

Negotin wine region, then and now – the role of tourism in revitalising traditional winemaking

Sanja Pavlović

University of Belgrade, spavlovic20@gmail.com

Marija Belij

University of Belgrade, marija.belij@gmail.com

Jelena Belij

University of Belgrade, jelena.belij@gmail.com

Marina Ilinčić

University of Belgrade, marinailincic@gmail.com

Bojana Mihajlović

University of Belgrade, bokicagf@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is based on identifying dynamics and tradition as cultural processes. Wine production in Negotin wine region (Rajac and Rogljevo area), eastern Serbia, is a family activity, but research has revealed some changes in traditional knowledge. We have explored the authenticity of tourism products on offer: whether the winemaking method is traditional, if there are rituals (traditions) regarding grape growing and winemaking as a cultural form, and if so, whether residents present them to tourists, as well as what the external effects related to the changes are. The aim of this research is to establish the reasons for changes in the way wine is produced, in the way of life, and whether tourism is a factor in revitalising traditional winemaking or not. This paper examines the development of changes, and explains how they are affected by the value system of the local community, their knowledge or experiences, what is considered traditional and what modern. *Pimnice*, folk architecture structures where wine was produced and stored were analysed in relation to their significance both in the past and in the present. We have investigated the response of residents to changes in production, whether there is a will to continue participating in viticulture, and the possibilities of public-private partnership with regard to the increase in wine production and restoration of these unique wine cellars.

KEYWORDS: tradition, changes, pimnice, Negotin wine region

ANTHROPOLOGICAL NOTEBOOKS 22 (1): 43–57.

ISSN 1408-032X

© Slovene Anthropological Society 2016

Authenticity and tourism – theoretical research and dilemmas

Cultural changes in a society include changes in the value systems, the traditional way of life, family relationships, and behavioural patterns of the individual or social structure of the community (Ratz 2000). Tradition and heritage possess different emotional contents, creating a ‘longing for and mourning over lost good old days’, but at the same time enable tourist visits without much nostalgia, obligation or grief (Ronström 2008: 8–9). Hayward (2008: 170) notes that the discourse of “world heritage” tends not only to overshadow issues of local importance but also to place emphasis on material cultural inheritance, regardless of whether the local community views such tangible culture as being of primary importance. Visitors to the traditional tourism regions expect typical local elements to be included in the services offered. The inclusion of local elements in the tourism products on offer requires the participation of the resident population in the production process. Adverse experiences of tourism centres demonstrate that this is the only way to ensure a typical local atmosphere (Williams 2000).

Much of today’s heritage tourism product depends on the staging or re-creation of ethnic or cultural traditions (Chhabra et al. 2003). Authenticity, or the perception of it, is an important attribute of heritage tourism (Boniface & Fowler 1993; Taylor 2001; Waitt 2000). Clapp (1999) and Cohen (1988) assert that the quality of heritage tourism is enhanced by authenticity. Debates on authenticity are at the core of tourism and culture studies. The change tourism brings to traditional heritage of a local community opens up a new chapter in tourism research: the question of authenticity of tourism products and services on offer. Many argue for the *quality* of tourism based on the authentic lifestyle of a community, their traditions, and products, i.e. everything that one community has to offer to tourists. Considering that society is not a static entity but is continually changing, an absolutely authentic way of life cannot be expected in any community. The questions to be answered are: what is authenticity, and what are its limits, and who gets to decide whether something is authentic or not. Many believe that the most competent to make that decision is the community itself. If a community enjoys its (in)authenticity, insisting on changes is often hard. All the phenomena a community accepts or rejects constitute products of a society and time in which that community exists; therefore, claiming that a particular product is of high quality based solely on its authenticity is often unfounded. Times change, and so do attitudes and values. Contemporary tourists often do not care all that much about the perfect accuracy of a presentation, which sometimes might even seem uninteresting due to the changes time brings. It is a matter of ability to adjust interpretation to new times (Jelinčić 2006).

Tveit (2007) concludes that tourists often enthusiastically embrace reconstructions and commercial events, but also poses the question of whether folklore displays should be preserved in the original form, as part of everyday life as it once was. Revitalising of old traditions and modern constructions of traditions are seen as significant in the construction and maintaining of cultural identity, which is a reflexive stance. She believes that researchers do not look for authenticity in the past, but in how individuals and groups use

the past to create something they perceive as meaningful, valuable and useful. Authenticity is perceived as an inherent quality. She concludes that everybody shows tourists who they once wanted to be instead of who they want to be today (2007). Interpreting heritage is always a challenge, and tourists (consumers) are active participants in developing and rejecting cultural meanings (Ashworth 1994). Ashworth (ibid.) also believes that tourists (consumers) authenticate cultural resources and define heritage. Authenticity in tourism poses as objectivism and holds the special powers both of distance and of truth (Taylor 2001). These are essential components in the production of tourism values. Fundamental to the authenticity concept is a dialectic relationship between object and subject, there and here, then and now.

Teo and Yeoh (1997) believe that culture is being “sold by the kilo”, and that its consumption becomes an inevitable consequence of the produced, staged authenticity, aimed at tourists. According to Schouten (1996: 53-4), ‘the harder a person is trying to find authentic experience, the more it will escape him. Through tourism, authenticity rapidly diminishes.’ Duggan (1997) concludes that authentic culture is not the one that remains unchanged, which seems impossible under any conditions, but the one which preserves the capacity for determining the appropriateness of its adjustment, implying that authenticity is a dynamic phenomenon.

Answering the question of what truly is authentic is not as important as identifying who needs authenticity and why, as well as how authenticity has been used by different groups (Bendix 1997), which means that the quest for authenticity is a peculiar longing, simultaneously modern and anti-modern (ibid.). This quest for the authentic in human experience is a crucial aspect of culture (MacCannell 1976). Tourism emerging from this search is based on the belief that authentic experience lies beyond the boundaries of everyday life in contemporary society – nostalgic collective memory rebuilds the past to serve the needs of the present (MacCannell 1973).

Impact of tourism on the traditional and contemporary culture of a local community

Writing about the ‘construction’ of cultural identity or ‘invented tradition,’ Linnekin (1997: 217) emphasises that ‘culture is a dynamic product of human consciousness’ and that it can be translated to contemporary contexts. Hence, contrary to the “naturalistic conception of tradition”, this statement implies understanding tradition as a symbolic construction, embodying both continuity and discontinuity. Handler and Linnekin (1984) claim that tradition is invented because it is necessarily reconstructed (selectively) in the present, notwithstanding some participants’ understanding of such activities as being preservation rather than invention.

In 1999, a pilot study on the subject of tourism as a factor of change within a local community was conducted in Croatia. The questionnaire included indicators related to the interaction between tourism and cultural heritage, using a random sample of the local population. The questions were divided into six groups dealing with the positive/negative effects of tourism, the identity of tourists/local population, preservation of

intangible cultural heritage, employment in tourism, tourism as a factor of change, and attitudes of residents towards tourist attractions (Jelinčić 2006).

Richards (2002) examines the relationship between traditional and contemporary culture and their development on the cultural tourism market. From the 1960s onwards, modernisation had a detrimental effect on traditional cultures. Modernity rejected tradition as old-fashioned and reactionary, which led to modern culture being privileged. Cultural perspectives changed at the end of the 1990s as ‘postmodern’ attitudes towards culture and heritage emerged. The renewed importance of narrative as a cultural form has reawakened interest in traditional cultures. The question for the postmodern individual is ‘Where do I come from?’ The search for meaning and enchantment is not just a feature of current cultural consumption but is also one of the major driving forces of tourism. Very often the tourism experience is derived from the culture of a place, and particularly its traditions, customs, and way of life. Richards (2002) believes that tourism tends to maintain a clear dividing line between traditional and contemporary culture.

Being a dynamic process rather than a static phenomenon, tourism has influenced tradition and heritage. In certain communities, tradition changes because of tourism: it is invented or created. Modern society forces people to create their own traditions, with tourism being one of the strongest modern traditions (Richards 1996).

Tradition and heritage change according to tourist needs. Of what the contribution of “authenticity” in the changes caused by tourism consists is a question to be tackled on an individual basis. Aspirations should be aimed at more original forms of tradition in order to present it with as much authenticity as possible. Authenticity and originality of the presentation of tradition in tourism will ensure the high quality of tourism products on offer, and will make it stand out from the others. Traditional offer is often aimed at “modernisation” due to tourism. In such cases, we are talking about examples of the interpretation and invention of tradition, which can have adverse effects, because they rely on traditions that were not, in fact, lived in this region, but are completely new and invented. In contrast, forgotten knowledge about one’s own roots and pride in one’s heritage, often have tourism to thank for their re-use and preservation. Thus, tourism has a vital role in the preservation of heritage. Changing tradition is a hallmark of our time, and whether this has positive or negative effects depends on the application, on an individual basis. The unique feature of future research is the contribution of creativity involved in the invention of tradition in relation to the presentation of what is offered in tourism (Jelinčić 2006).

Local resources are a true source of competitive advantage due to the higher regard for local particularities and better sustainable competitive advantage, which is acquired when the main presenters of a tourist destination are capable of creating an original combination of tangible and intangible resources, which could include residents and typical agricultural products (Presenza, Minguzzi & Petrillo 2010).

Carmichael (2006) indicates that the quality of life of tourists and residents, and the quality of their experience can be influenced by dynamic factors (such as type and number of tourists, type and number of residents, social exchange, social presentations and type of tourism). Lankford and Howard (1994) pointed out that several variables (such

as length of residency, distance from tourist centres to home, residents' involvement in tourism related to decision making) can interfere with the effect tourism has on residents. Diedrich and Garcia-Buades (2009) argue that analyses of residents' perception of tourism should include variables such as nationality, income, (i.e. dependency on tourism) and overall attitude towards tourism. Taking into account different socio-economic, cultural and ecological variables interacting within tourist destinations, it would be unrealistic to expect that there is a direct causality in the research of tourism impact studies.

The local community plays an important role in creating a destination's image, and residents are often an integral part of the tourist experience. Residents who support tourism have friendly tendencies. Community development is a process which allows residents to plan, generate solutions and take measures in the evolution of social, economic, environmental and cultural aspects (Fariborz, Sarjit & Farshid 2010). Numerous studies have focused on studying community factors as part of the overall tourist experience. Several factors ensure successful tourism industry: goodwill of the residents, community support for tourism development and the successful operation of tourist enterprises and organisations (Jurovski 1994).

This paper explores experiences and perceptions of local communities in the villages Rajac and Rogljevo, in the eastern part of Serbia, in terms of the impacts of tourism, culture, economy and demography on the development of communities.

Pimnice, now and then

Pimnice (also known as *pivnice*) are unique architectural complexes of wine cellars of Negotinska Krajina, a vine-growing region in Serbia. Pimnice are a group of tightly deployed buildings located near vineyards and used as a temporary settlement, and for making and storing wine.

The atmosphere in these settlements was somewhat peculiar. They were abandoned throughout the year, except during several harvest days in the autumn when they would come to life, especially in the past. During the rest of the year, people would visit to do some chores or to take something back home... You could feel the stillness of the settlement almost weighing on you, and encountering a keeper or anyone else coming to work in the vineyard or field would bring relief (Pantelić 1960: 172).

In line with the local community's belief that 'wine demands a peaceful, clean and quiet environment,' pimnice were built on hills, surrounded by vineyards. The quality of construction of these unique settlements depended on household wealth. In the beginning, wooden chalets were prevalent, but with the economic growth of winemakers, previously used construction material for pimnice was replaced with sandstone. The oldest dated Rogljevo wine cellar made of stone was built in 1861.

Pimnice in Rajac and Rogljevo were constructed using stone, dug in the ground to maintain stable temperatures, with small windows and without a chimney. Small windows were used for filling the barrels with grapes brought from the vineyard (Žikić 1997). Between the two world wars, villagers spent the autumn and part of the winter in

wine cellars preparing wine. The building has undivided interior space. The wine cellar floor is below ground level, because the building is dug into the ground. The building can have two opposing entrances, with one of them higher than the other. If there is only one entrance, a window on the one side with a wooden gutter, *gurma*, is used for pouring crushed grapes into the barrels. Wine containers are placed next to the walls, while the centre of the room remains vacant. Alongside various containers for making and storing wine, there are also machines for squeezing and preserving wine (Pantelić, 1960). After a devastating spread of phylloxera, the pimnice started to disappear. Most of the wine cellars lost their function at that time, or some time later.



Figure 1: Pimnice now

The majority of pimnice in Rogljevo were built between 1859 and 1889. The pimnice of Rogljevo represent a spontaneous agglomeration of winding streets with a *zapis* (sacred tree) and a well in the middle area. The well was a place for gathering and had a religious significance. Wells were dug to provide sufficient amount of water for washing wine containers. The oldest cellars were built by Macedonian craftsmen. The size of the buildings varied: smaller cellars could store one or two wine wagons, while the bigger ones could store ten or more wagons. Rogljevo pimnice have tribute plaques with porcelain photo tiles, placed there in memory of the cellar craftsman or a deceased family member. Amongst Rogljevo pimnice, there were two bakeries and two butcher

shops, which suggests an active social life (Žikić 1997).

In the pimnice of Rajac, there is a sacred tree on the central square. Spreading from the square are winding streets and narrow passages with expansions (i.e. small squares) used for trade and everyday activities during the grape harvest season. The cellars of Rajac village have richly decorated facades. Every cellar has a double door, usually with semi-circular vaults. Similar in shape are windows, small and narrow. Panels on the facade carry the name of the owner, the year of construction and the name of the craftsman who built the cellar.

Objects/structures should be restored according to traditional, local rules, which follow the requirements of space functionality and simple design. Restoration of buildings/structures should contain minimum architectural intake, keeping in mind all the details buildings had in the past, and the construction materials originally used (Demonja & Baćac 2012).

Most of the cellars are abandoned and subject to decay. Winemakers' descendants restored some of them; some were sold and now serve their original purpose. A few cellars were restored to lodging and hospitality buildings. Pimnice are exposed to arbitrary changes, and only professional conservation treatment could keep these buildings in their original state. In that context, local community cooperation with the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia could be significant, but financial resources pose limitations for pimnice revitalisation. Since the mid-1990s, pimnice are under the protection of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, which aided in preventing further deterioration of these structures. According to official records of this institution, there are 160 wine cellars in Rajac and 120 in Rogljevo village. Architecture documentation for each cellar is currently in progress, as well as the Study on the protection of cultural heritage in the villages of Rajac and Rogljevo, the plan of detailed regulation of pimnice, and the nomination of pimnice to the UNESCO List of world natural and cultural heritage.

The demographic structure of the local population had a negative impact on researched phenomena and processes. Between the two world wars, rich wine traders sent their children off to schools in cities, where they would remain as inhabitants. Gradually, demographic developments became unfavourable, and that trend continued after World War II. At that time, the association *Krajina vino* was founded, with grape trade as its basic function. Because residents were obligated to sell their grapes to local cooperatives (*zadruga*) and not to process them themselves, pimnice began to lose their primary function.

Regarding the aforementioned cooperation of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia and the local community, it is necessary to define the private-public partnership, which formulates the details of individual contributions of the public sector and private organisations and which is dictated by unique circumstances. Public-private partnerships can be classified into three main categories, which set a framework for the cultural tourism development. The first category includes mutual ventures, in which the public sector has the dominant role in developing cultural tourism capacities. The second category of partnership covers ventures in which the public sector

has a moderate level of involvement in facilitating cultural tourism development. The third category includes projects in which the public sector uses existing cultural resources solely owned by private organisations (OECD 2009). Wine cellar projects are organised according to the second category partnership, i.e. the public sector has a moderate level of involvement in facilitating cultural tourism development.

In Rajac pinnice, St. Trifun's Day is celebrated as a protector of wine and vineyards, and on that day festivities take place and winemakers perform ritual ceremonies of pruning the vineyard. In the beginning, every household performed this ritual in their own vineyard first and then everybody would gather for a group ceremony with a priest present. They believed that this ritual ensured vineyard fruitfulness. During the morning, winemakers would open their cellars, pour wine, prune vines, and cut the bread traditionally served for patron saint's day. A priest would say the prayer and everybody would gather around the table with wine and food set under an old tree (Prvulović 2002). The ritual ceremony of pruning the vineyard is attended mainly by locals, who do not, however, show it to the visitors.

Negotin wine region (Rajac and Rogljevo area) and wine tourism experiences around the world

A few archaeological findings dating from ancient history and medieval period toponyms prove that winemaking tradition in Rajac and Rogljevo area is very old. Statistical data from 1737 show that a relatively vast area of cultivated land was divided into vineyards (Maslovarić 1969).

The area of Rajac and Rogljevo received full affirmation during the international wine exhibition in Bordeaux 1882 and during the world wine exhibition in Anvers 1885, winning first prizes at both exhibitions. The wine was exported to Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Switzerland, Romania, and Russia (Maslovarić 1969). By 1888, phylloxera (grape disease) destroyed vineyards and stopped the wine trade. From 1890 to 1895, vineyard restoration was underway, using a new breed of vine, grafted on American rootstock. That marked the beginning of new era in viticulture development in this region. In the period between the two world wars, efforts were made to improve viticulture. After 1930, the buying of wine and grapes restarted, and a winemakers' cooperative was established in Rogljevo, aiming at achieving better quality for foreign markets (Žikić 1997). World War II interrupted the wine trade once again. After the war, winemaking was reorganised by introduction of large wine cellars and with the founding of the association *Krajina vino*. This association, in cooperation with *Slovenija vino*, launched their products both on domestic and on foreign markets (Maslovarić 1969).

Before the phylloxera devastation, the varieties *začinak*, *skadarska*, *drenak*, *bagrina*, *lisičina* were cultivated; after the reorganisation, the varieties were *plovdina*, *smederevka*, *tamjanika*, *prokupac*, and *bagrina*. After World War II, the *gamay* and *vranac* varieties of red grapes were favoured; since the 1980s, white grape varieties Rhine Riesling, Muscat Ottonel, Bouvier, and Traminer took the leading role, but *plovdina*, *prokupac*, *začinak*, and *smederevka* were retained (Žikić 1997).

The dense red wines of the Rajac and Rogljevo area are characterised by natural winemaking process and nurturing in stone cellars pinnice. Wine is produced from old local varieties, such as *crna* (black) *tamjanika*. Rajac and Rogljevo area is well-known for Gamay, Chardonnay and the local wine *bagrina* (Đorđević-Milošević & Milovanović 2012).

This wine is recognisable on the market despite small-scale production. Customers know Rajac wine to be a genuine, domestic product, and they associate it with the traditional skills of Rajac winemakers, attractive stone cellars settlements/villages without chimneys, inhabited only for wine. For processing grapes, winemakers use a traditional method that requires clean barrels (lasting longer than hundred years), yeast naturally present in grapes and wine maturing without temperature regulation in a stable climate. Intangible cultural heritage, i.e. tradition and life expressions, were passed on from ancestors to descendants (Đorđević-Milošević & Milovanović 2012).

Preserving cellars and traditions of the Rajac and Rogljevo area is possible only if national legislation on wine production receives components that regulate traditional small-scale wine production. Such practice exists in the EU, so there are no obstacles to receiving permission to deviate from the rules imposed on small-scale wine producers by industrial wine production. Rajac vineyards are too small for significant investments; they have no capacities for increasing production or to compete with industrial wine production. Many of the winemakers do not wish to register their wineries, because the attractiveness of tourism depends on winemaking tradition and the traditional way of selling products and providing services (ibid.).

In the context of the production and participation of the local community, the authors of this research present findings related to wine tourism. The small-scale wine makers production is relatively insignificant for global distribution chains and marketing agencies, but it represents an interesting part of the market for local and regional development experts in order to create genuine oenophile tourism products (Kesar & Ferjanić 2010).

Wine tourism studies propose that a visit to the winery should include the cultural and historical context of the wine region (Frochot, 2000), an introduction to the production methods (Charters, 2006), a search for education and variety (Ali-Knight, Charters, 1999), and a sense of authenticity (Charters et al., 2009). Wine tourism experiences could be provided in several ways, mostly through events and festivals, cultural heritage, hospitality services, education, sampling and selling wine, and wine tours (Charters & Ali-Knight 2002), since wine tourism is simultaneously a form of consumer behaviour, a strategy by which destinations develop and market wine-related attractions and imagery, and a marketing opportunity for wineries to educate and sell their products directly to consumers (Getz & Brown 2006).

While working on the project 'New trends in wine tourism and territorial development' during 2008 and 2009, Jaume Salvat and Jordi Blay Boqué identified several wine tourism models. The Rajac wine region corresponds to the model of wine tourism heritage defined as a European model closely connected with tradition, monuments, and cultural landscape. Tourism generates an exterior image combined with heritage, landscape, culture, and architecture. This model of wine tourism promotes the participation of small-scale winemakers to achieve product authenticity improvement and encourage adaptation of the traditional production sector to wine tourism initiatives.

Research methodology and discussion

Methods used in this paper include both field and desk research. Field research provided quality data (collected from primary sources (residents of Rajac and Rogljevo villages, the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia) that are relevant for the scientific understanding of the researched phenomena.

The research was conducted to determine possible differences in the attitudes of residents of two neighbouring villages towards the studied phenomena (pimnice, traditional wine production, and tourism). In this manner, the authors wanted to explain the perception of these target groups in relation to the observed phenomena.

This survey research, conducted in the villages of Rajac and Rogljevo in June 2013, included a sample of 131 respondents (or 32.6% of the total population).¹ The questionnaire consisted of 15 statements designed to reveal the attitudes of residents of the mentioned villages towards the traditional winemaking and tourism as one of the factors of development of the area. A Likert scale was used in the research: the respondents were expected to express their level of agreement ranging from complete disagreement to complete agreement with a statement (1–5). Data analysis was performed with the SPSS 20.0 software package for statistical data processing and analysis. When analysing the results for the purpose of this research, the following research techniques were used: descriptive statistical analysis, independent sample *t*-test and Mann-Whitney *U* test.

Analysis of the basic indicators in the first part of the research shows the structure of respondents with respect to sex, age and level of education.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Characteristics	Absolute frequencies	Share (%)
Sex		
Male	71	54.20
Female	60	45.80
Age		
Under 35 ²	27	20.61
36–50	23	17.56
Over 50	81	61.83
Education level		
No qualifications	6	4.58
Primary school qualifications	65	49.62
Secondary school qualifications	40	30.53
University qualifications	20	15.27

The sample, comprising 131 respondents, shows that the male population (54.20%) outnumbers the female population (45.80%). For the purpose of analysing the age structure, the respondents were divided into three groups. The largest number

¹ According to the 2011 census data, the total number of residents in Rajac is 278, and in Rogljevo 123 (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2011).

² This age group also includes students who are permanent residents of Rajac and Rogljevo, but do not intend to continue the winemaking tradition.

of respondents (more than half) belong to the over-50s age group (61.83%), followed by the group of respondents under the age of 35 (20.61%), while the 36–50 age group has the lowest number of respondents. Based on these data, it can be concluded that population ageing is widespread in this village (the deepest demographic old age). If negative demographic processes continue with such intensity, the demographic survival of the village will be threatened.

The analysis of the educational structure of the sample reveals that the majority of the population has primary school qualifications (49.62%, mostly farmers and pensioners), 30.53% of the respondents have secondary school education (mostly agricultural and mechanical technicians), university degree is obtained by only 15.27% (mostly economists), while six respondents (4.58% of the entire sample) have no qualifications. This structure of respondents does not come as a surprise, considering that the population is dominated by older residents.

Research results

The generally accepted rule for describing a scale's internal consistency, using Cronbach's alpha, a coefficient of internal consistency in the range of 0.6–0.7, is considered acceptable (Kline 1999; Darren & Mallery 2003). For the purposes of this study, we created a scale "Traditionalism and tourism", which includes 15 test items for measuring local people's attitudes relevant for this research². In our study, Cronbach's coefficient alpha has a value of 0.604, indicating that the scale has acceptable internal consistency.

Using descriptive statistics, we established the mean values of items ranging from the minimum value of 1.84 to the maximum value of 4.92. The lowest values indicate that winemaking is not done in a modern way (Item B) and that only a small number of respondents are involved in providing services to tourists (Item N), while the highest values (Items G, H) indicate the population believes that both foreign and domestic tourists find their traditional values interesting, which contributes householder's stories about winemaking process in the past (Item O). When visiting these unique wine cellars, domestic tourists are mostly looking for convenience and comfort, while foreign tourists seek adventure, are not too fussy and prefer traditional values (pimnice and viticulture).

Using the *t*-test, we wanted to determine whether there is a difference in attitudes of the respondents, divided into two groups, with one group comprising residents of Rajac and the other residents of Rogljevo. Therefore, the place of residence was used as the independent variable, while items were used as dependent variables.

3 A – Family has been producing wine for a long time, without interruptions; B – Winemaking method is modern (modern machinery); C – Local residents are willing to engage tourists in the winemaking process; D – Local residents are willing to produce wine the traditional way; E – Tourism can reduce emigration of young people from the village; F – Young people are interested in preserving village traditions; G – Foreign tourists are interested in traditional village values; H – Domestic tourists are interested in traditional village values; I – The wine cellars (pimnice) are restored in a traditional way (as they once were); J – Tourism has contributed to the change in lifestyle and in the appearance of the cellars; K – Without tourism, pimnice would not have been restored; L – Without using pimnice for winemaking once again, these cellars would not have been restored; M – Local residents are satisfied with the current way of presenting pimnice to tourists; N – Households provide services to tourists; O – Householders tell tourists about winemaking process in the past and about these unique wine cellars.

The *Independent Samples Test* demonstrates the results of Levene's test for equality of variances, showing whether the variability of the results is equal in two analysed groups (Rajac residents and Rogljevo residents). When the significance (p -value) is greater than 0.05, assumed equal variances are valid. In this example, the p -value of Levene's test is 0.681, meaning that the equal variances assumption was not disturbed. The difference between the two groups is not significant, but random, because it was determined that the value is 0.977, above the required limit, so we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean values of given statements between respondents living in the village of Rajac or those from the village of Rogljevo.

Although respondents from both villages generally expressed the same attitudes, it can be predicted that an unfavourable demographic structure will manifest faster in Rogljevo than in Rajac, implying that traditional values will disappear first in Rogljevo. In recent years, residents have been not only pinnice but also their vineyards. The buyers are wine producers who introduce modern methods and have a negative impact on traditionalism. While the older population shows enthusiasm and willingness to continue the traditions and revitalisation of the area, this tendency is not evident in younger residents.

Conclusion

Cultural exchange is under the influence of original and traditional culture in the region and at certain locations. Such is the case with Rajac and Rogljevo wine regions in eastern Serbia. With the increase of internationalisation, in daily social interactions the importance of roots that promote cohesion becomes more visible. This local trend acts as counterforce in the process of global integration. Globalisation leads to the creation of products that often combine traditional cultural heritage and modern civilisation achievements.

In addition to being structures in the wine regions of eastern Serbia, pinnice have a business character. Buying, selling and wine degustation takes place there. Possibilities of economic evaluation should be considered, taking into account numerous factors, both positive and negative. Pinnice are spatial, cultural, and historical entities of utmost significance with genuine traditional architecture. There is a long tradition of viticulture and winemaking, and locals are hospitable. In contrast, there is an evident lack of infrastructural objects, the age structure of the population is unfavourable, there are no programs that would attract capital for wine cellars revitalisation, and there are examples of arbitrary restoration with no respect to authentic features. Organising events with facilities promoting local ethnic cultures, integral linking of settlements Rajac and Rogljevo, advancement and development of small wineries according to market demands, more effective networking of viticulture, winemaking, tourism and hospitality services, locating new areas suitable for growing vines and establishing associations of winemakers, as well as organised buying of grapes – all these activities should be realised, with emphasis on traditional values and accompanied by decreases of external effects causing the changes.

A rise in public interest causes increased danger for the survival of pinnice. Without contemporary approaches to protection and without the adequate engagement of local communities, negative consequences are inevitable. Therefore, the local community

should include visitors in vineyard cultivation, such as grape harvest and crushing, winemaking, preparing authentic meals and other customs. This way, through an interactive relationship between locals and tourists, visitors' awareness of traditional production would grow stronger, and the influence of innovations would be reduced to a minimum.

Based on the research results it is evident that authenticity exists in the Rajac and Rogljevo vine-growing region. Considering that authentic culture is not the one that remains unchanged, but the one that keeps the ability to adapt, we can conclude that this condition of authenticity was also partly fulfilled, in the researched area. Only through acknowledging the distinctive features of the wine region that have been researched, shall examples of good and bad practices around the world and attitudes of local communities various traditional vs. modern dilemmas be resolved, and the past shall serve as a foundation for creating the future.

References

- Ali-Knight, Jane & Steve Charters. 1999. Education in a West Australian wine tourism context. *International Journal of Wine Marketing* 11(1): 7–18.
- Ashworth, Gregory. 1994. From History to Heritage - From Heritage to Identity: In Search of Concepts and Models. In: Gregory Ashworth & Peter Larkham (eds.), *Building a New Heritage. Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 13–30.
- Bendix, Regina. 1997. *Authenticity – The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Boniface, Priscilla & Peter Fowler. 1993. *Heritage and Tourism in the Global Village*. London: Sage.
- Carmichael, Barbara. 2006. Linking Quality Tourism Experiences, Residents Quality of Life, and Quality Experiences for Tourists. In: Gayle Jennings & Norma Nickerson (eds.), *Quality Tourism Experiences*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 115–35.
- Chhabra, Deepak, Robert, Healy, Erin, Sills. 2003. Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30 (3): 702–19.
- Charters, Steve, Jane, Ali-Knight. 2002. Who is the wine tourist? *Tourism Management* 23 (3): 311–319.
- Charters, Steve. 2006. *Wine and Society: The Social and Cultural Context of a Drink*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Charters, Steve, Joanna, Fountain, Nicola, Fish. 2009. 'You felt like lingering...' Experiencing 'real' service at the winery tasting room. *Journal of Travel Research* 48 (1): 122–134.
- Clapp, Gordon. 1999. *Heritage Tourism. Heritage Tourism Report. North Carolina Division of Travel, Tourism, Film, Sports and Development*. North Carolina: Raleigh.
- Cohen, Erik. 1988. Traditions on the qualitative sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15(1): 29–46.
- Diedrich, Amy, Esther, Garcia-Buades. 2009. Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management* 30(4): 512–21.
- Demonja, Damir, Robert, Baćac. 2012. Baština i tradicija u oblikovanju turističke ponude na ruralnom prostoru Hrvatske. *Podravina* 11 (21): 205–18.
- Djordjević-Milošević, Suzana, Jelena, Milovanović. 2012. *Održivi turizam u funkciji ruralnog razvoja – mala poljoprivredna gazdinstva i ruralni turizam u Srbiji*. Beograd–Vršac–Budimpešta: Fakultet za primenjenu ekologiju Futura, Agroznanje, FAO.
- Duggan, Betty. 1997. Tourism, Cultural Authenticity, and the Native Crafts Cooperative: The Eastern Cherokee Experience. In: Ed Chambers (ed.), *Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 31–57.
- Fariborz, Aref, Gill, Sarjit, Aref, Farshid. 2010. Tourism development in local communities: as a community development approach. *Journal of American Science* 6(2): 155–61.
- Frochot, Isabelle. 2000. Wine Tourism in France: A paradox?. In: Colin Michael Hall, Liz Sharples, Brock Cambourne & Niki Macionis (eds.), *Wine Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, pp. 67–80.

- George, Darren, Paul, Mallery . 2003. *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Getz, Donald, Graham, Brown. 2006. Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: a demand analysis. *Tourism Management* 27(1): 146–58.
- Handler, Richard, Jocelyn, Linnekin. 1984. Tradition, genuine or spurious. *Journal of American Folklore*, 97(385): 273–90.
- Hayward, Philip. 2008. Les Méduses dans la Marée de l'Histoire: L'Anse aux Meadows, Nan Sdins and Cultural Heritage Agendas. *Island Studies Journal* 3(2): 163–74.
- Jelinčić, Daniela Angelina. 2006. Turizam vs. Identitet. Globalizacija i tradicija. *Etnološka istraživanja/Ethnological Researches* 1(11): 161–83.
- Jurowski, Claudia Anne. 1994. *The Interplay of Elements Affecting Host Community Resident Attitudes Toward Tourism: A Path Analytic Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Blacksburg: VA, USA, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Kesar, Oliver, Danijela, Ferjanić. 2010. Ključni aspekti uspjeha u upravljanju razvojem enofilskog turizma u uvjetima svjetske gospodarske krize – slučaj Hrvatske (Key aspects of managing successful wine tourism development in times of global economic crisis – a case of Croatia). *Acta turistica* 22(1): 99–131.
- Kline, Paul. 1999. *The handbook of psychological testing (2nd ed.)*. London: Routledge Further Reading.
- Lankford, Samuel, Dennis, Howard. 1994. Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research* 21(1): 121–39.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1997. Consuming Cultures: Tourism and the Commoditization of Cultural Identity in the Island Pacific. In: Michael Picard & Robert Wood (eds.), *Tourism, Ethnicity, and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 215–50.
- MacCannell, Dean. 1976. *The Visitor: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.
- MacCannell, Dean. 1973. Staged authenticity: arrangements of social space in visitor settings. *American Journal of Sociology* 79(3): 589–603.
- Maslovarić, Dušan. 1969. Vinogradarstvo u Negotinskoj Krajini. *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* 31-32: 173–94.
- OECD. 2009. Chapter 8: Temple Stay Programme, Korea. *The Impact of Culture on Tourism*, Case Study of the Republic of Korea. Paris: Ministru of Culture, Sports and Tourism Republic of Korea, Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs and Local Development, pp. 115–27.
- Pantelić, Nikola. 1960. Pivnice – poljane. *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* 22-23: 171–85.
- Presenza, Angelo, Antonio, Minguzzi, Clara, Petrillo. 2010. Managing wine tourism in Italy. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice* 2(1): 46–61.
- Prvulović, B. 2002. Prolećni običaj zarezivanja čokota vinove loze o Sv. Trifunu u selu Rajcu kod Negotina. Teme zavičajne, Zbornik priloga iz materijalne i duhovne kulture područja Timoka: 162–65.
- Ratz, Tamara. 2000. 'Residents' Perceptions of the Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism at Lake Balton, Hungary. In: Greg Richards & Derek Hall (eds.), *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. Great Britain: Routledge, pp. 36–7.
- Richards, Greg. 1996. Production and consumption of European cultural tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(2): 261–83.
- Richards, Greg. 2002. Traditional and Contemporary Culture and Tourism. In: Elisenda Belda & Annamari Laaksonen (eds.), *European Project to Foster Linguistic Diversity and the Role of Tradition in Contemporary Arts Production*. Barcelona: Fundacio Interarts, pp. 65–73.
- Ronström, Owe. 2008. A different land: heritage production in the Island of Gotland. *The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures* 2(2): 1–18.
- Salvat, Jaume, Jordi, Boqué Blay. 2009. *New Opportunities and Challenges in Wine Tourism*. Research project on "New trends in Wine Tourism and Territorial Development" carried out by the Research Group "Territorial Analysis and Tourism Studies" of the Rovira i Virgili University in 2008/2009.
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia. 2011. *Comparative overview of the number of population in 1948, 1953, 1961, 1971, 1981, 1991, 2002 and 2011, data by settlements, book 20*. Belgrade: Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia.
- Schouten, Frans. 1996. Tourism and Cultural Change. Proceedings of a UNESCO Round Table 'Culture, Tourism, Development: Crucial Issues for the Twenty-First Century'. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 53–6.

- Taylor, John. 2001. Authenticity and sincerity in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(1): 7–26.
- Teo, Peggy, Brenda, Yeoh. 1997. Remaking local heritage for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(1): 192–213.
- Tweit, Eva-Marie. 2007. Folklore on display: the authenticity debate revisited. *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, 19: 293–302.
- Waite, Gordon. 2000. Consuming heritage. Perceived historical authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(4): 835–62.
- Williams, Peter. 2000. Incorporating indigenous people identity into cultural tourism product development: The case of Aboriginal tourism. AIEST, *Tourism and Culture*, 42: 91–111.
- Žikić, Aleksandar. 1997. *Krajinska naselja Donjeg Timoka (Rogljevo, Smedovac i Veljkovo)*. Beograd: Odbor Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti za proučavanje sela, Kulturno-prosvetna zajednica Republike Srbije.

Povzetek

Raziskava temelji na ugotavljanju dinamike in tradicije kot kulturnih procesov. Pridelovanje vin v negotinskem vinogorju (rajački in rogljevski pokrajini) je že od nekdaj tradicionalna družinska dejavnost v tem delu vzhodne Srbije, vendar pa je raziskava pokazala, da so danes ta tradicionalna znanja precej drugačna. Raziskali smo, v kakšni meri je turistična ponudba glede pridelovanja vin avtentična, oz. tradicionalna, ali vinsko trto vzgajajo in vino pridelujejo po starih običajih ter ali jih domačini nudijo in predstavijo turistom, pa tudi kaj je vplivalo na spremembe. Namen raziskave je bil ugotoviti vzroke za spremenjen način pridelovanja vina in drugačen način življenja ter raziskati, ali je turizem lahko dejavnik revitalizacije tradicionalne pridelave vin. Članek proučuje razvoj sprememb ter vpliv vrednostnega sistema lokalne skupnosti, obstoječega znanja in izkušnj in pojmovanja kaj je tradicionalno in kaj moderno. Pimnice, objekti nacionalne arhitekture, v katerih pridelujejo in skladiščijo vino, smo analizirali glede na njihov pomen v preteklosti in danes. Raziskali smo, kako se domače prebivalstvo odziva na spremembe pri pridelovanju vin, ali se je pripravljeno ukvarjati z vinogradništvom in kakšne so možnosti za javno-zasebno partnerstvo v zvezi s povečanjem proizvodnje vina in obnovo pimnic.

Ključne besede: tradicija, spremembe, pimnice, negotinsko vinogorje

CORRESPONDENCE: SANJA PAVLOVIĆ, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Geography, Studentski trg 3/3, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia. E-mail: spavlovic20@gmail.com.