

stance that it was written by a man. Namely, non-critical acceptance of the anti-androcentric position contributed to the fact that this book – although it deals with male-female relations – was less often mentioned and cited in feminist literature than would have been the case if it had been written by a woman.

nice što ju je napisao muškarac. Nekritičko preuzimanje antiandrocentričnog diskursa pridonijelo je, naime, tome da se knjiga – iako se bavi muško-ženskim odnosima – manje spominje i citira u feminističkoj literaturi, nego što bi to bio slučaj da ju je napisala žena.

**Inga Tomić-Koludrović**

*Odjel za sociologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru / Department of Sociology, University of Zadar*

## For Sociology Inspired by Anima

One of the questions emphasized by M. Petrić in his critical review (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39[40], 1-2) of the discussion about the second release of V. Katunarić book *Women's Eros and the Civilization of Death* is the question about the relationship between sociology and feminism. Even though the proper answer would demand comprehensive research – as would be the case with answers to many other questions raised that evening – the article “Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography” (Ellis and Bochner, 2006), which I have recently read, inspired me to note some thoughts on the topic.

Feminism has paved its way into the study programmes of sociology at our universities within the form of courses such as the Sociology of Gender, or Feminist Theories. We can read also about feminist epistemology in scientific journals, but the question remains: how much has the feminist critique of science influenced the epistemological subject of Croatian sociology? How much have we moved away from the traditional, modernist paradigm based on

## Za sociologiju inspiriranu Animom

Jedno od pitanja koje M. Petrić apostrofira u svom kritičkom osvrtu (*Revija za sociologiju*, 39[40], 1-2) na razgovor povodom drugog izdanja knjige V. Katunarića *Ženski eros i civilizacija smrti*, jest i ono o odnosu sociologije i feminizma. Iako bi odgovor na njega (uostalom kao i na mnoga druga pitanja otvorena te večeri) zahtijevao opsežno istraživanje, članak »Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006) koji sam nedavno pročitala potaknuo me da zabilježim neka promišljanja.

Iako feminizam u formi kolegija poput Sociologije roda, Feminističkih teorija i sl. posljednjih godina pronalazi svoj put u studijske programe sociologije na našim sveučilištima, a u stručnim je časopisima otvorena tema feminističke epistemologije, nadaje se pitanje koliko je doista feministička kritika znanosti utjecala na epistemološki subjekt domaće sociologije? Koliko smo se odmaknuli od tradicionalne,

the perspective of the distanced, “objective”, “neutral” observer, whose goal is to reach the Truth as it is seen from God’s view? The Truth here is conceived as the definitive description, as the analytical statement about the world as it is outside the multiple intercessions of language and culture. The Truth is expressed in generalizations, which halt, freeze, and change the context of social processes. The Truth is expressed in theory as impersonal abstraction, whose aim is to develop a universal “yardstick” that can be applied to particular cases. The theory conceived in this way is precisely the subject of (not only) the feminist critique, which denotes it as part of the “male paradigm”. Opposed to it, feminists point out the personalized and contextualized knowledge typical for female socialization (Blair, Brown and Baxter, 1994: 389).

Even the scientific community in more developed countries, with a longer tradition of social sciences, needed some time to recognize the transformative potential of feminist theory, and for some sort of epistemological gender mainstreaming to take place. During the last several years, instead of denial of the scientific character of feminist discourse, we can find the development of new research practices, such as sociological narrative or autoethnography, which incorporate some of the guidelines conceptualized within feminist theory. By including questions such as: “Where is the living experience of the individuals in the research? What about the context of researched phenomena? Where is the flesh and blood scholar in the work?” feminists are aiming to overrule the existing dichotomy between the scientific and the personal. They are trying to reach synthetic articulation of the personal and theoretical by weaving together autonarratives with critical argumentation (Burnier, 2006: 413).

modernističke paradigme koja počiva na pogledu distanciranoga, »objektivnoga«, »neutralnog« promatrača, koji iz božanske perspektive teži Istini? Istini shvaćenju kao konačan opis, kao analitička izjava o svijetu kakav jest s onu stranu višestrukih posredovanja jezika i kulture. Istini iskazanoj generalizacijama koje zaustavljaju, zamrzavaju i mijenjaju kontekst društvenih procesa. Istini iskazanoj u teoriji kao impersonalnoj apstrakciji kojoj je svrha razvijanje univerzalnog »aršina« primjenjivog na sve posebne slučajeve. A upravo tako shvaćena teorija predmet je (ne samo) feminističke kritike, koja takvoj »muškoj paradigmi« suprotstavlja personaliziranu i kontekstualiziranu spoznaju karakterističnu za žensku socijalizaciju (Blair, Brown i Baxter, 1994: 389).

I u razvijenim zemljama s duljom sociološkom tradicijom trebalo je vremena da se prepozna transformativni potencijal feminizma i da se dogodi neka vrsta epistemološkog *gender mainstreaminga*. Umjesto odricanja »znanstvenosti« feminističkom diskursu, posljednjih godina dolazi do razvoja novih istraživačkih praksi, poput sociološkog narativa ili autoetnografije, praksi koje uključuju neke od smjernica konceptualiziranih u feminističkoj teoriji. Postavljajući pitanja: »Gdje je živo iskustvo pojedinaca koje se istražuje? Što s kontekstom, situiranošću istraživanih fenomena? Gdje je utjelovljeni, živi istraživač?«, feministice smjeraju prevladavanju dihotomije znanstvenog i osobnog, nastojeći protkivanjem autonaracije i kritičke argumentacije doći do sintetičke artikulacije osobnog i teorijskog (Burnier, 2006: 413).

Rezultat je tog procesa istraživačka metodologija »dizajnirana da bude

The result of this process is research methodology “designed to be unruly, dangerous, vulnerable, rebellious, and creative”; methodology which “embrace[s] intimate involvement, engagement, and embodied participation”; which “shows multiple voices and positions”; which reveals “unsettled meanings” (Ellis and Bochner, 2006). While traditional analysis is based on transferring the information, the narrative inquiry emphasizes the communication: “It’s the difference between monologue and dialogue, between closing down interpretation and staying open to other meanings, between having the last word and sharing the platform” (Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 438).

Incorporation of the impulses originated by feminist theory resulted in change of scientific goals as well. By recognizing the scholarly value of the marginal social position, feminist critics of science have opened the door not just to the “feminine” perspective, but also to the voices of other repressed social groups. In this way, the ethical dimension of the scientific research became emphasized. The goal of the science is no longer merely the analysis, rather the scientist wants “the reader to care, to feel, to empathize, and to do something, to act. It needs the researcher to be vulnerable and intimate” (Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 433). The aim is to open up the dialogue about *how* people live, instead of achieving the closed perspective of (quantitative) analysis and its definitive description of the world. The aim is science which is changing the world, instead of mere transference of data.

When we observe recent Croatian sociological production having the above-mentioned perspective in mind, it seems that the influence of feminist theory is still marginal and shallow. Admittedly, feminist theories are part of the university curricula, and there is more research on the social po-

neposlušna, opasna, ranjiva, buntovna i kreativna«, koja »obuhvaća intimnu uključenost, angažman i utjelovljeno sudjelovanje«, koja »pokazuje višeglasje i mnogostrukost perspektiva« otkrivajući »uznemirujuća značenja« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006). Dok tradicionalna analiza počiva na prenošenju informacija, narativno istraživanje naglašava komunikaciju: »To je razlika između monologa i dijaloga, između zatvorene interpretacije i otvorenosti za drugačija značenja, između pozicije koja ima posljednju riječ i pozicije koja nudi zajedničku platformu« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006: 438).

Uključivanje impulsa feminističke teorije ima za rezultat i pomak u znanstvenim ciljevima. Pridavanjem znanstvene vrijednosti poziciji marginalnosti, feministička kritika znanosti nije otvorila vrata samo »ženskoj« perspektivi nego i glasovima ostalih diskriminiranih skupina, naglašavajući važnost etičke dimenzije znanstvenog istraživanja. Svrha znanstvenog rada više nije isključivo analitička, nego se želi postići da je »čitatelju stalo, da osjeća, da suosjeća i učini nešto, djeluje. Od istraživača se traži da bude ranjiv i intiman« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006: 433). Želi se otvoriti dijalog o tome *kako* ljudi žive, umjesto zatvorene perspektive (kvantitativnih) analiza koje nude konačne opise svijeta. Cilj je znanost koja mijenja svijet i ne zadržava se samo na posredovanju činjenica.

Kad iz te perspektive promotrimo recentnu domaću sociološku produkciju, čini se da je utjecaj feminističke teorije još uvijek marginalan i izvanjski. Da, feminističke teorije postale su dio studijskih kurikuluma sociologije i sve je više istraživanja koja se bave

sition of women in Croatian society. Data thus collected are undisputedly important for a better insight into local gender affairs. But, the majority of this research is conducted by old, quantitative, abstract, and generalizing methodology. A new perspective can be found only on the margins of academic production, as it is with the research project and the book *Activists*, produced by the Centre for Women's Studies, Zagreb.

If you enter the word "feminism" in the *Hrčak* search engine, the portal of the scientific journals of Croatia (<http://hrcak.srce.hr>, visited on 20 October 2009), you will get exactly 22 articles, 10 of which have been published in sociological journals (four of them in *Diskrepancija* – a student journal, the fact which offers some hope). Hope is also offered by the fact that three of the ten sociological articles are written by men. Of course, these few numbers are not representative of the relationship between Croatian sociology and feminism, but I still wonder if I will ever read sentences like the following in some Croatian scientific journal: "As a woman and a feminist, I think it's important not to lose sight of the politics of autoethnography. Analysis and theorizing on the pages of social science journals is the preserve of an elite class of professionals who wittingly or unwittingly divide the world into those who see the light and those kept in the dark. Autoethnography helps undercut conventions of writing that foster hierarchy and division" (Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 436).

It seems that it will take more time before the disembodied, authoritative, judgmental, academic voice of Croatian sociology opens up for the transformative experience (and lesson) of its own Anima.

društvenim položajem žena. Podatci dobiveni tim istraživanjima nedvojbeno su bitni za uvid u stanje rodni odnosa u hrvatskom društvu. No, glavnina tih istraživanja služi se starom, kvantitativnom, apstrahirajućom i generalizirajućom metodologijom. Naznake novoga mogu se naći tek izvan matice akademske produkcije, poput npr. istraživačkog projekta i knjige *Aktivistkinje*, Centra za ženske studije u Zagrebu.

Ako u tražilicu na Hrčku, portalu hrvatskih znanstvenih časopisa (<http://hrcak.srce.hr>, posjećeno 20. listopada 2009.), unesete pojam »feminizam« – izlistat će se točno 22 članka, od kojih je deset njih objavljeno u sociološkim časopisima (a čak četiri od deset u *Diskrepanciji* – studentskom časopisu, što je činjenica koja pobuđuje nadu). Nadu ulijeva i činjenica da tri od deset socioloških članaka potpisuju muškarci. Iako te štire brojke ne pokazuju stvarni odnos domaće sociologije i feminizma, pitam se hoću li ikada u nekom od časopisa pročitati rečenicu poput ove: »Ja, kao žena i feministica, smatram važnim ne izgubiti iz vida političnost autoetnografije. Analize i teoretiziranje koje nalazimo na stranicama društvenoznanstvenih časopisa služe očuvanju profesionalne elite koja svjesno ili nesvjesno dijeli svijet na one koji vide svjetlo i one u mraku. Autoetnografija potkopava norme pisanja koje proizvode hijerarhiju i podjele« (Ellis i Bochner, 2006: 436).

Čini mi se da će proći još vremena dok se rastjelovljeni, autoritativni, prosuđujući, akademski glas domaće sociologije otvori prema transformativnom iskustvu (i poduci) vlastite Anime.

LITERATURA / REFERENCES

- Blair, Carole, Brown, Julie R. & Baxter, Leslie A. (1994). »Disciplining the Feminine«, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80 (4): 383–409.
- Burnier, DeLysa (2006). »Encounters With the Self in Social Science Research«, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35 (4): 410–418.
- Ellis, Carolyn S. & Bochner, Arthur P. (2006). »Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography: An Autopsy«, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35 (4): 429–449.

**Vesna Janković**

*Katedra za sociologiju, Fakultet  
strojarstva i brodogradnje, Zagreb /  
Department of Sociology,  
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering  
and Naval Architecture, Zagreb*