contemporary generation of ethnographers, including those who worked in museums at that time' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 151).

Seventy-nine ethnographers and students from the Ethnography Department of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, were involved in the *EAS* project. The research was conducted by all staff members of the Institute, as well as non-members of the special *EAS* Department. They worked

in assigned municipalities, mostly for two weeks, according to the single three-part questionnaire. The members of the *EAS* Department were required to conduct research in at least five locations (Stoličná 2021). The mass research was carried out using the questionnaire method, taking place in 250 municipalities in 1971–5. The research locations were distributed evenly throughout Slovakia’s territory—with 189 Slovak locations, 37 Hungarian, 17 Ruthenian-Ukrainian, three former German locations, and four Goral municipalities. The *EAS* was thus a territorial atlas that accounted for Slovakia’s multi-ethnic composition, inspired mainly by the ethnographic atlas of Switzerland, unlike the ethnical perception of the German or Hungarian atlas, which only explored and mapped the culture of Germans or Hungarians, including beyond the borders of their respective country (*Ibid.*).

We can find the following first-hand memory in R. Stoličná’s reflection on her personal field research for the *EAS*: ‘I conducted research in three locations in Trenčín’s surroundings—Opatová nad Váhom, Selce, and Moravské Lieskové—taking advantage of being accommodated at my parents’ place in Trenčín. The fourth location was Hrušov in the Hont region, where I found a *kúrna izba* [smoky room]. A *baběnka* [slang, diminutive for an old woman] lived there, who cooked on an open fire; the room had no ceiling and the smoke escaped through the roof. The room was entirely covered by a black greasy substance and smelt like smoked meat. The fifth location was a village in the Lower Zemplín region, Hrušov. Since I had no appropriate transport connection from the closest town of Michalovce, I found accommodation directly in the village, at a very sympathetic widow. She offered me a beautiful room that smelled of apples placed on wardrobes. I gave the housewife all my *per diems* and she cooked and baked for me. It was a lovely September 1975; my interlocutors were excellent—they set a fire in the outdoor furnace and baked home-made bread for me. I will never forget going to the vineyard to help her pruning vines. I did it for the first time in my life and found out that it was hard work. We

interrupted our work during lunchtime, had a lunch and a drink. I was completely exhausted, and I instantly fell asleep. I didn’t wake up until late afternoon. By that time, the housewife had finished all the work. I felt ashamed, but she just smiled. As a reward, I took photos of the whole family as well as of the “football eleven” in which her son played’ (*Ibid.*).

In connection with the preparation of the *EAS*, half a million of cataloguing sheets, 20,000 black-and-white photographs, 4,000 colour slides, and 1,000 sketches were collected by the Institute during the 1970s. The first stage of the *EAS* preparation was the documentary processing of the collected materials. The original questionnaire was typewritten, creating two corpuses. The original questionnaires constituted the local *EAS* archive; the typewritten questionnaires were divided, forming the thematic *EAS* archive. During the second stage, the collected data were transferred into the evaluation sheets and, from there, to maps (*Ibid.*). During the preparatory stages, 2,500 analytical maps were created (Slavkovský 2006, pp. 20–1).

R. Stoličná commented on the process of creating the analytical maps as follows: ‘When the research was over, the second stage of the *EAS* preparation began: the evaluation of the obtained data on evaluation sheets and analytical maps. This means that every reply to the questionnaire was first transferred into the sheet and subsequently into the map. At this stage, Dr. Kovačevičová assigned themes to us that we were expected to deal with primarily. I was informed that I would be dealing with food and nutrition, because this topic was not personally covered within the Institute. I was unhappy, as I imagined I would be assigned a more noble topic. But my boss told me that I was stupid and that I couldn’t see past the tip of my nose, since it was a great and eternal topic. As always, she was right, but I realised it only later. We had not received any information about this topic while studying at university. The questions for the *EAS* questionnaire on food were prepared by Dr. Michal Markuš, former staff member of the Institute, who had left for the Institute of Social Sciences, SAS, in Košice before my arrival.

When she saw how scared I was, she brought me all the literature she could find on food and nutrition that she had at home and ordered me to start studying. Furthermore, she forced me to write a doctoral thesis on this topic. Under her tutorship, I wrote the thesis: *Cereal Dishes in Slovakia* [A Historical Overview and Systemic Categorisation Based on Ethnocartograms of the *Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia*]. Besides the text, the work also included relevant maps. I passed my exams in the history of philosophy and history, defended my thesis in 1979, and obtained my PhDr. title' (2021).

The evaluation required concentrated team work and collaboration with colleagues across institutions and scientific disciplines: 'At this stage, we cooperated with researchers from other departments of the Institute, the Department of Ethnography of the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University and from the Institute of Musicology, SAS. To harmonise the processes of maps preparation, meetings of all colleagues were held outside Bratislava two or three times a year' (Stoličná 2021).

The robust joint work tasks and several years of concentrated team collaboration on a collective work not only had an important influence on the shaping of the climate at the Institute, but a number of researchers with a high professional level and expertise emerged as well: '(...) each of us had to have our skin in the game and present our progress to all the others, often being subject to critical comments. This is how we helped each other and developed. And the best thing was that we obtained knowledge of all phenomena of traditional culture. It was so different from what had been dealt with by the Institute before the *EAS*, when researchers focused only on their wider or narrower topics and were not interested in anything else' (*Ibid.*).

The third stage was a final selection of relevant maps for the *EAS*, which contained 535 maps and 42 diagrams (Kovačevićová and Matula 1990, p. X.) In this phase, the team around S. Kovačevićová worked closely with the experts from the Slovak Cartography Institute, who explained in what ways the identified

facts could be graphically depicted on the map and what the map would absorb and 'tolerate' to remain readable (*Ibid.*). Before completing the text, the manuscript underwent an international peer review. 'Prof. J. Barabás and Dr. E. Kisbán from the Atlas Centre in Budapest and Dr. J. Bogdanowicz from the Department of the Polish Ethnographic Atlas in Wrocław came. They reviewed our maps and proposed some corrections. What helped me a lot was the consultation with Dr. Eszter Kisbán, an expert in culinary culture. She told me that the next conference of the International Committee for Ethnological Research at SIEF [International Society for Ethnology and Folklore] would take place in Hungary and that she would like to invite me. Linguists were also invited to attend the consultations and they helped us mainly with captions concerning folk names' (*Ibid.*).

In the latter half of the 1980s, the *EAS* manuscript was ready for printing. It required over two decades of intensive concentrated multi-generational team work, as well as cooperation with many external colleagues and scientists from different scientific disciplines. In her reflections, R. Stoličná (2021) evaluates her work within the *EAS* Department as follows: 'In connection with my work at the Department of Ethno-Cartography, I must say that I consider it my second university. I obtained a good overview of all phenomena, as well as historical-cultural contexts of traditional culture. I learnt to be precise in my expressions and comply with the deadlines. I am convinced that our words as editors of the volume *Ethnology and Cultural Heritage* (Danglová and Stoličná, Eds. 2001), published on the occasion of the 80<sup>th</sup> birthday of Soňa Kovačevićová, were correct stating that she brought up, in connection with the works on the *EAS*, an almost entire generation of Slovak ethnologists who now represent the basis of the scientific potential of the Institute of Ethnology SAS'.

The successful management of this extraordinary project task did not go unnoticed by 'Western circles', and its key leader, S. Kovačevićová, was awarded one of the most prestigious European prizes in the field of culture and humanities—the

Johann Gottfried von Herder Prize. In 1964–2006, the prize to honour J. G. Herder was awarded annually by the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung in Hamburg on the proposal of the independent Board of Trustees of the Vienna University to important personalities from Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe, who significantly contributed to the development of European culture. In connection with the awarding of this prestigious prize in 1982, R. Stoličná (2021) noted in her memory reflections that her colleagues were very proud of S. Kovačevićová: ‘When she returned, we asked her how it went, and certainly, we as women were curious about what she wore. She promised to show us at our next meeting. I personally expected some classic clothes, but instead, she showed up in a dusky pink suit in which she looked just brilliant’.

Even though the manuscript of the *Atlas* was ready for printing already in the latter half of the 1980s, it was not published until 1990. Its publishing depended on obtaining additional funds from the ‘foreign-exchange reserves’ due to the need of buying special, high-quality paper from Switzerland (*Ibid.*). The budget of the cartographic and printing works increased to 15 million Czechoslovak crowns (Slavkovský 2006, p. 21). The *Atlas* was finally published in 1990 thanks to the connections of the EI SAS management and personal political intervention by several top Communist officials. When taking over the *National Prize of the Slovak Republic* for this scientific opus in 1991, its authors witnessed that the *Atlas*, the creation of which was supported by the Institute’s management, several members of the SAS management as well as several representatives of the recently fallen regime, had also gained the recognition of the new, post-November state representation (*Ibid.*; Slavkovský 2012, pp. 56–7; Leščák 2006, p. 87; P. Slavkovský in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 151).

In the 1980s, apart from finalising the *EAS*, the EI SAS focused to a major extent on the research on the present and on capturing changes from a synchronous perspective (Leščák 1982). There were initial attempts to work on the ethnography of the city

(Salner 1982). P. Salner, pioneer in the field of urban ethnology in Slovakia, later noted that, as a researcher oriented on the study of the capital city of Bratislava, he felt like a lonely runner within the Institute even several years after defending his thesis on this topic. However, he was gradually joined by his colleagues V. Feglová, D. Luther, L. Falt’ánová, and Z. Beňušková. Support was eventually given to the research of small towns, launched by the recent graduates from ethnography, M. Kardošová (later Vrzgulová) and K. Popelková, at the end of the 1980s (2006, p. 106; Soukupová et al. 2013).

### Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia and Central Plan of Basic Research

In the second half of the 1980s, the Institute’s researchers began working on another collective work. The outline of the project in the form of the *Ethnographic Lexicon of Slovakia* had been prepared by A. Pranda back in 1983 (Slavkovský 2006, p. 23). A decade later, it resulted in the publishing of the *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia 1, 2* (Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995). The human and financial capacities of the Institute were initially fully occupied by the *EAS*. As noted by the Scientific Secretary of the *EAS* Department and scientific editor, as well as one of the authors of the *Encyclopaedia*, it was not in the power and possibilities of the Institute to work on two large projects and simultaneously fulfil other tasks arising from the state research plan. The Institute thus intensively continued realising the idea of publishing an encyclopaedic work with the working title *Encyclopaedia of the Ethnography of Slovakia* after completing the core works on the *EAS* (Slavkovský 2012, pp. 57–8).

The editorial team of the *Encyclopaedia* consisted mainly of former staff of the *EAS* Department. In 1984, after the death of A. Pranda, the responsibility for the project implementation was taken over by J. Botík, who worked as the Head of the Ethnography Department of the Institute in 1977–85 (Danglová 2018, p. 95). He prepared a detailed scientific outline and



timetable of the future synthesis and made it available for discussion in the *Slovenský národopis* journal (Botík 1987). The key principles during its preparation included the 'territorial-ethnic principle', 'historism', and the 'dialectic method of the exploration of phenomena' (*Ibid.*, p. 10). Conceptually, the preparation of the entries was divided into four thematic areas: material, social, ritual, and artistic culture (*Ibid.*, p. 6).

In order to get funding, the strategic goal in the second half of the 1980s was to include the project of *Encyclopaedia* in the tasks of the *State Plan of Basic Research* within the 8<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan (1986–90); specifically in the Key Task IX-8-4 'Historical and ethno-cultural aspects of the formation and development of the socialist way of life', as well as the partial task 'The share of folk culture in the evolution of the ethnical, historical, and cultural awareness of workers'. In this regard, the Institute declared that the result of its work would 'contribute to the development of *socialist patriotism*' (*Ibid.*, p. 14).

The concept formulated by J. Botík fine-tuned the goals of the work and the definitions of the subject of research so as to comply with the assignment and language of the *State Plan of Basic Research* and its tasks. The official statement formulated by J. Botík proclaimed that 'the progressive social and political mission of the *Encyclopaedia* consists of providing ideologically engaged information on the inherent laws of the evolution of people's traditions and their way of life, conditioned in the past by antagonistic social and class arrangement of society' and that 'since its origins, the ethnographic science, being oriented on obtaining knowledge on the way of life and culture of the wide popular classes of the given ethnic and cultural communities is in fact a scientific discipline of political nature and significance' (*Ibid.*).

The theoretical paper by M. Leščák of 1982 is written in a 'politicising' spirit too. It is also an implementation concept of the *State Plan of Basic Research* (1981–5), Partial Task XIII/8-3/1 'Integration of progressive folk culture traditions in the system of socialist culture and life of the working people'. In an innovative

manner, the author draws attention to the research on the present, to new topics such as 'everyday culture', and the 'issue of inter-generational communication and transmission'. On the other hand, it offers obligatory ideological phrases by noting the topicality of the 'social role of the ethnographic science in the period of building a socialist society' (1982, p. 6) or by highlighting the 'irreplaceable contribution [of ethnography and folklore studies] in the cultural and social practice of building developed socialism' (*Ibid.*, p. 9). Finally, he makes a very vague reference to 'Lenin's idea of two cultures in a class society', while using it excellently in the definition of 'folk culture' as an 'amorphous, harmonically developing whole' (...) 'with progressive, as well as regressive elements' (*Ibid.*). The particular work by V. I. Lenin or a citation is not contained in the references, which suggests that the author helped himself with an obviously very loose paraphrasing or significantly reinterpreted the ideas presented in the referred work.

In 1989, after J. Botík left the Institute and the *Encyclopaedia* project and became Director of the Slovak National Museum in Martin, P. Slavkovský became the project leader. During the next difficult transformation years, he had a demanding task to manage the team, which was largely exhausted from the preparation of the previous extensive collective work (*EAS*). He also had to deal with the situation related to the cancellation of the *State Plan of Basic Research* after 1989 and—in addition to scientific and editing activities—he had to raise a considerable amount of extra-budgetary funding (Slavkovský 2006, pp. 24–7).

In addition to the editorial team—consisting of the researchers from the Institute—the writing of entries and editing also involved young PhD students and participants on study stays, who generally began their internship first at the Documentation Department, which was at that time led by Elena Prandová. The works on the *Encyclopaedia* helped the young adepts of ethnology become familiar with their colleagues and their style of work, and the Institute used it as a tool to ensure continuity

and pass on the scientific and organisational experience to the new generation. M. Vrzgulová commented on this experience as follows: 'We learnt to write clearly, as well as formulate simply and concisely. Being in a team with my older colleagues, whom we had previously known from scientific texts and books and observing their discussions, became a further schooling for me' (in: Vrzgulová, Ed. 2020, p. 164).

The final change of its title from *Encyclopaedia of the Ethnography of Slovakia* to *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia* reflected the substantial shift of its topic from ethnography as a discipline per se to its major object—folk culture, returning thus to the very initial concept of the *Encyclopaedia*. One decade after its publishing, M. Leščák, who was the Director of the Institute at the time of culminating works on the manuscript (1989–92), noted that it still remained an instrumental and valid tool, though marked by decades of preparations. According to him, what the *Encyclopaedia* lacked were 'some entries from the theory, in particular a wider overview of methods; the information on the history of the science should also be reviewed, and a volume on folklorism is missing as well' (2006, p. 87). According to O. Danglová (2021), 'on the other hand, entries describing some of the yet unexplored phenomena were included in the *Encyclopaedia*'.

The *Encyclopaedia* can be designated as a project that symbolically closed the golden era of the Institute's ethnographic orientation by summarising the knowledge on traditional folk culture in Slovakia collected by means of scientific research throughout decades, making them available to wider public in encyclopaedic form.

To understand the functioning of science in the Slovak Republic, as well as research at the Institute in the 1970s and 1980s, it is important to briefly outline the principle of the *State Plan of Basic Research*, which has been mentioned above several times. As a central tool for the planning of the scientific research work in the CSSR, the *State Plan* was introduced in 1970 with the aim of framing research in 'five-year plan' periods. According to D. Luther, who was the scientific secretary of the

*State Plan* Key Task (1977–87) at the Institute, ethnography gained a separate chapter in this plan (2006, p. 93; see also Filová 1979, pp. 474–90). Between 1971–80, the Institute was responsible for the coordination of ethnographic research and the submission of relevant outcomes for the Czechoslovak Republic as a whole (Luther 2006, p. 92) and the Director of the Institute, B. Filová, coordinated one of the *State Plan* Key Tasks.

D. Luther concisely summarised the mechanism of functioning of the *State Plan* as a relatively loose and free process which enabled the formation of larger teams and concentration of the collective research capacity on demanding and time-consuming tasks. At the same time, considerable research comfort was guaranteed—once approved, the tasks had the necessary funds *de facto* guaranteed from central resources (*Ibid.*, p. 94). The first *State Plan* Key Task for ethnographic science was called 'Development of folk culture in the Czech lands and in Slovakia' (Filová 1979, pp. 474–90). Under this Key Task, the first Partial Task focused on research of cultural heritage from a historic perspective (Luther 2006, p. 93). The second Partial Task placed emphasis on research on the present, defined as research on the contemporary village, urban environment, and industrial areas.

The research of folklore and folklorism, which was also included in the research on the present, reported a boom in the 1970s and particularly in the 1980s within the golden era of folklore studies at the Institute. Great credit for the theoretical precision of the term *folklorism* and of the contexts of the 'second existence of folklore' was due to M. Leščák (Hlůšková 2020). He thus followed up on the contemporary research interest in folklorism within the wider Central European context. Let us mention at least Vilmos Voigt (Hungary) or Józef Burszta (Poland) and, certainly, their close Czech and Moravian colleagues, Oldřich Sirovátka and Bohuslav Beneš (Danglová 2021).

The third Partial Task focused on inter-ethnic relations, and the fourth one on history and theory (Luther 2006, pp. 93–4; Kiliánová 2016b, pp. 90–1).



## International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region and in the Balkans

Summarising the activities of the Ethnographic Institute in the 1970s and 1980s, we should also mention the work of the *International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region (ICFCC, 1959)*, which had developed scientific cooperation at the end of the 1950s, and whose secretariat was based at the Institute. In 1976, the Committee extended its scope also to the Balkan countries and was renamed the *International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region and in the Balkans (ICFCCB)*.

It issued the *Carpatica* or *Carpatobalcanica* bulletin (Kiliánová 2018, p. 51), following a comparative line oriented on research of folk culture in the Carpathian region. By the end of the 1970s, efforts to synthesise previous field research internationally culminated in ethnography in the Eastern Bloc countries. As Viera Gašparíková recalled (2006, pp. 75–6), the meeting of the *ICFCCB* Presidium in the autumn of 1976 came up with an idea to focus international cooperation on the preparation of three major syntheses (see also Podoba 2006, p. 99). The manuscript dealing with the robbers' tradition, which had been produced in collaboration with the Institute, was prepared and translated into Russian at the end of the 1980s; however, it was not published until 2002 (Gašparíková 2006, p. 76).

A former official of the Committee and staff member of the Institute, Juraj Podoba, described the working atmosphere in the *ICFCCB* and Ethnographic Institute in the 1980s as socially pleasant and creative and considerably distant from the 'stuffy and/or drowsy atmosphere of most socialist social science and cultural institutions'. In his opinion, unlike the *ICFCCB*, the Institute was characterised by 'decent scientific life' with a 'pleasant, sleepy atmosphere' (2006, pp. 96–7).

P. Slavkovský, one of the prominent representatives of the Generation of Builders, holds the view that the *ICFCCB* potential was not utilised sufficiently at the end of the 1990s:

'The Carpathians and the Danube region were an unbelievable cultural environment, literally an ethnological paradise. The socio-political situation in Central Europe and the Balkans in the 1990s was accompanied by a new paradigm of the gnoseological objectives of ethnology. Younger colleagues were no longer interested in the historical study of the ways of life and culture, but were becoming enthusiastic about the topics which were brought by Western Europe during that period. The excellent opportunity to present this region, its ethnic communities and culture to Europe thus disappeared. The *ICFCCB* in social sciences could have been what the V4 group of countries is in politics' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 154).

## Basic Communist Party Organisation (1970s and 1980s) –Memory Reflections of the Witnesses

With respect to the wider institutional background of the Ethnographic Institute, it is important to briefly mention the establishment and activities of the *Basic Communist Party Organisation* within the Institute. Paradoxically, most texts on the history of the Institute are silent about the work and history of the Basic Organisation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as if it was still a sensitive topic. The researchers dealing with the history of the discipline and of the Institute, including the authors of the publication dedicated to the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its establishment (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016), have not yet been successful in the study of the archives with respect to this topic.

Juraj Zajonc commented on this attempt as follows: 'With Gabriela [Kiliánová], we have not come across any archival materials on the activities of the Basic Communist Party Organisation in the SAS Archives. We don't know where the files that the Institute had disposed of ended up. There may be something at the Nation's Memory Institute, provided that they received materials from higher Party bodies with which the Basic Communist Party Organisation of the Institute communicated.'

A comparison of the information from the documents produced at the Institute and of the memories of the former Party members would explain a lot. It is a similar situation as when we studied the 1950s through archival documents, and then we were reading and listening to the memories of this period. This topic would deserve a separate research project' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 154).

In this regard, M. Benža, an important representative of the Generation of Builders, adds the following: 'All authors writing about the history of the Institute avoided the Communist Party group at the Institute like the plague. They were probably embarrassed as it reminded many staff members of the Institute about their membership in the Communist Party. However, the Party group at the Institute did some amazing work, why not to mention it? And I am telling it as a person who was deprived of his membership in the Party [as an employee of the Slovak National Museum in Martin] in connection with the Party checks' (in: *Ibid.*).

The concise history and principles of its functioning at the Institute during the 1970s and 1980s, which had been mapped through the recollection of memories of several colleagues, document the way the institution pragmatically and sensitively coped with the ideology and praxis of the Communist regime in the socialist period.

M. Benža thinks that 'what helped the Institute was the detaching of the *Basic Communist Party Organisation* of the Institute from the Party organisation at the Institute of History SAS. (...) The Party group dealt mainly with the problems of the Institute of History and the issues of the Ethnographic Institute were beyond their interest. However, the Ethnographic Institute could not have acted in its favour, as it was bound by Party discipline. (...) The Institute's Party group was set up in 1975. It was not large. Milan Leščák was its first Chairman. The Director [B. Filová] thus received support from the Institute's own staff. Ján Botík was the second Chairman from 1981. During this period, I was already on a study stay at the Institute and worked there as a scientific secretary since 1984. (...) Peter

Slavkovský was the last Chairman from 1986. (...) The Party group served as a second power centre at the Institute. It cooperated with the Institute's management and even supported it when needed' (in: *Ibid.*).

O. Danglová (2021) remembers the functioning of the Party group within the Institute as follows: 'It can be said that the Party group and its leaders were tolerant. They held a protective umbrella over their colleagues with a politically ruined profile, including me, D. Luther, and P. Salner, whose brothers emigrated abroad after the turbulent year of 1968, and later, Juraj Podoba, who joined the *Bratislava/nahlas* [Bratislava/aloud] environmental movement as an activist in the 1980s. From the point of view of the regime, this movement was considered rebellious and subversive. I remember M. Leščák and later J. Botík trying to convince me to join the Party. I refused this offer twice, laughing. A similar attitude would be a pure disaster for a person working in a different institution'.

The motivation to establish a Party group within the Institute during the normalisation period (1975) was also commented by its former Chairman M. Leščák (2006, p. 86): 'After Gustáv Husák came to power, the Ethnographic Institute found itself among the ideological institutions directly managed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia and its big disadvantage was that it had no member of the "healthy core" deciding on the future of its scientists'.

According to P. Salner, there was a special background motivation for the promotion of membership in the Communist Party at the Ethnographic Institute: 'The "lure" for joining the Party was that if there were enough of them [7 members], an independent Party group would be formed and become detached from the historians who were ideologically much more rigid and orthodox (...)', or they used the argument "Join us so that normal people can decide here!". Personal benefits or ideology were used as arguments to a much lesser extent (...). Thanks to this approach, careerists did not prevail in the Party' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, pp. 154-5).

The memories of the witnesses also reflect the fact that the Party group at the Institute served primarily for the institution's internal purposes, for supporting its organisational and work operation, as well as for protecting the vulnerable members of the community.

According to P. Salner, the Communists used their positions 'for the benefit of the Institute and its employees, much less for themselves. This is a big merit of the Director [B. Filová] and Milan [M. Leščák], as well as Mrs. Prandová [E. Prandová] (...); except for some details, I really cannot complain about the *Commies* at the institute [slang word for Communists]. On the contrary, they always supported me when I was under pressure from the outside' (in: *Ibid.*, p. 155).

There was a certain differentiation of opinions within the Institute, which had a generational, professional, as well as ideological dimension. As noted by P. Salner, 'at the Ethnography Department, the "ladies" (Urbanová, Paličková, Nosálová, Valentová, etc.) reprimanded the institutional *Red Guards* with a great deal of friendly irony; however, the Party group had functioned before them, as well as beyond them. In my time, Horváthová was the party boss, and then Slavkáč [P. Slavkovský] or Rast'a [R. Stoličná]. The term *Red Guards* referred to the young revolutionaries (Milan, Svet'o, Botík) [M. Leščák, S. Švehlák, J. Botík] and their revolutionary behaviour was not ideological'. P. Salner notes that 'using the label *Red Guard* confirms the high quality of relationships within the Institute, since it was possible to make jokes—in a friendly and intimate manner—on the "political account" of the Party members and the Institute's management; it was in fact good-humoured teasing. Just the fact that people dared to do it documents the supportive and friendly situation in the Institute' (in: *Ibid.*).

P. Salner appreciated the overall climate at the Institute where he began to work in 1975, and was willing to remain part of its team, even after defending his doctoral thesis. His tutor, A. Pranda, urged him 'to try to get the *bread book* [i.e. the Party card]. Since he was not a member of the Communist Party,

perhaps this was the reason why he realised how important it was in the circumstances of that time'. However, P. Salner adds the following: 'Even though I received this tempting offer several times, I did not agree with him on this point (...). What was also important was understanding by the management of the Institute. I was largely helped by Director Božena Filová, who did not hide her empathy towards "problematic" staff members. Despite normalisation's "top-down pressure", she was able to keep us in the Institute (I was far from being the only or the most difficult case). The Party organisation was also actively involved in this regard. Its members preferred professional and human qualities over automatic promotion of ideological criteria. Thanks to this approach (unlike many other academic and non-academic institutions), a normal atmosphere prevailed in the Institute, even during the tough times of normalisation' (in: Vrzgulová, Ed. 2020, pp. 74–6).

R. Stoličná comments her joining of the Party as follows: 'I was contacted by Božena Filová and Elena Prandová in 1981 to join the Communist Party, since they needed to strengthen the Party group with decent and hardworking people. It was a big dilemma for me at that time. On the one hand, I highly respected both of them and knew that it could have helped my scientific career; on the other hand, my grandfather had spent seven years in Jáchymov as a political prisoner sentenced under the trials with Milada Horáková in the 1950s. Ultimately, the family council decided that I should accept the offer, especially because my husband was a freelance artist, and we believed that our children would not have any problems getting admitted to the studies they chose. These opinions about children having problems without their parents' Party card, or about scientists not being allowed to increase their qualifications, were widespread at that time. Nevertheless, I never felt good in this position and had the feeling that I did not belong there, that I was depriving my family of the time I spent at Party meetings and of the money that I paid in monthly membership fees. It is true that we mostly discussed common work and staff issues of the Institute, but there were

also situations in which I felt very uncomfortable. One of them was when one of the Party members was upset over noticing that people had not decorated the windows of their houses with flags, by which the May Day parade passed. The Party group also investigated who had attended the May Day parade and who had avoided it. Even worse was the discussion about whether to allow Zora Rusnáková to publish a study in the *Slovenský národopis* journal about the seating arrangements in church. It was finally decided not to allow it, and the study was not published before the Velvet Revolution [in 1989]. In addition, the Party group selected the people to be sent to the Evening University of Marxism-Leninism [Slovak acronym—VUML]. This university was attended both by Party members and non-members. The places were assigned by the municipal organisation of the Communist Party of Slovakia, usually once a year. Therefore, some ambitious colleagues sought to get to VUML through acquaintances, bringing appointment letters in their names. And so it happened that it was never my turn, which brought satisfaction to me, as I had heard that it was totally boring and would deprive me of time with my family, since the studies took place always after working time. I left the Party in December after the Velvet Revolution in 1989, which was perceived as a betrayal by some Party members. The whole Party organisation of the Institute was dissolved in March 1990. After the political coup, I was often surprised about some committed Party members who suddenly turned to be convinced believers' (2021).

In a reflection on her work in the Communist Party, R. Stoličná also reveals the sophisticated methods of the political control of international scientific mobility in the socialist era: 'After joining the Communist Party, I was assigned the position of the Institute's "foreign secretary". This meant that all trips by my colleagues and receptions of foreign guests were managed by me. There was a Foreign Relations Department at the SAS Presidium, whose task was to book accommodation abroad, provide per diems, buy travel and flight tickets, and arrange service passports and visas for those travelling to the West.

Once everything was approved and arranged, the employee was granted permission to travel. There were also reciprocity trips to socialist countries, which meant that the inviting party provided accommodation and per diems. (...) Very famous were the visits of Soviet guests who almost always arrived around December 20. We also went shopping with them, which was literally a torture at times when there were long queues for almost everything before Christmas. When people heard us talking in Russian, they looked at us badly, and I was scolded at home for taking care of foreigners rather than dealing with Christmas preparations. An employee of the Moscow Institute came regularly for a "study visit" who, in my opinion, was sent to our institution to check whether we were working politically correctly. She was secretly caught taking photos of the maps prepared for the EAS, for example' (*Ibid.*).

The fact that the atmosphere at the Institute had a friendly-informal, yet critical-reflective nature, is illustrated, for instance, by a recollection of M. Leščák, according to which the meetings of the Ethnography Department of the Ethnographic Institute, which often lasted until the evening, 'were bringing numerous discussions on expert topics, critical comments on the work of the Institute's management and on the SAS as a whole, as well as many "anti-regime" notes and comments, (...) which often transformed into anecdotes or funny stories' (2006, p. 85). P. Salner added the following on the atmosphere at the Institute: 'Four armchairs in the corridor in front of the Folklore Studies Department were very important for informal communication. Smokers usually gathered there, joined by others for a (expert or social) talk' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 155).

The former Chairman of the Basic Communist Party Organisation at the Institute, P. Slavkovský, remembers the working meetings as follows: 'The Party meetings had a working character, usually dealing with work plans; sometimes, we didn't even know whether it was a Party meeting or a working meeting, and whether there were Party members or non-members; in fact, it didn't matter' (in: *Ibid.*, p. 156).

The reflection on the situation at the Institute by M. Leščák is unequivocal: 'It was a typical feature of the Institute that everyone helped as they could' (2006, p. 88). It was therefore important that the close-knit community was able to withstand external pressure. This protection, as the memories show, was co-created also by the Basic Communist Party Organisation: 'An important role was played here mainly by the Party organisation, which constantly and relentlessly interceded for the Institute. I was happy when Soňa Kovačevičová recently thanked the Party members for their attitudes, as she knew from her own experience what was needed to be done against the pressures from the top Party bodies' (*Ibid.*, p. 89).

At the same time, M. Leščák described the normalisation period as too complex to be interpreted through black-and-white lens, assuming that 'the younger generations would find it difficult to orient themselves in this and find adequate methods and facts explaining the experiment called "the building of developed socialism"' (*Ibid.*, p. 87).

### Collective Energy and Willingness to Spend Time Together

The period of the Generation of Builders can also be described as a period of great teams and intensive collective energy which was manifested, among other things, by the willingness to 'spend time together'. In addition to informal and more politically relaxed debates at the workplace, regular external trips were also organised in connection with large-scale projects. Since the most important project of the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century—the EAS project—involved, in fact, all staff members of the Institute of that time, the trips were mostly institutional. As R. Stoličná (2021) remembers, 'the work trips during the preparation of the EAS were also famous. They took place in various places, such as the manor houses in Malé Vozokany or Moravany, or a cottage in Senec, or even the castle in Smolenice. They were attended by all EAS colleagues who produced maps and wrote commentaries. The trips were organised two or three times a year. All of us

had to present their new maps and defend their contents before our colleagues. We had great parties after dinner, with dancing, singing, and venting our stress from the working day. Still, in the morning of the following day, Dr. Kovačevičová would uncompromisingly ring a bell in front of our bedroom doors to wake us up and get on with our work. Our generation remembers these trips with love and nostalgia'.

O. Danglová (2021) commented on the inner strength of the Generation of Builders who not only dealt with complex work projects, but also organised events of a purely entertaining and informal nature outside the Institute as follows: 'At that time, "teambuilding" was an unknown notion. We had famous carnival masked balls with unforgettable masks—Zuza Profantová as a heavy injured post-accident patient perfectly bandaged from head to toe, with her leg in a plaster; Hanka Hlôšková's husband as a surgeon wearing a blood-stained apron; Arne Mann and his wife Elena dressed like Ludovít Štúr and Adela Ostrolúcka; Viera Nosálová as a Roma woman, etc. The clothing creations were sometimes accompanied by unforgettable creative performances [while presenting the mask]. The masks were mandatory and were chosen carefully. I remember borrowing a dress from the theatre workshop to become Madame Bovary'.

R. Stoličná also remembers the masked balls as exceptional events 'to which we invited our colleagues from the department [Department of Ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava]. On one occasion, me and my female colleagues—former folk-dance dancers—encouraged each other, borrowed folk costumes and danced *karička* [Eastern Slovak women's dance performed in a circle]. The mask of *grgolica* [daemonic female being, also called *grgalica*] by Viera Feglová was unforgettable as well' (2021).

In this context, it can be said that the major intertwining or even overgrowing of the working and human dimensions, the desire to work and have fun together, the intimate knowledge of family relationships, which were also manifested through common celebrations of birthdays at the workplace, formed



a general behaviour pattern that was present as a leitmotif on all levels of the organisation's life, including the 'politically' oriented component of its activities.

Elena Marushiakova, a Romani studies expert, who was a postgraduate student at the Department of Ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava (under the tutorship of E. Horváthová) in the 1980s and later become an employee of the Ethnographic Institute (1983-5), offers a unique comparative insight: 'The team in the Institute was much bigger than the one in the Department; it wasn't the same feeling of a compact, self-help team; there were hierarchies, both in terms of position and age, various interests... internal ambitions... (...) yet the Institute also had a *modern elite* (Leščák, Feglová...); the second group was composed of *traditionalists* (ethnographers, such as Botík); then there were those who stood aside. One could feel internal tensions and a competition between the individual group leaders... And all this was actually balanced out by Filová, she settled disputes, diffused them, and didn't let the tensions come to the surface... At the Department, it was more family-like (including gossips and all other things), while, in the Institute, it was more hierarchical and more formal. For a short time, the Department was more suitable for postgraduate studies, while the Institute was better for independent work, but I think that, without Filová, the Institute could have easily turned into a battlefield (battles between internal groups). (...) There were two strong women: Horváthová was like a patroness, a teacher, with a motherly approach in the Department, while Filová kept her distance better, but she had it rough, because there were ambitious colleagues at the Institute who liked the idea that they once could become directors... (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

### Continuity in the Macro-Change

In 1989, after the retirement of B. Filová, M. Leščák became the last socialist and, at the same time, the first post-socialist

Director of the Ethnographic Institute SAS in 1989-92. During this period, the staff basis of the Institute consisted of 50 researchers and specialised staff members (Kiliánová 2020, p. 20).

Despite the change of the political regime in 1989, M. Leščák's continuation as Director is an interesting piece of evidence that within its internal micro-temporalities, the institution had a tendency toward *continuity*, often in opposition to the synchronous major historic turning points and social ruptures. According to P. Salner, this 'illustrates that the Institute was managed by normal people even in bad times and that there were normal relationships which survived the revolution' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2021a, p. 156).

As P. Slavkovský recalled, M. Leščák was appointed as the last socialist director based on a 'bottom-up' choice, i.e. by decision of the members of the employees' community; thus, he was not nominated based on a 'top-down' Party decision. This was exceptional in terms of the nomination procedure (in: *Ibid.*).

Despite his personal engagement in the Party organisation, M. Leščák obtained 100% trust of the work team in the elections for Director, as well as later in the 'vote of confidence' in 1989, which he greatly appreciated (2006, p. 90). Contrary to this result, more than a half of the former directors did not pass the post-socialist 'votes of confidence' within the SAS (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 105).

P. Salner, a companion of the Generation of Builders and an important representative of the next Transformation Generation, ideologically characterised the Ethnographic Institute in the 1970s and 1980s as an *island of positive deviation*: 'The management (including the Party group), despite personal and institutional risks, led by Director Filová, employed and protected people who were problematic from the political and ideological perspective: they had relatives who had emigrated or who had been expelled from the Party. They tolerated "stains" from the pre-normalisation past, as well as their current personal or ideological misdeeds' (2006, p. 109).



## The 1990s as a Post-Scriptum in the Life of the Generation of Builders

Despite the great social and political turning point (the Velvet Revolution or the democratic political upheaval in 1989), which liberalised Slovak science at multiple levels and also completely changed the way of functioning and financing of science in Slovakia, the Generation of Builders continued with an unchanged pace (research and publishing) also during the first post-socialist decade. Simultaneously with the emerging Transformation Generation, it continued to work virtually undisturbed on the tasks from the previous, socialist period.

From the point of view of publishing, the 1990s in the Ethnographic Institute/Institute of Ethnology SAS can be characterised as a 'harvest period'. It was a period of finalisation of great syntheses, which are unprecedented in the later period of the Institute's development. During the first post-socialist decade, the still key synthetic works of the Institute and of the discipline in Slovakia were produced in rapid succession: (1) the *Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia* (Filová and Kovačevićová, Eds. 1990), the translations of the textual parts of which were separately published in the 1990s—in German (*Ethnographischer Atlas...* 1991) and in English (*Ethnographic Atlas...* 1994); the publication thus gained the chance to transcend the boundary of its dissemination only within the country of its origin; the team of authors of the *EAS* won the *National Prize of the Slovak Republic* in 1991; (2) *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia 1, 2* (*Encyclopaedia 1, 2*; Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995), which was published as one of the first publications of the VEDA publishing house both in book form and electronically on a CD. Because of great public interest, the publishing house issued a reprint of the work. The publication obtained an entire range of important prizes: *SAS Prize for Scientific and Research Activities* (1995), *Award of the Literary Fund* (1995), and the international prize of ethnological and anthropological studies *Giuseppe Pitriè-Salvatore Salomone Marino* (1995), awarded by the International

Centre for Ethnohistory in Palermo, Sicily (Slavkovský 2006, p. 27); (3) *Slovakia. European Contexts of the Folk Culture* (Stoličná et al. 1997) and *Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry* (Stoličná et al. 2000). The book was awarded the *SAS Prize for Scientific and Research Activities* (2001) and received the *Award of the Literary Fund* (2001).

The publication was issued in English in 1997, and its later Slovak version (2000) attained not only professional, but also commercial success. The authors' team (mostly former editors of the *EAS*) thus also fulfilled the original *EAS* project which assumed a publication presenting the result of the *Atlas* works as part of European culture (Slavkovský 2012, p. 58). The work team of ethnographers, folklorists, and musicologists dealt with the interpretation of the recent ethnological research results (*EAS* and *Encyclopaedia*) from the perspective of broader European cultural history under the VEGA scientific project: *Traditional folk culture in the inter-ethnic context (A contribution to European cultural regional studies)*. The outcome was a new synthesising work on Slovakia's folk culture as part of the cultural history of Europe, created by the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural identity of Slovakia's inhabitants (*Slovakia; Slovensko*; Stoličná et al. 1997; 2000).

Three follow-up projects built on the *EAS* are worth mentioning: (a) a 16-part series of documentary films—*Etnografický atlas Slovenska* [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia] (1994), produced for the Slovak Television by the editors of the individual chapters under the direction of D. Luther; (b) representative exhibition in the Slovak National Museum in Bratislava (2004) *Slovensko a jeho kultúra—Jednota v rôznorodosti* [Slovakia and Its Culture—Unity in Diversity], whose authors (M. Benža, Vladimír Kysel', D. Luther, Peter Maráky, P. Slavkovský) used the knowledge base of the *EAS*; (c) a series of scientific and research projects supported by the VEGA agency, focusing on the traditional culture of Slovak minorities in Central and Eastern Europe (1997–2006), with the participation of M. Benža, P. Slavkovský, R. Stoličná, and Ľubica Falt'anová and resulting in an entire series of publications predominantly of an atlas type (Slavkovský 2012, p. 57).

As mentioned by the co-author of the *EAS*, M. Benža, the *EAS* team envisaged a part dedicated to the traditional culture of Slovaks living in the countries neighbouring with Slovakia with research to be conducted with the same type of comparative questionnaire as in the case of the *EAS* (2006, p. 50-1). However, this intention was not fulfilled until the the 1990s and 2000s with a series of atlas works: *Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovakia in Hungary* (Divičanová, Benža, and Krupa, Eds. 1996), *Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Romania* (Benža, Ed. 1998), *Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Poland* (the manuscript from 1999 was published six years later as Benža, Ed. 2015), *Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Yugoslavia* (Benža, Ed. 2002), *Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Croatia* (Benža, Ed. 2005b), *Folk Culture of Slovaks in the Ukraine* (Benža, Ed. 2005a). The last one of the series of publications, the *Atlas of the Traditional Culture of Slovak Minorities in Central and Southern Europe* (Benža, Ed. 2006), represents the historically first summary work on the traditional culture of Slovak minorities in Central and Southern European countries (Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Romania, Croatia, Serbia, and Bulgaria (Benža 2006, p. 58).

With the publishing of the works *EAS*, *Encyclopaedia, Slovakia, Slovensko* and of a corpus of atlas publications on the folk culture of Slovaks in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s and the 2000s, the mission of the Generation of Founders and Builders and the building of the ethnographic fundaments were successfully accomplished.

Nevertheless, publications of an ethnographic nature, which apply the methods of historical ethnography and archive research, continue to be produced within the Institute; let us mention, for example, the publications by P. Slavkovský (2011, 2013, 2014), R. Stoličná (1991, 2001, 2004a, 2004b, 2015), Stoličná-Mikolajová (Ed.) and Nováková (2012), O. Danglová (2001, 2009, 2014), A. B. Mann (2018), M. Benža (2015, 2017, 2019), J. Zajonc (2012, 2013, 2020, 2022). A large part of these publications in Slovak society saturated the gradually growing need for exploring the specificities of our own culture. They had a popular-scientific

character and a part of them was intended not only for the narrow group of ethnologists; in addition, they gained recognition by cultural historians, visual artists and designers and reached out to the general public as well.

By the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Institute was fully prepared for new research tasks and the transformation of its research paradigm and related methodological approaches, which passed on the shoulders of a new research generation coming forward.

# The Transformation Generation

(1990s and 2000s)

The Post-Socialist  
Transition Period

The decades at the turn of the millennium in Slovakia are characterised by political upheaval, transition from the Communist regime to liberal capitalism, and the subsequent complicated political and economic post-socialist transformation of society. During this period, the conditions under which science in general and the Slovak Academy of Sciences in particular had operated changed dramatically as well. These changes were signalled by the political upheaval in Czechoslovakia in November 1989, which put an end to the Communist regime that had dominated the country since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

From the very beginning, scientists from the SAS joined the revolutionary civic initiatives. The Academic Strike Committee of the SAS organisations, which was established during the general strike of November 28, 1989, immediately began negotiating with the SAS Presidium. The requirements they tabled were to depoliticise science, redress grievances by rehabilitating the victims of political purges during the Communist period, and to force the SAS Presidium to resign.

At the beginning of December, the newly-created *Scientists' and Researchers' Forum* took over the key initiative by preparing proposals for the set-up of democratic structures within the SAS (Kiliánová 2016c, pp. 103–4). In January 1990, the elected representatives of the SAS departments formed the SAS Scientists' Council (the predecessor of the present-day SAS Assembly) with 120 members. The nine-member organisational committee elected by this Council prepared the election of the new SAS Presidium, as well as an amendment to the Act on the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which was approved by the Slovak National Council in January 1990. Subsequently, the SAS Scientists' Council, legalised by the act, organised the election of a new SAS Presidium.

The programme that the new SAS Presidium adopted and implemented by 1992 included the preparation of a new Act on the SAS, the de-politicisation and de-ideologisation of scientific research, and the intention to address the main societal issues

through scientific analyses. In addition, the new SAS Presidium undertook to create a new system of science management within the SAS based on the principles of self-regulation of scientific research, cancellation of the central planning and funding system (*State Plan of Basic Research*), and the introduction of a grant-based system of funding (Kováč 2014, p. 205; Kiliánová 2016c, p. 104).

The fulfilment of these plans significantly increased the organisational self-governance of the SAS organisations, created rules for the election of new Scientific Boards, and subsequently, the Academy's organisations held votes of confidence regarding their directors.

After November 1989, the organisational and administrative units of the Communist Party of Slovakia, which had been involved in the management and determination of the scientific activities of the SAS organisations, ceased to exist. A central rehabilitation committee was also set up within the SAS (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 104).

According to an act adopted in the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic in 1991, which was intended to prevent any further powers by informants of the dissolved political police of the totalitarian regime, all leading staff members of the SAS institutes were required to apply for a check-up at the Ministry of the Interior. In the case of a positive result, they had to leave their positions (Benža 2003, p. 72).

### Liberalisation of Scientific Research and Restructuring of the System of Support

The efforts of the first post-November SAS management culminated with the preparation of two draft acts on the SAS. Given the political obstacles both in the government and individual ministries, these drafts were not submitted to the Parliament until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the 1990s, the social and political situation in Slovakia was complicated. The political discourse included not only the questioning

of the Academy's existence, but also repeated threats to its cancellation. One of them occurred at the end of 1992, when the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences ceased to exist as part of the process of division of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic. The SAS had formed its integral part under the Act of 1963. The amendment to this act—which was passed by the National Council of the Slovak Republic literally in the last moment (December 17, 1992)—prevented the cancellation of the SAS for legislative reasons at the moment of the break-up of the Federation on January 1, 1993 (Kováč 2014, p. 214; Kiliánová 2016c, p. 105).

In the latter half of the 1990s, during the first period of Vladimír Mečiar's government, the SAS criticised the political nationalism and populist style of managing the country. Not surprisingly, as a response, there were attempts to impose restrictions upon the SAS by the state. For instance, in 1996, the government's draft intended to transfer the institutes of historical and social sciences and of the science of art, which had formed part of the SAS Science Section III, to be administered by the nation-oriented institution Matica slovenská (Hudek 2014d, pp. 221-2).

This was ultimately prevented thanks to scientists' resistance and massive appeals by foreign partner institutions. In addition to political attacks, the political transformation of the SAS during the 1990s was also accompanied by economic restrictions. As a result of budget reduction, the Academy was forced not only to make its operations more effective, but, due to economic and organisational reasons, to also reduce its headcount by half until the mid-1990s (Kováč 2014, pp. 209-10).

The amount of finance that the SAS received from the state budget fell by 40% by the mid-1990s (Hudek 2014d, pp. 218-27); however, ring-fencing of the budget occurred later as well. Right in 1990, the SAS began dividing its incomes from the state budget into institutional funds (for the operation of its organisations and staff wages) and grants—for which the SAS institutes applied by means of projects. The former *State Plan of Basic Research* operated in five-year periods was thus replaced by a

competition mechanism in the framework of which smaller teams or individuals were given the opportunity to obtain some support for their basic research for a period of three to five years.

Since the end of 1990, this process was implemented by the SAS Grant Agency. In 1991, it was linked to the universities' grant agency and renamed the Science Grant Agency [Grantová agentúra vedy; GAV]; in 1996, it received the name Scientific Grant Agency [Vedecká grantová agentúra; VEGA] (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 107). The finance from its fund, which is allocated to the most successful and best-rated projects in the form of grant support, was interpreted as an extension of the SAS organisations' budgets. As a joint project of the SAS and the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic, the VEGA Agency provides grants to university and academic organisations in the form of a competition until today. Nevertheless, the project funding is ensured from the internal resources of both founding bodies at the expense of their own operational funds. Both the universities and the Academy approve the annual amount of funds for basic research projects, thereby, in fact, reducing the funds of their own budget line (Benža 2003, p. 73).

During the first post-socialist decade, the science in Slovakia had been freed from central planning, state tasks, and the implicit dictate of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and methodology. At the same time, however, it was a period of a considerable reduction of funds and resources. The grant system that replaced the previous *State Plan of Basic Research* was—compared to the previous system—underfunded.

Witnesses of this structural change are quite critical about this period. M. Leščák, who was a member of the GAV Committee in the 1990s, stated that key feature of the post-socialist decentralisation of science management and support was a 'lack of conceptual approach'. According to him, the free competition in the raising of funds exclusively by means of a project system caused a *general particularisation* and *individualisation* of scientific research in Slovakia: 'The Grant Agency became a distributor of money without any major requirements for



setting priorities (...). In social sciences, it is a competition of researchers with their individual plans and visions', which respects 'the freedom of scientific research, despite that the aims of science as a whole are not fulfilled in terms of its objective need' (2006, p. 89).

At the same time, the institutional resources were considerably reduced within the SAS. Hence, project funds (which were not sufficient even for research as such) were thus largely replaced or subsidised by the SAS organisations from their own overhead costs: 'It is money that fills gaps in the budgets of the individual departments (...)' (*Ibid.*).

The post-socialist transformation of the organisation and support of science in Slovakia was similarly evaluated in 2006 by D. Luther, who held the position of the secretary of the *State Plan of Basic Research* in the Ethnographic Institute in the latter half of the 1980s: 'Science is managed on its own "from within", at least according to proclamations. When there is a lack of finance, the freedom of choice of research tasks and publishing is quite relative. It worked the other way round during the Communist era. Science was assessed and approved "from above", but at least there was enough money for research' (2006, p. 92).

The new Act on the SAS was not approved until the beginning of 2002, defining the self-governance of the SAS and its competencies in the field of non-university tertiary education and allowing the SAS to award scientific and qualification degrees. The Act also defined the Academy bodies, determined its budget chapter, and the legal form of the SAS organisations as budgetary and contributory organisations (*Zákon č. 133/2002*). In addition, the Act on Universities specified the position of the SAS as a so-called 'external educational institution'. Ever since, the SAS has provided training based on contracts with university departments for PhD students who defend their dissertation theses in front of joint expert committees, while the degrees are awarded by the respective universities (*Zákon č. 131/2002*; Marčeková 2014, pp. 305-7).

The new SAS Presidium focused on defining the principles for the evaluation of its organisations that apply the internal accreditation system. In 1992, the central SAS Accreditation Committee was set up and the criteria for evaluating the scientific activities of its organisations according to international standards were elaborated. Since 1993, the funds have been tied to the results of internal evaluations of the SAS (Kováč 2014, pp. 212-5). During the 1990s, the accreditation process took place in three-year cycles. The SSH organisations within the Science Section III were evaluated based on their international visibility (number of cooperation projects and international projects) and the number of monographs; citations and responses began to be taken into consideration as well.

In addition to the changed legislative framework, liberalisation of topics, de-politicisation of research methods, and the fundamental change in the funding of science, the regime change also brought a new system of evaluation of scientific results. All these symptomatic features of the post-socialist macro-transformation had a major impact on restructuring the scientific concept and work organisation within the Ethnographic institute SAS microsystem as part of the Academy and of the broader science and research ecosystem in Slovakia.

This period can be split into two transition decades that had different characteristics not only in terms of the course of the scientific programme and of the work style, but also in terms of the functioning and life, based on a complex *modus vivendi* and *operandi* of the given scientific generation. The last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (i.e. the first transition decade) is still characterised as a period of research and publication dominance of the Generation of Builders, whose position was strong in the Institute. Nevertheless, the representatives of Transformation Generation started to mobilise during this period and took over the leading role in the second transition decade (i.e. the 2000s), fully assuming the direction of the Institute both in terms of the discourse and visioning.

# The First Transition Decade

## –Post-Socialist Restructuring

### ‘The Velvet Revolution’ within the Institute –Ruptures in the Micro-Picture

The Ethnographic Institute SAS joined the civic movements in late 1989 mainly through its Trade Union led by R. Stoličná (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 109). The Trade Union thus enabled a public discussion on the issue of de-politicising the scientific work, setting up democratic structures within the SAS, and the further direction of research. The Institute’s staff experienced the dramatic events and changing political atmosphere in society, in which the existing position of the Communist regime appeared to be firm, by mutually exchanging their views. Based on their personal decision, the scientists attended public protest gatherings and had dialogues with citizens after their work, thus bringing immediate news from the revolutionary events which were then discussed vigorously within the Institute.

R. Stoličná remembers the revolutionary years in the Institute in her reflections (2021) as follows: ‘I chaired the Institute’s

Trade Union [Revolutionary Trade Union] since 1988. During the revolutionary days in the autumn of 1989, I organised discussions with our staff members about the new situation and, on November 27, our Institute joined the nationwide general strike. I had put it to a vote to see who was in favour of the strike. Only one hand was raised against it, and there was a further employee who preferred not to come to work because she was afraid that the protesters would be shot. Otherwise, the whole Institute took a common position (...).

P. Salner notes that he could not have imagined the fall of the Communist regime not even a few days before November 17; however, he welcomed its consequences: ‘At the beginning, I was embarrassed about the November events, since I didn’t know what was going on and had no idea about what would come next. Despite this feeling, I kept on attending demonstrations, although I was perhaps more scared than in August 1968. (...) I could well imagine the panic if the army would have intervened or if someone would have jokingly activated the alarm system, for example. (...) I’m happy to recall a seemingly trivial episode. At that time, study at the VUML [Slovak acronym; Evening University of Marxism-Leninism] was one of the basic requirements for the Academy’s researchers. It was clear to me that I would not avoid it either, but I was still looking for excuses to delay it. The rational arguments of my colleagues, who said that the older I get, the harder it would be, did not help; others argued that I endangered my career advancement (...). When the requirement to cancel Constitutional Article 4, which declared the leading role of the Communist Party of Slovakia, was raised during television broadcasting at the beginning of December, I jumped out of the armchair, shouting winningly: “I won’t go to VUML!” At that moment, it was the biggest and fortunately, by far, not the last plus of the revolution’ (in: Vrzigulová, Ed. 2020, pp. 84–5).

M. Vrzigulová, who was on a study visit to the EI SAS at that time, remembers the revolutionary period after twenty years as follows: ‘I witnessed the declaration of the strike in the Astorka

Theatre at Suché myto, I had information from student strike committees (...). I brought news from student circles to work. There, we compared what we knew and what was happening. I remember that a colleague of mine was afraid of joining the general strike of November 27, because she was expected to attend the VUML that day. This illustrates how people were reacting and thinking—nobody believed that the regime would fall, especially that fast and even in a relatively peaceful way. (...) At that time, our Institute was located on Leninovo námestie [Lenin's Square], today's Jakubovo námestie. In the building of the first radio station. A huge bust of Lenin had been installed in the park. One day, someone encouraged us to go out onto the street. There was a crane in the park, comrade Lenin had a strong rope around his neck and was moved slowly from the base onto the truck. I haven't seen him ever since and I don't miss him at all' (in: *Ibid.*, pp. 166–7).

In February of the revolutionary year 1989, the Institute's management changed. The long-time Director, B. Filová, was relieved from her position at her own request and her then deputy, M. Leščák, was entrusted with managing the Institute.

P. Slavkovský remembers that the nomination of M. Leščák as Director was prepared by the Communist Party group in the Ethnographic Institute, which was not common at that time. In this case, the 'bottom-up' nomination was preceded by the 'top-down' nomination, which proved, among other things, the relatively good position and reputation of both the Institute and its Party group (2021).

The specific situation in the Institute, as well as the personality of M. Leščák, are illustrated by the fact that during the following year (i.e., first post-revolutionary year), the staff members unanimously confirmed him in the position of the Director despite his 'Communist past'. By confirming the pre-revolutionary Director, the Institute demonstrated, both internally and externally, not only its internal cohesion and integrity, but also continuity with the previous period when primary emphasis was placed on personalities and the

quality of work instead of political engagement. As Leščák later noted with regard to the previous period: 'Neither the Ethnographic Institute SAS nor the *Slovenský národopis* journal joined the political purges and discrimination, for which they received recognition even during the post-revolutionary days' (1991c, p. 67).

However, at a closer look at the micro-level, the closure of the Communist period in the life of the organisation was not so smooth and painless. The post-revolutionary period was marked by 'inverse purges' at a number of workplaces. Just like workplaces were periodically purged of people with the 'wrong personnel profile' (bourgeois origin, politically unclear, or pro-Western orientation, emigration in family, etc.) during Communism, after its fall, they were purged of former Communist leaders.

The 'purge' could also have the character of 'settling accounts'; it could be full-scope, humanly insensitive, or it could be an expression of personal or group opportunism. According to several memory narrations (P. Slavkovský, Magdaléna Slavkovská, O. Danglová, R. Stoličná, M. Benža), the long-time Director, B. Filová (1958–89), despite her high moral and human reputation among her colleagues, left the Institute with a feeling of bitterness. During this period, so difficult for the Institute, staff members did not stand sufficiently behind their long-time leader, although she herself had always politically protected the 'endangered individuals' in critical moments and on the edge of personal and contemporary opportunities (for personal testimonies on such protection, see, for instance, Vanovičová 2006, pp. 117–8; Salner 2006, p. 108).

The inappropriateness of the radical condemning reactions against the Director after November 1989 resonates in the memories of several staff members of the Institute. G. Kiliánová recalls one of the first discussion meetings at the Institute during the general strike on November 27, 1989: 'I remember the tense situation when Juraj Podoba verbally attacked our former Director B. Filová. In this general consternation, Dušan Ratica, who

had been rather shy and quiet, asked for the floor, addressing everyone with the call: “Let him cast a stone, he who is without guilt!”, which calmed the situation down. At that time, Dušan appeared in my eyes as a judicious man, showing clearly on which side he stood’ (in: Popelková 2022).

R. Stoličná captured that moment in her reflections as follows: ‘One of my colleagues [J. Podoba] spoke out against Dr. Filová, convicting her of political interventions in the activities of the Institute’s staff members as its Director. As if he had forgotten that it was she who had once recruited him to the Institute, fully aware of the risk of him being the co-author of the banned publication *Bratislava/nahlas* [Bratislava/aloud]. She was hurt very much, and so she left the Institute for good. I understood her, as we all knew that without her, several of our colleagues who did not have a *clean personnel profile* would not have been allowed to work in the Institute. That particular colleague did not stop his often indiscriminate criticism of the Institute and of its staff, even in the following years, thereby creating a stuffy atmosphere. That ended only after his departure for another workplace’ (2021).

Let us add a further recollection by P. Salner of the atmosphere in the Institute during the revolutionary period and of the moment of internal criticism in the Institute: ‘After November [1989], the revolutionary mood within the Institute was somehow hesitant. Except for the revolutionary Ďuro [J. Podoba], who scolded all of them and brought them to tears, it was nothing wild’ (2021a).

In this context, on the proposal of the then Chairwoman of the Scientific Board, G. Kiliánová, the Institute nominated B. Filová for an important SAS prize as an act of recognition of her life-long dedication, as well as her deeply human and professional managerial work. In February 2017, the SAS Scientific Board awarded PhDr. B. Filová, CSc., correspondent member of the SAS, a *Medal for the Promotion of Science* for her lifelong scientific work. In his laudatory speech, the SAS President affirmed that B. Filová largely contributed to the scientific and institutional

development of ethnography/ethnology with her lifelong work both in (Czecho)Slovakia and in Central and Eastern Europe in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, considering her involvement in the formation of the Institute of key significance.

Despite the pandemic situation, the funeral of B. Filová in 2020 was attended by the representatives of all generations of the Institute’s staff, as well as representatives of several university and other ethnological workplaces and institutions from Slovakia and Czechia. In her obituary speech, Tatiana Zachar Podolinská, as the current Director of the Institute, pointed out the moral and human integrity of her predecessor. She also apologised publicly for the possible grievance that Božena Filová may have felt due to the unjust criticism by a single employee. The story of the organisation thus maintained its cohesion based on humanity, solidarity, mutual respect, gratefulness, and esteem across several generations.

### Freedom of Scientific Research—Discussions and New Horizons

After several decades of central research planning, one of the major post-revolutionary changes was the possibility of free, ‘bottom-up’ direction of scientific research, i.e., at the level of the individual academic organisations. The discussion atmosphere was directly translated from what was going on in the public to the daily operation of the Institute, and stimulated reflections on its future and concept.

The 1990s initiated a revision of the scientific concept and of the definition of the discipline itself within the Ethnographic Institute as well, approaching the evaluation of the previous period with self-reflection (yet with respect and sensitively): ‘In my opinion, in terms of expertise, the Institute (and its staff) undoubtedly represented the top of ethnographic science at that time. Nevertheless, with a few exceptions, science and scientists did not exceed the limits of the regime or the professional boundaries of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. There was practically no theory, no methodology to develop, no

access to foreign (Western) literature. Emphasis was placed mainly on collecting materials, documenting the past, and on preservation research. Attention turned slowly and very carefully to the present and to new thematic and problem areas' (Salner 2006, p. 108).

M. Leščák, the Institute's Director between 1989 and 1992, initiated a survey in January 1990 among the EI SAS researchers and professional staff to map their opinions on the state and perspectives of ethnography and folklore studies in the next decade. All staff members had the opportunity to present their views of the conceptual background of their work and of the direction of the discipline in general, of the research methods and techniques, white spots (including taboo issues), the organisational prerequisites of scientific work, as well as of the Institute's infrastructure.

M. Leščák (1991c) summarised the results in a report which was published in the Discussion column of the *Slovenský národopis* at the beginning of 1991. The 'Useful Dialogue', as Leščák called the survey, revealed a whole range of diverse opinions both on the use of methodology and on the projection of the perspective of the disciplines that the Institute focused on principally at that time, i.e., ethnography and folklore studies. Even though the survey was anonymous, a couple of staff members signed their responses. The survey thus represents a valuable qualitative self-reflective source and temporal exploration pinpointed directly at the moment of the very beginning of the post-socialist transformation.

When it comes to the staff members' anonymised responses to the questionnaire, it is interesting that, more than a year after the political upheaval, there were critical voices of the 'Marxist method of work' being non-scientific and political, as well as opinions according to which it 'may further contribute to the interpretation of the functioning of human societies'. One respondent was of the view that the Marxist method had not been applied thoroughly in Slovakia and that if anyone decided to continue applying it in their work, 'it must be respected'.

In addition, this anonymous employee expressed his/her self-reflective critical view that 'one should not withdraw [from Marxist ethnography], especially when our information about the global archive of thinking is minimal' (*Ibid.*, p. 69).

Several scientists pointed out the need for long-term stationary research (already as a mandatory part of the PhD studies), accentuating 'direct contact techniques' (*Ibid.*, p. 71), i.e., participant observation, recurrent field research, as well as the need for a critical verification of information from archive and other sources (*Ibid.*, pp. 70–3). In addition to qualitative interview, the preferred research methods also included biographic interviews (*Ibid.*, p. 73).

In terms of the projection of the perspective, the staff oscillated between deepening links to historical (archiving, linguistics, history of art, museology, and historical geography) and social sciences (sociology, social psychology, and social anthropology (*Ibid.*, p. 74). They considered it necessary to abandon the exploration of the *folk* (as a socially-constructed category) and, instead, focused on exploring man, i.e., shifting from 'art history ethnography' and 'literary-scientific folklore studies' to the investigation of the social environment and mechanisms of social processes that shape 'cultural-historical phenomena' (*Ibid.*, p. 71). In this sense, they asserted not only the need to collaborate with related social sciences, but also with natural sciences (such as geography and ecology) (*Ibid.*, pp. 71, 74).

In addition, the staff members self-reflectively claimed the closed nature of the Institute in terms of information and languages and the lack of insight into the current trends of modern ethnology: 'Admittedly, due to the closed nature, the language barrier, as well as the difficult and clumsy ways of gathering information (see interlibrary loans), most of us do not know what is happening behind the fences of our Slovak ethnographic garden'. As a solution, it was recommended increasing academic mobility in the form of foreign internships (*Ibid.*, p. 74). The staff members pointed out the outdated



technical equipment and a certain degree of conservatism against emerging computerisation, as well as the undersized support staff (missing draftsman, only one professional photographer) (*Ibid.*, p. 73).

Topics such as ethics, sexual life, (political) humour, faith, religion, aesthetics, research on the culture of national minorities, children's and ritual folklore, and research on folklore genres in cities were identified as 'white spots' (*Ibid.*, p. 74). As summarised by M. Leščák, the responses to the questions on tabooed research topics focused 'clearly on religious studies' (*Ibid.*, p. 75).

The divergent spectrum of opinions fully corresponded both to the turbulent revolutionary intermediate period and to the difference of opinions and methodological fundamentals of several scientific generations within the Institute, in particular, the Generation of Builders and the Transformation Generation, which were more-or-less equally strong and staffed during the first transition period.

The management of the Institute sought to gradually implement the employee's initiatives by addressing the practical operation of the workplace. There were changes in cooperation with the Department of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, dedicating several lecture cycles to the EI SAS staff and simplifying the awarding of scientific degrees (*Ibid.*, p. 68).

In the introductory part of the discussion on the survey, M. Leščák noted that the post-revolutionary period brought a whole range of new issues related to the evaluation and planning of scientific work, mainly with regard to the publishing of scientific studies. In this context, the Institute adopted a binding schedule for the submission of manuscripts and agreed cooperation in the field of publishing with the domestic publishing houses *Práca*, *Veda*, and *Tatran* (*Ibid.*). Simultaneously, the Institute wished to maintain the option of publishing works with a smaller circulation on its own.

By evaluating the survey, M. Leščák, as an important visionary personality of the Generation of Builders, managed to identify right at the beginning of the Transformation period the changed external circumstances that influenced the operation of the Institute, as well as the background of the discipline's social impact under the new liberalised conditions in the following decades: 'Our ideals of carrying out some kind of "pure" science will be subjected to tests of social benefits, this time also stimulated by financial appreciation. (...) The focus of our worries and problems has shifted, and empty theorising has been replaced by a pragmatic approach, in particular, action' (*Ibid.*). In this context, he also noted that, for the shaping of a scientific programme, it would also be important to ask explicitly pragmatic questions that reflect, among other things, 'the position of humanities in society, their links to practical social problems, the economic and technical background, as well as the ways of organising and financing science as such' (*Ibid.*).

With hindsight, Leščák evaluated the transformation years 1988–92 at the Institute as difficult, making a general remark that 'the Institute worked even under this situation, that research was conducted, a good professional journal was published, important issues were investigated, and that (...) the Institute presented itself as a consolidated working unit that defended its status and produced certain positive professional outputs' (2006, p. 87).

### The Scientific and Research Programme during the First Transformation Decade

The institution responded to the post-socialist transition without interrupting its internal continuity and integrity and by reforming its conceptual visions and plans. Thanks to breaking information and communication barriers, the ethnographic discipline within the Ethnographic Institute SAS opened to international and interdisciplinary stimuli in humanities and social sciences, thus setting itself on the path of transformation into modern ethnology.

In the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, ethnography was a discipline with its key focus on a narrowly specified subject of interest (*folk and traditional culture*), defined and explored predominantly on the basis of a historical approach combined with traditional ethnographic methodologies (questionnaire surveys and in-depth interviews), with a systematic predominance of the ethno-cartographic and encyclopaedic approach within the Ethnographic Institute SAS. During the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, these two approaches represented progressive methods of contemporary socialist ethnography. The transformation process in the 1990s gave rise to a new research line at the Institute, which began calibrating the previous traditional ethnographic approaches, methods, and themes according to the newest trends of contemporary post-modern and post-socialist European ethnology.

From the thematic perspective, P. Salner characterises the process of paradigm change during the first transition decade as follows: 'An era of seeking topics emerged—for me, conceptually, this led to: (1) filling 'gaps' in our own topics, or to working on topics that could not be investigated previously; (2) opening new topics' (2021a). Likewise, M. Vrzgulová (Ed. 2020) and R. Stoličná (2021) perceive the post-November period as a period of 'opening new, previously tabooed research issues'.

Along with the opening of new topics and catching up on thematic debts from the previous period, it should be emphasised that the first transition decade in the Institute did not represent any methodological or thematic rupture, because in this period, works on a large encyclopaedic synthesis successfully continued under the leadership of the Generation of Builders (*Encyclopaedia*, Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995). At the same time, as a continuation of the *Atlas* project (*EAS*, Filová and Kovačevićová, Eds. 1990), the ethno-cartographic method was applied to the international research on Slovaks living abroad, based on which new atlas works were produced during both transition decades (Benža, Ed. 1998, 2002, 2005a, b, 2006, 2015). At the beginning of the 1990s, the 'pre-November' conceptual

efforts continued, using computing technology and a complex of electronic information sources along with scientific collection archives.

When transforming its scientific and research programme in the 1990s, the institution built on the theoretical discussions and inspirations that several scientific personalities brought to their works in a discursive manner as early as the 1960s and, in particular, in the 1980s along with the officially declared attachment to Marxist ethnography or historical materialism.

The concept of the first Transformation decade is characterised by continuing the first key topic of the long-term research plan of the previous period—study of traditional folk culture phenomena, which began to subside only during the second transition decade. In this period, another key research topic emerged as an important counterpart, called by the previous authors of the Institute's scientific concepts (J. Mjartan, B. Filová or A. Pranda) a study of changes and contemporary forms of folk culture, exploration of new life phenomena, or also an analysis of the process of changes, innovation, modernisation, and shaping of the special features of the current way of life and culture (Filová 1960, p. 183; 1979, p. 474; Pranda 1970; 1979, p. 219; 1984a, b, p. 408; Kiliánová 2016d, p. 127).

M. Leščák dealt with the definition of the content of the discipline called *ethnography* even earlier, mapping the current processes of the penetration of new theoretical and research impulses (such as the discussion on the ethnic categories and forms of cultural and social communication during the 1990s) (1991a, p. 2). He saw the transformation perspective of ethnography in its direction towards ethnology, in the gradual shift from the interpretation and analysis of the system of traditional culture of a specific nation to the explanation of its place in the context of modern European culture and, subsequently, towards a comprehensive understanding of man in relation to his social and cultural activities (*Ibid.*, p. 4).

The scientific and research programme of the Ethnographic Institute was based on a theoretical analysis of the previous

evolution of ethnography and the way this scientific discipline developed at the Institute. The new programme was prepared in April 1990 and contained the following eight thematic areas:

(1) The folk culture of Slovakia in the Central European context (comparative study of the Carpathian-Balkan, Pannonian region, Slavic studies, and relations between Czech and Slovak cultures);

(2) Interaction of man and nature—the contribution of ethnography to the study of the environment (interdisciplinary approach);

(3) The ethnography of Central European cities (parallel research of Bratislava, Vienna, Budapest, Zurich, Brno, and Prague);

(4) Research of ethnic communities in Slovakia (Hungarians, Ruthenians, Roma, Germans, Jews in Slovakia) and Slovaks abroad;

(5) Ethical and aesthetic norms of the Slovak ethnic group (the relationship between folk and Christian morale, the aesthetics of folklore, customary law, ethical standards in ritual culture);

(6) Ethnographic study of selected social groups and informal associations (cooperation with sociology);

(7) The way of life of contemporary family (continuity and discontinuity of evolution, the role of tradition, adaptation factors of the way of life of families in urban environments, contemporary rural family);

(8) Building of a scientific information centre for ethnography and folklore studies with the aim to make scientific documentation and archives available to experts and the public (system with nationwide coverage with links to the Czech lands) (Leščák 1991c, pp. 75–6).

This programme took a specific form by means of six internal SAS research grant proposals, which were reviewed publicly within the Institute and were also discussed by the Scientific Board. What is apparent is the continuation of the core research topics of the pre-revolution period (ethnographic research of ethnic communities, research of folklore in Europe's ethno-identification processes).

Equally strong, in the form of separate areas, are the innovative impulses that penetrated into the discipline and established themselves in the previous decade, such as the urban ethnography, environmental ethnography, or the study of social groups, as well as an integrated information system of ethnography (*Ibid.*, 76).

The new topics with respect to which the discipline was to repay its imaginary debt to society included research of minorities (in particular Jews, Roma, and Germans in the 1990s)—previously impossible to search for ideological reasons—, as well as research of cultural phenomena related to ethical and aesthetic norms, faith, and religion. The post-socialist research programme was expected to focus more on research on man and the phenomena taking place in modern contemporary society.

The topics of this programme remained key throughout the first transition period. After M. Leščák left the position of the Director, no new concept was formulated during that decade. G. Kiliánová, who was the Scientific Secretary of the Institute in 1993–7, remembered the discussions on the Institute's orientation with D. Ratica, who became the Director of the Institute in 1992. In a situation where part of the scientific team freely developed many new research areas, and another part perceived this orientation as a certain manifestation of the lack of a conceptual approach, '[D. Ratica] held the view that scientific freedom cannot be restricted in any manner. He did not consider it necessary to give direction on who would submit what kind of project. I would say, he respected the "bottom-up" creation of the further course of the scientific development within the Institute' (in: Popelková 2022).

From the position of a member (1993) and later Chairwoman of the Scientific Board of the Institute, R. Stoličná (2021)—as a representative of a more conservative core and of the generation raised on visioning and planning—evaluated the period of the 'planned lack of conceptuality' under the managing mandate of D. Ratica with some criticism. In the pre-revolutionary period, the Institute had a living tradition of discussion

expert seminars and annual international conferences, which used to be a reflection and, to a certain degree, mirror of the discipline on an international scale. She noted in this context: 'On the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute [1996], I proposed the Director [D. Ratica] to organise an international conference; however, he disagreed; neither a conference nor a commemoration of the anniversary took place. I confess I didn't understand this position and I was quite upset'.

As the current Director of the Institute, T. Zachar Podolinská (2023) adds the following: 'I think each Director gives the Institute something from his or her personal mindset. Each of us has a specific style of management which, however, largely depends on the external rules and conditions of the game, as well as the current team players. Based on my personal observations, I think Dušan Ratica respected every scientist within the Institute as a human and as a personality. To a certain extent and in certain situations, he gave me the impression of a socially shy person, which must have been extremely difficult to reconcile with the position of Director, where a person is socially exposed on a permanent basis. In terms of management, I completely understand the need for freedom as well as time dedicated to searching and experimenting—one part of the team was oriented precisely in this way and was certainly happy with this management style. The other part of the team, raised by the Generation of Builders, managed itself on its own during Ratica's era. I personally assume that every team is more effective and more coherent when it finds an optimal balance between the individual freedom of choice and the ability to set up teams of researchers, while fulfilling a common vision and concept. As a young researcher at that time, I would have welcomed, for example, being led by a tutor who would have conducted motivation discussions with me about my vision of working in the Institute, or who would have explained to me what the direction of the Institute was and what my path could be in it. The concept of "non-management from the top" is excellent for a short-term launch of something new; however, it is not sustainable in the

long term. In her forthcoming term of office (2000–12), the new Director G. Kiliánová faced a difficult task of consolidating the team'.

Not all topics from the scientific programme set up in 1990 evolved equally during the first transition decade: the research on family stagnated, and the research on man and the natural environment was driven to the background in the mid-1990s. On the other hand, urban studies, as well as the research of folk culture as part of the cultural heritage remained in the centre of attention for entire decades.

Some staff members were aware that the headcount reduction potentially resulted in the disappearance of important topics when it comes to the scientific focus. This was the reason why, for instance, G. Kiliánová decided to submit a project application at that time, covering the functions and manifestations of ethnic awareness (1995–8): '...after the leaving of Michal Kaľavský, who had been admitted to the Institute by M. Leščák in 1989 to study ethnic issues, and the break-up of his research team as a result of the dismissal of employees, this topic would have completely fallen out of our programme' (in: Popelková 2022).

After 1989, the researchers were given the opportunity to freely study the works of Western ethnological and anthropological literature and to follow current methodological discussions and the development of humanities and social disciplines in the post-modern era. Scientists of several generations were able not only to observe these discussions through foreign literature, but also become directly involved in them by means of foreign conferences and joint international projects. Thus, they could directly perceive the general shift in the approach to the subject itself, as well as in the methods of ethnographic/ethnological research, and bring these inputs to the Institute.

Hence, the transformation of the Ethnographic Institute in the 1990s primarily meant free and enthusiastic discussions on the new direction of the discipline, which continued on the pages of the *Slovenský národopis* journal even after 1991

(Slavkovský 1996 vs. Podoba 1996a, b; Benža 1998 vs Kiliánová 1999, Podoba 1999). This period in the Institute is characterised by the search for thematic and methodological inspirations in international science, a radical retreat from Marxist ethnography, and a gradual retreat from functional-structural orientation and historical-genetical approach, along with the continuation of collective research and synthetic works with an encyclopaedic and ethno-cartographical focus. The transformation of the thematic and methodological profiling took place under the changed conditions of science and research financing and evaluation, which also affected the structure of basic research and related publication outputs.

### Journals' Policy in the Transformation Period

In order to increase the international visibility of the Institute's main publication platform—the *Slovenský národopis* (*SN*) journal—one study of each issue was published in English during the first transition decade (sporadically also in German, e.g., Krekovičová 1995; Leščák 1997; Podoba 1998). The Institute decided to internationalise the results of the scientific research conducted primarily by its own employees (Apáthyová-Rusnáková 1991 [1977]; Krekovičová 1991, 1995; Leščák 1991d, 1993, 1997; Urbancová 1992; Kiliánová and Krekovičová 1993; Danglová 1994; Hlôšková 1994; Chorváthová 1995; Luther 1996; Kiliánová 1996a; Slavkovský 1997; Podoba 1998; Profantová 1999). Czech colleagues (Kandert 1992; Sirovátka 1993; Kadlecová 1993) were also invited to publish their works in the 'show-case' of the discipline.

In the 1990s, with the intention to follow international trends and horizons, the journal included discussions with ethnologists from partner organisations from neighbouring countries—André Ernest Gellner (*SN* 1992(3)), Vilmos Voigt (*SN* 1992(4)), Klaus Beitzl (*SN* 1993(2)), Jerzy Bartmiński (*SN* 1993(3)), Anna Divičanová (*SN* 1994(4)), Jürgen Dittmar (*SN* 1995(1)), Michael Mitterauer (*SN* 1995(2)). After M. Leščák (*SN* 1997(3)) was replaced by D. Ratica as

Editor-in-Chief of the *SN* journal, this practice was significantly reduced, preferring the experimental publishing of translations of previously published important anthropological texts from English to Slovak (see, for instance, Sperber 1998).

In 1994, the Institute set up an edition of non-periodical publications called *Etnologické štúdie* [Ethnological Studies].

In the transformation period (1990s and 2000s), the Institute continued publishing *Národopisné informácie* (*NI*) as an information bulletin of the Ethnographic Institute SAS and of the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia at SAS*. In 1989, the Slovak National Museum in Martin joined the shared publishing of *NI*. P. Salner became the editor in charge in 1991 (*NI* (1-2), J. Podoba in 1992(1), and P. Salner again in 1992(2). The editor in charge of the last issue 1993(1-2) was Z. Beňušková.

In 1994, *Národopisné informácie* transformed into a new periodical journal, which was published by the Institute of Ethnology SAS in 1994–2008. In the spirit of the Institute's name, a new name was chosen for the new journal—*Etnologické rozpravy* (*ER*) [Ethnological Debates]. The aim of the journal was to publish articles by Slovak ethnologists, experts in folklore studies and museologists, bring and raise discussions on current topics, and to become a discussion and information platform of (primarily) Slovak ethnology. For the entire time, the editorial team of the journal was based at the Institute of Ethnology SAS which, in addition to technical printing support, ensured the distribution of the copies to all members of the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia*, libraries, as well as to ethnological organisations in Slovakia and in neighbouring countries. The enveloping, updating of the mailing list, printing, and sticking of addresses on envelopes are therefore part of the memoirs of several scientists who were entrusted with this work by the Institute's management during their initial years.

Between 1994–7, the Director of the Institute, D. Ratica, was the editor in charge (with Z. Beňušková being the executive editor); in 1998–2001, he was replaced by P. Salner. In 2002–3, Z. Beňušková became the editor in charge (previously working as



executive editor). In 2004–6, the post of the editor in charge was assumed by K. Popelková (then Deputy Director and Scientific Secretary of the Institute). J. Zajonc was the executive editor at that time. In 2007–8, the editorial posts were taken up by the recently admitted staff members, T. Bužeková (editor in charge) and M. Ferencová (executive editor).

### Transformation of Fundraising—Project and Publication Activities

The system of so-called ‘internal grants’, which was introduced by the Ethnographic Institute at the beginning of the 1990s, can be considered not only an innovation in the organisation of scientific research, but also an expression of scientific enthusiasm. This system allowed researchers to pursue their scientific tasks without obtaining external payroll or overhead funding, but rather for a monthly salary. This measure liberalised basic research within the organisation and enabled teams or individual researchers to concentrate their scientific focus on a freely chosen scientific issue, independent from external grant schemes. On the other hand, especially in the case of more ambitious publication or research plans, this placed increased demands on authors when it came to the raising of additional funds.

With regard to the obtaining of external funds in the changed science support system, the Institute adapted itself without major problems to the transformed system of fundraising for basic research via competitions in the form of national grants. As noted by G. Kiliánová: ‘The raising of funds via competition was not unknown to the Institute after 1989. I remember Science Grant Agency (GAV) projects implemented since 1991. I recall that all of the first projects at the end of 1990, prepared under the leadership of the then Director M. Leščák, received funding for the years 1991–3. GAV and [later] VEGA projects continued to be successfully implemented’ (in: Popelková 2021b).

In summary, 29 domestic projects were implemented by the Institute during the first transition decade, most of them being three-year projects carried out by four to five

researchers (Benža 2003, p. 73). The project thematic profiling suggests the continuation of previously started project tasks—*Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska* [Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia], the project was led by J. Botík in 1986–8 and by P. Slavkovský 1989–95); as well as traditional topics focused on the research of folklore and cultural traditions—three consecutive projects carried out by E. Krekovičová in 1991–2000; M. Leščák, 1994–5; traditional folk culture in the inter-ethnic context—R. Stoličná, 1994–6; folk decorative expressions—O. Danglová, 1995–6; oral folk literature—Z. Profantová, two consecutive projects, 1997–2002; traditional culture of Slovak minorities in Central and Southern Europe—M. Benža, 1997–9 and 2000–2); and the ethnology of cities—P. Salner, four continuing projects in 1991–2002, as well as M. Vrzgulová and K. Popelková, 1999–2001.

Human research and the ethnological mapping of changes in a transforming society were addressed by projects focusing on: the research of values and adaptations of value systems (D. Ratica and later J. Podoba, two continuing projects 1991–8); study of the functions and expressions of ethnic awareness (G. Kiliánová, 1995–8); inter-generational transfer of values and cultural norms (H. Hlôšková, 1998–2000); socio-cultural trends of the Slovak countryside (O. Danglová, 2000–2), and modernisation processes in Slovakia (G. Kiliánová, 2000–2).

During the observed decade, one project dealt with the environmental line outlined in the scientific concept (J. Podoba, intra-institutional project 1991–3 and publications Podoba 1992; Huba and Podoba, Eds. 1998) (for a whole list of projects, see Annex 1 in: Benža 2003, pp. 76–8; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 174–7).

As the project profiling suggests, the new scientific programme was implemented in the Institute’s project and publication practice in a differentiated way. In terms of the project number, traditional topics oriented on the research of traditional folk culture prevailed in the long term (e.g., Stoličná 1991; Paličková–Pátková 1992; Pranda and Prandová 1994; Beňušková et al. 1998; Luther, Ed. 1998).

In this context, the first transition decade can also be called an *ad fontes* decade, since it was extremely rich in publications based on older ethnographic research documented in the archives. The key focus was on folklore themes (e.g., Krekovičová 1992), with emphasis placed on 'spiritual culture' which could not be explored more systematically in the previous period—*Pramene k tradičnej duchovnej kultúre Slovenska. Obrady, zvyky a povery – 1939* [Sources of Traditional Spiritual Culture of Slovakia. Rituals, Customs, and Superstitions – 1939] (Feglová and Leščák, Eds. 1995) and *Slovenské svadby. Z dotazníkovej akcie Matice slovenskej 1942* [Slovak Weddings. From a Questionnaire Survey of Matica slovenská 1942] (Feglová and Leščák, Eds. 1996). The latter two were published thanks to the co-financing by the *Prebudená pieseň* foundation.

The 1990s can be considered a 'golden period of folklore studies' within the Institute, when a strong generational female group was formed around M. Leščák (Eva Krekovičová, Gabriela Kiliánová, Hana Hlôšková, Z. Profantová, and Zora Vanovičová). The works in this area started to be published in English (Kiliánová and Krekovičová, Eds. 1992, 1994; Profantová 1997), while further refining the theoretical concepts and terms (e.g., Hlôšková and Krekovičová, Eds. 1991) and reflecting on the history of folklore studies (Leščák, Ed. 1996).

The interesting thing about the Transformation period is undoubtedly the fact that some important syntheses were published by emeritus female researchers of the Institute—representatives of the oldest line of the Generation of Builders (V. Gašparíková, B. Filová, S. Burlasová). The publications written by Women-Builders during the Transformation period represent syntheses of fundamental importance, produced by means of systematic processing of vast corpuses of source materials. Let us mention, for instance, *Vojenské a regrútske piesne* [Soldiers' and Recruits' Songs] (Burlasová 1991), *Katalóg slovenských naratívnych piesní, zv. 1–3* [Catalogue of Slovak Narrative Songs, Vol. 1–3] (Burlasová 1998), *Slovenské ľudové balady* [Slovak Folk Ballads] (Burlasová 2002), or the

monumental publication series *Katalóg slovenskej ľudovej prózy, 1. a 2.* [Catalogue of Slovak Folk Prose, Vol. 1 and 2] (Gašparíková 1991, 1992) and *Slovenské ľudové rozprávky, zv. I* [Slovak Folk Fairy Tales, Vol. I] (Filová and Gašparíková, Eds. 1993), *zv. II* [Vol. II] (Filová and Gašparíková, Eds. 2001), *zv. III* [Vol. III] (Filová and Gašparíková, Eds. 2004).

In most cases, these works were not covered by grants, and their publishing required massive efforts and fundraising; as an example, to publish the fairy tales corpus, it was necessary to obtain funding through the *Pro Slovakia* State Fund; some other publications were published with the financial contribution of the partner Ethnological Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

M. Leščák commented on the publishing of the fairy tales corpus as follows: 'In this regard, I welcomed with great relief the three volumes of the *Slovak Folk Fairy Tales*, which, after many years, filled an important gap in the study of folk prose; especially Viera Gašparíková, who deserves absolute appreciation for her efforts' (2006, p. 89).

In addition to the 'folklorist core group' of the Transformation Generation, another strong group was formed within the Institute in the 1990s, which focused on urban studies (P. Salner, D. Luther, V. Feglová, L. Faltánová, Z. Beňušková, later also M. Vrzgulová, K. Popelková). They followed up mainly on the research of the Slovak capital city of Bratislava, reconstructing the social life of the city during the period of the previous taboo era of the bourgeois Czechoslovak Republic of the years 1918–48 (Salner et al. 1991; Salner 1998), and also began exploring other cities, such as Trenčín (Vrzgulová 1997).

They thus continued the topic which had established itself in the previous two decades, and the study of which was characterised by ethnography combined with a historical approach (for more details, see Luther 1996; Popelková and Salner 2002). Thanks to the application of social science concepts, the thematic coverage deepened (e.g., research on the differentiation of urban society, study of social groups, middle classes, social communication, and

impacts of macro-social processes on the daily life in a city (Salner and Beňušková, Eds. 1999), and the focus extended to the Central European region and its metropolitan areas (Salner and Luther, Eds. 1992; Beňušková and Salner, Eds. 1995).

As a debt from the previous period, the research on ethnic minorities began receiving major importance. The key works in this area centred on the research of Jews—*Židovská identita včera, dnes a zajtra* [The Jewish Identity Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow] (Salner, Ed. 1995), *Židia v Bratislave* [The Jews in Bratislava] (Salner, Ed. 1997) and Roma—*Neznámi Rómovia* [Unknown Roma] (Mann, Ed. 1992).

Romani studies in the 1990s developed mainly thanks to A. Mann, who initially centred his research on emigration and the tramp subculture. In connection with Romani research, we should mention E. Horváthová, who left the Institute in 1975, as well Jelena Marušiaková, who left the Institute in 1985. Horváthová continued her research at the Department of Ethnography at the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava. Her PhD student, J. Marušiaková (E. Marushiakova), continued her research on Roma in the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences; later on, she worked at many prestigious European and US universities or scientific centres, being currently one of the leading Romani experts on a global scale.

The leaving of the two experts resulted in a thematic hiatus, which the Institute addressed, yet still under the leadership of B. Filová, by assigning the topic to A. Mann, who remained faithful to this study field until his retirement in 2017.

During the 1990s, intensive research of religion and confessional groups (Z. Beňušková, D. Ratica) as well as of the Holocaust (P. Salner, M. Vrzgulová) was also launched.

Likewise, one can observe the comprehensive development of theoretical reflections on some key ethnological terms, such as *ethnic awareness* (e.g., Kaľavský 1991) and *ethnicity* (e.g., Botík 1991), which also provoked an exchange of opinions between generations in the *Slovenský národopis* journal (Benža 1998 vs Kiliánová 1999; Podoba 1999).

The ‘research of the present’, i.e., exploration of the on-going transition processes, including modernisation, changes in the value systems, and socio-economic transformation (O. Danglová, D. Ratica, J. Podoba, M. Vrzgulová, L. Falt’ánová) came to the fore as an assertive and equivalent counterpart of the hitherto core topic of ‘traditional culture’.

This period is also characterised by the publishing of interdisciplinary works on the edge of ethnology, sociology, and political science, which identified the patterns of voter behaviour in different Slovak regions (Krivý, Feglová, and Balko 1996).

O. Danglová (2021) reflects on this research trend during the Transformation period as follows: ‘In accordance with this line of research interest, the Institute of Ethnology reflected on the shift from ethnography towards social anthropology. New questions emerged, which sought answers to fundamental social problems that came to the fore in connection with the transformation processes after 1989. These questions were particularly urgent during the Mečiar period’.

The Institute joined this research trend through several consecutive projects supported by the GAV; after its dissolution in 1994, the projects were temporarily carried out without funding and later received financial support from the VEGA. Between 1991 and 1993, it was the project: *Continuity and a Conflict of Values of Daily Culture*, led by D. Ratica; in 1994–8, the project: *Processes of Value Systems Adaptation to Social Changes*, led by D. Ratica and later by J. Podoba. Furthermore, there were projects managed by O. Danglová: *Socio-Cultural Trends in the Slovak Countryside (Implementation of Development Programmes at the Regional Level)*, 2000–2, and by G. Kiliánová and O. Danglová: *Global Processes and Daily Culture in Slovakia. The Ethnological Perspective*, 2003–5 (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, 175–8). This project series resulted in peer-reviewed volumes (Ratica, Ed. 1991, 1992).

The first publication of the Institute, which was published in a regular ‘Western’ academic publishing house (Peter Lang) in the 1990s, was the book by Eva Krekovičová *Zwischen*

*Toleranz und Barrieren: das Bild der Zigeuner un Juden in der Slowakischen Folklore* (1998). This publication brought a large number of citations and was also published in Slovak in 1999 (1999).

In the mid-1990s, *Bibliografia slovenskej etnografie a folkloristiky za roky 1986–1990* [Bibliography of Slovak Ethnography and Folklore Studies 1986–1990] (Kubová 1994) was released. With the retirement of the professional librarian Milada Kubová (1985), the Institute lost an expert who systematically produced bibliographies of the discipline and of the *Slovenský národopis* journal since the 1960s (for memories about her work in the Institute, see Kubová 2006).

The first transition decade at the Institute is also characterised by attempts to follow up on the systemic creation of the discipline's bibliography using computer technology. In 1997, the plan to set up an original specialised database for recording bibliographical data was adopted. It was initially dealt with by a team composed of Z. Beňušková, I. Kostovská, and J. Zajonc; later, it remained the task of only the latter two. Based on their requirements, which resulted from the general idea of building the Institute's electronic information system, external programmers created a system for the collection and processing of bibliographical data for the sixth volume of the bibliography (1991–5), which was to be published in printed form.

The setting up of the bibliography reflected on the changes in the direction and self-reflection of the discipline in the 1990s: based on the new approach, its object was defined, and the thematic hierarchical system of records sorting was replaced by an arrangement by authors in alphabetical order. Searches by topics and locations were to be provided by extensive registries. The changes also affected the format of each bibliographical record in order to harmonise it with the current international bibliographical standards (Zajonc 2006b, p. 38).

Even though the works on the database and bibliography had begun already in 1997 and continued for almost another ten years,

the progress of works was not continuous and eventually failed to be finalised. The reason—apart from the fact that bibliographical activity under the existing grant schemes could only be carried out at the Institute along with other projects—was in particular the lack of personnel capacity. The bibliography was compiled by a tandem of a scientist and a documentarist along with fulfilling other scientific, professional, and publishing tasks. Another problem was the incompleteness of personal bibliographies delivered by the Institute's staff, which had to be searched and verified at length. Last but not least, the very practice of the evolution of the discipline showed that such a task in the situation of improved availability of sources in electronic form was not of primary importance.

However, the efforts dedicated to the creation and testing of this database were not completely wasted. Part of the processed records was later used in the creation and book publishing of a comprehensive bibliography of the *Slovenský národopis* journal covering over fifty years of its existence (1953–2002) (Zajonc, Mészárosová, and Kostovská 2013).

### **New Horizons: International Cooperation, Project Writing**

The Institute had well-developed international cooperation also in the previous period and was part of European science; however, for understandable reasons, such cooperation concentrated solely on the countries of the so-called Eastern bloc (Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe).

R. Stoličná, the representative of the younger Generation of Builders, recalls the establishing of her international contacts with socialist partner institutions, which later often acted as bridges to Western colleagues and theoretical approaches: 'In the same year [1979], I left for a one-month study visit to Poland, where several scientists studied the culinary culture. I visited the institutes and university departments in Warsaw, Cracow, and Wrocław. It was a time when they had other duties than to take care of a visitor from Slovakia. Nevertheless, they took care of

me the best they could and, most importantly, they provided me with a lot of special copies of articles and literature on food. It was at that time that I came across the Polish translation of the famous essay by Claude Lévi-Strauss: *Culinary Triangle*. Only then I began to better understand what Dr. Kovačevićová was telling me. She also drew my attention to the study by Ulrich Tolksdorf in the *Ethnologia Europaea* journal on the construction of cultural models through the example of food' (2021). Or: 'In 1985, I attended for the first time a large international conference in Hungary at the invitation of Eszter Kisbán. It was for the first time that I presented my paper in a foreign language, which was accompanied by stage fright and stress. Dr. Markuš [former employee of the Institute], helped me a lot; he took me in and introduced me to his colleagues from all over the world. At the same time, I joined the SIEF International Committee for Ethnological Food Research, which organised conferences on a given topic every other year, always in a different country. (...) I also realised that German was already *passé* in the international context and that I needed to go back to English, which I fortunately had a good foundation of from secondary school. (...) In 1987, I travelled to the West for the first time, there was a conference in Norway. However, before my departure, I was required to be interviewed at "Februárka"—a police station where I was told that if someone asked me if there were airports or barracks in Czechoslovakia, I was not supposed to disclose anything and that I should report to our embassy after arriving at Oslo. It was an absurd situation, indeed, especially because I was to attend a conference on food. Norway enchanted me: with its cleanliness, natural beauties, and pleasant hosts. The only thing that disappointed me were the sweet sausage and boiled lamb heads with eyes, served at the reception' (*Ibid.*).

The Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia and the fall of the Iron Curtain in Europe resulted almost immediately in increased academic mobility, which gradually translated into international cooperation projects. In the framework of bilateral project cooperation, the Institute continued its collaboration with

Bulgarian and Serbian ethnographic academic institutions also in the post-revolutionary period (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 190–2).

One of the significant changes brought by the first years of the Transformation period was the launch of cooperation with scientists from Western European countries. Less than a half year before the Velvet Revolution, in June 1989, P. Salner managed to obtain a travel permit for Austria. He planned to have lectures on urban ethnology in Slovakia at the invitation of the Vienna Ethnographic Museum from 1988. In order to obtain a state permit to travel to a capitalist foreign country, it was necessary not only to repeatedly file requests, but also to attend a 'not very pleasant interview' with the secret police, accompanied by Salner's 'polite rejection' of the offer for collaboration (in: Vrzgulová, Ed. 2020, p. 84). When P. Salner was finally allowed to travel to Austria, he gained an interesting pedagogical experience and established open collegial relations with Austrian ethnologists. A couple of months after the fall of the Iron Curtain, this gave rise to direct friendly contacts: 'My week-long stay at the museum (including a one-day trip to the university in Innsbruck, was pleasant and interesting, as well as instructive in many ways. In the evening before my return, a colleague of mine from the museum, a Czech woman that had got married in Austria, took me to the lodging house. When we were saying good-bye, I literally cried on her shoulders, saying that it was hopeless, because the situation in our country would never change (...) I have one more special memory from my stay in Vienna. I no longer know how and why, but I invited my Austrian colleagues to a traditional ball organised by our Institute. They responded politely, but I felt they thought I was crazy (and my colleagues in the Institute told this to me straight away). Nevertheless, the revolution came in November, and they came in March...' (*Ibid.*, pp. 84–5).

The recollections of R. Stoličná contain the following reflection on the opening of scientific horizons towards the 'West': 'Shortly after the Velvet Revolution, the Institute was visited by our colleagues from Austria, who invited all of us to



a visit. They showed us the Ethnographic Museum in Vienna and hosted us. It was a beautiful gesture from them by which they welcomed us in the new Europe' (2021). The Austrian colleagues repaid that visit in February 1990, when a group of three members led by Klaus Beitzl attended the carnival event of the Institute—the masquerade ball (Beitzl 2020, p. 38). According to G. Kiliánová's reflections, 'the visit of our Austrian colleagues was certainly influenced by the fact that Peter Salner had personally invited them to our country back in the spring of 1989. What also played a role was the fact that, after the fall of the Iron Curtain, Klaus Beitzl considered the establishment of contacts with a close partner institute as his obligation (...)' (in: Popelková 2022).

Likewise, G. Kiliánová remembers that, at the beginning of the 1990s, 'the Swiss cultural anthropologists, Milan Stanek and his wife, who worked at the Department of Ethnology of the University in Zurich, came to visit the Institute. They were interested in the investigated issues, in particular, urban ethnography, research on values, and some others, and offered our German-speaking colleagues from the Institute a place for lecturing. The following persons came into consideration: Peter Salner, Juraj Podoba, Dušan Ratica, Ľuba Chorváthová, and me. They really liked Ratica, who, during the meeting, spoke about his approach to studying values. However, at that time, Dušan was not willing to leave the Institute and did not prepare a lecturing concept. Of the other nominated persons, the Stanek selected Peter Salner and Juraj Podoba, who, one after the other, attended a foreign semestral lecturing stay in Zurich' (in: *Ibid.*).

The established contacts were transformed into cooperation projects. In 1994, the first three-year Slovak-Austrian bilateral project with the Austrian Ethnographic Museum in Vienna was launched. G. Kiliánová (Scientific Secretary in 1993–7 and Deputy Director of the Institute in 1998–2000), who was its coordinator on the Slovak side, remembers in 2021 the circumstances that preceded this cooperation: 'I think it was in the spring of 1991,

when we met in Vienna in the building of Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde and also in the headquarters of the Institut für Gegenwartsvolkskunde der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, our direct academic partner institute (this institute of the Austrian Academy of Sciences was dissolved in 1992). I remember that the Slovak side was represented at the meeting by Milan Leščák, the Institute's Director, Juraj Podoba, Scientific Secretary, and me. The Austrian side was represented by Klaus Beitzl, Director of the Museum and of the academic institute, Eva Kausel, and Herbert Nikitsch (staff). We prepared a research project on the daily culture of the Slovak-Austrian bordering region and on Slovak-Austrian relations at the border. I can't remember if this project was initiated by our side or the Austrian side. The text of the concrete project was taken care of by Herbert Nikitsch, and I was the contact person on behalf of the Slovak side. Our Austrian colleagues submitted the project to their Culture Ministry, I think. However, the project was not approved by the evaluation committee. As our Austrian colleagues found out (probably through unofficial contacts), the project proposal was evaluated, among other things, by Károly Gaál, emeritus professor at the Department of Ethnography of Vienna University and an emigrant from Hungary. K. Gaál rejected the project on the grounds that the Slovak side was led by a former member of the Communist Party, Milan Leščák. There may also have been other reservations, I don't remember. And I don't even know whether these grounds were included in the official note of rejection; I assume not' (in: Popelková 2021b).

Nevertheless, both sides began carrying out research thanks to the financial contributions from both institutions. These efforts ultimately resulted in the project *Austria–Slovakia Actions: Daily Culture at the Border* (1994–7; for more details, see Beitzl 2020, pp. 45–8; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, p. 190). G. Kiliánová remembers that it was the first project she had written with a foreign partner in a foreign language for an international agency (in: *Ibid.*).

Foreign language skills very soon appeared to be a prerequisite for foreign mobility, the establishment of contacts, and active participation in scientific events. In her recollections, H. Hlôšková reflects on the commitment with which several staff members of the Institute began learning English: 'Soon after the upheaval, teachers of English, in particular volunteers from the USA and England, offered their help to SAS scientists, providing a group, as well as individual conversation courses directly at the workplace. We took it seriously. With some of my colleagues—Zuzana Profantová, Oľga Danglová, and others—, we sought to improve our skills as fast as possible and attended an English language course several times a week' (in: Popelková 2022). Z. Beňušková mentions that she and some colleagues of hers who spoke German (P. Salner, Helena Bakaljarová) paid jointly for private lessons with a German lecturer to improve their language skills (in: *Ibid.*).

In the 1990s, the Institute's staff also worked as individual researchers under other external foreign projects. After establishing contacts with coordinators, they operatively adapted to new topics, theoretical concepts, and research methods, as well as the set project standards and language requirements, and became members of international teams for one or two years. In this way, they were involved in sixteen foreign projects managed by universities (Vienna, Florence, Oldenburg, Cambridge, Manchester, Yale), academic institutions, non-governmental foundations, as well as UNESCO (for a whole list of projects, see Annex 2 in: Benža 2003, pp. 79–80; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 190–2).

The Institute thus achieved foreign publication outputs (e.g., Kiliánová 1995a, b, 1996b; Krekovičová 1996; Salner 1999), participation in international scientific events, as well as direct communication with current scientific trends. Its staff members began being involved in the study of the social history of poverty (V. Feglová), townspeople (P. Salner), stereotypes (E. Krekovičová), the Jewish Holocaust (P. Salner, M. Vrzgulová), social and collective memory in the European or Central

European context (G. Kiliánová, E. Krekovičová, R. Stoličná, Z. Vanovičová), and sought to apply the new concepts to Slovak materials.

In 1995, P. Salner and M. Vrzgulová joined the non-governmental project *Oral History: Fates of Those Who Survived*, which formed part of the international project *Fortunoff Video Archive* at Yale University in the USA (Salner 2006, p. 107). This project was brought to Slovakia by sociologists Zora and Martin Bútorá after their return from a fellowship at that university and was implemented through the Milan Šimečka Foundation in 1995–7. These two Slovak ethnologists learned to apply the *oral history* method, and the Holocaust as interpreted by the people who survived it also had a premier (Vrzgulová, Ed. 2020, pp. 90–4, 172–3). The outcome of this project was the book *Prežili holokaust* [Those Who Survived the Holocaust] (Salner 1997). The cooperation with the NGO sector and, in particular, the above-mentioned project brought both researchers to implement the oral history method in their scientific work over the next period and, at the same time, both of them focused primarily on the Holocaust and on the exploration of the Jewish community in Slovakia within the Holocaust Documentation Centre and the Institute during the next two decades.

With hindsight, G. Kiliánová notes the following about the Institute's activities during the first transition decade: 'Based on their foreign contacts, our staff had already received invitations to participate in international projects in the 1990s. Most of the time, it was various projects of foreign institutions and agencies that needed partners in Slovakia. The Institute received almost no finance from these projects. The positive thing was that our employees collected materials for the project money or published their works abroad, etc. Certainly, this was good and brought new potential contacts. As a good example, see the oral history project *The Fates of the Holocaust Survivors* by P. Salner and M. Vrzgulová (...). However, the SAS Presidium has constantly pushed for gaining EU framework projects' (in: K. Popelková 2021b; for more details, see Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, p. 190).

G. Kiliánová, as one of the pioneers of the preparation and execution of international projects within the Institute in the 1990s, recalls the background of awarding the first EU project (EU 5<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme, Marie Curie Training Programme scheme). The key focus was on acquiring project know-how and building social capital through a series of foreign mobilities during the 1990s: 'The European Doctorate in the social history of Europe and the Mediterranean was based on my contacts who I had established through Academia Istropolitana (AI, later AINova). In 1992, 1993, and 1994, I was on short visits to the European University Institute in Florence, financed under the Tempus project from AI. This is where I met and began to cooperate with the chief coordinator of the future European Doctorate project, Stuart Woolf, and other researchers. The FOROST [project] was coordinated by Klaus Roth, whose partner in Slovakia was M. Paríková from the Department of Ethnology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, and he also had a PhD student from our Institute, L. Herzánová. Klaus Roth knew me and our Institute well from various conferences. As far as I know, the vast majority of our cooperation under international projects emerged through personal contacts. We knew our foreign partners from conferences and international panels (e.g., membership in international scientific boards, programme councils, editorial boards, etc.)' (in: Popelková 2021b).

### Transformation of the Support of Science—Amateur Fundraising

The typical features of the post-socialist transition period included the acquisition of new skills, the key one undoubtedly being fundraising, carried out by the organisation on its own.

P. Slavkovský reflects on a number of critical moments in the preparation of the three most important syntheses of the Institute, which had been produced during the first transition decade. The first one was the publishing of the *Etnografický atlas Slovenska (EAS)* [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia] in 1990 (Filová and Kovačevićová, Eds. 1990), which was only possible thanks

to personal lobbying by the Institute's management with the key state political representatives: 'I remember the situation when, before finalising the authors' work on the *EAS*, they calculated the price for cartographic work in the amount of fifteen million crowns. It is a lot of money even today; however, at that time, it was an amount that was beyond the possibilities of the SAS Presidium. In that moment, Božena Filová, a small woman with a great heart, took a deep breath, took courage, and went to get the money from top-rank places—I mean, the *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia*. The then Minister of Culture, Miroslav Válek, and the First Secretary of the *Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia*, Jozef Lenárt, understood the cultural and historical importance of this work, as well as the argumentation of our Director. They not only provided the necessary finance to the SAS budget, but also arranged high-quality export print paper for the *EAS*' (2006, p. 21).

The publishing of another synthesis, the *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska 1, 2* [Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia 1 and 2] (Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995), which had been intensively worked on during the previous decade, collided with the restrictions in the SAS budget, including the changed science funding system under the liberal conditions, and 'there was an actual threat that, because of the lack of funds, the Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia (...) would never be brought to life. It was a new moment to which we had not been used to, considering the previous style of scientific work organisation through the state scientific research plan. Until then, we naively thought that the most difficult thing was to write a scientific publication. The new experience in preparing the Encyclopaedia heralded a new system of multi-source financing of science (...)' (Slavkovský 2006, p. 25).

The successful fundraising cost Peter Slavkovský, the Editor-in-Chief of the *Encyclopaedia*, a lot of personal effort, while he intuitively developed a surprisingly professional fundraising plan—in addition to letters written to the President of the Slovak Republic, the Prime Minister, members of the government,

church representatives, thriving agricultural cooperatives, and banks, he launched a promotion campaign in daily newspapers, as well as on Slovak Radio.

He also contacted the business sphere through the members of the board of directors of the Contact Business Club and carried out an effective political lobbying through the chairman of a parliamentary committee, thanks to which he was allowed to make a speech in front of parliamentary deputies. He recalls this event as follows: 'I had two experiences: the excitement of speaking in the parliament, and a pleasant surprise at the fact that the deputies of the Slovak parliament can agree on something. They unanimously voted in favour of the *Pro Slovakia* State Fund to financially support this project. The deputies from both the right and the left, nationally-oriented Slovaks, as well as nationally-oriented Hungarians voted in the same way' (*Ibid.*).

The publication on which the Institute's staff worked intensively since 1986 was ultimately published in 1995. Its editors were received by the President and the Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic; they attended an audience with the National Council of the Slovak Republic, the Minister of Culture, the SAS President, and also met the sponsors of the book.

The publication received several important awards, the *SAS Prize for scientific and research activity* in 1995, the *Literary Fund Prize* 1995, as well as the prestigious European award—the International Prize of Ethnological and Anthropological Studies *Giuseppe Pitriè—Salvatore Salomone Marino*. Since the first edition of the book was sold out very quickly, the publishing house had to prepare its reprint (*Ibid.*, p. 27).

The publishing of the book *Slovakia. The European Context of Folk Culture* (Stoličná et al. 1997) required a similarly concentrated effort to get sponsorship. D. Luther ensured the lion's share of funding for this project. As P. Slavkovský notes: 'Daniel Luther played an important, two-in-one role in publishing the book; in addition to being its co-author, he also provided the necessary, considerable amount of funds for its publishing ...'

(2006, p. 28). The release of the book was ultimately supported by VÚB Bank.

A similar situation was repeated when publishing the Slovak version of the book (*Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry*, Stoličná et al. 2000), which was supported by Východoslovenské železiarne [East-Slovak Ironworks] thanks to D. Luther's personal contacts. As commented by P. Slavkovský: 'The almost impossible came true—in three years, two language versions of an expensive, yet graphically and professionally truly representative work were published' (2006, p. 28). In 2007, the second edition of the English version of the book was prepared; like the first edition, it was hopelessly sold out in a very short time.

Without the concentrated efforts and symbolic personal capital of particular researchers, the key syntheses of the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska 1, 2* (Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995), *Slovakia* (Stoličná et al. 1997) and *Slovensko* (Stoličná et al. 2000) would not have been published (Leščák 2006, p. 88; Slavkovský 2003, pp. 96-7; 2006, pp. 25-8; Luther 2006, p. 94). The transformation of the support of science in Slovakia in the 1990s did not hinder the publishing of costly collective syntheses, thus testing the ability of individuals both from the Builders' and Transformation Generations to be flexibly oriented in potential additional sources and, along with their scientific skills, to learn, at a decent level, another skill—fundraising.

### The Willingness to Do Things Together —Transformation of the Style of Work and Leadership

In the 1990s, the Institute continued producing collective works. As one of the editors of the *Encyclopaedia*, R. Stoličná (2021), recalls: 'The editors divided among themselves the thematic areas to be edited and the entries to be written. As the book editor, I was responsible for the editing of the entries on agrarian culture, clothing, construction and housing, and trade, which was over 500 entries in total. I was the author of

109 entries on food, under the abbreviation R. S. (...) The category of the entries was defined in advance, and the maximum length was also specified. This caused problems to some authors in the case of shorter entries; they brought, for instance, a text on five pages instead of twenty lines, saying that they could not write it more briefly. And so, we had to rewrite it all, which delayed the work immensely. (...) We also invited our youngest colleagues to work on some of the entries: Monika Vrzgulová, Katka Popelková, and Juraj Zajonc’.

Several actors of the Transformation period note that even though traditional topics and large-scale synthesis projects from the previous period continued after the revolution, there was a noticeable transformation also in this ‘traditional segment’. For example, O. Danglová (2021) remembers that it was her work on the *Encyclopaedia* that inspired her to develop her research in one important research area: ‘It may appear at first sight that writing *Encyclopaedia* entries isn’t such hard work. All you have to do is put together what has already been explored and written about that particular phenomenon. Then, following a uniform key, shorten the text to the bone, yet with sensitivity, so that the most important information about a particular phenomenon comes to the surface, and that’s all. However, it turned out that, when writing some entries, the reference material that was available and based on which the entries were to be written had huge gaps. And if an entry was to be given an adequate form, the information about the described phenomenon had to be further searched and explored. In my case, this concerned entries related to decorative tradition. And once I arrived at quite rich materials when writing the entries, I didn’t want to let them lie fallow. I used them in the VEGA grant *Decorative Traditions in Slovakia*. In addition to other outputs, one of the grant outcomes was the book *Dekor symbol. Dekoratívna tradícia na Slovensku v európskom kontexte* [Decor Symbol: The Decorative Traditions in Slovakia in the European Context, Danglová 2001]. I compiled the book as a vocabulary of ornamental motifs. Their analysis showed how the folk ornamental tradition in Slovakia is deeply rooted in the European cultural heritage’.

P. Slavkovský, the editor of the *Encyclopaedia* after 1988, recalls the different approaches to leadership regarding the *EAS* and the *Encyclopaedia* as follows: ‘The editorial team consisted mostly of the former *EAS* editors. While the once young team of *EAS* editors considered their leader, S. Kovačevićová, who was a generation older, as a scientific and human personality and was able to respect her in both of these aspects, it was slightly different in the new situation. People became mature both in terms of age and expertise. The ideas of J. Botík [Editor-in-Chief of the *Encyclopaedia* in 1986–8] and some female colleagues about the organisation of work at the department were sometimes diametrically opposed, which brought too much unwanted tension into our work’ (2006, p. 24).

According to Slavkovský, S. Kovačevićová represented a charismatic type of leader with natural and spontaneous authority. The replacement of the charismatic type of leadership with authoritative did not meet with appropriate response in the team and, according to the memories of some actors (e.g., Stoličná 2021), the situation was so heated that several researchers considered leaving the Institute. In the end, the one who left was J. Botík, who accepted a managerial position at the Slovak National Museum in Martin.

P. Slavkovský, who took over the position of the Editor-in-Chief, resigned to the attempts of presenting a charismatic type of leadership. He preferred ‘peer-to-peer’ communication. He developed a highly effective work model for the *Encyclopaedia*, which he characterised as follows: ‘When I accepted my appointment letter, it was clear to me that my experience from the previous organisation of work was useless and that I would have to come up with a different system of cooperation. I called it “participatory”, which, in the theory of management, could mean the delegation of powers and responsibilities. It was actually very simple in essence—everyone is responsible for their own authorial and editorial work. It was a kind of variant of what S. Kovačevićová did within the *EAS* team. However, it was not safeguarded by her professional and human authority, but



by the responsibility and vanity of the individual team members' (2006, p. 24).

There was another shift in the change of work and type of leadership in the organisation work during the preparation of the synthesis *Slovakia. European Contexts of the Folk Culture*. (Stoličná et al. 1997) and its Slovak version *Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry* (Stoličná et al. 2000). Slavkovský interprets this book as a fulfilled ambition of the former EAS editors to write interpretative comments in addition to the cartographical part. In this sense, it is interesting to note that both publications were created as the outcome of the GAV/VEGA project *Traditional Folk Culture in the Inter-Ethnic Context* (1994–6); while the project was not even financed in 1995 due to the dissolution of the GAV agency, and the new VEGA agency did not finance it until 1996.

Slavkovský recalls that the colleagues from the Institute of Musicology (Stanislav Dúžek and Oskár Elschek) took part in the writing of the book as well. He also expresses his gratitude to the 'folkloristic reinforcements' from the Institute, namely G. Kiliánová and E. Krekovičová, suggesting that the *willingness to work together* was no longer obvious: 'I mention them by name because not all the consulted experts believed in this project and refused to cooperate' (2006, p. 27). It is not clear from the memory records who from the Institute refused to cooperate; however, the list of the authors of the publication suggests that it was the representatives of the Transformation Generation. Finally, Slavkovský addressed an explicit thank-you to the youngest member of the author's collective, J. Zajonc, who, as the editor of the pictorial part, contributed greatly to the final graphic design of the work (*Ibid.*, p. 28).

According to P. Slavkovský, the preparation of the last synthesis marked a paradigmatic change in the approach to work within the Institute, which he also considered characteristic of the entire period that followed. The authors of the individual chapters worked separately, and the editor harmonised the wording of the final texts: 'The common denominator that brought

us together was the expert intention and the project leader, R. Stoličná. Nevertheless, it was possible (...) not only to comply with the time schedule of the synthesis works, but also to consolidate the manuscript. (...) At that time, it was as if "fatigue from collectiveness" had emerged at our workplace, which was further intensified by the individual spirit of the time' (*Ibid.*, p. 28).

The loss of the Transformation Generation's *willingness to do things together*, at least during the first transition decade, was undoubtedly affected by the changed conditions of research organisation by means of short-term competitive project tasks, as well as a fundamental change in science funding, which was accompanied by underfunding as a new negative aspect.

### Computerisation of the Building of Scientific Collections

Since its inception in 1946, the Ethnographic Institute SAS continuously and conceptually collected research data. Once documentarily processed and catalogued, the textual and picture materials (field research reports by the Institute's staff, photos, slides, and archive documents from the collections of institutions that collected data on human culture before World War II) were placed in the scientific collections. During the 1970s and 1980s, the collections significantly grew thanks to the EAS and *Encyclopaedia* projects.

Since the mid-1980s, the Institute had the ambition to respond to the onset of science computerisation, digitisation, and informatisation. For example, immediately at the end of the 1980s, the project *Automated Processing of the EI SAS Documentation Archives—Wedding File* (Kaľavská and Továrek 1991) was launched. This project was carried out in collaboration with the SAS Institute of Technical Cybernetics within the SAS Computing Centre (Zajonc 2006b, p. 32).

In 1989, a database of the ethnic and confessional affiliation of Slovakia's inhabitants, called *Demographic Archive* (Jurzová and Kaľavská 1992, p. 224), or the *Database of information on*

*territorial monographs*, called MONO (Zajonc 1995), began to be set up. In 1987, the building of a central information centre for Slovakia's folk culture within the Institute, driven by computer technology, was identified as one of the priorities. This area was conceptually dealt with by M. Benža, who managed the personally reinforced EI SAS Documentation Department that evolved into the Scientific Information Department (Benža 1991; Zajonc 2006b, p. 31).

The plan acquired a specific form in 1987 (Benža et al. 1992, p. 4), following up on the previous ideas of automation of information processing (Prandová 1978, p. 512). The Institute supported this plan by assigning a dissertation thesis on the possibilities of computer technology application in technology. This topic had been explored by J. Zajonc since 1987, who successfully defended his thesis (Zajonc 1996).

The concept of the Folk Culture Information Centre of 1990-1 envisaged implementing an integrated information system for the entire field of ethnography with the intention of combining various collections and documents of several institutions into formally uniform databases. In addition to nomenclature issues, this would require unifying the differences in the documentation and presentation practices of the various institutions.

However, at the beginning of the 1990s, museums began using the *Automated Museum Information System*, as a result of which the original broad project design lost relevance. As a result, in 1992, M. Benža prepared a proposal for an *EI SAS Integrated Information System* (Benža et al. 1992), including several versions of the so-called 'rubricator'. The rubricator sought to create uniform nomenclature for computer-technology-based storage and search of ethnological data. With its focus on traditional culture from the ethnographic perspective, it was appropriate for data sorting in, for example, ethnographic museum collections. However, according to J. Zajonc, it did not allow for the 'processing of information on social processes and culture in the broader sense, which form part of the object of ethnology' (2006b, p. 34). In terms of concept development,

the unimplemented integrated information system projects indicated that it would be more feasible to create multiple, relatively separate, but structurally compatible databases with uniform nomenclature instead of building a single large database (*Ibid.*).

In the 1990s, the Institute therefore initiated several projects with the main objective of facilitating access to and use of the content of the collections and sources of information about folk culture by transforming them into database systems as a specific type of information source or base materials for scientific analysis and publishing. The project outcomes produced a number of successful verification phases and prototypes. However, many of them were not converted into newer information systems and eventually remained inaccessible (for more details, see *Ibid.*, pp. 33-4).

Another project developed at the Institute was the database system for the creation of the sixth volume of the discipline's bibliography for the years 1991-5. In this case, the work, in terms of creating electronic metadata files, got the farthest, because the project included the preparation of a prototype *Universal Ethnological Electronic Form*, which was implemented and tested in collaboration with colleagues from the Ethnographic Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Brno. It was designed to be used not only for bibliographic work, but also for the creation of catalogues for collection resources (Uhlíková and Zajonc 2003). However, only the Brno institute used it in the creation of catalogues; in the Institute of Ethnology SAS, its application was limited to bibliographic works and compilation as a form for the registration of electronic images.

Nevertheless, the process of building electronic databases at the Institute and the trend of replacing the previous hierarchical system of sorting of scientific collections in ethnography with a unified sorting tool, with the aim to comply with international standards and build electronic metadata databases, slowed down considerably during the first transition decade. This was caused mainly by organisational changes in the Institute and

headcount reduction. Even though the processing and archiving of research data remained an important task of the Institute, by the mid-1990s, the Scientific Information Department with nine staff members was reduced to a unit of two employees as a result of the restrictions (documentarist and photographer), who were directly responsible to the Director, D. Ratica.

Computerisation, which was practically incorporated into the work of the Institute while preparing the *Encyclopaedia*, was unique. The use of a personal computer was considered for the first time when processing the *Encyclopaedia* registry, when no one from the editorial team had any experience in this field. The first step was to set up, in collaboration with the SAS Information Centre, a programme for creating the *Encyclopaedia* registry and for checking the correctness of the links between entries, which totalled 2,777. Later, in September 1990, a 'big variant of PC use was approved, in which all parts of the *Encyclopaedia*, as well as other auxiliary works (...) were processed using a PC' (Zajonc 1994, p. 208). This collective decision of the team, pursuing a fundamental innovation of the approach to the final stage of the preparation of a manuscript for printing in electronic form, enjoyed full support of the Director M. Leščák and was based on cooperation with the programmers from the SAS Information Centre—M. Tupta, J. Lipták, M. Jurzová, and V. Benko. They operatively adapted the existing or created new tailor-made programmes according to the specific needs of the authors of the encyclopaedia (for more details, see *Ibid.*, pp. 207–8).

P. Slavkovský recalls that the period of the end of 1988 and beginning of 1989 brought two new moments in the preparation of the *Encyclopaedia*, which completely changed the organisation of work: 'The first one was the delivery of a computer and the second one Ján Botík's decision to accept the offer to become Director of the Slovak National Museum—Ethnographic Institute in Martin' (2006, p. 24).

However, the changed style of work, which accompanied the implementation of modern technology, did not meet automatically with a positive response among the representatives

of the Generations of Founders and Builders, as remembered by R. Stoličná: 'In 1987, as the former editors of the *Atlas*, we launched works on a new project, the outcome of which was the two-volume *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia* (1995). Ján Botík was the project leader. I noticed from the very beginning that it would not be the liberal atmosphere I had been used to at the *EAS* Department. The new boss was authoritative and commanding and, in particular, he acknowledged only his own opinions, and the discussions with him were therefore often full of stress. At that time, we had the first computer in the institute, including a secretary who was able to work on it; however, Jano [Botík] forced us to write the entries on a typewriter in four copies. If I had previously been used to going to work with joy, in that moment I considered leaving the Institute' (2021).

In this context, M. Leščák recalls J. Zajonc joining the editorial team of the *Encyclopaedia*: 'The joining by Juraj Zajonc of the Institute and the *Encyclopaedia* was a big help... Juraj overcame the traditionalist concept of writing and editing books and significantly contributed to the computer processing of texts. This is more or less where we crossed the border between the bull and the mouse. And although I personally didn't particularly like the glare of the screen (other than the television), I realised that I was to enter the third millennium, which would shift new technologies beyond our imagination' (2006, p. 87).

### Relocation, Funds Reduction, and Restructuring of the Institute

Until 1987, the Institute was seated in the building of the Institutes of Social Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences on Klemensova Street 19. On its second floor was the Secretariat and Director's Office, the Ethnography and Folklore Studies Departments, and the library. In the side wing, on the second mezzanine floor, there was the Documentation Department, the Editorial Board of the *Slovenský národopis* journal, and the *EAS* Centre.

Documentarist I. Kostovská remembers the dislocation before 1987 as follows: 'The Institute had its premises on the second floor, sharing its headquarters with the Institute of State and Law of the SAS and with the Encyclopaedic Institute of the SAS. The windows of the Director's Office, the Ethnography Department, the office of the Head of the Folklore Studies Department, Milan Leščák, the folklorists' office, and the Library looked at Klemensova street. The Secretariat, toilets, and a small room with books, called a cubbyhole by all of us, were oriented toward the courtyard of the building. The archives were stored directly in the workrooms. Both the folklorists and ethnographers had their collections in their offices, some texts from the research formed part of the documentation placed in a metal cabinet in the corridor, and the catalogues, photographs, and slides were inserted in the documentation or were stored by the Head of the Department, E. Prandová. Mrs Kubová kept the Library collections in the study room, behind the glass door in the lobby lounge in front of the entrance to the folklorists' office, and on the shelves along the corridor walls. The Institute's photographer, Helena Bakaljarová, shared her office with the photographer of the Historical Institute SAS on the ground floor of the building, where the laboratories and the dark rooms were located' (in: Popelková 2022).

At the end of the 1980s, thanks to B. Filová's efforts and her interventions with the SAS Presidium, the Institute moved from the cramped conditions in the building at Klemensova Street to larger spaces in the former building of the first Slovak Radio on nearby Jakubovo (then Lenin) Square 12. The former radio studios on the first floor were rebuilt from SAS investment resources into scientific offices for the Institute, and the building administered by the Ministry of Culture remained its headquarters until 2000 (D. Luther, M. Slavkovská in: *Ibid.*).

M. Leščák recalls the new dislocation at the beginning of the 1990s as follows: 'When I joined the EI SAS in 1963, several rooms were enough for the Institute. (...) The Institute expanded gradually and eventually moved to the building on Jakubovo

(then Lenin) Square, in which the Slovkoncert agency also had its headquarters. Being its Director, I could have a nap on soft leather armchairs in the large modern Director's Office, which made me unnecessarily nervous. The Institute had its own studio and the perspective of quantitative growth. Hours and hours spent negotiating on the use of the premises, on the ways of reconstruction, the location of a part of the Institute in the building on Klemensova Street, the technical conditions and rent, etc., took a lot of my time' (2006, p. 88).

The transfer of the Institute to its new headquarters took place gradually. 'The key part of the Documentation Department and the Head of this Department [E. Prandová] was first to move to the two rooms within the main lobby of the building. Part of the Department of Ethnography and the *Encyclopaedia's* editorial staff found their offices on the lower ground floor; there were also rooms for the Documentation Department, which was growing and was renamed to Scientific Information Department; after E. Prandová left the Institute, M. Benža assumed the management of this Department' (I. Kostovská in: Popelková 2022).

The way of occupying new spaces corresponded to the practical needs of the Institute, in particular, work on the initial segments of the building of the information centre, which were launched in 1987. The Scientific Information Department included not only workrooms, a room with a catalogue registry cabinet, but also a room with a large computer which was used, in cooperation with the IT staff, by ethnographer Viera Kaľavská—this is where the first databases for the project of research data computer processing and synthesising were created and tested. And finally, the rest of the Institute, including the *Encyclopaedia*, the library study room, and the editorial staff of the journal moved to the new bright workrooms in a separate corridor on the first floor, and the last ones were the Director's Office and the Secretariat.

Optimal conditions for scientific collection archives were found in the large basement. 'Library bookshelves were set up for the library collections in the large room at the back

of the ground floor, behind the big recording studio with good acoustics, which included a technical room for sound engineers, separated by a glass wall. The Institute acquired its own meeting room and a sound studio, in which magnetophone tapes from research were copied onto cassettes, and where the first copying machine of the Institute was located. There was one more small dark room behind the sound engineers' room' (I. Kostovská in: *Ibid.*).

However, the photographer, H. Bakaljarová, used that room less and less, because she began developing the photos from research in commercial outlets, which was, in addition, accompanied by a transition to digital photography (Z. Beňušková in: *Ibid.*). The Institute used the large recording studio mainly as a room for meeting and seminars, and some staff members also used it as a classroom: for instance, D. Luther, who began teaching visual anthropology after 1989, used the existing high-quality television and sound equipment in his pedagogical work (in: *Ibid.*).

M. Leščák recalls many technical problems that he had to deal with personally as the statutory representative of the scientific institution: 'For example, when I had the electrical wiring from the studio thrown away, thus causing the interruption of electricity supply in one part of the building. There was also the threat of being imposed a fine for rebuilding the original studios of the Slovak Radio on the first floor, which were allegedly protected as heritage' (2006, p. 88). Leščák mentions that the moving also required the concentrated efforts and workload of a large part of the scientific team: 'I also encouraged some staff members to help finish the works. Dano Luther and Jano Botík glued the linoleum, and almost all employees helped a lot while moving' (*Ibid.*).

At the beginning of the 1990s, the Institute helped the new Slovak editorial team of *Rádio Slobodná Európa* [Radio Free Europe]. This contact was established by D. Luther with the consent of the Institute's Director, D. Ratica. Accordingly, the radio station rented the sound studio from the Institute for about

two years, for several hours of recording a day at a time when its editorial team did not yet have its premises with its technical equipment in Bratislava. Later, in an effort to obtain funds to finance the rent of the building, in addition to the insufficient institutional funds, the Institute carried out successful business activities for several years by renting the premises of the former radio studios to a commercial dubbing studio (D. Luther in: Popelková 2022).

The period of seating on Jakubovo Square overlaps with the beginnings of computerisation and expansion of electronic communication within the Institute. Z. Beňušková reflects on this period as follows: 'In addition, PC writing started to be used at that time [late 1990s]. Ingrid [Kostovská] acquired the technical skills from her men at home and I was learning from her. In connection with the introduction of the internet at the Institute, I remember that we were offered by the SAS to send email through the internet from our library, via phone networks. It looked unbelievable, because the handling of letters took a lot of time. And so, I ran to see Dušan Ratica to ask him whether he would agree to start using this possibility. He—as the most skilful IT expert at the Institute for a long time—smiled kindly and said: "Well, if it has to be...". We only had one line at that time, at the secretariat; they used extensions in the workrooms. When e-mails were to be received, we had to shout loudly in the corridor or walk from door to door asking people not to make calls because we were receiving messages' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

The years 1989–2000 can be characterised as a period of improved dislocation situation of the Institute. In its temporary headquarters, there were enough standard workrooms available, a meeting room, a study room, as well as suitable storage rooms for its archives. The situation allowed for launching the plans of gradual computerisation of works, in particular, when it came to documentation and work on the *Encyclopaedia*. The Institute also operatively tested the option of raising extra-budgetary funds by renting its premises.



However, this stage of positive internal dynamics, into which the Institute invested a lot of human energy and internal financial resources, faced a period when institutional financial resources started to be drastically cut. The change of the administrator of the building, which belonged to the Ministry of Culture, the increased annual rent, as well as the administrator's intention to also bring other institutions and commercial companies in the building at the end of the 1990s resulted in that the dislocation of the Institute in the new premises, despite the personal intervention by D. Luther with the then Minister of Culture Milan Kňažko (D. Luther and M. Slavkovská in: Popelková 2022), was no longer feasible.

In 2000, the Institute moved again to the building of its original headquarters on Klemensova Street, where, however, there was not enough space left for the Institute to have its offices on a single floor. Under these circumstances, the Institute had to accept the dislocation on three floors of the building, without having its own meeting room, and agree on placing the extensive library and archive collections in the damp (insufficiently insulated) basement rooms.

At the beginning of the first transition period, the organisational structure of the Institute consisted of four functional departments—Ethnography, Folklore Studies, Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia, and Scientific and Technical Information, as well as the Director's Secretariat (Benža 2003, p. 72). At the beginning of 1991, in connection with the set-up of grant teams, the Department of Folklore Studies and the Department of Ethnography were cancelled, as well as the Department of the Encyclopaedia of Slovakia's Folk Culture at the end of 1992.

The budget reduction also affected the two journals published by the Institute. The budget of the *Slovenský národopis* journal was reduced by about a third in the 1990s (Leščák 2006, p. 88), and the *Národopisné informácie* journal, renamed to *Etnologické rozpravy* in 1994, was published thanks to the co-financing by the other two partner institutions (Ethnographic Society of Slovakia and Slovak National Museum). The cutting of institutional resources and the restructuring of the way of acquiring competitive resources forced

the organisation to improvise, increased the level of uncertainty and, certainly, did not contribute to a systematic development of science and research.

### Transformation Exchange and the Overlapping of Generations

The beginning of the Transformation period in the Institute overlapped with the generation exchange which had begun in the mid-1980s. Ema Drábiková, Mária Kosová, and Milada Kubová retired in 1985, Viera Urbancová and Viera Valentová in 1987, and Viera Nosáľová in 1988. The important representatives of the oldest Generation of Builders retired in 1989: Soňa Burlasová, Elena Prandová, and Ester Plicková. The Institute was also left by Adam Pranda (+1985).

Simultaneously, a generational renewal began at the end of the 1980s, taking on Ľubica Chorváthová (1987–95) to the Institute, as well as three recent graduates of the Bratislava Department of Ethnography and classmates for a three-year study visit: Katarína Popelková (1987), Monika Kardošová (1987), and Juraj Zajonc (1988); in the course of 1988, the Institute also admitted Eva Riečanská (later Cielová) and Andrea Onderčaninová (later Kadlecová) from the same graduate year. Shortly after November 1989, Ľubica Faltánová and Michal Kaľavský came to work at the Institute, and Ivona Balogová, Oľga Drahošová, Eva Svorová, and Regína Tomeková were admitted to study visits (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 170–3).

At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, the Directors of the Institute used study visits to temporarily reinforce the team or deal with new tasks. K. Popelková notes the following on the study visits instrument: 'Based on my personal experience, each particular stay corresponded to another pragmatic internal plan of the then Directors (Filová, Leščák); there was no single template or term for which an individual would be admitted—sometimes it was graduates, other times older ethnologists whom the Institute invited, making use of the study visit statute and using them for specific tasks, while also providing them temporarily with a background,

if, for example, they did not have any other job. It was a period of collective works and a new computer period in documentation, as a consequence of which the Institute needed many hands; though the resources were probably available. In 1987, the three of us [K. Popelková, M. Vrzgulová, J. Zajonc] were admitted to study visits based on the results of a competition. When taking up the job, we were assigned specific topics and tutors, and we were incorporated in the respective departments. I was assigned the topic of social life in a small town and, based on my own research, I was expected to write a final thesis from my study visit. At the same time, I became a member of the Ethnography Department and later of the Documentation Department. I participated in the research task with the working title 'social groups', which was coordinated by P. Salner, P. Slavkovský, and D. Ratica. Simultaneously, I was included in the team of the *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia* authors, which was at the stage of launching works on writing entries. Because of the absence of an author to write entries on folk construction, I was assigned the task of producing the entries on traditional construction materials and techniques. I was in constant contact with my tutor, P. Salner, who regularly informed the Institute's management about my interim results, and he read and commented on my texts. In parallel, I fulfilled various operational and organisational tasks. After completing my study visit, I took up the position of internal doctoral candidate at the Ethnographic Institute SAS based on a successful interview. The study visits worked as a tool to ensure generation exchange in a situation where there was a lack of vacant systemised jobs, and there was at least a partial perspective to employ new people in the future. In addition, the scientific team thus gained the possibility to test, in practice, the potential of its new colleagues before signing a permanent work contract or before admitting them to post-gradual scientific education (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

Nevertheless, from this wave of newly hired staff, in the end only E. Falt'ánová (she retired in 2014) and M. Kaľavský, who left to work at the Government Office of the Slovak Republic in 1996, remained working at the Institute for a longer period of time. K. Popelková,

M. Vrzgulová, and J. Zajonc completed their study visits, during which they had worked in the Scientific Information Department, the Ethnography Department, and in the editorial team of the *Encyclopaedia*; after successful interviews, they completed their doctoral studies at the Institute.

In 1991, some important female representatives of the Generations of Founders and Builders retired—Božena Filová, Viera Gašparíková, Soňa Kovačevičová, and Jarmila Paličková. From among expert staff, Tatiana Štibrányiová (1991) left the Institute (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 170–3). Given the budget cuts, staff renewal slowed down, since vacancies could not be filled (Leščák 2006).

The research group of scientists, whom we observed in the previous decades as the Generation of Builders, continued its scientific work in line with the Institute's scientific programme (M. Benža, P. Slavkovský, O. Danglová, as well as R. Stoličná, M. Leščák, and V. Feglová). They observed traditional ethnographic topics (material and spiritual culture), which formed part of the research on 'traditional culture', and many of them were also interested in modern issues, concepts, and approaches in the field of social sciences, which they used in their further work (Falt'ánová 1992, 1993; Feglová 1993, or Krivý, Feglová, and Balko 1996).

O. Danglová, who was also interested, apart from visual expressions of tangible culture (1994, 2001), in post-socialist transition, collectivisation, and de-collectivisation in the 1990s (1992, 1995a, b, c), reflects on her personal transformation also in the context of the approach to traditional topics as follows: 'In clarifying the phenomena of the material culture of the world of objects, which are considered trivial and traditionally historical-ethnographic (for example, blueprint, ornament, embroidery), I sought to re-tune to some extent from an ethnographic, typological-comparative-tuned interpretation to the cultural-historical or historical-anthropological interpretation. For instance, in the sense of how these phenomena represented or reflected social reality; what kind of communication significance they had in the socio-cultural environment into which they were embedded,

in particular at the stage of the historical development when the traditional peasant-shepherd society gradually changed into urbanised, modern society; how interactions between the elite style and folk culture could be traced in them, or the perception of what was considered ours and what was considered foreign according to local criteria of, for instance, the embroidery dialect, etc.' (2021).

Pursuing the organisation's internal cohesion, the scientists from the Transformation Generation also continued working on traditional ethnographic and ethnological topics, such as folklore studies, developed in the previous period—research on song (E. Krekovičová) and narrative folklore genres (G. Kiliánová, H. Hlôšková, Z. Profantová, Z. Vanovičová), research on theatre forms (D. Luther), research on traditional material (J. Zajonc) and building culture (J. Podoba), or family research (D. Ratica). The youngest members of the transformation generation were smoothly assigned to fulfil tasks launched by the Generation of Builders, which resulted in an easy transfer of skills and approaches.

At that time, the key figures of the Transformation Generation launched generation tutoring and mentoring; for instance, P. Salner, first on urban topic—M. Vrzgulová and K. Popelková, later on the Holocaust and oral history—M. Vrzgulová). Similarly, G. Kiliánová invited M. Vrzgulová (in 2006), K. Popelková (in 2008, 2010), as well as J. Zajonc (in 2016) to work on her research orientation on the reflexive history of the discipline and of the Institute at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Most of the time, the Generation of Builders pursued its traditional, rather conservatively conceived scientific focus from the previous period (large syntheses, continuation of the ethno-cartographical and encyclopaedical approach); while the Transformation Generation continued exploring well-established topics from the previous decades and a critical self-reflection of the discipline. In doing so, the latter one signed up fully for the research on the present and daily life, research on various social phenomena, social groups, and social structures. In the field of methodology and scientific approach, one could observe a departure from robust field research and a major focus on particular in-depth qualitative

surveys. Work with archive sources from the Institute's scientific collections experienced a comeback as well.

The approach to the history of the Institute through generations cannot be generalised through 'age cohorts'. For example, the personality of Oľga Danglová, representative of the Generation of Builders, combined the 'ethnographic' ability to create traditional representative syntheses (oriented primarily on the visual expressions of traditional tangible culture), and the 'anthropological' skill to sensitively explore the current social phenomena of modern society.

Likewise, some representatives of the Transformation Generation, including the youngest ones, were inclined to pursue the legacy of the previous generation (e.g., J. Zajonc), i.e., traditional exploration of material culture and of the tangible expressions of Slovak cultural heritage. On the other hand, the colleagues of the same generation, R. Stoličná and G. Kiliánová, represent prominent representatives of two essentially different approaches within the discipline: one of them developing a traditional ethnographic line *par excellence*, while the other one opening a critical line and the path of merging with social and cultural anthropology.

Equally interesting is the figure of M. Leščák, who is one of the key members of the Generation of Builders, but because of his personal habits and mindset, he can be rather considered a visionary and innovator, and, certainly, a personality who was able to launch wide-spectrum transformation processes during the critical 1990s.

In general, it was undoubtedly a Transformation Generation of scientists, which caused a paradigmatic turn in Slovak ethnology. During the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> and especially the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, its members took over the responsibility of the functioning and further course of the Institute.

## The Clash of Generations—Discussions Platforms and Dialogues

The divergence of opinions in the generational contours was explicitly manifested in a survey conducted in 1990 (Leščák 1991c). The different positions of the Builders' and Transformation

Generations were confronted for the first time in a discussion on a change of the Institute's name after 1989.

The discussion that preceded the change (Benža 2003, pp. 71–2) was a continuation of the presentation of views in the survey of 1990 and took the form of methodological seminars (on the issue of defining and determining the subject of ethnology, the relationship between ethnography and folklore studies, and the development of the study of religions), as well as debates at the meetings of the Board of the Director and of the Scientific Board of the Institute (Popelková 2003, p. 102).

At that time, the inclination to a more widely conceived modern ethnology and anthropology at the Institute was fully manifested. The proponents of the original name (primarily from the Generation of Builders) argued that the name of the discipline, not of the Institute, should change.

At the beginning of 1993, D. Ratica noted that, even though the result of the discussions on the alternatives in 1992 was that the name Institute of Ethnology would probably be the most acceptable option, no change had yet been made. According to him, the substantial changes that were going on within the Academy (budget cuts, accreditation process, SAS restructuring) completely absorbed the 'working capacities of the Institute's management. In addition, there was some opposition who, in the given situation, would probably have said that it would be more appropriate to stick to the "old firm", characterised by the significant work achievements of our Institute' (in: Beňušková 1993, p. 59).

The proponents of the change (Transformation Generation) pointed out the archaic character of the name, implying an active contribution of the discipline to the obsolete and clearly politically oriented 'national' programme, which perceived ethnography as a primarily descriptive discipline, useful in the formation and building of a 'nation' and 'national awareness' (Leščák 1991a; Benža 2003, p. 71). In 1994, this trend was ultimately translated in the change of the Institute's name, which was renamed from the Ethnographic Institute to the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

However, the name of the main journal publication platform remained unchanged—*Slovenský národopis*, just like its Czech counterpart *Český lid* [Czech People]—which can also be interpreted as a continuation of the tradition. Even though the fundamental paradigmatic change presented polarisation among the Generations within the Institute, it was carried out in a compromise, peaceful way with discussions, fully respecting the merits of the previous generations and accepting the willingness to change and the right to a different presentation of the next generation.

### Management and Restructuring of the Institute during the First Transformation Decade

M. Leščák ended his Director's term of office by resigning in 1992, when he assumed a leadership position in the recently established Department of Folklore and Regional Studies of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Education, later Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (Kiliánová 2020, p. 20). Nevertheless, he remained working in the Institute part time, and he also retained the position of the Editor-in-Chief of the *Slovenský národopis* journal (1991–6), which he took over from B. Filová.

In 1992, the representative of the Transformation Generation, D. Ratica, was elected as the Director of the Institute based on the results of a competition. He had worked in the Institute since 1979, when he was taken on, as an ethnography graduate oriented on the research of folk literature, by B. Filová despite the fact that his 'personnel profile' was not appropriate for the contemporary regime. Since 1986, he was a member of the eleven-member *Encyclopaedia* team as editor of the thematic area of the theory and methodology of science—currents and schools, methods, categories, and terms. At the end of the 1980s, he initiated, together with P. Slavkovský and P. Salner, the study of social groups, which was included by M. Leščák as one of the points of the Institute's scientific programme in 1990. In December 1990, D. Ratica was elected by the Institute's staff members as the representative of the EI SAS to

the SAS Scientists Board, which was a new, democratically elected body of 102 members, created during the November Revolution (its first meeting took place on January 5, 1990) as the transformation predecessor of what is today the SAS Assembly (Kováč 2014, p. 205). In the period of 1994–2001, D. Ratica was a member of its managing body—the Committee of the SAS Scientists Board (Luther 2014, p. 132; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, p. 167).

G. Kiliánová notes that ‘right after November 1989, the then Director M. Leščák began preferring the representatives of the younger generation in organisational cooperation projects, who had not been members of the Communist Party before the upheaval. He appointed J. Podoba as the Institute’s Scientific Secretary. After J. Podoba left for a lecturing visit to Switzerland, Milan asked Dušan Ratica to become the secretary. When Leščák left his office in 1992, Dušan didn’t rush into this position—he was very active in the SAS Scientists Board—; however, Zora Vanovičová from the *Slovenský národopis* editorial team knew about Milan’s plans and was one of those who came to see Dušan, telling him: “I hope you’ll apply!” (in: Popelková 2022). D. Luther says in this regard: ‘As I remember, Milan didn’t want a candidate who had been a member of the Communist Party. He consulted it with a kind of a revolutionary group in the Institute—Salner, Podoba, Ratica; they agreed and Dušan consented. He was alone, there was no other candidate’ (in: *Ibid.*).

R. Stoličná (2021) recalls the change in the Institute’s management in the 1990s as follows: ‘In 1993, the Institute’s management changed. Milan Leščák unexpectedly left for the Department of Ethnography in Nitra, and we began seeking for a new candidate for Director. There was a general opinion that it should not be someone who had been in the Communist Party. Dušan Ratica was a good choice. It was unexpected, because until then, Dušan behaved as if he did not even belong at the Institute. I just noticed that he had a good dissertation thesis on social culture. He served as Director for two terms, until 2000. However, he had the unpleasant task of informing many, especially older colleagues, that they had to retire because of

headcount reduction in the SAS. On the other hand, he enjoyed the achievements of the Institute, since under his leadership, the *Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia* and the *Slovakia* and *Slovensko* monographs were published and awarded. During his term in office, the institution was renamed the Institute of Ethnology SAS’.

The engagement and work in the highest body of the academic self-government specifically interlinked the EI SAS with the process of the post-socialist transition of the SAS. G. Kiliánová remembers that, throughout his entire term in office, D. Ratica ‘worked with great commitment also in the Scientists’ Board. This meant the attendance of long, complicated negotiations or the preparation of various documents; he often dictated various opinions to the secretary for hours. In fact, he dedicated half of his energy to building a democratic academy of sciences. For this activity, he was awarded the SAS Commemorative Plaque in 1999’ (in: Popelková 2022).

In connection with the overall headcount cut in the SAS, D. Ratica was forced to initiate massive layoffs in 1993–4 (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 113). While at the beginning of the 1990s, the Institute had 38 employees, of which 18 were researchers, 13 expert staff members, and seven other employees (Benža 2003, p. 73), at the end of the 1990s, the Institute had only 25 employees, with 19 researchers, three expert staff members, and three other employees (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 113). The downsizing partly took place naturally—Tatiana Štibrányiová (1991), Zora Apáthyová-Rusnáková (1994), Lubica Chorváthová (1995), and Michal Kaľavský (1996) left because of their transfer to another workplace. Viera Feglová reduced her working time because she began teaching at a new department in Nitra (1992). In 1997, M. Leščák moved from Nitra to the Department of Ethnology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, where he worked as Head of Department in 1997–2003 (G. Kiliánová in: K. Popelková 2022).

The headcount reduction mainly affected the Scientific Information Department, from which six expert and technical staff members were dismissed in the mid-1990s (Ol’ga Drahošová, Viera Kaľavská, Gabriela Lunterová, Margita Méryová, Eva Svorová,



Regína Tomeková) (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 170–3). At that time, the work of this department was coordinated by M. Benža, who assumed this role from his previous ‘boss’ E. Prandová.

As a result of the redundancies, the department ceased to exist. The archives and the library were attached to the Director’s Secretariat (Benža 2003, p. 72), which considerably slowed down the fulfilment of one of the programme tasks defined in the concept of 1991.

D. Ratica reflected on this situation in 1993 (one year after assuming office) in an interview for the *Národopisné informácie* journal about the research and science-organisation aspects of the Institute’s activities under his management and about the correction of his ideas about the further course of the Institute: ‘Since I have worked in the Institute since 1979 and I know the work and the skills of its staff well, I was never worried that (...) the very scientific activities of the Institute would be in crisis (...). I am more concerned today because of the scientific-organisational existence of the Institute, in particular about the financial issues. (...) As of the end of 1992, the budget cuts of the entire SAS and, hence, of our Institute, were irreversible, and it was necessary to translate them not only into measures aimed at saving our material non-investment resources, but also at personnel reductions (...); I was forced to particularly correct my ideas regarding the staffing of the Institute’s documentation activities and partly also the individual areas of research. Nevertheless, I think the current composition of the Institute is still a guarantee of its successful work also in the future’ (in: Beňušková 1993, p. 58).

In the position of Director in the era of a nationalist government policy, D. Ratica was also confronted with the external threat of dissolving the Institute or restricting its activities. In 1996, Vladimír Mečiar’s government came up with the proposal to integrate all institutes of the so-called SAS Science Section III into *Matica slovenská* (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 106).

Despite restrictions, there was some renewal of the Institute even during this period: in 1994, Eva Cielová was admitted to

postgraduate studies in the Institute (Zajonc 2006a; Kiliánová 2016c, p. 113), who focused on the theoretical approaches to the study of ethnic groups. At the end of the 1990s, she left for a study visit to the USA. However, after her return to Slovakia (1999), she remained working in the NGO sector and no longer returned to the Institute.

In 1996, Andrea Kalivodová was taken up as librarian. This graduate of ethnography replaced Z. Beňušková, who worked part time in the Library after the lay-off of Gabriela Lunterová. As recalled by G. Kiliánová, ‘in 1996, Milan Leščák invited Zuzka Beňušková, who defended her dissertation theses that year under his tutorship, to teach at a university department in Nitra; however, she continued to work simultaneously at the Institute’ (in: Popelková 2022).

At the beginning of 1997, Tatiana Zachar Podolinská (née Podolinská) was admitted to a scientific position, also reinforcing the *Slovenský národopis* editorial team. She recalls her admission to the Institute at the time of freezing the posts as follows: ‘I considered it a miracle that they managed to arrange a new systemised job for a history, philosophy, and religious studies graduate at the Institute of Ethnology SAS. The prime mover and father of this idea was my teacher, professor Ján Komorovský from the Department of Ethnology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, who made it work thanks to all his professional reputation of the founder of religious studies in Slovakia, as well as his moral authority—because of his religious conviction, he was twice expelled from Comenius University in the era of Communism. In that period, I was completing my PhD degree in religious studies and, simultaneously, I was teaching at a grammar school on Metodova Street in Bratislava. Because of the lack of vacant academic positions, a scientific career seemed unattainable to me. Without telling anything to me, the professor went to the Institute where he strongly appealed on admitting his student. However, it was the then Director, D. Ratica, who, after a personal interview with me, had to go to the SAS Presidium and convince the management that the SAS needed me so much that they had to create a new systemic position at the Institute. Given the budget commitment

period and general cuts, it was an admirable achievement indeed, and I'm so thankful for it to both of them!' (2023).

The Communist Party groups within the SAS institutes were dissolved after 1989, which gave rise to Scientific Boards that were expected to coordinate the scientific activities of the institutes. The organisational structure of each institute consisted of project teams, whose leaders formed, together with the chair of the Scientific Board and representative of the Trade Union organisation, the so-called Board of the Director.

The members of the management were the Director, Deputy Director appointed by the Director, and Scientific Secretary. The position of Secretary was usually entrusted by the Director to any of the young scientists.

At the end of the 1990s, more than a half of the scientists lectured externally on a selective or semestral basis at domestic or foreign universities. The Institute continued providing the internal as well as external form of postgraduate education, resulting in thirteen successfully defended dissertation theses in the 1990s (Benža 2003, p. 74).

According to internal SAS accreditations, the Institute became one of the successful SAS institutes in the 1990s, receiving a 'B' rating from the rating scale 'A-D' in the framework of the first internal accreditation for the period 1990-2, and rating 'A' under the next accreditation processes in 1993-5 and 1996-8 (Kiliánová 2016c, p. 113).

In 2014, D. Luther evaluated the Director's mission of D. Ratica in the existentially unfavourable stage of the Institute's development as follows: 'It was a period of coping with the Communist past, as well as with a previously unknown "new situation". Thanks to Dušan Ratica's ability to see the bigger picture and his wisdom, both the Institute and good collegial relationships have been preserved' (2014, p. 132).

D. Ratica managed the Institute until 2000, while simultaneously working in all-academy structures which, in his opinion, together with important publication outcomes, 'helped maintain a stable position and a relatively high prestige'

(in: Beňušková 1993, p. 59). During his two terms of office, he ensured the continuity of the scientific programme launched by M. Leščák, and the *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska 1, 2* was completed and published (Botík and Slavkovský, Eds. 1995). In addition, the Institute's staff worked on almost twenty national grant project tasks (Benža 2003, pp. 76-8; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 174-6). His ambition was to open the discipline and the Institute to international contacts, enable the development of new topics that critically reflected contemporary society, and encourage theoretical development of the discipline.

### Teambuilding and Spending Time Together

After the social change brought by the year 1989, the Institute's community pursued the successful practice from the previous period to enhance its unity. This included joint celebrations of colleagues' personal anniversaries, which were spent with cold delicacies and sweets that they had brought from home and consumed together during lunch breaks or after working time.

The Ethnographic Institute SAS celebrated International Women's Day, which had been generally supported by the socialist regime and was considered a formal tribute to working women, 'as an event where one of the men, most often S. Švehlák, had a funny and kind speech or recited a poem, the women received cloves, followed by a joint celebration. The truth is that everything was invented in advance and the sandwiches were prepared by women' (G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2022).

The Head of the Secretariat, Magda Slavkovská, had already managed to innovate this tradition in the latter half of the 1980s. Together with her husband, P. Slavkovský (Scientific Secretary of the Institute at that time), they devised the celebration of Women's Day so that women were truly celebrated and in the spotlight. A friend of theirs managed a restaurant in Bratislava's Medical Garden, where they ordered a room and organised the event: 'It was not about giving carnations; the point was that women didn't have to prepare anything, they dressed up beautifully, and the

company was having fun with dignity. I remember that it was snowing heavily and that the entire Institute went to the venue by foot. Our friend prepared and served fried *oštiepok* cheese with garnish and some wine. Ms Kubová said that she finally felt like a real lady' (M. Slavkovská in: *Ibid.*).

In addition, the Institute's Trade Union organised a skiing trip for the staff and their families at Donovaly, in the Hydrostav tourist resort, which was arranged by another friend (M. Slavkovská in: *Ibid.*). There were also some family meetings at the castle in Smolenice, which was organised by Jarmila Paličková on the occasion of International Children's Day, in the period when she chaired the trade union (H. Hlôšková in: *Ibid.*).

H. Hlôšková recalls that the strong Transformation Generation of that time (the Krekovič, Mann, Kostovský, Profant, and Hlôška families) had children of more-or-less the same age, thanks to which they used to prepare and organise celebrations together. At one of these meetings, her husband prepared a 'military training' in the form of a knowledge relay with posts hidden in the forest around the Smolenice Castle. The competing teams were composed of children from different families and of different ages. The task of the team was to obtain one letter of a searched word for each correctly solved task. 'The idea was that at the end of the competition the children would find all letters of the abbreviation of the Institute—NÚ SAV [EI SAS]. However, when the second team also triumphantly arrived at the finish line with the abbreviation NÚ VAS, Braňo [the husband of H. H.] realised that he had swapped the posts (Hlôšková 2021b).

Before Christmas, on Santa Claus Day, the trade union (called Revolutionary Trade Union Movement, Slovak acronym 'ROH', at that time) of the Ethnographic Institute SAS donated a collection of chocolate decorations each year to families with children, which was related to the 'Dedo Mráz' event (Soviet secularised counterpart of Santa Claus—*Ded Moroz*), for which the employees' children prepared a programme. H. Hlôšková (*Ibid.*) remembers Mojmír Benža and Dušan Ratica dressed in the costume of Dedo Mráz. In this regard, she also recalls D. Ratica in the role of Dedo Mráz: 'Dušan, as a well-known anti-regime person, portrayed

Dedo Mráz on his own: he played the guitar for the surprised kids!'. G. Kiliánová (in: Popelková 2022) remembers the Dedo Mráz and Snow White couple in costumes, performed by M. Benža and Z. Beňušková.

In addition to Dedo Mráz and International Women's Day, the Institute also commemorated, in the framework of the Soviet secular holiday practice, the day of Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship, which was organised by the institutional Association of Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship. H. Hlôšková recalls (2021b) Soňa Burlasová organising an exhibition of Soviet art, to which guests from Russia were also invited.

The three-week summer tent camp PIPEX for children in Banská Štiavnica also became memorable. According to G. Kiliánová's recollection, 'it was organised in 1987 and 1988 by a few of the natural science sections of the Academy. We joined them thanks to the contact of Peter Salner and his wife Eva. The age limit of children was nine years. We had a lot of children there: Salner's son Andrej, Editka Vrátna's daughter Andrea, Arne Mann's son Andrej, our three Kilián sons (though Ondrej was younger and was there on exception), Hela Bakaljarová's two daughters Zuzka and Barbora, Ingrid Kostovská's son Michal; her daughter Katka was afraid of spiders, so she couldn't come. We had to appoint a leader; it was decided that it would be Hela Bakaljarová, who took her two daughters. She worked in the camp's field kitchen. The camp was financially supported by our trade union; at that time, I was the Trade Union Secretary, Viera Feglová was its Chairwoman; on that occasion, she sent me to quickly buy three tents so that our children have a place to sleep. It was excellent, we got rid of our children for three weeks, we could write contently or, like my husband and I, reconstruct and paint the whole flat. Our children established a close relationship. Since then, they have known each other well and maintained contacts even later, some work together even today' (in: Popelková 2022).

Hana Hlôšková attributes the willingness of the community members to meet together outside work to several factors: 'We had good relations within the ethnological circles in Slovakia.

In my opinion, this was related to the fact that, on the one hand, there were not so many students of the discipline; we knew each other, generations up, generations down, we worked together. What may also have been important was the fact that we worked on large projects, such as the *Atlas* or the *Encyclopaedia*, that these were collective works and that we also met at seminars and working meetings, so it was not so separated. Moreover, we had our children there, a single generation of more-or-less the same age, and we organised various events for them. This was also related to the fact that we had a SZM organisation [Socialist Youth Union] at the Institute, just like at any other workplaces, or the ROH [Revolutionary Trade Union Movement] as well, which was required to report some activities. Within our possibilities, we were looking for events that would not be formal, that would not offend anyone and where we would feel good, pleasant, and cheerful. I think what the women had in common was the fact that they were mothers, that we could talk to each other about household issues. In addition, many of us used to be members of folklore ensembles—singers and dancers. This shapes people in a certain way. It also depended on the type of personality, willingness to organise events, spend time, invest energy and, from time to time, undergo some risk. For instance, Magduška Slavkovská—the Women's Day used to be celebrated in a very kind and cultivated manner, she was excellent in organising it, perhaps from the background, she was not that visible, but she contributed a lot. The actors were also important, they always had a speech, such as Arne Mann, Dano Luther, Svet'ò Švehlák, with sweet congratulations, nothing forced' (in: *Ibid.*).

On the occasion of the carnival season in 1988, the Ethnographic Institute SAS staff began organising masquerade balls; there were ten of them until 2003. The first ball did not have a special theme; however, there was an original, hand-painted poster with the drawing of the fairy-tale Punch puppet (*Gašparko*), created by Jaroslav, husband of Gabriela Kiliánová. The text imitated in a carnival way the contemporary formulation of the state research plan, including the name of the persons

responsible for the fulfilment of partial tasks. G. Kiliánová recalls that it hanged on the notice board in front of the Director's Office on the second floor of the Institute's headquarters on Klemensova Street, and that the staff of the neighbouring Institute of the State and Law SAS commented on it with astonishment or even indignation (in: *Ibid.*).

According to Hana Hlôšková, 'the idea of the masquerade balls came from the initiative to organise entertainment events without great expense, where there is no need to be dressed in ball gowns. It was great that there was a smaller group of people who organised it and came up with a programme and a theme. We were joined by family members, husbands, and wives, as well as our colleagues, with whom we were bound in a friendly way, they were our workmates—they came, for example, from Moravia—but it was often through some closer contacts, not formally. For instance, my best friend, Jana Pospíšilová from the Czech Ethnological Institute in Brno, a very communicative person, who came with her husband and her colleague Juška Kosíková; and then my colleague Zygmund Kłodnicki from Poland; later, after 1989, our Austrian colleagues, or a foreign student from Africa—that is, people who were in some way connected to our community. I don't remember any problems, nobody being unable to join the group, and even being beneficial' (in: *Ibid.*).

The venues of the balls varied, which was again related to the contacts of the Institute's staff, their friends, or partners—first, the Slavkovský couple arranged a bar in the Zlatá Lipa restaurant in Dúbravka, Bratislava; then, Branislav, Hana Hlôšková's husband, arranged the Club of the University of Economics on Konventná Street in Bratislava. Several balls took place at the Institute's headquarters on Jakubovo Square, in the hired spaces of the theatre hall. Here, the organisers had to arrange the cleaning of the hall, tablecloths, and dishes, as well as the final decoration with garlands and refreshments. This required ordering cold snacks at a local buffet; other times, the Institute's librarian, A. Kalivodová, an extremely skilled cook and confectioner, cooked a pot of sauerkraut soup for the ball. For the ball in 1999, the Institute's collaborator,

Darina Pavlů, arranged the hiring of a hall in the Topolčianky Castle, including accommodation and a tour of the historical premises and of the stud farm (H. Hlôšková and G. Kiliánová in: *Ibid.*); the last ball of 2003 took place in the V-Club in Bratislava.

According to the witnesses, the first ball was full of funny masks; for instance, Zuzana Profantová was wrapped from head to toe in bandage and held a crook in her hand; her husband (a doctor) came in a blood-stained surgical gown; the Kilián spouses wore authentic Venetian masks of birds; P. Salner was dressed in shorts and wore a red scarf around his neck as a small boy—pioneer; the unrecognisable V. Feglová as a female demonic being *grgalica*; M. Slavkovská in the uniform of a hospital nurse with a bribe bag attached to her hips; J. Podoba in the mask of a woman and his wife Katarína as Charlie Chaplin, etc. (e.g., Hlôšková 2021b).

The second ball, which took place in February 1989, had two carefully rehearsed programme performances. The first one was a dramatised scene *Spinning* by J. Zajonc, A. Onderčaninová, and K. Popelková. Completely dressed in traditional female costumes from the Horehronie region (from the private collection of J. Zajonc), they spun flax on spindles, sang double voice, and verbally commented on the situation in the Institute.

The second one was a group performance with *karička* dance, accompanied by singing. This performance was rehearsed by the former members of folklore ensembles with choreography by Z. Beňušková: 'It was at the time the Institute was moving. We worked physically in the morning—carried packed boxes from Klemensova Street to Jakubovo Square—and after lunch we went to the seminar room of the Ethnography Department on Zelená Street, where we moved away the benches and rehearsed the dance number. We called our ensemble the Quasi Folk Art Ensemble (Slovak abbreviation KLUS was an anagram of the name of the SLUK professional dancing ensemble) and borrowed our costumes from the Gymnik ensemble. The choreography prepared by Zuzka Beňušková was complicated, and we already knew it quite well when Rast'a Stoličná, who had missed several rehearsals, came and cancelled everything, saying no figures,

that we would dance only with a step to the left and a step to the right, so that she could master it as well. Eva Krekovičová and Gabika Kiliánová accompanied us singing. It was unbelievable, that feeling of fun and unity, that we were looking forward to something. Then we successfully performed it at the ball in Lipa' (H. Hlôšková in: Popelková 2022).

Since 1990, the balls had a particular theme, which offered an opportunity to express a common idea in an original way, to use various domestic resources, artistic elements, and skills in the artistic or naive depiction of themes, or to mobilise contacts in theatre studios or wardrobes of folklore ensembles.

The theme of the ball in 1990, which was held only three months after the political upheaval, was *Change*. There were several outstanding masks at the edge of political satire, in particular three Austrian colleagues in the masks of the Berlin Wall, the United States of Europe or colporteur of the Austrian Kurier newspaper; Milan Leščák in a hat and suit with a tie, dressed inside out, as a self-ironic mask of a *Coat flipper*; or urban ethnologists in the group mask of *Old Bratislava Structures*. Other ball themes included the *Life of Ancient Slavs* with the unforgettable 'Svätopluk's wet-nurse' by Moravian folklorist Jana Pospíšilová, *King Svätopluk* (M. Leščák), and *Svätožizňa* (H. Hlôšková), or African student Fernando in the traditional costume of the Detva region with the *valaška* shepherd's axe, or the joint mask of Lubica Faltánová and her husband Lubomír from the Institute of Sociology SAS, who came as a couple called *Beauty and the Beast* (Hlôšková 2021b).

From the ball themed *Trip around the World*, what remains in memory is G. Kiliánová wearing the mask of an owner of a travel agency offering a cruise on the Titanic, or J. Zajonc as a native Indian. The balls on Jakubovo Square always had a jury who, after the masks' promenade, announced the best mask. The two permanent jury members were D. Ratica and S. Kovačevićová, plus two guests. At some balls, there was also a midnight raffle or admission to the ethnographers' guild, which was performed by M. Leščák or Magdaléna Paríková from the Ethnography



Department, then Chairwoman of the Ethnographic Society of Slovakia, by attaching the *valaška* shepherd's axe to the adept's shoulder.

The other ball themes included *Flora and Fauna*, where Z. Beňušková in a black costume, rolling a huge fitball, unforgettably portrayed a dung beetle; *Flower Children* with funny Darina Pavlů as Yoko Ono; and the husband of E. Krekovičová, archaeologist Eduard, who played the guitar as background music for the joint singing of Beatles songs (*Ibid.*).

All the balls were attended not only by friends, colleagues from other institutes of the same field and external collaborators of the Institute, but also by the Austrian colleagues (H. Hlôšková and G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2022). H. Hlôšková recalls that during balls and, after all, during all other leisure activities, work matters were commonly discussed (2021b).

In this context, it is interesting how humour and social satire, as well as kind self-irony (both intra-institutional and individual) resonated not only as a form of team-building, but also as a way of intimate sharing, group identification, and relief of the weaknesses in society. This happened both during the socialist era (bribes, ironisation of state planning) and during the ensuing post-socialist period: the post-November 'coats flipping'—the mask of a former Communist, or humorous commentaries on the representatives of the contemporary political scene—E. Krekovičová as a goose pulled by her husband by a string at the ball in Topolčianky, which was an allusion to the policy of Augustín Marián Húska (Húska meaning goose), or the mask of H. Hlôšková called *We are not Mečiar's sheep*, dressed all up in a woollen suit, including slippers with the head and ears of sheep. There were also masks reflecting on the gender aspects of the double-career of female scientists—mothers: H. Hlôšková, for example, produced a suit, half of which was a culinary apron (*Ibid.*). In addition to a funny idea, most masks usually required home production. In some cases, professional costumes were borrowed from the Slovak National Theatre, but again, with an unconventional, intellectually humorous purpose. In this sense, professional masquerade costumes, in which foreign

colleagues, who were unfamiliar with the internal unwritten 'ball rules', came to the Institute's balls after the revolution, did not work well (*Ibid.*).

At the turn of the millennium, the ball activity that accompanied the first transition decade ceased despite considerable efforts to hand over the organisational relay to the youngest generation—Lubica Herzánová and Ivica Bumová. The theme of the last ball in 2003 was *Globalisation*. However, the interest in attending a ball waned in the years after. The scope of responsibilities and, in particular, the time required to prepare such events, became too demanding. Part of the Builders' and Transformation Generations, who were in the background of the preparation of these events, somehow 'lost the organisational drive'.

It is also necessary to take into consideration the more general context, in which balls as a widespread way of spending time together during the socialist era, in particular in smaller teams and companies, were gradually replaced by other forms of teambuilding (Christmas parties, wine tasting, goulash parties, etc.). The reason to come together 'because of children' lost significance, too, since the children born predominantly in the 1970s grew into adults during the first transition period. Likewise, a wide offer of children's programmes and experiential camps during the summer holidays developed as an attractive alternative.

In 2006, P. Slavkovský reflected on this inactivity as a natural consequence of the fact that the Institute ceased carrying out collective projects and that the style of work became individualised: 'Nevertheless, we live in a period of increasingly sophisticated evaluation and accreditation criteria. Perhaps, it will be these criteria that will raise the need for a new, large collective work in the future, thus increasing the visibility of our Institute and ethnology as a scientific discipline. If such work becomes the common denominator, bringing together the efforts of all colleagues, then it will certainly not be a problem to also restore the tradition of ethnographic balls, because people who collaborate in a meaningful way usually wish to have fun together' (2006, pp 28-9).

## The First Transformation Decade —Continuity, Search, and Experimenting

The first Transformation decade in the organisation overlapped with generation exchange, i.e., the definite leaving of the youngest part of the Generation of Founders and the gradual leaving of the older and middle part of the Generation of Builders. The Transformation Generation entered the stage of senior researchers, while it was renewed at least partly and grew by the youngest members, who were newly arrived graduates. The 1990s thus represent in the organisation generational blending and overlapping of two strong lines, while the youngest layer of the Generation of Builders reached its publication and research zenith, with a still strong publication support of the older, emeritus layer of the Builders. In this period, the Transformation Generation assertively claimed the task to define the scientific concept of the Institute and its further direction, which was also reflected in the change of the institution's name to the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in 1994.

In doing so, the organisation coped quite smoothly with the external change of the political climate and, apart from the dissolution of the Communist Party group at the workplace and the corresponding change of the organisational structure (establishment of the Scientific Board and Director's Board), it avoided work or personnel rupture. Moreover, it was quickly able to navigate and adapt to the changes in the financing and evaluation of science in Slovakia. Remarkably, the representatives of both generation lines were also successful in acquiring new skills (fundraising, project know-how) and smoothly handled also their personal (individual) switch to the computerisation and digitisation of science.

In connection with the restriction in the financing of science and of the SAS, the organisation had to dismiss several employees, mainly in the segment of expert and technical staff. In connection with the general trend of computerisation, the Institute attempted to set up, at the beginning of the 1990s, an integrated ethnographic information system; however, these attempts failed due to the headcount reduction and cancellation of the

Documentation Department. Partial projects pursuing the creation of closed thematic electronic databases in the 1990s failed too, because of finance and personnel downsizing of this orientation of the Institute. Given the changed method of evaluation, the organisation had to watch its scientific performance and the proportion of scientific and expert staff members within the key staff team.

The emergence of digital media, the massive reduction of staff that took care of the scientific collections, as well as changes in the financing of science began causing a shift in the project and publication *habitus*. While the previous decades saw exponential growth, an incremental hiatus in archives acquisitions began in the 1990s—except for 'Atlas acquisitions' related to the field research among Slovaks abroad. The scientific activities of a part of the Generation of Builders (current and emeritus) returned to the archives, and the 1990s in the Institute can be considered the golden age of publishing systematically processed sources.

The Generation of Builders was critical about the abandonment of traditional topics and approaches and was nostalgic about the central planning of science and research that allowed for a concentrated team work on large syntheses, pointing out the excessive particularisation and individualisation of research, which was systematically visible in the numerical increase of research issues under the first transformation scientific programme.

On the other hand, the possibility of free submission of project applications by smaller teams or even individual applicants, complying thematically with the approved scientific programme of the institution, definitely liberalised research and brought a moment of creativity and flexibility, as well as the possibility of responding to current processes and social issues. Previously tabooed (religiosity, traditional spiritual culture) or underdeveloped topics (research on ethnic minorities, environmental ethnology) came to the fore. Folklore and urban studies celebrated a research boom. The representatives of both generations raised with great enthusiasm new and highly topical issues, such as economic and social transformation in post-socialist society. This development

can also be interpreted as a liberating response to the previous period of central planning and, at the same time, as the generational assertion of the new Transformation Generation against the Builders.

Nevertheless, both generations, at least during the first post-socialist decade, were affected to some extent by socialist education, language barriers, the underdeveloped international social capital, insufficient know-how with regard to the submission of international projects, as well as the unavailability of (translations) key Western literature works. As a result, the involvement of the Transformation Generation into the international research area was not so smooth and problem-free. In this sense, both the Builders' and the Transformation generations paid a certain price.

The key representatives of the Transformation Generation needed, first and foremost, to orient themselves in the European scientific area and build from scratch an international scientific capital through scientific mobility. Since the institutional sector was underdeveloped in this regard—just like the very infrastructure of the Academy—the necessary possibilities and opportunities were often provided to them by the NGO sector. This navigation and self-learning interim period took place spontaneously, individually, and at different paces. The key representatives of the Transformation Generation acquired the necessary knowledge for the setting-up of their own teams and ambitious scientific tasks during the second transition decade.

With hindsight, some innovations introduced during the first transition period turned out to be counterproductive. For instance, extensive workload dedicated to pedagogical activities: in 1998, the Institute had over 20 lecturers at eight universities; in statistical terms, the Institute's staff gave 5,225 hours of lectures and exercises in the course of the 1990s (Benža 2003, p. 74). This, logically, impacted the scientists' engagement in the Institute, as well as their publication outputs.

The wide range of cooperation projects with the NGO sector, under which the staff members worked simultaneously full-time outside the Academy, turned out to be unsustainable in the long term, too.

From the longer time perspective, the execution of internal institutional, national, and international projects, which did not bring any financial resources to the Institute, also appeared to be inefficient, just like the development of international cooperation projects without deeper internal links to the scientific concept. These transformational innovations began to be gradually dropped in the 2010s, despite the ever-increasing external pressures to deliver and raise competitive and extra-budgetary finances.

During the Transformation period, the institution was not afraid of discussions and critical reflections that opened up new horizons; and even though some paths turned out to be dead ends, they initiated the necessary transformation processes and willingness to experiment. The first transition decade can also be described as the aftermath of the concentrated work of large teams on cross-cutting syntheses, which was reflected in the continued spending of time together (the golden age of masquerade balls) in the institution, joint celebrations of anniversaries of current, as well as emeritus staff members, meetings of the Generation of Founders (regular Tuesday meetings of the 'girls'). The changed system of work, the individual and particular formulation of scientific tasks, as well as the leaving of the generationally strong groups ultimately caused the gradual abandonment of organising larger (all-institutional) work trips and leisure activities in the second transition period.

The post-revolutionary internal constructive reflection of the discipline and the dynamic social and political development at the beginning of the 1990s indicated that the impacts of non-scientific (stimulating or limiting) factors on ethnology would not end; on the contrary, they would continue to grow. The discipline observed them and gradually began to accept them as one of its applied dimensions. There was a growing interest in advising and expertise for government bodies, civic initiatives, non-governmental organisations, and local authorities. As a social demand, the field of view was penetrated by tasks related to the research on ethnic minorities, social inclusion, issues of European cultural heritage and values, which became symptomatic leitmotifs of the next transition period.

# The Second Transition Decade —Anthropologisation and Internationalisation

After the end of the first Transformation period, during which the scientific programme was based on the concept prepared under the leadership of M. Leščák at the beginning of the 1990s, the history of the Institute of Ethnology SAS again saw a stage of debates related to, among other things, the new management that took over in 2000.

In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Institute became directly dependent on external, predominantly quantitative evaluation of its scientific outcomes. Another criterion of success from the external perspective was mainly the obtaining of European framework projects funded from abroad.

After ten years of transition, an urgent need emerged at the Institute to clarify again issues related to its mission, vision, and research objectives, including to define the relationship between ethnology and social/cultural anthropology. Towards the end of his second term in office, Director D. Ratica publicly declared that he would not run again in the next elections, which brought some dynamics into the internal relationships between generations.

Many representatives of the Transformation Generation appreciated the conceptual freedom of the first post-revolution decade which they made use to gain better orientation within the wider European scientific space, build social capital, and expand their methodological perspectives and language competences.

In contrast, the Generation of Builders—which was still the most productive in terms of publications and projects—faced increased feelings of dissatisfaction with the way the Institute was being run, as well as the post-November management style, which they considered non-conceptual: ‘Ratica “skimmed off the top” of the previous period. At the SAS Presidium, he could boast the awards for the *EAS* and the *Encyclopaedia* as well as other scientific activities of the previous period. During his term, the Institute worked only out of inertia’ (P. Slavkovský in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

In a similar spirit, the then Chairwoman of the IE SAS Scientific Board, R. Stoličná (2021), did not even attempt to hide in her memories her disappointment at not holding a conference on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the Institute in 1995: ‘In 1993, I was elected to the Scientific Board of the Institute and became its Chairwoman in 1997-2000. On the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute, I proposed to the Director that we organise an international conference, but he disagreed. Neither the conference nor any commemoration of this anniversary ever took place. I admit that I didn’t understand his attitude’. As a result, however, back in 1999, R. Stoličná began preparing the first proposal for a conference on the 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the Institute in 2001, which was to discuss mainly its new scientific and research programme.

## The ‘Struggle’ for the Scientific Concept and for the Way of Managing and Directing the Institute

There were two candidates for the election at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century: Gabriela Kiliánová and Rastislava Stoličná. The election of the IE SAS Director thus represented, to some extent,

not only a clash of the Builders' and Transformation Generations, but to a large extent, a consensus of both Generations as well about the need to form a new scientific programme of the Institute and change the style of the work system.

In this context, the Builders were inclined to develop traditional ethnographic or modern post-socialist ethnology, while the members of the Transformation Generation preferred the post-modern 'Western' ethnological line, which meant starting to 'taste' social and cultural anthropology. The group of Builders was particularly dissatisfied not only with current management style, but also with the scientific direction and the increasingly tangible *anthropologisation* of the Institute.

The first post-revolutionary decade also saw several discussion clashes between the leaders of the Builders' and Transformation Generations which—from the point of view of the speakers of the Generations of Builders, sometimes took place even in the spirit of radical, indiscriminate condemnation of the previous key research methods and themes that were worked on at the Institute (Slavkovský 1996).

As mentioned earlier, these conceptual inclinations did not pursue strictly generation-restricted cohorts. While the Transformation Generation was not significantly unified in terms of its conceptual approach and tended to support the member of the previous management, G. Kiliánová, the 'hard' core of the Generation of Builders—M. Benža, P. Slavkovský, R. Stoličná—put forward R. Stoličná as a candidate for the Director's post.

During the first Transformation decade, Stoličná, who was first a member (from 1993) and later Chairwoman of the Institute's Scientific Board (1997–2000), had a large track record of several stays abroad, being coordinator of several successful national projects and author of monographs on culinary culture (Stoličná 1991, 2000) and awarded collective syntheses, such as *Slovakia. European Contexts of Folk Culture* (Stoličná et al. 1997) and *Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry* (Stoličná et al. 2000).

While M. Benža and P. Slavkovský presented themselves on a number of occasions and in several discussions on the pages of

the *Slovenský národopis* journal (Slavkovský 1996; Benža 1998) as proponents of conservative, traditionally oriented ethnographic research, R. Stoličná identified herself with the need for transformation and modernisation of Slovak ethnology and anticipated the usefulness of dialogues with social and cultural anthropology (1994).

Her rival candidate in the election was a prominent representative of the Transformation Generation, G. Kiliánová, who was a member of the Institute's management during the first transformation period—first as its Scientific Secretary (1993–97) and later as Deputy Director (1998–2000). During the first Transformation decade, Kiliánová sparked a controversy with the Generation of Builders (1999) by responding critically and with balanced argumentation to M. Benža's article on the objective existence of 'ethnicity' in the *Slovenský národopis* journal (1998). Kiliánová came from a strong group of female experts in folklore studies working in the Institute (A. Hlôšková, E. Krekovičová, Z. Profantová, Z. Vanovičová) and, at the time of running for the Director's post, she had a successful record of English publications on folklore and folklorism (Kiliánová and Krekovičová, Eds. 1992, 1994), as well as extensive managerial experience and contacts from international cooperation. She was supported by the then management of the Institute, as well as by the discussion leader of the Transformation Generation, J. Podoba.

J. Podoba came to a study visit at the Ethnographic Institute SAS in 1985. His ethnographic start and initial thematic orientation on settlements, building culture, and housing were strongly influenced by the distinguished personality of the former Director of the Institute, Ján Mjartan. Being involved in civic activism, in the latter half of the 1980s he became a member of the Slovak environmental initiative and one of the co-authors of the publication *Bratislava/nahlas* [Bratislava/aloud], which openly described the state of the environment in the country ruled by the Communist regime (Danglová 2008, p. 230). At the beginning of the 1990s, he established scientific contacts



with organisations abroad, worked under several international projects, and was personally confronted with Anglo-Saxon anthropology as an advanced modern social science. His focus on social anthropology and, thematically, on the study of the impacts of political, economic, and social transition on the daily culture and the way of life significantly deepened. During the first Transformation decade, as the manager of several project teams at the Institute of Ethnology SAS, he advocated the social-anthropological approach and the opening to new theoretical and methodological impulses. These efforts, as noted by O. Danglová, 'soon brought J. Podoba fruits with the bitter taste of criticism, often perceived as fouling their own nest, but also with the tint of novelty, shifting the domestic discipline towards the horizons of Western standards' (2008, p. 231). During the transformation period, J. Podoba held several important posts in the Institute: he was its Scientific Secretary (1990–1) and Vice-Chair of the Scientific Board (1998–2001). In 2001–4, he chaired the Scientific Board of the IE SAS and, between 2002–9, he was a member of the Assembly of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. In the second Transformation decade, his efforts to open the discipline to impulses from Western anthropological science were translated into his pedagogical activities while, in 2000, he began conducting a seminar for PhD students at the Institute (*Ibid.*, p. 232).

As for discussions within the transforming Slovak ethnology, from the point of view of the Builders, J. Podoba raised sharp and degrading criticism (Slavkovský 1996) in some of his contributions of the scientific competence and expertise of the representatives of the Institute's older generations and Slovak ethnology in general (Podoba 1996a, b, 1999).

After M. Leščák retired from the post of the Director (1992) and M. Kaľavský left the Institute (1996), the baton of theoretical debates on the key notions of ethnology at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century—*ethnicity* and *identity*—was gradually taken over mainly by G. Kiliánová. She edited several works on this topic in Slovak (Ed. 1998) and English language

(Kiliánová and Riečanská, Eds. 2000). Together with her husband, she was actively involved in cooperation with the educational NGO Academia Istropolitana Nova (AINova), becoming one of the founders of the European Studies in AINova. There, she began teaching in English (and later also at the University of Vienna) and acquired basic know-how in project writing. In 1992, 1993, and 1994, she attended repeated stays at the European University Institute in Florence (Kiliánová 2006, p. 62), thanks to which she laid the fundamentals for the cooperation of the Institute in the 'European Doctorate' project.

During the first transition decade, a three-round system of electing the Director of SAS organisations was introduced. The candidate applied for a public selection procedure, submitted the application to the SAS Presidium, including the CV and other necessary documents and, in particular, the concept of managing the Institute. During the first round, after the candidate's public presentation and a discussion at the Institute in front of the Selection Committee and members of the academic community of the Institute, the academic community held a secret vote, which was followed by a private hearing and voting by the Selection Committee members. If there were several candidates, the Committee set the order and sent the report from the selection procedure and recommendations to the SAS Presidium. The third round included the hearing of the candidate at the SAS Presidium, where the candidate again presented the vision of managing the Institute and was required to answer questions from members of the Presidium. Subsequently, the candidate was informed about the result on the spot and the decision was later sent to the Institute officially in writing. Even though cases of non-approval for the Director in the third round of the election were rare, they did happen, and so the hearing at the SAS Presidium was not only a formality. In fact, the questions of the SAS Presidium members intentionally tackled the weaknesses of the organisation and the vision for how to deal with them.

In the first round of the election of the Director of the IE SAS in June 2000, the majority of the staff, after hearing

and discussing the concepts of both candidates, voted for G. Kiliánová. The selection of the academic community in the first round was subsequently confirmed both by the Selection Committee and the SAS Presidium, and G. Kiliánová was appointed as Director of the IE SAS for the 2000–4 period.

The opposing candidates remained without any personal conflict because of the election. Kiliánová sought to act without confrontation, while R. Stoličná continued exercising the role of the Chair of the Scientific Board, remaining involved in the preparation of the scientific programme and the annual conference on the establishment of the Institute in 2001.

L. Voľanská, then a PhD student at the Institute, recalls another important moment that might play crucial role in the election in 2000: 'I think that during that period, as doctoral students, for the first time we had the chance to take part in the running of the Institute, having the opportunity to elect a new Director. Maybe it's just an impression, but it somehow stuck in my memory that Gabika Kiliánová became the Director thanks to our votes [PhD students]. What I always admired about her was that she was able to talk to anyone in exactly the same way, regardless of whether it was just a student, a starting PhD student, or a distinguished professor or academic' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

G. Kiliánová remembers her taking up the duties and the need for urgent changes in the management and direction of the Institute as follows: 'When I took up the Director's post on August 1, 2000, I thought the creative freedom of the project teams (totally understandable during the first years of transformation) should be regulated to a larger extent. Or to say it otherwise, all staff members should make up a single team (split into mobile project groups) pursuing an agreed objective(s). What I therefore considered very important was: (1) to create a concept of the Institute's scientific direction, (2) to seek to obtain projects so that they comply with the agreed concept, discussed by the team. (...) The basis of the concept was set up by the IE SAS Scientific Board in autumn 2000 or at the beginning

of 2001. The Scientific Board was chaired by Rastislava Stoličná at that time, and I remember that the very first outline of the concept was written by E. Krekovičová as a member of that board. We discussed the concept and finalised it at the Institute's meetings (...). I was convinced that if we had a clear and good programme, knowing what we wanted to achieve, we would have found the projects/funds for pursuing our objectives as well' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 3).

G. Kiliánová remained at the Director's post for two more terms (2004–8, 2008–12), with nobody running against her. As a prominent and respected leader, she largely contributed to the consolidation and transformation of the Institute in the second Transformation decade, turning it into a modern ethnological and anthropological institution with a significant national and visible international dimension.

### **The Scientific Concept of the Second Transformation Decade –Anthropologisation of the Institute**

In the winter of 2000, the proposal of the Scientific Board determined three areas that appeared to be promising points of focus of ethnological themes for the next five years: (1) ethno-historical development in the Central European space, (2) ethnological reflection on the transition processes in Slovak society after 1989, and (3) the role and contribution of cultural heritage in the European context.

A number of specific topics were proposed in the framework of these major points of focus. The Scientific Board presented the draft concept to all staff members for comments, asking also the former Director, D. Ratica, and the IE SAS researcher and Head of the Department of Folklore and Regional Studies of the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, V. Feglová, for its critical evaluation.

In March 2001, the reviewers presented their opinions as part of an institutional discussion. Though each of them came from opposing sides, both of them jointly suggested that if the concept

was to succeed, it would require a change in the discourse. Feglová appreciated the efforts to disrupt the stereotypical perception of the topics, the exploration of changes in cultural phenomena and channels for a dialogue between generations, changes in the life worlds under the impact of consumerism, the processes of the atomisation of society, new forms of ritualised behaviour, and the ways of group identification within individualised society (Popelková 2003, p. 103).

D. Ratica recommended that the research take into account the impacts of mass media and internet communication in the image of daily life and the transmission of culture, which highlighted the need to explore changes in values under the influence of the commodification of the human body and mass use of civilisational and scientific achievements (*Ibid.*). Ratica also brought forward an unusually creative idea for that time to create space in the concept for 'workshops' to 'reflect on the sources of thematic innovation of the discipline'. He thus laid the foundation for the later fourth theme of the concept, which was dedicated not only to history, but also to theoretical discussions on the current directions and trends in the discipline.

As it turned out, the concept, which required further dialogue, ultimately became the basis for discussions at the international conference *Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections and Trends*, which had been organised by the Institute in Topoľčianky in November 2001 on the occasion of its 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The conference took the form of papers and related supplementary papers. The presentations made by the Institute's researchers (see *Slovenský národopis* 2002(3-4); Kiliánová et al., Eds. 2005) were accompanied by supplementary papers—critical comments and observations by external Slovak ethnologists or experts in the respective topics from neighbouring countries.

The paper of the IE SAS Director, as one of the three opening keynote speeches, outlined the scientific concept and future direction of the Institute. This paper was reviewed by three members of the Institute's academic community: R. Stoličná,

E. Krekovičová, and J. Podoba. In addition to the IE SAS Director, foreign guests also gave their keynote speeches within the given section: Peter Niedermüller from Humboldt University in Berlin and Jolanta Ługowska from the University of Wrocław (Kiliánová and Stoličná 2005, p. 10 and 16). The framework for the future prospects and vision of the IE SAS was prepared by the Scientific Board members, E. Krekovičová and R. Stoličná, in cooperation with the five-member working group. The presented draft of the scientific concept identified four key topics detailed through specific sub-topics:

(1) An ethnological reflection on the transition processes in Slovak society after 1989 (1993). Studies oriented towards social and political anthropology (ethnic processes, ethnic/national identity, ethnic minorities, ethnic conflicts; modernisation and post-modernisation processes; socio-cultural aspects of economic and political transformation);

(2) The role and contribution of the cultural heritage of Slovakia in the European context (constant enlargement of the source base, building of a scientific and information foundation as a prerequisite for preserving historical memory; usage and application of the knowledge of basic ethnological research for the cultivation of the relation towards national, regional, and European values);

(3) The ethno-historical development of the Central European space (evolutionary processes of daily culture in rural and urban society; the image of cultural development in Central Europe, its reinterpretation, deconstruction, demythologisation; inter-disciplinary research leading towards cultural and social history (historical anthropology); ethno-cultural aspects and processes in Slovakia, which were taboos in the years 1945-89, their research and (re-)interpretation (religion, values, norms, regulation, and the like); the ethnography of Communism);

(4) The history of the scientific discipline (Kiliánová 2005a, pp. 28-9).

The proposal sought to combine two key trends of ethnological research at the Institute: the continuation of research on the ethnic determination of folk (traditional) culture on the one hand,

and a clear commitment to understanding traditions in the spirit of the new theoretical concept of the cultural heritage studies developed as part of cultural anthropology on the other.

In addition, the research concept largely expanded the thematic portfolio towards social (or declaratorily also political) anthropology. In the forthcoming period, research was to focus on two core lines of basic research: *post-socialist transition and cultural heritage*, while systematically focusing on Central Europe.

Even though new scientific concept clearly declared full deployment of the capacities to build a modern anthropological line in the spirit of the expectations and mindset of the Transformation Generation, its narrative also increased the importance of 'historical anthropology', thus creating a sufficiently dignified place for the completion of traditional research conducted by the Generation of Builders.

The self-reflection of the discipline, promoted under the fourth research line, is an interesting element from the point of view of exploring the history of the institution, since not all disciplines and not all SAS institutes had the energy and finance for its systematic realisation under the changed conditions.

In her conference paper of 2001, G. Kiliánová reflected on ethnological research in Slovakia in the 1990s as 'a relatively dynamic period of looking for new ways, critical re-evaluations, as well as revision of former topics from different perspectives' (2005a, p. 30). She attributed the greatest importance to the paradigmatic change in the framework of which ethnology in Slovakia began leaning towards 'the study of human beings, culture, and society, which digressed from the historical, evolutionary, or typological study of (traditional) culture of one's own nation and narrow national research' (*Ibid.*, pp. 29–30).

In this context, her contribution to the future direction of the Institute—unlike the text of the concept—sounds somewhat confrontational: 'Is the culture of ethnic community the priority for our research, or is it the study of human beings and human communities, their social and cultural activities, institutions, and processes?' (*Ibid.*).

Even though her intention is formulated as a question, this formulation puts both lines in opposition and, in a certain sense, places the direction of ethnology in Slovakia to the position of *either one or the other*. The speaker's opinion is clearly intelligible and can be interpreted also as a programme declaration of the new anthropological direction of the Institute and an important milestone in its transformation to pursue the anthropological direction.

The outlined concept of the Institute as a framework for its research strategy did not see major changes in the following years of the second transition decade. The four main research theme clusters (transformation processes, cultural heritage, ethno-historical development of Central Europe, and the history and theory of the discipline) thus remained continuously preserved.

#### Internalisation of External Milestones—Self-Reflection

The open discussions on the concept before and during the conference on the occasion of the 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute, the work of the Scientific Board members on formulating the scientific programme, as well as the critical analysis of the previous decade by the Institute's Director document the great deal of energy spent by the scientific team to guide the development of research at the IE SAS at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Like M. Leščák in 1991 (1991a, b, c), G. Kiliánová also contributed personally to the self-reflection of the discipline. These were fundamental impulses for the continuity and sound functioning of the institution during the difficult transition period, marked by two important historical milestones of Slovak society: the collapse of the Communist regime in 1989 and the birth of the Slovak Republic in 1993.

In the subsequent period, the directions of the scientific programme set in 2001 were successfully copied in a relatively balanced way with outputs in the particular thematic areas of social and cultural changes, life in socialism, post-socialist

transformation, research of the city, religiosity, and ethnic minorities. These were followed by ethno-cartographic research on traditional culture among Slovak minorities in European countries, as well as the development of Romani studies, and a new scientific field—religious studies that was established with the admission of T. Podolinská.

Slovakia's entry in the European Union (EU) in May 2004 represented the third external challenge for the Institute during the transition period. Nine staff members of the Institute joined the discussion in a special issue of the *Etnologické rozpravy* journal (2004(1)) on 'Ethnology, ethnologists, and the European Union'.

J. Podoba reflected on the situation in the discipline and its preparedness for the European integration. According to him, the process that brought better availability of funds for promoting scientific research and scholarships for students, doctoral or post-doctoral students, enhanced cooperation between institutions on both sides of the former Iron Curtain, elimination of the administrative barriers that facilitated work stays at foreign academic institutions, etc., had begun after November 1989. From this perspective, he did not perceive the country's accession to the EU as a turning point. What he considered a problem was the fact that, over the fifteen years that had passed since then, no discussion was opened in Slovak ethnology about its compatibility with the scientific standard in Western Europe or even about the need for a 'theoretical-methodological and epistemological shift of the discipline more into the context of European science' (2004, p. 15).

Another Institute's staff member and ethnologist, M. Kaľavský, who had gained personal experience as a government official in the mid-1990s, also considered it a deficiency that Slovak ethnology was 'not completely' able to embrace the discussion on changes caused by the long-awaited entry in the EU (2004, p. 19). He described the possibilities created by the legal system of the European Community for its Member States in the field

of culture and research. While he emphasised the topicality of the issue of cultural heritage for Slovak ethnology, when it came to research, however, he saw its perspective in joining the interdisciplinary research of global issues, 'such as sustainable development, regional development, or the Lisbon strategy' (*Ibid.*, p. 20). As an example, he presented the aspects of the current situation and position of the Roma minority in Slovakia at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century—a high number of asylum seekers in Western European countries, reductions in social benefits, and the related civil unrest, deficiencies in education, housing, and health in segregated Roma communities—and, although marginally, in the subject of the fight against racism as well. In this regard, he highlighted the urgent need for applied research and engaged science. He identified the dissemination and popularisation of Slovak ethnology as another current issue to achieve greater visibility, positive perception, and a more modern image of the discipline in the wider public (*Ibid.*).

The same issue of the journal contained discussion papers by PhD students at the Institute from that time on current topics: the deteriorating social situation in connection with European integration (the phenomenon of urban and rural poverty, Beňová 2004, pp. 60–1) and Europe's ageing population (Herzánová 2004).

M. Vrzgulová—who at the time of Slovakia's accession to the EU, in addition to her scientific and research work at the Institute, was intensively engaged in lecturing and managerial work at the Milan Šimečka Foundation for almost ten years and coordinated educational activities on the Holocaust in Slovakia—contributed to the issue with a reflection on educational activities outside the academic environment and their inspiration for scientific research (2004, pp. 74–5).

In 2006, the Institute commemorated six decades of its activities as a key academic institution in the field of ethnology in Slovakia by publishing a special issue of the *Etnologické rozpravy* journal (2006(1)). The editors of the issue, K. Popelková and J. Zajonc, approached more than ninety retired and active ethnographers, experts in folklore studies, ethnologists from



various expert organisations (universities, museums etc.) with an offer to publish their reflections on the Institute.

In the end, 26 authors from Slovakia and abroad contributed to the issue. The section of the issue, which reflected on the relationship of the discipline and the celebrating Institute through individual fates, contained 24 personally-tuned reflections and essays. The offer was also accepted by the staff members of the Institute, who represented several generations: S. Kovačevičová, V. Gašparíková, M. Kubová, M. Leščák, M. Benža, R. Stoličná, D. Luther, G. Kiliánová, P. Salner, Z. Vanovičová, J. Podoba, and T. Podolinská. The issue also contained an extensive interview with the long-time Director of the Institute, B. Filová (Bobáková and Tužinská 2006).

The published set of individual memories, factual descriptions, personal opinions, and evaluations of selected moments and facts in the history of the Institute, represents a specific attempt to reflectively look back over the decades of its existence. From today's perspective, it can be considered a kind of a description of the Institute's history by its staff members and, hence, a symbolic closing of various (internally) important stages of the 60-year history of the Institute.

### Internal Consolidation of the Institute and Performance Evaluation

As remembered by G. Kiliánová, her taking up of office was also accompanied by the internal consolidation of the Institute or, as she called it in her memoirs, 'tidying up'. In this context, it was necessary to introduce a whole series of internal regulations, since, as she noted, 'there were also labour regulations which had not been applied, or just loosely...'. It was necessary to begin requiring the employees to comply with the basic labour regulations even in the day-to-day common operation of the Institute (workplace attendance, teleworking, posting on business trips and field research) (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 7).

Seeking to consolidate scientific performance, the Institute's management began demanding from the staff members that they present their individual work plan at the beginning of the year. In 2002, a system of reporting results by filling in an electronic form of activity reports was approved upon discussions within the academic community and the Scientific Board. These reports monitored the publication, teaching, popularisation, and organisational activities of individuals, as well as their efforts to obtain extra-budgetary funds. After the academic community had discussed a proposal for the outputs scoring system, as well as its approval by the Board of the Director in 2001, the scoring system became a tool for setting the individual annual performance of scientific staff.

The entire process was based on a new internal regulation on the rules of allocation of individual extra-pays and bonuses granted by the Director, which the IE SAS then adopted in 2002. According to this regulation, the amount of the individual extra-pay, which was paid in addition to the salary during the next twelve months, was based on the Institute's performance scale for 'creative', i.e., scientific staff members. Based on the total score for the activities reported in a reference period, staff members were assigned to a concrete place on a point scale or to one of the performance groups rated with five or ten points. The funds from the central salary resources, which were available to individual extra-pays, were divided by the Director into specific amounts for specific performance groups. In addition to scientific staff, she determined the amounts of individual extra-pays also for specialised and technical staff. The Director presented the performance scales of the individual scientific staff members to the Board of the Director. This system was applied in January 2003 for the first time when evaluating the year 2002.

An older, traditional tool of performance remuneration—which was used only when available funds were left in the allocated budget or if extra funds were allocated for this purpose from the SAS central resources—were distributed either as end-year

or half-year extraordinary bonuses. G. Kiliánová rewarded important publication or editorial outputs and the coordination or organisation activities of project teams, while consulting the proposed principle for the allocation of the funds with the Board of the Director.

In 2004, she made the remuneration system more transparent by implementing the 'guaranteed remuneration' instrument, which mainly involved a symbolic bonus to the research staff for their publication, editorial, and managerial outcomes under the set categories, with a fixed amount for each item. In order to obtain authentic figures for the purposes of the remuneration, the employees were required to submit to the Institute's management a report of their outputs in the given categories as of the set date.

The system of Director's rewards concerned not only creative staff, but also specialised staff and staff of the Institute's secretariat. Their organisational achievements and activities beyond their job description were recorded and rewarded separately. The remuneration for the Director of the Institute was decided by the SAS Presidium.

The remuneration system—in the form of half-year and/or end-year bonuses and monthly individual extra-pays based on the results of the activity report scores of the previous year—was in place throughout all three terms of office of G. Kiliánová as the Institute's Director. Minor changes of the activity report form and the scoring system were implemented three times during this period.

In 2010, the internal regulation from 2002 was amended. To prevent a shortage in publications by the Institute's researchers, the condition for granting the individual extra-pay and extraordinary bonus was in compliance with the *publication limit* of at least two studies per calendar year. One interesting feature of this scoring system was the favouring of the foreign language versions of the publication and presentation outputs in a world language and the assignment of points for a certain volume of external funds raised for the Institute. The Institute

thus sought to motivate its staff to publish in a foreign language and to contribute to improving its financial situation. These two trends correspond to the post-socialist transformation of science and research in Slovakia. The national ecosystem politically opened to liberalisation, which was accompanied by the limitation of budgetary funds for science and research. The need to penetrate in the global research space required improvement of the researchers' language competences as a prerequisite for obtaining know-how about publishing at foreign high-impact journals.

### Personnel and Qualification Structure of the Institute

In 2000, the Institute had 24 FTEs (Full-Time Equivalent), of which 19 were scientific staff FTEs, with an average age of 46 years. G. Kiliánová, the newly-elected Director for the period 2000–4, appointed K. Popelková as Scientific Secretary, while the Deputy Director post was not occupied. The Scientific Board was chaired by R. Stoličná. In 2001, J. Podoba became the Chairman of the Scientific Board. In the same year, K. Popelková became Deputy Director, holding this post until 2017. At the end of the first term of office of the new management, the Institute had 24.7 FTEs with 18.2 scientific staff members at an average age of 51 years.

In 2004, G. Kiliánová was re-elected as the Institute's Director for another four years (2004–8). M. Vrzgulová became the Chairwoman of the Scientific Board. In 2005, T. Bužeková, a graduate from PhD studies, became the Scientific Secretary (until July 31, 2007). From August 1, 2007 until her maternal leave in June 2008, the position of the Scientific Secretary was held by T. Podolinská. This post was subsequently assumed again by K. Popelková (2008–16).

The Institute entered the second Transformation decade with one researcher with the DrSc degree (abbreviation of the Latin *doctor scientiarum*). This degree was awarded by the SAS from 1953 until 2011 to outstanding scientific personalities after the submission and public defence of their doctoral thesis.

In 2011, this authority was assumed by an independent state committee. The lower-rank scientific degree CSc (abbreviation of the Latin *candidatus scientiarum*) was awarded as the result of a successful public defence of the so-called candidate's dissertation thesis in Slovakia until 1996. Once cancelled, the CSc degree was replaced by the PhD degree.

Under the categories that determined their job classification, the creative staff of the SAS could be assigned to various qualification levels during their scientific career (III, IIb, IIa, I). These were achieved by completing the relevant education and attaining a scientific degree or by the submission of the required documents to the Attestation Committee at the Institute or at the level of the SAS, based on the decision of which the staff member was successfully 'transferred' to a higher qualification level. Based on this transfer and, at the same time, according to the type and degree of responsibility of the currently performed scientific and scientific-managerial work listed in the 'activities catalogue' (project manager, leading of a domestic or international scientific team, etc.), the Institute's management assigned to this staff member a certain pay grade for a specific period.

The highest scientific degree, DrSc, colloquially referred to as the 'big doctorate' and awarded by the SAS as a counterpart of the scientific-pedagogical university Professor's degree, has remained in practice to this day. On the other hand, what disappeared from practice is the 'SAS correspondent member', of which B. Filová was the last holder at the Institute.

In the post-socialist period, the first person awarded the DrSc degree was the important representative of the Transformation Generation from the group of female experts in folklore studies, Eva Krekovičová, who was the first one to publish a scientific monograph in a Western European publishing house at the end of the previous decade (1998). In her work, she successfully combined in-depth archive folklore research and the current concept of construction of a self- and hetero-image, while comparing the historical constructions of the images of two

marginalised groups in Slovak mainstream society—Jews and Roma (Gypsies). After obtaining the degree, she became the expert guarantor of the PhD studies at the Institute (until she retired in 2019) as well as a member of the *SAS Learned Society*.

In the table of the organisation's staff, E. Krekovičová held the position of DrSc principal researcher. The positions of CSc/PhD principal researchers were occupied by the top representatives of the Generation of Builders who were assigned qualification level I—M. Benža, O. Danglová, M. Leščák (on a 20% part-time basis), P. Slavkovský, R. Stoličná—and the key representative of the Transformation Generation, P. Salner. The core of the group of the so-called CSc/PhD senior researchers, who were assigned qualification level IIa, was made up by scientists who are considered to be members of the Transformation Generation: Z. Beňušková, L. Falt'anová, H. Hlôšková, D. Luther, Z. Profantová, G. Kiliánová, J. Podoba, as well as a representative of the Generation of Innovators, T. Podolinská (*Výročná správa...* 2002).

The years 2003–4 saw qualification shifts, with R. Stoličná and P. Salner (2003), as well as P. Slavkovský (2004) reaching the highest qualification level after defending their degree. The group of senior researchers (qualification level IIa) was extended by A. Mann, M. Vrzgulová, and J. Zajonc. Until 2002, the Institute employed a professional photographer H. Bakaljarová on a 25% part-time basis.

In 2002, the long-year editor of the *Slovenský národopis* journal, Z. Vanovičová, retired. The duties of the language editor and executive editor were assumed by another expert in folklore studies, A. Hlôšková. After she left for the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, in 2004, Hlôšková remained working at the Institute on a 25% part-time basis, where she devoted herself mainly to activities related to the *Slovenský národopis* journal.

In that decade, due to a lack of institutional salary resources, the Institute began systematically working on finding alternative solutions to stabilise the future career of successful graduates from PhD studies. For instance, in the

summer of 2003, two internal PhD students, Ivica Bumová and Andrea Šalingová, who, upon completion of their academic year, were to defend their dissertation theses in autumn of the same year, became employed by the Institute as expert staff at least on a half-year employment contract. They were thus guaranteed the continuity of an institutional background when applying for foreign post-doctoral internships and other jobs in the given field.

The first graduate employed by the Institute in 2004 under an employment contract for several years was Tatiana Bužeková (graduate from ethnology and religious studies), working initially on a 1/3 part-time basis and, from 2005, full-time, half of which was paid by the Institute from its own global salary resources during the first three years.

The framework for this system was created by the new SAS central support scheme, the so-called *Štefan Schwarz Fund*, under which scholarships were granted to young post-docs. This scholarship was applied for by doctoral students from various scientific disciplines under a selection procedure. Beyond their global salary budget, institutes received funds to cover half of the salaries of these students for a period of three or four years. The scholarship recipients worked on their own research topics, which had been previously approved during the selection procedure. The topic was usually a continuation of their PhD research project; however, young scientists usually became an inherent part of the project tasks that were dealt with at the Institute.

In line with the Accreditation Committee's recommendation of 2003 to rejuvenate the team, the Institute began using this scheme from the latter half of the 2000s and was successful in obtaining scholarships. In this way, the organisation admitted Ľubica Herzánová in 2005 with support for the years 2006–10 (including her maternity leave), Zuzana Búriková in 2006 with support for the years 2006–9, Michaela Ferencová in 2008 with support for the years 2009–11, Zuzana Galiová (later Panczová) with support for the years 2009–12, and Tomáš Hrustič for

the years 2009–13. The graduate Katarína Nováková, who successfully defended her dissertation thesis in 2006, acquired the post of assistant professor at the Department of Ethnology of Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Trnava and, in 2007, the IE SAS admitted her as a researcher for the Slovak Research and Development Agency (Slovak acronym APVV) project for a three-year period (2007–9).

As remembered by G. Kiliánová in her memoirs of 2021, 'the young generation brought fresh ideas and different perspectives to the Institute and strengthened our project work. We were usually lucky regarding our new colleagues, even though, of course, we also had failed collaborations' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 7).

In 2011, shortly before the change in the Director's post (in August 2012) and another accreditation (in September 2012), the Institute's FTEs reached 21.1, of which 19.1 were scientists at an average age of 53.6 years. During that time, the Institute had four managing staff members with the DrSc degree, two principal researchers, one professor, two associate professors, and eleven senior researchers.

### **Journals Published by the Institute during the Transformation Period**

In the post-revolution period, B. Filová continued to be the Editor-in-Chief of the *Slovenský národopis (SN)* journal. Even though she left the post of the Institute's Director at the beginning of 1989 (at her own request), she defined the strategy of its main publication platform until a new Director was appointed in 1991.

The political changes were reflected by the *SN* Editorial Board in the spring of 1990 with a statement that 'the previous November's sharp turn in the social conditions' was a challenge for Slovak ethnography and folklore studies to contribute with 'truthful analyses of the social reality from the point of view of its historical and cultural determinations' to a deeper understanding and enhancement of society, and that the journal welcomed and

accepted this challenge (Redakcia 1990, p. 7). The double issue SN 1991(1-2) published the results of the 1989 colloquium on social differentiation and social groups.

After B. Filová retired at the end of 1990, the SN Editor-in-Chief's post was assumed by the new Institute's Director, M. Leščák, in January 1991. In 1991, he published in SN the results of the survey on the attitudes of the Institute's staff on the state of ethnography and folklore studies and their perspectives in the forthcoming decade, which had been conducted in early 1990. He also informed about the new research programme of the Institute, about the new grant scheme of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, as well as the projects that the Institute translated into applications for research funding for the period 1991-3 (1991c).

The post of the SN Executive Editor in 1991-2000 was held by Z. Vanovičová—together with L. Chorváthová (1991-3) and T. Podolinská (1997-2000). Under Leščák's management, the journal promoted the programme and continuity of its previous focus, declaring an attempt to document the scientific events in Slovak ethnography and folklore studies by publishing up-to-date theoretical and thematical articles. He also affirmed the ambition to make knowledge from Slovakia available abroad and to join international scientific discussions.

This step meant the beginnings of the endeavours of SN, as a journal with Central European territorial coverage, to overcome language limits (Uherek 2012, p. 397). The translations of the key anthropological works from the late 1990s to Slovak were only an experiment. In this context, the journal experimented a lot during the transition period, having to re-define its target readers' group, while also facing the dilemma as to what extent to focus on foreign audience and export *outwards* the best studies in the form of translations (i.e., to publish studies or their translations in English or German), and to what extent to address the domestic (or Slavic language) readers' community.

In the first stage, the transformation of the journal in the form of *exporting knowledge outwards* was carried out by

publishing German or English translations of selected important methodological studies in each SN issue; after 1997, translations of domestic studies or essays with new results appeared irregularly. Pursuing the strategy of *importing knowledge inwards* (i.e., translations of studies or interviews by foreign authors to Slovak), interviews with ethnologists and scientists from related disciplines from abroad were introduced so that Slovak readers could receive an overview of foreign theoretical trends and the width of research methods.

In 1996, a new column was created, 'Reserved for...' , in which older staff members of the Institute published their opinions on scientific work in the past, as well as their memoirs about their scientific activities. According to G. Kiliánová, the journal pursued in this way the objective of creating a basis for the future study of the history of science (2013, pp. 27-8).

The limited funds for the journal in 1990 was accompanied by a change in its layout and a more economical cover made of recycled paper, with single-colour printing. As a result, colour illustrations disappeared from SN for almost two decades (*Ibid.*, p. 28).

In 1997, the then Director of the Institute, D. Ratica, became SN's Editor-in-Chief and managed the journal together with its executive editors, Z. Vanovičová and T. Podolinská, until 2000. The Editor-in-Chief's post was subsequently assumed by the new Director, G. Kiliánová. After Z. Vanovičová left her post, she was replaced by H. Hlôšková as the journal's Executive Editor (2001-10). At the end of the second transformation decade, M. Ferencová and T. Bužeková came to work in the journal for a short period (2009-10). T. Podolinská worked there from the time of her admission to the Institute (1997) until 2012 when she was elected the Director of the Institute, carrying out the tasks of the Deputy Editor-in-Chief. In 2011, the editors' team was expanded to include the expert staff member, Vladimír Potančok, as its Executive Editor. In 2009, the journal created the status of guest editors for its thematic issues.

Through the 'Discussion' column, the editorial team encouraged an expert exchange of opinions, published contributions, and



opened discussions on its own. The researchers' opinions on the role of agriculture collectivisation in Czechoslovakia after 1948 generated controversy on the pages of this column (SN 1995(4); 1996(2); 1996(4)). The journal thus also became a mirror of different approaches to the study of ethnic processes not only through theoretical papers (1991(3–4)), but also through articles in the Discussion column (1995(4); 1998(4); 1999(2–3); 2000(1)).

In the second Transformation decade, the interest of several authors was raised by issues related to the perspectives of cultural and social anthropology (2002(1), the study of the process of transmission of values in family (2005(3), or ethnological concepts and stereotypes (2004(1); 2004(2)). The scientific dispute at this stage was characterised by the authors dedicating their papers, with a few exceptions, to specific topics and fields of research rather than the methodological focus of ethnography before 1989 or the current theoretical issues of ethnology and social/cultural anthropology. The past period was more broadly evaluated on the pages of SN twelve years after the political change when, in 2002, SN (2–3) offered a selection of conference papers from the international conference on the 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute's establishment.

Regarding the editorial team's efforts to present Slovak research results to foreign researchers, the editorial team made an attempt in 2001: the fourth issue of the journal was published in English language, containing translations of key studies over the last five years (SN 2001(4)). This attempt was not continued for seven years.

In 2009, SN began publishing beyond the regular four issues a year, by way of experiment, a fifth one in English (Kiliánová 2013, p. 29). This step reflected the Institute's endeavours to penetrate the publication space of Central European and EU countries. The publishing strategy correlated with the recommendations of the first and second accreditation (2004, 2007) and reflected on the internal dynamic of the institution, as well as on the science ecosystem in Slovakia at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

According to Zdeňěk Uherek, SN kept its position in the country during that period by consciously maintaining thematic diversity, as well as by preserving its features as a *community journal*—offering a social chronicle, columns, comments, reports, or interviews focusing on the Slovak environment and the institution that published the journal (2012, p. 397). Simultaneously, it began opening to the broader Central European expert context with a focus on Slavic language speaking countries (except for Czech texts, which were published in their original versions, the texts were usually translated into Slovak)—towards the end of the 2010s, one-fourth of the SN authors came from abroad. The introduction of the English issue in 2009 enriched the international expert community and enhanced the supranational, Central-European profiling of the journal. SN began attracting a new type of Slovak and Czech authors interested in publishing for the broader international scientific community, as well as researchers from Western universities (like Austria or the United Kingdom) (*Ibid.*, p. 399).

Towards the end of the second Transformation decade, SN returned to the pre-coup publishing policy of combining free and monothematic issues, as well as to the publishing of field research results, predominantly as part of the Institute's project outcomes. Thematically, it began focusing increasingly on the current period and research on the present. According to Z. Uherek, the journal accentuated, in regional terms, materials from Slovakia and Central Europe, while responding to a whole range of global discourses, and also raised modern topics (*Ibid.*, p. 402).

By the end of the 2000s, the journal successfully handled its transformation from an institutional journal that primarily published contributions by the Institute's own employees and information on the life and events of the ethnological, folklore, and museology community in Slovakia. In this context, it not only stepped assertively beyond the gates of the Institute, but also beyond Slovakia's borders.

In addition to the two main publishing platforms—*Slovenský národopis* as a scientific and *Etnologické rozpravy (ER)* as an expert platform—in 1993–2002, the Institute was also involved in publishing *Slavistická folkloristika* [Slavistic Folkloristics] (1988–2002), a bulletin of the International Commission of Slavic Folklore at the International Slavistics Committee, which was published in cooperation with the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Brno, with a contribution from the Slovak Slavistics Committee (1995, 2001–2) and the SAS Slavistics Department (2000).

In the 2010s, namely between 2015–7, the Institute was also involved in the publishing of the *Ethnologia Europaeae Centralis* international journal, which originated as an ethnological journal for Central Europe in 1992 and was published alternately in the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovakia.

In 2008, the Institute of Ethnology SAS decided to stop publishing *Etnologické rozpravy* after 42 years of its existence. The publishing of the journal was taken over by the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia* (in 2003, it gave up its original name *Slovak Ethnographic Society*), the Department of Ethnology and Ethnomusicology of the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, and the Slovak National Museum in Martin.

The management of the Institute came to the conclusion that, for capacity reasons, the Institute was unable to ensure the publishing of two scientific periodicals. In the background of the decision, there was also the premise that the amount of funds allocated to the Institute for the publishing of periodicals, i.e., journals, would remain unchanged.

However, after renouncing *ER*, the SAS Editorial Board reduced the volume of financial support proportionately. The *ER* journal was thus handed over to the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia* without financial coverage, which causes big organisational problems to the editorial team of the journal even today. In the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Institute sought to contribute to the publishing of the *ER* at

least partially by means of a Cooperation Contract with the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia* and with a contribution to the cooperation with scientific societies, granted by the SAS (2018–23).

### PhD Studies, European Doctorate, and Pedagogical Activities

Based on the agreement between the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, and the Department of Ethnology and Ethnomusicology of the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, in the second Transformation decade, the IE SAS became an external educational organisation that organised a PhD Seminary for all participants to doctoral studies in the field of ethnology.

J. Podoba was in charge of conducting the Seminary on behalf of the Institute. The management of the Institute also approached Martin Kanovský, who was at that time affiliated with the Department of Ethnology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University. During the first academic year 2000/2001, G. Kiliánová also taught at the Seminary; M. Kanovský taught there during the next two years, and J. Podoba in 2003–5. In September 2005, Z. Búriková came to the Seminary as its assistant and, in September 2007, M. Kanovský returned there (Podoba 2008, p. 87).

The concept of education of young scientists of that time was based almost exclusively on the individual relationship between the supervisor and PhD student. According to the personal oral memoirs of D. Luther (in: Popelková 2022), the origins of the Doctoral Students Seminary can be found in the 1970s when, as his supervisor, M. Leščák (1974–7) initiated for all candidates educated at the Institute selective lectures to which he invited guests from other disciplines as well (e.g., historians, orientalist) to extend the knowledge and methodological base of the scientific education candidates beyond the ethnographic discipline.

The purpose of the Seminary established in 2000 was to create a common conceptual platform for the education of doctoral students at the IE SAS and at the Department of Ethnology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava. After two years, this initiative was joined by the Department of Ethnology and Ethnomusicology of the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra and, from 2007/2008, also by the Institute of Cultural Studies at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava (Podoba 2008, p. 85). Once social anthropology became established (2007), after the transfer of M. Kanovský to the newly created Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University in Bratislava, and after J. Podoba began teaching full time at this faculty, the PhD Seminary moved from the IE SAS to that faculty (until 2013).

The existence of the PhD Seminary in the second transition decade, its origin and functioning are an excellent example of the transformation of the academic environment in Slovakia which, despite all bottom-up attempts, energy, and enthusiasm, was only gradual and slow, while progress could be observed only from the perspective of five-year plans or even an entire decade.

The pioneer beginnings of the Seminary and its birth is recollected by its long-year manager, J. Podoba (2000–13), as follows: ‘I remember the first “conceptual” meeting in the living room of our flat in Petržalka somewhere in September 2000. Being confined to four walls for several weeks because of my broken ankle, I had enough time to think about the conceptual problems of the future seminary (...).’ When he presented the preliminary concept of the management of the Seminary to his two colleagues [G. Kiliánová, M. Kanovský], ‘both of them agreed that this concept was definitely not applicable to graduates from Slovak universities’ (*Ibid.*, p. 88).

J. Podoba commented on the initial phase of the existence of the Seminary as follows: ‘The birth of the Seminary was a combination of good intentions and the absence of the

necessary experience. The first stage of its existence was mainly about improvising. As it turned out, the initial, overly idealistic plans, mainly in the first period of the Seminary’s existence, soon collided with the reality of the Slovak academic environment... (...); even though it was officially a Seminary for PhD students, in reality, it had the character of a bachelor’s seminary’ (*Ibid.*).

During the initial phase, the Seminary consisted of lectures on theory and methodology—these being presentations by key authors from the field of anthropology and/or social sciences. The frequency was one two-hour session per month, which was around ten sessions during the academic year. The lectures were accompanied by a training project and review writing, as well as presentation skills (*Ibid.*).

L. Voľanská recalls the very beginnings of the Seminary as follows: ‘..., we were quite a strong group of PhD students, especially female doctoral students, and the Seminary was therefore very vibrant. It was led by Juraj Podoba and Martin Kanovský, who brought the anthropological moment to our debates about the texts we read’ (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

After Z. Búriková joined the Seminary in the academic year 2005/2006, its model became stabilised with three basic segments: text seminar (based on work with the reader), training of skills, and presentation of projects and theses (Podoba 2008, pp. 89–90). During this period, the periodicity of the sessions increased as well—initially to two sessions per month and, from 2006, to one session per week.

One graduate from the 2007/2009 Seminary, Miroslava Hlinčíková (2008, p. 94), described its composition as follows: ‘In the first semester (...), the seminary [was] split into two areas (...)—namely Marx (led by Z. Búriková), Weber (J. Podoba), and Durkheim (M. Kanovský). We had to prepare in writing for each seminar. One week in advance, we received a text and questions that we were required to answer. The Seminary was conducted in the form of a discussion, it was not a common lecture (...). This led us not only to read the texts, but to also carry out their

critical analysis. These were moments that I highly appreciate, even though it was sometimes beyond my ability to find answers to all the questions asked. In any case, if we had been guided towards this form of learning during our university studies, the level of our knowledge would have been much better. The second semester of the seminary, conducted by J. Podoba, consisted of a presentation of draft dissertation thesis projects’.

The students themselves were very positive about the opportunity to meet regularly with their classmates and Seminary teachers. They also appreciated the chance ‘to learn how to critically deal with a scientific text and, in addition, to formulate and defend their opinions’ (Lutherová 2008, p. 97).

According to J. Podoba, the problematic points of the Seminary included, in particular, the ‘discipline and lax attitude of a great part of the PhD students to their studies’, due to which they were required to make written preparations for the text seminars at home (2008, p. 91). However, the students perceived this innovation rather negatively: ‘They seem to me like an end in itself, since we do not rely on them directly during our discussions at the seminar...’ (Lutherová 2008, p. 97).

Moreover, the head of the Seminary struggled with its unofficial status within the university curricula. In the framework of the system of the dual education of PhD students, the Slovak Academy of Sciences as an external education institution granted monthly scholarships and training services to a limited number of doctoral students based on its internal quota. Even though the Seminary was attended by all students of ethnology of the contracted universities, the head of the Seminary assigned credits for attendance only to the PhD students from the Institute of Ethnology SAS (Podoba 2008, p. 92), as a result of which some students ‘considered the Seminary to be quite an interesting, though not mandatory supplement to their doctoral studies’ (*Ibid.*, p. 91). Another weakness of the Seminary’s concept was, according to its long-time leader, the ‘zero engagement of the lecturers’ team in its work and the absence of clear rules for the PhD student vs. lecturer relationship’ (*Ibid.*, p. 92).

In 2003, the IE SAS in collaboration with the contracted university departments, introduced the *Doctoral Student Conferences* format, where PhD students had the opportunity to present their dissertation projects at the end of the summer semester. The scenario of the conference enables first-year students to present the project of their dissertation thesis in front of the academic community. Two appointed commentators—one from the ranks of older PhD students and another from among lecturers—were to prepare their expert opinions on the project, which is followed by a general discussion on the presented projects (for more details, see: *Ibid.*, p. 90).

In 2005, the IE SAS submitted its application for accreditation as an educational organisation under the new Act No. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions (*Zákon č. 131/2002...*). Based on the positive opinion of the Accreditation Committee of the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic of March 29, 2006, the IE SAS was granted the right to conduct doctoral studies in the study field 3.1.3 Ethnology. By August 31, 2008, the Institute was conducting doctoral studies in cooperation with the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava.

At the end of the academic year 2007/2008, the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, lost its right to provide tertiary education (doctoral studies) given the insufficient personnel composition of the department (the department did not have a regular professor at that time). The IE SAS responded to this adverse situation operatively and, at the beginning of 2008, it prepared an application for the accreditation of the Institute through the Department of Ethnology and Ethnomusicology of the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra. The application was approved by the Accreditation Committee of the Ministry of Education SR on July 30, 2008. In 2010, the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, regained its right to educate PhD students, and so the IE SAS filed a new application for accreditation in the field of ethnology at this

faculty as well. The accreditation programme was confirmed on May 26, 2010. At the end of the second transition decade, the IE SAS thus trained PhD students in the field of ethnology through the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in Bratislava (until 2008 and again from 2010) and the Faculty of Arts of Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (from 2008).

In the first half of the second Transformation decade, the Institute annually trained a total of seven to ten internal PhD students and fourteen to twenty external PhD students in all study years. In the second decade, the Institute reflected on the increased number of failed defences or studies that did not end with a successful defence (these were mainly related to early terminated studies)—in 2006: one successful defence and four cases ending without defence; 2009: one successful defence and five cases ending without a defence. It was also in connection with this experience marked by the growing occurrence of early terminated PhD studies by external students that, in 2009, the IE SAS management significantly reduced the admission of students to this form of study (2009: six internal vs. four external students; 2010: eight internal vs. two external students). This trend corresponded to the national trend: in the academic year 2008/2009, higher education institutions introduced fees for external PhD studies (Beňušková 2008, p. 100). In 2010, the completion of studies with a successful defence (3) prevailed over that without a defence (2). At the end of the second transition decade, the requirement to spend at least one semester at a foreign university became an unwritten rule for IE SAS doctoral students.

In the second Transformation decade, the Institute's involvement in two consecutive framework projects was an important step into the European area in the field of the education of young scientists, namely the *European Doctorate in Social History of Europe and the Mediterranean 'Building on the Past': EU FP5 European Doctorate (2002–5)* and *EU FP6 European Doctorate (2005–9)*. Thanks to these two projects, six PhD students from the IE SAS left for foreign study visits in the

period 2002–9 and three of them completed their studies not only by obtaining the PhD degree, but also with the certificate *European Doctorate: Social History of Europe and Mediterranean* (Kiliánová 2008; *Výročná správa...* 2009). Throughout the duration of both projects, the Institute of Ethnology SAS, together with the Institute of History SAS, as a joint training organisation, admitted eighteen foreign doctoral students (G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2022) and engaged them, among other things, in the activities of the *IE SAS Doctoral Student Seminary*. The internal doctoral students of the IE SAS were also involved in the activities under important national and international research projects: L. Herzáňová worked on the FOROST international project, M. Ferencová on the interdisciplinary project of the State Science and Research Programme for Young Scientists, etc. In 2006, M. Ferencová was awarded the *Student Personality of Slovakia* prize in the school year 2005/2006, winning first place in the category Philosophy, Political Science, Law, Theology (*Dotazník...* 2007; *Výročná správa...* 2008).

The second Transformation decade is characterised by increased pedagogical exposure of the Institute's employees at other workplaces. The Institute's management supported this trend that started after the November revolution. On the one hand, it interlinked basic research with pedagogical practice and, on the other hand, enhanced the visibility of the Institute's core staff in the eyes of the new scientific generation, strengthened the existing friendly relationships, and expanded the symbolic social capital of the workplace at home and abroad. At that time, this trend was also supported by the SAS management, as proven by the statistical surveys, not only as part of annual reports, but also questionnaires related to international accreditations.

For the SAS employees, it was in fact the only way during the transformation period of obtaining the highly valued scientific-pedagogical degrees of associate professor (*docent*) and professor, which were recognised also within the SAS for guaranteeing fields of study. Only a scientist with the professor or DrSc title was allowed to become a guarantor of PhD studies.



The teaching activities of the Institute of Ethnology SAS staff at higher education institutions during the second transition decade had a rapidly rising tendency and reached its peak at the end of this period. During the culmination period (2009), eighteen staff members of the Institute gave 1,068 hours of semestral lectures, conducted 606 hours of seminars, and supervised 23 diploma theses. The IE SAS staff gave regular lectures, supervised bachelor and diploma theses, and were also members of expert committees at several faculties of the Comenius University in Bratislava, at the Academy of Performing Arts in Bratislava, the Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, the Faculty of Arts of Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, as well as the Faculty of Arts of Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Trnava. Outside Slovakia, they led individual courses or lectures at universities in the Czech Republic, Poland, and Germany (*Dotazník... 2012*).

### Financial Resources in the 2000s

In the new millennium, the management of the Institute was increasingly occupied with issues related to the funding of research and staff salaries, which later became a direct precondition for the successful development of human resources. The financial situation, along with the SAS Presidium's policy, aimed at institutes of the SAS being primarily oriented on competitive, i.e., project finances.

The Institute gained experience with GAV or VEGA grant projects already during the first transition decade. In the second transition decade, it obtained support for almost thirty VEGA projects (for more details, see Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 177–81). The average financial subsidy per VEGA project for the IE SAS in 2003–6 was SKK 72,000 (approx. €2,400), which was insufficient both for research and publication. The grant amount under VEGA projects gradually increased: while it was SKK 59,000 on average in 2003 (€1,966), it grew to €5,716 in 2011 (*Výročné správy... 2003–11*).

The funds available to the VEGA agency originated by allocating a finance package from the SAS budget, which was automatically translated into overhead cost reduction of the SAS organisations. As a result, the Institute had to use part of the competitive/project finance (usually 20–25%) to cover its overheads. The researchers who had the ambition to carry out more complex research or publishing activities successfully continued fundraising during that period and were able to obtain relatively large volumes of extra-budgetary finance through other state project schemes (*Pro Slovakia, Literary Fund*) or through non-profit civic associations and foundations (Rotary Club, Chronos, Open Society Foundation, etc.). The ability of research members of the Institute to raise external funds for the support of scientific activities in 1999–2002 was also appreciated by international experts in the 2003 accreditation process.

In addition to national projects, the internal evaluations by the Slovak Academy Sciences highly appreciated the involvement of the SAS institutes in European framework projects (Framework Programme 5 and 6), bilateral and multilateral programmes, such as Action Austria–Slovak Republic, the International Visegrad Fund (IVF), and others.

After the establishment of the Slovak Research and Development Agency (APVV) to promote basic and applied research (in 2005), it was possible to apply for significantly better funded projects under general calls which were successfully joined by the Institute in collaboration with several other domestic partners. In the second transition decade, its projects focused on the safeguarding of the cultural heritage and its opening to the public or the digitisation of the Institute's archives. In 2007–9, for instance, the Institute improved its IT infrastructure thanks to the funds obtained through an APVV project, as described below. At the national level, there was an opportunity to become the coordinator or partner in larger, usually multi-disciplinary projects, such as SAS Centres of Excellence or State Research and Development Programmes. Participation in these types of projects helped the Institute

to gradually improve its finances under the overheads and capital expenditures items (for more detail, see: Kiliánová 2006, pp. 63–4; *Akreditačný dotazník 2003*; *Dotazník... 2007*; *Dotazník... 2012*).

## International Projects and Cooperation

The education of PhD students at the IE SAS also became a symbolic gate through which the institution entered the world of European Union framework projects (EU FP). The preparatory negotiations with a consortium composed of the representatives of several European universities in 2000 were attended by G. Kiliánová. She made use of her previous personal and working contacts that she had obtained when preparing the European Studies programme with the non-profit educational organisation *Academia Istropolitana Nova*. Kiliánová was also involved in the conceptual and content preparation of an international project application (for more details, see: Kiliánová 2008, p. 119; G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2021b, p. 5) aimed at the education of PhD students in the field of European social history.

During preparations, the IE SAS strategically approached the Institute of History SAS, since the core part of the project being prepared consisted primarily of historiographical educational curricula, and the consortium preferred the key specialisation of the cooperating organisations to be in line with it. In 2001, the project application was approved in Brussels, as well as by the Institute of Ethnology and the Institute of History, which were formally represented by the Slovak Academy of Sciences and jointly became participants to the FP5 Marie Curie Training Programme for five years (*European Doctorate in Social History of Europe and the Mediterranean: Building on the Past* (2002–5)). Its principal project holder and coordinator was *Università Ca'Foscari di Venezia*.

The training programme supported comparative PhD studies and aimed at providing students with the opportunity to attend, during their PhD studies, three- to twelve-month study visits

to any of the six partner foreign universities or academic organisations in Italy, the United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, The Netherlands, and Slovakia.

The consortium of the education organisations later managed to raise funds for a follow-up project under the EU FP6 (2006–9), which was extended to ten organisations. The training network trained a total number of 200 doctoral students throughout the duration of the two projects. The Institute of Ethnology and the Institute of History SAS were promoted to the category of a European foreign training organisation, having admitted eighteen foreign doctoral students in total.

The presence of foreign students at the Institute enriched its academic life. According to G. Kiliánová, the joining of the project led to 'higher language and expert demands in the PhD Seminar in all domestic PhD students and, last but not least, the head of the Seminary and its assistant' (2008, p. 124). The tutoring of the admitted students was difficult work even for the hosting lecturers (A. Hlôšková, A. Mann, G. Kiliánová, J. Podoba, M. Vrzgulová) whom the Institute offered to work in the project. Six PhD students of the Institute (Andrea Šalingová, Zuzana Búriková, Irena Jenčová, Michaela Ferencová, Natália Veselská, and Soňa Lutherová) attended foreign study visits and, in 2005–8, three of them (Z. Búriková, A. Šalingová, and M. Ferencová) obtained, in addition to the PhD degree from Comenius University in Bratislava, the *European Doctor* certificate from *Università Ca'Foscari di Venezia* (*Ibid.*, p. 123; Kiliánová 2016c, p. 112).

After entering the project, the European project cooperation by the Institute became more dynamic. In 2005, under the Cooperation Agreement with *Academia Istropolitana Nova*, the Institute offered an expert for the EU FP5 application project *Re Urban Mobil (Mobilising Reurbanisation on Condition of Demographic Change)* (2002–5). The project focused on observing (re-)urbanisation trends in European cities based on four case studies in the cities of Leipzig, Bologna, León, and Ljubljana. On behalf of the IE SAS, T. Podolinská was responsible in the project

for preparing the final project report and she was also involved in setting a Toolbox for local authorities, having evaluated the final reports of four national centres, socio-metric questionnaires from four cities, national demographical, socio-economic reports and forecasts, as well as environmental evaluation reports (for more details, see: Podolinská 2008a, pp. 125–8).

In 2006, T. Podolinská was invited as co-investigator for the EU FP6 REVACERN project (*Religion and Values: Ventral and Eastern European Research Network*; Coordination Action, Priority 7—Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge Based Society; 2007–9), which aimed at creating a functioning network of Central European researchers specialised in the research of religious values. The chief coordinator was the Department of Religious Studies, University of Szeged (HU). As part of the project, 73 researchers from fourteen European countries met on a regular basis (for more details, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 129–32). T. Podolinská became a member of the Advisory Board, which selected young scientists from the participating institutions and provided them with support in the form of scientific scholarships for two years. In this programme, the IE SAS was represented by T. Hrustič, who later had the opportunity to publish his study in the final publication of the programme participants (2011).

Through his cooperation with Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica (as one of the participating organisations), D. Luther was a co-investigator in the EU FP6 *Sustainable Development in a Diverse World* project (SUS.DIV, 2005–11). The project focused on an interdisciplinary exploration of the possibilities of the political management of cultural diversity as the key element of European new sustainable development strategy. Thirty four organisations participated in this project, with coordination by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milano (IT). The project outcomes included several foreign collective monographs. In one of them, D. Luther (IE SAS), together with A. Bitušíková (Matej Bel University), elaborated on the development of European post-socialist cities from the ethnological perspective (Bitušíková and Luther 2010a). They jointly edited one of the final project

monographs published in both Slovak and English, which summarised the results of the research conducted in post-socialist cities from the point of view of cultural and social diversity (*Ibid.*, Eds. 2010).

Simultaneously, the Institute carried on the cooperation and personal contacts with its partners in the Czech Republic, especially the Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague and Brno, as well as in other former socialist countries. With this approach, G. Kiliánová wished ‘to prevent the interruption of contacts with our traditional partners, such as Poland, Hungary, Russia, as well as the EU candidate countries—Bulgaria, Serbia, etc.’. Since this kind of cooperation was in most cases tied to specific staff members of the Institute and successful collaboration back from the socialist period (E. Krekovičová—Bulgaria and Hungary, Z. Profantová—Russia, H. Hlôšková, P. Salner, D. Luther, R. Stoličná—Poland), it naturally continued also in the second transformation decade. The ethno-cartographic team, composed of the core representatives of the Generation of Builders—M. Benža and P. Slavkovský, together with R. Stoličná and L. Faltánová—developed contacts mainly in the surrounding countries (Ukraine, Hungary, Poland, ex-Yugoslavia), mapping by means of several continuous research projects the culture and traditions of Slovaks living in these countries as a minority. G. Kiliánová remembers that, in the second transformation decade, the IE SAS had very good relationships with Slovenia, which were ‘strengthened even more by the study visit of PhD student M. Ferencová in Ljubljana’ (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 6).

In the given decade, the number of the Institute’s bilateral projects with traditional partner institutions in the surrounding countries and external international projects exceeded thirty (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016, pp. 192–9).

This illustrates the capacity of the representatives of all generations and thematic orientations to establish and share sustainable work relationships abroad, as well as apply their effects in favour of the Institute: ‘As far as I know, the vast

majority of our international cooperation projects originated based on our personal contacts. We knew our foreign partners from conferences or international bodies (such as membership in international scientific boards, programme boards, editorial boards, etc.). Our international project activities were soon joined by the youngest generation as well: T. (Zachar) Podolinská, L. (Voľanská) Herzánová, Z. (Sekeráková) Búriková, Soňa (Gyárfáš) Lutherová, and others, based on their contacts' (G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2021b, p. 5).

According to G. Kiliánová, while at the beginning it was necessary to conduct informal, yet diplomatic discussions on the Institute's projects and activities to obtain project involvement, the Institute's position began to change: 'Our situation as a "suppliant" changed after we ourselves were able to offer something to our foreign colleagues—e.g., the education of their doctoral students at our Institute under the *European Doctorate* project plus a good scholarship as a bonus' (in: Popelková 2021b, pp. 5–6).

Thanks to international contacts, project cooperation, and publications beyond the national space, the Institute raised its profile in the middle of the second transition decade by winning two international prizes. In 2006, R. Stoličná received the *Gourmand World Media Award* in Kuala Lumpur for her co-authorship of the book *Culinary Cultures of Europe. Identity, Diversity and Dialogue*. In the same year, G. Kiliánová won the *Herder Prize* international award.

The Johan Gottfried von Herder Prize was established by the Alfred Toepfer Foundation (Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F. V. S.) in Hamburg in 1963. In the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it became one of the most prestigious European prizes in the field of culture and humanities. On the proposal of an independent board of trustees, it was granted annually since 1964, in cooperation with the Alfred Toepfer Foundation, by the Vienna University to several important personalities from Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe who made a significant contribution to the development of European culture. During the existence of the Iron Curtain in the latter half of the last century,

the Herder Prizes served to maintain and enhance cultural relationships between Western and Eastern Europe and were aimed at stimulating and increasing the visibility of scientists from Central- and Eastern-European countries.

On behalf of the Institute, the prize was awarded to Ján Podolák in 1974 and to Soňa Kovačevičová in 1982. As for the Slovak Academy of Sciences, it was awarded to musical scientist Oskár Elschek (1997), literary scientist Ján Bakoš (2000), and historian Dušan Kováč (2004). G. Kiliánová won the prize in 2006 for her 'work on historical memories, borders, identities, and nationalisms' and for 'building bridges between the East and West of Europe'. In 2006, the Herder Prize was awarded for the last time, also as a symbolic end to the post-socialist transformation and integration of the European scientific area.

The prize amounted to 15,000 euros, and the awarded person could nominate one talented artist or scientist from the field of humanities for a one-year scholarship at a university in Vienna. G. Kiliánová gave this opportunity to M. Ferencová who was a PhD student at the Institute of Ethnology SAS at that time (*Herderova cena... 2006; Herderova cena*).

### The Most Important National Projects

The interdisciplinary institutional cooperation within the SAS was successfully formalised by creating a virtual research team which examined collective identities—*Collective Identities in Modern Societies. Central European Region* (acronym *Processes*, 2002–6). One of the first Centres of Excellence under SAS Science Section III was established by ethnologists together with historians. E. Krekovičová from the Institute of Ethnology SAS became the leader of the centre, Ewa Kowalská from the Institute of History SAS its deputy leader, and J. Podoba from the IE SAS its secretary. The centre associated investigators from six academic and four university organisations, representing historiography, linguistics, Oriental studies, political science, social psychology, ethnology, religious studies, sociology, philosophy, and Germanic studies.

According to the memories of G. Kiliánová, the offer for the first Centre of Excellence (CE) was initiated at the beginning of 2002 by Dušan Kováč as a member of the SAS Presidium and employee of the Institute of History SAS (IH SAS): 'The IH SAS approached our institute with an offer for cooperation. At that time, we were already working with the IH SAS on the EU Framework Programme 5 (...). D. Kováč came with the first proposal for a CE topic—if I remember it well, it was national identities. Our institute raised a broader proposal for "collective identities" and we promoted the involvement of several disciplines. The preparation of the entire CE project was subsequently assumed by our Institute that became the coordinating organisation. I indeed enjoyed the preparation and implementation of this project. I understood it as an excellent opportunity for a transdisciplinary dialogue. I think several members of the CE team who already had had experience in similar projects perceived it in the same way (...)' (in: Popelková 2021b, pp. 3–4).

The key outcomes of the interdisciplinary project were two monographs. The work by O. Danglová (IE SAS) and Vladimír Krivý (Institute of Sociology SAS) offered an illustration of the processes of creation and functioning of local, regional, and other collective identities, interlinking a sociological macro-picture and micro-perspective: *Svet mnohých 'MY' a 'ONI'. Kolektívne identity na súčasnom Slovensku* [The World of the Many of 'US' and 'THEM'. Collective Identities in Present-Day Slovakia] (Krivý and Danglová 2006). The collective publication *My a tí druhí v modernej spoločnosti: konštrukcie a transformácie kolektívnych identít* [We and the Others in Modern Society: The Constructions and Transformations of Collective Identities] (Kiliánová, Kowalská, and Krekovičová, Eds. 2009) deal with the processes of creating collective identities in Slovakia, in the (Central-)European and, in some chapters, even non-European context, their construction, reconstruction, and transformation.

The interdisciplinary team tackled not only *collective identities* that had already been explored in Slovakia for longer

(national, ethnic identities), but included in the field of focus also issues (in particular, gender identities) the research of which had only begun. G. Kiliánová and E. Krekovičová were the authors of the theoretical-methodological introduction to the book, which discusses the ways of defining the notion of identity, the theoretical concepts, questions, and research issues, and maps the development of the approaches to the exploration of identity in humanities and social sciences (*Ibid.*, pp. 13–37).

The research material covering the period from the 17<sup>th</sup> century until the early 21<sup>st</sup> century was produced by 22 investigators in six chapters dealing with an analysis of the mutual relations between identity and gender, language, religiosity, nation, minority, and conflict. Six researchers of the IE SAS contributed to the book with case studies: G. Kiliánová ('places of memory' linked to the Slovak national story), E. Krekovičová (self-stereotypes of Slovaks and their hetero-stereotypes of other ethnic groups/nations), T. Podolinská (the spiritual identity of the Roma after 1989), A. Mann (the collective identity of the Roma after 1918), J. Podoba (ethnic conflicts in Slovakia after 1989), and P. Salner (Jewish identity after 1945). The chapter on identity and religiosity was edited by T. Podolinská (*Ibid.*, pp. 139–228), and the one on identity and conflict by J. Podoba (*Ibid.*, pp. 499–587). In addition to their own studies, both editors contributed to their chapters also with theoretical introductions on the topic and with a summary of conclusions.

The success of the first Centre of Excellence SAS, during which a whole range of individual and collective outputs were produced (see Kiliánová 2016c, pp. 122–4), confirmed the scientific, communication, and managerial readiness of the Institute of Ethnology SAS to establish interdisciplinary partnerships. In 2002–6, the operating mode of the IE SAS was temporarily modified into another kind of operation: scientists from other disciplines were present in its premises; thus methodological and working meetings of the Centre's partial scientific teams were held simultaneously with institutional meetings. The Secretariat of the Institute, which



also provided for all the Centre's logistical and economic operations, communicated with the investigators and their home organisations on a continuous basis: 'The Centre had 24 investigators, which was more than the total number of all staff members of the Institute, due to which the Institute coordinated, given its capacity, quite a large project. In addition, the funds annually obtained by the *Processes CE (...)* were around three times higher per investigator than they could have raised via VEGA projects' (*Ibid.*, pp. 122-3).

The research team associated in the SAS Centre of Excellence *Collective Identities in Modern Societies. Central European Region* was awarded an important public prize—the Prize of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Education of the Slovak Republic for Science in the *Scientific Team of the Year 2009* category.

### Digitisation and Electronic Archives

After the failed or incomplete attempts to carry out a digital transformation of the scientific collections during the 1990s, the need for a systematic digitisation and development of an integrated electronic ethnological data system for the Institute of Ethnology SAS became urgent. In 2002, after improving the material and technical conditions by providing for better quality hardware and software, the Institute came up with the Proposal for the Processing of the IE SAS Scientific Archives, prepared by K. Popelková and J. Zajonc. After 2004, the plans contained therein began to be implemented under two internal projects coordinated by the members of the Institute. The outcomes of the first project included methodologies for the processing of picture and text documents in the form of electronic documentary/graphical databases, while the second one resulted in a manual on the archive documents digitisation techniques (Zajonc 2006b, pp. 41-3).

The Institute was successful in obtaining grant support from the Slovak Research and Development Agency for its project called *Traditional Culture of Slovakia as Part of the*

*European Cultural Heritage. Based on the Digital Processing of Archive Documents of the Institute of Ethnology at the Slovak Academy of Sciences and the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at Comenius University* (APVV; 2007-9). The project focused on the gradual preparation and publishing of monograph publications on the phenomena of traditional daily life culture using the digitised documents of the archive collections of the Institute of Ethnology SAS and the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava. The authors of this idea on behalf of the IE SAS were D. Luther and D. Ratica. Together with the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, the IE SAS launched the processes of making its scientific archives available to the public.

The previous, conceptually prepared internal framework and outcomes were used in the project. A significant part of the documents from the Institute's picture documents archive was digitised (the whole archive has around 128 thousand negatives, slides, and drawings), and a plan for making them available for scientific, university education, and popularisation purposes was produced. One of the first uses of the digitised picture documents was for a monograph on embroidery in Slovakia (Danglová 2009); however, the project also included the publishing of a monograph on traditional agrarian culture of Slovaks living with a minority status in European countries (Slavkovský 2009) and on the specific features of the culture of the socio-professional group of winegrowers in Slovakia (Nováková 2009).

### The Cultural Heritage Topic and Its Application

At the end of the second transformation decade, a certain decline in research on traditional culture in Slovakia, as well as field research in general could be observed at the Institute. This process partly overlapped with the gradual leaving of the Generation of Builders from their posts in the field of research

and publication. Nevertheless, it was primarily related to intensive modernisation which, in addition to globalisation and westernisation, was accompanied by the growing de-traditionalisation of Slovak society (Podolinská 2013).

The Transformation Generation needed some time not only to acquire the necessary theoretical and analytical staff, but also to get a new perspective of the turbulent transformation processes that were underway. One of the significant manifestations of the second Transformation decade was the systematic anthropologisation of the Institute. Apart from a critical self-reflection of the previous period, it was also accompanied by discursive highlighting of the anthropological line. This partly happened not only to the detriment of research on traditional culture, but also to the research on cultural heritage and historical ethnology. According to the oral memories of D. Luther (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022), the Institute did not favour certain topics during that period, which was reflected, among other things, in the announced topics of PhD theses and/or in the admission of new researchers. The personnel policy of that time, leading to the rejuvenation of the workplace, was oriented on founding a proto-anthropological generation that was to ensure a future transformation of the Institute into a modern anthropological organisation.

However, even after the birth of the Slovak Republic in 1993, the topic of cultural heritage was still a politically demanded and financially supported commodity, and the state declared a conceptual protection of the component of culture designated as 'traditional folk culture'. In this sense, towards the end of the transformation period, the Institute was invited to join partnership in two application-popularisation projects aimed at making the knowledge of traditional culture available to the general public. The projects popularised the results of large synthetic ethnographic works from the previous decades and built on the experience of the still active members of the Generation of Builders in the creation of collective works and media presentation.

In the framework of the implementation of the National Concept of Care for Traditional Folk Culture, the institution called *Coordination Centre for Traditional Folk Culture* received financial support from the Ministry of Culture for the project *Traditional Folk Culture in Slovakia through Words and Pictures* (2009–10), having invited the Institute of Ethnology SAS to cooperate in it. In the project, the Institute directly used the results of the APVV digitisation project (2007–9). The project outcome was an Electronic Encyclopaedia *Traditional Folk Culture in Slovakia through Words and Pictures* (*Elektronická encyklopédia* 2008), published in Slovak on the website of the *Coordination Centre for Traditional Folk Culture*. The editorial board of this work, which contains almost 1,800 text entries with pictures supplements, consisted of ten staff members of the IE SAS led by G. Kiliánová as the Chief Editor.

The Institute's investigators, M. Benža, P. Slavkovský, and D. Luther, were also engaged in another popularisation activity that capitalised on the topic of the cultural heritage by preparing, in collaboration with the Slovak National Museum in Bratislava in 2004, an exhibition *Slovakia and Its Culture. The Unity of Diversity. The Cultural Specificities of the Traditional Regions of Slovakia*. In 2005, the exhibition won the Prize of the Ethnographic Society of Slovakia and the Annual Prize of the *Pamiatky a múzeá* [Monuments and Museums] journal.

The management of the Institute supported the popularisation and application activities, though it still stuck to the perspective of the accreditation processes of that time and, in this spirit, sought to keep balance when it came to basic research: 'The evaluation of our employees had to be based also on what we as an institutional team were evaluated for, which reflected the indicators of our accreditation. We were primarily a basic research organisation. However, I wanted the Institute to be visible, appreciated, and wanted in the scientific popularisation sphere as well' (G. Kiliánová in: Popelková 2021b, pp. 7–8).

## Research Trends in the Second Transformation Decade

One of the main directions pursued by the Institute's project and publication activities was the ethnological study of the expressions of cultural change after the political changes in 1989 and the impacts of globalisation and European integration. The post-socialist transition process in urban and rural environments was observed by a team led by O. Danglová (VEGA; 2005–7). The results of the field research of the trends, factors, and actors of urban local and regional development in different Slovak regions were published both as partial studies in journals and in book form (Danglová and Zajonc, Eds. 2007; Danglová 2006; Beňušková and Danglová, Eds. 2007). The prominent figure of the Transformation Generation of ethnologists with a social-anthropological focus, J. Podoba, became the co-editor of the international volume *Changing Social Practices and Strategies. Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe and Mongolia* (Pine and Podoba, Eds. 2007). His national project (VEGA; 2008–10) applied the concepts of adaptation and innovation to the observation of socio-cultural changes. J. Podoba also addressed material culture issues in socialist period and produced a book monograph on architecture and housing in the Slovak countryside (2011).

The issues of modern collective identities, which were dealt with by the above-mentioned interdisciplinary SAS Centre of Excellence *Collective Identities in Modern Societies. Central European Region* (CE; 2002–6), successfully shifted the ethnological study of social transformations at the Institute to the interdisciplinary context and a deeper historical framework.

The urban ethnology at the national level focused on the expressions of the diversification of urban spaces (VEGA; 2008–10), and the sustainability of urban societies in the context of globalisation was addressed by the Institute thanks to the cooperation of D. Luther with the European project *Sustainability in a Glocalising World* under EU FP6 (SUS.DIV; 2006–10). An important outcome in the field of urban ethnology was

a monograph on changes in the daily life of Bratislava's citizens between 1918 and 1938 (Luther 2009).

At the Czecho-Slovak bilateral level (thanks to the Agreement on Scientific Cooperation and Joint Publication), the IE SAS, the Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, and the Statutory City of Brno—Archive of the City of Brno prepared a collective scientific monograph *Paměť města: obraz města, veřejné komemorace a historické zlomy v 19.–21. století* [Memory of the City: The Image of the City, Public Commemoration, and the Historic Turning Points in the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> Centuries] (Ferencová and Nosková, Eds. 2009). The monograph, which was produced—in addition to the PhD student M. Ferencová who was the co-editor and author of one of the chapters, by three other staff members of the IE SAS—significantly contributed to the knowledge of the historical, cultural, and social changes in the urban environments of Czechia, Germany, and Slovakia over the past 200 years. The monograph also contains an extensive theoretical introduction by the two editors, dealing with the concept of memory and its different understanding and application in urban studies.

According to the set concept, the Institute focused on the research of daily culture and way of life in Slovakia during the socialist and post-socialist period. This topic was explored under two VEGA projects: 2007–9 and 2010–2. Upon completion of the first project, the principal investigator—Zuzana Profantová—edited the interdisciplinary collective publication *Hodnota zmeny—zmena hodnoty: demarkačný rok 1989* [The Value of Change—The Change of Value: The Demarcation Year 1989] (Profantová, Ed. 2009). The co-authors worked with the concepts of the dynamic of values, social and cultural change, freedom, daily life, and others.

With regards to the second thematic area of the Institute's scientific concept—the study of ethnic minorities, in 2008, M. Benža, P. Slavkovský, and R. Stoličná completed their several-year field research on the traditional culture of Slovak minorities (1991–2008) with the last project (VEGA). With five monographs

published by the Institute between 1998 and 2005 and a final summary monograph from 2006, one important stage of research on the traditional culture of Slovak minorities abroad was over, being unprecedented in Slovak ethnology in terms of extent. The next period was characterised by repeated thematic research mainly on the Slovak minority in Hungary under the bilateral project of the IE SAS and the Research Institute of Slovaks in Hungary (Krekovičová, Uhrinová, and Žiláková, Eds. 2010).

More general minority issues were discussed in a volume that formed the outcome of continuous Czecho-Slovak cooperation and whose co-editor was P. Salner (Jurková et al., Eds. 2007). In 2007-10, the Institute was one of the partner organisations to the interdisciplinary international project *Reflexion kultureller Interferenzräume*, coordinated by Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas, University of Leipzig (Germany). The Institute was represented in the project by G. Kiliánová, who studied places of memory and national symbols, including their dependence on the construction of ethnic identities in the 19<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> centuries. As part of the project outputs, she was successful in publishing her monograph *Identität und Gedächtnis in der Slowakei. Die Burg Devín als Erinnerungsort* (2011) in the foreign publishing house Peter Lang. The book was created by reviewing and supplementing the original Slovak publication *Identita a pamät'. Devín/Theben/Dévény ako pamätné miesto* [Identity and Memory. Devín/Theben/Dévény as a Place of Memory] (2005b).

The one-year ethnographic research by Z. Búriková in the United Kingdom, which focused on Slovak au-pairs in British families in London, constituted a platform on the basis of which the study of migrations within the Institute of Ethnology SAS reached beyond national limits. Her empirical data complemented the research by Daniel Miller (University College of London, UK), which focused on the British members of the studied families. The monograph *Au Pair* (Búriková and Miller 2010) brought new knowledge on labour migration and raised significant media interest in the United Kingdom and in Slovakia.

At the end of the second transition decade (2009-11), the IE SAS joined, through M. Ferencová and the topic of state vs. civil society, the international European project *Models and Their Effects on Development Paths: An Ethnographic and Comparative Approach to Knowledge Transmission and Livelihood Strategies* (EU FP7; MEDEA; 2009-12). The Goldsmiths University London (UK) was the project coordinator, and the Institute of Social Anthropology and the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava were the project partners.

The research on ethnic minorities conducted in Slovakia focused on the Jewish and Roma minorities, since the study of these two minorities had been little developed before 1989 for political and other reasons. The key figure of Judaist studies at the IE SAS of that time was P. Salner, whose research on Jewish identity (2007a, b; 2008) specifically overlapped with the study of the transformation of urban culture of the Slovak metropolis Bratislava. The consequences of the Holocaust on the life of the post-war generation of the Jewish minority was studied by M. Vrzgulová, who wrote a monograph on the relationship between children and the Holocaust (2007).

As a prominent expert in Judaist studies, Peter Salner was invited to join the team of the interdisciplinary SAS *Centre of Excellence for the Research and Development of Citizenship and Participation* (CE COPART; 2007-10), which was coordinated by the SAS Social and Biological Communication Research Unit. One of the final works under this project was a book focusing on the mechanisms of construction of group identity (2010). The Institute's project team, led by P. Salner (VEGA 2/0099/11), collected and published extensive empirical materials on the current trends in the creation of the identity of modern man, whose predecessors were Jews (Bumová et al. 2011).

During the transformation period, research on the Roma minority had become a socially pressing issue. The textbook *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma History] by A. Mann (2000), a researcher from the Institute of Ethnology SAS, which was temporarily banned by the state, showed the ambivalence that scientific texts

can acquire in the political contexts of a transforming society. A. Mann subsequently continued with research on the Holocaust in Roma environments (Kumanová and Mann, Eds. 2007).

In 2010, the fifteen-member researchers' team led by T. Podolinská, obtained an applied project from the Social Development Fund in the Slovak Republic in the framework of combating poverty. On behalf of the Institute, the *Research on the Social Inclusion of the Roma via Religious Pathway* (SIRONA 2010) was conducted (members of the research team from the IE SAS: T. Podolinská, T. Hrustič, and PhD students L. Hrustičová and J. Štofej). The final publication (Podolinská and Hrustič 2010) had a great impact in professional circles and the media. For the first time, it brought detailed information on the activities of large, small, registered and non-registered churches, as well as religious movements in Slovakia among the Roma. In addition, the authors published their recommendations for the formulation of government and other policies in favour of successful integration of the Roma into mainstream society in Slovakia. One year after the project's completion, the authors also wrote a policy paper in English language, summarising the research results and recommendations for the stakeholders (Podolinská and Hrustič 2011b).

The third segment of the Institute's science concept—the study of traditional culture and cultural heritage—was characterised by on-going basic research under several national and international projects. At the same time, in the 2000s, the dealing with this issue moved into the stage of preserving analogue picture collection archives by means of digitisation and the stage of making the knowledge about traditional culture to the broadest audience possible via important scientific-popularisation outputs.

In this period, cultural heritage related topics created a basis for extending part of the Institute's research activities abroad. T. Podolinská was involved in the international project *Proyecto Uaxactun—Monumentos de Uaxactún* (Uaxactún; PÚ/2010), which was coordinated by the Slovak Institute of Archaeology and History in Bratislava and carried out by the Department of

Comparative Religious Studies of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, and the Institute of Ethnology SAS. Several European, American, and Mesoamerican institutions, members of local communities, and scientists from Guatemala participated in the project. As part of the research on the world cultural heritage in Guatemala, T. Podolinská was engaged in the study of religious inscriptions on the material artefacts of Maya culture (*stelae*), leading an operation to document and preserve them.

Two publications on cultural heritage were published under the *Folklore Genres and Social Communication* project (VEGA; 2008–10). One of them was a monograph by T. Bužeková (2007) on superstition narratives from Western Slovakia, the other one was a monograph written by an important retired Slovak expert in folklore studies, Ľubica Droppová, in co-authorship by E. Krekovičová from the Institute of Ethnology SAS. They jointly edited a previously unprocessed large body of leaflet fair songs of Slovakia from the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (2010). It was the first scientific publication in Slovakia that integrated Slovak materials on this phenomenon of modern pop culture, disseminated by prints, in the international catalogue of ballads and narrative songs.

Through its researcher, the IE SAS focused on studies of religious diversity in Slovakia and a cartographic presentation of the history of the Evangelical (Protestant) Church. In 2007, M. Benža became a co-investigator in a project coordinated by the Faculty of Natural Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava (VEGA; 2007–9) and became the scientific editor of the textual part of the key project output entitled *Historický atlas Evanjelickej cirkvi a. v. na Slovensku* [Historical Atlas of the Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession in Slovakia] (2011).

In the given period, the Institute pursued several application and popularisation outcomes. The long-time cooperation with the Slovak National Museum led to the preparation of a large exhibition of culinary culture *Chute a vône Slovenska* [The Tastes and Scents of Slovakia], which opened in Martin on November 28, 2007. R. Stoličná, who collaborated on the



preparation of the exhibition scenario, in the same year edited a collection of texts that served as a Catalogue for the exhibition. In many cases, it presented for the first time to both the scientific and lay public, the traditional meals of Slovaks and ethnic minorities in Slovakia and explained their symbolic meaning (Ed. 2007). The Institute's application outputs of that period also included the above-mentioned electronic popularisation encyclopaedia *Traditional Folk Culture in Slovakia through Words and Pictures (Elektronická encyklopédia 2008)*. As an internet source of information for the general public in Slovakia, it still maintains a wide reach.

In the late 2000s, the scientific concept that the Institute pursued in the field of the study of theoretical issues responded to the long-felt need to develop a discussion on basic ethnological and anthropological notions and qualitative research methods (*Dotazník... 2007*). Thanks also to the experience with the *Rómsky dejepis* textbook (Mann 2000) and the spread of socially engaged and application activities of the researchers, the issue of ethics in field research appeared to be a specific problem. Theoretical and methodological issues were being developed under specific research projects and formed part of their publication outputs. For instance, the concepts of identity, memory, and group were elaborated by G. Kiliánová in her introduction to the monograph *My a tí druhí v modernej spoločnosti* [We and the Others in Modern Society] (Kiliánová, Kowalská, and Krekovičová, Eds. 2009); in the same publication, J. Podoba dealt with the methodological issues of research on identity and conflict in the introduction to the chapter with the same title. The social science concept of *collective memory* was critically analysed by the editors M. Ferencová (IE SAS) and J. Nosková (Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic) in the Introduction to the Czecho-Slovak Monograph dedicated to the role of remembering in the creation of the pictures of Slovak and Czech cities in the background of the history of the last two centuries (Ferencová and Nosková 2009). Valuable methodological and theoretical topics were also brought by the works of T. Podolinská (2008b),

T. Bužeková (2008), A. Bitušíková and D. Luther (2010b), published in the given period.

The study of theoretical issues was linked to a critical reflection on the history of ethnology in Slovakia for which, in addition to archive research and critical reading of expert texts from the given period, interviews with the members of the older generation of ethnologists in Slovakia were used. One of the specific problems was the development of ethnology in Slovakia in the context of the 20<sup>th</sup>-century totalitarian regimes and the Marxism-Leninism ideology in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These issues were explored under a separate project led by G. Kiliánová under the title *Ethnology in Slovakia in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The History of Scientific Thinking* (VEGA; 2008–10). Apart from partial papers, the project outcome was a monothematic issue of *Slovenský národopis* (2010(4)), which contained the final studies by G. Kiliánová, K. Popelková, R. Stoličná, M. Benža, and J. Zajonc. Through D. Ratica, the Institute of Ethnology SAS cooperated in another project: *The History of Ethnology in Slovakia in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Institutions, Personalities, Projects, and Results* (VEGA; 2008–10), coordinated by the Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra. The conceptual research on the history of the discipline, in particular the history of the institutions, actors, and their strategies, aimed at creating the prerequisites for synthetical works with a specific emphasis on the period of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (*Dotazník... 2012*).

### Religious Studies—the Rising Star of the Second Transformation Decade

In the second Transformation decade, beyond the main research topics defined by the new scientific concept, the Institute began intensively developing religious studies. At the end of the first Transformation decade, this new scientific discipline became established at the Institute through a new researcher who

specialised in religious studies, the historian, and philosopher T. Podolinská. Following up on her PhD work on the iconological analysis of mythological motifs on Celtic coins and Germanic bracteates, T. Podolinská established contacts with medievalists at the University of Oslo where she completed part of her PhD studies. In 1996–8, team research of cult rock carvings from the Bronze Age in Italy, France, and Sweden was conducted under her leadership. Within the research, she was involved in the creation of 3D exhibits that formed part of the exhibitions at the Slovak National Museum in Bratislava (1998). Podolinská studied the *frottage* art technique under the guidance of Miroslav Kšica in Brno and then began cooperation with the Swedish centre in Tanumshede as well as French colleagues who had a permanent research base for the mapping of cult rock carvings at Mont Bego in the Alps. Later, she made full use of this technique when documenting the world cultural heritage at Uaxactún, Guatemala (2010–5).

Towards the end of the first and at the beginning of the second transformation decade, under the segment of the developing comparative religious studies, the first ever stationary anthropological research was carried out in line with Western standards among the indigenous Maya ethnic group of the Lacandons at Nahá, Lacanjá, and Betel in the tropical forest of Chiapas, Mexico (1999–2000).

Tatiana Podolinská and Milan Kováč (from the Department of Comparative Religious Studies of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University), carried out pioneering research among the members of the Maya tribe, yet untouched by civilisation, to capture the traditional beliefs, myths, and rituals in the context of daily life and natural situations through long-term research stay in the community. Due to a taboo on women's contact with men, male researchers had no access to local women. T. Podolinská therefore focused on exploring female rituals, taboos, and narratives spread among the women.

A unique monograph was produced from this research, entitled *Lakandónci—poslední praví Mayovia* [Lacandons—

The Last Genuine Maya] (Kováč and Podolinská 2001), three exhibitions—at the Slovak National Museum in Bratislava, Slovakia (2001), at Náprstek Museum in Prague, Czech Republic (2004), and the Culture Centre Dúbravka (Bratislava, Slovakia; 2015), as well as several studies (Podolinská and Kováč 2001; Kováč and Podolinská 2001; Kováč and Zachar Podolinská 2017). Podolinská also studied healing methods and fine arts (engravings on sacred vessels of gods), thus following up on her previous research on religious art in Europe. The field research travel costs were covered by the Open Society Foundation in Bratislava, while the more than year-long field research in Mexico was paid by the researchers from private sources.

T. Podolinská continued developing religious studies at the international level by taking part in the international European project *Religion and Values: Central and Eastern European Research Network* under the EU FP6 (REVACERN; 2007–9). She edited the monothematic *Slovenský národopis* issue (2007(2)) dealing with the theoretical approach to research on religion and spirituality and the *SN* issue (2008(4)) on Marian worship in Europe. In 2010, she was the principal guest editor of the monothematic issue on current forms of religiosity, spirituality and nonreligion in Europe for the *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures—New Forms of Modern Religiosity in Europe* (Vol. 19(1)), having written the theoretical introduction (2010a). Also further studies of Podolinská published abroad brought new empirical data from research on current forms of religiosity (2008b, 2010b). As a host discipline under the auspices of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, religious studies thus unequivocally stepped into the European and transatlantic space and pursued the position of an important international player.

In the framework of the developing religious studies at the Institute, in 2009, another expert in this field, T. Bužeková, completed several years of her empirical research on present-day sorcery and witchcraft in several municipalities of Western and Central Slovakia and, under the VEGA project, she published her monographic synthesis of empirical findings (2009).

She applied the cognitive anthropology methodological approach to the processing and interpretation of ethnographic empirical materials.

In the second Transformation decade, a third ethnologist, an expert in religious studies, Tomáš Hrustič, came to work at the Institute. Podolinská and Hrustič cooperated in several research projects focusing on religion among the Roma in Slovakia. In the 2010s, they became key figures of modern Romani research in Central Europe.

### Infrastructure

In 2002, the Institute of Ethnology SAS, by means of a pooled investment in expensive equipment by several social science institutes, acquired new devices that created the technical background for the digital processing of archive resources. As far as the dislocation of the Institute is concerned, in 2003, an attic in the building of the IE SAS headquarters (and other SAS institutes) was completed from central funds on Klemensova Street 19 in Bratislava, where the IE SAS acquired three rooms. They were equipped with appropriate furnishings thanks to the funds from the *European Doctorate* international project and began serving both as a digitisation studio and workrooms for domestic as well as foreign students. Upon completion of the *European Doctorate* project, the two attic rooms for students became standard workrooms. This significantly improved the overall workplace facilities and deepened the spatial dispersion of two dozen staff members on four floors.

In 2007 and 2008, thanks to the APVV project *Traditional Culture of Slovakia as Part of the European Cultural Heritage*, the IE SAS invested in costly computer technology for its audiovisual studio. At the end of the second Transformation decade, it disposed of state-of-the-art devices for the digital processing of archives. During that period, the Institute provided for PCs for all researchers and doctoral students and ensured a smooth functioning of the computer network.

However, the building of the Institute's headquarters on Klemensova Street 19 coped for a long time with problems related to spaces for its library and archives. In 2013, the Institute reported to the SAS management in its Annual Report 2012 that the given 'spaces are located in the basement with a part of its walls getting constantly wet, which affects the library units and parts of the Institute's text archive. Unless these premises are refurbished (given the limited possibilities of the SAS Emergency Fund), the Institute will be forced to transfer a part of the library and archives to the storage rooms of the social sciences pavilion within the SAS campus on Dúbravská cesta. However, the Institute would like to avoid such a solution, since the library items and the text archive would become less accessible and would have to be brought for users from another building, which would place a burden on the budget due to additional expenses' (*Výročná správa... 2012*).

### Information and Documentation Section

After the considerable headcount reduction of the Institute of Ethnology SAS Documentation Section, the Information and Documentation Section was established during the first Transformation decade, which combined the functions of a professional library and scientific archives and had two expert staff members: Andrea Kalivodová (from 1996) was responsible for the Library and Ingrid Kostovská (1973–2017) for the Scientific Archive.

The transition period and the activities of the Information and Documentation Section is remembered by the then young researcher, Z. Beňušková, as follows: 'Dušan Ratica was the Director at that time, (...) I was offered to work as a scientist part-time and also be responsible for the Library, because our librarian Drahošová had been dismissed along with headcount reduction. I worked as a scientific aid with Ms Kubová at the Institute's Library during my studies, thanks to which the spaces between bookshelves were not so foreign to me. The Library was

open, I think, twice a week, and so I spent a lot of time in the Library workroom, as well as in Ingrid Kostovská's workroom, where we worked together on *Etnologické rozpravy* (I had been its executive editor since 1992, issue no. 2). In addition, PC writing started to be used at that time. Ingrid acquired the technical skills from her men at home and I was learning from her. (...) After I obtained my CSc degree, I realised that there would be a problem with the Library. Even though I officially worked as a scientist on a part-time basis, it was never taken into account when it came to remuneration; science candidates were expected to work more, and it would have been a risk to stay at the Library. I warned our Director, Dušan Ratica, about this [and he] took note of it... (...) At that time, he used to meet Andrejka Kalivodová at the kindergarten—a graduate from ethnology without a job, their daughters went to the same kindergarten, and so he was successful in taking her on, and my career as a librarian was over after three years (I enjoyed it)' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

A. Kalivodová—according to her personal memoirs from 2022—took up the librarian post at the Institute on a part-time basis in September 1996, 'after graduating in ethnology from the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University and after six years of maternal leave. The Institute was seated on Jakubovo Square at that time. There was a reference library on the second floor, which served as a study room and my workroom; on the ground floor, there was a large book storage room next to the darkroom and the dubbing studio. I took over the Library from Zuzka Beňušková. Zuzka introduced me to all the Library duties: registration of new books and journals, the lending services agenda, interlibrary lending, purchase of books, registration of publications... The Library's archive was specific, focusing predominantly on ethnological literature that was not available in any other library. The Library was largely visited by students of ethnology and related fields, scientists, as well as the public in general. While working at the Library, the librarian's work changed significantly. The principal reason was the computer. I was scared of computers, though

now I can't imagine working without them. My first computer job was the registration of publications in the CDS ISIS information system. The result was the ASEP database—it was a local database without any possibility of making it available on the internet' (in: Popelková 2022).

In the 1990s, the Library began focusing, like the Institute itself, on contemporary ethnological, anthropological, and social science domestic and foreign literature. After 2000, the modernisation of its archives was followed by the dynamic development of the electronic registry of publications, which was managed centrally by the SAS. 'In 2002, the SAS began using commercial library software, which enabled the online entry of data in the central database on behalf of each of the SAS institutes. The guarantor of these changes was (and still is) the SAS Central Library, which is run as an umbrella library and information network of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, of which our Library is a part. Having attended a series of training sessions, I began inputting data into the electronic database' (A. Kalivodová in: *Ibid.*).

According to the Annual Report 2011, the library stocks reached 12,149 library items, with an average annual increase by 250–300 items (*Výročná správa...* 2011). Most of them were acquired by donation, but also by purchase under projects or by exchange. In 2011, the Institute of Ethnology SAS subscribed to, or received by exchange, 53 periodicals in total, of which eleven were domestic and 42 foreign. Lending saw a rising trend when it reached 1,286 items in 2011, which was double the number compared to some previous years (e.g., around 600 lending items in 2008). The librarian also began creating a physical archive of Institute of Ethnology SAS publications (i.e., archiving copies of the publications and responses to works by the Institute's researchers by years) and inputting of the electronic, publicly available, bibliographical database of the Institute's publications as part of the SAS database. The database contained complete data per each staff member for the period 2001–11, and the data of previous years was also continuously added.

According to A. Kalivodová, 'many organisations hesitated to switch to electronic records; the EPCA database was implemented in all SAS organisations only thanks to the adoption of the first SAS Presidium Guideline No. 573/A/03/2007 on the Registration and Categorisation of Publication Activity and Responses, valid from September 1, 2007. This Guideline introduced the institutes' obligation to process their data electronically, and electronic annual reports, called ELVYS, were also launched. Statistics on publications and responses, a comprehensive list of publication activity during the reference year, and a list of citations of the Institute's publications were generated automatically for the purposes of the SAS annual report. No other form of reporting was allowed anymore. Based on the methodological instructions of the SAS Central Library, each SAS institute is required to enter the respective data in the central database where these data are safely stored and backed up. In addition to the automatic generation of outputs for the annual report, the database can also be used for the purposes of evaluation, accreditation, personal bibliography, grant applications, career paths, etc. It is a source of metadata for building the SAS Institutional Repository as a source of information for the purposes of science evaluation (e.g., performance funding). Citations from the WoS and Scopus databases can be directly uploaded in the bibliographical records of the EPCA database, add permanent identifiers to them, or import international evaluation metrics' (in: Popelková 2022).

### Start of Applied Research and Engaged Anthropology

As remembered by G. Kiliánová, during her terms of office, as a manager, she focused on consolidating the position of the Institute through basic research under national and international projects. Applied projects were therefore rather rare during her period.

At the beginning of the second Transformation decade, a team of researchers oriented on Romani studies emerged. Apart from A. Mann, T. Podolinská also began focusing

on Romani studies; the Institute was joined by T. Hrustič, a graduate in ethnology and comparative religious studies under the Štefan Schwarz Fund; and Ludmila Plachá (later Hrustičová) and Juraj Štofej were admitted to PhD studies, specialising on topics related to Romani studies. Between 2002-3, the Institute became, in cooperation with the Department of Comparative Religious Studies of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University, a partner in the international project to map the religiosity of the Roma in Slovakia, supported by the Open Society Foundation in Budapest (HU).

In 2009, the Institute of Ethnology SAS was invited by the Social Development Fund of the Slovak Republic to join a research project that aimed at identifying the barriers to field social work among marginalised Roma communities. After the research evaluation, the Institute assumed responsibility for the qualitative part of the project, and nine researchers, led by T. Hrustič, produced a report that identified the limitations of field research and brought recommendations to streamline the activities of social workers (Hrustič, Ed. 2009). T. Hrustič gained public recognition for his scientific work by being awarded the *Prize of the President of the Slovak Republic* in 2010, granted to young scientists.

Towards the end of the second transition decade, the Institute obtained its first applied research project through T. Podolinská in the role of the main coordinator, called *Research on the Social Inclusion of the Roma via Religious Pathway* (SIRONA 2010), in which the Institute acted as the principal investigator. The project proposal gained support under the call of the *European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion* and was financed from both EU funds and the state budget of the Slovak Republic through the Social Development Fund.

The project provided the Institute a financial grant to fully cover robust field research at fifteen locations, to outsource ten field researchers, as well as organise workshops, lectures, and the publishing of the final publication. The project involved the IE SAS researchers T. Podolinská and T. Hrustič, as well as



doctoral students L. Plachá and J. Štofej. The project outcome included the publishing of knowledge acquired by qualitative ethnographic research and recommendations for policymakers for successful integration of the Roma in mainstream society in Slovakia. The results and recommendations were made available by means of a final workshop accompanied by a media campaign and public lecturing. The results were published in the form of the publication *Boh medzi bariérami. Sociálna inklúzia Rómov náboženskou cestou* [God between Barriers. The Social Inclusion of the Roma via Religious Path] (Podolinská and Hrustič 2010). One year after the project completion, the authors also prepared a policy paper with the most important findings and recommendations (2011a, b). In the same year, the SAS management included the SIRONA project among the most important scientific outputs in the field of tackling serious problems for social practice.

Likewise, in the field of Romani studies, the Institute managed to generate a social impact in the form of awareness raising with respect to the Roma Holocaust. In cooperation with the Slovak National Museum and the In Minoria Foundation, the Institute's researcher, A. Mann, was involved in the *Ma bisteren!* [Don't Forget!] project. This project included the construction of Roma Holocaust monuments in Slovakia, which was accompanied by an exhibition at the Slovak National Uprising Memorial in Banská Bystrica (2005), as well as several seminars and commemorative events on the occasion of the unveiling of monuments in situ with the participation of high-ranking state officials (2006, Minister of Culture F. Tóth) (*Dotazník... 2007*).

In addition to the growing number of application and popularisation projects in the field of Romani studies, close cooperation with the NGO sector on a personal basis developed as part of the Judaic studies at the Institute in the second transition decade. Between 2003–6, the Institute's staff member, M. Vrzgulová, lectured and managed the research and educational project of the Milan Šimečka Foundation

in Bratislava (under the programme *The Fates of Those Who Survived the Holocaust and Education for Human Rights*) under the title *Multicultural Education*. In the same period, M. Vrzgulová participated in the international project *Education about the Holocaust* in cooperation with the *International Task for Holocaust Research, Education and Remembrance*. Between 2003–6, on behalf of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, the project investigator conducted regular lectures for elementary and secondary school teachers in Slovakia and, in 2006, she prepared and carried out an international educational seminar for secondary school teachers on *How to Teach about the Holocaust* (*Dotazník... 2007*, p. 51). The project was implemented in cooperation with the Ministry of Education SR, the Council of Europe, Yad Vashem Israel, and the Holocaust Documentation Centre NGO in Bratislava.

As reflected by G. Kiliánová, the researchers' civic engagement during her term of office significantly increased. This required the introduction of rules for when the staff member is to act on behalf of the Institute and, when on behalf of the NGO, as well as the setting of financial flows for joint projects. Kiliánová comments that it was parallel activities in many cases (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 8), i.e., researchers worked simultaneously at the Institute and at institutions from the non-governmental sector (Holocaust Documentation Centre, Milan Šimečka Foundation). The Institute tolerated this situation since it was aware of the insufficiently motivational economic conditions under which researchers from the state sector worked in connection with the so-called 'salary tables'. On the other hand, the Institute perceived that many of them enjoyed working in the NGO sector, which filled them with the feeling of being useful. The engaged activities of the researchers brought to the Institute contacts with personalities and environments outside the academic sector, an advanced project know-how, as well as language competences, and improved the organisational and dissemination skills of the researchers, which extended their expertise.

## The Case of 'Rómsky dejepis'—The Power of Cohesion

In 2000, the mass media in Slovakia focused their attention on the dispute over the publication *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma History] by Institute of Ethnology SAS researcher, Arne Mann. Shortly after its publishing, the book suffered the fate of forbidden literature; the publishing house (Kalligram) was sued by a private individual, and the book was withdrawn from distribution.

What turned out to be problematic was the fact that 'the text mentioned the surname of the complainant's long-dead relatives which, however, was spelled differently than his own surname' (A. Mann in: Popelková 2022). Throughout this case, which had a dramatic chronology, adverse effects arose on the rights of private persons with a direct or indirect relationship to the content of the book, infringed on the rights of the author, his workplace and the publishing house, and the scientific community encountered a negative experience with state institutions and an incorrect application of the law.

*Rómsky dejepis*, a brief illustrated complementary textbook for history teaching, intended for second-grade elementary school pupils, aimed at explaining them in a comprehensible manner the history and contemporary realities of the life of the Roma minority and thereby at contributing to ethnic tolerance in society. By writing this book, the author responded to the initiative of the Ministry of Education which, through the State Pedagogical Institute of the Slovak Republic, received his manuscript in 1994, had it professionally reviewed and then approved in 1995 with a recommendation to have it published.

Before *Rómsky dejepis* was published in print, its manuscript version was distributed in samizdat among teachers in Slovakia and the Czech Republic. In 1998, based on the proposal of the representatives of the Czech Ministry of Education, which showed interest in the publication, the text was complemented with the realities of the history and present situation of the Roma from the Czech Republic. In 1999, the publishing of the manuscript in Slovakia was promoted by the Slovak Deputy Prime

Minister for Human Rights and Ethnic Groups, Pál Csáky, and the book was released at the end of the year by Kalligram publishing house. On December 10, 1999, on the occasion of the Human Rights Day, *Rómsky dejepis* was distributed at the Bratislava Castle and, at the turn of the years 1999 and 2000, it triggered intensive positive responses in the mass media (Kiliánová and Mann 2002, p. 153).

In 2000, after a distant ancestor of a famous musician's Roma family addressed the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic and protested the publishing of the text of the book, the Kalligram publishing house withdrew *Rómsky dejepis* from bookstore shelves. Despite blanking out the surnames of the two Roma families in the book at the complainant's request, by May 2000, he did not consent to restoring its distribution. Another state authority—the Government Plenipotentiary for Personal Data Protection in Information Systems, Pavol Husár, intervened in the case as well. In November 2000, he summoned and interviewed A. Mann on his own initiative and ruled that, pursuant to *Act (No. 52/1998 Coll.) on Personal Data Protection in Information Systems*, A. Mann was required to present the written consents of all people mentioned in *Rómsky dejepis*. The plenipotentiary decided so, even though the law did not specify the form of consent of the given persons and that A. Mann disposed of the oral consents of all persons mentioned in the book (Kiliánová and Mann 2002, p. 153). However, the author did not have the consent of the complainant, since he was not mentioned in the publication at all, the author did not know him, and had 'no knowledge of his existence' (A. Mann in: Popelková 2022).

At the end of 2000, the Institute of Ethnology SAS also became engaged in the case. After a conversation with A. Mann and having examined the chronology of the events, the legislation, and the correspondence sent to A. Mann, Director G. Kiliánová came to the conclusions that the procedures against the author and the book were not justified. Together with the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the SAS Science Section III, Ľubomír Falt'an, Chairman of the Scientific Board of the Institute

of History SAS, Ivan Kamenec, and Director of the SAS Institute of State and Law, Jozef Vozár, they drafted the *Opinion of the directors of scientific institutes on the issue of Act No. 52/1998 Coll. on Personal Data Protection in Information Systems and on its application*.

The protest of the scientific community concerned the ambiguities as regards the law and its application in the case of the *Rómsky dejepis* publication. According to this opinion, which was signed by the majority of directors of the SAS Science Section III as well as several directors of other SAS organisations, the book was to be considered a scientific or artistic text and should not have been subject to the application of the said Act (Kiliánová and Mann 2002, p. 154).

In February 2001, the opinion was provided to the Press Agency of the Slovak Republic and sent to the Slovak Government's Legislative Council, the Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights and Nationalities, and to the Government Plenipotentiary for Personal Data Protection in Information Systems. After the Slovak Academy of Sciences got involved in resolving the case, P. Husár addressed a letter to the SAS President in March 2000 with questions about the operation of the personal data information systems in the IE SAS and asked whether A. Mann had worked on the book as part of his job description. In line with the SAS internal communication procedure, SAS President, Štefan Luby, forwarded the letter to the Institute of Ethnology SAS Director, G. Kiliánová.

In April 2001, P. Husár suspended his decision prohibiting the distribution of *Rómsky dejepis*, and the textbook was once again distributed in bookstores. However, the political party The Roma Initiative of Slovakia expressed its opposition to the book at a press conference in July 2001 saying that the book 'promotes racism and intolerance'. The Slovak and Czech media discussed these statements uncritically, yet the Ministry of Education of Slovak Republic distanced itself from this problem.

In May 2001, Plenipotentiary P. Husár sent the Institute a letter similar to the one he had addressed to the SAS Presidium.

The response to this letter, which had been prepared by the Institute's Director upon legal consultation with the Director of the Institute of State and Law SAS, J. Vozár, highlighted the following arguments: The Institute of Ethnology SAS is not the operator of the personal data information system; the IE SAS administers scientific archives; the right to scientific research and publication is guaranteed by the Constitution of the Slovak Republic; the IE SAS staff member, A. Mann, wrote *Rómsky dejepis* upon request by the Ministry of Education of Slovak Republic, and the IE SAS created the working conditions for him to complete the task.

As a reaction to this response, in July 2001, P. Husár sent Inspection Sheets to the Institute for the purposes of checking its information systems which, however, the Institute sent back stating that it did not operate the personal data information system. In September 2001, Plenipotentiary T. Husár asked the Director to visit the IE SAS premises. At a meeting on October 4, 2011, P. Husár informed G. Kiliánová in person that, according to the opinion of the Ministry of Culture of Slovak Republic that he requested, the *Rómsky dejepis* can be interpreted with respect to Act No. 52/1998 as an artistic text (the said Act did not mention the term 'scientific text'). He noted that he intended to inform the complainant that his office would no longer deal with the *Rómsky dejepis* case. In connection with the operation of the personal data information system, the Plenipotentiary explained that the IE SAS was indeed an operator of such system due to the collection and administration of the personal data of a set number of employees. He repeatedly asked the Director to fill in the Inspection Sheets. He also informed her that he had prepared reference documents to amend Act No. 52/1998, which are available on the internet, and that he would welcome any suggestions, comments, or criticism (*Ibid.*, p. 155).

In October 2001, the Institute received again the Inspection Sheets for the purposes of checking its information systems. Since they concerned another SAS organisation—the Technical and Economic Management of the SAS Social Science Institutes—Director G. Kiliánová informed the SAS Presidium about this

matter. Based on the result of the legal consultation that the SAS Vice-Chair, Tatiana Sedová, requested, the IE SAS sent a response to the Plenipotentiary in November 2001, asking for complementary information about the reasons for which the Institute was chosen for control of the personal data information system (i.e., data related to the salaries and human resources department) (*Ibid.*).

The case had a judicial follow-up, as the complainant sued the Kalligram publishing house, requesting high compensation. Even though the complainant lost the lawsuit, during which 'it turned out that the Government Plenipotentiary, P. Husár, was a close relative (brother-in-law) of the complainant' (A. Mann in: Popelková 2022), the Ministry of Education, which took side neither of the author nor of the publishing house, was no longer interested in the book.

The case of the *Rómsky dejepis* book highlighted in a specific way a whole range of social contradictions of the post-socialist transformation in the Slovak Republic in the latter half of the 1990s. It revealed the frustration of society from the consequences of the segregated status of the members of the Roma community, the contradictions in the individual strategies of its members on the path towards their integration in mainstream society, as well as the methods of the political struggle combined with the efforts of some Roma leaders to gain political hegemony.

At the same time, the case brought a whole range of challenges to the ethnological scientific community. In the aftermath of the scandal, the editors of the *Etnologické rozpravy* journal, P. Salner and Z. Beňušková, decided to open a discussion on the *Rómsky dejepis* book in the second issue of 2002. According to P. Salner, this thin book and the responses to it raised for scientists 'important issues concerning scientific truth or the limits for publishing truthful data, professional pride, and the need to defend colleagues under the external threat of attacks and purposeful lies, as well as the protection of the individual, which are closely linked to sensitive information that

ethnologists work with' (Redakcia 2002, p. 150). J. Podoba (2002) and E. Krekovičová (2002) also expressed their opinions on this issue, and the entire chronology of the case was described by the Director of the Institute and the author of the *Rómsky dejepis* himself (Kiliánová and Mann 2002).

With hindsight, Arne Mann, who, as a researcher and pioneer of modern Slovak Romani studies, sought to overcome, before as well as after, a number of social prejudices and barriers, reflected on the events following the publishing of the *Rómsky dejepis* as one of the most difficult periods in his life. Even after more than ten years, he remembered the fear he felt when the complainant threatened to demand compensation from him, the unpleasant feelings when blanking out parts of his books, during the interrogations by the Government Plenipotentiary, when lies and half-truths were published in the mass media, as well as when giving testimony during the lawsuit with the publishing house (in: Popelková 2022).

In her memoirs, G. Kiliánová noted that, as a novice Director of a scientific organisation, she obtained 'on the one hand, an indeed unusual experience in dealing with state institutions. On the other hand, there was the feeling of satisfaction that, with the help of the broader scientific community, a wrong decision was overturned, even though the whole case had a bitter follow-up. In any case, the academic community showed its solidarity and conviction that the truth and justice needed to be defended' (in: *Ibid.*).

Among other things, the case tested again the strength of the Institute's internal cohesion and organic solidarity when the team pulled together to help and protect a troubled individual member. It also proved the social capital of the Institute, which was able to mobilise also other SAS organisations and its management to defend an employee who was accused and harmed unfairly.

Moreover, the case drew attention to the ethical dilemmas in field research and in writing expert and scientific texts. To cope with these dilemmas, the Institute had to find effective mechanisms in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century to be able

to guarantee the protection of not only the interlocutors, but also its researchers and the organisation itself as a workplace of qualitative research.

### The External Perspective—Accreditations in the Second Transformation Decade

At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the regular internal evaluations of the SAS scientific organisations were conducted in four-year cycles. In addition to the final score and performance scale classification, the organisations were also provided with Verbal Evaluations from the Accreditation Committee, as well as Lists of Recommendations. They thus received proportional feedback and were able to find out their performance condition within the relevant SAS section by applying identical criteria. Under the first evaluation during the second Transformation decade, the organisations were evaluated based on the following criteria: international visibility (number of cooperations and international projects), quality and composition of publication outputs, and the success rate of PhD studies. In addition to book monographs, journal publications gradually began coming to the foreground in the field of social sciences and humanities as well. At the same time, not only numbers, but also the composition of citations or responses began being monitored.

*Accreditation in 2003.* The Accreditation Committee for the SAS Science Section III evaluated the end of the first and the beginning of the second Transformation decade (1999–2002) with mark 'B', i.e., 'organisation with very good results'. The accreditation file was produced in Slovak language; two external reviewers were Slovak (Ján Michálek from the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in Bratislava; Miroslav Marcelli from the Department of Philosophy of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava), and one from the Czech environment (Stanislav Brouček from the Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic).

Despite the positive reviews from the external reviewers (Popelková 2008, p. 134), the Institute only obtained 87 points out of 100 in the Accreditation Committee's final evaluation (mark 'A' was assigned for the score of 91–100 points). In the List of Recommendations addressed to the organisation's management in 2004, the Committee recommended 'considering the age structure of the workplace, increasing the success rate of PhD studies (no defence of a PhD thesis took place during the reference period), improving publication in high-impact journals (the Institute had no response in a Current-Contents journal registered in the WoS database)' (*List of Recommendations from the SAS Accreditation Committee* addressed to the IE SAS management, January 30, 2004; see also *Ibid.*).

In 2004, the Institute had three years of consecutive, intensive restarts under the leadership of G. Kiliánová and a clearly defined scientific concept. It was part of the international network of six European university and academic organisations authorised to train people and grant the *European Doctorate* degree, due to which its classification in the 'B' category was perceived unfair. In its Annual Report 2004, the Institute stated: 'The IE SAS management and its staff consider the decision on the organisation's accreditation to be biased, without taking into account the dynamic development of the workplace, as well as its domestic and international scientific results achieved in the course of the reference period' (*Výročná správa... 2004*, p. 3).

The organisation appealed against the evaluation by a letter of the Chairman of the IE SAS Scientific Board, J. Podoba, of March 25, 2004, which was responded by the SAS President, Štefan Luby, and the Accreditation Committee Chairman, Vojtech Rušín, by letter on April 22, 2004. Both of them affirmed that the Accreditation Committee appreciated the Institute's book production, as well as the *European Doctorate* project and its scientific and research focus. Chairman Vojtech Rušín noted in his reply (letter no. 106/0214/2004 of April 22, 2004) that, 'in the first round of the regular evaluation, out of 29 scientific organisations of the SAS, only two did not have a single citation in WoS [database].



The number of citations in your organisations increased during the reference period, but is below average of the SAS Science Section III. The number of articles in Current-Contents journals is also below average. It would perhaps be more appropriate to create one Current-Contents journal instead of the four non-Current-Contents journals published by your organisation. If we want to enter the single European research area, we have to publish the results of our work mainly in high-impact journals'.

*Accreditation in 2007.* From the initial mark 'B' in 2003 (evaluation of the period 1999–2002), during the second term of office of G. Kiliánová, the Institute became one of the leaders of the organisations within the SAS Science Section III (SSH). In the annual evaluation 2006, the Institute occupied the first place (Popelková 2008, p. 134). In 2007, in the regular evaluation of the period 2003–6, the Institute obtained top ranking 'A\*' (performance scale of 'A\*–D'), which was verbally expressed as 'excellent' performance. The protocol of the scientific organisation evaluation was issued by the Accreditation Committee of the SAS Science Section III, which proposed classifying the organisation in the top performance category.

The evaluation was based on the so-called accreditation questionnaire—like in the previous evaluation, the questionnaire was filled in by all scientific organisations in Slovak language, plus, its translation to English was added as a novelty (*Dotazník... 2007*). In 2007, the SAS Accreditation Committee also relied on three reviews by external reviewers: two international experts in European ethnology and cultural anthropology—Regina Bendix from Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen (DE) and Gábor Barna from the University of Szeged (HU)—and a domestic expert in museology—Miroslav Sopoliga from the Museum of Ukrainian Culture SNM, Svidník (SK). The foreign evaluators wrote their reviews in English. G. Barna and M. Sopoliga were physically present during the site visit of the review committee (June 21, 2007); the review by Regina Bendix was translated into Slovak and read by the secretary of the Committee, Eva Kowalská (Institute of History SAS).

In the evaluation protocol, the following partial indicators were evaluated (both verbally and by weighted points): (1) scientific outputs, (2) responses (citations), (3) the organisation's status in the international and national context, (4) project structure, (5) PhD studies and other teaching activity, (6) outputs for the social practice: application and popularisation of the results, and (7) the environment and management: infrastructure and personal development.

Of the evaluated partial indicators, five were evaluated as 'strong': scientific outputs (124.5 of 140 points), scientific status (53.36 of 60 points), project structure (34.75 of 40 points), the environment (17.37 of 20 points) and PhD studies (35.57 of 40 points). The responses to scientific outputs (28.95 of 40 points) and outputs for the social practice (43.42 of 60 points) were evaluated as 'weak'. The organisation obtained 84.49% of the total percentage points and was accredited as an organisation that fulfilled the criteria for excellent research under the given criteria, reaching a high scientific and methodological level of its outputs, *with a leading position in national research and with an unequivocally accepted position in the international context*. The verbal evaluation highlighted the effective arrangement of PhD studies (including training for doctoral students from abroad), and supported the direction of the scientific concept. The Institute's infrastructure and management were assessed as excellent. The organisation was evaluated without adding any comments or objections (*Protocol on the Evaluation of the SAS Scientific Organisation*, approved on July 23, 2007).

In addition to the overall review, the organisation also had at its disposal the evaluations by three reviewers who helped it gain a valuable picture of itself through an external and international perspective (*Expert Review 1, 2, 3... 2007*). The experts evaluated the organisation in the following areas: - contribution of the research organisation to the development of knowledge in the issued disciplines, - main R&D results achieved and implemented, - level of international cooperation and projects,

- the organisation's role in the overall research effort within field of the intended research plan on both national and international scales, including the strategies, methods and timetable, - quality of the management, - qualification structure of the personnel, - infrastructure and technical equipment, - distribution of the assessed parameters within the organisation' (*Expert's Report Template... 2007*). Experts also expressed their views on how successful the organisation was in four partial indicators: B1 Research funding, B2 Responses to scientific outputs, B3 Research status, and B4 Research grants and funding. In each indicator, they were required to rate the organisation using one of five ratings: 'excellent—very good—good—sufficient—insufficient'.

International Evaluator 1 concluded that 'the IE SAS shows itself to be a highly potent, internationally competitive research institution. With a relatively small staff, the institute manages to carry out effective research projects of a diverse nature, as well as present and publish the results in conferences and the regular spread of scientific publications and, when applicable, to also transfer knowledge into the broader public sphere'. Expert 1 appreciated the quality of the PhD studies and the international visibility of the staff at conferences, as well as the overall publication performance. The Evaluator was also positive, noting that 'the amount of soft moneys raised for research activities is impressively high, especially for a humanities field' (C1 *Summary and List of Recommendations* in: *Expert Review 1... 2007*).

Among the *List of Recommendations for the Future* (Part C2 of the Report), Expert 1 navigated IE SAS to make efforts to receive extra 'funding from the Ministry of Education for translation of key research papers' in order to get more visibility in international 'citation prone journals'. The same expert suggested that the Institute should be proactive in finding 'support for PhD students to spend a semester abroad' and to also find sources to support 'PhD students and younger scholars to attend international conferences and symposia'. Finally, the expert encouraged the Institute to 'make full use of the reflective

power inherent to the studies of intellectual history of the field' and to 'consider the potential synergy effects between the planned research projects' and 'hold occasional comments and feedback sessions on research designs and research results between project staff'.

In the overall assessment of R&D activities, Expert 2 stated that the IE SAS 'carries out extensive activity worthy of recognition on a generally high standard and following current European trends'. At the same time, there was a statement that the core of research is focused on Slovak traditional culture, peasant society, and the culture of Slovaks living in other countries, while less emphasis is placed on the study of material culture. Expert 2 also commented that 'research on religious communities, new religious movements, and ethnic minorities is less strong'.

The reviewer also included a critical note that 'the problem of the cultural heritage figures is largely only at the level of words, but this is a more complex problem (tangible and intangible, natural heritage, etc.)' (Part A1 of *Expert Review 2... 2007*). Furthermore, in connection with the research concept of thematic clusters, it was mentioned that, in the thematic group *Study of Social and Cultural Changes and Transformation Processes after 1989*, the 'processes were studied mainly at the micro-level, with the exception of one research project outside Europe (T. Podolinská, Mexico)'.

Expert 2 also recommended strengthening the thematic line focused on *Theoretical Issues and History of the Discipline*. The main critical comment that Expert 2 expressed in the review was that the publications of the Institute 'appeared in B and C category journals on the basis of the qualifications of the European Reference Index for Humanities (ERIH), or in journals that are not registered' and 'no articles appeared in A category journals'. It can be assumed that it was the reason why the overall R&D assessment of the Institute by Expert 2 was 'very good' and not 'excellent', as Expert 1 claimed.

In part A2 of the review (*Comments on the proposed concept*), the review expressed satisfaction with the current

themes and issues identified in the proposed concept and the interdisciplinary approach. However, it was stated that there was a profound lack of research on cultural diversity, which should be saturated by young researchers and PhD students. Also, it was stated that 'it is worth preserving the high standard of folkloristics research'.

The reviewer also pinpointed some important themes that 'are entirely absent not only from achievements to date, but also from the plans', naming 'historical ecology, the historical approach in general, dance, music, ethnological film etc.'.

The reviewer also stressed that 'the archive needs to be developed (digitisation, inline access, multimedia CDs, DVDs, etc.)'. In Part B3 (*Comments and evaluation of research status... in the international and national context*), Expert 2 expressed the view that 'the activity of the institution can be evaluated as very good and effective among the new EU Member States', choosing the option 'very good' in rating.

Project structure (Part B4) was evaluated with 'excellent' rating. In Part B5 (*Comments on PhD studies and other pedagogical activities*), Expert 2 highly acknowledged the international *European Doctorate* programme: 'I found this to be one of the most impressive points of the report'. At the same time, however, the reviewer stated that there was a 'substantial decline of around 30% in the number of internal and external students. The report gives no explanation for this'.

In Part B7 (*Comments on management, organisational structure, infrastructure and qualification structure, and HR policy*), Expert 2 acknowledged in particular the professional and financial management of the Institute. It was stated that there were 'key persons with a decisive influence on the Institute, with two of the most cited authors (P. Salner and E. Krekovičová) and several other outstanding scholars (G. Kiliánová, Z. Profantová, H. Hlôšková, O. Danglová)'.

Regarding infrastructure and equipment, it was noted that if the Institute 'wished to develop the archive', it needed 'to create a stock of advanced digitisation equipment'. Some concerns were

expressed also in connection with the prevalence of particular research teams or *ad-hoc* team operation. The HR policy was rated good; nevertheless, further rejuvenation was recommended and the trend towards 'strong feminisation' was recognised. The Herder Prize received by G. Kiliánová during the reference period (in 2006) was acknowledged with high respect.

In Section C (*Summary and List of Recommendations in: Expert Review 2... 2007*), the following ideas as a kind of recommendations were offered by Expert 2: - preserve the present well-elaborated equilibrium between ethnological and anthropological themes, theoretical approaches, and methods, - put more research emphasis on current phenomena such as new celebrations, symbolisation, and ritualisation, - launch research on religious culture (oriental religions, new religious movements, neo-pagan movements etc.), - strengthen the historical approach to cultural processes, - launch a B category (rating in ERIH) foreign language journal with international authors (as an urgent and important issue).

The evaluation by the third external expert brought national external feedback to the Institute. The domestic reviewer, who best understood the national context and his evaluation, was undoubtedly influenced also by a museology perspective. At the time of reviewing the R&D outputs, he valued the research on traditional culture highly: 'It was principally the ethno-cartographic method that was used to approach the topic of Slovak minorities in Central and South-Eastern Europe. During that period, four atlases had been published, which has no parallel in the history of ethnology of any other country'.

In addition to several works on traditional culture (e.g., Stoličná 2004b; Beňušková et al. 2005), the evaluator highlighted the publishing of the third volume of *Slovak Folk Fairy Tales* as an extremely commendable work (Filová and Gašparíková, Ed. 2004). As for folklore studies, he noted the editing of several volumes (Z. Profantová, H. Hlôšková, E. Krekovičová) and methodological publications (Krekovičová 2005; Kiliánová 2005a). He also stressed the Judaic studies represented by the works of P. Salner (Ed. 2006), research on the Holocaust (M. Vrzgulová), works in the

field of Romani studies (A. Mann, E. Krekovičová, T. Podolinská), research on Hungarian-Slovak relationships in Slovak towns (M. Ferencová), and the two-volume publication published as the result of a bilateral project that covered research on Bulgarians in Slovakia (Krekovičová and Penčev, Eds. 2005).

When it comes to the anthropological research on transformation processes, the evaluator appreciated the outputs by O. Danglová, Z. Beňušková, and D. Luther; among the authors who reflect on the theory and development of the discipline, he mentioned G. Kiliánová, R. Stoličná, M. Ferencová, Z. Profantová, M. Vrzgulová, and J. Podoba. What he considered a 'novelty in the IE SAS activities' were field research conducted outside the European continent (T. Podolinská).

As for project activities, he emphasised the management of the SAS *Centre of Excellence* and involvement in four state scientific research and development programmes. In terms of partial indicators, he evaluated the organisation as 'excellent' in indicator B1 Research outputs, 'very good' in indicator B2 Responses, and 'excellent' in the two remaining indicators (B3 Research status, and B4 Project structure). In connection with project structure, he noted in the comments that most international projects did not bring direct finance to the Institute (*Partial indicators of main activities in: Expert Review 3... 2007*, p. 8). He highly valued the cooperation of the IE SAS (with the Institute of History SAS as an interlinked training organisation) under the EU FP5 *Marie Curie Training Programme European Doctorate in Social History of Europe and the Mediterranean* and the follow-up EU FP6 (2006–8).

Regarding the recommendations addressed to the organisation, the reviewer recommended under Section C (among other things): '- to strengthen research on national minorities and relationships between the mainstream and minority population (set up a specialised workplace), - to initiate the establishment of a specialised department or unit for comparative religious studies as a scientific discipline, - to ensure a systematic approach to dealing with the methodological and theoretical issues of the discipline' (*Expert Review 3... 2007*, p. 11).

The domestic reviewer, who was familiar with the financial situation of the scientific institutions in Slovakia, included a general critical comment in his review as a contextual footnote for his evaluation: 'The staff remuneration has long ceased to reflect the importance and demanding nature of the work performed and is far below the level of their colleagues in other European countries' (*Expert Review 3... 2007*, p. 10).

In the wider context of the history of science and the methods of evaluating the organisation in the post-socialist transition period, it is valuable to also observe the remarks on the concept of the evaluation itself by the foreign reviewers. For instance, in his accompanying letter of April 9, 2007 addressed to the management of the SAS Science Section III, Expert 1 offered the following statement after expressing thanks for being invited to work as a reviewer: 'Allow me, in conclusion or as an aside to remark on the nature of this review process. I have been asked to serve as an evaluator at this point in my professional life for various purposes and it is invariably an interesting task. Simultaneously, I have grown increasingly disturbed at the ways in which evaluation processes have begun to resemble industry or business evaluation and I would like to put forth—as recommendation to the Slovak Accreditation Board—to consider that higher education and scholarly research should not be measured by the same kinds of tools as industrial production or white collar services. The very vocabulary we use in these evaluation processes is business vocabulary and one ought to remember that this language use already is alien to the tradition of scholarship'. At the end of the letter, Expert 1 also comments on the overall national climate and the promotion of science: 'If a country is interested in having its researchers thrive in an atmosphere of trust and encouragement, it is advisable to lessen bureaucratic processes of self-examination and self-documentation'.

Expert 2 begins the final part of the review (Section C, Part C2, *List of Recommendations for the Future*) with a series of systemic questions addressed to the SAS: 'As I understood it,

the evaluation questionnaire was elaborated by the Slovak Academy of Sciences for its institutes. Is there an EU standard for this? How is this done, if it is done at all, by other countries and institutions?'. The context suggests that he has not yet encountered a similarly set-up internal self-evaluation system. In this regard, Expert 2 also believes that: 'It is to be hoped that the four-year-evaluation cycles do not cause rigidity in scientific planning'. Even though, as an evaluator, the expert was primarily supposed to give recommendations to the organisation, he/she considered it necessary to make an appeal regarding coverage from the central budget of the SAS (implicitly addressed to the SAS Presidium): 'There is an urgent demand to constantly seek funding through applications (grants, fundings), which often makes deeper research and analysis impossible. The constant fundraising constraint could be avoided if the basic financing of the Institute is ensured in the central budget'.

In summary, in the period 2003–6, the Institute's research staff produced 27 monographs (four foreign and 23 domestic ones), 170 chapters (58 foreign and 49 domestic), 137 studies in total (six of them in Current Contents journals, 64 in registered and 67 in non-registered journals), as well as 145 conference papers published in conference proceedings (74 international and 71 national). During the reference period, the core of citations consisted of book and volume citations (691 national and 336 international), while the WoS and Scopus citations of all staff during the reference four-year period reached a total number of 18.

In the second transition decade, the publication *habitus* of the Institute focused principally on monographs published in Slovak, with a high number of published chapters. The composition of the studies is characterised by a prevalence of volume works and studies in non-registered journals. In general, publishing in 'Current Contents journals' was preferred in Slovakia during the 2000s, i.e., in journals registered in the Current Contents (CC) databases such as Web of Science (WoS) (Thomson and Reuters, Clarivate today) and later also Scopus (Elsevier). This launched the 'scientometric' period of science and research at the SAS and

also in the national context. With some delay, this trend copied the scientometric approaches in evaluation within the wider ecosystem of science in Europe.

### Implementation of Accreditation Recommendations

*Accreditation in 2003.* Under the evaluation of the period 1999–2002, the Institute of Ethnology SAS was recommended by the SAS Accreditation Committee lowering the average age structure of the Institute. Almost all IE SAS members admitted during the transition or pre-transition period worked under employment contracts of indefinite duration, and since there were no available funds in the Institute's wage budget, the possibility to take up new employees depended on the voluntary leaving of staff, or new staff could be employed under fixed-term contracts financed from external project funds. To rejuvenate the team, especially in the second transition decade, the funds from the new central financial scheme, the so-called *Štefan Schwarz Fond* scholarship, began to be used. In 2004–6, three new employees, successful graduates from PhD studies, were taken on (T. Bužeková, L. Herzánová, Z. Búriková), thanks to which the number of young scientists at the workplace increased.

Other recommendations of the Accreditation Committee included improving the quality of PhD studies. In 2006, the Institute of Ethnology SAS obtained new accreditation for PhD studies in the field of ethnology. Involvement in the EU FP5 and FP6 through the European Doctorate project brought an international dimension to doctoral studies, increased the mobility of Slovak students towards foreign universities, and allowed for the arrival of foreign students at the IE SAS. In 2006, the Institute met the criteria to become a partner to the 'International Doctoral School' and the central institution by organising a *PhD Seminary* in the field of ethnology, also for ethnology departments at other Slovak universities. In 2003–6, the Institute significantly strengthened the quality and complexity of its PhD studies.



The success rate of PhD training began being monitored as well. Although the Institute's researchers were successful in preparing PhD students at other workplaces (domestic university workplaces), during the reference period, students often left their PhD studies at the Institute. The Institute's management therefore sought more intensively to stimulate PhD students to complete their studies by submitting their doctoral theses for defence. At the end of the second Transformation decade (from 1997), the internal defence system was implemented, which enabled PhD candidates to submit the final manuscript of their thesis to be defended within the Institute. Before definitively concluding their dissertation thesis and before the public defence, the candidates obtained not only the first evaluation (from a chosen older colleague who read and evaluated the work) but also valuable feedback from the academic community. By practicing presentation during a simulated defence, candidates could also improve their presentation skills.

As part of the accreditation, the Committee also recommended the Institute improve publication in CC journals or journals registered in other databases. In this regard, the Institute felt an increased need to register its *Slovenský národopis* journal in any of the preferred databases (CC, WoS and later also Scopus). The editorial teams of many journals within the SAS used the first transition decade for registration in international databases. At that time, the journals from post-communist Europe had open access to CC and WoS databases, as these databases needed to cover the post-socialist region. During the first decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the SAS institutes with CC journals benefitted largely from WoS studies and citations obtained through their own institutional journals. In line with the recommendations, in the latter half of the 2000s, the Institute's management began taking steps to register the journal in the WoS database.

One of the key recommendations of the Accreditation Committee of 2003 was implemented towards the end of the

second transition decade (in 2008) by reducing the number of journals published by the Institute. Of the periodically published journals, the Institute only retained one—*Slovenský národopis*—, while the publishing of *Etnologické rozpravy* was assumed by its co-publisher, the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia*. The Institute began monitoring not only the quantity, but also the composition of responses to its scientific publications, observing an increase in the most evaluated citations in the next reference period (obtaining 18 WoS and one Scopus citations in total in the period 2003–6).

As noted by the Deputy Director, K. Popelková, in her article summarising the implementation of the comments from the Accreditation 2003 and the process of preparation for the comprehensive quality assessment of scientific organisations in 2007 (2008, p. 135), the implementation of the measures from the first accreditation was intensively dealt with also by the Institute's Scientific Board: 'The Scientific Board of the Institute of Ethnology SAS was aware of its weaknesses even before the completion of the "unsuccessful" accreditation, and thus worked on their elimination'. Popelková adds that it was the Chairman of the Scientific Board, J. Podoba, who 'warned about the need for a conceptual work to increase the methodological and epistemological level of the discipline, the need for its involvement in the current anthropological discourse and for improving the quality of research and scientific texts to make them acceptable abroad'. Together with the Institute's management, the Scientific Board prepared a concept of internal seminars and, in cooperation with the Institute for Sociology SAS, also theoretical and methodological seminars to which foreign experts and experts from other disciplines were invited (*Ibid.*).

*Accreditation in 2007.* In 2003–6, the Institute pursued the line corrected by the previous accreditation, focusing its energy on improving its publication and on obtaining responses, establishing international cooperation, and continuing cooperation projects at national level, as well as on rejuvenating

the team. During this period, it also performed an interesting experiment within the internal system of evaluation of the publication performance of its staff when the Scientific Board attempted in 2004 to evaluate the quality of the Institute's publications published in 2003. The chart of the 'winning works' was presented only at the meeting of the Board of the Director, which was composed of the leaders of the Institute's projects currently underway. This qualitative assessment attempt took place only once, with the Board of the Director taking a sceptical attitude (*Ibid.*). The Institute never again returned to the internal self-evaluation in which the organisation's staff were expected to evaluate the performance of their own colleagues.

When the organisation was required to comment in the accreditation questionnaire of 2012 on the implementation of the Accreditation Committee's recommendations of 2007, the management took the following position: 'Under the previous evaluation, the Institute of Ethnology SAS was classified in category "A\*". The organisation was not given any recommendations. The Protocol of Evaluation of a SAS Scientific Organisation, issued by the Accreditation Committee of the SAS Science Section III for the Institute of Ethnology SAS on July 23, 2007, contains the following sentence under the point Comments and recommendations (...): "The organisation has been evaluated without any comments and recommendations"'.

### The Willingness to Work and Spend Leisure Time Together

The second Transformation decade was characterised by further fragmentation of the working teams and was reduced to *ad-hoc* free cooperation under national projects. This system of work, which evolved into an institutional *habitus* during this decade, was pointed out in unison also by the three external evaluators in the 2007 accreditation.

The Institute was successful when it came to participation in international projects; however, most of them were carried out only with the involvement of a single investigator in a freelance

position, i.e., most cooperation projects were not run at the institutional level and did not bring any extra-budgetary finance to the Institute.

Teams coordinating joint field research, which pursued collective works, were predominantly established by the members of Generation of Builders that carried on its working *habitus* from the 'golden' ethno-cartographic times. In this context, the above-mentioned project of the SAS Centre of Excellence, *Collective Identities in Modern Societies. Central European Region (CE Processes; 2002-6)*, was unique in having brought together for five years a research team of IE SAS researchers within an interdisciplinary national network for the study of collective identities in Central Europe.

With the disappearance of the SAS central project scheme *Centre of Excellence* in the early 2010s, interesting interdisciplinary cooperation projects and teambuilding activities of top academic and university organisations in Slovakia ceased to exist.

In connection with the institutional fragmentation of the teams in the post-socialist period, it should be noted that a similar behaviour pattern can be generally observed in the field of SSH also within the wider, national context. When the Slovak Academy of Sciences contracted the external Academic Ranking and Rating Agency (ARRA) in 2011 to assess the performance of its organisations in order to detect 'excellent teams', the evaluators of the SAS Science Section III had to convince the SAS Presidium about the need to change the methodology, as it was not possible to follow teams here and it was necessary to descend to the level of the individual. On behalf of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, E. Krekovičová was, at that time, identified as *top researcher*. The evaluation was based on a scientometric analysis of the number of outputs and citations during the reference period.

In 2006, on the occasion of the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its establishment, the Institute of Ethnology SAS organised an official meeting of its current and former employees in the Mirrors Hall off the Primate's Palace in Bratislava on May 18.

The guests of this event were colleagues and collaborators from universities and museums in the Slovak Republic, representatives of partner academic ethnological organisations in Prague, Brno, and Budapest, directors of the SAS social science institutes, and members of the SAS Presidium. Around a hundred participants listened to the speeches of Director G. Kiliánová, Chairwoman of the IE SAS Scientific Board M. Vrzgulová, and philosopher Miroslav Marcelli. The social event ended with a reception. The second part of the celebration of the anniversary was a teambuilding event for the Institute's staff, which took place on the next day, on May 19, 2006. All participants were transferred by bus to a cottage on Pezinská Baba hill in the Small Carpathian mountain, where they attended a short working seminar, a joint lunch, and finally a hiking trip and sports activities.

With growing individualisation and scientometric monitoring of the performance and the evaluation of science and research in Slovakia as well as generational change at the Institute, a gradual decline in organising joint leisure activities could be observed. They were reduced to joint celebrations of round anniversaries in smaller groups at the workplace.

However, Christmas parties were still held regularly, organised by the Institute's secretariat (M. Slavkovská and E. Vrátna) under the auspices of the local Trade Union. These pre-Christmas meetings of the whole workplace team and former retired employees were also called *Mikuláš* [Santa Claus] and took place in the decorated Director's office and the Secretariat, to which guests brought home-made treats and sweets. The Director thanked all participants for their work over the past year and the whole team spent the evening with pleasant personal discussions.

During the third term of office of Director G. Kiliánová, these events, demanding in terms of personal engagement, time, and preparations, changed into a joint lunch before Christmas at a restaurant near the Institute's headquarters. All staff members, PhD students, and all former retired colleagues were invited

to the lunch. Between 2008-12, the first joint all-day team trip to Pezinská Baba was organised. Its main part consisted of a half-day working seminar dealing with cross-border scientific cooperation between Austria and the Slovak Republic and with the Institute of Ethnology SAS project strategy in 2011. The working part was followed by a joint hike.

Despite the changed pattern of spending leisure time together, it can be stated that, at the end of the second transformation decade, the Institute was characterised by strong internal cohesion, with high-quality interpersonal relationships and forms of communication. According to Director G. Kiliánová, one could have the feeling of belonging to the workplace and, in connection with the good evaluations, the staff had an increased feeling of pride of their own Institute (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 7).

### Successes and Challenges of the Second Transformation Decade

From the generational and performance perspective, the Generation of Builders was still strongly visible, however, the discourse and management were unequivocally taken over by the Transformation Generation, who advocated new approaches and themes and claimed a systemic anthropologisation of the organisation. A new scientific concept was identified during the intensive discussions of the Scientific Board, the Institute's management, and the academic community, with a key focus on an ethnological reflection on the transformation processes in Slovakia after 1989, research of collective identities, impacts of modernisation and globalisation processes on daily culture, research of folklore and traditional culture as part of Slovakia's tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and the history of the scientific discipline.

In addition to these core topics, religious and Romani studies began developing at the Institute in terms of human resources, publication, and projects, which was connected with the emergence of the important representatives of the group identified as the Generation of Innovators.

In field research, the work of the ethno-cartographic team focusing on the traditional culture of Slovak minorities abroad carried on, as well as earlier launched research in the field of urban studies, research on the Roma Holocaust, post-socialist transformation of the countryside, and the extensive folklorist project on *Slovak Fairy Tales* was concluded.

The research in the field of folklore studies was thereby successfully adapted to research on society in the process of transformation, and research on socialism using the oral history method was launched.

Thanks to the centrally implemented scheme of the *Štefan Schwarz Fund* scholarship for postdocs, the Institute managed to rejuvenate its core staff team. In terms of expertise, it was mainly interdisciplinary-oriented recipients of the scholarship who, in addition to ethnology, also graduated in comparative religious studies, archaeology, or other related disciplines, and enriched the theoretical-methodological perspective of the entire team. The Institute's management put hope in this proto-anthropological generation when it came to human resources and further development of the anthropological line at the workplace.

As far as the qualification structure is concerned, the Institute managed to prepare enough qualified staff both from the Transformation and the Builders' Generation and to smoothly guarantee PhD studies.

In the course of the second decade, there was a major shift in the level of difficulty and importance of the implemented projects. It was one of the first organisations that created SAS *Centres of Excellence*. Between 2002–6, the Institute coordinated the SAS *CE Processes* which brought together 24 investigators. In addition, several staff members joined the State Science and Research Programmes and the two consecutive APVV projects focusing on the digitisation of and opening access to cultural heritage. The Institute participated in the implementation of several European framework projects (EU FP5–7). The most important of them, which focused on training *European Doctorate* in the field of social history in Europe

and the Mediterranean, brought an international dimension to the Institute and significantly contributed not only to its international visibility, but also to improving PhD studies.

The principal trends manifested in the second Transformation decade included project-based internationalisation of the Institute and project upgrades on the national basis. The Institute underwent an in-depth internal reflection and set out a new scientific concept. In addition, the new management sought to professionalise the internal administrative and economic processes and set transparent rules for evaluating researchers' performance. During this period, the Institute continued developing its strong ties with the Institute of History SAS, which had been established in the previous period. In the second Transformation decade, these ties were translated not only into cooperation on both Marie Curie Training Programmes, but also into coordination of the *CE Processes* and its key publication output *My a tí druhí v modernej spoločnosti: konštrukcie a transformácie kolektívnych identít* [We and the Others in Modern Society: The Constructions and Transformations of Collective Identities] (Kiliánová, Kowalská, and Krekovičová, Eds. 2009). The very successful publication project of a popularisation nature, *Mýty naše slovenské* [Our Slovak Myths] (Krekovič, Mannová, and Krekovičová, Eds. 2005), was also created in the framework of cooperation between an archaeologist, a historian, and an ethnologist.

Regarding the direction of the Institute, accreditations began playing an important role with a stronger international dimension. The recommendations of the accreditation evaluations (2003, 2007) were successfully implemented, thereby correcting and verifying its conceptual direction from the external perspective. In connection with pressure on publication performance and the project workload of its research staff, the Institute of Ethnology SAS reduced the number of journals it had published to a single scientific periodical, *Slovenský národopis*. In the second decade, it concentrated on the internationalisation of basic research.

Towards the end of the decade, applied research began playing an increased role in the project structure, especially in the field of Romani studies. During this period, the educational activities of the Institute's staff reached their peak, and the parallel activities of their staff within the NGO sector at the individual level culminated as well. This period is also characterised by weakening research on the cultural heritage and of the folklorist research line, which was related to the leaving of its key representatives for other university organisations as well as a change in the scientific focus of the remaining researchers. In the second Transformation decade, there was also a noticeable decline in organising joint leisure activities, institutional work trips, and teambuilding activities.

At the end of the second transition decade, the IE SAS worked its way up among the leaders of the organisations within the SAS Science Section III, became a prominent research institution in the field of humanities and social sciences in Slovakia, and joined the network of international doctoral schools in Europe, while, according to international reviewers, it met the international research standard criteria. In the context of post-socialist transition, it was a consolidated workplace with a well-defined scientific concept and a vision.

The second decade was characterised by the management's increased efforts aimed at the anthropologisation of the Institute, perceived as an essential symbol of its progressive direction. This period thus saw gradual weakening of traditional ethnographic and folklorist topics and approaches. On the one hand, the personnel policy aiming at the enhancement of the anthropological line and interdisciplinarity was an important conceptual enrichment of the Institute, on the other, it represented later challenges in the sense of a potential generational rupture and loss of core research integrity.

Despite the new management's vision of consolidating the Institute when it came to its team and topics, the fragmentation of the team and the particularisation of the topics continued in the second Transformation decade. In the same period, the

Institute successfully launched the programme of digitisation of its scientific collections. In summary, the Institute managed the post-socialist transformation of its scientific concept smoothly, respecting the merits and limits of all generations. The tradition of internal cohesion thus continued uninterrupted while strengthening the internal story of inherent solidarity and cohesion.



# The Generation of Innovators

(2010s)

Completing the Building  
of Social Anthropology,  
Returning to Qualitative  
Ethnography

The 2010s posed several difficult challenges to the institution's functioning. In the framework of the national ecosystem, the Institute faced growing marginalisation of science and research in Slovakia, which was reflected in reduced public finance for science and, in general, unstable conditions for its functioning and development. In terms of budget, the SAS maintained its privilege of having a separate budget chapter, i.e., it was, in fact, in the same position as the ministries. Once the annual budget was allocated to the SAS from public funds, the Academy was free to internally distribute the funds among the SAS Office and its individual organisations.

However, mainly in the earlier half of the 2010s, the SAS organisation coped with a significant reduction in funds, given the fact that the management of the Academy failed to negotiate an automatic increase of the budget chapter based on the year-on-year inflation rate. Thus, the growing inflation was not translated into increased salary, overhead, and project costs. The organisations' capital expenditures, which could have been used as investments in their infrastructure, were also frozen for a lengthy period of time. In addition, they were often required to 'commit' their budget expenditures (between 5–8%), which, in addition to instability, resulted in a disproportionate handling of their finance. Even if they managed to avert the risk of budget cuts, committed finance had to be used quickly in the course of the remaining, year-end months.

At the same time, there was growing pressure on increasing the performance of the scientific institutes within the SAS. It was measured mainly through the quantity of publications and citations. Success of the organisations began being measured also by the volume of the so-called competitive funds, obtained primarily from project resources.

With a certain delay—compared to the countries with an advanced and supportive ecosystem—Slovakia also began to apply scientometrics (albeit disproportionately) for the evaluation of science and research, which was expressed by the volume of publications and citations in CC and impact

journals. Since 2014, public higher education institutions have received part of their budget based on the number of published quartile journal publications and responses to these publications that authors receive. Despite the fact that the developed Western world had warned in the *Leiden Manifest* (Hicks et al. 2015) against the application of flat scientometrics, especially in the field of SSH, a 'quartile' topic boomed in Slovakia at that time.

Around this period, another discourse emerged, which was extremely dangerous for SSH and corresponding disciplines—as long as they wished to defend their right to public funding—to prove their 'social usefulness'. In the SAS, this trend was interpreted mainly as the organisation's ability to raise extra-budgetary funds. Natural, technical, medical, and biological sciences under the SAS Science Sections I and II were able to prove their social usefulness mainly with the number of patents, paid expertise, and industrial innovations. These managed to bring many organisations external extra-budgetary funds as well. In the 2010s, the majority of the academic institutes studying inanimate and living nature were therefore run as state contributory organisations in terms of their legal form, which meant that only a part of their budget came from the state budget or, more precisely, from the SAS budgetary chapter.

In 2021, the SAS had 26 contributory and 22 budgetary organisations (*Výročná správa o činnosti Slovenskej akadémie vied za rok 2021*). Within the SSH disciplines which formed the SAS Science Section III, the institutes did produce a lot of expertise for the decision-making sphere or conducted applied research with a significant societal impact; however, these outputs did not translate into an increased budget for these organisations in the form of extrabudgetary resources. The SSH institutes were thus almost exclusively dependent on the centrally allocated budget and project funds obtained through competition.

In the 2010s, new EU project schemes were launched under EU programmes, which were coordinated by the European Research

Council. The framework projects from the first decade were replaced by the *Horizon 2020* programme scheme (until 2020). The scientific ecosystem in the EU countries with stable science and research funding created favourable conditions for the development of project know-how, having invested considerable funds into this segment in the 2000s. In these countries, coordination centres of international consortia were established in the 2010s, which were subsequently successful in obtaining European projects. Likewise, intensive mentoring and tutoring of potential applicants for excellent European Research Council projects (ERC projects) were developed, which was accompanied by bridging projects financed from national funds.

In contrast, Slovakia did not have any systematic national project support or schemes for acquiring project know-how for potential leaders, which largely *a priori* disqualified Slovak researchers from obtaining European project grants. The former geopolitical border between the East and the West thus turned into a more sophisticated line defined by the volume of outgoing domestic talents (*brain-drain*), attracted international talents, and obtained European (especially ERC) projects.

With regards to national schemes, the project scheme of the SAS and the Ministry of Education—the Scientific Grant Agency (VEGA)—was the only one that worked reliably. Nevertheless, the amount of funds allocated to project applications from the SAS remained unchanged in the 2010s despite the fact that the SAS budget gradually increased from around 60 million euros (in 2015) to around 113 million euros (in 2023). From the total amount of funds allocated to VEGA projects (approx. 4.5 million euros annually from the SAS internal budget), the organisations received one euro per hour of research capacity (on average) through successful projects (representing max. 2,000 hours per year). Within the SAS, the funds from these grants could not be used to cover capital expenditures or staff costs.

The only national project agency in Slovakia—the Slovak Research and Development Agency (APVV)—launched calls on an irregular basis or, in some years, did not launch any calls at all.

Moreover, in the 2010s, it was not possible to apply for funds to cover capital expenditures under the APVV project budgets. This agency received a growing number of applications every year, while disposing of a constantly reduced volume of funds for the launched calls.

In the 2010s, science and research organisations in Slovakia faced a lack of funds for research and development, for the purchase of necessary infrastructure, as well as day-to-day operation and overheads. The national system was unstable and unpredictable. In addition, our competitiveness in obtaining European projects compared to strong Western consortia was declining significantly. Moreover, Slovakia began lagging behind surrounding post-socialist countries.

In order to cope with these challenges, the Institute of Ethnology SAS repeatedly mobilised its internal potential. Its pursuit of internal cohesion, institutional integrity, generational continuity, and consensually-set research orientation acquired a new element, namely—the efforts to do things ‘differently’ and ‘in a new way’.

In addition to a number of managerial innovations that required the Institute to be run under extremely unstable, non-systemic and, at times, even hostile conditions, the staff team, as it turned out, was prepared to view the subject of research, approaches, and methods from an *innovative perspective*, as well as critically re-evaluate the post-socialist transformation stage and set new research objectives. The general prioritisation of applied research and the political pressure on SSH to focus primarily on dealing with social problems and challenges encouraged the Institute to seek an optimal balance between basic and applied research.

During the given decade, the Institute underwent significant institutional changes that were manifested, among other things, in its name: based on its resolution of March 21, 2018, the SAS Presidium approved the change of its name to the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the SAS (acronym IESA SAS); less than four years later, the Institute’s legal form, being a state budgetary organisation since its establishment, changed without

interrupting its institutional continuity. On January 1, 2022, the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS became a *public research institution* (Slovak acronym 'v. v. i.').

Unstable financing and the evaluation of science and research in Slovakia also affected the *modus operandi* of the Institute, but, at the same time, there was also in-depth internal transformation of the Institute's organism itself, connected with the rise of a new generation. The team which, during the 2010s, smoothly integrated the youngest generation of scholars educated at the Institute, as well as new experts coming from the outside, was ready to flexibly respond to the emerging challenges. Following up on the previous development, it was also able to draw entirely new scientific, methodological, and administrative horizons. The Institute's youngest generation is therefore designated and observed as the Generation of Innovators.

### Competition for the Post of Director in 2012—The Reconciliation of the Generations and the Beginning of the Innovation Period

In the summer of 2012, upon expiry of the third term of office of G. Kiliánová as the Director, the scientific team generated another mature scientific personality from its midst and made her the leader of the organisation.

The Director's post was assumed by Tatiana Podolinská (later Zachar Podolinská), a staff member of the Institute since 1997, and an expert in religious studies with a focus on the ethnography of religion. Additionally, she came with experience in coordinating international European and transatlantic research teams. Within the Institute, she was a researcher and initiator of the first successful applied project for the government dealing with the social inclusion of the Roma minority (SIRONA 2010), as well as a scholar with field ethnographic practice among Mexican Maya communities (Chiapas, 1999–2000) and research of the cultural heritage at Uaxactún (Guatemala, 2009–15).

Her aspiration towards the post of the Director, supported by her election by the academic community and approved by the

SAS Presidium with effect from August 1, 2012, was the natural result of her work at the Institute. Her previous activities, the way of looking at problems, as well as her working style and mindset brought new elements to the functioning of the team; therefore, she can be considered one of the first representatives of the Innovators at the Institute.

T. Zachar Podolinská remembers her period before the competition and her vision for the the post of the Director as follows: 'It was around two years before the end of the third term of office of G. Kiliánová that a representative of the Generation of Builders at the Institute, M. Benža, approached me, asking me about where I saw myself in five years. I couldn't reply (in embarrassment). I was 38 years old, had two small children at home (seven- and two-year-old sons), and had just found a position in an international project in Uaxactún, where I became the head of the operation to document and safeguard stone *stelae* with Maya hieroglyphs. I resolutely rejected his vision for the Director's post in the next period. On the one hand, I had no such ambition; on the other, I did not see any possibility for reconciling this post with my stage of life at that time, as well as the tasks I had planned for the forthcoming period.

In 2011, my colleague repeated this offer. He asked me if I was sure that the future management would allow me to travel abroad and conduct operations that did not fall among the core topics of the scientific concept and were not directly related to the Institute's focus.

At the beginning of the year 2012, a couple of months before the end of G. Kiliánová's mandate, I had a surprise visit by J. Podoba in the *Slovenský národopis* editorial office. He asked me direct questions about my vision of our Institute's future, including what I would do with the anthropological line. I quickly understood that his visit aimed at exploring what would happen if I became the Director. In the meantime, he expressed his opinion that the anthropological turn at the Institute failed to be completed because of staffing.

The last in the row of visits was the then Director of the Institute, Gabika Kiliánová. Sitting in the same comfortable

socialist armchair as the two previous “persuaders”, she tried to convince me to apply for the competition. I could talk with Gabika frankly; we had an open relationship and I appreciated her both as a human and the Director and admired her for how tactically she managed to manoeuvre out of many complicated situations. In other situations, I thought I would have handled them differently. I immediately began giving her examples of persons whom we could approach instead of me. I thought of our clever postdocs who did not find a place at the Institute, but later demonstrated their managerial skills at other institutions, such as Juraj Buzalka and Katarína Nováková. She said that they had already been unsuccessfully approached by the management before me.

The offer thus had the taste of a rescue mission. At the meeting, I was given two weeks to think it over. The documents for the three-round competition had to be submitted some time ahead, and I was about to leave for two-month field work research in Guatemala in March. With the support of my family as well as several people from the Institute, I decided to try it. This meant studying the Institute’s annual reports and talking to people. Since I had spent two of the last years on maternity leave, I had to get familiar with the Institute’s condition, its projects, publications, and finances. In the end, I had one week to submit my application and CV, write a vision and managerial concept, and arrange an extract from the criminal records. It was a difficult period of my life because I was about to submit my first ERC-AdG project application and also, I was preparing our household for our two-month absence. Furthermore, I was getting all the necessary vaccinations and preparing for a dangerous journey into the jungle, with transfers between planes and buses, alone, with two small children. Once the application was submitted, Gabika informed the members of the Board of the Director about her intention not to run again for the Director’s post and about the submission of my application’ (2023).

In 2012, Podolinská was the only candidate for the Director’s post. In her vision for this position, she raised the need for a number of managerial and conceptual innovations.

Before voting by the academic community, she orchestrated individual meetings with the key representatives of all research Generations and sections of the Institute, staff members of the Archive (I. Kostovská) and the Library (A. Kalivodová), Deputy Director (K. Popelková), as well as the Secretariat staff (M. Slavkovská and E. Vrátna).

The vision that she presented to the academic community of the Institute aimed at building a visual and corporate identity of the organisation (logo, functional website, banner, business cards, etc.), strengthening the segment of international (ERC and Horizon 2020) and national projects (especially APVV projects), putting in place an electronic library catalogue, and registering the *Slovenský národopis* journal in international databases. She won the election unanimously, with one abstaining vote.

Zachar Podolinská sees her election in 2012 as ‘a great sign of trust accompanied by huge responsibility. One month after being elected to this post, I had to deal with international accreditation and the presentation of the Institute in front of an international panel. This was followed by the consolidation of the Institute in terms of personnel, administrative management, and performance. It was a difficult period when many things had to be changed.

I was lucky to have three excellent helpers: Magduška [M. Slavkovská], who helped me on a daily basis and patiently taught me what I had to think of as Director and how to plan everything in advance; Katka [K. Popelková], who was a great support to me, an excellent and rational adviser with a sense of order and an eye for human solutions; and Gabika [G. Kiliánová], a strategist and experienced adviser, playing chess two moves ahead.

From the point of view of the generations, my election to the office can also be seen as their reconciliation. I had the feeling that the Generation of Builders identified themselves with me because I sincerely appreciated and admired their work. They felt various unspoken grievances and a certain underestimation of the results of their work from the transition period. On the other hand, the Transformation Generation saw an Innovator in me and felt that I was project-driven, with education, and internships abroad,



having experience in conducting international projects, as well as several national applied projects.

In terms of relationships, I have never had any conflict with anyone, as it is against my mindset of primarily seeking win-win solutions and living in harmony. Despite all this, it was a great courage to entrust the management of a top institute to a young woman shortly before the transformation of the Academy and another accreditation' (*Ibid.*).

The representative of the Transformation Generation of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, the youngest member of the core of the Builders, as well as the then Chairwoman of the Institute's Scientific Board, commented in her memoirs on T. Podolinská's election as follows: 'In 2012, Tatiana Podolinská was elected as the new Director of the Institute. This young, ambitious woman full of energy brought a fresh energy to our organisation. She set an example for her colleagues and showed that, along with her position and family duties, she could perfectly manage also her scientific work. She introduced fairer staff appraisal and was not afraid to openly point out their deficiencies. I am convinced that it was largely thanks to her that our Institute was the only social science institute of the SAS to receive the top ranking of "A" in the international accreditation in 2016. I was only with her for four years, but I know that her work as Director of the Institute helped stir up twenty years of relatively stagnant waters. It was inconvenient only for the persons who had been used to the fact that former management of the Institute tolerated their insufficient work performance and weak scientific outputs. Thumbs up to her!' (Stoličná 2021).

Lubica Voľanská, an important representative of the Generation of Innovators, remembers the election of the new Director and further heading of the Institute under her management as follows: 'I remember that I was on maternity leave and came to the Institute to celebrate the election of the new Director. Our new Director, Táňa Podolinská, prepared *sushi* for the celebration, and I told Táňa that I didn't know whether to congratulate her or to wish her to survive the new position in good health. Gabika Kiliánová said that it was great that the Director's post would be filled by

someone who wanted to do it. And she was right: Táňa (as she said herself) "turned on the turbo mode" and I think there was a change in the intensity with which we worked. I can imagine that not everyone was happy with this result-oriented system. An older colleague of mine said that Gabika had spoiled us and that this pace was now impossible to keep up... Well, it was a period of changes in the functioning of society in general, and it was necessary to continuously respond to the pressure on proving the need for humanities and social sciences, and thus, I understood it' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

### International Accreditation of the Institute 2012

In terms of management, the 2012 accreditation referred to the Institute's performance of the period 2008-11, during the third (last) term of office of G. Kiliánová. From a procedural point of view, it is interesting to note that the questionnaire was filled in by the previous management (April 2012); however, the statutory representative's presentation during the site visit of the accreditation panel members in September 2012 was done by the new Director, T. Podolinská, who was appointed on August 1, 2012.

She remembers the preparation of the presentation as follows: 'For me as a novice manager, the accreditation was a huge challenge. For most of the time of the period under review, I was on my second maternity leave, and so I presented the work results of another statutory representative. Gabika was on a month-long summer leave abroad at that time. I had around a month from my appointment until the presentation of the Institute. During that period, I had to familiarise myself in detail with the results of the previous accreditations and with the recommendations of review committees and foreign experts, as well as carry out an internal SWOT analysis. The whole team was dispersed in the summer period, people wanted to relax instead of preparing the accreditation in a turbo mode. In the end, each of them did their bit, and we prepared everything perfectly, from the decoration of the hired meeting room (K. Popelková, J. Zajonc) to the fantastic

refreshments and a book exhibition (A. Kalivodová). The Institute finished high in the ranking, which I considered both a great commitment and responsibility. I inherited the organisation in good condition, consolidated and transformed. Innovations start well in such a position' (Zachar Podolinská 2023).

According to the new Director, the 2012 accreditation became a strong catalyst for a number of qualitative changes in the running of the organisation: 'In my vision for the Director's post, I presented the need for several innovations. In addition, I was aware of other, from my point of view, important circumstances that had to be dealt with urgently before the accreditation began: in fact, the Institute had no logo, and our visual identity and presentation were quite amateur. We had no letterhead paper, business cards, no banner; our website was weak.

I approached a young professional graphic artist and typographer, Samuel Čarnoký. I explained to him the philosophy of our Institute: – groups and communities are the focal point of our discipline, but that we can also descend to the level of an individual, – we explore traditional culture phenomena, but we also trace their modern expressions and current forms, – we also follow vibrant changes and social transformations of present-day society. The subtext of the job also included the information that we were a good and coherent team.

Samo proposed three versions of the logo which we, along with members of the Board of the Director, could select from. The chosen design was composed of a central red schematic figure of man with figures of the same size around it. The visual is minimalist and modern, evoking traditional embroidery from a distance. (The central motif of *manikin* became iconic for our Institute, representing our visual identity, from our website to Christmas postcards—the professionally designed variations of our logo were also placed in all our promo materials and objects that we started to produce.) Before the site visit of the Accreditation Committee, we also produced promotion brochures and four banners that presented our most important projects conducted during the review period' (*Ibid.*).

## Results of the 2012 Accreditation

The 2012 accreditation evaluated the activities of the organisations in the period from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2011. For this purpose, the SAS Presidium set up as its supporting bodies three accreditation committees for each science section, nine review panels, and a top board, the Accreditation Committee of the Slovak Academy of Sciences which prepared the system and the methodology. The accreditation committees of the science sections had twelve members each, with SAS staff constituting a maximum of two thirds of them. The committee members were active scientists with the title of DrSc, university professors, or senior scientists from the academic and university environment in Slovakia. The SAS Accreditation Committee managed the review process, and it also coordinated and controlled the activities of its subordinated committees (*Výročná správa o činnosti Slovenskej akadémie vied za rok 2012*, pp. 90–3).

Towards the end of 2011, the SAS Assembly approved eight common partial evaluation indicators, with the following percentage weight for the SAS Science Section III: the organisations could obtain a maximum of: 30% for scientific outputs, 12% for responses, 15% for international and national position, 15% for project structure, grant and other resources, 10% for PhD studies and other teaching activities, 5% for popularisation, and a maximum of 8% for the environment, management, infrastructure, and personal development (*Zápisnica... 2012*).

For review purposes, every scientific organisation submitted a filled-in accreditation questionnaire in English; however, the committee of the given section also allowed the questionnaire to be submitted in Slovak, if the organisation requested so. During the evaluation process, the organisations' annual reports for the reference period were also taken into account.

The review panel consisted of four members of the accreditation committee of the given section and at least three

external reviewers (at least one of them from abroad). At least one member of the Panel had to be an expert in the scientific disciplines listed in the deed of foundation of the organisation. The organisations could appeal against the external reviewers appointed by the accreditation committee of the respective science section through its scientific board within seven days of their appointment.

After studying the accreditation documents, the Review Panel visited the scientific organisations and familiarised itself with their activities, work conditions, and academic achievements. The site visit had to be physically attended by at least two-thirds of its members. The site visit included an oral presentation of the statutory representative and a meeting of the panel members with the members of the academic community.

Subsequently, the Review Panel drafted a Review Report about the organisation based on the set indicators as well as an overall evaluation report, using the following scale for the partial indicators: 4 points = excellent, 3 points = very good, 2 points = good, 1 point = satisfactory, 0 points = unsatisfactory. The Review Report could also include substantive comments and tasks for the organisations for the forthcoming period. Based on the overall evaluation, the Panel proposed the classification of the organisations in one of the five performance categories, from 'A' (excellent) to 'E' (not accredited). Category 'A' was assigned to organisations obtaining over 80% of the points, and their respective reports did not contain any comments and tasks. The organisations accredited as 'B' obtained between 60 and 79% of the points. According to the narrative evaluation, these were 'very good organisations whose major part of research met the international standards'. The Review Reports of these organisations included comments and recommendations (*Zásady...* 2012).

All SAS organisations received the report of the Review Panel and the opinion of the accreditation committee of the respective science section by October 18, 2012. This decision could also be appealed. In such case, the SAS Presidium organised a meeting

of the accreditation committee of the given section with the organisation's statutory representative and chairperson of its Scientific Board, adopted an opinion on the appeal, and presented this opinion for final approval by the SAS Presidium. Upon completion of the appeal procedure, the Presidium issued an accreditation certificate to all evaluated organisations.

The accreditation committee evaluated the Institute of Ethnology SAS based on the questionnaire (*Dotazník...* 2012, 65 pp.) completed in Slovak by the Director of the Institute, G. Kiliánová, with the help of Deputy Director, K. Popelková, in April 2012. On September 18, 2012, the Review Panel for History Sciences—to which the Institute of Ethnology was assigned along with the SAS Institute of History, Institute of Archaeology, and Institute of Social Sciences SAS—conducted a site visit. The panel was chaired by Eduard Krekovič, and its members were Eva Kowalská, Jozef Baďurík, Egon Wiedermann, and Marek Blatný; Štefan Šutaj and Marta Botiková were external domestic experts in ethnology, and Josef Kándert from Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic) represented a foreign expert. A member of the Review Panel, Š. Šutaj, was appointed rapporteur on behalf of the Institute of Ethnology SAS. During the oral presentation and ensuing discussion, the Institute was presented by the new Director, T. Podolinská.

The Panel took the following information into consideration when preparing the final Review Report: (a) the presentation by the statutory representative, (b) discussion during on-site evaluation, (c) questionnaire filled in by the organisation, (d) the rapporteur's findings and recommendations, (e) the ARRA evaluation, (f) the opinion and recommendations of the previous accreditation committee (*Manuál...* 2012).

Compared to the previous accreditation, the analysis of the Academic Rating and Ranking Agency (ARRA) was included in the review as a novelty. The SAS Presidium requested ARRA to carry out a scientometric evaluation of the academic performance across the SAS sections. The Agency applied its earlier methodology of the identification of the top teams and staff

members of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which it adjusted with combined benchmarks of the SAS and Comenius University. For the SAS Science Section III, the ARRA produced a separate report, while taking into account the 'specificities of humanities and part of social sciences' (Medved' et al. 2012, p. 3).

ARRA divided the SAS Science Section III institutes into three disciplinary clusters within which the institutes were subsequently compared: historical sciences, human and social sciences, and culture and art sciences. For economics and psychology, the same methodology was used as for the institutes of the SAS Science Sections I and II.

From the point of view of the history of science and research evaluation in Slovakia, it is interesting to note that ARRA considered three differences in the publication and citation practices of the majority of the disciplines within the SAS Science Section III: (1) publication in media other than journals (internally, greater importance was assigned to works, such as monographs and chapters), (2) local research focus and publication in languages other than English, (3) slower accumulation of citations and a higher citing half-life (*Ibid.*, p. 4). In addition to the WoS and Scopus databases, other open databases for setting the benchmark were used too, such as the SAS Publications Catalogue and EviPUB of Comenius University. Subsequently, they observed the following aspects of each institute: (1) overall impact of the organisation (number of citations, H-index), (2) effectiveness (average number of citations per work and the percentage of not cited works), (3) international visibility (structure of citations per source), and (4) relative impact (number of highly cited works) (*Ibid.*, p. 6).

In the given analysis, applying combined benchmarks, the Institute of Ethnology SAS occupied the third place of four within the historical sciences cluster, while it had only two works with more than ten citations during the reference period and five works with more than five citations (*Ibid.*, p. 10). When identifying 'top' and 'above-average' staff, ARRA identified one top researcher (E. Krekovičová) and two above-average researchers (P. Salner

and G. Kiliánová). In 2013, the SAS Prize was awarded to Eva Krekovičová for excellent academic achievement on the basis of the ARRA ranking agency evaluation.

The result of the accreditation of the SAS Science Section III institutes was eleven 'A' ratings and nine 'B' ratings. Within the SAS Science Section III, the Institute of Ethnology SAS finished second with 86.95% behind the Institute of History SAS, which attained 88.41%. As for the evaluation of the partial indicators, the Institute obtained the following scores out of 4: 3.29 for scientific outputs, 3.41 for responses, 3.58 for scientific position, 3.53 for projects and grant funds, 3.66 for outputs into social practice, 3.37 for popularisation, and 3.34 for the environment and management. In some evaluation parameters, the Institute of Ethnology SAS surpassed the Institute of History SAS, specifically in the partial indicators related to the success rate in obtaining grants and other funds, PhD studies, outputs into social practice, and in infrastructure and management (work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská). With a rating of 'A', the Accreditation Committee characterised the Institute as an 'excellent organisation whose research meets international standards'.

When looking back at the past, it is worth mentioning that, in 2006, the Accreditation Committee appreciated mainly the balanced production of the Institute. Even though it had no comments on the production and activities of the organisation, in quantitative terms, the Institute did not attain the highest values in the majority of the indicators and, in some indicators (responses)—compared to other SAS Science Section III institutes—it even lagged behind. In the period 2003–6 (with 19 FTEs), the Institute produced, on average, one monograph issued abroad, 5.8 domestic monographs, and 1.5 CC studies annually. During that period, the Institute recorded 691 responses in total to the works of its staff, including 19 WoS citations.

In the period 2007–11 (with 19.5 FTEs), the Institute published 0.6 foreign and 5.6 domestic monographs and 1.14 CC/WoS studies annually. During the said period, the Institute recorded 813 responses, including 74 WoS and two Scopus citations.

Compared to the previous period, in 2012, there was an increase in individual researchers' syntheses, summarising their long-term research. At the same time, ten researchers (of the total physical number of 23) worked as editors of the Electronic Encyclopaedia *Traditional Folk Culture of Slovakia in Words and Pictures* in the period 2009–11. Of the total number of 1,813 entries, around 80% were written by the scholars from the Institute. To a certain degree, these reasons influenced the decline in the Institute's publishing performance during the period evaluated in 2012. Likewise, the number of published studies decreased; however, the publishing structure of the media in which these studies were published changed. This fact was reflected in the growth of WoS citations. The scientometric analysis also showed that the citations of the works of the Institute's staff suggested a high-quality profile, i.e., they increasingly came from abroad and from flagship journals.

The 2012 accreditation highlighted the ability to raise grant funds, PhD studies, as well as the social impact of the Institute's strengths. This accreditation also showed clearly for the first time that the SAS Presidium attached important weight to scientometric analyses in the evaluation of academic performance.

When ARRA was unable to identify 'top teams' within the SAS Science Section III in 2011, using the different publishing and citation *habitus* of SSH as an argument, a dishonorable narrative emerged in the SAS about the 'specificities' of the SAS Science Section III, which needed some *special evaluation criteria*.

It was a misfortune for the members of the then SAS Presidium representing the SAS Science Section III that they were unable to sufficiently defend the fact that the essential differences among scientific disciplines are quite natural, since they correspond not only to different research methods, but also to fundamentally different subjects of research. The aura of the SAS Science Section III slowly faded away in the 2010s and, within the SAS, the Department of Social Sciences and

Humanities drifted into a marginalised position in which it was expected to prove its usefulness (or even its right to exist) by focusing on dealing with social problems and challenges through applied research.

Even though the ARRA evaluation did not have a major impact on the final evaluation of the SAS Science Section III organisations, the management of the Institute of Ethnology SAS identified a weakness thanks to it, which was also noted by the Review Panel in the score it assigned to the partial indicators in 2012, namely that, compared to the institutes of history sciences, when converted to FTEs, the Institute lagged behind in scientific production—the number of monographs, the number of journal publications, and citations indexed in WoS and Scopus journals. Also, the skill of publishing in English by the members of the Institute was still at a very earlier stage. After the 2012 accreditation, the new management of the Institute thus faced the challenge of how to maintain and develop strengths, how to strategically identify challenges as well as collective and individual potentials, how to ensure the conditions for development of the workplace, and how to stimulate its staff to attain their maximum performance.

### Major Management Innovations

One of the inevitable steps in the consolidation of the Institute after the accreditation in 2012 was the adoption of an internal guideline on recording publications. For example, one external reviewer drew attention in his accreditation review to the publication duplicity of a part-time staff member of the organisation. The Institute's management instructed the librarian to check the reporting of the publications during the review period. The internal audit pointed out numerous duplicities (in the case of one full-time staff member it reached 100%) that occurred among those employees with parallel jobs at higher education institutions. In an attempt to prevent this, the management of the Institute organised a seminar in



December 2012, explaining the rules of reporting publications to the staff members and the basic principles of scientific ethics and integrity, including the new guideline which, following the model set by Comenius University in Bratislava, classified publication duplications as gross violation of the work discipline. The innovative plan of introducing internal individual attestations in a five-year perspective was also presented.

In the next step, the Director set up an Attestation Committee composed of leading internal and external experts. G. Kiliánová, who chaired the Scientific Board at that time, was appointed as its chair. She also prepared the concept of the new type of individual attestation of the research staff. Together with the Director, they prepared a questionnaire and the qualitative parts of the evaluation, the scoring system that took into account the career levels, job titles, and the working hours of the evaluated employees, including their self-evaluation and a vision for their activities at the Institute.

The first individual attestation (for the years 2007-13) took place in 2014. In addition to the candidates for a potential qualification growth, the attestation also detected the strengths and potentials of the individual researchers from a complex perspective. Thus, the evaluation focused not only on publications and responses, but also on the obtaining and management of projects, popularisation and dissemination activities, and on the applied research and training of PhD students. The filling in of the questionnaire, as well as the interview with the Committee, provided the individual researchers with the possibility to see their performance from an external angle and from a longer time perspective, as well as to reflect strategically on their work at the Institute in the following period.

The second individual attestation was to take place in 2018; however, the Institute's management was busy with the second attempt to conduct the SAS transformation at that time. Given the retirement of G. Kiliánová, it was also necessary to

set up and appoint a new committee. The second individual attestation was therefore carried out at the end of 2019 (for the years 2014-8). The individual performance of the research staff members was evaluated based on the same criteria as in 2014, but from a six-year perspective. In the second period, the Attestation Committee was chaired by the then Chairwoman of the Scientific Board, M. Vrzgulová. The Attestation Committee ended its activities upon the transformation of the Institute into a public research institution at the beginning of 2022, when its duties were assumed by the Scientific Board of the Institute.

On the initiative of several representatives of the Generation of Builders, a guideline on *imprimatur* was adopted at the Institute at the beginning of the Innovation decade, introducing the obligation to present the book manuscript in electronic form and with a layout to the Director for approval, including two originals of peer-reviews. The Institute thus gained control over the appearance and content of the book imprints: affiliations, logo, and project dedications, copyrights, and licences. The administration of this agenda was later taken over from the Director by Deputy Director, Zuzana Panczová. Since 2021, when Z. Panczová became a member of the SAS Presidium, this agenda has been carried out by the Institute's librarian, A. Kalivodová. In 2018, the *imprimatur* was expanded to include the digital object identifier (DOI). The authors were imposed the obligation to present the final version of the manuscript in electronic form so that its full text could be published on the Institute's website or, in the case of licensed works, stored in the repository.

In 2012, works on the institutional edition of *Etnologické štúdie* were also intensified. The edition was created in 1994, with a total of 17 book titles published by 2011. Since 2012, duly imprinted manuscripts of the Institute began to be systematically published in concentrated form as part of this publication line. In the span of one decade, 38 book titles were published in this way (Volumes 18-55).

## The Long Decade of the Unsuccessful SAS Transformation

The running of the Institute in the 2010s was determined by a number of fundamental changes in financing and performance evaluation within the Slovak Academy of Sciences. From the point of view of the internal history of the Academy, it would take years in which the qualitative changes launched in 1989 were to be completed: the scientific organisations associated in the SAS were supposed to be legislatively excluded from direct economic dependence on the state. However, the process, called the ‘transformation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences’ in Slovakia, was not completed until January 1, 2022, once several failed attempts had been overcome.

In this decade, the SAS set itself on a path leading to a public status of academic science. This long and complicated path ended in January 2022 by administrative change in the legal form of the academic organisations (without interrupting their organisational continuity) into public research institutions, as enacted by a law in 2017 (*Zákon č. 243/2017...*).

At the beginning of 2011, the directors and chairpersons of the institutes’ scientific boards were invited by the SAS President to a meeting with a representative of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. He presented information about the course, key features, as well as the legal and economic advantages and disadvantages of the transformation of the Czech academic institutes into public research institutions, onto which the assets of the original state organisations of the Czech Academy were automatically transferred under law. The legal form of a public research institution—a public entity entered in the register and an accounting unit that is not founded for business purposes—was non-existent in Slovakia at that time.

The transformation plan was prepared in January 2011 by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the President of the Academy to find a suitable economic model for the SAS. This plan was distributed to all organisations, which were requested to express their opinions on the transformation by filling in the attached

questionnaire. The opinions of the SSH institutes of the SAS, which, given their predominant focus on basic research at the national level, did not consider the framework restructuring principles in the form of a ‘top-down’ mechanical merge of institutes to be advantageous and were also critical about the unclear transformation model.

They demanded the plan to be detailed and justified, calling for the opening of a discussion with the external environment. According to the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the SAS Presidium, which was held on February 10, 2011, several suggestions and warnings were raised with regard to the plan, highlighting the need to thoroughly discuss the need for SAS transformation and to communicate each step with the SAS organisational units.

The then SAS President, Jaromír Pastorek, interpreted the opinions of the organisations as majority support, suggesting a clear mandate for the SAS Presidium to present the transformation proposal to the SAS Assembly and to subsequently launch negotiations with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Education and Science. At this meeting, the SAS Presidium approved the transformation plan, setting the following conditions: (1) preserve the budget chapter as a tool for basic institutional research funding, to be managed by the SAS, and (2) legal sovereignty of the organisations in the form of public research institutions (*Zápisnica... 2011*).

Once approved, the transformation proposal became part of the SAS Programme Statement for the period 2013–7. In 2014, it was approved by the government in the framework of the National Reforms Programme of the Slovak Republic. Compared to other post-socialist countries, it largely lagged behind (for instance, by thirteen years compared to the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic) (*Transformácia... 2018*, p. 10).

T. Zachar Podolinská remembers this period as follows: ‘The SAS transformation was a topic even before my appointment as Director in August 2012. It was one of the reasons why I hesitated to apply for the competition for this position. It was

clear that it would cost a lot of energy, that the system would be unstable, that we would have to improvise and learn while running.

I remember well my *grilling* at the SAS Presidium (as its members call the third round of competitions for director's posts). President J. Pastorek asked two fundamental questions about my idea of running the Institute under my leadership: (1) what should be done with the common service unit of the SAS Science Section III institutes, and (2) with whom we, as the Institute, would like to merge before the transformation—adding in the same breath that it could be the historians (i.e., the Institute of History SAS). As for the first question, I replied that I considered the Technical and Economic Management Unit of the SAS Social Science Institutes to be an effective organisation for managing the day-to-day agenda; however, I could not imagine how it would have helped us in dealing with a major international project, which I considered a problem. My reply to the other question was that I had no mandate to answer on behalf of the team, since we considered the SAS transformation an opportunity and not an inevitable reason for merging with other institutes. If I was to merge with anyone based on some external strategic argument, given the strengthening anthropological line of our focus, I could also imagine other partners.

I think he was not happy with any of my answers. I learnt during our later conversations that he considered cancelling the Technical and Economic Management Unit within the SAS Science Section III and saw our, in headcount terms, smaller Institute merged with the Institute of History SAS after the transformation.

J. Pastorek, as President of the self-governing SAS, pursued his own vision of its transformation by reducing sixty budgetary and contributory organisations to twelve public research institutions, with the SAS Office being the thirteenth. However, we did not learn about the reasons why the transformation was to be accompanied by such a drastic reduction of the organisations' (2023).

Since 2012, the members of the Institute's management and its Scientific Board worked intensively on studying available documents concerning the SAS transformation, conducted discussions at meetings within the SAS Science Section III, formulated opinions on the proposed restructuring, and submitted comments on all available working materials presented to the SAS Assembly. In the spring of 2014, an amendment to Act No. 133/2022 Coll. on the Slovak Academy of Sciences began to be prepared as part of the SAS transformation process in cooperation with the SAS Assembly and a working group appointed by the SAS Presidium, and thus the concept of the Act on Public Research Institutions was drafted.

At this stage of the preparation of the transformation, the issue of merge was the key topic of the day: 'I remember that we spent practically the entire year of 2014 desperately creating alliances. I was on an internship in the USA, and we communicated via Skype with a great time difference. We also saw the possibility of merging with the Institute of Philosophy and the Institute of Social Sciences SAS with which we conducted negotiations, or with the Institute of Sociology SAS which, however, later announced that it would not merge with anyone. Our Institute was mostly inclined to merge with the Institute for Research in Social Communication and the Ludovít Štúr Institute of Linguistics SAS. Since 2014, compared to the previous decades, we had less and less common activities with the Institute of History SAS. It was a relatively large organisation (around 60 persons) with a historically strong position within the SAS (also thanks to the activities of its researchers in the SAS Presidium). The creation of the centres was to guarantee the preservation of the relative self-governance and administrative culture of its organisational units. However, the centres were to be managed by general managing bodies headed by the director of one of the merged organisations. There were concerns that we would have to be tough in negotiating our position in the potential partnership. In the background, there were also fears of the potential headcount reduction' (Zachar Podolinská 2023).

The change in the legal form of the SAS institutes began its preparation in the spring of 2014 and was to be carried out as of January 1, 2016. However, this attempt failed and ended with an unprecedented removal of the SAS President, J. Pastorek (2009–14), at the extraordinary meeting of the SAS Assembly on December 18, 2014 (*Snem SAV prijal... 2014*), with 62.5% of the representatives of the SAS organisations voting for his dismissal. After announcement of the voting results, the chairpersons of all three chambers, as well as another two members resigned from their membership in the SAS Assembly committee.

The main reason they mentioned was the non-functional communication within the SAS, as well as the weak position of the SAS President in negotiations on the SAS budget. In addition, the academics began to view in a negative light the apparent connection between a part of the SAS management and the government representatives of the SMER political party and its Chairman, who was also the Prime Minister, Robert Fico. This was manifested, among other things, by the speech of the then Minister of the Interior at the extraordinary Assembly on recalling the SAS President (*Ibid.*). Minister and top representative of the SMER party, Robert Kaliňák, came to explain to the academics the logic of the public administration reform that also concerned the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which was criticised by scientists at several fora. The presence of the Minister of the Interior at the SAS Assembly was also viewed as an implicit demonstration of political support to the SAS President that was to be removed. Moreover, it was manifested in the fact that, after the recalling of J. Pastorek from the SAS management, the government almost instantly appointed him in 2015 to the newly created position of Government Plenipotentiary for Research and Innovation.

In 2015, the Assembly elected Pavol Šajgalík, who previously served as SAS Vice-President for Budget, as new SAS President. After his appointment by President of the Slovak Republic, Andrej Kiska, the new SAS President released a media statement in which he noted that the SAS budget, as it was negotiated for the

year 2015, would have required a drastic reduction of the SAS headcount by 497 persons, which was almost 17% of the total number of 3,000 academics. At the same time, he characterised the year 2015 as one of the most difficult in the SAS history: 'It is the most major change since 1989. (...) In 1989, there was simply a decision—there are a lot of you, the budget was cut, and the Academy had to cope with it by reducing the headcount from 6,000 to 3,000. There is now a certain pressure from the top, but not so apparent. (...). It is, in principle, much harder to find a consensus about such changes within the community of the people who are well-educated (...). You need a lot of effort for a discussion, an explanation campaign, and the arguments must be strictly logical' (Balážová 2015).

The coming to office of P. Šajgalík meant the beginning of the second attempt to transform the SAS. According to his strategy, the organisational change was to be carried out gradually, step-by-step. In 2016–7, pilot Centres were created within the SAS by the merge of several institutes, in which the institutes preserve relative autonomy in the form of organisational units. The number of SAS organisations was thus reduced from 60 to 47 (two new Centres in each science section), without any headcount cuts. In addition, following the model of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, the Centre of Operations SAS was established, bringing together eight service organisations: the Technical and Economic Management Unit for Social Science Institutes, the Congress Centres Smolenice and Stará Lesná, the VEDA Publishing House, the Management of Special-Purpose Facilities, the Computing Centre, and the Encyclopaedic Institute SAS.

The change of the legal form of the SAS institutes in 2018 was to be carried out in such way that the management of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, which was to become the founder of new public research institutions, was required to present to the Ministry of Education the documents for registration by April 1, 2018. The Ministry was expected to review the documents by May 31, 2018. After the documentation was completed, registration was to take place on July 1 and the organisations were subsequently

required to begin creating their new bodies (Board of the Directors, Supervisory Board).

The documents were submitted on behalf of the SAS on the last day of the set time-limit. The Ministry of Education found several irregularities and sent the SAS a call for completing the documents and make the necessary corrections on May 21. Since the shortcomings were not remedied by the deadline, the Ministry did not register the SAS organisations in the List of Public Research Institutions. To prevent a legal vacuum, rescue measures were incorporated in the Act on the SAS at the meeting of the Parliament's Education Committee on June 11, 2018. The quick law amendment extended the deadline for the registration of public research institutions, however, President Andrej Kiska ultimately vetoed the amendment.

In 2018, the institutes of the SAS became public research institutions in an absolutely unprecedented manner, without being registered, and the date of their establishment was March 1, 2018 (*Transformácia... 2018*). The SAS Presidium had its own legal analysis prepared, based on which it noted that the institutes were transformed into public research institutions by the act of establishment carried out by the SAS, whereas the act of registration was interpreted as a formality in which the Ministry made purposeful delays.

In the autumn of 2018, the case was referred to the Supreme Audit Office of the Slovak Republic for investigation. In December 2018, the Supreme Audit Office published the *Final Report on SAS Transformation*, in which it noted that, based on the amended Act on SAS (*Zákon č. 133/2002...*), all organisations of which the founder was the SAS were required to change the legal form from state budgetary and contributory organisations to public research institutions from September 1, 2018. However, on September 10, 2018, the Ministry of Education, Science, Research, and Sports of the Slovak Republic issued a decision suspending the registration procedure due to the fact that the SAS failed to comply with the set deadlines and registration conditions. Subsequently, an amendment to the Act on Higher

Education Institutions also amended the Act on the SAS, under which, from September 26, 2018, the organisations that had not been listed in the register of public research institutions became, once more, state budgetary or contributory organisations and managers of the assets that they had managed before June 30, 2018 (*Transformácia... 2018*, pp. 5, 12). The Supreme Audit Office also noted that, 'in addition to the unclear legislation and the short time for the preparation of the documents, insufficient communication, cooperation and the lack of availability also played a negative role in dealing with the confusions and problems' between the founder and the Ministry of Education.

To illustrate the situation, it can be noted that in the period of culminating preparations for the change in the legal form of the SAS organisations, Martina Lubyová—a member of the SAS Presidium and Director of the SAS Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences, the first pilot centre within the SAS Science Section III—became the Minister of Education (as a nominee of the Slovak National Party). Soon afterwards, a deterioration in communication between the SAS Presidium and the new Minister became apparent, which led to presumptions that this fact as well, together with the above-described circumstances, could have eventually led to failure of the SAS transformation.

As another important reason for the failure of the transformation, the Supreme Audit Office of the Slovak Republic detected the risk of non-transparency in the transfer of state property managed by SAS organisations to individual public research institutions. This risk resulted from the legislative setting of the process of state property transfer to public research institutions. As of December 31, 2017, the SAS managed assets in the value of around 240.4 million euros, of which long-term tangible assets comprised almost 92%. The assets managed by the SAS organisations amounted to 128.1 million euros (*Ibid.*, p. 5). The relevant report noted that 'the state property of considerable value (...) that was to be transferred into the ownership of public research institutions was decided only by the SAS itself'. The property transfer was



not subject to approval or control by any other bodies, such as the Ministry of Finance, the Government, or the Ministry of Education, which made entries in the register of public research institutions (*Ibid.*).

The lengthy and unsuccessful process drained a lot of creative and managerial energy of the SAS institutes to the detriment of performance and development. The pressures on the merging of the organisations and the creation of larger entities, budget commitments, the risk of lay-offs, non-transparency, and insufficient communication, as well as the lack of a systemic approach and the unpreparedness of the entire process, which ended up in total failure, led not only to the deterioration of the SAS institutes, but also undermined the directors' confidence in professional and effective running of SAS in the hands of the SAS management.

T. Zachar Podolinská added the following on the process of unsuccessful transformation in 2018: 'I remember well the hectic spring and the even more hectic summer when we were ordered to generate a list of our assets and create new public research institution bodies. In the atmosphere of legal uncertainty and double interpretations of whether we *are* or we *are not* a public research institution, we were to forget about going on a vacation that we needed so much or motivation meetings with the team leaders, or working meetings concerning the strategy or effective performance. In September, united under the SAS flag, we took to the streets and demonstrated in front of the parliament. I had a *déjà vu* from the times of the Velvet Revolution. When we were finally told that all the effort was in vain, a part of my being that had lived and breathed for SAS died. I clearly saw the animosity in communication, the unpreparedness of the entire process both on the side of the SAS and the legislators, as well as the politicisation of the transformation because of the unwillingness to entrust state property to the SAS. In the whole process, we were only small pawns who did their job well on breakneck deadlines and on time. And, absolutely for nothing' (2023).

The SAS management continued its effort to complete the transformation. The final report of the Supreme Audit Office (*Transformácia... 2018*) noted that it was not necessary to transform the SAS as a whole and at once; a more suitable alternative would be a gradual and individual transformation, depending on the condition of the individual organisations.

On the initiative of the then Chairwoman of the SAS Assembly, Zuzana Kusá, from the Institute of Sociology SAS, a questionnaire was conducted among the directors of all SAS institutes at the beginning of June 2020 which aimed at exploring the positive expectations, as well as concerns associated with the transformation of the SAS organisations into public research institutions (*Transformácia z pohľadu... 2020*). Even though the majority of the directors stated in the questionnaire report that the change process was still unprepared and it was not clear whether it was advantageous for all SAS organisations, in the spring of 2021, the SAS management launched for the third time the transformation of all SAS institutes simultaneously.

Eventually, the Academy successfully finalised the process of transformation on January 1, 2022, creating 47 public research institutions. The SAS Office retained its status of a state budgetary organisation as the mother organisation and central recipient of funds from the respective budget chapter. During the spring of 2022, the institutes re-created their Boards of Directors and Supervisory Boards, drafted and approved mandatory internal regulations, and learned the functioning under the new legal conditions which, among other things, involved budget distribution in the form of monthly advances for the annual approved budget.

### The Scientific Concept of the Innovation Decade

In the third millennium, the Institute of Ethnology SAS has provided a background for developing ethnology, social and cultural anthropology, and religious studies. At the beginning of 2012, Director G. Kiliánová and the Scientific Board led by

R. Stoličná drafted a *Research and Development Concept of the Organisation for the Period 2012–2015 (Dotazník... 2012)*. The principal research areas remained unchanged, compared to the previous document—there were four core thematic clusters: (1) social and cultural change, (2) social diversification, (3) cultural heritage, and (4) the theory, methodology, and history of the discipline. This concept was subsequently implemented by the new management led by T. Podolinská.

Influenced by intensive communication with the international scientific discourse, research at the Institute opened significantly to new theoretical and methodological stimuli. The institution increasingly sought partners in other disciplines and abroad. At home, it looked simultaneously for a way to increase its societal impact, while widely developing applied research and socially engaged activities.

In 2016, the Institute's Scientific Board, with G. Kiliánová at its head, initiated an internal discussion on the new scientific concept and prepared its draft, having identified the key thematic clusters.

During the same period, a new national strategy launched by the Ministry of Economy, called *Research and Innovation Strategy for Smart Specialisation of the Slovak Republic (RIS3)* gained relevance in the ecosystem of science and research in Slovakia. This document listed five key strategic research and development areas in terms of the production of new knowledge: (1) material sciences, (2) medical sciences, (3) agricultural sciences, (4) technical sciences, and (5) mathematics. The *RIS3* also identified seven main thematic areas for scientific research with the potential for growth and cooperation with the economic practice and for dealing with urgent social problems, namely: (a) materials research and nanotechnology, (b) information and communication technology, (c) biomedicine and biotechnology, (d) industrial technology, (e) sustainable energy and energetics, (f) agriculture and environment, (g) selected areas of social sciences (with a view to the most pressing problems of society that place increased burden on Slovak society) (*Through knowledge... 2013*, p. 39).

The preparation of the National Strategy involved the SAS representatives, and the document was also presented at the joint meeting of the SAS Assembly and directors of all academic institutes. The representatives of the SAS Science Section III were highly concerned that the strategic areas of the new strategy did not include SSH topics. Only the last *RIS3* area focused systematically on dealing with social problems and challenges, which significantly marginalised basic research and reduced the complexity of knowledge production in the field of SSH exclusively to applications. Despite these circumstances, all SAS institutes were given the task of significantly bringing their scientific concepts in compliance with the new National Strategy.

This task was undertaken by the Director of the Institute, T. Podolinská. She harmonised the draft of the scientific concept with the text of the National Strategy and submitted it to the Scientific Board for discussion. Several themes were subsequently identified in the concept that would enable the Institute to create synergies with the National Strategy in the forthcoming period.

In this context, the scientific concept of the Institute for the period 2016–20 reflected not only the internal core research areas, but it was also an attempt to find such research potential that the Institute would be able to offer when it came to dealing with current and urgent social problems and challenges. The scientific concept 2016–20 thus identified three main thematic areas: (1) the social diversification of Slovakia from the historical and present-day perspective, including partial topics, such as exploration of the forms of mobility and migration processes; changes in family, social cohesion, inclusion and exclusions; industrial innovations and their impacts on people's ways of life, the life strategies of various generations, and the phenomenon of population ageing; (2) identification and exploration of the social and cultural capital of society, with sub-themes such as research on the memory representations of socialism; forms of inter-generational communication; forms of cultural heritage as part of the construction of traditions and cultural industry;

(3) the theory, methodology, and history of the discipline. In addition to the current methodological approaches applied by social sciences, the Institute declared its interest in enhancing the history of the discipline and development of ethnography and folklore studies/ethnology in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The new scientific concept also announced a systemic need for the building of scientific collections and for preparing a concept of increasing data availability. The fourth pillar that it defined was the need for networking at the European level (*Koncepcia aktivít...* 2016), thus clearly declaring an assertive ambition to settle the European research area and become a player at the European level.

The conceptual efforts to explore the memory representations of socialism, migration processes, and the population ageing phenomena appeared to be the major thematic innovations in the latter half of the Innovation decade. The U-turn to folkloristic themes was reflected in the research of modern, as well as historical forms of conspiracy theories. In the field of modern forms of expressions of traditions, researchers began studying in innovative ways the topic of modern feasts and post-socialist transformations of the traditional forms of celebrating holidays in post-modern Slovakia.

In 2013, the management of the Institute initiated a project of a new interdisciplinary *Centre of Excellence* within the SAS, focusing on the documentation and exploration of a wide range of *social representations of socialism* and networking by 27 academics and university staff members. The project was presented to the SAS Presidium by the Director of the Institute as part of the shortlisted projects. However, in the last official year of launching and implementing the Centres of Excellence scheme, the SAS committee preferred the project submitted by the Institute of History SAS to map the history of castles in Slovakia.

The Institute, however, continued to perceive as a priority to conduct qualitative research of memory representations of socialism in Slovakia. The nearly two decades of transition since the fall of socialism created an ideal (or even limit) space for a documentation of 'first-hand' memoirs in this—in the

history of Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe—a key stage of 20<sup>th</sup> century history. The project titled *Current Images of Socialism* (SOS) was finally approved after a second attempt under the APVV's general call by the Committee for Humanities. Under the leadership of M. Vrzgulová, the project was carried out by a team of nine scientists from four institutions in the period 2017–21.

In 2014, the Institute managed to bring the issue of population ageing in Slovakia to the international platform by L. Voľanská joining the researchers of the project COST: Action CA 1402, *Ageism, a Multi-National, Interdisciplinary Perspective*. The project was coordinated by the Bar Ilan University (Ramat Gan, Israel) and was carried out at the Institute in the period 2014–8.

The anthropological aspects of the origins and dissemination of conspiracy theories and their impacts on social life have so far been studied by two young researchers, Z. Panczová and Vladimír Bahna. In 2016–20, both of them joined the work of the interdisciplinary international team of the project COST: Action CA 15101 *Comparative Analysis of Conspiracy Theories*, coordinated by the University of Manchester (Great Britain).

### The Jubilee Year 2016: 70 Years of the Institute

On the occasion of the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the existence of the Institute, its management prepared a comprehensive, multi-faceted Laudation scenario, focusing on several target groups. From the symbolic perspective, the scenario of the anniversary celebration—which was simultaneously prepared by several working groups managed by the Institute's Director—featured two key moments: (1) a Laudation day at which the first book on the history of the Institute and a panel exhibition with key events, publications, and personalities of the Institute were presented, and (2) an international scientific conference that was to present current topics and methodological approaches of the Institute's researchers at a wider international forum. In addition to the conceptual, financial, and logistical support, the Institute also

ensured professional media coverage of the anniversary: in addition to information published on the websites of the Institute and of the SAS, two press conferences were organised for the media, an extensive press release was published through the press agency, and key electronic and printed media outlets published interviews with the research members of the Institute.

On the initiative of Director T. Podolinská, around two years before the anniversary, the project team (VEGA 2011-3), tracing the development of scientific thinking and history of ethnology in Slovakia agreed to prepare the first book on the origins and history of the Institute since its establishment in 1946. In this regard, G. Kiliánová and J. Zajonc conducted a series of archive research and interviews with some of the living key personalities of the Institute to interpret the existing knowledge about the history of the discipline and of the Institute, applying the historical approach. Documentalist I. Kostovská and librarian A. Kalivodová prepared a bibliography of publications, project overviews, as well as photographic documentation. At the end of 2015, an extensive manuscript was prepared, which was peer-reviewed by an emeritus researcher from the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology, Comenius University in Bratislava, Ľubica Droppová. The other reviewer was the long-time Director of the SAS Central Archive, Jozef Klačka.

The scientific monograph *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie SAV. Kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology SAS. Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and One Institution] was published at the beginning of the anniversary year 2016. The history of the Institute from its establishment until 2012 is described in the background of the SAS history, as well as in the context of the broader, political, and economic situation of science and research in Slovakia (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016).

The research members of the Institute, D. Luther and D. Ratica, applied their experience in the preparation of museological, stage, audio, film, and digital forms of presentation in the creation of the scenario and installation of the panel exhibition on the history

of the Institute, titled *70 Years among People*. The documentary photographs from research and scientific events, profiles of personalities, and visual representations of publications and projects were complemented with expert texts. The graphic layout of the materials was designed by artist Eva Kovačevićová-Fudala. The final output offered a detailed summary of the activities of several generations of scholars and milestones of the Institute. Electronic versions of the banners were published on the Institute's website.

The first event of the celebration was the Laudation Day of the Institute of Ethnology SAS, which took place at Pálffy Palace in Bratislava on June 17, 2016. It was attended by almost seventy domestic and foreign guests, official representatives of the SAS, the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University, colleagues, as well as current and former employees of the celebrating institutions. They could listen to the speech by the Director of the Institute, Tatiana Podolinská, and laudation reflections by SAS President, Pavol Šajgalík, as well as former long-term SAS President, Štefan Luby, on the history and current activities of the Institute.

Special greeting speeches were given by the representatives of partner institutions from Austria, Serbia, Hungary, Slovenia, Czechia, as well as by the representatives of domestic cooperating organisations. The new publication on the history of the Institute was officially presented to the participants by its co-authors, G. Kiliánová and J. Zajonc, and by the reviewer, Ľ. Droppová, who touched the book with a bouquet of seven evergreen plants.

The core part of the event was the presentation of awards. During the official ceremony, the SAS President awarded Mojmír Benža with a *Gold Medal of the Slovak Academy of Sciences* for his lifelong scientific work, which was followed by the awarding of *Commemorative Badges on the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences*.

On the occasion of the organisation's anniversary, the Director and the Scientific Board of the Institute decided to award seven important founding personalities, directors, and researcher members (Božena Filová, Milan Leščák, Soňa Burlasová, Ján

Podolák, Viera Gašparíková, Viera Nosáľová, Ľubica Droppová) and four long-time important foreign colleagues of the Institute (Anna Divičanová, Jiří Langer, Dušan Holly, Klaus Beitl). By dedicating them a plaque made of onyx based on an original graphical design (by Artist Eva Kovačevićová-Fudala), the Institute expressed its gratitude and professional recognition of their work and of their professional and personal contribution to its development and academic profiling.

The video-presentation illustrated both the everyday and significant moments from the history of the Institute through photographs.

The last part of the programme was the opening of the exhibition *70 Years among People*, which was introduced by D. Luther. The exhibition triggered a vivid debate among the participants, because it reminded them of the events and colleagues from the entire existence of the Institute. After closing the official part, the event followed with a gala reception (Popelková 2016).

The anniversary year of the Institute of Ethnology SAS symbolically closed with another event—the international conference *Ethnology in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium: Topics, Methods, Challenges* (Smolenice, October 19–21, 2016), which was held under the auspices of the Representation of the European Commission in the Slovak Republic. The Institute organised the conference in collaboration with its partner institutions from the Czech Republic (Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague), Hungary (University in Szeged), and Poland (University in Opole).

The innovation trend of the Institute was fully manifested in the preparation of the scientific concept and discussion themes of the conference. The seven panels organised with the involvement of several institutional VEGA projects included thematic panels with several innovative formats: *Thematic and methodological challenges in current ethnology and anthropology; Applied anthropology—How to cope with current social and societal challenges?; Functions of rumours and*

*conspiracy theories*, as well as *Young Scientist Forum* (Podolinská and Potančok 2017). Over forty domestic and foreign experts discussed in the thematic blocs, and an individual panel was dedicated to the presentation of PhD projects (for more details, see Bitušíková et al. 2016).

Key papers were presented by Haldis Haukanes (University of Bergen, Norway), Tatiana Podolinská (Institute of Ethnology SAS), Valentina Gulin Zrnić and Jasna Čapo (Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb, Croatia), Zdeněk Uherek (Institute of Ethnology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic), Gábor Barna (University of Szeged, Hungary), Joana Breidenbach (Betterplace Lab, Berlin, Germany), Noel B. Salazar (University of Leuven, Belgium), and Julien Giry (IDPSP—Université Rennes 1, France) (for more, see Panczová and Popelková, Eds. 2016).

The critical reflection on the methodological approaches, as well as opinions on innovative social-science concepts and on the possibilities of their adaptation for the purposes of present-day ethnology created space for enthusiastic and professional discussions during the official conference and the corridors, opening paths for future international cooperation projects. Some of the papers presented at the jubilee international conference were published by the *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology journal* in the following period (2017(2)).

### **Internal Challenges: Dislocation, Reconstruction, Rescue of Collection and Library Stocks**

The series of external challenges and stimuli brought by the 2010s, as described above, were expanded also by internal challenges that directly affected the daily running of the Institute.

In the second transition decade, the dislocation situation of the Institute became more complicated. In 2000, for economic reasons, the Institute was forced to move back from its suitable rented premises on Jakubovo Square to the building of the Social Science Institute SAS on Klemensova Street 19 in Bratislava. After



moving, the scientific archives with an extensive body of picture and text documents as well as the library stocks (with over twelve-thousand items) were placed in partially adjusted basement rooms, which, however, did not fit the purpose.

After some time, this decision turned out to be fatal. Stored in humid conditions, the entire archive was attacked by mildew and fungi after several years. To rescue it, the new management not only had to mobilise a great part of its human resources in the 2010s, but also raise external funds and seek new storage spaces.

Within the building on Klemensova Street, the Institute's Secretariat and offices were dispersed on several floors, in rooms that had been vacated by other institutes and the building management. The Institute did not have its own meeting room or study room. During the Innovation decade, the organisation thus faced serious infrastructure and operating problems. Even though the Institute's management warned about these problems on a regular basis in its annual reports—sections on suggestions addressed to the SAS Presidium (*Výročné správy...* 2012–8)—and also approached the SAS Dislocation Committee with a request, no help came from the founder.

In around 2015, the vision of building a Pavilion of Social Sciences within the SAS campus on Dúbravská cesta in Bratislava started to be intensively discussed. The Institute specified the needs for the internal layout of the building that was to house selected institutes of the SAS Science Section III. After internal discussion, the Institute showed a clear interest in moving to the planned new building. The main reason was the urgent need to relocate the valuable collection and library stocks from the humid basement rooms. However, the concept of the Pavilion of Social Sciences became a topic for various debates for another decade and was even the subject of a participatively facilitated discussion (in 2019) across SAS departments linked to the idea of the overall concept of the SAS campus arrangement on Dúbravská cesta.

During this period, the Director of the Institute took intensive steps to arrange a dislocation of the workplace beyond the planned Pavilion. Podolinská clearly explained at several

meetings of directors, as well as during individual conversations with several members of the Presidium and the SAS President that the precious collections of the Institute were in danger and asked for help in finding a solution.

Thanks to the excellent results of the international accreditation in 2016, the Institute was in a good negotiation position. During that time, the Institute received two offers from the Presidium to relocate its headquarters to the SAS campus. However, the two buildings offered (one of them consisting of unimo cells) were in a deplorable condition, requiring either demolition or complete reconstruction, with a very uncertain possibility for the allocation of funds from central resources both for reconstruction and moving.

T. Zachar Podolinská adds the following: 'At a certain point, it was clear to me that the Social Sciences Pavilion turned into a discussion narrative that returned to the table periodically just in order to be postponed again and again. Funds were never allocated for this purpose, and I was therefore surprised how much energy, passion, and expectations people invested in it. Likewise, after many negotiations with the Presidium members in charge, as well as after the physical inspections of the offered buildings and spaces within the SAS campus at Patrónka, I realised that our current premises were the only certainty that we had. I had to accept this fact and begin working on enhancing the existing premises' (2023).

In 2016–8, the SAS Presidium, as well as the Institute's management were occupied with preparing the first international accreditation and the awaited legislative transformation of the SAS. During the spring months of 2019, due to the failure to carry out the planned replacement of the toilets' supply pipe by the Technical and Economic Management Unit, the Institute's Secretariat, Library, Archive, and Director's room were massively flooded. Since the basic remediation only began several hours after the flood (the Institute's staff were on a regular work trip at Smolenice Castle at that time), the walls and furniture also absorbed moisture.

Following a comprehensive evaluation of the situation with a vision to prevent any future accidents (desolate state of the power and water distribution systems), the management of the Institute decided to perform a total reconstruction of its premises on the ground floor, including the replacement of the water and power distribution systems, sockets, switches, light distribution, remove the existing floor coverings, to level the floors, and apply new wall and ceiling plaster. In addition to moving out from and emptying the ground floor, a public tender to select several contractors (electricity, water, floors, plasters, ceilings) had to be arranged, as well as an architectonic study to prepare the drawings of all distribution systems so as to correspond to the design of the new, tailor-made furnishings.

The reconstruction was performed in the summer months of 2019, with half of the funds received by the Institute's management based on two applications addressed to the SAS Emergency Committee, and the other half was provided by the Institute from its own funds. Thanks to the repeated excellent performance evaluation of the organisation and the Interreg DRIM international project (2017-9), the management also created both a budgetary and extra-budgetary financial reserve that was subsequently invested into improving the infrastructure and working conditions. The tailor-made new furniture, new meeting room equipment, and devices enabling internet connection and projection in two meetings were fully covered from the Institute's internal resources.

Simultaneously with the process of reconstruction, mould on books and collections was detected in the basement area. The Institute's management took all necessary steps to preserve them, from chemical treatment of the collections in the ethylene-oxide fumigation chamber of the Slovak National Gallery in Zvolen, including physical packing and transport of the collection items to Zvolen and back up to the arrangement of temporary storage spaces for the treated items within the SAS campus on Dúbravská cesta. It was again necessary to secure funds for the rescue operation, both from the central resources of the SAS and from the internal resources of the Institute.

In addition to funds, these two difficult operations in the course of one year also required logistic and administrative arrangements and were an extraordinary challenge not only for the Institute's management, but also for the Secretariat and staff of the Information and Documentation Unit. Ultimately, the staff working in the offices on the fourth floor and in the attic also had to endure discomfort for some part of the year because of the temporary storage of the material from the reconstructed ground-floor premises there.

In the spring and summer months of 2020, the Institute launched both financially and conceptually the reconstruction of the ascending pipes in the entire building, which was coordinated by the Technical and Economic Management Unit. Thanks to these works, the Institute's offices on the fourth floor acquired a separate entry, a kitchenette, and a toilet. The reconstruction was carried out during the pandemic period when the scientists worked from home for the most part of the year, and it thus did not affect the running of the workplace in terms of logistics.

### **Innovations in the Information and Documentation Unit, Digital Humanities, and European Infrastructure**

During the Innovation decade, the position and organisation of the Library and scientific collections that preserve text, picture, and multimedia research documents began to change.

During the first half of the Innovation decade, the Institute joined the international project thanks to which not only a significant part of the picture documents from its scientific collections were digitised, but also the picture documents were made accessible to the public in the framework of a newly created European portal. Since 2011, the Institute of Ethnology has been involved in the international ETNOFOLK project (European Regional Development Fund) focused on the *Preservation and Enhancement of Folk Culture Heritage in Central Europe* (2011-4). The main project coordinator was the Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic in Prague. Five organisations from four countries participated in the project

(Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, and Slovakia). D. Ratica and D. Luther were the principal project coordinators on behalf of the Institute. The aim of the project was to prepare a database of folk culture in Central Europe and make it available to end users and institutions. The project thus contributed not only to the preservation of cultural heritage (through its digitisation), but also to its dissemination and popularisation by opening the data from one of the databases to the public.

The Institute of Ethnology SAS as the main coordinator for the communication and dissemination activities of the ETNOFOLK project prepared the concept and arranged the publishing of multilingual banners for the ETNOFOLK international exhibition (40 banners in total). In addition, the Institute prepared the draft and published multilingual versions of the ETNOFOLK poster (90 posters). At the same time, the research team continued working on metadata digitisation for the Picture Documents Digital Archive of the Institute of Ethnology SAS. The database reached approx. 113,000 entries in total. During the timespan of the project and the corresponding period of five consecutive years, ETNOFOLK represented a rich source of attractive and useful information on the cultural heritage of folk culture in four Central European countries (<http://www.etnofolk.eu>). The project was listed in the SAS Annual Report 2012 among the most important outputs addressing issues of social praxis.

In 2014, the building of the electronic catalogue was intensively launched in the Library. In addition to the librarian, this activity was also joined by full-time postgraduate students under the PhD students' assistance activities module. Over 2,000 books were included in the catalogue, these being newer publications, as well as new, annual acquisitions.

After Milada Kubová, who was a long-time professional librarian, retired in 1985, there was a rupture in the publishing of the discipline's bibliographies and journal, which was overcome in the Innovation decade by publishing a comprehensive bibliography of the *Slovenský národopis* journal of over fifty years of its existence (1953–2002) (Zajonc, Mészárosová, and Kostovská 2013).

During the Innovation decade, the personal bibliographies of Soňa Burlasová (Krekovičová and Potančok, Eds. 2013) and Božena Filová (Kiliánová and Potančok, Eds. 2017) were also released, the preparation of which involved several scientists and experts.

In line with the open access and open science concept, the Institute began applying, as the first organisation within the SAS, unique digital object identifier (DOI) for its publications via the SAS Central Library and, in 2018, it began publishing in Open Access (OA) mode. It was also agreed with the management of the Slovak academic publishing house VEDA that, after one year from the print edition, the publications of the authors from the Institute can be available in OA form free of charge.

In 2020, the Institute joined the EODOPEN international project carried out by the Slovak Centre of Scientific and Technical Information of the Slovak Republic, under which it was possible to digitise and publish in a virtual library the entire monographic production of the Institute from its establishment until the present (*Virtuálna študovňa...*). The Institute thus arranged the digitisation and publishing of over 110 books which are now open in Diamond OA mode. Based on the SAS internal guidelines, in 2020, the librarian also began entering the books by the Institute's staff in the electronic repository.

In 2021, the Institute published its first five publications in e-book format and changed to publishing in a fully open licensing mode through Creative Commons BY (*About CC Licenses*).

Thanks to its ten-year-long progressive publication strategy and a systemic implementation of innovations, in 2023, the electronic Database of Open Access Books—DOAB—listed the Institute as the first publisher in Slovakia among official publishers of OA publications. The publications released by the Institute thus became part of the international production of the publishers of e-publications which are available to readers worldwide through the DOAB platform.

As far as the scientific collections during the Innovation decade are concerned, the Institute's documentalist, I. Kostovská, along with J. Zajonc created a concept of electronic research data

processing in the IE SAS Scientific Archives under the Institute's internal project. On this occasion, the research rules were updated, the principles of processing of electronic image data were drawn up, and a form for recording data about electronic images was created for the newly created IE SAS Archive of Electronic Images.

I. Kostovská retired in 2017. During this period, the Institute filled the leading position of the Information and Documentation Unit (IDU) with professional staff, invested specifically in the strengthening of human resources in this unit, initiated the preparation of a step-by-step concept, and financially supported its five-year action plan from internal resources. Two new staff members were recruited for the IDU, which now, in addition to scientific collections, also included the Library with A. Kalivodová as librarian. Tomáš Kubisa, a young ethnologist, became the documentalist, and Andrej Gogora, an expert in philosophy and university lecturer specialised in the methodology of research in humanities (2018b), digital humanities, digital storage, and digital curatorship, became the Head of the Unit.

Immediately after taking up the job, A. Gogora began consolidating both the Scientific Collections Department and the Library. He comments on his work at the Institute as follows: 'The Scientific Collections have a special position in the Institute, because it fulfils various tasks (documentation and information services; archiving—often physically demanding; application of information technology; data management; technical support; scientific, research, and networking activities). Despite intensive support by the management of the Institute, since the beginning of our operations, we have been constantly dealing with deficiencies and errors inherited from previous periods (such as the books and scientific collections attacked by mould, placement under absolutely unsuitable conditions and with improper archive packing; collections arranged without a clear long-term archival and thematic strategy; undocumented processes; non-compliance with the archive metadata assignment standards; outdated system of object entries; absence of a legal reflection on opening access to the collections, etc.). These problems (often unpredictable in

advance) significantly slow down and complicate work on the set objectives. Given the wide range of activities that we are currently working on, we feel that the Unit is significantly understaffed. The Unit's technical infrastructure was completely restored and fully meets our needs' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 17).

Once employed, the new staff of the IDU jointly conducted an internal audit of the text collections and, on the management's request, prepared a conceptual step-by-step document on the digitisation and computer processing of the text archive (2018–22). They consulted the digitisation and creation of databases with the digitisation unit of the National Educational Centre and the Centre for Traditional Folk Culture. During the first project phase, which required, among other things, the removal of dust from the documents, the incremental book was manually transcribed into metadata structure. The next step was the creation of an electronic catalogue and register of object entries (Kubisa and Gogora 2018).

In 2018, the Institute's management acquired from its internal resources costly scanning infrastructure for the IDU. The completion of the reconstruction and chemical treatment of the collections was followed by massive digitisation of the text body (over 1,300 units) in 2019–20, which was successfully finalised in the first half of 2023. Spaces directly at the Institute were created for the storage of the digitised units. After the digitisation of the catalogue storage units, space was freed up for heavy metal cabinets located in three rooms on the ground floor. The vacated space was equipped with the necessary archival furniture, in which the saved text collections could be stored. The text collections were thus both chemically treated and physically transferred from the wet basement to the safe premises of the Secretariat.

Thanks to the conceptual and intensive work of the IDU, a digitised version of the text body of the Institute's scientific collections was created in line with the digital archiving standards in 2020–3. The text archive consists of unique ethnological and anthropological materials which systematically captures the

intangible cultural heritage of Slovakia. The archive contains 1,510 text documents collected by the Institute's staff members in the course of field and other research from 1950 until the present, as well as around 69,241 filled in archive cards, around 85,584 text units of A4 sized (in manuscript, typescript, and printed format), and around 524 supplementary drawings and 988 supplementary photos.

The data created by digitisation are now securely stored on computer hard drives, a portable drive, and online storage network drives. From the long-term perspective, the IDU staff performs a continuous implementation of other IESA SAS scientific collections into a single archive system, while creating the related metadata links: archive of digitised archive volumes and online versions of the *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology* journal, ETNOFOLK picture archive (with around 180,000 digitised units), and the archive of video- and film recordings.

In 2021, Digital Humanities became an important part of the Institute's scientific concept for the 2020s (2021–5), thanks to which it was possible to announce the historically first PhD topic on the processing of digital records on the cultural heritage in the Institute's scientific collections (PhD student: Barbora Siváčková, tutor: J. Zajonc, consultant: A. Gogora), indirectly following up on J. Zajonc's dissertation thesis on digital humanities, which focused on the possibilities of computing application in the R&D process of ethnology in Slovakia (Zajonc 1996).

When a discussion opened after the international accreditation in 2017 on the possibilities of linking the digital database of the Institute's text archive to the EUROPEANA and DARIAH European structures, the Institute joined the initiative to establish the Digital Humanities Centre within the SAS.

T. Zachar Podolinská and A. Gogora launched negotiations with the SAS Presidium on the possibility of integrating the Slovak Republic into the DARIAH-EU European research infrastructures. In 2018, A. Gogora prepared, as a hosting editor, a special issue of *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology* on digital ethnology (2018a). He subsequently joined the digital humanities and digital

archiving community in the framework of the international project *Training Digital Scholars: Knowledge Exchange between V4 and Austria* (International Visegrad Fund, 2018–20), in which he also collaborated with the Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities (*Výročné správy...* 2018–20).

This step brought a qualitative change in looking at scientific collections, their preservation (digitisation), and use. A. Gogora formulated the vision for his unit as follows: 'From the point of view of our department, we understand the expressions of the development of innovative approaches in the form of the current building of digital infrastructure for scientific collections (in particular, the text archive and the subsequent review of the visual collections), making them available online in the near future, and their further use for the scientific and research activity of the staff. This means: simplified availability of the archive; improved archive search primarily by location and object entries; the option to create specific collections based on various criteria; and the option to carry out statistical analysis of archive documents based on selected metadata records. Within the unit, we seek to document and reflect on this practice in the form of outputs in the field of digital humanities and digital archiving, as well as by promoting national and international infrastructure (DARIAH)' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 18).

In 2019, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology SAS as the first Slovak institution ever became a collaborating partner of the DARIAH-EU. Since the Slovak Republic is not a DARIAH member, the Institute joined the infrastructure with the status of a collaborating partner. This position enabled it to directly cooperate with the working groups and gain access to several virtual services, as well as to a network of top experts in digital humanities.

The Institute focused its efforts on seeking a suitable form for further development of its infrastructure for digital research in humanities in Slovakia, as well as on coordinating the Slovak digital humanities community with a vision of full membership of the Slovak Republic in DARIAH-ERIC (*Výročné správy...* 2019–20).



It can be noted in this context that, during the Innovation decade, the IDU, which had been undersized both in personnel and in terms of infrastructure for years, was not only consolidated, but it also turned into a progressively developing unit that is among the European top in the field of digital humanities and digital archiving (for more, see Gogora 2023).

In 2021, the Institute extended its cooperating partnership with the DARIAH-ERIC by two more years. It cooperates with the Sustainable Publishing of (Meta)Data Working Group, prepares manuals for the creation of digital collections in the field of ethnology and social anthropology, and gains access to several DARIAH virtual services and to the network of top experts in this sphere (*Výročné správy...* 2021-2).

### Transformation of the Slovenský národopis Journal into an International Registered Journal

In the 2010s, the Slovak expert community overcame the language and methodological handicap caused by 'life in socialism' and was able to assertively present the results of its research in foreign languages. This trend was also manifested in the *Slovenský národopis* journal. In 2009–10, the number of issues published annually increased from four to five, the fifth one being in English. Nevertheless, the editorial team did not receive any extra funds from the central resources for the fifth English issue. When it comes to contents, the publication strategy was unclear as well, i.e., whether to publish translations of the best studies of the year, or to release a 'project issue' presenting the results of a particular research project carried out at the Institute, or to publish original studies in English regardless of the affiliation and topics of the articles. In 2011, the journal expanded its name to become bilingual (*Slovenský národopis/ Slovak Ethnology; SN/SE*).

In her vision for the Director's post, T. Podolinská considered the transformation of the journal as a priority. She was aware of its importance for the formation of the discipline at the national

level, while she also identified an urgent need to transform it into a regular international journal offering a publication platform to researchers from abroad in a foreign language. After her election in 2012, she did not choose the concept of her predecessors who, simultaneously with the Director's post, accepted the Editor-in-Chief's position. In this regard, she approached her predecessor, G. Kiliánová, with a request to continue her leading of the journal.

T. Podolinská became the Deputy Editor and a member of the Editorial Board. At the end of 2012, she presented to the Editorial Board a vision for a gradual transformation of the journal, which consisted of the following steps: (1) stabilisation of the publication format with four issues per year with simultaneous strengthening of foreign-language issues at a 2:2 proportion, (2) preparation of a publication strategy and plan of issues for two-three years ahead, (3) introducing a regular format of monothematic issues accompanied by the search of suitable external hosting editors, (4) proactive search of high-quality authors with an increased citation rate (impact factor). She also defined as an absolute priority the intensification of the efforts to include the journal in the Elsevier (Scopus) and Thomson Reuters (WoS) databases. For this purpose, she enlarged the editorial team to also include Zuzana Panczová, who was in charge of concluding licence agreements with authors and communication with databases. The journal also changed its layout and cover.

As far as the funding of the journal is concerned, its external evaluation by the SAS Editorial Board was crucial for its operation. At the beginning of the Innovation decade, the Institute was represented in this body by P. Slavkovský, who flexibly communicated to the Director of the Institute not only the official recommendations, but also the unofficial evaluation criteria of the SAS Editorial Board.

After he retired in 2014, the Institute lost its representation in the SAS Editorial Board, which described *SN/SE* as a 'club journal'—i.e., with a preference to publishing domestic authors' papers and to spreading information on Slovak ethnology for Slovak ethnologists—and significantly reduced central support

in this respect. The SAS Editorial Board recommended reducing the 'non-academic content', i.e., the number and size of the relatively robust section of conference reports, greetings on anniversaries, memoirs, and obituaries, as well as interviews, discussions and materials.

To maintain the existence of the journal, the Institute financed its running from internal resources, introducing again 'project issues'. *SN/SE* ceased publishing reports, memoirs, interviews, greetings, and obituaries, leaving this agenda to the journal *Etnologické rozpravy*.

Despite meeting the condition of reducing 'non-academic content', the central support for the journal remained significantly reduced even in the following year. T. Podolinská objected to the SAS Editorial Board's evaluation and visited its Chair, Karol Nemoga, and Vice-Chair for the SAS Science Section III, Dagmar Podmaková, in person. In her second competition for the Director's post in 2016, during the hearing at the SAS Presidium, she raised the issue of the way of calculating institutional support to journals published by the SAS institutes. She noted, for instance, that the cost calculation coefficients for the production of the issues were still quantified in Slovak crowns and did not take into account the significantly higher expenses for the production of English issues, etc.

Innovations by the editorial team of *SN/SE* and the gradual increase in the ranking and citations of the journal ultimately resulted in stable financial support from central resources. In 2017, T. Podolinská became a member of the SAS Editorial Board, which enabled her to contribute to the setting of the criteria for the evaluation of journals within the SAS. As the evaluator of entire volumes of six journals published by the institutes pertaining to the SAS Science Section III, she had the opportunity to observe innovations and good ideas applied by the editorial teams of other journals.

In connection with the OA strategy that the Institute declared and implemented, the Director negotiated the possibility of its involvement in the EODOPEN European

digitisation project through the Slovak Centre of Scientific and Technical Information. In this way, all *SN/SE* volumes were digitised, and a comprehensive electronic archive of the journal was created. The articles with respect to which the Institute disposed of a licence (based on the employee work instrument) were subsequently made available on the journal's website via OA.

In connection with the efforts to include *SN/SE* into international citation databases, it was necessary to modify the publication strategy and the journal's website, draw up an ethical statement for the journal, as well as to meet other demanding criteria defined by the databases, including monitoring the regularity of publication and citation of the journal.

In 2019, after G. Kiliánová retired, Ľubica Voľanská, an important representative of the Generation of Innovators, became the journal's Editor-in-Chief. The citations of the journal significantly increased with the introduction of two English issues in 2014. In line with the Institute's internal strategy and the Open Science National Strategy, *SN/SE* was transformed into a regular OA journal in 2016; in 2018, it began assigning a DOI to the articles and, in the same year, it was admitted to the DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) database.

In mid-2018, after facilitating the journal's entry in DOAJ, Z. Panczová was released from her position as a member of the Editorial Board, taking up the position of Deputy Director. The editorial team welcomed two new members at that time: Adam Wiesner, who was exclusively in charge of communication with databases, and Vladimír Bahna, who strengthened the editorial area. Both of them were active in the editorial team until 2021, when they were replaced by Soňa Gyárfáš Lutherová. From 2019 to 2021, the journal was a part of the Sciendo publishing company (subsidiary of De Greuter). In 2020, the editorial team began using professional software for communication with authors and for its internal work arrangements.

In 2018, the long-year intensive efforts of the management of the Institute and the editorial team to enhance the level of the scientific journal *SN/SE* resulted in its indexation in the Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), which pertains to the database group Web of Science™ Core Collection by Clarivate.

In 2019, the journal was admitted to the Scopus database and, in 2021, to the Q3 quartile in social studies (anthropology). This marked the culmination of the transformation programme of the periodical, which became a regular scientific journal with the predominance of international authors, registered in scientific databases. The journal publishes articles with a DOI, in the Diamond OA mode, and with Creative Commons BY 4.0 licence. In its work, the editorial team uses a professional editorial system which makes work with the articles and reviews more transparent and simpler. The journal is released four times a year, in English, except for the first issue. After the cooperation with Sciendo was over, the SAS Central Library became the DOI provider for *SN/SE*.

### Reviewing the Proportion of the Teaching Workload

The increasing demand for teaching workload of the academics from the Institute at universities caused that, at the end of the 2000s, in addition to senior scientists, five members of the youngest generation (T. Bužeková, M. Ferencová, T. Hrustič, Z. Búriková, T. Podolinská) also lectured at Slovak and Czech universities. PhD students and graduates from the Institute also gave lectures to university students: Juraj Štofej, Vladimír Bahna and Soňa Lutherová. The subjects taught on a semestral basis included economic and political anthropology, selected issues of cognitive anthropology, the anthropology of religion, psychological anthropology, material culture, field methods and techniques, European mythologies, the history of Romani culture, applied anthropology, etc. Some of them also lectured in selected subjects in other European countries (*Výročné správy...* 2010–12).

The new management of the Institute considered that the amount and proportion of teaching activities of its researcher members, as it culminated at the end of the second Transformation decade, was not desirable for the Institute. The disproportionate workload of the staff at other institutions naturally manifested itself in a decrease of their research and publication potential at their main workplace. Therefore, the management decided to change the method of evaluation of teaching activities when it came to annual scoring: only the amount of teaching activity that was necessary to obtain the scientific-pedagogical titles of docent and professor, which could only be acquired at universities, was scored.

It was a strategic managerial decision. Within a short time, the desired effect showed up in the form of a voluntary reduction of teaching activities to selected lectures or seminars, or a correct reduction of working hours at a higher education institution or institute. Its employees thus remained in contact with the university environment and the transfer of knowledge and expertise from the academic to the university environment was maintained. At the same time, however, they could be fully dedicated to the content of their position as creative members and research staff within the SAS academic sphere.

During this period, several representatives of the proto-anthropological generation left the Institute. Among the first ones was Juraj Podoba, a prominent representative of the Transformation Generation, who as a supervisor had intensively guided new anthropologists (including Z. Búriková and S. Lutherová). For several years, J. Podoba lectured externally (the anthropology of post-socialism, contemporary anthropological theories, applied anthropology) and supervised final theses at the Department of Social Anthropology of the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University). In 2013, he firmly decided to follow a teaching career exclusively and became a full-time employee only at the faculty. Likewise, after leaving the Institute, T. Bužeková (2013) and Z. Sekeráková Búriková (2014) began focusing on teaching at other workplaces.

During the Innovation decade, the Institute corrected to some extent the tendency from the post-November 1989 period: to invest an important part of the scientific working time of its employees into teaching at higher education institutions. Since university and academic institutions began strictly monitoring not only individual work performance, but also duplicity in reporting the publications of their employees, the Institute also began prioritising the need for focusing on the publication and project performance of its staff primarily in the mother institution. Simultaneous full-time work of some staff members at a higher education institution and the Institute, including the related risk of parallel reporting of publication outputs for several employers, entered the game as well. The employees, who simultaneously worked full-time at universities, therefore either left the Institute or significantly reduced their working time at one of their workplaces (e.g., Z. Beňušková reduced her workload at the Institute to 10%), which strengthened the trend of sound scientific mobility within academic and university workplaces.

### The Institute's Doctoral School during the Innovation Decade

At the beginning of the Innovation decade (from the winter semester of the academic year 2011/2012), a PhD Seminary for students in the field of 'ethnology' began to be organised at the Institute. The Institute, as an external training institution, prepared it jointly with the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava. The Seminary was led by G. Kiliánová and T. Hrustič, who divided the educational process into three or four cycles corresponding to the daily study years.

In 2015, in addition to G. Kiliánová and T. Hrustič, V. Bahna also began teaching and training PhD students at the Institute, focusing on the text seminar. During the next six years (2016–21), the PhD Seminary was conducted by T. Hrustič and V. Bahna. Ten years later, T. Hrustič was replaced by Peter Maňo. Together with

V. Bahna, they prepared a semestral Specialised Seminar for PhD Students (with a focus on the creation of scientific projects).

Since 2021, after the curriculum of the new study programme World Cultures and Religions for scholars of religion, ethnologists, and external institutions IESA SAS and the Institute of Oriental Studies SAS, the teaching of other subjects (research methods, text seminar with an overview of theories, etc.) has been organised by the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava.

In 2012–9, the Institute, as an external training institution for the third higher education level, conducted PhD studies in the field of Ethnology based on an agreement with two Slovak universities: Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (from 2008) and Comenius University in Bratislava (from 2010). In 2020, after the partner department at Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra lost accreditation for the third level of education, the cooperation was reduced to Comenius University in Bratislava. In 2019, the Institute extended its training portfolio to include the accredited Religious Studies field of study as well. In the same year, Social Anthropology also became part of the portfolio—the Institute obtained accreditation for the training of PhD students in this field after signing an agreement with the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava in 2019.

In 2021, in connection with the new accreditation, a new study programme World Cultures and Religions was created at the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, enabling third-level higher education in the study field of Ethnology and Religious Studies. Since 2021, the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS, as an external training institution, has had an agreement on conducting PhD studies for the study programmes World Cultures and Religions (four-year full-time and distance form of study) with the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University and for the study programme Social Anthropology with the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava (three-year full-time and part-time form of study).

In the course of the 2012-22 decade, the Institute trained 32 PhD students in total (eight of which are still in the process of studying), three of them in external form. However, because three external PhD students terminated their studies prematurely, the Institute's management, upon consultation with the Scientific Board, ceased organising admissions for the external form of PhD studies in 2016. During this period, fourteen students completed their studies by successfully defending their theses. Potential supervisors announced topics for the individual academic years in line with the Institute's scientific concept and upon a joint discussion moderated by the Director and Coordinator in charge for PhD studies (T. Hrustič, later V. Bahna). Of the applying candidates, one to four doctoral students were selected by competition annually. The strongest years were between 2012-6, when the doctoral group at the Institute consisted of ten persons on average; in 2017-22, there were six doctoral students on average.

In 2023, the Institute trained eight PhD students. Since scholarships for PhD students are paid from the SAS internal budget, the SAS Presidium allocates an annual quota to its institutes for a certain number of PhD positions. During the Innovation decade, the limit number for PhD students was one to three per year. In addition to the PhD Seminar, the Institute also organises a doctoral conference each year (*Výročné správy...* 2012-22).

In order to create a stimulating environment for its PhD students, the Institute supported international networking and was involved in the organisation of summer schools during the Innovation decade. In 2015, it joined the summer school for PhD students, which was organised by the Department of Ethnology and Museology of the Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, and the Department of Ethnology of the University in Szeged (Hungary).

In addition, the organisation established cooperation with the international network *Copernicus Graduate School* (CGS) Wroclaw with the aim of organising thematic seminars and summer schools conducted by international experts and selecting and

supporting candidates for the international level of the PhD degree, the so-called *cotutelle process* in the field of social sciences and humanities. In 2016, the Institute cooperated in the 6<sup>th</sup> CGS Seminar, which centred on *Minorities in (Central) Europe with a Special Focus on Roma* (Warsaw, Poland). The seminar was conceptually prepared and led by T. Podolinská and T. Hrustič. PhD students from the Institute, who became members of the CGS, also attended the next, 7<sup>th</sup> CGS Seminar with the title *Visual History and Historical Reception Studies* (Rostock, Germany, 2016) (*Výročné správy...* 2015-6).

Thanks to participation in the *Network of Academic Institutions in Romani Studies* (NAIRS, 2015, with T. Podolinská as a founding member and Vice-President), the Institute had the opportunity to be part of the platform of 27 academic institutions pursuing, among other things, the exchange of tutors and doctoral students and the organisation of summer schools for PhD students. In 2016, the Institute of Ethnology SAS organised the 1<sup>st</sup> NAIRS European Summer School for PhD students in the field of Romani studies in Slovakia. The cooperation by the Institute through the activities of T. Podolinská continued with the preparation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> NAIRS Summer School for PhD Students in 2017 (Prague, Czech Republic) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> NAIRS Summer School for PhD Students in 2018 (Huddinge, Sweden) (*Výročné správy...* 2015-8). These events were attended by over 100 PhD students from all over Europe, including several PhD students from the Institute.

In 2017-8, thanks to its cooperation with the International Institute for the Study of Culture and Education at the University of Lower Silesia (Wroclaw, Poland), the Institute was involved in the organisation of two years of the seminar for students from Syracuse University (USA). In September 2017 and 2018, the research members of the Institute prepared an expert programme in the framework of the seminars on *Negotiating Identities Across Europe's Borders* (for more, see *Výročné správy...* 2017-8).

During the Innovation decade, the Institute motivated supervisors as well as PhD students to spend a part of their



PhD studies at prestigious universities abroad: Natália Blahová worked as a Visiting Research Fellow at the International Migration Institute (University of Oxford, UK) in 2016; Radoslava Semanová attended a stay at the University of Lancaster, Department of Linguistics and English Language (UK) in 2018–9; Júlia Holoňová took use of the scholarship obtained for a stay at the Centre of Expertise in Longevity at the Department of Gender Studies of the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic) in 2018–9; and Edita Rigová obtained a grant for a foreign study visit under the National Scholarship Programme at Harvard University (USA) in 2022 (*Výročné správy...* 2016, 2018–9, 2022).

During the Innovation decade, the PhD students of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS were engaged in the research and publication activities of national, as well as international projects. In 2021, E. Rigová obtained financial support for her PhD research on social inclusion and mobility of the Roma in Slovakia under the new SAS call of the *Doktogrant* scheme (*Výročné správy...* 2021–2).

In order to provide PhD students with practical expert skills, the Institute adopted an internal guideline on assistance activities of PhD students in 2017. During the initial stage of their studies, PhD students dedicate part of their work capacity to activities at the IDU under the guidance of expert staff, assisting in the digitisation of scientific collections and the Library catalogue (*Výročné správy...* 2017–8, 2022).

### **Innovations in the Personnel Policy: Generational Change without Ruptures and Reduced Performance**

In line with its concept of improving the organisation's infrastructure, obtaining European projects, international cooperation and internationalisation of its scientific orientation, T. Zachar Podolinská brought a number of innovations to the organisation, personnel policy, and scientific management of the Institute. During the Innovation decade, particularly during

its second half, the retirement of the top representatives of the Generation of Builders—Mojmír Benža (2013), Peter Slavkovský (2014)—and important representatives of the Transformation Generation—Ľubica Faltánová (2014), Zuzana Profantová (2015), Arne B. Mann (2016), Rastislava Stoličná (2016), Gabriela Kiliánová (2018), Eva Krekovičová (2019), and Dušan Ratica (2019), became a great internal challenge.

Since she took office, T. Zachar Podolinská has pursued a transparent Human Resources policy—she introduced the praxis of hiring new staff members exclusively through open competitions before a Recruitment Committee—including for the positions of external experts in domestic or international projects, technician, and administrative staff.

In the process of generational exchange, she continued implementing the Institute's strategy of stabilising own successful postdocs (by making use of the competition tool of the *Štefan Schwarz Fund* scholarship), which she combined with a targeted proactive personnel strategy of talent search.

At the beginning of 2016, after several years of postponement, the long-time Head of the Secretariat, Magdaléna Slavkovská, retired as well. With erudition and a human approach, she had managed the extensive economic, project, as well as personnel agenda of the entire Institute and had been a good advisor (sometimes even 'shadow Director') to the entire director line, starting with B. Filová. Along with her, another long-time staff member of the Secretariat, Edita Vrátna, retired in the same year. The job competition for the position of the secretary was won by Katarína Paduchová. After she left for a maternal leave at the end of 2019, she was temporarily substituted by Branislava Demková (later Kolesárová). With the return of K. Paduchová from her maternal leave, the Institute restored the model of two Secretariat staff members. With the exponential increase of the project agenda, it was necessary to assign one employee to project management. At the same time, with the gradual loss of capacity of the Technical and Economic Management Unit led by Gabriela Mokráňová and later Gabriela Veselková, the Institute had to

invest increased amounts of energy in handling and controlling the economic and personnel agenda.

During the Innovation decade, the organisation maintained 21 FTEs on average, with an average of 17 scientists (with equal representation of women and men). In terms of the personnel policy, the Institute rejuvenated during the first term of office of T. Podolinská (2012–6) with the stabilisation of successful postdocs, Schwarz Scholarship graduates (Z. Panczová, T. Hrustič, V. Bahna, S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, A. Wiesner). In the same period, due to teaching and working at other institutes, J. Podoba and T. Bužeková (2013), as well as Z. Sekeráková Búriková (2014) left the Institute.

After 2016, the Institute pursued a targeted pro-active personnel strategy to search for prospective employees based on the new scientific policy and strategic action plan. In 2017, after I. Kostovská left the Scientific Collections Unit, Tomáš Kubisa was hired as expert staff and, simultaneously with this position, was admitted as a PhD student a year later. In connection with the new strategic action plan, the Institute's Director approached Andrej Gogora, an expert in digital humanities in Slovakia, to become the Head of the newly created Information and Documentation Unit of the Institute of Ethnology SAS.

The work of the teams dealing with international projects was conceptually stimulated by short-term employment of experts in the given area by searching for suitable new scientists in the external environment. Contracts for an indefinite period ceased to be the predominant form of employment contracts in the Institute. There was an increased number of part-time jobs and fixed-term contracts for newly admitted staff and postdocs, which corresponds to the current standard in scientific organisations in the world, as well as the rhythm of project research stages.

In 2015, a new part-time position of project manager was created at the Institute. After the selection procedure, this post was taken by Alexandra Bitušíková (former PhD student of P. Salner), urban anthropologist, and expert in critical heritage studies from Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica. Thanks

to her rich experience in institutional and project management and her work in research development bodies of the European Commission in Brussels, she brought to the Institute her knowledge of the functioning of European grant schemes, constantly updated information on both on-going and planned European project calls, as well as her international contacts. Her admission also meant an opportunity to move research, publication activities, and the training of new PhD students in a new direction in the areas of her scientific expertise. In 2020, she became the Chairwoman of the Scientific Board of the Institute, thanks to which this important advisory body in the life of the institution acquired an international insight into the current issues in the field of European ethnology and social anthropology.

In 2017, sociologist and anthropologist Daniel Škobla began working at the Institute as a senior researcher specialised in ethnicity, social inequalities, cohesion policy, and Romani studies. In 2019, Martina Sekulová (later Wilsch), an expert in migration and integration, gender, and human rights, Andrej Belák, an expert in medical anthropology and Romani studies, Jaroslava Panáková with expertise in visual anthropology and sensory anthropology, Siberia, and the Arctics, and Peter Maňo, an evolutionary and cognitive anthropologist with a focus on religion and rituals, came to work at the Institute. To promote folklore studies and the study of narratives and folklorism, Anna Hlôšková, a former research staff member of the Institute, who had previously conducted scientific and teaching activities at Comenius University in Bratislava for more than a decade, was admitted in 2020 (*Výročné správy... 2017-20*). With this step, the Institute wished to enhance the undersized personnel in older key fields, such as folklore studies.

The admission of the strong group of people with education and work experience from foreign institutions significantly expanded and internationalised the internal perspective and, moreover, the organisation clearly opened to interdisciplinary methods and approaches. This group of the Innovation Generation had regular

anthropological qualifications, was familiar with the standard methods of anthropological research, and commonly applied stationary forms of qualitative research in its work. The Institute personally strengthened the key strategic lines (migration, religious, and Romani studies) to create the prerequisites for the set-up of effective project teams.

Thanks to good results, a positive work atmosphere, and the support team, the Institute became attractive to young Slovak talents with a high publication and research potential. The admission of staff on the basis of open competitions with Recruitment Committee made it possible to consider not only the candidates' professional, but also human qualities, i.e., to assess whether they were team players capable of implementing team values and internal cohesion, as well as leaving the individual comfort zone to the benefit of the whole.

In 2019, the Institute became interested in the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R), which is followed by the European Commission (for more details, see *EURAXESS*). HRS4R supports research institutions and funding organisations in the implementation of the Charter & Code in their policies and practices, in order to be more attractive to researchers looking for a new employer or for a host for their research project.

The right to use the *HR Excellence in Research Award* logo means meeting the forty principles of the Charter & Code, based on a customised action plan/HR strategy. The organisation must comply with stringent criteria when it comes to the recruitment of staff, working conditions at the workplace, promotion of scientific integrity and the freedom of research of employees, the creation of suitable working conditions for mothers and fathers who returned from the maternity or parental leave, tutoring not only for PhD students, but also for young postdocs, and regular care for enhancing the skills and qualifications of the entire team. In 2020, the Institute's management joined the SAS call to prepare the full documentation of the application. The documentation was prepared by the then Deputy Director, Z. Panczová, together with the Director. After reviewing the application, the Institute of

Ethnology and Social Anthropology and the Institute of Astronomy SAS became the first SAS organisations that were allowed to officially use the Excellence in HRS4R logo.

During the Innovation decade, the transparent recruitment mechanism and the monitoring of and compliance with gender equality and gender balance indicators enabled the organisation to meet the demanding criteria for the implementation of the *Gender Equality Plan (GEP)*. In 2022, the Institute adopted the document, the pilot version of which was prepared by the research team of the Horizon 2020—ATHENA international project (Žilinská 2021). The Institute thus fulfilled the important prerequisite for obtaining international projects under the new EU project scheme—Horizon Europe.

### Internal Structure

At the beginning of the Innovation decade, the internal structure of the Institute remained unchanged. Its management consisted of the Director (T. Podolinská from August 1, 2012), Deputy Director (K. Popelková, and Z. Panczová from 2018), and Scientific Secretary (K. Popelková; Z. Panczová from 2016, and A. Gogora from 2019). In 2021, Z. Panczová was successfully voted as a member of the SAS Presidium as the first employee ever of the Institute. She became the Vice-President of the SAS for International Relations. Z. Panczová was subsequently released from the position of the Deputy Director and reduced her working time at the Institute by half.

A seven-member Scientific Board elected by the academic community, including two external foreign experts, remained the conceptual body and equivalent partner of the statutory representative. In the past decade, this board was chaired by R. Stoličná, G. Kiliánová, M. Vrzgulová, and A. Bitušiková (*Výročné správy... 2010–22*).

The Attestation Committee operated at the Institute from 2012 to 2022 and was chaired by G. Kiliánová during the first term of office and by M. Vrzgulová during the second term of

office. The Attestation Committee provided feedback to the Director and individual researchers on their creative performance within the organisation, assigning them to research ranges. The evaluation had a narrative nature and aimed at providing motivational feedback that detected the research potential of the staff members. The evaluation was conducted in approximately five-year cycles. Another of its objectives was to present recommendations for qualification progress. As a result of the transformation into public research institutions in 2022, the attestation committees within SAS organisations ceased to exist and their competences were transferred to scientific boards. In 2022, by approval of an internal regulation of public research institutions on the evaluation of R&D staff, the Scientific Board preliminarily stated that, given the functional system of three-year strategic planning and regular reporting of individual action plans, the staff evaluation system with five-year periodicity was no longer necessary.

In 2018–20, the Scientific Board of the Institute worked with a reduced number of five members (including three internal members: M. Vrzgulová, J. Zajonc, and D. Škobla). At the time of preparations for the transformation in 2018, as a preventive measure, the organisation reduced the number of internal members of the Scientific Board to three—in order to satisfy the mandatory minimum numbers of members of the administrative bodies of the future public research institution. At that time, L. Vol'anská and A. Bitušíková voluntarily left the Scientific Board. In 2020, they were re-elected as its members.

Until the change of the legal form, the Board of the Director remained an important advisory and operational body. Podolinská extended membership in this Board to the heads of all projects carried out at the Institute that were financially covered. In addition to national VEGA projects, there was an increase in the number of APVV and international projects, in particular, COST networking projects and related international scientific and technical cooperation projects. Zachar Podolinská preserved the existence of the Board even after

the change of the Institute's legal form; however, pursuant to the Act on Public Research Institutions, some of its duties were shifted to other statutory bodies (Board of Directors, Scientific Board, Supervisory Board). Nevertheless, it retained its important advisory and operative duties in connection with the implementation of the scientific concept and project management at the workplace. Towards the end of the Innovation decade, internal institutional projects without external financial coverage ceased to be executed and approved at the Institute. The Institute thus declared inwards the need to apply project know-how by acquiring extra-budgetary funds.

In 2019, the Institute's management initiated the set-up of an internal ethical committee at its seminar in Smolenice. The Director presented the concept of the agenda of ethical committees on an international scale. The academic community subsequently discussed the possibility of its installation and approved the concept of its operation—help with the formation of the ethical designs of the projects executed at the workplace or even their approval.

At the end of 2019, the Ethical Committee of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS was established as one of the first ethical committees of the SAS organisations. In line with its statute and relying on the Code of Ethics of the *Ethnographic Society of Slovakia*, the Code of Ethics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, and the basic norms of ethical behaviour at SAS workplaces, the Ethical Committee of the IESA SAS deals with issues associated with the scientific and research activities of its staff. It prepares and approves documents that are necessary for the creation of the ethical designs of projects carried out at the Institute; comments on and approves ethical project designs on request; helps solving ethical issues that may arise during project implementation; deals with suggestions from staff members related to the breach of the basic ethical rules of scientific work, codes of ethics, and general legislative norms; and reviews the ethical design of PhD projects. The members of the Ethical Committee (based on their

position at the workplace and during its performance) include: Chair of the Scientific Board, Head of the IDU, coordinator of the PhD studies agenda, Editor-in-Chief of *SN/SE*, and one member appointed by the Director.

After the change of the Institute's legal form into a public research institution, two new bodies were created under the law in 2022: the Board of Directors, which consists of the Director as its Chairwoman *ex offio*, and four elected members (first term of office: B. Kolesárová as Deputy Chairwoman, S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, J. Panáková, L. Voľanská, and M. Vrzgulová); Supervisory Board, which consists of three members appointed by the SAS Presidium (a member of the Presidium, a lawyer or an economist, and one person with a non-academic background).

The key task of the Board of Directors is to approve the budget and the annual report of the organisation. The Supervisory Board controls the effectiveness of the management and implementation of the SAS strategic documents in the organisation's operation. The Scientific Board primarily drafts and approves the scientific concept of the Institute and comments on the results of its R&D activities. In this spirit, it also gives opinions on the relevant parts of the Institute's annual report, approves proposals for a qualification staff transfer, and the topics of PhD theses.

There is also a Trade Union within the Institute. After the cessation of the former Revolutionary Trade Union Movement following the political changes in 1989, it was restored, this time as part of the Trade Union of Workers in Education and Science of Slovakia. With regard to employee rights, it relies on the conditions negotiated by the national Trade Union Confederation at the tripartite level. The communication with this confederation is ensured by the SAS Employees Trade Union. With the Institute's management, the Chair of the Employees' Trade Union Organisation negotiates on the conditions of signing the collective agreement each year, cooperates in the preparation of Christmas and summer parties for employees and pensioners, and decides on the use of the money that the trade union members voluntarily transfer from their salaries to the common

funds. In addition, the Chair of the trade union organisation is invited by the Director to attend the meetings of the Board of the Director and Recruitment Committees. During the second Transformation decade, the Trade Union Organisation at the Institute was chaired by A. Kalivodová (2001-4) and D. Ratica (2005-12), and during the Innovation decade, by Z. Panczová (2013-5), M. Hlinčíková (2016), and T. Hrustič (from 2017).

### **Anthropological Turn: An Attempt to Achieve Exclusivity of the Cognitive Approach at the Institute**

In the 2010 Annual Report, the Institute of Ethnology SAS declared for the first time that, in addition to ethnology and comparative religious studies, it also develops social anthropology. During the 2000s, a proto-anthropological group (T. Bužeková, M. Ferencová) was formed, which, along with the then management of the Institute and progressive part of the Transformation Generation (especially J. Podoba), attempted to bring about an anthropological turn.

Ethnological research at the Institute started to discursively prioritise anthropological approach in counterpoint to the formerly preferred historical-evolutionary approach that explored given phenomena as embodied in their historical and cultural context and traced their phenomenologically rooted development and transformation.

In this context, in line with the general trend in anthropology, the subject of ethnographic research and the essentialist approaches to identity, ethnicity, and collective memory were deconstructed (e.g., Marušiak and Ferencová, Eds. 2005; Ferencová and Nosková 2009). In her work, T. Bužeková applied the cognitive approach to the research on magic ideas and practices (2009). She later co-edited a publication from the seminar that the Institute organised on the methodological issues related to ethnographic research on social representations (Bužeková and Jerotijević, Eds. 2012). The term *proto-anthropological group* is used here, because this group of scholars did not have regular anthropological education



(acquired at home or abroad) yet, thus became familiar with anthropology through other disciplines through self-study.

The proto-anthropological group enjoyed strong support from the management of that period (the 2000s), which placed high hope in the progressive direction of the Institute and of the discipline as such. During the second Transformation decade, when its efforts to achieve an *anthropological turn* at the Institute culminated, some of the researchers across all generations began to feel uncomfortable, since the anthropological turn at the Institute acquired strong, *neo-positivist* and *exclusivist* contours. These corresponded to the wider discourse promoted by a group of scientists at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava, whose aim was the implementation of *cognitive anthropology* in Slovakia in the 2000s as the principal or even only correct and progressive research method.

Katarína Slobodová Nováková, a graduate in PhD ethnology studies at the IE SAS in 2002–6, who is today Professor at the Department of Ethnology and Non-European Studies and Rector of the Faculty of Arts of Saints Cyril and Methodius University in Trnava, remembers her apprenticeship years at the Institute during the second Transformation decade as follows: ‘After completing my Master’s degree in ethnology and history at the Faculty of Arts of Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, I was lucky to be admitted to PhD studies at the Institute of Ethnology SAS in 2003. As a graduate from the Department of Ethnology and Folklore Studies from Nitra, I wanted to conduct research on material culture and present-day winegrowers. However, it was not fashionable during those years. Bourdieu, the theory of capitals, cognitive anthropology, and otherness were “in”. Traditional material culture was considered a field from the “stone age”, uninteresting, bringing nothing, and not “sexy” at all.

Some of the academics considered the graduates from the Departments of Ethnology in Nitra or Trnava to be second-class graduates, and they displayed this opinion openly. I will never forget the words of a colleague of mine with whom the Institute’s

doctoral students shared the workroom and who addressed me with the following words during our first meeting: “What do you guys from Nitra want here, you can only dance and sing!”. It was a difficult period for me as a young PhD student. Despite all these pressures, Rast’a [Stoličná], my supervisor, supported me. During my entire PhD studies, she literally had to fight for me and my topic. Figuratively speaking, she had to defend me before the Institute’s management against the pressures of the emerging anthropological group of researchers who did not consider my approach “in” enough’ (2023).

T. Zachar Podolinská adds the following on the given period: ‘As an expert in religious studies, I was well familiar with the Czech cognitivist school at Masaryk University in Brno. They were renowned experts who were able to obtain large projects, attract foreign top experts, and give a chance to talented Slovaks to collaborate in the project and learn cutting-edge international science in the newly established laboratory and research hub LEVYNA in Brno. Our scholars specialised in religious studies, Vlado Bahna and later also Peter Maňo, were invited to participate in the LEVYNA as well. Using experimental methods in laboratory conditions, they carried out interesting experiments (for instance, using the eye-balls tracking method), which, in fact, represented the testing of certain general hypotheses through a small sample of people under artificially created conditions.

They were fully aware of the methodological limits of their experiments, as well as the limits of the generalising validity of their conclusions. In addition, they correctly acknowledged the plurality of scientific approaches and opinions. They were enthusiastic about the cognitive current, because it gave them clear guidance on how to explore and interpret complex social phenomena through partial themes. Nevertheless, they perceived their research line as one of many. From religious studies, they gradually moved to evolutionary anthropology and psychology, with which they seem to have the most areas of contact today.

It was therefore a great surprise for me to see with what vehemence and sometimes even arrogance cognitivism in

Slovakia (and also at the Institute) was being promoted. In some internal seminars, as well as in PhD defences, I experienced a rigid requirement to postulate a hypothesis even in research with a deliberately exploratory design, or in research that intended to use an ethnographic insight and thick description. What bothered me most was those people's intentionally superior criticism used to humiliate older colleagues. For me, as a team member and later Director, the leaving of this group from the Institute during the Innovation decade (2011–3) was an expression of a centrifugal force of internal cohesion.

In any case, they were replaced in the Institute by a strong group of young and passionate anthropologists with team spirit. In addition to expertise in anthropology from foreign universities, they claimed interdisciplinarity. At the same time, they highly appreciated and developed a combination of professionalism and constructive criticism in a generally supporting atmosphere at the workplace. Later, as a Director, I frequently recalled the words of B. Filová, conveyed through the Generation of Builders that “you can raise a good scholar out of almost anyone, but not a good man” (2023).

A prominent representative of the anthropological line from the Generation of Innovators, S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, comments on the period of attempts to make anthropological turn by promoting a cognitive approach at the Institute as follows: ‘I always like debating with my older colleagues about how they perceived it. New opportunities opened up for them, however, they were not equally prepared to face these challenges. For other members of our generation, it was an effort to embed new approaches and not to get “crushed” by some areas that were becoming dominant, such as cognitive anthropology (which had strong proponents when we came to work to the Institute; on the one hand, they advocated stricter scientific criteria (which I appreciated), on the other, certain rigidity in the scientific approach (which I am not OK with)’ (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

The *centripetal*, as well as *centrifugal* forces of the internal cohesion that manifested themselves with the leaving of the

proto-anthropological group from the Institute at the end of the second Transformation period and the beginning of the Innovation period is commented by L. Voľanská, a top representative of the Innovation Generation, as follows: ‘During my time at the Institute, there was a moment when I was in fact happy to be on maternity leave. The Institute was at that time left by my colleagues with whom I shared my office. I still don't know exactly what happened. One of my older colleagues told me that she was sorry that someone preferred work to relationships with other colleagues at the workplace. It was the very moment that I realised the importance of harmony in working life’ (in: *Ibid.*).

Following the recommendations from the International Accreditation Panel (2016), the emancipated and interdisciplinarily, open-minded anthropological line at the Institute was also translated into its name, when, in March 2018, during preparations for the change of the organisation's legal form, the management applied for its renaming to the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS. In the second half of the Innovation decade, the anthropological direction at the Institute was completed in a peaceful, consensual, and inclusive manner. In terms of the Institute's internal history, it also represented a U-turn towards qualitative ethnography, while rehabilitating not only the historical approaches, but also the various areas of the modern research on cultural heritage.

### First International Accreditation 2016 —An External Mirror and Strategic Navigation

The first international evaluation in 2016 was an important impulse for the strategical development and functioning of the Institute in the latter half of the 2010s.

On the order of the SAS Presidium, for the first time in the SAS history, an international panel of independent evaluators assessed all 61 scientific organisations, having applied a single methodology. The management of each Institute prepared

an accreditation questionnaire in English, which served as a reference material for the site visit of the international panel. The questionnaire was subsequently evaluated by one foreign expert, whose review was anonymous, and it was available to the institute only after the evaluation was over.

Each SAS science section had its own Panel consisting of five foreign experts, and the compatibility of the entire evaluation process was ensured by a six-member Meta-Panel chaired by Marja Makarow.

The evaluation was composed of three separate parts: the first one assessed Research and Development, the second Societal Impact, and the third one reviewed the Vision and Future Prospects (*Evaluation 2012-2015*). The activities of the IE SAS, which were summarised in the accreditation questionnaire in English (*Questionnaire...* 2016, 74 pp.), were not evaluated by any external expert, since the chairwoman of the panel for the SAS Science Section III, Milena Žic Fuchs, was qualified in ethnology, due to which the Panel declared that it did not need an external expert.

By Resolution of the SAS Presidium No. 1212.C of February 9, 2017, the Institute of Ethnology SAS was rated as an 'A' organisation with the following characteristics: *'The research is internationally leading within the European context. The institute has demonstrated important contributions to the field and is considered an international player in Europe'*. In their evaluation, international experts emphasised effective management; excellent operation within European networks (not only as a partner but also leader); top national and transnational research; a publication vision and a balanced composition of publication outputs; targeted proactivity and success in obtaining international projects; a balanced age, gender, and qualification structure of the work team; and a personnel policy aimed at stabilising the quality of postdoc and continuous education and training of PhD students in the field of ethnology. Experts also appreciated the extraordinary societal impact of the Institute, as well as the connection with the decision-making sphere and

the 'third sector' (i.e., cooperation with NGOs), and the strong emphasis on research data dissemination and popularisation.

As far as future development was concerned, the Meta-Panel addressed the Institute with the following recommendations: (1) considering the spectrum of activities performed and the orientation of research, the Panel suggested 'renaming the Institute of Ethnology to the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS'; (2) considering shifts in the publishing strategy: '...publishing record is commendable, although more internationalisation is welcome' and 'in order to enhance the research visibility of the Institute in the sense of making the research of the Institute available to a wider audience', and 'as far as the publication outputs are concerned, still more emphasis should be put on article production, but this does not mean that monographs should be neglected'; (3) to approach both the SAS and the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sports, to open the doors for the Institute to European infrastructures within the ESFRI National Roadmap: '...once the Roadmap for the Slovak Republic has been prepared by the Slovak government, membership should be applied to multilingual online collections, such as DARIAH and EUROPEANA'; (4) The Panel also suggested 'improving communication between the SAS institutions' (*Meta-Panel Assessment Report...* 2016). The Institute's management immediately began working on all recommendations and, by the new international accreditation in 2022, all recommendations were thoroughly implemented.

From the point of view of scientometry, in 2012-5 (with the capacity of 17.5 FTEs), the Institute published a total of five foreign and 25 domestic monographs, as well as six WoS and two Scopus studies. During the given period, it recorded 962 responses in total to the works of its staff, including 121 CC/WoS and 23 Scopus citations. The publishing trend during the first half of the Innovation decade meant a significant increase in CC/WoS publications, which was also reflected in an increased number of citations in registered databases; nevertheless, it was still necessary, in line with the Panel's recommendation, to work

on increasing this number simultaneously with promoting the international visibility of the publication outputs (i.e., increase publishing in foreign languages and in flagship international journals).

Overall, the international accreditation 2016 included two SAS institutes in 'A' category—the Institute of Ethnology and the Polymer Institute SAS. Twenty-four SAS institutes were ranked in the second, 'B' category, which obtained the following narrative evaluation: *'The research is visible on the European level. The organisation has achieved valuable input in the given field within Europe'*. The panel included thirteen SAS institutes in the third category 'C', concluding that research *'has solid foundations and has contributed to knowledge in the given field on the European level. The organisation is visible on the national level'*. Five SAS institutes were classified the last category 'D', the activities of which were evaluated as follows: *'Research does not have solid foundations or stagnates or has deficiencies from the scientific or technical point of view'*. The two Centres that had been created through a merge of several institutes were classified in 'B' category (Earth Science Centre SAS) and 'C' category (Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences SAS) (*Odporúčania...* 2017).

Inclusion in category 'A' by the Institute of Ethnology SAS within the SAS Science Section III was a big surprise within the Slovak Academy of Sciences. In addition to this outstanding result, from the point of view of SSH disciplines, another ten institutes within the SAS Science Section III also received an excellent evaluation. The number of institutes that obtained 'B' ranking within the SAS Science Section III proportionately corresponded to or was even higher than in the SAS Science Sections I and II.

The first international accreditation, which evaluated all SAS scientific organisations using the same methodology, thus clearly showed that the previously marginalised SAS science section is generating excellent science and significantly contributing to the development of international science. This result was a great

satisfaction for the SAS Science Section III. SSH organisations were able to gradually reverse the negative narrative on the 'immeasurability of performance' and its 'specific nature', and the excellent result of the accreditation of the Institute of Ethnology SAS played a key role in this turn.

The results of the first international accreditation not only increased the institution's visibility at the national level, but also strengthened its reputation as an excellent workplace internationally. T. Zachar Podolinská adds the following on the accreditation result: 'The good accreditation results surprised us as well. We knew that we were good, but none of us expected an "A" ranking. And so, first we forced ourselves to believe these results. The 2016 accreditation was great in that it clearly identified what we had to strive for next, so that we didn't rest on laurels. I will not forget the Chairwoman of our Review Panel, Milena Žic Fuchs, speaking to me after the end of the press conference in the SAS Presidium premises. With a firm handshake and piercing eyes, she told me that the Meta-Panel had recommended the SAS Presidium that the directors attend managerial and presentation skills courses. And she added smiling: "You personally don't need anything like this. However, the main asset of your Institute is that you have a bunch of excellent people". I was proud to agree with it' (2023).

### **The 2020s: Change of the Financial Ecosystem—Performance Evaluation, Wage Reform, and Change of the Legal Form**

At the turn of the 2010s and 2020s, the Institute's running was significantly influenced by a substantial turn in the SAS rules for the evaluation of scientific performance, as well as in the mechanisms and allocation of central funds to the individual organisations. In 2019, the SAS introduced a wage reform and, in 2022, it changed the legal form of its organisations.

In the previous decade, an expenditure limit of around 60 to 54 million euros was allocated to the Slovak Academy of Sciences each year in accordance with the State Budget Act. The stability

agreement with the state also ensured the financing of its activities. This agreement was concluded during the presidential mandate of P. Šajgalík for the period 2016–8 and guaranteed a minimum of 60 million euros in the budget of the SAS chapter (*Transformácia...* 2018, p. 9). In 2019–22, the SAS budget increased, considering the year-on-year inflation rate, and achieved around 113 million euros in 2023.

*Vis-à-vis* the government, as well as its organisational units, the SAS Presidium began promoting the idea of performance-based funding. For the first international accreditation in 2016, it made a deal with the state for a one-time increase of the SAS budget by 1.5 million euros. Thanks to the excellent evaluation result in 2016, the Institute of Ethnology SAS received a one-time sum of 37,000 euros in 2017, which was uniformly allocated to all of the Institute's staff members, including mothers on maternity leave. The state also promised that if the SAS proved to allocate funds internally in order to encourage higher performance, such an increase could turn into a permanent scheme. The design of the new performance evaluation model was entrusted to the SAS Vice-President for science and research, Peter Samuely. The system of state subsidies allocation to higher education institutions in the Slovak Republic served for him as a reference a model.

The performance evaluation was implemented in 2017, assessing the institutes' performance in the previous two years. The Academy allocated for the purposes of its funding a fixed, yet annually variable sum of funds, which was composed of 10% of the organisation's current total wage allocation (the funds were formally allocated, but were not transferred to the account of the Institute) and 6% from the SAS Presidium's fund.

The new funding system obliged the organisations to first earn 10% of their reference salaries via competition with other institutes within the corresponding SAS Department. Only then could they obtain extra-reference funds (i.e., finances for individual allowances or end-year bonuses). During the period of validity of the first international accreditation results (2017–22), the funds

were internally allocated to six basic performance categories in the following ratio: 43% for international accreditation, 40% for publications and responses, 5% for national and 5% for international projects, 2% for societal impact, and 5% for PhD studies. The competitive capital (10% of the organisations' wage allocations + 6% of the SAS Presidium's fund) were later distributed according to the wage bill amount among the individual SAS science sections, and was subsequently allocated to each of the six evaluation categories in line with the aforementioned percentages. In the next step, the cumulative number of outputs from all institutes within a science section determined the financial value of the performance units in partial evaluation categories by types of research. By multiplying the number and value of the performance units according to the evaluation categories, the resulting amount of the organisation's performance bonus in the given evaluation year was determined.

At the same time, the SAS science sections were able to also apply their own specific criteria to the score calculation for publications, citations, projects, etc. During the first year of the evaluation, there were certain differences within the SAS Science Section III when it came to the weight placed on monographs and journal publications; however, the internal weighing criteria were later harmonised for all science disciplines. One of the principles adopted in the SAS Science Section III was the extra score for monographs written in foreign languages, regardless of the place of their publishing. According to this principle, the institutes obtained 1.5 points for a foreign-language monograph published in Slovakia and 1 point for a monograph in Slovak.

From a long-time perspective, the implementation of this criterion caused an increase in the number of domestic monographs published primarily in English. Likewise, the category of monographs of 'particular importance' was introduced in 2020. Regardless of the language and place of publishing, the institutes could obtain increased scores in the performance evaluation, since a 'monograph of particular importance' is scored with three



points, which corresponded to two foreign-language or three domestic monographs.

In the performance evaluations of the second half of the Innovation decade, the Institute of Ethnology SAS regularly took the top positions both within the SAS and its Science Section III (for a detailed overview, see *Questionnaire... 2022*, pp. 120-1). In 2019 (performance evaluation of the years 2017-8), the Institute was able to obtain an extra sum of 66,000 euros (12.82% compared to its total wage allocation), which was the third best result within the SAS. With 79,000 euros (11.87% compared to its total wage allocation) in 2020 (performance evaluation of the years 2018-9), the Institute achieved the best performance within the SAS Science Section III. In 2021 (performance evaluation of the years 2019-20), it was 65,490 euros (7.92% against the wage bill), whereby the Institute achieved the best performance within the SAS Science Section III in FTE terms. In 2022 (performance evaluation of the years 2020-1), this amount reached 66,759 euros (10.47% against the wage bill), with the best performance within the SAS Science Section III in terms of the number of project researchers. The slight decline in the performance evaluations of 2021 and 2022 was due to the fact that, having completed the Interreg DRIM international project (2017-9), the Institute was not carrying out any international project with increased funds at that time. Likewise, the evaluation field 'extra-budgetary resources' was characterised by lower figures.

At the renewed post-pandemic spring evaluation seminar in Smolenice in 2021, the Director of the Institute conducted an internal SWOT analysis 2017-20 of the performance of the Institute based on performance evaluation categories. In addition to the publication outputs, the following principal priorities were defined for the forthcoming period: to intensify efforts to obtain an international project and increase the amount of extrabudgetary funds.

In 2018, the SAS conducted an audit of the current expenses for the daily running of its organisations. The audit identified

differences between the science sections, as well as between the individual institutes. Some institutes of the the SAS Science Sections I and II received a multiple amount of the overheads per employee compared to the SAS Science Section III. Many institutes of this SAS Science Section did not receive from their founder enough funding to cover even the basic overheads of their employees guaranteed by the law (utilities and employee food allowance).

At the meetings of the SAS directors in 2017-8, the Director of the IESA SAS, T. Zachar Podolinská, regularly raised the issue of the insufficient allocation of overheads and the disproportionate redistribution of the overhead costs between SAS Departments. She also initiated several individual meetings with the SAS Vice-President for the SAS Science Section III, Miroslav T. Morovics, as well as with the SAS Vice-President for Budget and Legislation, Juraj Koppel. Ultimately, these negotiations brought a change in the method of overheads calculation (from 2018) and the application of identical principles of overhead expenses distribution between the SAS organisations.

Nevertheless, despite of a regular year-to-year budget increase of SAS by the previous-year inflation rate (since 2019), the system of overheads distribution among the SAS institutes is not adjusted—despite the regular growth of the employee food allowance in the country and the dramatic increase of all prices, especially energy, due to inflation and the global energy crisis.

Until the wage reform in 2019, the SAS management considered the historical effect of the headcount in each workplace when allocating wage funds, which meant that the calculation of the total wage allocation did not reflect the actual number of employees. A similar mechanism was used to calculate possible wage indexation (valorisation based on the Higher-Level Collective Agreement). Many SAS organisations therefore internally opted for a personnel policy of not filling vacant positions. This allowed them to handle the available part of the wage bill more flexibly. This policy was also indirectly recommended by the SAS Presidium, while the directors were

to use the reserve to motivate employees to achieve excellent performance.

On the other hand, as a side effect, this approach began producing an ageing of the SAS, as well as causing generational ruptures. With respect to the SAS, the Ministry of Education began monitoring the so-called *employee limit*, while critically reflecting on the fact that, at the end of the 2000s, the SAS had a high number of actual vacant positions (when converting the registered number of employees to full-time equivalents).

At the end of 2018, the SAS thus launched a demanding discussion on the need to reform the wage calculation and its more accurate and actual distribution within the SAS organisations. Eventually, the wage reform, i.e., the new system of wage calculation per SAS organisations was finally approved by the SAS Assembly in 2019.

The wage reform defined the method of calculation of the institutes' wage bills as follows: 60% of the organisation's funds for the given year to be calculated according to the *historical model* (including the corresponding performance evaluation) and 30% according to the *current need* for reference salaries from the previous year. The calculation according to the historical model operates with a four-year floating interval of the amount of the historically paid wage funds of the institutes. This component also takes into account the finances obtained through performance evaluation funding (before 2022, 42% were funds obtained for the international accreditation results of 2016).

The current component, on the other hand, operates only with the number of actually appointed positions within the organisation up to the so-called *employee limit* of the previous year. If the organisation failed to meet the limit in the given year, the salaries for the vacant positions were not calculated for the updated component. If it was exceeded (due to the coverage of staff costs from extrabudgetary project funds), they were not included in the updated component either.

These economic measures within the Academy also affected the personnel strategy and sustainability of the Institute of

Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS. In 2020, an internal audit of the employee limit allocation to the SAS organisations was conducted. By decision of the SAS Presidium, the limit for the Institute was reduced from 23 to 21.7 (FTE). The Institute's management argued with its personnel policy and with an increased number of female staff members being on maternity leave in the reference period, which was not considered in the calculation of the current occupancy limit. In the course of the next two years, the Institute exceeded the reduced employee limit due to the gradual return of mothers to their workplace. Part of the salaries beyond this limit thus had to be covered from the internal resources of the Institute. The repeated appeals of the Director of the Institute addressed to the SAS Presidium about the need for increasing the employee limit for the Institute lasted until 2023. The SAS management ultimately approved a new limit for the IESA SAS of 22.3 FTE employees, thus averting the risk of stagnation of the organisation's headcount development. Several other scientific organisations found themselves in a similar situation during this period. The employee limit that served only as an indicative figure for the Ministry before 2019 thus became the subject of fights and disputes between the SAS institutes.

The SAS performance evaluation primarily introduced *flat scientometry* into the evaluation of organisations, seeing their publication performance through the lens of the number of monographs and the number of journal studies. Taking into account the language criterion, the organisations began to increasingly publish foreign-language monographs published in domestic publishing houses, since they were scored by the SAS in the same way as monographs published in renowned foreign publishing houses. As far as journal publications are concerned, their quality is measured exclusively on the basis of quartiles (Q1-Q4 according to the Scopus database). Again, there was no difference between domestic and foreign journals. Some institutes of the SAS Science Section III release even two Q1 journals, with increased publication by their own staff. From this evaluation perspective, the energy of authors who publish

articles in high-quality foreign journals with a high percentage of rejected texts and a lengthy rigorous peer-review process is degraded.

In view of the current performance evaluation, the quality of projects and societal impact are measured exclusively through the volume of obtained funds. Its main disadvantage is that the performance measurement units are allocated on a top-down basis, i.e., the amount fixed at the top is allocated to the individual review categories using a fixed percentage. The more outputs (monographs, studies, etc.) of the reference period that are included in the evaluated category, the lower the resulting performance funding unit. The desired performance increase in the highest rated categories thus causes a decrease in their financial value, which is discouraging for many organisations. In addition, the two-year performance evaluation criteria *do not correlate* to the criteria of the SAS international accreditation, which is carried out in four- to six-year cycles.

In 2020, the new central national system of evaluation of research and science in Slovakia was introduced—*Verification of Excellence in Research (VER)*. Currently, the SAS scientific organisations are thus subject to three *completely different* performance evaluations. Each of them drains managerial energy, adds an administrative burden, and makes the strategic (financial, personnel, and performance) planning of science and research organisations in Slovakia more complicated.

The wage reform and audits of the overheads breakdown introduced the principle of more accurate budget allocation to the organisations within the SAS. The change of their legal form into public research institutions in 2022 was accompanied by a dramatic change in the allocation of money: the organisations now only receive 1/12 of their annual budget (so-called *institutional support*), and any changes thereto are made on the basis of amendments. The calculation of wage indexation based on the Higher-Level Collective Agreement, subsequent budget recalculations based on the wage reform principles, and, finally, the calculation of performance funding based on the respective

performance evaluation resulted in the complicated and lengthy, step-by-step approval process of the budget, which is constantly being adjusted. Under the current system of managing public research institutions founded by the Slovak Academy of Sciences, statutory representatives learn about the final budget allocation for their organisation for the given year through an amendment presented in May or June of a respective calendar year.

## Strategic Planning and Performance Evaluation —Innovative Internal Formats

After the completion of the international accreditation process in 2016, the management of the SAS obliged the institutes to create new conceptual tools to streamline the management and coordination of their research activities—*Research and Development Strategy* and corresponding *Action Plan*. For the Institute, these documents—*Development and Research Strategy of the IE SAS 2017-2021* and *Balanced Plan of Actions of the IE SAS 2017-2021*—were drawn up by the Director, T. Zachar Podolinská. The documents were subsequently commented on and approved by the Board of the Director and the Scientific Board, and handed over to the SAS Presidium.

The Institute chose an innovative approach to the task of drawing up two new strategic documents. First, a *Balanced Plan of Actions with Implementation Commentaries* was prepared. At that time, the Director of the Institute argued that *linear performance growth is neither possible nor desirable*. ‘For optimal and sustainable grow, the institution needs to know not only its potential but also its limits, since increased quantity could come at the expense of quality and burn-out of the organisation. Therefore, we, as the only institution within the SAS delivered a “balanced” Plan of Actions. At the same time, we supplemented the Plan with executive managerial commentaries, in order to verbalise explicit implementation tools for each “action” proposed. Our “Balanced Plan of Actions with Implementation Commentaries”

was taken with a bit of curiosity and surprise by the SAS top management, even though for us, it was something very natural, coming out of the very nature of strategic planning' (Zachar Podolinská 2023).

To prevent the *Plan of Actions* ending up as a document shelved in the SAS Presidium's office, the Institute made also its internal SWOT analysis, in order to detect its strengths and weaknesses, as well as identify its potential and challenges for the future. In line with the principles of strategic planning, the Institute went beyond the preparation of two required new strategic documents: 'After drawing up the action plan and the strategic vision, I realised that an important flexible top-down and at the same time bottom-up tool for strategic planning and communication was absent at the Institute. The Scientific Concept was a general summary of the key topics that the staff worked on. In reality, however, it did not bind the organisation, the team, research groups and individual researchers to anything. We lacked a flexible strategic planning model to translate the Scientific Concept into publications, specific projects, and applications, or other organisational, popularisation, and dissemination activities. For this reason, I initiated a new operation model in the form of Three-Year Action Plans for research projects and individual researchers. In them, the activities are planned and scheduled by quarter-years. The plans are published on our website in the intranet section and are available to all internal staff members and team leaders. The management can check the planned bottom-up performance and is able to work with this plan— negotiate top-down adjustments in order make the research topics and activities balanced from a strategic perspective. In this way, people have learnt to work with their working time more efficiently and are able to manage and perceive their portfolios both from a longer time perspective as well as the Institute as a single working unit' (Zachar Podolinská 2023).

Once approved by the Director, both individual and project Action Plans become binding for the members of research teams. They are regularly consulted and checked during individual

one-to-one meetings with the Director. The most important action plan elements (publications, projects, conferences) form the Institute's *Road Map* for the following two- or three-year period.

This managerial change, which requires continuously targeted and efficient communication, brought another novelty to the life of the Institute. Since November 2017, working sessions of the entire team (including PhD students) outside the Institute have been organised, where scientific, conceptual, as well as organisational materials are communicated and discussed, along with strategic direction and vision. These meetings are now held twice a year: the spring session evaluates the previous year, checks the fulfilment of the strategic plan, and performs an interim internal SWOT analysis of the performance. In autumn, the needs of the teams and individual researchers to implement the action plans are identified. There is also space for meetings of project teams, presentation of projects and publications, as well as a free presentation under the bloc 'What bothers me and what amuses me', etc. The working sessions are connected with carefully prepared teambuilding activities.

The innovations in management have also affected staff performance evaluations. In 2012–6, the Institute's management applied the scoring system implemented internally in 2006 to set the number of end-year remunerations and individual bonuses. Before 2012, individual annual worksheets were evaluated according to the valid scoring system and the amount allocated by the SAS Presidium was subsequently distributed among the staff according to their scores. Employees with part-time jobs had their remuneration and individual bonuses adjusted according to their working hours.

During her first term as Director, T. Zachar Podolinská gradually cancelled the system of remuneration of research performance based on working hours of individual researchers. Researches working part-time thus began to be remunerated exclusively based on their performance, according to the corresponding performance scale. Mothers returning from maternity leave could choose whether they wanted to be evaluated

based on their current performance, or their performance before they left for maternity leave.

In order to adjust the internal evaluation of the Institute to external perspectives, the scoring system has been regularly updated. For instance, in 2015, extra bonuses were provided for CC, WoS, and Scopus publications, because the Institute had identified a weakness in this area. The implementation of this motivation tool immediately caused an increase in journal publications in the relevant databases and has gradually grown each year.

Another important innovation was the introduction of cumulative calculation of end-year bonuses and of the amount representing the variable salary component in the form of individual allowances in the Institute's annual budget by applying a bottom-up system. This meant that the remuneration for settled outputs became fixed with the intention of encouraging higher performance. The management undertook to cumulatively pay out such amounts of remunerations as calculated bottom-up, i.e., proportionately to staff performance. The amount of funds paid for remunerations both at the end of the year and throughout the year, as well as individual allowances as part of monthly salaries, thus increased several times and continued to increase further each year.

After T. Podolinská assumed her function, the Institute doubled its performance in the course of four years with a simultaneously lower number of scientific staff. The management was able to keep this generous system of above-reference staff remuneration for eight years (2012–9). Thanks to very good performance evaluations, excellent result of international accreditation, and extrabudgetary funds received within two consecutive projects of the Interreg scheme (ETNOFOLK 2011–4 and DRIM 2017–9), the management was able to remunerate the performance of all employees in a transparent way and encourage and motivate the entire team to use its potential more efficiently, as well as reach out to its maximum.

The wage reform in the SAS in 2019 caused the calculation of the annual budget of the institutes to become so complicated

and the funding so unstable and unpredictable that, after discussions within the Board of the Director and upon approval by the Scientific Board, the Institute returned to a top-down remuneration system. After budget allocation and the setting of the rules for remuneration for performance evaluation by the SAS Presidium, the Institute's management would perform a simulation of the annual wage calculation and set the total amount for remuneration purposes in the budget (individual allowances and end-year bonuses). This amount would subsequently be divided among the staff members according to the valid scoring system.

After the system of funds allocation by the SAS Presidium according to the performance evaluation rules was introduced in 2017, the Institute's management added another tool to the remuneration system—in order to distribute the extra money pursuing a transparent and fair logic. Based on the discussions within the academic community, the extra-finances for performance evaluation of 2016–7 were paid out to the employees according to their performance corresponding to the years of respective evaluation. Thus, for a short period of 2018–20, the Institute simultaneously applied two scoring systems. The end-year remunerations and individual staff evaluations were based on the internal scoring system, while extraordinary half-year bonuses were paid out on the basis of external performance evaluation results.

In an effort to simplify the internal performance evaluation system and bring it closer to international standards, the Director prepared a major reform of the internal score-based evaluation system at the end of 2018. This reform was presented to the academic community in the spring of 2019 at a meeting in Smolenice. After discussions, the academic community approved the change in the calculation of the cumulative amount for remuneration into a *top-down system*, thus meeting the condition of stability and sustainability of the remuneration system.

At the same time, the idea of implementing a *single evaluation system* was approved by accommodating both external as well



internal evaluation scope. The new evaluation system introduces *individual staff performance profiles* that reflect and rate a whole spectrum of activities and achievements: publications and citations, on-going projects as well as submitted proposals, supervision of PhD students, and contribution to the development of the Institute's societal impact, which is manifested by the researchers' activities related to the application, dissemination, and popularisation of scientific knowledge or the organisation of scientific and expert events.

After repeated discussions within the academic community and approval by the Scientific Board of the Institute, the new system was implemented at the end of 2021. The new performance evaluation scope identified previously less visible researchers who dedicated their time to the preparation of projects, trained PhD students, significantly popularised, disseminated, or worked on applied projects.

It also made it possible to bring the Institute's performance closer to the scope of international evaluations which largely consider the project condition, societal impact, and infrastructure of institution under evaluation. This meant that even after the introduction of a new type of science and research evaluation in Slovakia in 2022—*Verification of Excellence in Research (VER)*, the Institute did not have to change anything in its internal evaluation system.

Furthermore, following the debates within the academic community, the team came to the conclusion that it was familiar with the definition of quality and excellence in the current international science, and therefore the Institute preferred to adjust its internal evaluation system and strategy preferably in line with international evaluation trends. On the occasion of the next international accreditation of the Institute in 2022, its Director clearly declared in the accreditation questionnaire (in the Future Prospects and Vision section) that the Institute would systematically focus on frontier research and support excellent research, which she called a *qualitative turn* in the history of research development of the institution.

## Research, Thematic Integrity, and Innovations

The Innovation decade was characterised by the strong presence of a still productive group of members of the Generation of Builders in the Institute, who continued developing the conceptual line of research of 'traditional folk culture' and 'cultural heritage' producing thematic syntheses, as they were used to in the 'golden era' of their generation in the Institute. They thus developed working cooperation with the Institute and continue publishing even when retired (Benža Ed. 2015, 2015, 2017, 2019; Danglová 2014, 2019; Slavkovský 2013, 2014).

It is worth noting that, in the Innovation decade, the fourth thematic line of the Scientific Concept, which focused on the theory and history of the discipline and the history of the Institute in the framework of the national science and research ecosystem in Slovakia, was presented evenly in the works of both the Builders (Slavkovský 2012) and representatives of the Transformation (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016) and Innovation Generations (Panczová, Kiliánová, and Kubisa 2021, 2023). The Institute also paid attention to the Generation of Founders and invested efforts in publishing personal bibliographies and summaries of life-achievements of its iconic figures—Andrej Melicherčík (Hlôšková 2018, 2021a), Božena Filová (Kiliánová and Potančok, Eds. 2017), and Soňa Burlasová (Krekovičová and Potančok, Eds. 2013). The key personalities of the Generation of Builders were reflected according to their life anniversaries—Ján Botík (Danglová 2018; Kiliánová 2018) and Milan Leščák (Kiliánová 2020).

Through natural communication with other disciplines of humanities and social sciences, the new topics were simultaneously opened up: a critical look at the relationship between collective memory and the Roma Holocaust (Kumanová and Mann, Eds. 2014); the reflection of the socialist regime in Slovakia of the 1948–89 period in food and culinary culture (Stoličná 2015); the penetration of modern secular holidays in Slovakia at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries (Zajonc 2020, 2022), and others. With a view to reflecting on the current

social challenges, other perspectives and backgrounds for the exploration of traditional issues were looked for, such as holidays and feasts (Popelková, Ed. 2014); funeral rituals (Salner 2014); civil ceremonies during the socialist period (Beňušková 2017), etc.

The Institute's research and publication teams, even considering its less than two dozen regular employees, were formed from representatives of different age groups and specialisations. What brought them together was the qualitative approach, ethnographic methods of work in the field, and the ways of collecting empirical data in their constant working discussions pursuing their scientific goals. During the Innovation decade, the scientific institution largely opened to methodological innovations and opened the doors to interdisciplinarity. According to S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, it is good that the backgrounds for various directions in ethnology, anthropology, religious studies, as well as other disciplines 'find their place at the Institute. I consider it important that none of them "pushes out" the others in the future (as we could see in some other organisations)' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 12). Similarly, M. Vrzgulová views the strengthening of the interdisciplinary and anthropological line at the Institute as an important developmental element: 'Cooperation with other disciplines and the integration of social anthropology represents for me an opportunity to explore more comprehensively and, hence, understand the processes and phenomena in society that interest us. I consider this development inevitable for the creation of synergies and new quality' (in: T. Zachar Podolinská 2022).

As a result of the theoretical innovations among well-established ethnological and folklorist topics of the Institute (*Výročné správy... 2012-22*), new research areas found their place there, including the social inclusion of Roma, conflict and consensus, social inequalities, migration, transgender studies, ageism, civic activism, conspiracy theories, labour migration, research on non-religion, and others. During this period, the Institute incorporated them into its basic research in Slovakia and beyond, bringing a whole range of important scientific publication

outputs (e.g., Zajonc 2012, 2013; Hlinčíková et al. 2014; Podolinská and Hrustič, Eds. 2015; Gyárfáš Lutherová and Hlinčíková, Eds. 2016; Voľanská 2016; Panczová 2017; Vrzgulová, Voľanská, and Salner 2017; Wiesner 2017; Zachar Podolinská, Ed. 2019; Panáková 2020; Winkler 2021; Voľanská and Haberlandová 2021; Zachar Podolinská 2021b; Salner 2021b, 2022 ).

Visual anthropology oriented on documentary film appeared to be a specific feature of the innovation trend. Several staff members of the Institute deal with documentary film production—despite the fact that documentary (anthropological) film is not yet an officially recognised and registrable scientific output in Slovakia. Z. Beňušková and D. Ratica prepared several documentary films under projects covering the history of the discipline—biographic profiles of important scientific personalities of Slovak ethnology (see *Osobnosti slovenskej etnológie*). The youngest representative of this line at the Institute is Soňa Gyárfáš Lutherová, who translates her expertise as an anthropologist into the design, script, and direction of films. She presented her first documentary film *Zatopené* in 2017 (*Flooded* 2016). Thanks to external subsidies, as well as professional guarantee and formal patronage based on agreements between the Institute and commercial production companies, in 2019–22, she created her second anthropological documentary film *Šťastný človek. A Happy Man (2023) (Výročné správy... 2019-22)*. She visually depicts themes of home, property, and transgender identity that she also deals with in her basic research. The methodological shift of visual research in social sciences is also pursued in the work of another visual anthropologist, who has worked at the Institute since 2019—Jaroslava Panáková. Through an analysis of her field material from Chukotka in the Russian Far East, her monograph (2020) reveals the general mechanisms of how the socio-cultural context and the environment in which people live influence the relationship between the visual perception of reality and the creation of its multifaceted representatives or images in the form of so-called visual regimes.

In the second half of the Innovation decade, stronger thematic lines were formed within the Institute, which were also reflected in the drafting of project applications, successful projects, and teams. Six thematic lines can be identified in this regard: (1) research on the contemporary forms of holidays and rituals, (2) memory studies (Holocaust studies and the oral history of socialism), (3) Romani studies (applied anthropology), (4) religious studies, (5) migration studies; and (6) research on the cultural heritage. This period was also marked by the intention to establish a department or hub for visual anthropology (for more details, see Zachar Podolinská and Wilsch, Eds. 2022). Despite the shaping of the new key research lines, the Institute respected the freedom of research by the individual staff members and supported their particular research passions.

Tomáš Winkler, who came to the Institute as a PhD student in 2016, welcomed this fact as a researcher straight after defending his dissertation thesis in 2020: 'What I consider the greatest benefit of my work at the Institute is the fact that I can deal, both at the theoretical and empirical levels, with topics that I like and am interested in (urban ethnology, civic activism, cultural and creative centres, i.e., research on Nová Cvernovka in Bratislava). This is mainly thanks to the thematic diversity of research at the Institute. Although some topics covered by the Institute are not so close to me, I consider it good and important that we explore with them and "do not walk" only along a single thematic and theoretical line' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 14).

### Increase of Grant Resources and Slovak Research and Development Agency Projects

During the Innovation decade, the Institute reviewed its strategy of obtaining grants for national projects. In the previous period, the Institute's portfolio of national projects was built principally on lowest-level projects (i.e., VEGA) led by senior and PI researchers. The new management encouraged the postdocs to get familiar with the project know-how and apply for their

own VEGA projects. In the second half of the Innovation decade, younger researchers submitted applications and obtained VEGA project grants as principal investigators: T. Hrustič, Z. Panczová, L. Voľanská, V. Bahna, A. Wiesner, and S. Gyárfáš Lutherová (*Výročné správy...* 2016–22).

Similarly, senior and excellent researchers were motivated to prepare and submit excellent national projects with the Slovak Research and Development Agency (APVV). In this context, the Institute reconsidered the common strategy of submitting only one APVV project application per institution, fearing that the Institute's projects do not compete with each other. As the result of a growing number of submitted APVV project applications on behalf of the Institute, there was an increase not only in the number of approved projects, with the Institute being the principal project coordinator, but also the total number of APVV projects. These had an interdisciplinary character and were carried out under cooperation across SAS departments (with human geographers, botanists, geographers, architects, etc.).

The organisation thus significantly expanded its extrabudgetary resources. This can be illustrated by the fact that, in the second half of the Innovation decade, all VEGA grants brought the Institutes 40–50 thousand euros annually. Approximately the same amount of funds was obtained annually by the Institute through one APVV project, in the case that it was its main coordinator. While a total of nine VEGA projects were carried out in the period 2012–5, which brought a total of 212,830 euros for the fulfilment of basic research tasks, a total of 17 VEGA projects with the Institute's staff as the principal investigator and five projects as co-investigator brought 273,690 euros in 2016–21.

The change of the Institute's project strategy was manifested not only in a growing number of executed projects, but also in a considerable increase in extrabudgetary resources: while the Institute carried out only one APVV project with its staff in the position of co-investigators in the period 2012–15, which did not bring any external finance, in 2016–21, it was three APVV

projects with the Institute as the principal coordinator and six projects with co-investigators, bringing a total of 483,324 euros of extrabudgetary finance.

In addition, the Institute was successful in obtaining national projects beyond the VEGA and APVV schemes. The development project of the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sports of the Slovak Republic, entitled *Crisis—A Threat As Well As a Challenge. The Strategy of Coping with Pandemic Situation in Families and at Schools*, with T. Zachar Podolinská as its coordinator, and L. Voľanská and S. Gyárfáš Lutherová as investigators, was executed in collaboration with the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava in 2022–3. The project brought over 121,000 euros to the Institute and, at the same time, made it possible to employ three PhD students.

Of the APVV projects carried out by the Institute, we shall only mention those in which it exercised the role of the principal coordinator. In 2017, the Institute thus obtained two of its own APVV projects. The first of them was called *The Socio-Cultural Capital of Successful Villages as a Source of Sustainable Development of the Slovak Countryside* (APVV 2017–21). The project with a major application segment was led by D. Luther, who, in addition to the workplace team, also coordinated researchers at two Slovak universities. Among other outputs, it prepared a monothematic issue of the *SN/SE* in 2019 (Vol. 67(3)). Its coordinator edited the final monograph in Slovak (Luther, Ed. 2021) and also published a synthesis of the project findings in English in the form of an e-book (2021).

In the framework of the second project coordinated by the organisation, entitled *The Current Images of Socialism* (APVV 2017–21), ethnological teams from the Institute and three Slovak universities collaborated under the leadership of M. Vrzgulová. They focused on collecting biographical narratives on the lives of the witnesses of the period when the Communist Party was in power in Slovakia. The research methodology was defined in collaboration with the Oral History Centre of the Institute for

Contemporary History of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. The project was accompanied by a number of media releases, application and popularisation activities. In 2019, the project's co-investigator, L. Voľanská, organised an international panel *Current Images of Socialism* in the framework of the international 14<sup>th</sup> Congress of SIEF in Santiago de Compostela. In October 2020, during the pandemic, the project managed to organise a virtual conference *Memory of the Communist Past* and published two scientific monographs (Voľanská and Haberlandová 2021; Vrzgulová, Ed. 2020). In 2022, the project was acknowledged by the Agency for excellent research results.

In 2018, the IESA SAS as principal coordinator obtained support for Daniel Škobla's project *Analysis of Barriers in Access to Employment for Marginalised Groups of Population: Selected Regions of Slovakia from the Socio-Economic, Geographic, and Socio-Anthropological Perspectives* (APVV 2018–22). This project, oriented on one of the most pressing social problems in Slovakia, produced a range of application outputs and scientific publications based on the acquired knowledge (Filčák and Škobla 2019; Škobla and Filčák 2020; Filčák, Škobla, and Dokupilová 2020).

### **Strong Emphasis on Popularisation —Continuity with Previous Generations**

Even in the last decade, the Institute worked conceptually on sharing the knowledge from the different fields of its focus in the public. Under the popularisation project *Radio Lexicon of Folk Culture*, which was prepared by the Institute of Ethnology SAS in 2012–3 in collaboration with the public Slovak Radio, a set of authors' works were created and recorded by eleven members of the project team in cooperation with two radio editors. Radio Regina broadcasted 230 parts throughout 2013 (*Novinky v programovej štruktúre...* 2013). In 2013, the SAS Prize for the *Popularisation of Science* was awarded to the project team for this successful media output in the form of a radio series (*Výročná správa...* 2014, p. 77).

An innovative approach to science popularisation has long been applied by M. Vrzgulová—as a collaborator of the *Forgotten Slovakia* initiative, she presented scientific knowledge on authoritarian regimes, fascism, extremism, and other forms of violence at public discussions with citizens on the squares of Slovak towns and cities. This initiative met with large appreciation by society and was awarded the *Human Rights Award 2017* by the US Embassy in the Slovak Republic (*Ambassador... 2017*). In 2018, this scientist was awarded the SAS Prize for science popularisation and educational activities. The Institute's popularisation activities were awarded by the management of the Academy in the following period as well: in 2021, this prize was given to Z. Panczová for sharing scientific knowledge on the origins and dissemination of conspiracy theories and, in 2022, to K. Popelková for the popularisation of the newest research findings on the transformation of Slovakia's holiday and feast culture (*Výročné správy... 2017-22*).

### Entering Europe—International Projects and Networking

The Innovation decade is characterised by a considerable increase in the number of international projects carried out by the Institute. It is also worth mentioning that almost all of them had an important application nature and societal impact as well. For instance, in 2012, it was the applied international project (REF SLO 045) *Roma Inclusion in the Majority Society through Targeted Financial Support and Mentoring of Roma Children at Secondary Schools*. Based on desk research and extensive qualitative research, a research team from the IE SAS (T. Podolinská, T. Hrustič, and PhD student Marek Hojsík) delivered an external evaluation of the Roma secondary school scholarship granted by the Roma Education Fund. The IE SAS gathered over 50 individual interviews during the collection of qualitative data. The focus group method was used to collect data from another 60 respondents. Field research was conducted in more than 20 secondary schools. The authors summarised the

research results in a research report for REF and for the Slovak organisation that implemented the project.

As for application research projects in 2013, the Institute participated in the international project *Crimes against Civilian Populations during WW2: Victims, Witnesses, Collaborators, and Perpetrators*, implemented under the patronage of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (Washington, US). The main objective of the project was to capture the testimonies of non-Jewish people about the fates of local Jews in various European countries, as well as stories of rescuers, Roma people, etc. The main research coordinator in Slovakia was M. Vrzgulová from the Institute of Ethnology SAS, who set up the entire research team together with the Israeli historian, Nathan Beyrak. The project outputs included DVD records with bio-questionnaires, a summary of interviews and their transcription, as well as a body of oral history narratives. These outputs became part of the Institute's archive in 2014. Among the important outputs, the compilation of education programme for teachers for the Methodology and Pedagogy Centre of the Education Ministry should be mentioned (*Selected Aspects and Methods of Education on the Holocaust in Slovakia*, author: M. Vrzgulová). As an important follow-up, the education project of the Jewish Community Museum was carried out. Under the project, two education rounds were organised at secondary schools managed by the Bratislava Self-Governing Region. The project was listed in the SAS Annual Report 2013 among the most important outputs in the part 'Addressing issues of social praxis' (*Výročná správa... 2014*, p. 24).

In the first half of the Innovation decade, the Institute, within the cultural heritage studies segment, focused on the accomplishment of research tasks under the (above-mentioned) European ETNOFOLK project (2011-4), and successfully joined the international project *Innovative Methods in Education for Supporting Partnerships—InovEduc* in 2015-7. The main objective of the project was to remove existing barriers in cross-border cooperation. The project was supported from EEA grants and Norwegian grants: Co-operation towards Common Values). The



Eastern Slovakia and Lower Carpathian regions have a common history of over a thousand years. This fact is not reflected sufficiently in the teaching process and in the awareness of today's (young) people on both sides of the border. The specific project objectives included the training of teachers on both sides of the border, development of co-operation between educational institutions, the production of methodological work sheets for the purposes of dissemination of information, and the creation of 3D models of selected objects—ten in Slovakia and another ten in Ukraine. In 2017, methodological sheets for secondary schools were published as part of the project. The project results were also presented to the professional public through an international conference held on April 4, 2017 in Michalovce (for more, see *InovEduc*).

In 2017-9, the Institute became a member of the international consortium of nine institutions dealing with the agenda migration within the Danube Basin. The project entitled *Danube Region Information Platform for Economic Integration of Migrants* (DRIM; EU Interreg Danube Transnational Programme; 2014-20) was coordinated by the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia. The main project was the creation of a functional information portal for labour migrants in all partner countries. Under the heading of the project and in line with the predefined and approved methodology, each country created a five-language version of the national portal with a robust body of all necessary information for labour migrants (see *Danube Compass*). In addition to the national portal, the research team of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS prepared a methodological framework and two scientific publications (Divinský and Zachar Podolinská et al. 2018; Hlinčíková and Sekulová, Eds. 2019).

In 2021-2, the IESA SAS took part in the *World Values Survey Wave 7* (WVS Wave 7) for Slovakia, based on the Memorandum of Cooperation with the Institute for the Research of Social Cohesion in Modern Societies (Germany). On behalf of the IESA SAS, T. Zachar Podolinská became the official co-researcher

of the WVS project. Every three years, the World Value Survey Association organises the largest and most comprehensive survey of standards, values, and beliefs in the world. To place these categories in an appropriate context, the sociodemographic, economic, and ethnological data are collected across almost 100 countries from around the world. The resulting dataset is the most comprehensive source of social science information about the respective countries, with the possibility of transnational comparison. The WVS is the primary source of data for international institutions, such as the United Nations, the World Bank, OECD, or OSCE, and for the nation states as such. Slovakia has not participated in the WVS since 1998. The WVS project and its implementation through the DEKK Institute in Bratislava and IESA SAS also obtained the support of the state administration analytical units. The data were collected via the FOCUS agency in 2021. In 2022, the whole dataset was analysed and made available to the public as an open-source database.

In addition to project activity, by 2015, the number of international conferences, the main coordinator of which was the Institute, increased to a total of one to two per year (*Questionnaire... 2016*); in the second half of the decade, this number totalled fifteen (*Questionnaire... 2022*). Similarly, the Institute's involvement in international networks, especially COST actions, grew significantly: while there was one such project before 2015, their number increased to eight in the period 2015-22.

In 2015, the Institute of Ethnology SAS was involved through its researcher L. Voľanská in the COST international project *Ageism, a Multinational, Interdisciplinary Perspective* (Action IS 1402; 2014-8). Two other young researchers (Z. Panczová, V. Bahna) were appointed in 2016 for another COST project (Action CA15101) *Comparative Analysis of Conspiracy Theories*. In 2018, D. Škobla joined the COST network called *The International Ethnic and Immigrant Minorities' Survey Data Network* (Action CA16111; 2018-21).

In 2022, the IESA SAS was a member of six COST action projects: *Who Cares in Europe?* (CA18119; 2018-23; L. Voľanská and S. Gyárfáš Lutherová), *Worlds of Related Coercions in Work*

(CA18205; 2019–23; D. Škobla), *Decolonising Development: Research, Teaching, and Practice* (CA19129; 2020–4; A. Belák), *Slow Memory: Transformative Practices for Times of Uneven and Accelerating Change* (CA20105; 2021–5; M. Vrzgulová), *Connecting Theory and Practical Issues of Migration and Religious Diversity*, (CA20107; 2021–5; D. Škobla and T. Zachar Podolinská), *Transnational Family Dynamics in Europe* (CA21143; 2022–6; M. Wilsch), and launched one International Visegrad Fund project *Transgeneration Transfer of the Holocaust Trauma—Prevention and Care* (2021–4; M. Vrzgulová).

The COST Action projects within the SAS are also associated with the funds of the SAS internal support project scheme—International Scientific and Technical Cooperation (approximately 2,500 euros annually per international project carried out by a SAS organisation). Given the large number of international projects at the Institute, cumulatively, this support becomes interesting in terms of the coverage of indirect overhead costs of the institution.

In 2021, the IESA SAS, as a partner organisation, implemented an international project within the ERASMUS+ scheme: *Design for All Methods to Create Age-Friendly Housing* (DESIRE; 2020–2; project coordinator: Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava; researchers from the IESA SAS—L. Volanská, S. Gyárfás Lutherová; financial funds for the entire project: 210,885 euros). In 2021, the project team of the IESA SAS organised two international workshops focused on Design for All in an Aging Society and prepared the concept and working version of teaching materials as a project output in 2022 (see *Desire*).

Given its internal SWOT analysis, the Institute extremely intensified its project pro-activity in 2021. It prepared and delivered two ERC grant proposals (ERC-AdG 2021: *TraceMary: Tracing Mary: Marian Devotion in CESE post-WWII Europe*, Proposal ID: 101053732), and ERC-StG 2021: *LiveFamily–Living Post-Socialist Transformation: Study of China and Russia through Family History*, Proposal ID: 101039666), as well as one HORIZON 2020 project as the main coordinator (*CHANSE–Collaboration*

*of Humanities and Social Sciences in Europe*). The ERC-AdG received a positive evaluation (B) and was awarded the ESET Tutorial Prize in 2022, which enables the author to resubmit the proposal. In 2021, the IESA SAS also submitted seven proposals of the HORIZON scheme (one Horizon Europe project and five Horizon 2020 projects—as a research partner of international consortia). The Institute also participated in the preparation of the Slovak Centre for Digital Innovations (SCDI) project proposal, under a project call under the Horizon Europe DEP II Digital Technologies and Digitisation of Industrial Enterprises (Industry 4.0). The project application achieved the ‘Seal of Excellence’ and was financed from national resources.

G. Kiliánová, the former Director of the Institute, claims that the project activity and proactivity of the Institute is commendable: ‘Compared to the period when I was the Director, the number of involvements in international projects, as well as projects conducted by the Institute itself, significantly increased. Understandably, these projects are more demanding in terms of work organisation and staff performance. In addition, strong project engagement changes the method of scientific work as well. For instance, scientists are expected to be more flexible, able to “jump” into new topics, and acquire the necessary knowledge. The mastering of English, as well as other foreign languages is becoming an inevitable skill of staff. These are the attributes of a modern, European-level scientific workplace’ (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 10).

### Romani Studies: A Supernova of the Innovation Decade

In 2012, T. Podolinská became a member of the oldest international society bringing together experts in Romani studies from all over the world—the *Gypsy Lore Society* (GLS, established in 1888, UK). In 2013, the Institute was successful in applying for organising the GLS annual conference in Slovakia. In 2014, the conference was held in Slovakia with a record number of participants (over 220) and acquired the character of a world

congress. T. Zachar Podolinská was subsequently elected to the managing body of the society, the Board of Directors, exercising the position of its Secretary from 2017 to 2019. In 2018, she became a member of the Editorial Board of the prestigious *Romani Studies* journal, published by the Liverpool University Press. In 2019, she was elected as the GLS President, historically becoming the first President ever from Central and Eastern European countries.

Thanks to the international social capital of T. Podolinská, in 2016, the Institute became the founding member of the network of 27 European organisations dealing with Romani studies, the *Network of Academic Institutions in Romani Studies (NAIRS)*.

In 2011-8, the Institute carried out two consecutive VEGA projects on Romani issues. Under the project *The 'Roma' Label—Its Emic and Ethic Reflections and Social Impact* (VEGA; 2015-8), a collective publication *Čierno-biele svety* [Black and White Worlds] (Podolinská and Hrustič, Eds. 2015), was prepared, with the contribution of 22 authors from various disciplines. Based on empirical research, these studies showed how the construction of the Roma image was associated with the collective attribution of certain ethnic and cultural stereotypes. The studies that described the analysed issues from the perspective of the Roma community became useful in thinking about why some balancing policies and government measures fail in real life. The scientific publication thus became an attempt to present a better understanding of the mutual interactions between the Roma and mainstream society. In 2016, the book was nominated for the *Roma Spirit* award in the media category. This prize has been awarded in Slovakia since 2009 by an independent public platform focused on the development of intercultural dialogue and activities promoting social inclusion (see *Finalisti 2016*).

In 2015, the Institute became part of the international network for young scientists in the field of social sciences and humanities, the *Copernicus Graduate School (CGS)*, in the framework of which T. Podolinská and T. Hrustič were involved as invited lecturers specialised in Romani studies in 2016. In

2019, T. Zachar Podolinská established the *PAN-ROM* academic platform for the networking of researchers in Romani studies, dealing with research on religiosity. In 2019, she obtained the ERC Visiting Scholar Fellowship for a three-month stay at St Andrews University to write an ERC project application with a topic from Romani studies. She submitted the ERC Advanced Grant project in 2020, dedicating a part of it to the mapping of ethnicised and acculturated forms of the Virgin Mary in post-socialist countries.

In 2021, T. Zachar Podolinská and T. Hrustič edited the monothematic issue of the *Romani Studies* journal (Vol 31(2)) on religiosity among the Roma in Europe. In 2021, the Institute's first publication in the field of Romani studies was published by the Palgrave MacMillan publishing house (Zachar Podolinská 2021b). The publication won the *SAS Top Publication award* in 2022.

In the second half of the Innovation decade, the Romani studies were considerably strengthened with the arrival of two new researchers, Daniel Škobla and Andrej Belák. In 2018-22, D. Škobla, as a senior researcher, led the APVV project at the Institute entitled *Analysis of Barriers in Access to Employment for Marginalised Groups of Population: Selected Slovak Regions from the Socio-Economic, Geographic, and Socio-Anthropological Perspective (MARGIWORK)*. Furthermore, in cooperation with the Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences SAS, he was involved in the execution of several important application projects in 2018-20 on waste treatment, mapping of basic infrastructure in Roma communities, and others. On behalf of Slovakia, he was also the coordinator of several COST action projects (CA16111 2018-21; CA18205 2020-3) focusing on Roma issues. As an expert in Romani studies and medical anthropologist, A. Belák came to work at the Institute after obtaining a SAS scholarship under the S. Schwarz support scheme. Thanks to his intensive cooperation with the *Healthy Regions* organisation, he was involved as an employee of the Institute in setting up a network of Roma medical assistants in over 250 settlements throughout Slovakia. After the outbreak of the pandemic in 2020, he created a unique tool for

the monitoring of health in Roma communities, which allowed for early identification of places with potential increased pandemic occurrence of COVID 19. In 2020, A. Belák received the *White Crow Award* for Social Innovators for his efforts and expertise applied during the pandemic period in marginalised Romani settlements (see *Biele vrany 2020*).

The Institute regularly announced Romani studies topics for PhD theses, thanks to which several young experts were trained during the Innovation decade: L. Hrustičová (supervisor T. Zachar Podolinská), J. Štofej (supervisor A. Mann), and Ivana Šusterová (supervisor T. Hrustič). At present, E. Rigová (supervisor T. Hrustič), Korina Mitrová (supervisor D. Škobla), and Kristína Cichová (supervisor A. Belák) are currently being trained at the Institute in this field.

The International Accreditation Panel stated in its review report of 2022 that the Institute had developed into a world leader in the field of Romani studies (*Meta-Panel Assessment Report... 2022*). At the beginning of 2023, the Institute employed Elena Marushiakova, who had terminated her activities at St Andrews University in Scotland as a PI of ERC-AdG in Romani studies. After several decades, she thus followed up on her work at the Institute in the 1960s. E. Marushiakova is one of the world leaders in Romani studies, having promoted the Institute's position in this field even more. In 2023, the IESA SAS also signed a contract as a hosting institution within the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, supporting the training of excellent postdocs in Europe. PhD student Petr Nuska from Durham University will thus work at the Institute on his project *Romani Chords: Uncovering Romani Practice for Harmonic Accompaniment with Musical, Visual, and Ethnographic Analysis*.

### Promotion of and Innovations in Applied Research

The Innovation decade was also accompanied by a change in the approach to applied research at the national level. Applied research usually did not bring any direct financial resources or major

publication outputs to the Institute. Nevertheless, the management was able to identify its importance early and supported it consistently. In its scientific strategy and staff evaluation, the Institute allocated parity space to the applications, along with publication, project, training, organisational, and popularisation activities, and began calling for the formalisation of cooperation projects under official contracts and agreements. These steps allowed for strategically focusing the capacities invested in social innovation on direct interaction with basic research.

During the 2010–20 decade, the civic engagement activities became increasingly oriented on practical application. As invited experts from the Institute began to systematically provide their scientific knowledge to non-academic entities. For the Institute, this shift meant an extension of its societal impact, as well as a rich source of innovation stimuli.

Where the application topic was in direct interest of government bodies, scientists with an excellent professional credit, proven through their practical activities, became appointed experts for the decision-making sphere in the given field (e.g., M. Vrzgulová as a member of the national *Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Research, Education, and Remembrance* since 2005 and later of the *International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance* (2005–13); L. Vol'anská as a member (2015–20) and, since 2021, Chairwoman of the Expert Committee for the Review of Proposals for Inscription in Slovakia's Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic; Vice-Chair (2015–9 and, since 2021, Chairwoman of the Board of the Minister of Culture for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage; member (2014–8), national delegate (2019–20) and, since 2021, Chairwoman of the *UNESCO Evaluation Body at the Intergovernmental Committee of the States Parties to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*; T. Hrustič as a representative of the Slovak Republic to the *Advisory Committee for Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of Council of Europe* (2014–8 and from 2022 until the present); A. Bitušíková as



a national delegate of the Slovak Republic to the *Governing Board of the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change at the European Commission* (2019–22) and, since 2022, as a national delegate to the *Standing Working Group on Gender in Research and Innovation at the Council of the European Union* (*Výročné správy...* 2012–22).

In collaboration with the Pan-European University and other partners, the Institute joined a project funded through Norwegian Grants, called *InovEduc* (2015–7), which focused on applied research of traditional culture under innovative education (coordinated by Ľ. Voľanská; consultants: V. Bahna, S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, and M. Hlinčíková). Another example was the Public Affairs Institute's project *Secrets from Migrant Diaries on the Edge: More Inclusion for People under International Protection* (2014–5). M. Hlinčíková as its investigator was the co-author of the final monograph (Hlinčíková and Sekulová 2015) and conducted numerous dissemination and popularisation activities on this topic.

The seminar for students from Syracuse University in 2017–9 became successful internationally; the Institute organised for them an expert programme, including lectures, during their study trip to Central Europe (*Výročné správy...* 2017–9). As an original international applied format of the Institute, which was also expected to enhance Romani studies within the Czecho-Slovak sphere, T. Podolinská initiated the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the *Academy of Romani Studies* in 2015. The programme originally consisted of expert lectures for both the lay and expert public, as well as a two-day course of Romani language for the public. In 2018, this format changed into one- or two-day presentation and discussion events focusing on current research and findings. The main objective of these events is to make the Czecho-Slovak expert community specialised in Romani studies meet and present the current trends in this discipline to the general public in Czechia and Slovakia. The Academy takes place alternately in Slovakia and Czechia (*Výročné správy...* 2016–22).

The social relevance, as well as a specific type of feedback on the Institute by Slovak society was confirmed in 2015 by the fact

that three of its staff members—M. Hlinčíková, T. Hrustič, and A. B. Mann—became part of the *Social Innovators Map*, created by the Pontis Foundation with a focus on education, social inclusion, active citizenship, the promotion of democracy, and community development (*Pozrite si mapu...*; *Výročná správa...* 2015).

In 2018, T. Hrustič and D. Škobla became members of a team of independent researchers, whose task was assigned by the Implementation Agency of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, and Family of the Slovak Republic to conduct an evaluation of the impacts of field social work in marginalised Roma communities based on field research. The project was financed by the European Social Fund (Škobla, Hrustič, and Poduška 2019).

D. Škobla was successful in applying his expertise and research experience under projects that he coordinated himself or in which he was engaged while dealing with social problems in the field of Roma integration, human rights, social and environmental inequalities, and exclusion, associated in Slovakia with the life of marginalised Roma communities. Additionally, a number of consultations and cooperation projects with both national and international non-profit organisations took place (Amnesty International, EU Fundamental Rights Agency, European Roma Rights Centre, Friends of the Earth). He was also active in communicating with the national decision-making sphere—the government, ministries, and Office of the Government Plenipotentiary for Roma Communities—and worked as a member or expert guarantor of several projects (for more details, see *Atlas rómskych komunití*), working groups (research on social economies, 2018; sustainable field social work in Roma communities, 2019; desegregation in housing, 2022), as well as advisory government panels (preparation of the Roma Integration Strategy until 2030 in 2020 and of the Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion, and Participation until 2030 in 2022) (*Výročné správy...* 2018–22).

One of the research topics of the Institute—the exploration of the factors of discrimination when it comes to inequalities in access to healthcare due to ethnic origin—became the basis for an application output during the COVID-19 pandemic (2020–2).



The contributory organisation of the Ministry of Healthcare, *Healthy Regions*, contacted the IESA SAS, requesting conceptual assistance in the collection and processing of data that could help the state to effectively monitor and check the pandemic developments within marginalised Roma communities as a specifically threatened population group. The aim of the collaboration was to deliver a proposal free of charge, and to continuously develop and consult the monitoring system. The COVID-19 surveillance system, created by a team of analysts from the *Healthy Regions* organisation led by anthropologist Andrej Belák from the IESA SAS, proved to be a functional instrument during the pandemic period. It was used not only by the *Healthy Regions* in its intervention work in the field of health prevention and promotion at the community level, but also by other state authorities engaged in controlling the pandemic in the country (*Výročné správy... 2020-1*).

In the time-span of the Innovation decade, new areas emerged in the applied agenda of the Institute. The traditional ethnological agenda, such as expertise in the field of cultural heritage safeguarding, museology, or folklorism, which the Institute provided to state authorities and institutions on a stable basis, was extended by the need to respond to societal challenges and urgent problems, bringing innovative approaches to the scientific orientation of the Institute. T. Winkler, a successful PhD student, who became the administrator of the social networks and website of the Institute in 2017, stated: 'I think the applied dimension of our Institute is also represented in research, which may not necessarily fit directly into applied anthropology and "applicability" may not be its primary objective. This is manifested, for instance, in numerous media releases (of which I have the best overview as the web and Facebook editor). These releases show that our colleagues are visible also in the media and the public discourse and contribute with their results and knowledge at the applied level, too. One such example is the coronavirus pandemic, to which our workplace was able to react—including in the form of a web blog or thanks to the expertise and

media presence of many of our colleagues. (...) as a work team, we always "have something to tell" about a wide range of topics, even without purposefully calling some research as applied—a greater or lesser degree of applicability is an organic part of it' (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 15).

## Election of the Director 2016 and 2020

### —The Clash and Communication of Generations

Tatiana Zachar Podolinská remained in office also for the next two four-year terms. In the 2016 election, she ran for this post again as the only candidate. In the selection proceedings, she summarised the successes of the Institute and the innovations that organisation implemented, and presented the challenges for the forthcoming period (2016–9). The Institute awaited a difficult international accreditation (in 2016) and, simultaneously, a change of its legal form, which was to take place at the beginning of the year 2018. After the hearing before the academic community, T. Zachar Podolinská was elected with all the votes of the eligible voters present.

From the managerial perspective, the second term of T. Zachar Podolinská was accompanied by many difficult challenges. In 2017, the funding of the organisations became largely dependent on the newly introduced SAS funding tool—the performance evaluation. After the successful completion of the international project of the Interreg Central Europe—ETNOFOLK (2011–4), it was necessary to ensure another international project with relevant extra-budgetary funds and improve the institutional know-how in applying for top international projects. T. Zachar Podolinská attended several research stays in this regard (Missouri State University, USA, 2015; Södertörn University, Sweden, 2016, 2017; St Andrews University, Great Britain, 2019). These resulted in the submission of more than a dozen applications under the Horizon 2020 project scheme and the preparation of the ERC-AdG project. Her second term as the Institute's Director brought an international accreditation (2016), the preparation of the organisation's transformation that

ultimately failed (2018), generation exchange, a change in the post of the Head of the Secretariat, a change in the system of planning and staff remuneration, the implementation of performance funding, wage reform (2019), as well as the renovation of the workplace and preservation of the collections.

Because of the pandemic, the Director's election did not take place in August 2020, and the SAS Presidium entrusted the management of the Institute to its then Director for another six months. Two candidates applied for the competition at the end of 2020: M. Vrzgulová and T. Zachar Podolinská.

M. Vrzgulová, a representative of the younger Transformation Generation, had had 33 years of work at the Institute behind her at that time, exercising the post of its Scientific Board Chairwoman for a longer period of time (2004–11, 2018–9). In 2009–18, she represented the Institute at the SAS Assembly, and was a member of the SAS Assembly Committee for the SAS Science Section III. Thanks to her scientific activities under several international projects, she was one of the leaders in Holocaust studies and pioneers of the oral history method in qualitative research in Slovakia, with an extensive publication list and experience in project management. In 2018, she obtained the *Gunzenberger-Reichman Family Fellow* at the Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies (Washington, US). She also had numerous collaborations with the civic and third sector (founder and Director of the Holocaust Documentation Centre, member of the Board of Directors of the Milan Šimečka Foundation). As a member of the *Forgotten Slovakia* civic initiative, she received the *Human Rights Award* from the US Embassy in the Slovak Republic (*Ambassador Sterling...* 2017). In 2018, the SAS Presidium appreciated her popularisation activities in combating extremism and anti-Semitism. In 2019, her research and civic activities were acknowledged by the 'Not in Our City' civic platform by awarding her the *Human Forum 2019* prize (TS 2019).

T. Zachar Podolinská ran for the Director's post as the project manager of the Interreg Danube Transnational Programme—DRIM

(2017–9) project, holder of the 'B' rating of the ERC-AdG project on Marian devotion in Europe, a prominent representative of Romani studies at the global level, President of the international *Gypsy Lore Society*, editor of the English publication on Marian devotion in Central and Southern Europe (Zachar Podolinská, Ed. 2019), and author of a monograph published by the prestigious foreign publishing house Palgrave MacMillan (Zachar Podolinská 2021b; published in 2020), project manager of several projects and international teams, and the holder of several prizes.

Both candidates were mature leaders experienced in managing organisations and research teams, acknowledged experts recognised at home and abroad, with a high human credit and team support. The members of the academic community of the Institute assessed and discussed the concepts and visions of both candidates and, with the majority of the votes, elected T. Zachar Podolinská, who thus proceeded to the second round of election. After the successful hearing at the SAS Presidium, the administration of the Academy appointed her as the IESA SAS Director for another four-year term.

Similar to the election competition Kiliánová vs Stoličná, the candidates did not enter a personal conflict before or after the competition, and both of them perceived their candidacies as a correct competition of their visions for the future course of the Institute. Another personal reflection by T. Zachar Podolinská about the given stage of her career as Director: 'In 2018, I was extremely disillusioned about the unsuccessful transformation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences both within the Academy and on the side of the political representations at the Ministry of Education. I even wrote a letter to the Vice-Chair of the SAS Science Section III that I would not run for the next term. In this regard, I also began approaching potential candidates for the next term and Monika [Vrzgulová] was among the three that I contacted. However, at the end of 2020, I increasingly realised the challenges that the Institute would face in the next period. In parallel to the international accreditation, the envisaged transformation of the SAS represented an extraordinary

challenge for the statutory representative. I had the feeling that thanks to my previous experience and social capital, I could be useful for the Institute' (2023).

The competition for the post of the Director in 2020 can be regarded as a contest of two generations and two managerial concepts: on one hand, the younger layer of the Transformation Generation, which was inclined to 'slow down', and the ever-stronger Generation of Innovators on the other. A part of the team did not feel comfortable about the intense workload and pressure on performance and the relatively high number of innovations introduced during the Innovation decade. However, the competition confirmed that the majority of the research members of the team were comfortable with the current direction and innovative drive.

On the other hand, the competition for the post of the Director in 2020 showed that the organisation was ready for another change in the forthcoming decade. While, at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Institute had to confirm its position as a *national leader with European visibility* (competing with the Institute of History, Institute of Archaeology, and Institute of Sociology SAS), in the Innovation decade, it turned to be not only a SAS leading organisation but a *European leader*.

During the Innovation decade, the organisation made every effort to gain a leading position and build a modern European ethnological and anthropological institution, open to interdisciplinary inputs and with a high societal impact factor. In line with international trends and long before the national criteria for science and research evaluation in Slovakia were approved, the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS was ready to review its one-way anthropological turn, rehabilitate historical ethnography and the qualitative forms of research, thematise the importance of the research on cultural heritage, consolidate the integrity of the discipline and, above all, it was ready for a *qualitative turnaround*, reflexive interiorisation, and post-pandemic restoration of internal peace and sound running of the organisation.

## Scientific Concept 2021–5

The Scientific Concept adopted by the Institute in 2016 expired in 2020. On the initiative of T. Zachar Podolinská, the Institute's Scientific Board, led by M. Vrzgulová, launched intensive debates on the new concept, which identified in a bottom-up manner the thematic and methodological direction of the individual researchers. In the spring of 2020, new elections of the Scientific Board took place. Given her intention to run for the Director's post, M. Vrzgulová did not apply for membership in the Scientific Board.

Once the new rules for electing the Scientific Board were approved, this body again had seven members. Five internal members: A. Bitušíková, Z. Beňušková, A. Belák, L. Voľanská, D. Škobla, and two external members: E. Marushiakova from St Andrews University (Great Britain) and H. Kubátová from the Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University Prague (Czech Republic), were elected.

In early 2021, after her appointment as Director, T. Zachar Podolinská initiated a discussion on the Scientific Concept within the new Scientific Board led by A. Bitušíková. Because of the pandemic measures, the draft was discussed by the academic community online. The final concept was approved in March 2021 as a binding document on the Institute's scientific and project policy and the announcement of PhD topics for the period 2021–5.

In the document *The Science and Research Concept... 2021–2025*, the Institute divided its activities into four core research areas or research orientations: (1) Continuity and transformation in the lives of people, groups, and society; (2) Sustainability of the cultural heritage; (3) Challenges of the Anthropocene; (4) The history of the discipline, development of the theory and methodology. The individual concepts are detailed on the basis of specific themes, which present not only current problems being explored, but also questions to answer and issues deliberately set by the Institute's team as extremely important cornerstones of its future scientific orientation.

The first area—*Continuity and transformation in the lives of people, groups, and society*—comprises a wide range of topics, featuring as key words research on family, ageing, gender identities, as well as individual and social memory. Other key topics are the current forms of religion, new spirituality, secularity and atheism, ethnic groups and communities, active citizenship and active participation, and the forms of dissemination of information (including conspiracy theories and hoaxes, etc.).

The second area—*Sustainability of the cultural heritage*—contains a critical analysis of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and its values; collective memory; the role of traditions for present-day communities; ethnic groups and national minorities; new uses of the cultural heritage and creative industry; the misuse of the cultural heritage under various regimes; feasts, rituals, and the process of eventisation; narrative folklore; scenic folklorism; world cultural heritage; and the role of cultural heritage in building the resilience of local communities.

The third area—*The challenges of the Anthropocene*—represents the widest range of topics, and outlines the direction of the exploration of social inequalities arising on the basis of different categories (from ethnicity, age, and gender; through social status, education, poverty, religion; up to spatial or social marginalisation) and the possibilities of their elimination, and ensuring the quality of life and sustainable development. The other topics include population ageing, secularisation, experience-based vs. knowledge-based society, research on mobilities and migrations; depopulation of the countryside; urbanisation and new urban challenges; xenophobia, racism, and the consequences of the pandemic. The last cluster of topics comprises new lifestyles; the social causes and impacts of climate change; environmentalism; the impacts and risks of new technologies and artificial intelligence on daily life; ethnic, cultural, and social innovations as a consequence of the digital revolution.

The fourth thematic area of the current scientific concept is the *History of the discipline, the development of the theory and methodology*. In this category, history, theory, and methodology in

ethnological, anthropological, and religious knowledge gained an equal status, associated with a critical reflection on their subjects, methods, and approaches.

The document affirmed the links of all research areas to the existing national and international strategic documents: the programme document *Through Knowledge towards Prosperity—Research and Innovation Strategy for Smart Specialisation of the Slovak Republic (RIS3 2013–21)*, the new EU Horizon Europe programme, as well as the UN Agenda 2030.

When it comes to observing the development of science at the Institute and the perspectives of the research orientation formulated in the relevant Scientific Concept, the 77 years of the institution can be characterised by a major qualitative transformation of the content of the *ethnography/ethnology* discipline. Thanks to close links to and overlaps with religious studies and anthropology, the ethnology pursued by the Institute entered the international space and underwent theoretical, thematic, and organisational innovations. At the beginning of the 2020s, the organisation thus self-reflectively claimed to be part of the prominent institution of ethnological, social-anthropological, and religious research in Slovakia and Central Europe. The concept affirmed that the Institute assured parity between basic and problem-oriented or applied research, strived for a balance between historical and social-science direction, while attempting to ‘contribute to seeking scientific answers to current, historical, as well as timeless issues’ (*The Science and Research Concept... 2021–2025*, p. 1).

On the threshold of the 2020s, an important turn can be observed in the concept related to the methodological background, which can also be characterised as a shift from ‘unrestrained interdisciplinarity’ towards the identification and development of unique research methods: ‘Unlike other historical and social sciences, we build primarily on field research and use mainly qualitative methods for data gathering (...). The concept defines them as in-depth research in the form of long-term and recurrent ethnographic fieldworks,

interviews, qualitative surveys, and questionnaires. In the field of rehabilitated historical ethnography, the methods used are defined as critical work with archive resources and use of the *oral history* method. The innovative approaches to data analysis also include discursive and content analysis and the use of statistical methods for analysis of larger data corpuses. Last but not least—for instance, in the field of religious studies—the Institute claims also to work with experimental research methods in social laboratories. With regard to visual anthropology, the Institute declares increased use of the methods and processes which are commonly used in the production of documentary films (*The Science and Research Concept... 2021-2025*, p. 1).

In addition, the new Scientific Concept verbalised the intention to ‘support the systematic building of scientific collections in the framework of digital humanities and involvement in EU infrastructures’. This manifests the awareness of the need to make all data concentrated at the Institute during the previous period available as quickly as possible, both to scholars and the wider public.

G. Kiliánová, as the main author of scientific concepts in the previous Transformation decade, commented on the new Scientific Concept as follows: ‘I have read the IESA SAS Science and Research Concept for the period 2021-2025 (...), as it could represent a picture of changes in the Institute’s orientation. Yes, there is a change, indeed. I can see it in the approach to basic and applied research. They are in an equal position and, in fact, the concept wishes to “keep balance between basic research and research oriented on current social problems” (p. 2). One can only agree with it. It is wise that the very next line reads as follows: “keep balance between the historical and social-science direction” (p. 2). The combination of the historical and social-science focus distinguishes the IESA SAS from other institutes of the SAS Science Section III, and I welcome the fact that it is included in the Concept’ (in: Popelková 2021b, p. 9).

## International Accreditation 2022

The second international accreditation took place six years after the first one (2016, for the years 2012–5); the evaluation therefore covered a period longer by two years compared to the previous one (2022, for the years 2016–21). During the last six years of the given period of assesment, the institution focused on implementing the recommendations addressed by the international Review Panel in 2016. The Meta-Panel presented four key recommendations to the Institute, which were implemented by the team’s joint efforts by the 2022 accreditation:

(1) The Panel recommended the Institute to change the name. After a discussion with the entire team of the Institute, including voices of both the International Advisory Board and the Scientific Board, the Institute—on the occasion of the planned SAS transformation in 2018—officially addressed the SAS Presidium with a request to change the name of the Institute from the Institute of Ethnology SAS to the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS. The request met with a positive response. According to SAS Presidium Resolution No. 314 of 21 March 2018, Amendment No. 1 to the Founding Document of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences No. 740/0214/2003 entered into force, officially changing the name of the institution. The anthropologisation of the Institute was thus completed, along with the rehabilitation of historical ethnography and the promotion of applied forms of research aimed at reaching a societal impact.

(2) The Panel also recommended the Institute: (a) to elaborate a plan of how to intensify international visibility of the Institute’s research outputs and (b) put more emphasis on article production. In order to enhance its international visibility, the Institute maximised and intensified its research proactivity, elevated the project know-how, and proactively looked for strong international consortia. During the reference period, two ERC grant applications were delivered; one Horizon 2020 application in which the Institute acted as the main coordinator; eleven



Horizon 2020 applications; two Horizon Europe applications in the position of the partner; six IVF applications; and one Michael Fox Foundation application were submitted. In addition, the Institute's management promoted project activities by hiring a professional project manager on a part-time basis. During the accreditation period, the Institute was considered an attractive working place for foreign researchers; there were three candidates in the SASPRO2 programme (2021), two candidates in the Impulse programme (2021, 2022); the Institute was chosen to be the host institution for an ERC-StG 2021 applicant from the USA (2021); one PhD student from Belarus and one from the UK chose our Institute as the host institution for the MSCA application. During the assessed period, the Institute organised a number of key international conferences as the main organiser (at least one international conference per year). Members of the Institute took part in international PhD schooling (*Copernicus Graduate School*, 2016-7; Seminars for the Syracuse University; 2017-9), and organised international summer schools (e.g., Romani Studies, *NAIRS*, Bratislava 2016, Prague 2018). The Institute also strongly supported the academic mobility of its researchers to prestigious academic institutions abroad: fellowships for individual researchers at Södertörn University (Sweden, 2016), Morton Mandel Center for advanced Holocaust Studies in the United States Holocaust Museum (Washington, D.C, USA 2018), St Andrews University (UK, 2019), Mauritius (2019), and Cuba (2020).

To improve the quality and visibility of its publication outputs, the managerial unit of the Institute encouraged researchers to increase their publishing in international flagship journals and to intensify search for established foreign publishing houses when releasing scientific monographs. The Institute also strongly recommended publishing in internationally recognised and OA journals, and encouraged early career researchers (post-docs) to publish elaborated versions of their PhD works in English (i.e., Winkler 2021). The internal model of the annual Employee Score in the section 'publication outputs' was modified in terms of a major rating for publications in international scientific

peer-reviewed impacted and peer-reviewed journals registered in the WoS and Scopus databases; that is, those considered to be 'flagship' journals for the respective field or discipline. Since 2016, all books released by the Institute (26 monographs) have been published with DOI and as OA. Since 2021, all books published by the Institute have been licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. In 2021, the Institute began publishing e-books (in 2021, five e-Pubs as OA with CC BY 4.0 licence were released). In 2023, the Institute as the first institution in Slovakia, was registered in the international database for OA book publishers—DOAB. Since 2018, the *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology* journal has annually published three issues in English and one in Slovak; all studies have a DOI and the journal is registered in DOAJ. All researchers are required to maintain their ORCID account updated and are encouraged to promote their current research outputs in the footnotes of their working e-mails.

In terms of a visible increase among internationally recognised publishing houses during the given period, the members of the Institute published in Palgrave MacMillan, Policy Press, Routledge, LIT Verlag, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Karolinum, etc. Out of 90 articles published within the Institute in the reference period 2016-21, 57 were produced in English and 33 in Slovak. Out of 35 monographs, eleven were published in English; out of 42 chapters, eleven were written in English and two in German.

To implement the Panel's recommendation to put more emphasis on article production, the Institute paid great attention not only to the quantitative increase of article production, but it also intensified its efforts aimed at high-ranking international journals registered in the WoS and Scopus databases, CCC, and IF journals. According to the internal SWOT analysis, the Institute had already reached its publication maximum; therefore, a shift was achieved by reducing the number of articles published in less visible journals (see table on p. 114, *Questionnaire...* 2022).

The Panel also recommended that the managerial unit of the Institute approached both the SAS and the Ministry of Education,

Science, Research and Sports, to open the doors for the Institute into the European infrastructures within the so-called ESFRI National Roadmap. After Slovakia's enrolment into existing European infrastructures in the field of SSH, the Institute was recommended to enter the European networks, such as DARIAH (Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities) or EUROPEANA. In 2017, the IESA SAS became one of the founding institutions of the DARIAH Central European Hub (DARIAH-CEH), which is aimed at promoting exchanges between Digital Humanities researchers in Central Europe (for more, see *ELTE. DH*). In 2018–20, the IESA SAS participated in the International Visegrad Fund project, *Training Digital Scholars: Knowledge Exchange between the V4 and Austria*, which was successfully carried out by the institutions involved in the DARIAH Central European Hub, interconnecting V4 regional digital humanities activities, preparing lectures and workshops designed to disseminate digital humanities in these countries, and strengthening their international cooperation. At the DARIAH-EU General Assembly, which took place in Warsaw in May 2019, the IESA SAS was unanimously accepted as a Cooperating Partner for a two-year period (2019–21). The IESA SAS is the first Slovak institution to enter this prestigious European research infrastructure (Papaki 2019). In 2021, on the basis of previous collaboration, DARIAH-EU signed a Cooperating Partnership agreement with the IESA SAS for the following three years (2021–4). In the framework of this partnership, the IESA SAS participates in knowledge and technology exchange in the field of digital archiving. This cooperation has also helped consolidate the community of digital humanists and institutions in Slovakia (Papaki 2021).

Finally, the Panel also suggested improving communication between the SAS institutions. Based on the Panel's recommendation, but also as a natural bottom-up call for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary communication, the Institute intensified mutual cooperation within the SSH section of the SAS, particularly with the Institute of History SAS: The Centre

of Psychological and Social Sciences SAS, The Institute of Social Communication SAS, and the Institute of Sociology SAS. The IESA SAS also took part in cross-disciplinary projects carried out by the SAS, such as the Open Academy.

The second international accreditation was based on an evaluation system that was very similar to the first one. The major difference, however, was the introduction of a more detailed scoring: 'A', 'A/B', 'B', 'B/C', 'C', 'C/D' and 'D', with corresponding verbal evaluations (*Principles... 2021*).

The reviewers focused on three parameters: quality and productivity, societal impact, and development potential. The Meta-Panel, led by Marja Makarow from Finland, positively evaluated the change in quality and the impact of the research conducted at the SAS, as well as the establishment of the doctoral school for young scientists. The Panel also pointed out the still insufficient financial support for science and research in Slovakia.

The second international accreditation was conducted at several stages. As the first step, the external reviewers (one external expert per Institute) studied the accreditation questionnaires with annexes and delivered their expert evaluation review. In the autumn of 2022, the members of the international Review Panels (one panel per SAS Science Section) gradually visited all SAS research institutes to get acquainted with the activities of the organisations, their working conditions, and scientific results, and held discussions with the academic communities. The experts paid special attention to PhD students, young scientists, and the transfer of knowledge and innovation into practice. The last step was to assign a rating to each institute. In the 2022 accreditation, not a single institute received the lowest, 'D' rating. Rating 'A' was awarded to the title holder of the previous accreditation—the Institute of Polymers SAS. Rating 'A/B', i.e., '*part of the research pertains to the international top scientific league*', was obtained by six institutes, including the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology and the Institute of Social Communication SAS from the SAS Science Section III.

For the purposes of the accreditation, the IESA SAS prepared an accreditation questionnaire in English (*Questionnaire... 2022*, 127 pp.), as well as six thematic panels presenting the main thematic lines of the Institute (Cultural Heritage, Memory Studies, Romani Studies, Visual Anthropology, Feasts and Rituals in Contemporary Society, and Digital Humanities), including an information brochure with basic information about the Institute in English (*Posters #1 - #6 2022*; Zachar Podolinská and Wilsch, Eds. 2022).

The evaluation of the Institute by the international Review Panel largely relied on the review of an anonymous external expert who assessed the Institute exclusively on the basis of the accreditation questionnaire—a later analysis showed a 98% textual match between the Panel's evaluation and the expert's review. The Institute was evaluated as *an important international player with part of its research reaching the international top league*. The thematic area of Romani studies was rated as 'world leader'. The Institute was recommended to intensify in the future the production of popularisation documentary ethnographic films, elevate its societal impact on the international level (mainly in the field of Romani and gender studies), reconsider the publishing of the *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology* journal and the declared strengthening of research focusing on cultural heritage, as well as to develop specific strategies for obtaining prestigious international projects and tools to attract foreign experts and PhD students.

The Panel's recommendations as well as the external reviewer's opinion were discussed in detail at the 2023 working meeting in Smolenice. During this session, the project strategy was reviewed, and tools for attracting foreign PhD students and postdocs were adopted. The academic community did not accept some of the Panel's recommendations—in particular, ending the publishing the *SN/SE* journal and the strategic silencing of research on cultural heritage. Likewise, a major production of ethnographic films, which are invisible from the point of view of officially registrable outputs of the Institute, is a requirement that currently cannot be

implemented. As the next step, the team agreed to prepare a new strategy to define the core and key topics so that a qualitative shift towards international leadership in all core topics can be proven under the internally defined indicators over time. In addition, the team decided to work systematically on building *case studies* to illustrate the Institute's societal impact, which will represent one-third of the overall performance evaluation under the future international accreditation, as well as in the second round of the central periodical *Verification of Excellence in Research* in 2027.

### Verification of Excellence in Research—New Central Evaluation of Science and Research

In 2022, a new system of evaluation of science in Slovakia was implemented within the so-called Periodical Evaluation of Creative Performance—*Verification of Excellence in Research (VER)*. According to the legislation of 2022, *VER* is a new, central, national instrument for performance evaluation of universities, as well as public research institutions (including SAS institutes). Based on this legislation, which will take effect in 2024, the Ministry of Finance may take into account the evaluation results when allocating state budget funds and announcing national grant schemes. In 2022, simultaneously with the transformation and international accreditation, the Institute underwent a *VER* periodical evaluation of its publication activities in the period 2014–9. For the purposes of evaluation, each institution was required to generate a list of eligible employees (based on the set methodology) and attach a list of five publication outputs for each employee, with active links to the given works. Subsequently, based on the *uniformity* and *representativeness* criteria and methodology set by the organisation, each evaluated organisation generated a list of 25 outputs with active links to the works to be evaluated by international evaluation panels. The *VER* periodical evaluation is inspired by the British *Research Excellence Framework (REF)*. In the next evaluation period (2020–5), which

is planned for the year 2027, the complex performance of institutions will be evaluated in three areas: publications, societal impact, and infrastructure.

Under the *VER 2022*, a total of twenty public higher education institutions and 44 public research institutions in Slovakia were evaluated, reviewing a total of 308 applications and 7,700 outputs from scientific and creative activities.

The evaluation results of the first national *VER* evaluation were announced at the beginning of 2023. Based on the *VER 2022*, the International Evaluation Panel in the field of historical sciences assigned the so-called *profile of quality* to all assessed organisations. In the case of the Institute, 60% of its publication outputs were assessed as reaching the world (8%) or an important international level (52%). For comparison, according to the *VER 2022*, the national profile of quality in Slovakia (cross-sectionally all areas) reached a total of 22%—world (4%) and an important international level (18%). The average evaluation of public research institutions founded by the SAS was 36.9%—world (7.1%) and important international (29.8%) level (*Výsledky... 2023*).

The new international *VER* evaluation confirmed the Institute's position as an important player at the global and international scene, encouraging it to further pursue its way. At the same time, this evaluation raises challenges, in which the team will have to orient itself given the new evaluation segments in the next round. According to the new created *National Research, Development, and Innovation Strategy 2030*, the *VER* is to be indicative not only in the allocation of the state budget funds, but also of the launch of calls for support programmes financed from European funds. These challenges will constitute the context for the creation of the new strategic documents of the Institute for the next period, the preparation, discussion, and approval of which are planned for the years 2023 and 2024.

The new internal strategy is expected to implement the lessons learned from both international evaluations. At the same time, it should define, based on an internal SWOT analysis, the specific milestones, as well as supporting tools for achieving

them, in a gentle way and with respect to a sensitively balanced and carefully built-up system of internal measures and already existing managerial tools within the Institute.

### Spending Time Together—The Internal Power of Cohesion

The need to consolidate the organisation's performance required the return to the forms of working meetings in the 'golden era' of the Generation of Builders. The team needed to understand the (external) performance evaluation rules and know what is evaluated and how. In the latter half of the Innovation decade, the management of the Institute introduced 2- to 3-days work trips accompanied by teambuilding activities. A total of seven have taken place so far: Stará Lesná—2015, Smolenice—2016, 2017, (2020 organised but cancelled because of the pandemic measures), 2022, 2023, Modra—2018, Mikulov—2019. These sessions were used for annual performance evaluation, strategic planning, and enhancement of the internal cohesion.

At the beginning of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted heavily the Institute as well. It was necessary to urgently explore new forms of communication and management methods. The research staff worked from home; only a small group of members of the management and employees of the IDU met physically at its headquarters on Klemensova Street in Bratislava because they were not able to work from home. The management of the IESA SAS provided for the ZOOM communication platform for the employees and prepared electronic forms for quarterly activity plans (Individual Action Plans).

In 2020 and 2021, work trips with teambuilding activities could not take place for health and preventive reasons. Therefore, one-to-one quarterly online meetings between the Director and individual staff members, including expert staff and PhD students, were introduced as a new communication format in 2020 aiming to ensure individual contacts of the Director with each employee, find out the needs, deal with potential problems in a timely manner and on an individual basis, maintain the work momentum,

and eventually guide the publication or other individually planned activities so that they would remain in line with the central plan and Scientific Concept of the Institute.

The two-day work trip of the entire workplace team, which took place in the spring of 2023, reviewed recommendations and evaluation results of the international accreditation 2022 results and *VER 2022*. The Institute's management aimed at creating the space for a reflective discussion on its work plans, challenges, limits, and opportunities for its direction and administration. This discussion was conducted with the assistance of a professional facilitator and presented a great momentum for team integrity and cohesion.

The Institute maintained its tradition of meeting once a year (before Christmas) by having a joint lunch; however, this cycle was interrupted in 2020–1 due to the pandemic. In the given period, the meetings took place online. After the COVID-19 pandemic was over, joint Christmas lunches were upgraded with a new format of staff members' informal meetings on St John's Day, with the possibility of bringing their partners and children. These meetings are organised by the Trade Union organisation jointly with the Institute's management.

During the Innovation decade, the Institute focused primarily on developing and promoting the power of internal cohesion as the main asset of the Institute. The research team was increasingly aware of the value of a supporting team, which was manifested also in the willingness to spend time together. Even though the working pace set on the basis of performance evaluation and international accreditations was considerable, the team was able to communicate its aims and priorities in a cultivated and respectful manner so that members of the team reached out to their maximum and felt accepted and recognised.

The Head of the IESA SAS Information and Documentation Unit, A. Gogora, who came to work to the organisation in 2016, defined it as follows: 'From the very beginning, I have regarded the working environment of the Institute (set by its management) as progressive and supporting, with a long-term strategic vision

for the Institute as a whole, for the individual thematic working groups, and individuals (while being able to flexibly respond to challenges), and with a considerable appeal to reaching international quality. This significantly contributes to the gradual fulfilment of (time- and capacity-intensive) working tasks in our Unit. Communication at our workplace is above standard and, in the event of any complications, everyone (regardless of generation) is willing to give us advice and help. In most cases, the informal relationships at the workplace are friendly and relaxed' (in: Popelková 2021b).

The climate at the workplace was perceived similarly by T. Winkler, a young postdoc, whom the Institute employed for a temporary period before submitting an application for support from the *Štefan Schwarz Fund* and encouraged him to publish the monograph in English on the topic of his dissertation thesis: 'I think it was thanks to the people and good atmosphere at the Institute that I managed to do it quickly and smoothly. At the beginning, most help was provided to me by the team of doctoral students with whom I spent most of the time at the workplace (thanks to our shared doctoral workroom); however, I also perceived the very human, generous, and helpful approach of my older colleagues and the Institute's management. The less formal events, like seminars outside the workplace or Christmas parties, as well as our joint work, in particular organisational activities (e.g., Researchers' Night 2016, scientific conferences) also helped getting to know the team). (...) The working environment of the Institute is very inspiring and, simultaneously, it forced young scientists to work hard on their portfolio and publications' (in: *Ibid.*).

L. Voľanská very openly defined the problematic points of her scientific life at the Institute, identifying the good and supportive team as the key benefit: 'During my work at the Institute (it has been fifteen years already, gee :O), there has been a considerable change of generations. However, continuity has been maintained. We are still a coherent team and provide human support to each other. I consider it a prerequisite for the viability of the



team, which is definitely not a rule in the world of science. Over these years, there have been moments when I felt scientifically burnt out; however, I stayed at the Institute despite the difficult conditions, low salary, and a fast-working pace—mainly because of the people. It may sound a cliché, but it is so. I appreciate the variety of topics and approaches that we as a team deal with, as well as the great degree of creative freedom. I am annoyed by increased paper work, but, unfortunately, that's part of it' (in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

Another important representative of the Innovators, S. Gyárfáš Lutherová, sees the Institute in a similar spirit: 'When I came to work at the Institute, I knew many of the "names" mainly from lectures on the history of our scientific discipline, and so I approached them with great awe and shyness. I soon realised that the atmosphere at the workplace was informal and collegial, which I appreciate most even today' (in: *Ibid.*).

A prominent representative of the Transformation Generation, who had the opportunity to experience the climate at the workplace during the Builders' period and had come into contact with the Founders, comments critically on the professional cohesion and the Generation of Innovators: 'I have the feeling that [the Institute] is full of individuals, which has both advantages and disadvantages: each of them is working with their own topic, we are often too distant from each other thematically, methodologically, as well as geographically; it seems to me that the Institute has fallen apart from this point of view. Apart from the Roma, the other topics are dealt with by one or two persons, and many important topics remain unattended. I don't mean solutions in the form of a collective work, like the *Atlas* or the *Encyclopaedia*, or the artificially inflated grants. What should rather be worth considering is to find one or two cross-cutting topics (identity, minority, relationship to faith and other values, etc.) which concern most of us in some way. It would be long-term topics, and people would approach them from their own perspectives. From time to time, we could work on a cross-cutting study, a monothematic

volume, or something similar. I think that, instead of the Generation of "Innovators", the Generation of 'Individualists' would be a more appropriate term' (Salner 2021a).

The team cohesion, respect, and mutual support as the main assets of the workplace and permanent parts of its story are also perceived and identified by an important representative of the younger layer of the Transformation Generation: 'Over the 35 years that I have been working at the IESA SAS, I have never noticed the existence of bounded generational groups among my colleagues. (...) When people came together in teams, the differences brought challenges and pleasure rather than fear of being different, of belonging to a different generational group (...) I have been at this workplace continuously since I finished my university studies. From the beginning, I witnessed here an environment with considerable demands not only for expertise, independent, punctual and high-quality work, but also for decency and correctness, whose role models were the directors. (...) Scientists can adapt very well to difficult external conditions if their personal qualities are accepted, and they feel well-anchored in the team. Where clear rules of internal functioning are set and the management declares that it wishes to create existential security for people even in difficult stages of their lives, there is no need to waste time and spoil the creative atmosphere with fear, worries, and intrigues. Where important things can be discussed openly and at any time, then cohesion is natural. If the atmosphere is generous (...), then scientists are able to respect and honour their colleagues, whether younger or older ones, and overcome adverse circumstances together with the institution. No matter in which chapter of the 'great' story of the Institute their personal story takes place' (K. Popelková in: Zachar Podolinská 2022).

The internal power of cohesion and team support is mostly appreciated by the new staff members who have had the opportunity to experience multiple working environments (either at home or abroad), as they do not take good workplace

relations for granted. Jaroslava Panáková, an employee of the institute since 2019, who had the opportunity to work in a top foreign institution for several years (Max Planck Institute, Germany) and subsequently worked at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava, expressed her frustration with growing individualism and neoliberalism in science in Slovakia in her memoir: 'Everyone is in it just for themselves, either when it comes to finance, networking with foreign countries, or publishing. It also affects communication in the work environment—it takes place in the form of charts; it is fragmented into who is with whom and who stands where—or it is completely absent. The main focus is on publishing, and the components of scientific life that help scientists to create are neglected. In promoting changes, one is once again alone (...). The question is to what extent such atomism is the result of relationships between specific people and to what extent it is part of imperfect institutions. In extreme cases, relationships can be broken off, but in such a small professional community, a person can unintentionally exclude himself or herself from other ties.

Nevertheless, institutions can be changed using various management tools. It is then interesting to observe if such *islands of good hope* arise. And people attach to them. Personally, I have found long-sought support at the IESA SAS. On the one hand, it manifests itself formally on the part of the management, on the other hand, it can be felt in direct communication, mutual respect, recommendations. Sometimes, it seems to me that above the entrance to the institution is written: 'We help each other here'" (in: *Ibid.*).

### Innovation Decade—Summary and Evaluation

The analysis of the internal processes that took place at the workplace in the past decade show that the success and prosperity of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS remain in the hands of the team of

researchers who work there, even in the situation of various temporal changes. Neither the unstable ecosystem of support and evaluation of science and research in Slovakia, which go hand in hand with ever-increasing demands for performance and international visibility, nor the insufficient form of financial and social remuneration, have a negative impact on the sound internal climate and supportive behaviour patterns at the Institute. In addition to the centripetal force of internal cohesion, what we could also observe in the Innovation decade is its centrifugal force, when the team was abandoned by the individuals who did not put the team and cohesion first.

When it comes to the development of internal processes, we note a significant increase in managerial, thematic, and methodological innovations during the last decade. These were created, communicated, and implemented in a consensual and inclusive manner, while the pace and extent of their introduction was largely related to the turbulent transformations of the external ecosystem of science and research in Slovakia.

The Institute faced several major challenges in the field of performance review—performance evaluations (since 2017), international accreditation of SAS organisations in 2016 and 2022, and the *VER* international evaluation of 2022. Despite the different perspectives, the Institute was able to repeatedly defend its position as a leader in the field of SSH both at national as well as international level. In the area of publication strategy, the share of articles in peer-reviewed international journals and monographs in established foreign publishers has grown significantly. In proportion to the increase in publishing in foreign languages and the consistent strategy of OA publishing, the number of citations and hence, the visibility of the Institute within the international space has increased too.

In the field of internal publishing, the Institute instantly implemented current foreign trends, e.g., introduction of DOI not only for articles published in *Slovenský národopis/*

*Slovak Ethnology*, but also for monographic publications. Another innovation is the publishing in e-book format and under Creative Commons licences. The registration of the institutional journal in the WoS and Scopus has been another important milestone of the Innovation decade.

With regard to infrastructure building, the Institute invested its own, as well as external resources in renovating a substantial part of its premises, in furnishings, and presentation equipment. The same happened with the safeguarding, moving, and digitisation of the scientific bodies and library stocks.

The Innovation decade was characterised by a generational change, which took place smoothly, without any generational and qualification ruptures and without any decline in performance. Thanks to the scientific concept, a clear strategy, and an open competition policy, the Institute has managed to not only rejuvenate, but also ensured the necessary expansion of the institutional expert portfolio in terms of themes, methodologies, and disciplines.

At the end of the decade, a new internal evaluation system was adopted for comprehensive performance evaluation of individual performance in various areas (publications; projects; organisational, application, dissemination, and popularisation activities; and PhD student training). New performance profiles provide annual feedback and a more complex picture on the proportion and distribution of the workload of individual research members of the team.

During the given decade, the number of international projects submitted under prestigious EU schemes (Horizon, Europe) increased exponentially, which was accompanied by a considerable elevation of the project know-how of the Institute.

Last but not least, the Institute began to systematically process its collections and provide support to build digital humanities and became a cooperating partner of the European DARIAH infrastructure at the end of the decade.

During this decade, the anthropologisation of the Institute was also completed in an inclusive way, while simultaneously rehabilitating the results and approaches of the previous generations. It was not an uncritical adoration distorted by the power of the currently accentuated narrative of internal solidarity and cohesion. Rather, it was a methodologically correct awareness of the temporal embeddedness of methods and approaches in specific cultural, political, and geographical realities, as well as a recognition of the research scope and focus and concentrated teamwork, which was able to cement the entire Institute and systematically lead to great joint outputs, sometimes even for decades.

At the end of the Innovation decade, the team clearly identified its direction towards a balance between basic and applied research, historical, and social science approach. The team was also aware of the need to sensitise the language, thematise the ethics and integrity of research, foster constructive discussions and hear opponent voices, increase popularisation and dissemination also outside the academic community, as well as to ensure quality PhD training.

During the Innovation decade, the Institute made efforts to free itself from the diverse aspects of three different external performance evaluations and—based on international quality and excellence criteria—finally established its own tailor-made rules, goals, and supporting tools to achieve them. Along with all this, it was able to undergo deep self-reflection. Perhaps the pandemic also played a role in this process, as well as the extreme focus on performance and results in the external ecosystem, which found a response in its internal system and settings. And maybe it is just a smooth continuation of the inherited story of internal cohesion as a legacy of the previous generations. For the next decade (which is still waiting for its name), the Institute defined as its values, along with the quality, excellence, and applicability of its research results, also mutual support and respect, transparency, open communication, consensus and teamwork in decision-making, solidarity, and organic cohesion.

# Conclusion

## –*Laudation*

# to the Institution and Generations

As this publication may have shown against the background of historical facts from the life of one institution, its development unfolded in the context of larger temporalities and, in this respect, it has certainly been a culturally and politically conditioned project. However, the internal history of the institution sometimes seemed to have gone in the opposite direction, since it has had its own dynamics. Within the framework of the internal micro-temporalities, the institution has moved towards *integrity* and *continuity*, often in *opposition* to currently prevailing societal trends, as well as with a significant degree of *resistance* to societal ruptures and external political pressures.

The publication follows making-the-institution processes, tracing not only the telling and (re-telling) the official history(-ies), but also, quite intentionally, it gives voice to the scraps of memories and emotions as subjectivised, intimate, and deeply internalised (hi)stories of the people that represent the living essence of the institution.

As illustrated by this publication in the case of the Institute, there is a strong tendency to follow and further nurture a positive auto-narrative, thus creating an internal story of cohesion that contributes to a favourable and supportive micro-climate and stimulates the collective to find progressive survival strategies and protect vulnerable team members in difficult times.

In the post-war period (the 1950s and 1960s), the institution and the discipline of ethnography in Slovakia were built and stabilised. In order to survive and develop the institution, it was necessary to comply with the programme of the external ideological order in the form of the *Sovietisation* of research and its methodological direction. However, the compulsory task of examining workers' and cooperative culture and socialist folklore was later (at the end of the 1960s, and especially in the 1970s) transformed into broader synchronous *research on the present*. These called not only for a reflective approach and new methods, but also sought to rehabilitate Western ('bourgeois') theoretical sources of inspiration (structuralism, semiology, etc.).

At the time of the harshest normalisation (1970s), the institution also experienced the greatest professional and research concentration in the form of dealing with large collective projects and scientific ethnographic syntheses, which created an empirical basis not only within the institution, but throughout the ethnographic discipline in Slovakia. The implementation, completion, and success of individual projects were undoubtedly the primary merit of leading personalities, who were able, based on their erudition and charisma, to keep the teams in pace and focused on achieving great research and publication goals. The *Atlas (EAS)*, as the largest ethnographic work of the Institute of Ethnography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and later, the *Encyclopaedia* engaged and united a whole generation of researchers into one 'scientific body'. Božena Filová, then Director of the Institute, later characterised this generation as follows: 'There were great visions in the atmosphere of the Institute. There were many visionaries. And those visionaries

were respectful of each other. (...) In the sense that they confirmed each other's opinions' (in: Bobáková and Tužinská 2006, p. 245).

The 1970s and 1980s saw a major personnel development of the institution. During the period of 'ideological softening' (in the late 1960s), two former employees, Soňa Kovačevičová (1968) and Mária Kolečányi-Kosová (1969), returned to the workplace. They had been forced to leave due to their unsuitable cadre profiles established during the first wave of background checks in the 1950s. In addition to the then Director Božena Filová, the institutional organisation of the Communist Party also played an important role in retaining or recruiting more politically 'problematic' staff in the Institute in the following period. Instead of 'collecting points' for exemplary staffing policy, the institution prioritised internal integrity, the human dimension, and concentrated collective work on large research tasks in the normalisation period.

With regard to the extraordinary publication performance of the institution (1960s to 1980s), P. Slavkovský highlights the personal managerial contribution of the then management of the Institute: 'The Builders' period had one more characteristic, which was "caused" by B. Filová. As the Director, she tried to ensure through the Institute's personnel policy that all key topics were covered by authors. Sometimes, it was by mutual agreement, other times, as in my case, even with some "blackmailing". As a result, each of us, apart from participating in collective works and running the Institute, wrote not only many studies on their particular topics, but comprehensive monographs as well. I think that the Generation of Builders closed in this way all their gnoseological intentions with dignity' (2021).

In terms of the 'small history' of the Institute, it is also interesting to observe, in addition to continuous development, a relatively smooth intergenerational transmission. Over one post-war and one early socialist decade, the Generation of Founders was able to establish and build an institution, defend its existence in difficult times, form a mission, and instill it in the next generation.

During the next two decades of building (developed) socialism, the Generation of Builders was successful in undertaking several tasks: (1) to complete the mission, build an 'empirical foundation', and publish synthetic collective works of an essential nature, and (2) to master the art of ideological declarations and, under their guise, to critically reflect on the internal development of the discipline; to continuously refine its direction in discussions; to call for more innovative methods of field research (reflection on the situational context, use of quantitative methods, importance of stationary and recurrent research); to critically reflect on the subject of research itself, and grasp it from a synchronous and processual perspective.

Despite the paradigmatic differences in the focus and subject of research of the two generations, the Institute experienced a *smooth intergenerational transmission*, while maintaining and continuously constituting a strong *positive institutional self-narrative*. The successful intergenerational transmission and continuity within the institution (from the Founders to Builders) was also perceived by Peter Slavkovský (2006, p. 19). Institutional continuity without significant ruptures and discontinuities in the scientific programme and projects were also noted by Gabriela Kiliánová (2016c, p. 126). Božena Filová, the longest-serving Director in the history of the institution (1958–89), witnessed both of these generations, and later defined the Institute as a 'collective scientific organism' (in: Bobáková and Tužinská 2006, p. 216). These two elements in the history of institutions and disciplines are by no means self-evident.

At the end of the 1980s, the Builders successfully transmitted their enthusiasm for the discipline, hunger for innovation, and the ability to survive onto the first post-revolutionary, Transformation Generation, which was freed from ideological pressure and general meaningless phrases, and to which scientific and methodological horizons were opened along with the opening of the borders.

While society was free to accept all currently available trends in terms of the development of the national ecosystem,



the internal scene was dominated mainly by political struggles for power, property, and finance. The uncritical takeover of Western neoliberalism meant, above all, significant central budget cuts with respect to science and education, which resulted in a dramatic headcount reduction (almost by half) at the Institute and forced restructuring of the workplace.

From the point of view of the history of the institution, it is again interesting that the first post-socialist Director, Milan Leščák, as a representative and member of the Communist Party of Slovakia, gained the full trust of all staff of the Institute after the Velvet Revolution and later left the workplace only to help establish the Department of Ethnology and Folklore in Nitra. However, the sceptre was taken over from him by a nonpartisan, Dušan Ratica.

During his term of office, he faced, on the one hand, a difficult personal and, as an employer, legal dilemma of how to reduce the number of employees and keep the institution running with a significant reduction in finances, while on the other hand, thanks to synthetic works produced in previous decades, he experienced a fructification period and a time of unprecedented fame of the Institute thanks to its publications. At the beginning of the Transformation period, the name of the Institute changed from Ethnography to Ethnology, despite resistance by part of the Generation of Builders. The first Transformation decade is thus a period of the gradual takeover of the Institute's strategy management by the leaders of the Transformation Generation, which is also related to the beginning of its anthropologisation.

To a large extent, the Transformation Generation built its symbolic and social capital on a green field. It had to quickly overcome not only its linguistic, but also theoretical and methodological handicaps caused by isolation, and carefully began to compare itself to developed Western science.

The fall of socialism was also accompanied by a fundamental change in the planning and financing of science and research. The end of the era of central planning and stable funding in the

rhythm of five- to ten-year cycles, caused thematical and human 'disintegration' of the Institute which body was split into project teams dealing with smaller scientific tasks over a period of two to four years. In terms of internal cohesion, the Institute experienced, during the first transition decade, the golden era of balls, which were voluntarily organised by enthusiastic representatives of the Transformation Generation. However, the significant change in the way of working, along with the general trend of increased individualisation in society, gradually manifested itself in the reduction of not only working, but also collective leisure activities.

During the second Transformation decade, the Scientific Concept of the Institute was consolidated. Along with foreign languages, the institution learned project know-how at the international level. In this sense, its then leader, Gabriela Kiliánová, played a key role. The cooperation of several experts with the non-governmental sector, such as Academia Istropolitana Nova, the Holocaust Documentation Centre, the Milan Šimečka Foundation, and others elevated considerably the project know-how in the Institute. In the 2000s, the non-governmental sector in Slovakia operated almost exclusively on the basis of foreign projects, which is why the project know-how was more developed here compared to the academic and university environments.

In the second Transformation decade the *collective identities* and *collective memory* became the key words at the Institute. When it comes to cooperation within the SAS, the Institute cooperated intensively with the Institute of History SAS (*European Doctorate, Centre of Excellence*). Holocaust studies experienced a golden age and religious studies became a supernova of a decade. Although the stilling of common working and leisure activities culminated in this period, the team did not lose its strong internal cohesion and, similarly to the normalisation period, it came together at critical moments to support the individuals of its team under threat (the 'Rómsky dejepis' case). This period was also marked by the launch of applied research.

In the 2000s, the Transformation Generation underwent an in-depth critical self-reflection in a postmodern spirit in terms of problematising the methods of research and deconstructing its own subject of research. At the same time, it gradually moved away from the category of *nation* and *people*, through research of collective, ethnic identities and memory, to de-essentialised and partially de-ethnicised research of *social representations*; from traditional culture, it shifted to the critical study of *cultural heritage*, from 'contemporary research' to research of everyday life, it (e)migrated from the village to the city and began to repay debts to the discipline (research on marginalised groups, religiosity, and socialism) and society (Holocaust research, *Ma bisteren* studies).

The systematic anthropologisation of the organisation and the accentuation of anthropological approaches led to the suppression of historical ethnography and research on traditions and cultural heritage. The attempt to make an anthropological turn in the Institute by its proto-anthropological group in an exclusivist way resulted in the departure of its representatives from the workplace. Here, the *centrifugal* force of internal cohesion played its crucial role.

In the second Transformation decade, the Institute became a sovereign leader of ethnological research in Slovakia and a visible player in the international scene. Researchers began to increasingly publish in foreign languages. The accreditation results of the Institute were excellent, and the Institute became the leader among SSH institutes of the SAS Science Section III. Its weaknesses included publication in registered and indexed journals, which was also associated with the low number of citations in such media.

The Generation of Innovators emerged simultaneously with the Transformation Generation. The Innovation decade began with a change of Director. The election of Tatiana Podolinská can, to some extent, be viewed as a *reconciliation of generations* (that of the Builders and of the Transformation Generation). Crucial changes in evaluation and the financing of science (introduction

of international accreditations, performance evaluation financing, and *VER*) took place in this period in a turbulent sequence.

The 2010s decade in Slovakia is characterised by the definition of the algorithm of success by the number of scientometrically determined units. At the same time, the SSH had to prove the degree of their usefulness for society and shift a substantial part of their basic research to applied and problem-oriented research.

The focus on performance, efficiency, and application was translated into the Institute's direction, especially in the first half of the Innovation decade. During this period, also thanks to the higher number of adopted management innovations, the performance was consolidated, which was reflected in the excellent result of the first international accreditation in 2016.

In the latter half of the decade, innovations gradually penetrated all segments of the Institute's structure: from its Scientific Concept, through its Library, journal, scientific collections, the strategy for submitting national projects and publication strategy, up to the rules for evaluating and rewarding scientific performance. The number of submitted prestigious international projects increased exponentially, which significantly enhanced the Institute's project know-how. In addition to rejuvenation, the Institute's expertise portfolio expanded by recruiting talented young staff from other disciplines. At the same time, by completing the anthropologisation of the workplace—which also resulted also in the change of its name from the Institute of Ethnology to the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology in 2018—historical research was rehabilitated and the research line of cultural heritage was strengthened. At the end of the decade, Romani studies fought its way among the core topics and, in 2022, an international reviewers' panel rated them as achieving the world level. During the Innovation decade, the Institute became a major player in the international field, which was unanimously stated by several independent international evaluations (international accreditations 2016, 2022, and *VER* 2022).

In the second half of the Innovation decade, the Institute identified in good time the potential threat of 'overheating and burnout' of its organism due to its unilateral orientation on performance and results, especially when using flat scientometric indicators. Similarly, in the second half of that decade, the team began to feel a more intense need to spend time together. Thus, regular working sessions outside the workplace, devoted to strategic planning and ongoing evaluation of results and by teambuilding activities, became part of the life of the institution.

In some respects, the Innovation decade can also be considered the completion of the post-socialist transition, either within the SAS or within Slovak society. It was only at the end of this decade that the SAS organisations were transformed into public research institutions, the need for qualitative evaluation of excellent and frontier research, targeted support for infrastructure, and the need to prevent brain-drain from the country were thematised. In this context, one can observe a delayed emergence of the trends and discourses—or a certain path-dependent trajectory—compared to the academic environment in the V4 countries. If we take the Czech Republic as a benchmark, the Slovak National Strategy 2030 sets an ambitious goal to reach the level of investments in science and research in the Czech Republic by 2020.

The challenges and goals of the third decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be detailed by the Institute in its new strategy in 2023. In the 2022 accreditation questionnaire, T. Zachar Podolinská clearly defined, in the future prospects and vision section, the *qualitative turn*, the promotion of excellence and frontier research, the support for the key disciplines and their own methods, and the reaching of thematic, methodological, and research equilibrium. The key issue for the future will be to reduce the number of themes by finding flexible *core topics* in which most staff members can generate working synergies, while maintaining individual *key topics* to keep the freedom of research and interests of the individual researchers.

The capitalisation and commercialisation of the institutional expertise and other knowledge offer a similar new potential, enabled by the change of the legal form to a public research institution.

As this publication has shown, the living body of the institution is made up of people, and its quality and prosperity are primarily based on internal cohesion and mutual support. It is not mechanical support, but an organic one. The perspective inherited from the previous generations, which emphasises team value and a quality working atmosphere at the workplace, as well as the formula of coming together to support those under threat, is now being transferred to new team members and future generations thanks to well-functioning inter-generational communication. This is also possible due to the fact that there have been charismatic and value-oriented individuals in each generation line who, in addition to peak performance, have also promoted the value of the collective and teamwork.

At the beginning of the 2020s, the team tends towards greater thematic and human bonding, which would not only be present in the narratives of strategic materials and texts of scientific concepts, but would reflect past experience and current working synergies. In the case of our Institute, its excellent performance is primarily based on a clear vision and strategy, open communication and collective decisions, internal cohesion and organic solidarity, dedication of its managers and research teams, as well loyalty of engaged researchers. Last but not least, it is based on expertise, the love for science, passion for knowledge, and the ability to perceive events beyond the horizon of current temporalities.

# Post-Scriptum: Story of the Story of Cohesion

This book has its own two-and-half-year long history. At its beginning, there was an intention to write a short *Laudation* to the Institute on the occasion of its 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its establishment in January 2021, following the model of my predecessors (mostly former Directors and Chairs of the Scientific Boards of the Institute). However, the short *Laudation* soon resulted in a text of over 120 pages, which in no way could be fully completed within the given period of time and could certainly not be published as a journal study in the Slovak issue of *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*. For that moment, the 'long version' thus became a 'short one' (which still had the character of a journal monograph), while in terms of the time framework, it was limited to the first two generations (Founders and Builders).

It was already during writing the initial study (Zachar Podolinská 2021a) that I perceived as a great handicap that I did not know the well-described period of the institution's life from my own experience, and so I had to rely exclusively on

primary and secondary sources. This made me use more-or-less a historical and reflective approach. As a graduate in history and philosophy, I had appropriate education and qualifications to use both approaches. However, my ambition was to cross the genre of an 'author's compilation', and so I decided to supplement my sources, at least selectively, with reflections and memories of the representatives and companions from two research generations dealt with by the text of the study.

In the process of finalising the study, I had intensive communication with the key representatives of the Builders' (Peter Slavkovský, Mojmír Benža) and Transformation (Daniel Luther and Peter Salner) Generations, who critically commented on the manuscript of the study and provided me with valuable contextual additions in the form of personal memories. Reading the manuscript prompted various reflections, which they shared with me not only in the form of comments and notes to the revised body of the study, but we also exchanged telephone and e-mail communications. These individualised and internalised histories helped me to formulate ideas more precisely and carefully, and provided an important human dimension to much of the information contained in the text.

After the release of the study in the spring of 2021, a large part of the collected material remained unpublished. Therefore, a fairly logical, although very spontaneous, idea arose to rework, substantially extend, and publish the text as the first comprehensive publication on the Institute in English, which is drawn up using the method inherent to our discipline, i.e., to complement the historical, archival, and electronic data with qualitative data and, against their background, to describe the anthropology of the Institute as a 'living organism'. It seemed appropriate to me to give in this way tribute to an institution that I have had the honour to lead for a decade. At the same time, while writing the first initial study, I realised what a great lesson and enrichment working with the results, ideas, and concepts of the previous generations brings me.

In May 2021, I approached Katarína Popelková, a long-year member of the management of both Transformation decades and the first half of the Innovation decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with the idea of becoming the co-author of this publication on the history of the Institute. In the previous period, Katka was a member of several projects aimed at collecting data on the history of the institution and scientific thinking in the field, and she also published a number of texts in this regard. At the same time, she was well familiar with the internal contexts of the described processes through the prism of her direct experience. Her personal anchoring in the younger Transformation Generation, along with her intensive living with the core group of the Generation of Builders since the late 1980s, was an opportunity for an instant verification of our attempts to provide bold interpretations, while avoiding excessive generalisations.

Since our opinions and the way of working are complementary in many respects, and each of us is able to convince the other one by using valid arguments, I was more than glad that she decided to join our collaborative writing project, which we had never tried before. Together, we agreed on the process of our work, which was not easy, since the writing went completely beyond our other responsibilities and scientific work, and the publication was not part of any current project executed at the Institute. We also agreed to include not only published, but also completely new memoirs in the publication and conduct a targeted survey among all the staff members of the Institute. One of the main benefits of the publication should be the qualitative processing of the first two decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the history of which has not yet been systematically compiled.

In July and August 2021, K. Popelková carried out a questionnaire survey among the IESA SAS staff on the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its establishment in order to obtain personal reflections of its employees for the upcoming monograph. She also contacted two previous Directors of the Institute (Gabriela Kiliánová and Dušan Ratica), but only G. Kiliánová agreed with the research and the processing of her answers. The material

sent by Kiliánová as an answer to our questions forms Part I of the research report (Popelková 2021b). The survey was addressed to fourteen current employees who had joined the Institute after 2000. Soňa Gyárfáš Lutherová, Tomáš Winkler, Andrej Gogora, and Andrej Belák sent their answers; these form Part II of the research report.

When writing the manuscript during the summer of 2021, various gaps emerged with regard to memories and personalities. I therefore conducted personal qualitative surveys, whether by e-mail or telephone, approaching Peter Salner, Peter Slavkovský, Magdaléna Slavkovská, Hana Hlôšková, Oľga Danglová, Elena Marushiakova, and Rastislava Stoličná. This provoked Stoličná to write her own memoirs reflecting on her stay and work at the Institute against the background of external and internal temporalities (2021).

We thus devoted the year 2021 to collecting qualitative data for all parts of the manuscript. In that year, we managed to finalise the parts about the Generation of Founders and Generation of Builders. The year 2022 was considerably demanding in terms of the concurrent transformation of the SAS, international accreditation reviewing for the previous six years, and the introduction of a new central tool for the evaluation of science and research in Slovakia, *VER*. Nevertheless, we managed to complete the first Transformation decade in the first half of the year.

In the summer of 2022, I carried out a second research survey among selected representatives of all generations (Peter Slavkovský, Peter Salner, Zuzana Beňušková, Katarína Popelková, Monika Vrzgulová, Juraj Zajonc, Soňa Gyárfáš Lutherová, Ľubica Voľanská, Jaroslava Panáková). Their answers, along with free written memoir by Elena Marushiakova, form part of the research report (Zachar Podolinská 2022).

In the course of writing, there was a need to review the memoirs on the *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma history] case, on the running of the Library, on PhD studies, as well as on opportunities to spend time together. In the framework of the



research survey by K. Popelková, personal memories, as a material on these topics, were gratefully provided by: Zuzana Beňušková, Viera Feglová, Hana Hlôšková, Andrea Kalivodová, Gabriela Kiliánová, Ingrid Kostovská, Daniel Luther, Arne Mann, Peter Salner, Magdaléna Slavkovská, Peter Slavkovský, and Ľubica Voľanská (Popelková 2022).

During the first half of 2023, the history of the 21<sup>st</sup> century was completed, i.e., the second Transformation decade and the Innovation decade. These are considerably larger than the text on the Founding and Building decades. On the one hand, given the numerous digital traces, there is significantly more factual data for this period, while on the other, we managed to reach out to and receive answers from a significant part of the Institute's staff through targeted research. Since the publication of memoirs has been reduced in the 21<sup>st</sup> century in connection with the transformation of the two publishing platforms (*Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology* and *Ethnologické rozpravy*), we perceive it as a unique opportunity for capturing and publishing them. The absence of these formats also prompted me to write a personal memoirs on my so-far work at the Institute (Zachar Podolinská 2023), some of which were used as insights in the description of the Innovation decade.

In 2023, we decided, in a way characteristic of the Innovators' Generation, to not follow the established rhythm of celebrations of five-year and ten-year anniversaries. Although the main reason was the impossibility of physically celebrating the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary at the time the pandemic reached its peak in 2021, we were enthusiastic at the beginning of 2023 about the idea of celebrating the 77<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our founding together with the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. In this context, we were inspired by our graphic designer, Matúš Hnát, who voted for changing the number '5' to '7' on the previously prepared cover of the publication.

Two identical numbers are rare in the history of the institution. We decided to combine this out-of-the-box celebration format with innovative content. The scenario of the celebration of

the upcoming *Laudation Day* (September 20, 2023, Pálffy Palace in Bratislava) should not consist of reading laudatory speeches by foreign guests and representatives of partner institutions or awarding commemorative plaques to leading figures of ethnological research in Slovakia. With the celebrations, we plan to thank our dear deceased in the form of their induction into the Hall of Fame, to have the key representatives of each generation speak in person, and to thank the people who have made a fundamental contribution to the good and healthy functioning of the 'living body' of the organisation, those who have dedicated and devoted to it a large part of their life energy, even though they usually did not stand on the stage when the awards were given. Their work and mission can also be seen in this publication, and perhaps its other novelty is that it observes the complex life and development of the organisation intertwined with the attitudes, thoughts, and feelings of the people who were willing to perceive the story of the Institute not only as *their own*, but as *ours*.

Tatiana Zachar Podolinská

# References

- About CC Licences. Creative Commons. <https://creativecommons.org/about/cclicenses/>. Accessed March 14, 2023.
- Akreditačný dotazník 2003 [Accreditation Questionnaire 2003]. Internal unpublished document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS.
- Ambassador Sterling Presents Embassy's Annual Human Rights Awards (2017). U.S. Embassy in Slovakia. <https://sk.usembassy.gov/ambassador-sterling-presents-embassys-annual-human-rights-awards/>. Accessed April 12, 2023.
- Apáthyová-Rusnáková, Z. (1981). Skice k systémovému vymedzeniu etnografie [Sketches for a Systematic Definition of Ethnography]. *Slovenský národopis*, 29(1), 123–35.
- (1991). An Attempt at Establishing Values Structure and Values Orientation Measuring. *Slovenský národopis*, 39(1), 51–66. (The original paper was submitted to the journal *Slovenský národopis* in 1977 and rejected for political reasons.)
- (1999). Znakový systém – sonda do charakteru ľudovej kultúry. (Na materiáli kostolného zasadacieho poriadku) [Sign System—A Survey into the Nature of Folk Culture. Based on a Church Seating Chart Material]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 6(1), 38–67.
- Atlas rómskych komunit [Atlas of Roma Communities]. <https://www.romovia.vlada.gov.sk/atlas-romskych-komunit/>. Accessed May 11, 2023.
- Bahna, V. (2019). *Nadprirodzené skúsenosti a naratívna myseľ: sociálna nákazlivosť spomienok* [Supernatural Experience and a Narrative Mind: The Social Virulence of Memories]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2019.9788022417754>.
- Balázšová, D. (2015). Šajgalík: Čaká nás najväčšia zmena od roku 1989 [Awaiting the Major Change since 1989]. *Pravda*, January 12, 2015. <https://spravy.pravda.sk/domace/clanok/342095-sajgalik-caka-nas-najvacsia-zmena-od-roku-1989/>. Accessed August 9, 2021.
- Barabášová, B. (1952). Príspevok k problematike vzniku nového folklóru na Slovensku [Study on the Emergence of New Folklore in Slovakia]. *Národopisný sborník SAVU*, 11, 321–64.
- Barker, R. (2001). *Legitimizing Identities: The Self-Presentations of Rulers and Subjects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bednárik, R. (1942). *Príručka pre národopisný výskum slovenského ľudu* [Manual for Ethnographic Research on Slovak People]. Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Beitl, K. (2020). 'Tatry Alpy' ein Testimonium amicitiae für Milan Leščák zum 80. Geburtstag. In: H. Hlôšková (Ed.), *Milan Leščák – vedec, pedagóg, človek* [Milan Leščák—Scientist, Teacher, Man] (pp. 37–62). Bratislava: Stimul.
- Beňová, N. (2004). Európska únia, Slovensko a vrstvy na „okrají“ spoločnosti [European Union, Slovakia, and the groups 'on the Margin of Society']. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 11(1), 55–64.
- Beňušková, Z. (1993). O starostiach a radoostiach Národopisného ústavu SAV. Rozhovor s Mgr. Dušanom Raticom, CSc., riaditeľom NÚ SAV. [On the Problems and Joys of the Ethnographic Institute SAS. An Interview with Mgr. Dušan Ratica, CSc., Director of the EI SAS]. *Národopisné informácie*, 1, 58–60.
- (2008). Externé štúdium – osveta či biznis [External Studies—Education or Business]? *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 99–102.
- (2017). *Občianske obrady na Slovensku* [Civil Ceremonies in Slovakia]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2017.9788022416238>.
- (2019). 60 rokov Národopisnej spoločnosti Slovenska [60 Years of the Ethnographic Society of Slovakia]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 26 (Supplement), 24–71.
- (2021). *Civil Ceremonies in Socialist Czechoslovakia and Post-Socialist Slovakia*. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788056909447>.
- et al. (1998). *Tradičná kultúra regiónov Slovenska*. 1. vyd. [The Traditional Culture of Slovak Regions. 1<sup>st</sup> edition]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- et al. (2005). *Tradičná kultúra regiónov Slovenska*. 2. doplnené vyd. [The Traditional Culture of Slovak Regions. 2<sup>nd</sup> extended edition]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Beňušková, Z., & Danglová, O. (Eds.) (2007). *Trendy regionálneho a miestneho rozvoja na Slovensku* [Regional and Local Development Trends in Slovakia]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – Bratislava: Centrum pre európsku politiku – Nitra: Katedra etnológie a etnomuzikológie UKF.
- Beňušková, Z., & Salner, P. (Hrsg.) (1995). *Stabilität und Wandel in der Großstadt*. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Benža, M. (1991). Návrh koncepcie integrovaného informačného systému pre národopisnú vedu [Draft Concept of an Integrated Information System for Ethnographic Science]. *Múzeum*, 36(2), 19–20.
- (1998). Etnická identita z pohľadu etnológie [Ethnic Identity from the Ethnological Perspective]. *Slovenský národopis*, 46(4), 466–70.
- (2003). Národopisný ústav – Ústav etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied v 90. rokoch 20. storočia [The Ethnographic Institute—the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the 1990s]. *Ethnologia Actualis Slovaca*, 1(3), 71–80.
- (2006). Slovenské menšiny vo výskumných plánoch Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied [Slovak Minorities in the Research Plans of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 48–60.
- (2015). *Tradičný odev Slovenska/ Traditional Clothing of Slovakia*. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby.
- (2017). *Tradičný odev Záhoria* [Traditional Clothing of the Záhorie Region]. Skalica: Záhorské múzeum v Skalici v spolupráci s Ústavom etnológie SAV.
- (2019). *Tradičný odev Turca* [Traditional Clothing of the Turiec Region]. Vrútky: FOMI.
- et al. (1992). *Integrovaný informačný systém Národopisného ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied* [Integrated Information System of the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. Bratislava: NÚ SAV. Internal unpublished document of the Ethnographic Institute SAS.
- (Ed.) (1998). *Atlas ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Rumunsku/Atlasul culturii populare a Slovacilor din România* [Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Romania]. Nadlak: Kultúrna a vedecká spoločnosť Ivana Krasku.
- (Ed.) (2002). *Atlas ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Juhoslávii/Atlas narodne kulture Slovaka u Jugoslavii* [Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Yugoslavia]. Báčsky Petrovec: Matica slovenská v Juhoslávii – Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.

- (Ed.) (2005a). *Ludová kultúra Slovákov na Ukrajine/Народна культура Словаків в Україні* [The Folk Culture of Slovaks in Ukraine]. Užhorod: Mystercka linia.
- (Ed.) (2005b). *Atlas ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Chorvátsku/Atlas narodne kulture Slovaka u Hrvatskoj* [Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Croatia]. Našice: Zväz Slovákov v Chorvátsku.
- (Ed.) (2006). *Atlas tradičnej kultúry slovenských menšín v strednej a južnej Európe* [Atlas of the Traditional Culture of Slovak Minorities in Central and Southern Europe]. Nadlak: Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko.
- (Ed.) (2015). *Atlas ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Poľsku/Atlas kultury ludowej Słowaków w Polsce* [Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Poland]. Krakov: Spolok Slovákov v Poľsku.
- Biele vrany 2020 [White Crows 2020]. <https://bielavrana.sk/oceneni/2020.html>. Accessed February 8, 2023.
- Bitušiková, A., Blahová, N., Hlinčíková, M., Kiliánová, G., Gyárfás Lutherová, S., Panczová, Z., Podolinská, T., Popelková, K., Potančok, V., & Voľanská, L. (2016). International Conference: Ethnology in the Third Millennium: Topics, Methods, Challenges (October 19–21, 2016, Smolenice). *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 64(4), 541–7.
- Bitušiková, A., & Luther, D. (2010a). From Uniformity to Sustainable Diversity: Transformations of a Post-Socialist City. In: M. Janssens, M. Bechtold, A. de Ruijter, D. Pinelli, G. Prarolo, & V. Stenius (Eds.), *The Sustainability of Cultural Diversity. Nations, Cities, and Organizations* (pp. 178–206). Cheltenham, UK – Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- (2010b). Sustainable Diversity and Public Space in the City of Bratislava, Slovakia. *Anthropological Notebooks*, XVI(2), 5–18.
- (Eds.) (2010). *Kultúrna a sociálna diverzita na Slovensku III.: globálne a lokálne v súčasnom meste/Cultural and Social Diversity in Slovakia III: The Global and Local in Contemporary City*. Banská Bystrica: Inštitút sociálnych a kultúrnych štúdií FHV, Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici – Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Bobáková, M., & Tužinská, H. (2006). Rozhovor s Boženou Filovou, riaditeľkou Národopisného ústavu SAV v rokoch 1958–1989 [Interview with Božena Filová, Director of the Ethnographic Institute SAS in 1958–1989]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 207–45.
- Bogatyrev, P. [Bogatyriov, P. G.] (1935). Funkčno-štruktúrna metóda a iné metódy etnografie a folkloristiky [Functional-Structural Method and Other Methods Used in Ethnography and Folklore Studies]. *Slovenské pohľady*, 51, 550–8.
- Botik, J. (1987). Encyklopédia národopisu Slovenska. Projekt komplexného syntetizujúceho diela slovenskej etnografie a folkloristiky [Encyclopaedia of Ethnography of Slovakia. The Project of a Comprehensive Synthesizing Work of Slovak Ethnography and Folklore Studies]. *Slovenský národopis*, 35(1), 5–21.
- (1991). Etnicita ako základná kategória národopisnej vedy [Ethnicity as the Basic Category of Ethnographic Science]. *Slovenský národopis*, 39(1), 18–25.
- (Ed.) (1988). *Hont. Tradície ľudovej kultúry* [Hont Region. The Traditions of Folk Culture]. Bratislava: Osveta.
- Botik, J., & Slavkovský, P. (Eds.) (1995). *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska 1, 2* [Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia 1, 2]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). Social Space and Symbolic Power. In: L. J. D. Wacquant (Ed.), *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology* (pp. 122–39). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braudel, F. (2009). History and the Social Sciences: The Longue Durée. *Review*, XXXII(2), 179–80.
- Brubaker, R. (2002). Ethnicity without groups. *Archives de Sociologie*, XLIII(2), 163–89.
- (2003). Přehodnocení národní identity: národ, jeho institucionalizovaná forma, praktická kategorie, nahodilá událost [Rethinking National Identity: Nation, Its Institutionalised Form, Practical Categories, Random Event]. In: M. Hroch (Ed.), *Pohledy na národ a nacionalismus* [Views on the Nation and Nationalism] (pp. 375–85). Praha: SLON.
- Bumová, I., Gažovičová, T., Salner, P., & Soukupová, B. (2011). *Premeny židovskej identity po holokauste* [Transformations of Jewish Identity after the Holocaust]. Bratislava: Zing Print.
- Búriková, Z., & Miller, D. (2010). *Au pair*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burlasová, S. (1960). K otázkam hudobného folklóru Slovákov v Rumunsku [On the Issues of Musical Folklore in Romania]. *Slovenský národopis*, 7(1), 139–53.
- (1964). K problému genézy, funkcie a štýlu ľudovej piesne s družstevnou tematikou [On the Issue of the Genesis, Function, and Style of Folk Song with Cooperative Themes]. *Slovenský národopis*, 12(1), 3–67.
- (1991). *Vojenské a regrútske piesne* [Soldiers' and Recruits' Songs]. Klenotnica slovenskej ľudovej kultúry, zv. 18. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (1998). *Katalóg slovenských naratívnych piesní. Typenindex slowakischer Erzähllieder*. Zv. 1–3. E. Krekovičová (Ed.). Etnologické štúdie, 2–4. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (2002). *Slovenské ľudové balady* [Slovak Folk Ballads]. Bratislava: Scriptorium Musicum.
- Bužeková, T. (2007). *Za horama, za vodú... Ľudové rozprávania z obce Závod* [Beyond Mountains, Beyond Water... Folk Narratives from the Municipality of Závod]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2008). Nepriateľ zvnútra a jeho povest' – skúmanie bosoráctva a klebiet v antropológii [The Enemy Within and His Reputation—Exploring Witchcraft and Gossip in Anthropology]. *Slovenský národopis*, 56(2), 130–45.
- (2009). *Nepriateľ zvnútra. Nadprirodzená hrozba v ľudskej podobe*. [The Enemy Within. A Supernatural Threat in Human Form]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Bužeková, T., & Jerotijević, D. (Eds.) (2012). *Metodologické problémy etnografického výskumu: zborník z konferencie: Metodologické problémy v etnografickom výskume sociálnych reprezentácií*. Bratislava, 8.–9.11.2012 [Methodological Problems of Ethnographic Research: Proceedings from the Conference: Methodological Problems in the Ethnographic Research on Social Representations. Bratislava, November 8–9, 2012]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Chorváthová, L. (1995). On Factors, Shaping Social and Ethnic. National Identity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Slovakia. *Slovenský národopis*, 43(1), 57–74.
- Čechi i Slovaki (1964). In: *Narody mira. Etnografické skice. Narody zarubežnej Evropy I* [Nations of the World. Ethnographic Essays. Nations Beyond Europe I] (pp. 173–276). Moskva: Nauka.
- Československá vlastivěda. Díl III. *Ľudová kultúra* (1968) [Czechoslovak Homeland Studies. Part III. Folk Culture]. Praha: Orbis.
- Danglová, O. (1976). Pololudové maliarstvo na Záhorí. Pokus o semiotický rozbor [Semi-Folk Painting in Záhorie Region. An Attempt to Conduct a Semiotic Analysis]. *Slovenský národopis*, 24(1), 75–82.
- (1992). Modernizácia alebo (de)modernizácia roľníckej ekonomiky [Modernisation or De(modernisation) of Peasant Economy]. In: D. Ratica (Ed.), *Zmeny v hodnotových systémoch v kontexte každodennej kultúry: výsledky výskumov v roku 1992* [Changes in Value Systems in the Context of Daily Culture: Research Results 1992] (pp. 5–22). Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- (1994). Folk Art in Slovakia and the European Context. *Slovenský národopis*, 42(1), 48–52.
- (1995a). Rural Community in the Process of Socio-Economic Changes. *Collegium Anthropologicum*, 19(2), 129–44.
- (1995b). Transformácia poľnohospodárstva ako otáznik pre etnológa [The Transformation of Agriculture as a Question Mark for the Ethnologist]. *Slovenský národopis*, 43(4), 487–92.
- (2001). *Dekor symbol. Dekoratívna tradícia na Slovensku a európsky kontext* [Décor Symbol. Decorative Traditions in Slovakia and the European Context]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2006). *Slovenský vidiek. Bariéry a perspektívy rozvoja* [The Slovak Countryside. The Barriers and Perspectives of Its Development]. Bratislava: Zing Print.
- (2008). Juraj Podoba jubiluje [Celebrating Juraj Podoba's Anniversary]. *Slovenský národopis*, 56(2), 229–31.
- (2009). *Výšivka na Slovensku/Embroidery in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby – Ústav etnológie SAV – Národné osvetové centrum.
- (2014). *Modrotlač na Slovensku/Blueprint in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2018). Blahoželanie Jánovi Botíkovi [Congratulations to Ján Botík]. In: P. Maráky, H. Hložková, & M. Botiková (Eds.), *Cesty Jána Botíka. Zborník venovaný životným cestám etnografa prof. PhDr. Jána Botíka, DrSc. pri príležitosti životného jubilea* [The Pathways of Ján Botík. Volume Dedicated to the Life's Paths of Ethnographer, Prof. PhDr. Ján Botík, DrSc. on the Occasion of His Life Anniversary] (pp. 94–5). Bratislava: Národopisný ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2019). *Ornament a predmet. Dekoratívna tradícia na Slovensku/Ornament and Object. Decorative Tradition in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby – Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV.
- (2021). E-mail correspondence with T. Zachar Podolinská as part of the research probe, December 13, 2021.



- Danglová, O., & Stoličná, R. (Eds.) (2001). *Etnológia a kultúrne dedičstvo. Zborník venovaný jubileu Soni Kovačevičovej* [Ethnology and Cultural Heritage. Volume Dedicated to Soňa Kovačevičová's Jubilee]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Danglová, O., & Zajonc, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Mestá a dediny pod Malými Karpatmi: etnologické štúdie* [Towns and Villages under the Small Carpathians: Ethnological Studies]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Danube Compass*. Podunajský kompas. Slovenská republika. <http://sk.danubecompass.org/?lang=sk>. Accessed August 13, 2021.
- Desire*. <https://projectdesire.eu/>. Accessed February 12, 2023.
- Divičanová, A., Benža, M., & Krupa, O. (Eds.) (1996). *Atlas ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Maďarsku* [Atlas of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Hungary]. Békešská Čaba: Slovenský výskumný ústav.
- Divinský, B., & Zachar Podolinská, T. et al. (2018). *Globe in Motion: Patterns of International Migration: Similarities and Differences*. Ethnological Studies 34. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2018.9788.097097578>.
- Dodatok č. 1. k Zriaďovacej listine Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie Slovenskej akadémie vied č. 740/0214/2003 zo dňa 9. 10. 2003, vydaný 21. 3. 2018 s účinnosťou od 1. 7. 2018 [Addendum no. 1. to the Incorporation Document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences No. 740/0214/2003 of 9/10/2003, issued on 21/03/2018 with effect from 1/7/2018] (2018). [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/dodatok\\_k\\_zriadovacej\\_listine\\_uesa\\_sav.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/dodatok_k_zriadovacej_listine_uesa_sav.pdf). Accessed March 10, 2022.
- Doplnok k Zriaďovacej listine Ústavu etnológie SAV č. 430/0214/94 zo dňa 22. 7. 1994 [Amendment to the Incorporation Document of the Institute of Ethnology SAS No. 430/0214/94 of July 22, 1994] (1994). Internal unpublished document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS.
- Dotazník. Súhrn hlavných aktivít vedeckej organizácie Slovenskej akadémie vied Hodnotené obdobie: 1. január 2003 – 31. december 2006 [Questionnaire. Summary of the main activities of the research institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Period: January 1, 2003 – December 31, 2006] (2007). [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny\\_dotaznik\\_2003-2006.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny_dotaznik_2003-2006.pdf). Accessed August 2, 2021.
- Dotazník. Súhrn hlavných aktivít vedeckej organizácie Slovenskej akadémie vied Hodnotené obdobie: 1. január 2007 – 31. december 2011 [Questionnaire. Summary of the main activities of the research institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Period: January 1, 2007 – December 31, 2011] (2012). [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny\\_dotaznik\\_2007-2011.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny_dotaznik_2007-2011.pdf). Accessed April 5, 2022.
- Droppová, L. (1966). K problematike národopisného výskumu súčasnosti [On Contemporary Ethnographic Research]. *Slovenský národopis*, 14(4), 595–600.
- Droppová, L., & Krekovičová, E. (2010). *Počujte Panny, aj vy Mládenci...: letákové piesne zo slovenských tlačiarň* [Listen, Maidens and Young Men...: Leaflet Songs from Slovak Printing Works]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Elektronická encyklopédia* [Electronic Encyclopaedia] (2008). <https://www.ludovakultura.sk/encyklopedia/o-projekte-elektronickej-encyklopedie/>. Accessed June 15, 2021.
- ELTE.DH. <https://elte-dh.hu/en/dariah-ceh/>. Accessed May 10, 2023.
- Espósito, R. (2010). *Communitas. The Origin and Destiny of Community*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia: Translations and Explanations of Texts* (1994). Trans. by L. Mikulcová, E. Salnerová, A. Szabová, & A. Fenton. Bratislava: VEDA – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Ethnographischer Atlas der Slowakei: Übersetzungen der Texte und der Erläuterungen* (1991). Übersetzung M. Horáriková, & F. Förster. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- ETNOFOLK. *Preservation and Enhancement of Folk Culture Heritage in Central Europe*. <https://uesa.sav.sk/projekty/ochrana-a-rozvoj-dedicstva-ludovej-kultury-v-strednej-europe-etnofolk/>. Accessed August 10, 2021.
- ETNOFOLK.eu. *Záznamy* [ETNOFOLK.eu. Records]. <https://uetetnofolk.eu/index.php/main/records>. Accessed February 21, 2023.
- Etnografický atlas Slovenska* (1994) [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia]. <https://www.tv-archiv.sk/etnograficky-atlas-slovenska>. Accessed February 28, 2021.
- EURAXESS. <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/hrs4r>. Accessed January 12, 2023.
- Evaluation 2012–2015*. Slovak Academy of Sciences. <https://www.sav.sk/?lang=en&doc=activity-evaluation-2012>. Accessed March 15, 2022.
- Expert 1 Letter*, addressed to the management of the SAS Science Section III, April 9, 2007. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Expert Review 1. SAS Accreditation 2007*. (Expert's report on quality, relevance, topicality, and effectiveness of research and development in the assessed organisation of the SAS.) Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Expert Review 2. SAS Accreditation 2007*. (Expert's report on quality, relevance, topicality, and effectiveness of research and development in the assessed organisation of the SAS.) Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Expert Review 3. SAS Accreditation 2007*. (Expert's report on quality, relevance, topicality, and effectiveness of research and development in the assessed organisation of the SAS.) Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Expert's Report Template. SAS Accreditation 2007*. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Falťanová, L. (1992). Obchod a tolerancia [Business and Tolerance]. *Slovenský národopis*, 40(3), 280–8.
- (1993). Profesná dráha živnostníkov a znárodňovacie procesy [The Professional Career of Tradesmen and Nationalisation Processes]. *Slovenský národopis*, 41(2), 139–60.
- Feglová V. (1993). Priestor ako antropologický fenomén [Space as an Anthropological Phenomenon]. *Slovenský národopis*, 41(2), 131–8.
- Feglová, V., & Leščák, M. (Eds.) (1995). *Pramene k tradičnej duchovnej kultúre Slovenska. Obrady, zvyky a povere – 1939* [Sources of Traditional Spiritual Culture of Slovakia. Rituals, Customs, and Superstitions–1939]. Bratislava: Prebudená pieseň – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (Eds.) (1996). *Slovenské svadby. Z dotazníkovej akcie Matice Slovenskej 1942. Pramene k tradičnej duchovnej kultúre Slovenska*, zv. II. [Slovak Weddings. From a Questionnaire Survey of Matica slovenská 1942. Sources of Traditional Spiritual Culture of Slovakia, Vol. II]. Bratislava: Prebudená pieseň – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Ferencová, M. (2006). Od ľudu k národu: vytváranie národnej kultúry v etnografickej produkcii v socialistickom Československu a Maďarsku [From People to Nation: The Creation of National Culture in Ethnographic Production in Socialist Czechoslovakia and Hungary]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(2), 104–33.
- Ferencová, M., & Nosková, J. (2009). K otázke studia paměti a města [On the Study of Memory and City]. In: M. Ferencová, J. Nosková (Eds.), *Paměť města. Obraz města, veřejné komemorace a historické zlomy v 20. – 21. století* [The Memory of the City. The Picture of the City, Public Commemorations, and Historical Turning Points in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries] (pp. 11–40). Brno: Etnologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky, v. v. i., pracoviště Brno; Statutární město Brno – Archiv města Brna – Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (Eds.) (2009). *Paměť města: obraz města, veřejné komemorace a historické zlomy v 20. – 21. století* [The Memory of the City. The Picture of the City, Public Commemorations, and Historic Turning Points in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries]. Brno: Etnologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky, v. v. i., pracoviště Brno; Statutární město Brno – Archiv města Brna – Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Filčák, R., & Škobla, D. (2019). No Pollution and no Roma in my Backyard: Class and Race in Framing Local Activism in Laborov, Eastern Slovakia. In: *Environmental justice, popular struggle, and community development* (pp. 53–68). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Filčák, R., Škobla, D., & Dokupilová, D. (2020). *Ensuring Access to Sanitation Infrastructure: Roma Settlements and Structural Inequalities in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences, Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Filová, B. (1959). Stav ľudovej kultúry Slovákov v Juhoslávii a otázka jej ďalšieho výskumu [The State of the Folk Culture of Slovaks in Yugoslavia and Its Further Research]. *Slovenský národopis*, 7(1), 139–53.

- (1960). K niektorým metodologickým otázkam národopisnej vedy [On Some Methodological Issues of Ethnographic Science]. *Slovenský národopis*, 8(2), 177–88.
- (1966). Filozoficko-metodologický seminár o vplyve industrializácie na súčasnú kultúru [Philosophical-Methodological Seminar on the Impacts of Industrialisation on Contemporary Culture]. *Slovenský národopis*, 14(4), 506.
- (1979). Integrácia československej etnografie a folkloristiky v rámci Štátneho plánu základného výskumu – výsledky a perspektívy [Integration of Czechoslovak Ethnography and Folklore Studies in the National Basic Research Plan—Results and Perspectives]. *Slovenský národopis*, 27(3), 474–90.
- Filová, B., & Gašparíková, V. (Eds.) (1993). *Slovenské ľudové rozprávky I.* [Slovak Folk Fairy Tales I]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (Eds.) (2001). *Slovenské ľudové rozprávky II.* [Slovak Folk Fairy Tales II]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (Eds.) (2004). *Slovenské ľudové rozprávky III.* [Slovak Folk Fairy Tales III]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Filová, B., & Kovačevićová, S. (Eds.) (1990). *Etnografický atlas Slovenska* [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Finalisti 2016* [Finalists 2016]. <https://www.romaspirit.sk/rocnik/roma-spirit-2016/>. Accessed April 15, 2023.
- Flooded*. 2016. Documentary Directed by Soňa G. Lutherová: The Past under Water. Osudy pod hladinou. <https://ah.sk/en/projekt/flooded/>. Accessed July 12, 2021.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Dozerať a trestať. Zrod väzenia* [Supervise and Punish. The Origins of the Prison]. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- Gašparíková, V. (1991, 1992). *Katológ slovenskej ľudovej prózy 1, 2* [Catalogue of Slovak Folk Prose 1, 2]. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- (2006). Od výskumu k syntéze (Ľudové tradície o zbojníkoch na poľsko-slovenskom pomezí v spomienkach etnológa) [From Research to Synthesis (Robbers' Folk Traditions on the Polish-Slovak Border in the Memories of an Ethnologist)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 68–90.
- (Ed.) (1988). *Horehronie. Folklorne prejavy v živote ľudu* [Horehronie Region. Folklore Expressions in People's Lives]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Gogora, A. (2018a). Editoriál 1. [Editorial 1]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 66(1), 5–6. <https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/04081156etno1-2018-editoriál1-gogora.pdf>.
- (2018b). Philosophy and Digital Humanities in Slovakia—Problem of Digital Textual Resources. *Communications—Scientific Letters of the University of Žilina*, 20(1A), 22–6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26552/com.C.2018.1A.22-26>.
- (2023). Digital Research Collection—Principles and the Case of the Ethnological Collection of Research Reports. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 71(2), 107–25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/SN.2023.2.13>.
- Gyárfáš Lutherová, S. (2020). „Spraviť hrubú čiaru“: Etnografický film ako antropologický nástroj skúmania životných príbehov a traumy [‘Drawing a Thick Line’: Ethnographic Film as an Anthropological Instrument for Exploring Life Stories and Traumas]. In: P. Salner (Ed.), *Ťažké časy: Roky 1938–1945 v aktuálnom spoločenskom diskurze* [Hard Times: The Years 1938–1945 in Contemporary Social Discourse] (pp. 75–96). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2020.9788056906736>.
- Gyárfáš Lutherová, S., & Hlinčíková, M. (Eds.) (2016). *Za hranicami vedy? Aplikovaná antropológia v spoločnosti* [Beyond the Borders of Science? Applied Anthropology in Society]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415439>.
- Herderova cena pre Gabrielu Kiliánovú* [Herder Prize for Gabriela Kiliánová]. May 10, 2006. [https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source\\_no=20&news\\_no=875](https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source_no=20&news_no=875). Accessed May 12, 2023.
- Herderova cena* [Herder Prize]. In: *Encyclopaedia Beliana*. <https://beliana.sav.sk/heslo/herderova-cena>. Accessed May 12, 2023.
- Herzánová, L. (2004). Starnúca Európa – aktuálny problém: možnosti etnologickej reflexie a interpretácie (na príklade výskumných skúseností v Rakúsku) [Ageing Europe—Current Problem: The Possibilities of Ethnological Reflection and Interpretation (Through an Example of Research Experience from Austria)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 11(1), 47–54.
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L. et al. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520, 429–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/520429a>.
- Historický atlas Evanjelickej cirkvi a. v. na Slovensku* [Historical Atlas of the Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession in Slovakia] (2011). Scientific editors: D. Kusendová, & M. Benža. Liptovský Mikuláš: Transcousius, a. s.
- Hlinčíková, M. (2008). Niekoľko poznámok k doktorandskému štúdiu [Some Comments on PhD Studies]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 94.
- Hlinčíková, M., Chudžíková, A., Gallová Kriglerová, E., & Sekulová M. (2014). *Migranti v meste: prítomní a (ne)viditeľní* [Migrants in the City: Present and (In)Visible]. Bratislava: Inštitút pre verejné otázky – Centrum pre výskum etnicity a kultúry.
- Hlinčíková, M., & Sekulová, M. (2015). *Integrácia ľudí s medzinárodnou ochranou na Slovensku: Hľadanie východísk* [Integration of People under International Protection in Slovakia: Finding Ways Out]. Bratislava: Inštitút pre verejné otázky.
- (Eds.) (2019). *Globe in Motion 2. Multiple Shades of Migration: Regional Perspectives*. Ethnological Studies 36. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2019.9788097337209>.
- Hlôšková, H. (1994). The Problem of Historical Consciousness and its Narrative Forms in the Development of Scientific Interpretation in Slovakia. *Slovenský národopis*, 42(3), 304–20.
- (2018). Andrej Melicherčík – osobnosť v dobe, doba v osobnosti (na príklade jednej bádateľskej témy) [Andrej Melicherčík—Personality within One Era, an Era within One Personality (Through the Example of One Research Topic)]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 66(1), 140–55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26363/SN.2018.1.06>.
- (2020). Namiesto úvodu – Laudatio pro Milan Leščák [Instead of a Foreword—Laudation for Milan Leščák]. In: H. Hlôšková (Ed.), *Milan Leščák – vedec, pedagóg, človek* [Milan Leščák—Scientist, Teacher, Man] (pp. 10–12). Bratislava: Národopisná spoločnosť Slovenska.
- (2021a). *Andrej Melicherčík – Osobnosť v dobe, doba v osobnosti* [Andrej Melicherčík—Personality within One Era, an Era within One Personality]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT – Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropologie SAV.
- (2021b). Telephone communication with T. Zachar Podolinská as part of the research probe, August 23, 2021.
- Hlôšková, H., & Krekovičová, E. (Eds.) (1991). *Folklórne žánre – archívy – katalogy* [Folklore Genres—Archives—Catalogues]. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- Horváthová, E. (1964). *Cigáni na Slovensku: Historicko-etnografický náčrt* [Gypsies in Slovakia: Historical-Ethnographic sketch]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (1973a). Hlavné smery a činnosť Národopisného ústavu SAV od založenia Slovenskej akadémie vied [The Main Focuses and Activities of the Ethnographic Institute SAS from the Establishment of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. *Slovenský národopis*, 21(2), 169–81.
- (1973b). Teoretické otázky súčasnej etnografie [The Theoretical Issues of Present-Day Ethnography]. *Slovenský národopis*, 21(3), 311–8.
- Horváthová, E., & Urbancová, V. (Eds.) (1972). *Die Slowakische Volkskultur*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Hrustič, T. (2011). Values and Ethnicity—Religious Conversions of Roma in Eastern Slovakia to the Watchtower Society. In: A. Máté-Tóth, & C. Rughinis (Eds.), *Spaces and Borders: Current Research on Religion in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 23–31). Berlin: DE Gruyter.
- (Ed.) (2009). *Výkon terénnej sociálnej práce v marginalizovaných rómskych komunitách. Záverečná výskumná správa Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied pre Fond sociálneho rozvoja* [Conducting Field Social Work in Marginalised Roma Communities. Final Research Report of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences for the Social Development Fund]. Bratislava. [https://www.ia.gov.sk/external/37/vykon-tsp-v-mrk\\_finalna-sprava.pdf](https://www.ia.gov.sk/external/37/vykon-tsp-v-mrk_finalna-sprava.pdf). Accessed November 12, 2021.
- Huba, M., & Podoba, J. (Eds.) (1998). *Bratislava/nahlas po desiatich rokoch* [Bratislava/aloud after 10 years]. Bratislava: Mestská organizácia SZOPK.
- Hudek, A. (2014a). Slovenská akadémia vied a umení v rokoch 1945–1952. Prerod SAVU do Slovenskej akadémie vied [The Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts in 1945–1952. The Transformation of the SASA into the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny*



- Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 69–86). Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2014b). Protirečivý vývoj SAV. Vedecký výskum a budovanie pracovísk na pozadí tlakov politickej moci [Contradictory Development of the SAS. Scientific Research and the Building of Institutes against the Background of Political Pressures]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 107–19). Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2014c). Slovenská akadémia vied a umení v „obrodnom procese 1968–1969“ [The Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts in the ‘Revival Process of 1968–1969’]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 145–66). Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2014d). Zásadné spoločenské zmeny a vývoj SAV po roku 1993 [Fundamental Social Changes and the SAS Development after 1993]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 217–41). Bratislava: VEDA.
- Hudek, A., & Klačka, J. (2014). Slovenské „Predjari“ a jeho obraz v spoločenských aktivitách SAV [The Slovak ‘Early Spring’ and Its Image in the SAS Social Activities]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 138–44). Bratislava: VEDA.
- InovEduc. <http://www.inoveduc.eu/>. Accessed February 12, 2023.
- Jurková, Z., Soukupová, B., Novotná, H., & Salner, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Minority: Construct or Reality? On Reflection and Self-Realisation of Minorities in History*. Bratislava: Zing Print.
- Jurzová, M., & Kalávková, V. (1992). Demografický archív [Demographic Archive]. *Slovenský národopis*, 40(2), 224–8.
- Kadlecová, A. (1993). The Ethnic Pluralism of a Small Farming Town in the First Half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and Today. (A Case Study of the Slovak Minority in Southern Hungary). *Slovenský národopis*, 41(2), 171–93.
- Kalávková, V., & Továrek, L. (1991). Automatizované spracovanie dokumentačných fondov Národopisného ústavu SAV – súbor „Svadba“ [Automated Processing of the Documentation Collections of the Ethnographic Institute SAS—‘Wedding’ Files]. *Slovenský národopis*, 39(1), 86–97.
- Kalavský, M. (1991). Etnicita alebo etnické vedomie? [Ethnicity Or Ethnic Awareness?]. *Slovenský národopis*, 39(3–4), 354–57.
- (2004). Vstup Slovenska do Európskej únie – výzva pre slovenskú etnológiu [Slovakia’s Entry in the European Union—A Challenge for Slovak Ethnology]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 11(1), 18–24.
- Kandert, J. (1992). The roots of Czecho-Slovak folk models. *Slovenský národopis*, 40(1), 52–5.
- Kiliánová, G. (1995a). La premiere guerre mondiale dans le souvenir du peuple dans les années 1960 à 1990. *La nouvelle alternative*, 37, 29–30.
- (1995b). Ethnicity, Culture, and Boundaries. The Central European Case. In: K. Beitzl, & O. Bockhorn (Eds.), *Ethnologia Europaea. 5. Internationaler Kongreß der SIEF, Wien, 12.–16. 9. 1994. Plenarvorträge* (pp. 103–22). Wien: Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Volkskunde der Universität Wien. Band 16/II.
- (1996a). Agenda of Research on Nationalism (Eastern Central Europe). *Slovenský národopis*, 44(4), 454–62.
- (1996b). Narratives about Death in Modern Society. In: L. Petzoldt (Hrsg.), *Folk Narrative and World View* (pp. 381–90). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- (1999). Niekoľko poznámok k článku Mojmir Benžu „Etnická identita z pohľadu etnológie“ [Some Comments on Mojmir Benža’s Article ‘Ethnic Identity from the Ethnological Perspective’]. *Slovenský národopis*, 47(2–3), 223–5.
- (2002). Etnológia na Slovensku na prahu 21. storočia: reflexie a trendy. [Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections and Trends]. *Slovenský národopis*, 50(3–4), 277–91.
- (2005a). Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections and Trends. In: G. Kiliánová, K. Köstlin, H. Nikitsch, & R. Stoličná (Eds.), *Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections and Trends* (pp. 17–36). Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAS – Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Wien.
- (2005b). *Identita a pamäť. Devín/Theben/Dévény ako pamätné miesto*. [Identity and Memory. Devín/Theben/Dévény as a Place of Memory]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – SAP.
- (2006). Riadenie a plánovanie na vedeckom pracovisku [Management and Planning at a Scientific Workplace]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 61–7.
- (2008). Projekt „European Doctorate“ po siedmich rokoch [‘European Doctorate’ Project after Seven Years]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15 (1), 119–24.
- (2011). *Identität und Gedächtnis in der Slowakei: die Burg Devín als Erinnerungsort*. Schriften der Slowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Band 4. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- (2013). Päťdesiat ročníkov Slovenského národopisu: bilancia vedeckého časopisu [Fifty Years of Slovenský národopis: The Balance of a Scientific Journal]. In: J. Zajonc, M. Mészárosová, M., & I. Kostovská, *Slovenský národopis. 1953–2002. Bibliografia* [Slovenský národopis: 1953–2002. Bibliography] (pp. 10–44). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV. [https://uea.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/slovensky\\_narodopis\\_bibliografia\\_1\\_0.pdf](https://uea.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/slovensky_narodopis_bibliografia_1_0.pdf). Accessed May 12, 2023.
- (2016a). II. kapitola. Národopisné pracovisko Slovenskej akadémie vied (1953–1969) [Chapter II. The Ethnographic Workplace of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. In: G. Kiliánová & J. Zajonc, *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution] (pp. 55–80). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- (2016b). III. kapitola. Národopisný ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied od normalizácie po neznú revolúciu (1969–1989) [Chapter III. Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences from Normalisation until the Velvet Revolution (1969–1989)]. In: G. Kiliánová & J. Zajonc, *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution] (pp. 81–102). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- (2016c). IV. kapitola. Národopisný ústav Slovenskej akadémie vied v čase spoločenských zmien po novembri 1989 [Chapter IV. The Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the Period of Social Changes after November 1989]. In: G. Kiliánová & J. Zajonc, *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution] (pp. 103–26). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- (2016d). Záver [Conclusion]. In: G. Kiliánová, & J. Zajonc, *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution] (pp. 127–30). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- (2018). Vedecká práca Jána Botíka v Národopisnom ústave Slovenskej akadémie vied [The Scientific Work of Ján Botík at the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. In: P. Maráky, H. Hlôšková, & M. Botíková (Eds.), *Cesty Jána Botíka. Zborník venovaný životným cestám etnografa prof. PhDr. Jána Botíka, DrSc. pri príležitosti životného jubilea* [The Pathways of Ján Botík. Volume Dedicated to the Life’s Paths of Ethnographer Prof. PhDr. Ján Botík, DrSc. on the Occasion of His Life Anniversary] (pp. 49–56). Bratislava: Národopisná spoločnosť Slovenska.
- (2019). Scholarship and Power: Research of the Ukrainian Ethnic Group. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 67(4), 441–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/se-2019-0026>.
- (2020). Práca Milana Leščáka v Národopisnom ústave SAV (1963–1992/2003) a zdravotníka k životnému jubileu [The Work of Milan Leščák at the Ethnographic Institute SAS (1963–1992/2003)]. In: H. Hlôšková (Ed.), *Milan Leščák – vedec, pedagóg, človek* [Milan Leščák—Scientist, Teacher, Man] (pp. 13–22). Bratislava: Národopisná spoločnosť Slovenska.

- (Ed.) (1998). *Identita etnických spoločenstiev: výsledky etnologických výskumov* [The Identity of Ethnic Communities: Ethnological Research Results]. Etnologické štúdie, 5. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Kiliánová, G., & Krekovičová, E. (1993). Research on Slovak Erotic Folklore with a Focus on Context Study. *Slovenský národopis*, 41(3), 313–25.
- Kiliánová, G., & Mann, A. B. (2002). Rómsky dejepis – chronológia udalostí [Roma History—A Chronology of Events]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 19(2), 152–5.
- Kiliánová, G., & Popelková, K. (2008). Dialektischer Materialismus, Formalismus, Strukturalismus als Mittel zwischen den Zeiten: Emília Horváthová (1931–1996). In: E. Wallnöfer (Ed.), *Maß nehmen, Maß halten: Frauen im Fach Volkskunde* (pp. 123–44). Wien – Köln – Weimar: Böhlau Verlag Ges.m.b.H. – Co.KG.
- (2010). Zavádzanie marxistickej etnografie v národopise na Slovensku: zmena vedeckého myslenia [Introducing Marxist Ethnography in Slovak Ethnography: Change in Scientific Thinking]. *Slovenský národopis*, 58(4), 410–24.
- Kiliánová, G., & Stoličná, R. (2005). Introduction. In: G. Kiliánová, K. Köstlin, H. Nikitsch, & R. Stoličná (Eds.), *Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Reflections and Trends* (pp. 9–16). Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAS – Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Wien.
- Kiliánová, G., & Vrzgulová, M. (2006). 60. výročie založenia Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied. Obzretie a pohľad do budúcnosti [60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Founding of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. *Slovenský národopis*, 54(3), 279–93.
- Kiliánová, G., & Zajonc, J. (2016). *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuita a diskontinuita bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and of One Institution]. Bratislava: VEDA – Ústav etnológie SAV. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- Kiliánová, G., Kowalská, E., & Krekovičová, E. (Eds.) (2009). *My a tí druhí v modernej spoločnosti: konštrukcie a transformácie kolektívnych identít* [We and the Others in Modern Society: The Constructions and Transformations of Collective Identities]. Bratislava: VEDA – Historický ústav SAV – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Kiliánová, G., Köstlin, K., Nikitsch, H., & Stoličná, R. (Eds.) (2005). *Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Reflections and Trends*. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAS – Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Wien.
- Kiliánová, G., & Krekovičová, E. (Eds.) (1992). *Folklore, Folklorism and National Identification: The Slovak Cultural Context*. Bratislava: Ethnographic Institute SAS.
- (Eds.) (1994). *Folklore in the Identification Processes of Society*. Ethnological Series 1. Bratislava: Ethnographic Institute of SAS.
- Kiliánová, G., & Potančok, V. (Eds.) (2017). PhDr. Božena Filová, CSc., členka korešpondentka SAV: osobnosť, dielo a osobná bibliografia [PhDr. Božena Filová, CSc., Correspondent Member of the SAS: Personality, Work, and Personal Bibliography]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV. [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/bozena\\_filova.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/bozena_filova.pdf). Accessed February 12, 2023.
- Kiliánová, G., & Riečanská, E. (Eds.) (2000). *Identity of Ethnic Groups and Communities: The Results of Slovak Ethnological Research*. Ethnological Studies 7. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology of SAS.
- Klačka, J. (1994). Prerastanie SAVU do SAV [The SASA Growing Into the SAS]. In: O. Pöss (Ed.), *Slovenská akadémia vied a umení. Z dejín vied a techniky na Slovensku* [The Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts. From the History of Sciences and Technology in Slovakia] (pp. 41–8). Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV.
- (2014). Vzťah SAV a ČSAV v zákone z roku 1963 [The Relationship between the SAS and the CSAS in the Act of 1963]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [The History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 124–8). Bratislava: VEDA.
- Koncepcia aktivít, výskumu a vývoja Ústavu etnológie SAV na roky 2016–2020* [The Concept of the Activities, Research, and Development of the Institute of Ethnology SAS for the Years 2016–2020] (2016). Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV, v. v. i. Dokumenty. [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/koncepcia\\_uet\\_sav\\_2016-2020\\_2017\\_01\\_31.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/koncepcia_uet_sav_2016-2020_2017_01_31.pdf). Accessed November 20, 2022.
- Kosová, M. (1973). Magické usmrčovanie protivníka na diaľku (Rozbor úkonu imitačnej mágie) [Magically Killing an Opponent at a Distance (Analysis of the Act of Imitation Magic)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 21(4), 543–54.
- Kováč, D. (2014). Transformácia Slovenskej akadémie vied v rokoch 1989–1993 [Transformation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in the Years 1989–1993]. In: D. Kováč et al., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 199–215). Bratislava: VEDA.
- Kováč, M., & Podolinská, T. (2001). *Lacandónci: poslední praví Mayovia* [Lacandons: The Last Genuine Mayas]. Bratislava: Katedra etnológie – Oddelenie religionistiky FIFUK v Bratislave v spolupráci s vydavateľstvom Chronos.
- Kováč, M., & Zachar Podolinská, T. (2017). *Maya Female Taboo: Menstruation and Pregnancy in Lacandon Daily Life. Contributions in New World Archaeology*, 11 (special issue), 143–8.
- Kovačevičová, S. (1955). *Ludový odev v Hornom Liptove* [Folk Clothing in the Upper Liptov Region]. Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry.
- (1974a). *Lidové výtvarné umění. Slovensko* [Folk Fine Arts. Slovakia]. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- (1974b). *Knižný drevorez v ľudovej tradícii* [Book Woodcarving in Folk Tradition]. Bratislava: Tatran.
- (1987). *Človek tvorca. Pracovné motívy Slovenska vo vyobrazeniach z 9.–18. storočia* [Man—Creator: Slovakia's Work Motifs in 9<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> Century Pictures]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2006). *Človek a jeho svet na obrazoch od stredoveku až na prah súčasnosti* [Man and His World in Picture from the Middle Ages until the Threshold of the Present]. Budmerice: Vydavateľstvo Rak.
- Kovačevičová, S., & Matula, Z. (1990). Úvod [Introduction]. In: B. Filová, & S. Kovačevičová (Eds.), *Etnografický atlas Slovenska* [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia] (p. X). Bratislava: VEDA.
- Kovačevičová, S., & Schreiber, B. (1971). *Ludové plastiky* [Folk Sculptures]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Krekovič, E., Mannová, E., & Krekovičová, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Myty naše slovenské* [Our Slovak Myths]. Bratislava: AEP.
- Krekovičová, E. (1991). The category of function in ethnological and folklore research: (Through the example of song repertoire analysis). *Slovenský národopis*, 39(2), 191–201.
- (1992). *Slovenské koledy: od Štedrého večera do Troch kráľov* [Slovak Carols: from Christmas Eve to the Three Kings Day]. Bratislava: Práca.
- (1995). Das Bild der Zigeuner und seine Reflexion in der slowakischen Folklore. *Slovenský národopis*, 43(3), 348–64.
- (1996). Reflexion des Bildes des Zigeuners in der Folklore. In: J. S. Hohmann (Ed.), *Handbuch zur Tsiganologie* (pp. 303–8). Frankfurt a. M. u. a.: Peter Lang Verlag.
- (1998). *Zwischen Toleranz und Barrieren. Das Bild der Zigeuner und Juden in der slowakischen Folklore*. Studien zur Tsiganologie und Folkloristik. Herausgegeben von Joachim S. Hohmann. Band 21. Frankfurt a. M. u. a.: Peter Lang Verlag.
- (1999). *Medzi toleranciou a bariérami. Obraz Róma a Žida v slovenskom folklóre* [Between Tolerance and Barriers. The Image of a Roma and a Jew in Slovak Folklore]. Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press.
- (2002). Obrusovanie mytologických bariér (k diskusií o publikácii Rómsky dejepis) [Grinding Mythological Barriers (On the Discussion on the Roma History Publication)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 19(2), 162–4.
- (2005). *Mentálne obrazy, stereotypy a mýty vo folklóre a v politike* [Mental Images, Stereotypes, and Myths in Folklore and Politics]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – ETERNA Press.
- (2015). *Naratívne piesne o zbojníkoch. Príspevok k porovnávaciemu štúdiu* [Narrative Songs on Robbers. A Contribution to a Comparative Study]. Etnologické štúdie, 22. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2015.9788097097547>.
- Krekovičová, E., & Penčev, V. (Eds.) (2005). *Bulhari na Slovensku. Etnokultúrne charakteristiky a súvislosti. Štúdie* [Bulgarians in Slovakia. Ethnocultural Characteristics and Context. Studies]. Bratislava: VEDA – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Krekovičová, E., & Potančok, V. (Eds.) (2013). *Personálna bibliografia PhDr. Sone Burlasovej, DrSc.* [Personal Bibliography of PhDr. Soňa Burlasová, DrSc.]. Bratislava: Eterna Press, s. r. o.

- Krekovičová, E., Uhrinová, A., & Žiláková, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Kontexty identity/ Az identitás összefüggései* [Identity Contexts]. Békéscsaba: OSZÖ – ELTE BTK – VÚSM – Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Krivý, V., & Danglová, O. (2006). *Svet mnohých „MY a ONI“*. *Kolektívne identity na súčasnom Slovensku* [The World of Many 'US and THEM']. Collective Identities in Present-Day Slovakia]. Bratislava: Centrum excelentnosti SAV „Kolektívne identity“.
- Krivý, V., Feglová, V., & Balko, D. (1996). *Slovensko a jeho regióny. Sociokultúrne súvislosti volebného správania* [Slovakia and Its Regions: The Socio-Cultural Context of Voting Behaviour]. Bratislava: Nadácia Média.
- Kubisa, T., & Gogora, A. (2018). Stav textového archívu Ústavu etnológie SAV a možnosti jeho digitálneho spracovania [The Situation of the Text Archive of the Institute of Ethnology SAS and the Possibilities of Its Digital Processing]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 66(1), 97–106.
- Kubová, M. (1994). *Bibliografia slovenskej etnografie a folkloristiky za roky 1986–1990* [The Bibliography of Slovak Ethnography and Folklore Studies in 1986–1990]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2006). Ústav etnológie a jeho vedecká knižnica v rokoch 1957–1986 [The Institute of Ethnology and Its Scientific Library in the Years 1957–1986]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 82–4.
- Kumanová, Z., & Mann, A. B. (Eds.) (2007). *Nepriznaný holocaust: Rómovia v rokoch 1939–1945* [Unacknowledged Holocaust: The Roma in the Years 1939–1945]. Bratislava: Občianske združenie In minorita – Slovenské národné múzeum – Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (Eds.) (2014). *Ma bisteren! Pripomínanie rómskeho holokaustu* [Ma bisteren! Commemorating the Roma Holocaust]. Bratislava: Občianske združenie In Minorita.
- Labrousse, E. [1933] (1984). *Esquisse du mouvement des prix et des revenus en France au XVIIIe siècle*. 2 Vols. Paris: Librairie Dalloz/ Repr. Paris: Éditions des archives contemporaines.
- Langer, J. (2005). Budúcnosť časopisu Ethnologia Europae Centralis [The Future of the Ethnologia Europae Centralis Journal]. *Slovenský národopis*, 53(3), 338–40.
- Leščák, M. (1966). Príspevok k metodike výskumu súčasného stavu folklóru [Contribution to the Methodology of Research on the Current State of Folklore]. *Slovenský národopis*, 14(4), 570–78.
- (1969). Úvahy o predmete národopisného bádania [Reflections on the Subject of Ethnographic Research]. *Slovenský národopis*, 17(2–3), 369–80.
- (1972). Výskum súčasného stavu folklóru na Slovensku – Metódy, problémy, ciele [Research on the Current State of Folklore in Slovakia—Methods, Problems, Objectives]. *Slovenský národopis*, 20(1), 185–94.
- (1982). Včleňovanie pokrokových tradícií ľudovej kultúry do systému socialistickej kultúry a do života pracujúcich. Projekt čiastkovej úlohy VIII-8-3/1 Štátneho plánu základného výskumu na roky 1981–1985 [Integration of Progressive Folk Culture Traditions into the System of Socialist Culture and Workers' Life. Project of Milestone VIII-8-3/1 of the National Basic Research Plan for the Years 1981–1985]. *Slovenský národopis*, 30(1), 6–16.
- (1985). Národopisné informácie po pätnástich rokoch [Ethnographic Information after Fifteen Years]. *Národopisné informácie*, 3 (Príloha Bibliografia Národopisných informácií 1969–1984) [Supplement Bibliography of Ethnographic Information 1969–1984], 1–5.
- (1991a). Horizonty súčasného národopisu (od etnológie, cez etnografiu, ľudovedu, národopis k etnológii) [The Horizons of Present-Day Ethnography (from Ethnology through Ethnography and Folk Sciences to Ethnology)]. *Múzeum*, 2, 1–5.
- (1991b). Diskusia o našej vede [Discussion on Our Science]. *Národopisné informácie*, 2, 117–9.
- (1991c). Začiatok užitočných dialógov? (Na okraj jednej ankety) [The Start of Useful Dialogues? (Comments on One Questionnaire Survey)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 39(1), 67–76.
- (1991d). The beginnings of functional structuralism in Slovak ethnology: (To Commemoration of P. G. Bogatyriov). *Slovenský národopis*, 39(3–4), 336–47.
- (1993). Ethische Prinzipien des Familienlebens in slowakischen Märchen. *Slovenský národopis*, 41(4), 448–52.
- (1997). Quellen zur Entwicklung der slowakischen Volkskultur in den Jahren zwischen den Weltkriegen. *Slovenský národopis*, 45(2), 175–87.
- (2006). Dejiny a reminiscencie [History and Reminiscences]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 85–94.
- (1996). *K dejinám slovenskej folkloristiky* [To the History of Verbal Folkloristic]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – Nadácia prebudená pieseň.
- Leščák, M., Kovačevićová, S., & Michálek, J. (1997). Profesor Andrej Melicherčík: spomienky a inšpirácie k nedožitej osemdesiatke (1917–1966) [Professor Andrej Melicherčík: Memories and Inspirations on His Missed 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday (1917–1966)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 45(1), 78–86.
- Letter of the Chairman of the IE SAS Scientific Board, of Podoba, of March 25, 2004*. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Letter of the Chairman of the Accreditation Committee, Vojtech Rušín (no. 106/0214/2004 of April 22, 2004)*. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- List of Recommendations from the SAS Accreditation Committee addressed to the IE SAS management, of January 30, 2004*. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Luther, D. (1996). Research in towns and the formation of urban ethnology in Slovakia. *Slovenský národopis*, 44(3), 334–44.
- (2006). ŠPZV – spomienky na plánovanú vedu [State Plan of Basic Research –Recollecting Planned Science]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 91–4.
- (2009). *Z Prešporka do Bratislavy* [From Pressburg to Bratislava]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT.
- (2014). Blahoželanie k šesťdesiatke Dušana Raticu [Congratulations on Dušan Ratica's 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday]. *Slovenský národopis*, 62(1), 131–2.
- (2021). *The Socio-Cultural Capital of Successful Villages: The Villages of the Year in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788056909157>.
- (Ed.) (1998). *Masky v ľudovej kultúre. Zborník k Antológii východoslovenského folklóru* [Masks in Folk Culture. Volume on the Anthology of Eastern Slovak Folklore]. Bratislava: NOC.
- (Ed.) (2021). *Dobré miesto pre život. Dediny roka na Slovensku* [Good Place for Life. The Villages of the Year in Slovakia]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788056909249>.
- Lutherová, S. (2008). Doktorandská výučba v Ústave etnológie SAV [PhD Education at the Institute of Ethnology SAS]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 97–8.
- Mann, A. B. (2000). *Rómsky dejepis* [Roma History]. Bratislava: Kalligram.
- (2018). *Rómski kovári na Slovensku/ Roma Blacksmiths in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby v spolupráci s Ústavom etnológie SAV.
- (Ed.) (1992). *Neznámi Rómovia: zo života a kultúry Cigánov-Rómov na Slovensku* [Unknown Roma: From the Life and Culture of Gypsies-Roma in Slovakia]. Bratislava: Ister Science Press.
- Manuál pre prezenčné hodnotenia organizácií hodnotiacim panelom* [Manual for Face-to-face Evaluations Organisations by Evaluation Panels] (2012). Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Marčeková, A. (2014). Vedecká výchova v SAV [Scientific Education in the SAS]. In: D. Kováč a kol., *Dejiny Slovenskej akadémie vied* [The History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (pp. 299–341). Bratislava: VEDA.
- Marušák, J., & Ferencová, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Teoretické prístupy k identitám a ich praktické aplikácie. Zborník zo seminára* [Theoretical Approaches to Identities and Their Practical Applications. Book of Abstracts from the Seminar]. Bratislava: Ústav politických vied SAV – VEDA.
- Medveď, M., Devinsky, F., Barta, J., & Hric, M. (2012). *Scientometrická analýza vedeckého výkonu ústavov tretieho oddelenia Slovenskej akadémie vied* [Scientometric Analysis of the Scientific Performance of the SAS Science Section III]. Bratislava: ARRA.
- Melicherčík, A. (1945). *Teória národopisu* [The Theory of Ethnography]. Národopisné spisy Tranoscia, zv. 2. Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš.
- (1950a). Československá etnografia a niektoré jej úlohy pri výstavbe socializmu [Czechoslovak Ethnography and Some of Its Tasks in the Construction of Socialism]. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 9, 25–36.
- (1950b). Sovietskaja etnografija 1946, č. 1–4. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 9, 226–9.
- (1950c). Sovietskaja etnografija 1947, č. 6–7. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 9, 229–30.
- (1952a). Sovietska etnografia – náš vzor [Soviet Ethnography—Our Model]. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 10, 5–23.



- (1952b). *Jánošíkovská tradícia na Slovensku* [The Jánošík Traditions in Slovakia]. Bratislava: SAV, VEDA.
- (1966). Tradičné a netradičné v ľudovej kultúre [The Traditional and Non-Traditional in Folk Culture]. *Slovenský národopis*, 14(4), 563–9.
- Meta-Panel Assessment Report of SAS Research Institute. Period January 1, 2012–December 31, 2015* (2016). Internal unpublished document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS.
- Meta-Panel Assessment Report of SAS Research Institute. Period January 1, 2016–December 31, 2021* (2022). Internal unpublished document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS.
- Mjartan, J. (1953). Prvý výskum ľudovej kultúry na družstevnej dedine [The First Research on Folk Culture in a Cooperative Village]. *Slovenský národopis*, 1(1), 253–61.
- (Ed.) (1956). *Banická dedina Žakarovce* [The Mining Village of Žakarovce]. Práce Národopisného ústavu SAV, zv. I. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.
- (Ed.) (1974). *Horehronie II. Kultúra a spôsob života ľudu. Ľudové zamestnania* [Horehronie Region II. People's Culture and Way of Life. Folk Jobs]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Nováková, K. (2009). *Vinohradníctvo a vinohradníci v procesoch transformácií* [Viticulture and Winegrowers in Transformation Processes]. Trnava: Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave.
- Novinky v programovej štruktúre Rádia Slovensko a Rádia Regina* [News in the Programme Structure of Radio Slovensko and Radio Regina] (February 1, 2013). [https://www.rtvs.org/aktualne-oznamy-tlacove-spravy-pr/158\\_novinky-v-programovej-strukture-radia-slovensko-a-radia-regina](https://www.rtvs.org/aktualne-oznamy-tlacove-spravy-pr/158_novinky-v-programovej-strukture-radia-slovensko-a-radia-regina). Accessed July 11, 2021.
- Odporúčania medzinárodných expertov pre ústavy SAV* [Recommendations of International Experts for SAS Institutes] (2017). Veda na dosah. <https://vedanadosah.cvtsir.sk/ine/odporucania-medzinarodnych-expertov-pre-ustavy-sav/>. Accessed January 14, 2023.
- Osobnosti slovenskej etnológie: Katarína Holbová* [Great Figures of Slovak Ethnology: Katarína Holbová]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QNqLFH16IHE&t=221s>. Accessed August 2, 2021.
- Paličková-Pátková, J. (1992). *Ľudová výroba na Slovensku* [Folk Production in Slovakia]. Klenotnica slovenskej ľudovej kultúry, zv. 19. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Panáková, J. (2020). *Vizuálne režimy ruskej Beringie* [The Visual Regimes of Russian Beringia]. Etnologické štúdie, 46. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2020.9788022418324>.
- Panczová, Z. (2017). *Konšpiračné teórie: témy, historické kontexty a argumentačné stratégie* [Conspiracy Theories: Topics, Historical Contexts, and Argumentation Strategies]. Etnologické štúdie, 29. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2017.9788022415460>.
- Panczová, Z., Kiliánová, G., & Kubisa, T. (2021). *Národopis na Slovensku v službách Tretej ríše* [Ethnography in Slovakia in the Service of Third Empire]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788056909591>.
- (2023). *Volkskunde in den Diensten des Dritten Reiches: Deutsche Forscher und Forscherinnen in der Slowakei*. Kultur: Forschung und Wissenschaft, Band 26. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Panczová, Z., & Popelková, K. (Eds.) (2016). *Ethnology in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium: Topics, Methods, Challenges: International Conference, October 19–20, 2016, Smolenice Castle, Slovak Republic: Book of Abstracts*. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology SAS.
- Papaki, E. (2019). DARIAH welcomes three new Cooperating Partners. DARIAH-EU. May 31, 2019. <https://www.dariah.eu/2019/05/31/dariah-welcomes-three-new-cooperating-partners/>. Accessed 14 April 2022.
- (2021). The Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology at the Slovak Academy of Sciences joins DARIAH as Cooperating Partner. DARIAH-EU. November 15, 2021. <https://www.dariah.eu/2021/11/15/the-institute-of-ethnology-and-social-anthropology-at-the-slovak-academy-of-sciences-joins-dariah-as-cooperating-partner/>. Accessed 10 May 2023.
- Pine, F., & Podoba, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Changing Social Practices and Strategies: Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe and Mongolia*. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – Zing Print.
- Po hodnotení organizácie vypracujú akčné plány* [Organisation Review to Be Followed by Action Plans]. Slovenská akadémia vied. Aktualita 6. 8. 2017. [https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source\\_no=20&news\\_no=7060](https://www.sav.sk/index.php?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source_no=20&news_no=7060). Accessed August 2, 2021.
- Podoba, J. (1992). Etnografický pohľad na problematiku vzťahu človeka a životného prostredia: etnoekológia, kultúrna ekológia alebo environmentálna etnológia [An Ethnographic Perspective of the Relationship between Man and the Environment: Ethnoecology, Cultural Ecology, or Environmental Ethnology]. *Slovenský národopis*, 40(3), 252–66.
- (1996a). Niekoľko poznámok k diskontinuitám vo vývoji slovenského poľnohospodárstva a etnologického myslenia [Some Comments on Discontinuities in the Development of Slovak Agriculture and Ethnological Thinking]. *Slovenský národopis*, 44(2), 212–4.
- (1996b). Ad Peter Slavkovský: Dve diskontinuity a štýl diskusie [Two Discontinuities and the Style of Discussion]. *Slovenský národopis*, 44(4), 484–6.
- (1998). Das Ringen zwischen Moderne und Tradition: soziales Prozesse in der Slowakei nach 1989. *Slovenský národopis*, 46(3), 286–301.
- (1999). Ad: Etnická identita z pohľadu etnológie [Ad: Ethnic Identity from the Ethnological Perspective]. *Slovenský národopis*, 47(4), 390–2.
- (2002). Kauza Rómsky dejepis a akademická obec [The Case of Roma History and the Academic Community]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 19(2), 157–61.
- (2004). Unavení pútnici pred bránami alebo slovenská etnológia v Európskej únii – Európska únia v slovenskej etnológii [Tired Pilgrims at the Gates, or Slovak Ethnology in the European Union—the European Union in Slovak Ethnology]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 11(1), 13–7.
- (2006). MKKKB: jeden pohľad na úspešnú medzinárodnú vedeckú organizáciu, ktorá neskončila dobre [International Committee for the Study of the Folk Culture in the Carpathians and the Balkans: One View of a Successful International Scientific Organisation That Failed]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 95–102.
- (2008). Medzi improvizáciou a európskym štandardom: osem rokov doktorandského seminára [Between Improvisation and European Standards: Eight Years of the Doctoral Seminar]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 84–93.
- (2011). *Vývoj staviteľstva a spôsobu bývania v dedinskom prostredí v 20. storočí: etnografické aspekty štúdia kontinuálnych a diskontinuálnych procesov v podmienkach industrializácie krajiny a socialistickej kolektívizácie poľnohospodárstva* [The Development of Construction and Housing in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Rural Environments: The Ethnographic Aspects of the Study of Continuous and Discontinuous Processes during the Industrialisation of the Country and Socialist Collectivisation of Agriculture]. Etnografické monografie, zv. 1. Bratislava: Slovenská asociácia sociálnych antropológov, o. z.
- Podolák, J. (1955a). Desať rokov slovenského národopisu (1945–1955) [Ten Years of Slovak Ethnography]. *Slovenský národopis*, 3(4), 421–50.
- (1955b). K doterajším výsledkom národopisného výskumu družstevnej dediny na Slovensku (1945–1955) [On the Existing Results of Ethnographic Study of Cooperative Villages in Slovakia (1945–1955)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 3(2), 268–77.
- (1958a). Ľudové pálenie vápna u maďarských Slovákov [Folk Lime Burning among Hungarian Slovaks]. *Pamiatky a múzea*, 1, 15–7.
- (1958b). Ľudové hry a zábavy slovenských detí v Nagyhute (Maďarsko) [Folk Games and Fun of Slovak Children in Nagyhuta (Hungary)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 6(3), 279–92.
- (1959). Tri textové varianty betlehenských hier z Abovskej stolicy v Maďarsku [Three Textual Variants of Bethlehem Games from the Abov County in Hungary]. *Slovenský národopis*, 7(3), 114–31.
- (Ed.) (1969). *Horehronie I. Kultúra a spôsob života ľudu. Ľudové zamestnania* [Horehronie Region I. People's Culture and Way of Life. Folk Jobs]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Podolinská, T. (2008a). Čo mi dali európske programy alebo EÚ projekty – „know how“ [What European Programmes or EU Projects Gave Me – „Know-How“]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 125–32.
- (2008b). Religiozita v dobe neskorkej modernity: Prípád Slovensko [Religiosity in the Late-Modernity Period: The Case of Slovakia]. *Sociálni študia*, 5(3–4), 53–88.

- (2010a). Introduction: Religion in Post-Secular and Post-Communist Europe—Trends, Visions and Challenges. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 19(1), 1–8.
- (2010b). The Religious Landscape in Post-Communist Slovakia. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 19(1), 58–101.
- (2013). Religiozita: Slovensko a jeho susedia [Religiosity: Slovakia and Its Neighbours]. In: V. Krivý (Ed.), *Ako sa mení slovenská spoločnosť* [How Slovak Society Changes] (pp. 181–256). Bratislava: IRIS – Sociologický ústav SAV.
- (Ed.) (2015). *Čierne-biele svety. Rómovia v majoritnej spoločnosti na Slovensku* [Black and White Worlds: Roma in Majority Society in Slovakia]. Etnologické štúdie, 23. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- Podolinská, T., & Hrustič, T. (2010). *Boh medzi bariérami. Sociálna inklúzia Rómov náboženskou cestou* [God between Barriers. The Social Inclusion of Roma via Religious Path]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2011a). Vedie náboženská zmena k sociálnej inklúzii Rómov [Does Religious Change Lead to Roma Social Inclusion]? *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 59(4), 413–31. [https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/11101402SN\\_4\\_2011.pdf](https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/11101402SN_4_2011.pdf). Accessed February 10, 2023.
- (2011b). *Religion as a path to change? The Possibilities of Social Inclusion of the Roma in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Fridrich Ebert Stiftung e. V. – Institute of Ethnology of Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Podolinská, T., & Kováč, M. (2001). Daughters of Luna. Ritual Status of Women in the Mayas-Lacandons Society. *Slovenský národopis*, 49(4), 479–94.
- Podolinská, T., & Potančok, V. (2017). Institute of Ethnology of Slovak Academy of Sciences in the Third Millennium. Editorial. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 65(2), 114–9. DOI: [https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/0704103902%20slovensky\\_narodopis\\_2\\_2017\\_editorial.pdf](https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/0704103902%20slovensky_narodopis_2_2017_editorial.pdf).
- Popelková, K. (2003). Ústav etnológie SAV – poznámky ku koncepcii disciplíny po roku 2000 [Institute of Ethnology SAS—Comments on the Concept of the Discipline after 2000]. *Ethnologia Actualis Slovaca*, 1(3), 99–104.
- (2008). Ústav etnológie SAV a komplexné hodnotenie kvality vedeckých organizácií SAV v roku 2007. Poznámky k prípravám akreditácie pracoviska [Institute of Ethnology SAS and Comprehensive Quality Assessment of the SAS Scientific Organisations in 2007]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 15(1), 133–41.
- (2016). Slávnostný Laudačný deň k 70. výročiu založenia Ústavu etnológie SAV v Bratislave (17. jún 2016, Bratislava) [Official Laudation Day on the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Institute of Ethnology SAS in Bratislava (June 17, 2016, Bratislava)]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 64(3), 396–400.
- (2021a). PhDr. Gabriela Kiliánová, CSc. jubileju [PhDr. Gabriela Kiliánová, CSc. Celebrates Her Anniversary]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 28(1), 186–92.
- (2021b). *75. výročie založenia Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – výskumná sonda; júl–august 2021. (Materiál z ankety realizovanej mejlovou komunikáciou)* [75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS—Research Probe; July–August 2021 (Material from the Survey Carried out by Email Communication)]. Research Collection of the IESA SAS Bratislava, Text Archive, Acq. No. 1517.
- (2022). *75. výročie založenia Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – výskumné sondy z roku 2022. (Materiál z ankety realizovanej rozhovormi a mejlovou komunikáciou)*. [75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS—Research Probe from 2022. (Material from the Survey Carried out by Interviews and Email Communication)]. Research Collection of the IESA SAS Bratislava, Text Archive, Acq. No. 1522.
- (Ed.) (2014). *Čo je to sviatok v 21. storočí na Slovensku?* [What Is a Holiday in Slovakia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century?]. Etnologické štúdie, 21. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Popelková, K., & Salner, P. (2002). Urbánny svet v slovenskej etnológii – pokus o dialóg [Urban World in Slovak Ethnology—An Attempt to Lead a Dialogue]. *Slovenský národopis*, 50(3–4), 444–51.
- Popelková, K., & Zajonc, J. (2008). Po prvej tisícke... Skúsenosti z tvorby elektronického katalógu obrazových dokumentov Ústavu etnológie SAV [After the First Thousand... Experiences from the Creation of an Electronic Picture Documents Catalogue of the Institute of Ethnology SAS]. *Slovenský národopis*, 56(4), 445–66.
- Posters #1–#6 (2022). <https://uesa.sav.sk/en/science-research/#download>. Accessed April 12, 2023.
- Pozrite si mapu ľudí, ktorí menia Slovensko k lepšiemu [Look at the Map of People Who Make Slovakia a Better Place]. Pontis Foundation, November 30, 2015. <http://www.nadaciapontis.sk/clanok/pozrite-si-mapu-ludi-ktori-menia-slovensko-k-lepsiemu/1692>. Accessed August 13, 2021.
- Pranda, A. (1966). K otázke vzniku oblastí ľudovej kultúry na Slovensku [On the Emergence of Areas of Folk Culture in Slovakia]. *Slovenský národopis*, 14(4), 511–62.
- (1970). Niektoré teoretické otázky štúdia ľudovej kultúry v súčasnosti [Some Theoretical Issues of the Study of Folk Culture at Present]. *Slovenský národopis*, 18(1), 39–60.
- (1979). Národopisný výskum kultúry družstevnej dediny. (Problémy, metódy, ciele) [Ethnographic Research on the Culture of Cooperative Village. (Problems, Methods, Objectives)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 27(2), 209–29.
- (1984a). Kategória tradície z hľadiska procesu transmisie [The Category of Tradition from the Point of View of the Transmission Process]. *Národopisné informácie*, 2, 12–20.
- (1984b). Výskum spôsobu života a kultúry družstevnej dediny Sebechleby. (Východiská a výsledky) [Research on the Way of Life and Culture in the Cooperative Village of Sebechleby. (Background and Results)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 32(3), 400–20.
- Pranda, A., & Prandová, E. (1994). *Slovenské kraslice* [Slovak Easter Eggs]. Martin: Osveta.
- Pranda, A., & Leščák, M. (Eds.) (1977). *Premeny ľudových tradícií v súčasnosti. I. Československo* [Transformations of Folk Traditions at Present. I. Czechoslovakia]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (Eds.) (1978). *Premeny ľudových tradícií v súčasnosti. II. Socialistické krajiny* [Transformations of Folk Traditions at Present. II. Socialist Countries]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Prandová, E. (1978). Súčasná a perspektívne úlohy dokumentácie v Národopisnom ústave SAV [The Current and Future Documentation Tasks of the Ethnographic Institute SAS]. *Slovenský národopis*, 26(3), 509–12.
- Principles of Regular Evaluation of SAS Research Institutes for the Period 2016–2021 (2021). <https://www.sav.sk/?lang=en&doc=activity-evaluation-2016>. Accessed April 12, 2023.
- Profantová, Z. (1997). *Little Fish Are Sweet. Selected Writings on Proverbs*. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (1999). Mentality and Historical Memory. *Slovenský národopis*, 47(4), 382–9.
- Profantová, Z. (Ed.) (2009). *Hodnota zmeny – zmena hodnoty: demarkačný rok 1989* [The Value of Change—Change in Value: The Demarcation Year of 1989]. Bratislava: Zing Print.
- Protocol on the Evaluation of the SAS Scientific Organisation, approved on July 23, 2007. Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Questionnaire. Summary of the Main Activities of the Research Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Period: January 1, 2012–December 31, 2015 (2016). [https://uesa.sav.sk/files/akreditacny\\_dotaznik\\_2012\\_2015\\_eng.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/files/akreditacny_dotaznik_2012_2015_eng.pdf). Accessed August 5, 2021.
- Questionnaire. Summary of the Main Activities of the Research Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Period: January 1, 2016–December 31, 2021 (2022). [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny\\_questionnaire\\_iesa\\_sas.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/akreditacny_questionnaire_iesa_sas.pdf). Accessed January 10, 2023.
- Rabinow, P. (1996). Science as Practice: Ethnos, Logos, Pathos. In: P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason* (pp. 3–27). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ratica, D. (Ed.) (1991). *Kontinuita a konflikt hodnôt každodennej kultúry: výsledky výskumov v roku 1991* [Continuity and Conflict of Values in Daily Culture: Research Results 1991]. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- (Ed.) (1992). *Zmeny v hodnotových systémoch v kontexte každodennej kultúry: výsledky výskumov v roku 1992* [Changes in Value Systems in the Context of Daily Culture: Research Results 1992]. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- Redakcia (1990). Funkcie spoločenských skupín pri formovaní spoločenského vedomia a spôsobu života – historické a etnokultúrne aspekty [The Functions of Social Groups in the Shaping of Social Awareness and the Way of Life—Historical and Ethnocultural Aspects]. *Slovenský národopis*, 38(1–2), 7.



- Redakcia (2002). Diskusia o knihe Arne B. Mann: Rómsky dejepis. Doplnkový učebný text pre vyučovanie dejepisu (pre 2. stupeň základných škôl a strednej školy) [Discussion on the Book by Arne B. Mann: Roma History: Complementary History Teaching Material (for Level II of Elementary and Secondary Schools)]. Kalligram Bratislava, 2000, 56 s., čb. a far. obr., noty. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 19(2), 149–51.
- Salner, P. (1982). K teoretickým problémom etnografického výskumu mesta [On the Theoretical Problems of the Ethnographic Research on Cities]. *Slovenský národopis*, 30(2), 211–8.
- (1997). *Prežili holokaust* [They Survived the Holocaust]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (1998). *Premeny Bratislavy 1939–1993: etnologické aspekty sociálnych procesov v mestskom prostredí* [Transformations of Bratislava 1939–1993. The Ethnological Aspects of Social Processes in Urban Environments]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (1999). Die Stellung der Juden in einer Majorität-gesellschaft am Beispiel der Slowakei im 20. Jahrhundert. In: E.-P. Brezovsky, A. Suppan, & E. Vyslonzil (Hrsg.), *Multikulturalität und Multiethnizität in Mittel-, Ost- und Südosteuropa* (pp. 123–38). Frankfurt a. M. u. a.: Peter Lang.
- (2005). *Cesty k identite* [Paths to Identity]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Zing Print.
- (2006). Človek – téma – Ústav etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied alebo Hľadanie seba a témy na ostrove pozitívnej deviacie [Man—Theme—Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences or Seeking Oneself and of a Theme on an Island of Positive Deviation]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 105–9.
- (2007a). *Mozaika židovskej Bratislavy* [A Mosaic of Jewish Bratislava]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT.
- (2007b). *Budúci rok v Bratislave alebo Stretnutie* [Next Year in Bratislava or a Meeting]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT.
- (2008). *Premeny židovskej Bratislavy* [Transformations of Jewish Bratislava]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT.
- (2010). *Minulý rok v Jeruzaleme* [Last Year in Jerusalem]. Bratislava: Marenčin PT.
- (2014). *Požehnaný spravodlivý sudca. Súčasné formy židovského pohrebu* [Blessed Righteous Judge: Current Forms of Jewish Funeral]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2021a). E-mail correspondence with T. Zachar Podolinská as part of a research probe, November 11, 2021.
- (2021b). *Crossroads of Jewish Bratislava. An Ethnological Examination of the Jewish Community between the 19<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries*. Berlin: Peter Lang – VEDA.
- (2022). *Sedem (židovských) problémov: sociálna kultúra židovskej komunity z pohľadu etnológie* [Seven (Jewish) Problems: The Social Culture of the Jewish Community from the Ethnological Perspective]. Etnologické štúdie, 54. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV, v. v. i. – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2022.9788056909805>.
- (Ed.) (1995). *Židovská identita včera, dnes a zajtra* [Jewish Identity Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow]. Bratislava: Zing Print.
- (Ed.) (1997). *Židia v Bratislave* [Jews in Bratislava]. Bratislava: Inštitút judaistiky FiF UK – Ústav etnológie SAV – Židovská náboženská obec.
- (Ed.) (2006). *Židovská komunita po roku 1945* [The Jewish Community after 1945]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Salner, P., Feglová, V., Luther, D., Mannová, E., & Obuchová, V. (1991). *Taká bola Bratislava* [That Was Bratislava]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Salner, P., & Beňušková, Z. (Eds.) (1999). *Diferenciácia mestského spoločenstva v každodennom živote* [Differentiation of the Urban Community in Daily Life]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- Salner, P., & Luther, D. (Eds.) (1992). *Ethnokulturelle Prozesse in Großstädten Mitteleuropas*. Bratislava: Národopisný ústav SAV.
- Sirovátka, O. (1993). Der ethnische Humor. *Slovenský národopis*, 41(1), 55–9.
- Slavkovský, P. (1996). Dve diskontinuity a štýl diskusie [Two Discontinuities and the Style of Discussion]. *Slovenský národopis*, 44(4), 480–3.
- (1997). The Encyclopedia of Folk Culture of Slovakia. *Slovenský národopis*, 45(1), 75–7.
- (2003). Ako sme vydávali encyklopédiu o ľudovej kultúre Slovenska [How We Published the Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture of Slovakia]. *Ethnologia Actualis Slovaca*, 1(3), 93–9.
- (2006). Vedecké syntézy druhej polovice 20. storočia – výzvy i limity. (Etnografický atlas Slovenska, Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska, Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry) [Scientific
- Syntheses in the Latter Half of the 20th Century—Challenges and Limits. (Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia, Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture of Slovakia, Slovakia. European Contexts of Folk Culture)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 16–29.
- (2009). *Svet na odchode. Tradičná agrárna kultúra Slovákov v strednej a južnej Európe* [The World Leaving. The Traditional Agrarian Culture of Slovaks in Central and Southern Europe]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2011). *Svet roľníka. Agrárna kultúra Slovenska ako predmet etnografického výskumu* [Farmer's World. Agrarian Culture of Slovakia as a Subject of Ethnographic Research]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (2012). *Slovenská etnografia (kompendium dejín vedného odboru)* [Slovak Ethnography (A Compendium of the History of the Scientific Discipline)]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (2013). *Slovenský roľník: Pramene k štúdiu spôsobu života* [Slovak Peasant: Sources on the Study of the Way of Life]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (2014). *S nošou za industrializáciou krajiny: Tradičné podoby dopravy na slovenskom vidieku* [With a Back-Basket Towards the Country's Industrialisation: The Traditional Forms of Transport in the Slovak Countryside]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- (2021). Telephone and e-mail correspondence with T. Zachar Podolinská as part of the research probe, January–February, 2021.
- (Ed.) (2006). Ján Mjartan: Z minulosti Národopisného ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied (Úvod a do tlače pripravil P. Slavkovský) [Ján Mjartan: From the History of the Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (Introduction and printing prepared by P. Slavkovský)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(2), 214–57.
- Slobodová Nováková, K. (2023). *Osudové stretnutie* [Fateful Encounter]. (Manuscript for the annual publication for the 75<sup>th</sup> birthday of R. Stoličná. We thank K. Slobodová Nováková for lending the manuscript.)
- Slovenské ľudové umenie. Výtvarný prejav. I. diel – Architektúra, Kroje a výšivky* [Slovak Folk Art. Artistic Expression. Part I—Architecture, Folk Costumes, and Embroidery] (1953). Bratislava: Tatran.
- Slovenské ľudové umenie. Výtvarný prejav. II. diel – Keramika, Rezba, Maľba* [Slovak Folk Art. Artistic Expression. Part II—Pottery, Carving, Painting] (1954). Bratislava: Tatran.
- Snem SAV prijal návrh na odvolanie predsedu SAV* [SAS Assembly Approved the Proposal to Recall SAS President] (2014). Aktuality. Slovenská akadémia vied, December 18, 2014. [https://www.sav.sk/index.php?doc=services-news&source\\_no=20&news\\_no=5703](https://www.sav.sk/index.php?doc=services-news&source_no=20&news_no=5703). Accessed August 10, 2021.
- Soukupová, B., Hroch, M., Salner, P., & Pauknerová, K. (2013). *Cesty urbánnej antropológie: tradície – nové smery – identita* [The Pathways of Urban Anthropology: Traditions—New Directions—Identity]. Urbánni studie, sv. 4. Praha: Fakulta humanitných štúdií Univerzity Karlovy.
- Sperber, D. (1998). Interpretatívna etnografia a teoretická antropológia. (Preložil M. Kanovský) [Interpretive Ethnography and Theoretical Anthropology. (Translated by M. Kanovský)]. *Slovenský národopis*, 46(2), 179–93.
- Stano, P., & Žatko, R. (1989). Národopisná literatúra na Slovensku za roky 1901–1959 [Ethnographic Literature in Slovakia in 1901–1959]. *Slovenský národopis*, 37(4), 624–6.
- Stoličná, R. (1991). *Jedlá a nápoje našich predkov* [The Meals and Food of Our Predecessors]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (1994). Ľudová kultúra Slovenska ako súčasť európskej kultúrnej identity: zásadné kontexty výrazu [Slovakia's Folk Culture as Part of the European Cultural Identity: The Crucial Contexts of Expression]. *Slovenský národopis*, 42(4), 402–12.
- (2001). *Kuchyňa našich predkov* [The Cuisine of Our Predecessors]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- (2004a). *Slovenský rok* [The Slovak Year]. Martin: Vydavateľstvo Matice slovenskej.
- (2004b). *Jedlo ako kľúč ku kultúre* [Food as a Key to Culture]. Martin: Vydavateľstvo Matice slovenskej.
- (2015). *Socializmus na tanieri. Možnosti a praktiky stravovania obyvateľov Slovenska v rokoch 1948–1989* [Socialism on the Plate. Eating Possibilities and Practices of Slovakia's Inhabitants in 1948–1989]. Bratislava: VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2015.9788022414678>.

- (2021). *Reflexia Rastislavy Stoličnej rodenej Mikolajovej na prácu a atmosféru v Ústave etnológie SAV* [Reflection of Rastislava Stoličná born Mikolajová, on the Work and Atmosphere at the Institute of Ethnology SAS]. Research Collection of the IESA SAS Bratislava, Text Archive, Acq. No. 1520.
- et al. (1997). *Slovakia. European Contexts of the Folk Culture*. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA.
- et al. (2000). *Slovensko. Európske kontexty ľudovej kultúry* [Slovakia. European Contexts of the Folk Culture]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA
- (Ed.) (2007). *Chute a vôňa Slovenska. Zborník štúdií o kulinárnych tradíciách* [The Taste and Smell of Slovakia. A Collection of Studies on Culinary Traditions]. Martin: Slovenské národné múzeum.
- Stoličná-Mikolajová, R. (Ed.), & Nováková, K. (2012). *Kulinárna kultúra regiónov Slovenska* [The Culinary Culture of Slovak Regions]. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Škobla, D. & Filčák, R. (2020). Mundane Populism: Politics, Practices, and Discourses of Roma Oppression in Rural Slovakia. *Sociologia ruralis*, 60(4), 773–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12286>.
- Škobla, D., Hrustič, T., & Poduška, O. (2019). *Evaluácia dopadu terénnej sociálnej práce 2018: evaluácia realizovaná v roku 2018 s dôrazom na program implementovaný IA MPSVR SR* [Evaluation of the Impacts of Field Social Work 2018: 2018 Evaluation with an Emphasis on the Programme Implemented by Implementation Agency of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, and Family SR]. Bratislava: Implementačná agentúra Ministerstva práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny Slovenskej republiky.
- Šťastný človek/A Happy Man (2023). <http://www.aic.sk/slovak-films/24267.html>. Accessed May 28, 2023.
- Švecová, S. (1956). Príspevok k ľudovému staviteľstvu v Tótkomlóši (Slovenský Komlós, obec v juhovýchodnom Maďarsku) [Study on Folk Architecture in Tótkomlós (Slovenský Komlós, a Municipality in South-Eastern Hungary)]. *Národopisný věstník československý*, 3-4, 322–35.
- The Science and Research Concept of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS for the Years 2021–2025*. [https://uesa.sav.sk/files/science\\_and\\_research\\_concept\\_2021-2025.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/files/science_and_research_concept_2021-2025.pdf). Accessed August 5, 2021.
- Through Knowledge towards Prosperity. Research and Innovation Strategy for Smart Specialisation of the Slovak Republic. November 13, 2013* (2013). Ministerstvo hospodárstva Slovenskej republiky. <https://www.mhsr.sk/uploads/files/81ed1x1h.pdf?csrt=16836885480254907193>. Accessed November 20, 2022.
- Tokarev, S. A. (1951). Engels a súčasná etnografia [Engels and Contemporary Ethnography]. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 10, 71–88.
- Tolstov, S. P. (1951). Význam prác J. V. Stalina o otázkach jazykovedy pre vývin sovietskej etnografie [The Importance of the Works of J. V. Stalin on Linguistic Issues for the Development of Soviet Ethnography]. *Národopisný zborník SAVU*, 10, 25–51.
- Tomich, D. (2011). The Order of Historical Time: The Longue Durée and Micro-History. *Artigo. Almanack. Guarulhos*, 2, 52–65. <https://www.scielo.br/aj/alm/a/dF7D8LWPFhCjtjmx7NKbtQk/?lang=en&format=pdf>. Accessed November 21, 2020.
- Transformácia Slovenskej akadémie vied. Záverečná správa* [Transformation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. Final Report] (2018). Najvyšší kontrolný úrad Slovenskej republiky. <https://www.nku.gov.sk/documents/101577/fe31250c-c164-4392-b7d0-3b881ccfb6ff>. Accessed July 9, 2021.
- Transformácia z pohľadu riaditeľov organizácií: Správa z prieskumu* [Transformation from the Perspective of Organisational Leaders: Survey Report] (2020). Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- TS (2019). Cenu Human Forum 2019 získala Monika Vrzgulová [Human Forum 2019 Prize Awarded to Monika Vrzgulová]. <https://mybystrica.sme.sk/c/22272188/cenu-human-forum-2019-ziskala-monika-vrzgulova.html>. Accessed February 12, 2022.
- Turner, E. (2012). *Communitas: The Anthropology of Collective Joy*. New York: Palgrave.
- Turner, V. (1974). *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Uherek, Z. (2004). Slovenský národopis v minulých padesáti rokoch v kontextu evropských oborových periodik [Slovenský národopis over the Past Fifty Years in the Context of European Expert Periodicals]. *Slovenský národopis*, 52(1), 53–64.
- (2012). Slovenský národopis a etnicita: obsahové a tematické zamčrení časopisu [Slovenský národopis and Ethnicity: The Content and Thematic Focus of the Journal]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 60(4), 395–403.
- Uhlíková, L., & Zajonc, J. (2003). Univerzálna karta – dve podoby jedné databáze [Universal Card—Two Forms of One Database]. In: *Neničte archivy! Současné metody dokumentace lidové kultury a digitalizace získaného materiálu či údajů o něm. Sborník příspěvků* [Don't Destroy Archives! The Current Methods of Folk Culture Documentation and the Digitisation of Collected Materials and Data. Collection of Studies] (pp. 39–50). Strážnice: Ústav lidové kultury.
- Urbancová, V. (1992). The interest in folk culture in the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century seen according to the Czecho-Slovak relations. *Slovenský národopis*, 40(2), 170–6.
- Vanovičová, Z. (2006). Časopis Slovenský národopis v Ústave etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied [The Slovenský národopis journal at the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 117–9.
- Virtuálna študovňa digitalizovaných dokumentov Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV* [Virtual Digitised Documents Study Room of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS]. Centrum vedecko-technických informácií SR. <https://digitalnakniznica.cvtisr.sk/page/uetsav-1>. Accessed January 16, 2023.
- Voľanská, L. (2016). „V hlave tridsať, v križoch sto“ [“Thirty in the Mind, Hundred in the Back”]. Etnologické štúdie, 27. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415446>.
- Voľanská, L., & Haberlandová, K. (2021). *AVION*. E-book. Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788097337285>.
- Voľanská, L., & Wiesner, A. (Eds.) (2019). *Nové prístupy v etnológii a sociálnej antropológii na Slovensku* [New Approaches to Ethnology and Social Anthropology in Slovakia]. Etnologické štúdie, 39. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2019.9788022417891.9-24>.
- Vrzgulová, M. (1997). *Známi neznámi Trenčania* [Known Unknown People from Trenčín]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Peter Popelka.
- (2004). Vzdelávanie o holokauste. Slovensko v európskom kontexte [Educating about the Holocaust. Slovakia in the European Context]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 11(1), 70–5.
- (2007). *Deti holokaustu* [Children of the Holocaust]. Bratislava: Dokumentačné stredisko holokaustu.
- (2016). *Nevyrožprávané susedské histórie. Holokaust na Slovensku z dvoch perspektív* [The Untold Neighbour Stories. The Holocaust in Slovakia from Two Perspectives]. Bratislava: VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415422>.
- (Ed.) (2020). *Dvojrozhor. O pamäti, etnológii a meste... Rozprávajú sa Monika Vrzgulová a Peter Salner* [Double Interview. On Memory, Ethnology, and the City... Monika Vrzgulová and Peter Salner Talking]. Etnologické štúdie, 42. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – Marenčin PT. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2020.9788056906767>.
- Vrzgulová, M., Voľanská, L., & Salner, P. (2017). *Rozprávanie a mlčanie: medzigeneračná komunikácia v rodine* [Talking and Silence: Intergenerational Communication in Family]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2017.9788022416214>.
- Výročná správa o činnosti Slovenskej akadémie vied za rok 2012* [Annual Report on the Activities of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2012] (2013). <https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=docs-annual-sas>. Accessed February 10, 2023.
- Výročná správa o činnosti Slovenskej akadémie vied za rok 2013* [Annual Report on the Activities of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2013] (2014). <https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=docs-annual-sas>. Accessed April 21, 2023.
- Výročná správa o činnosti Slovenskej akadémie vied za rok 2021* [Annual Report on the Activities of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2021]. <https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=docs-annual-sas>. Accessed April 11, 2023.
- Výročná správa.../Výročné správy...* [Annual Report.../ Annual Reports...]. The Corpus of Annual Reports of the Institute (2000–2022) is available on the IESA SAS web page section Dokumenty, subsection Výročné správy. <https://uesa.sav.sk/dokumenty/>. Accessed August 5, 2022.

- Výsledky periodického hodnotenia výskumnej, vývojevej, umeleckej a ďalšej tvorivej činnosti [Results of periodic evaluation of research, development, artistic and other creative activities] (2023). <https://www.minedu.sk/33250-sk/vysledky-periodickeho-hodnotenia-vyskumnej-vyvojevej-umeleckej-a-dalsej-tvorivej-cinnosti/>. Accessed April 7, 2023.
- Wiesner, A. (2017). *Jediná jistota je zmena: autoetnografie na transgender téma* [The Only Certainty Is Change: Auto-Ethnography on a Transgender Topic]. Etnologické štúdie, 30. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2017.9788022416221>.
- Wilsch, M. (2023). The new documentary film *A Happy Man*, directed by Soňa G. Lutherová. Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology Slovak Academy of Sciences. <https://uesa.sav.sk/en/news/the-new-documentary-film-a-happy-man-directed-by-sona-g-lutherova/>. Accessed June 7, 2023.
- Winkler, T. (2021). *Transactional Activism in Bratislava: A Case Study of Nová Cvernovka Cultural and Creative Centre*. Ethnological Studies 50. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS: VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2021.9788022419277>.
- Zachar Podolinská, T. (2021a). Dobové paradigmy v kontexte dejín Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV (1946–1989): od generácie zakladateľov po generáciu budovateľov [Contemporary Paradigms in the Context of the History of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS (1946–1989): From the Founders' Generation to the Builders' Generation]. *Slovenský národopis/Slovak Ethnology*, 69(1), 137–65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/se-2021-0008>.
- (2021b). *Marian Devotion Among the Roma in Slovakia. A Post-Modern Religious Response to Marginality*. New York/London: Palgrave MacMillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-56364-6, e-book <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9783030563639>.
- (2022). *77. výročie založenia Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV. Materiál z výskumnej online sondy s pracovníkmi ústavu a z e-mailovej komunikácie s bývalými pracovníkmi/PhD. študentami ústavu* [77<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS. Material from the Research Probe Carried out via E-mail communication with former employees/PhD students]. Research Collection of the IESA SAS Bratislava, Text Archive, Acq. No. 1523.
- (2023). *Osobné memoráty riaditeľky T. Zachar Podolinskej k 77. výročiu založenia Ústavu etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV* [Personal memoirs of the Director of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS on the 77<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the institution]. Research Collection of the IESA SAS Bratislava, Text archive, Acq. No. 1524.
- (Ed.) (2019). *Traces of the Virgin Mary in Post-Communist Europe*. Etnologické štúdie, 38. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – VEDA.
- Zachar Podolinská, T., & Wilsch, M. (Eds.) (2022) *The Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Basic Facts*. Bratislava: IESA SAS. <https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/brozura-netto-format-01-11-fin-web-1-min.pdf>. Accessed April 12, 2023.
- Zajonc, J. (1994). Vznik a miesto Encyklopédie ľudovej kultúry Slovenska v procese skúmania vývoja tradičnej kultúry a formovania národopisu/ etnológie na Slovensku [The Origins and the Place of the Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture of Slovakia in the Process of Exploring the Developments of Traditional Culture and the Shaping of Ethnography/ Ethnology in Slovakia]. *Slovenský národopis*, 42(2), 207–13.
- (1995). MONO – databáza informácií o územných monografiách v Ústave etnológie SAV [MONO—Information Database on Territorial Monographs at the Institute of Ethnology SAS]. *Slovenský národopis*, 43(1), 107–13.
- (1996). *Niektoré možnosti aplikácie výpočtovej techniky vo vedeckovýskumnom procese etnológie na Slovensku (s príkladmi z textilnej kultúry)*. Dizertačná práca [Some Possibilities of Computer Technology Application in Ethnological Science and the Research Process in Slovakia (with Examples from Textile Culture. Dissertation Thesis)]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV.
- (2006a). Vedeckí a odborní pracovníci Národopisného ústavu SAVU (1946–1951), Národopisnej sekcie Historického ústavu SAV (1951–1953), Národopisného kabinetu SAV (1953–1955), Národopisného ústavu SAV (1955–1994), Ústavu etnológie SAV (od 1. 1. 1994) [Scientific and Expert Staff of the Ethnographic Institute SASA (1946–1951), Ethnographic Section of the Institute of History SAS (1951–1953), Ethnographic Cabinet SAS (1953–1955), Institute of Ethnology SAS (from January 1, 1994)]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 14–5.
- (2006b). Budovanie elektronických dokumentačných a bibliografických databáz v Ústave etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied [Building of the Electronic Documentation and Bibliographical Databases at the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13(1), 30–47.
- (2012). *Premeny vlákna* [Metamorphoses of the Fibre]. Trnava: Edition Ryba.
- (2013). *Tkanice* [Woven Bands]. Edícia Pramene. Bratislava: Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby.
- (2016). I. Kapitola. Národopisné pracovisko v Slovenskej akadémii vied a umení (1946–1953) [Chapter I. The Ethnographic Workplace within the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts (1946–1953)]. In: J. Zajonc, & G. Kiliánová, *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied: kontinuita a diskontinuita bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuities and Discontinuities of Research and One Institution] (pp. 21–54). Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2016.9788022415125>.
- (2020). *Svätí s menom Valentín a sviatky zamilovaných* [Saints Named Valentine and Lovers' Feast Days]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie a sociálnej antropológie SAV – VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2020.9788022418539>.
- (2022). *Valentín na Slovensku* [Valentine's Day in Slovakia]. Etnologické štúdie, 55. Bratislava: VEDA. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2022.9788024419703>.
- Zajonc, J., Mészárosová, M., & Kostovská, I. (2013). *Slovenský národopis 1953–2002. Bibliografia* [Slovenský národopis 1953–2002. Bibliography]. Bratislava: Ústav etnológie SAV. [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/slovensky\\_narodopis\\_bibliografia\\_1\\_0.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/slovensky_narodopis_bibliografia_1_0.pdf). Accessed May 12, 2023.
- Zákon č. 131/2002 Z. z. *Zákon o vysokých školách a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov* [Act. No. 131/2002 Coll. on Higher Education Institutions and on changes and amendments to some acts]. <https://www.zakonypreludi.sk/zz/2002-131>. Accessed July 14, 2021.
- Zákon č. 133/2002 Z. z. *o Slovenskej akadémii vied* [Act. No. 133/2002 Coll. on the Slovak Academy of Sciences]. <https://www.zakonypreludi.sk/zz/2002-133>. Accessed July 14, 2021.
- Zákon č. 243/2017 Z. z. *Zákon o verejnej výskumnej inštitúcii a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov* [Act. No. 243/2017 Coll. on Public Research Institution and on changes and amendments to some acts]. <https://www.slov-lex.sk/pravne-predpisy/SK/ZZ/2017/243/20180101.html>. Accessed August 9, 2021.
- Zápisnica z mimoriadneho zasadnutia Predsedníctva SAV dňa 10. 2. 2011 [Minutes of the special session of the SAS Presidium of February 10, 2011] (2011). Work archive of K. Popelková.
- Zápisnica zo zasadnutia Akreditačnej komisie 3. oddelenia vied SAV, 25. 11. 2011 [Minutes of the meeting of the Accreditation Commission of the SAS Science Section III, November 25, 2011] (2012). Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Zásady pravidelného hodnotenia organizácií 2007–11 [The Principles of the Regular Evaluation of SAS Research Institutes 2007–11] (2012). Work archive of T. Zachar Podolinská.
- Zriadovacia listina Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied, č. 142/0214/94 zo dňa 6. 4. 1994. [Incorporation Document of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences] (1994). Internal unpublished document of the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS.
- Zriadovacia listina Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied, č. 740/0214/2003 zo dňa 9. 10. 2003 [Incorporation Document of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, No. 740/0214/2003 of October 9, 2003] (2003). [https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/ue-sav-zriadovacia\\_listina.pdf](https://uesa.sav.sk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/ue-sav-zriadovacia_listina.pdf). Accessed November 25, 2021.
- Žatko, R. (1959). *Hádanky Slovákov v Maďarsku* [Puzzles of Slovaks in Hungary]. *Slovenský národopis*, 7(1), 129–31.
- Žilinská, M. (2021). Začal sa projekt prípravy a implementácie plánu rodovej rovnosti pre SAV [The Project of Preparation and Implementation of the Gender Equality Plan for the SAS Launched]. Aktualita SAV. [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source\\_no=20&news\\_no=9405](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=services-news&source_no=20&news_no=9405). Accessed January 12, 2023.



# Personal Index

Apáthyová-Rusnáková, Zora (*see also*  
Rusnáková, Z.) 40, 139  
Baďurík, Jozef 265  
Bahna, Vladimír 285, 303–4, 306–8, 312,  
321, 345, 351, 358  
Bakaljarová, Helena 112, 126, 128, 145, 175  
Bakoš, Ján 197  
Balogová, Ivona 131  
Barabás, Jenő 51  
Barabášová, Božena *see* Filová, B.  
Barna, Gábor 230, 289  
Barthes, Roland 40  
Bartmiński, Jerzy 98  
Beitl, Klaus 98, 110–1, 288  
Belák, Andrej 313, 352, 355–6, 360, 365,  
399  
Bendix, Regina 230  
Beneš, Bohuslav 57  
Benko, Vladimír 124  
Beňová, Nina 169  
Beňušková, Zuzana 53, 99, 103–4, 106,  
112, 128–9, 141, 145, 148–50, 175, 215–6,  
226, 236, 306, 343, 365, 399–400  
Benža, Mojmir 45–6, 60–1, 71–2, 85, 98,  
101, 104, 122, 127, 133, 140, 144–5,  
158–9, 170, 175, 195–6, 203, 205, 209,  
211, 257, 287, 311, 397  
Beyrak, Nathan 349  
Bitušíková, Alexandra 194, 211, 312, 315–6,  
357–8, 365

Blahová, Natália 310  
Blatný, Marek 265  
Bogatyrev, Peter *see* Bogatyriov, P. G.  
Bogatyriov, Piotr Grigorievich 15–6  
Bogdanowicz, Janusz 51  
Botík, Ján 43, 47, 53–5, 60–2, 68, 101, 119,  
124–5, 128, 341  
Botiková, Marta 265  
Bourdieu, Pierre 320  
Breidenbach, Joana 289  
Bromley, Yulian Vladimirovich 37  
Brouček, Stanislav 228  
Brubaker, Rogers 10  
Bruk, Solomon 37  
Bumová, Ivica 151, 176  
Búriková, Zuzana (*see also* Sekeráková  
Búriková, Z.) 176, 183, 185, 193, 196,  
206, 239, 304, 305  
Burlasová, Soňa 28, 47, 102, 131, 145, 287,  
295, 341  
Burszta, Józef 57  
Bútor, Martin 113  
Bútorová, Zora 113  
Buzalka, Juraj 258  
Bužeková, Tatiana 100, 173, 176, 179, 209,  
211, 213–4, 239, 304–5, 312, 319  
Chorváthová, Lubica 110, 131, 139, 178  
Chotek, Karel 16, 33  
Cielová, Eva (*see also* Riečanská, E.) 131,  
140

Cichová, Kristína 356  
Csáky, Pál 223  
Čapo, Jasna 289  
Čarnoký, Samuel 262  
Danglová, Oľga 24, 26–7, 32, 39–40, 45–6,  
56, 61, 67, 85, 101, 105, 112, 118, 133–5,  
160, 175, 198, 204, 234, 236, 399  
Demková, Branislava (*see also*  
Kolesárová, B.) 311  
Dittmar, Jürgen 98  
Divald, Kornél 33  
Divičanová, Anna 98, 288  
Drábiková, Ema 29, 43, 46–7, 131  
Drahošová, Oľga 131, 139, 215  
Droppová, Lubica 209, 286–8  
Durkheim, Émile 185  
Dúžek, Stanislav 120  
Elschek, Oskár 120, 197  
Engels, Friedrich 19, 38  
Falťan, Lubomír 149, 223  
Faltánová, Lubica 53, 71, 103, 105, 131–2,  
149, 175, 195, 311  
Feglová, Viera 43, 45–6, 53, 67–8, 103, 112,  
133, 139, 145, 148, 163–4, 400  
Ferencová, Michaela 32, 100, 176, 179, 189,  
193, 195, 197, 205, 207, 210, 236, 304, 319  
Fico, Robert 276  
Filová, Božena 23, 28–30, 31, 37, 41, 45, 47,  
57, 60, 62–3, 68–9, 84–7, 93, 102, 104,  
115, 126, 131, 133, 137, 170, 174, 177–8,  
287, 295, 311, 322, 341, 387–9  
Gaál, Károly 111  
Galiová, Zuzana *see* Panczová, Z.  
Gašparíková, Viera 47, 58, 102–103, 133,  
170, 288  
Gellner, André Ernest 98  
Giry, Julien 289  
Gogora, Andrej 296–7, 298–9, 312, 315,  
378–9, 399  
Gottwald, Klement 21  
Gulín Zrnić, Valentina 289  
Gyárfás Lutherová, Soňa (*see also*  
Lutherová, S.) 196, 303, 312, 318, 322,  
342–3, 345–6, 351–2, 358, 380, 399  
Hanzel, Lev 20  
Haukanes, Haldis 289  
Herzánová, Lubica (*see also* Volanská, L.)  
114, 151, 169, 176, 189, 196, 239  
Hlinčíková, Miroslava 185–6, 319, 350, 358–9  
Hľoška, Branislav 67, 144, 147  
Hľošková, Anna/Hana 67, 101–2, 112, 134,  
144–51, 159, 175, 179, 193, 195, 234–5,  
313, 399–400  
Hnát, Matúš 400  
Hojsík, Marek 348  
Holanová, Júlia 310  
Hollý, Dušan 288  
Horáková, Milada 63  
Horváthová, Emília 20, 28–30, 38–9, 47, 62,  
68, 104

Hrustič, Tomáš 176, 194, 208, 214, 219–20,  
304, 306, 308–9, 312, 319, 345, 348,  
354–7, 359  
Hrustičová, Ludmila (*see also* Plachá, L.)  
208, 219, 356  
Husák, Gustáv 61  
Husár, Pavol 223–6  
Húska, Augustín Marián 150  
Jenčová, Irena 193  
Jurzová, Miroslava 124  
Kadlecová, Andrea *see* Onderčaninová, A.  
Kahounová, Ema *see* Drábiková, E.  
Kaľavská, Viera 127, 139  
Kaľavský, Michal 97, 131–2, 139, 160, 168  
Kaliňák, Robert 276  
Kalivodová, Andrea 141, 147, 215–8, 259,  
262, 271, 286, 296, 319, 400  
Kamenec, Ivan 224  
Kandert, Josef 40, 265  
Kanovský, Martin 183–5  
Kardošová, Monika (*see also* Vrzgulová, M.)  
53, 131  
Kausel, Eva 111  
Kilián, Jaroslav 146  
Kiliánová, Gabriela 32, 59, 85–6, 95, 97,  
100–2, 105, 110–1, 113–4, 120, 134–5,  
138–9, 141, 143, 145–50, 157–60, 162–3,  
166–7, 170, 172–3, 175, 177, 179, 183–4,  
192–9, 203, 206, 210–1, 218, 221, 223–7,  
229–30, 234–6, 244–5, 256–61, 265–7,  
270, 281–2, 286–7, 301, 303, 306, 311,  
315, 353, 363, 368, 389, 391, 398–400  
Kisbán, Eszter 51, 108  
Kiska, Andrej 276, 278  
Klačka, Jozef 286  
Kłodnicki, Zygmunt 147  
Knausová, Naďa 43  
Kňazko, Milan 130  
Kolečányi-Kosová, Mária *see* Kosová, M.  
Kolesárová, Branislava 311, 318  
Komorovský, Ján 141  
Koppel, Juraj 331  
Kosíková, Jířina 147  
Kosová, Mária 19, 40, 43–5, 47, 131, 388  
Kostovská, Ingrid 43, 106, 126, 129, 145,  
215–6, 259, 286, 295–6, 312, 400  
Kováč, Dušan 197–8  
Kováč, Milan 212  
Kovačevićová, Soňa 19, 23–4, 31, 45–7,  
49–52, 66–7, 108, 119, 133, 149, 170,  
197, 388  
Kovačevićová-Fudala, Eva 287–8  
Kowalská, Eva 197, 230, 265  
Krekovič, Eduard 144, 150, 265  
Krekovičová, Eva 101–2, 105–6, 112–3, 120,  
134, 144, 149–50, 159, 163, 165, 174–5,  
195, 197, 199, 209, 227, 234–6, 243,  
266–7, 311  
Krivý, Vladimír 198  
Kšica, Miroslav 212

Kubátová, Hana 365  
 Kubisa, Tomáš 296, 312  
 Kubová, Milada 22, 106, 126, 131, 144, 170, 215, 294  
 Kusá, Zuzana 281  
 Kyseľ, Vladimír 71  
 Langer, Jiří 288  
 Lenárt, Jozef 115  
 Lenin, Vladimír Illich 19, 55, 84  
 Leščák, Milan 31, 38, 40–1, 43, 45, 47, 54, 56–7, 60–2, 65–6, 68–9, 79, 84–5, 88, 90–1, 93, 95, 97–8, 100–3, 111, 124–6, 128, 131, 133, 135, 137–9, 141, 143, 149, 156, 160, 167, 170, 174, 178, 183, 287, 341, 390  
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude 40, 108  
 Lipták, Jaroslav 124  
 Luby, Štefan 224, 229, 287  
 Lubyová, Martina 279  
 Ługowska, Jolanta 165  
 Lunterová, Gabriela 139, 141  
 Luther, Daniel 25–6, 38–39, 43, 53, 56–7, 61, 71, 80, 103, 116–7, 128–30, 134, 138, 142, 146, 170, 175, 183, 194–5, 201–4, 211, 236, 286, 288, 294, 346, 397, 400  
 Lutherová, Soňa (see also Gyárfás Lutherová, S.) 186, 193, 196, 304–5  
 Makarow, Marja 324, 373  
 Malonyai, Dezső 33  
 Mann, Arne (B.) 43, 67, 72, 104, 144–6, 175, 193, 199, 207–8, 218, 220, 222–7, 236, 311, 356, 359, 400  
 Mannová, Elena 67  
 Maňo, Peter 306, 313, 321  
 Maráky, Peter 71  
 Marcelli, Miroslav 228, 244  
 Markuš, Michal 49, 108  
 Marushiakova, Elena 68, 104, 356, 365, 399  
 Marušiaková, Jelena see Marushiakova, E.  
 Marx, Karl 19, 38, 185  
 Mečiar, Vladimír 78, 105, 140, 150  
 Melicherčík, Andrej 14–5, 17–20, 24, 28, 30, 40, 341  
 Méryová, Margita 139  
 Michálek, Ján 228  
 Miller, Daniel 206  
 Mináč, Vladimír 23  
 Mitrová, Korina 356  
 Mitterauer, Michael 98  
 Mjartan, Ján 17, 19–21, 24, 93, 159  
 Mokráňová, Gabriela 311  
 Morovics, Miroslav Tibor 331  
 Mruškovič, Štefan 41, 47  
 Nemoga, Karol 302  
 Niedermüller, Peter 165  
 Nikitsch, Herbert 111  
 Nosáľová, Viera 28, 47, 62, 67, 131, 288  
 Nosková, Jana 210  
 Nováková, Katarína (see also Slobodová Nováková, K.) 72, 177, 258

Nuska, Petr 356  
 Onderčaninová, Andrea 131, 148  
 Ostrolúcka, Adela 67  
 Paduchová, Katarína 311  
 Paličková, Jarmila 28, 47, 62, 133, 144  
 Paličková-Pátková, Jarmila see Paličková, J.  
 Panáková, Jaroslava 313, 318, 343, 381, 399  
 Panczová, Zuzana 176, 271, 285, 301, 303, 312, 314–5, 319, 345, 348, 351  
 Paríková, Magdaléna 114, 149  
 Pastorek, Jaromír 273–4, 276  
 Pavlu, Darina 148, 150  
 Plachá, Ludmila (see also Hrustičová, L.) 219–20  
 Plicková, Ester 23, 29, 47, 131  
 Podmaková, Dagmar 302  
 Podoba, Juraj 45, 58, 61, 85–6, 99, 101, 105, 110–1, 134, 138, 148, 159–60, 165, 168, 170, 173, 175, 183–6, 193, 197, 199, 204, 210, 227, 229, 236, 241, 257, 305, 312, 319  
 Podobová, Katarína 148  
 Podolák, Ján 20, 25, 45–6, 197, 288  
 Podolinská, Tatiana (see also Zachar Podolinská, T.) 141, 168, 170, 173, 175, 178–9, 193–4, 196, 199, 208–10, 212–4, 218–9, 233, 236, 256, 258, 260–2, 265, 282–3, 286–7, 289–90, 300–2, 304, 309–10, 312, 315–6, 338, 348, 353–5, 358  
 Popelková, Katarína 32, 53, 100–1, 103, 118, 131–2, 134, 148, 169, 173, 200, 211, 241, 259, 261, 264, 315, 348, 381, 398–400  
 Pospíšilová, Jana 147, 149  
 Pranda, Adam 27, 31–2, 37–8, 41–3, 47, 53, 62, 93, 131  
 Prandová, Elena 22, 55, 62–3, 126–7, 131, 140  
 Pražák, Vilém 33  
 Profantová, Zuzana 43, 67, 101–2, 112, 134, 144, 148, 159, 175, 195, 205, 234–6, 311  
 Ratica, Dušan 43, 85–6, 95–6, 98–9, 101, 104–5, 110, 124, 128–9, 132, 134, 136–45, 149, 156–7, 163–4, 179, 201, 211, 215–6, 286, 294, 311, 319, 343, 390, 398  
 Riečanská, Eva (see also Cielová, E.) 131  
 Rigová, Edita 310, 356  
 Roth, Klaus 114  
 Rusnáková, Zora (see also Apáthyová-Rusnáková) 46, 64  
 Rušín, Vojtech 229  
 Salazar, Noel B. 289  
 Salner, Peter 43–5, 53, 61–3, 65, 69, 83, 86, 92, 99, 101, 103–4, 109–10, 112–3, 132, 134, 137–8, 145, 148, 170, 175, 195, 199, 206–7, 226–7, 234–5, 266, 312, 397, 399–400  
 Salnerová, Eva 145  
 Samuely, Peter 328

Saussure, Ferdinand de 40  
 Sedová, Tatiana 226  
 Sekeráková Búriková, Zuzana (see also Búriková, Z.) 196, 305, 312  
 Sekulová, Martina (see also Wilsch, M.) 313  
 Semanová, Radoslava 309  
 Schier, Bruno 16  
 Sirovátka, Oldřich 57  
 Siváčková, Barbora 298  
 Slavkovská, Magdaléna 85, 126, 130, 143–4, 146, 148, 244, 259, 311, 399–400  
 Slavkovský, Peter 37, 45–7, 52, 55, 58–60, 62, 65, 69, 71–2, 84–5, 101, 114–7, 119–20, 124, 132–3, 137, 143, 147, 151, 157–9, 175, 195, 203, 205, 301, 311, 388–9, 397, 399–400  
 Slobodová Nováková, Katarína (see also Nováková, K.) 320–1  
 Sopoliga, Miroslav 230  
 Stalin, Joseph Vissarionovich 19, 21  
 Stanek, Milan 110  
 Stoličná, Rastislava 31, 43, 46–52, 62–7, 71–2, 82–3, 85–6, 92, 95–6, 101, 107–10, 113, 117–8, 121, 125, 133, 135, 138–9, 148, 157–8, 162–5, 170, 173, 175, 195–6, 205, 209–11, 236, 282, 311, 315, 321, 363, 399  
 Stoličná-Mikolajová, Rastislava (see also Stoličná, R.) 72  
 Stránská, Drahomíra 33  
 Svorová, Eva 131, 139,  
 Šajgalík, Pavol 287, 328  
 Šalingová, Andrea 176, 193  
 Škobla, Daniel 313, 316, 347, 351–2, 355–6, 359, 365  
 Štelmachovič Bumová, Ivica see Bumová, I.  
 Štibrányiová, Tatiana 133, 139  
 Štofej, Juraj 208, 219–20, 304, 356  
 Štúr, Ludovít 67  
 Šusterová, Ivana 356  
 Šutaj, Štefan 265  
 Švecová, Soňa 40  
 Švehlák, Svetozár 27, 47, 62, 143, 146

Tolksdorf, Ulrich 108  
 Tomeková, Regina 131, 140  
 Tóth, František 220  
 Tupta, Mario 124  
 Uherek, Zdeněk 181, 289  
 Urbanová, Viera 29, 39, 47, 62, 131  
 Ušák, Jozef 41  
 Válek, Miroslav 115  
 Valentová, Viera 29, 47, 62, 131  
 Vanovičová, Zora 102, 113, 134, 138, 159, 170, 175, 178–9  
 Veselková, Gabriela 311  
 Veselská, Natália 193  
 Voigt, Vilmos 57, 98  
 Vofanská, Lubica (see also Herzánová, L.) 162, 185, 196, 260, 285, 303, 316, 318, 323, 345–7, 351–2, 357–8, 365, 379, 399–400  
 Vozár, Jozef 224–5  
 Vrátna, Edita 43, 145, 244, 259, 311  
 Vrzgulová, Monika (see also Kardošová, M.) 53, 56, 83–4, 92, 101, 103–5, 112–3, 118, 132–4, 169, 173, 175, 193, 207, 220–1, 235–6, 244, 271, 285, 315–6, 318, 342, 346, 348–9, 352, 357, 362–3, 365, 399  
 Weber, Max 185  
 Wiedermann, Egon 365  
 Wiesner, Adam 303, 312, 345  
 Wilsch, Martina (see also Sekulová, M.) 313, 352  
 Winkler, Tomáš 344, 360–1, 379, 399  
 Woolf, Stuart 114  
 Zachar Podolinská, Tatiana (see also Podolinská, T.) 87, 96–7, 141–2, 196, 256–60, 273–5, 280, 291, 298, 310–1, 316–7, 321–2, 327, 331, 335–7, 346, 350–2, 354–6, 361–5, 394, 401  
 Zajonc, Juraj 59–60, 72, 100, 106, 118, 120, 122, 125, 131–2, 134–5, 148–9, 169, 175, 200, 211, 261, 286–7, 295, 298, 316, 399  
 Žatko, Rudolf 14, 17, 22  
 Žic Fuchs, Milena 324, 327



# List of Abbreviations

AI	Academia Istropolitana	DOAB	Directory of Open Access Books
AINova	Academia Istropolitana Nova	DOAJ	Directory of Open Access Journals
APVV	Agentúra na podporu výskumu a vývoja [Slovak Research and Development Agency]	DOI	Digital Object Identifier
		<i>EAS/Atlas</i>	<i>Etnografický atlas Slovenska</i> [Ethnographic Atlas of Slovakia]
ARRA	Academic Ranking and Rating Agency	EEA	European Economic Area
CC	Current Contents	EI SAS	Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
CCC	Current Contents Connect	EI SASA	Ethnographic Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts
CDS ISIS	Computerised Documentation Service/ Integrated Set of Information Systems	<i>Encyclopaedia</i>	<i>Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska</i> [Encyclopaedia of the Folk Culture of Slovakia]
CE (SAS)	Centre of Excellence (Slovak Academy of Sciences)	<i>ER</i>	<i>Etnologické rozpravy</i> [Ethnological Debates] journal
CEH	Central European Hub	ERC	European Research Council
CGS	<i>Copernicus Graduate School</i>	ERC-AdG	European Research Council-Advanced Grant
COST	European Cooperation in Science and Technology	ERC-StG	European Research Council-Starting Grant
CSAS	Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences	ERIC	European Research Infrastructure Consortium
CSSR	Czechoslovak Socialist Republic	ERIH	European Reference Index for Humanities
DARIAH	The Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities		

ESCI	Emerging Sources Citation Index	OA	Open Access
ESFRI	European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
EU	European Union	ORCID	Open Research and Contributor ID
EU FP	European Union Framework project	OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent	PI	Principal Investigator
GAV	Grantová agentúra pre vedu SR [Science Grant Agency]	R&D	Research and Development
<i>GEP</i>	<i>Gender Equality Plan</i>	<i>REF</i>	<i>Research Excellence Framework</i>
<i>GLS</i>	<i>Gypsy Lore Society</i>	REF	Roma Education Fund
HRS4R	Human Resources Strategy for Researchers	<i>RIS3</i>	<i>Research and Innovation Strategy for Smart Specialisation of the Slovak Republic</i>
ICFCC	International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region	SAS	Slovak Academy of Sciences
ICFCCB	International Committee for the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathian Region and in the Balkans	SASA	Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts
IDU	Information and Documentation Unit	SCDI	Slovak Centre for Digital Innovations
IE SAS	Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences	SES	<i>Slovak Ethnographic Society</i>
IESA SAS	Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences	SIEF	Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore [International Society for Ethnology and Folklore]
IF	Impact Factor	SN	<i>Slovenský národopis</i> [Slovak Ethnography] journal
IH SAS	Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences	<i>SE</i>	<i>Slovak Ethnography</i> journal
IH SASA	Institute of History of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts	SNM	Slovak National Museum
IVF	International Visegrad Fund	SR	Slovak Republic
LEVYNA	Laboratoř pro experimentální výzkum náboženství [Laboratory for the Experimental Research of Religion]	<i>State Plan</i>	<i>State Plan of Basic Research</i>
MSCA	Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions	SSH	Social Sciences and Humanities
<i>NAIRS</i>	<i>Network of Academic Institutions in Romani Studies</i>	USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
NGO	Non-governmental organization	V4	The Visegrad Group
<i>NI</i>	<i>Národopisné informácie</i> [Ethnographic Information] journal	VEGA	Vedecká grantová agentúra [Scientific Grant Agency]
		<i>VER</i>	<i>Verification of Excellence in Research</i>
		VUML	Večerná univerzita marxizmu-leninizmu [Evening University of Marxism-Leninism]
		WoS	Web of Science
		WVS	World Values Survey

# Story of Cohesion

On the History of an Academic Institution

ZACHAR PODOLINSKÁ, Tatiana

POPELKOVÁ, Katarína

Published by VEDA, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences, Centre of Operations of the SAS, Dúbravská cesta 5820/9, 841 04 Bratislava in 2023 as its 4 704<sup>th</sup> publication, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 432 pages.  
[www.veda.sav.sk](http://www.veda.sav.sk)

Published by the Institute of Ethnology and Social Anthropology SAS as Ethnological Studies publication no. 57.  
[www.uesa.sav.sk](http://www.uesa.sav.sk)

ISBN 978-80-224-2022-8

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/2023.9788022420228>

ETHNOLOGICAL STUDIES 57



Institute of Ethnology  
and Social Anthropology  
Slovak Academy of Sciences



VEDA



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0  
International License.