

- Hamdy *Clarence Borom vs Eli Lilly* District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division, 6 July.
- US Court 1983g Deposition of Walter Mikulassek *Clarence Borom vs Eli Lilly* District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division, 20 June.
- US Court 1983h Deposition of Charles Vaughan *Clarence Borom vs Eli Lilly* District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division, 28 October.
- US Court 1983i Deposition of Karl Desamie *Clarence Borom vs Eli Lilly* District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus Division, 18 October.
- US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 1977 Department of Health and Human Services *Guidelines for the Clinical Evaluation of Anti-Inflammatory and Anti-Rheumatic Drugs*.
- World Health Organisation (WHO), 'Health Care in the Elderly: Report of the Technical Group on use of Medicaments by the Elderly', *Drugs* 22: 279-94.

Sasha Roseneil

The coming of age of feminist sociology:
some issues of practice and theory for the
next twenty years*

ABSTRACT

After more than two decades of challenging mainstream sociology, feminist sociology has come of age. Recognizing that the strength of feminist sociology in the early 1990s is the product of considerable struggle and is an achievement to be celebrated, this paper explores the implications of the maturation of the feminist project within sociology. It examines issues concerning the practice of feminist sociology and addresses its current and future theoretical orientations. The relationship of feminist sociology to both the discipline as a whole and to the interdisciplinary area of women's studies is discussed, and the merits of the 'integratorist' versus the 'multiculturalist' strategies are evaluated. The paper then discusses recent concern about 'political correctness' as a form of backlash against the success of feminist work in the academy. The theoretical concerns of the paper focus on the implications of the poststructuralist turn in feminist sociology, and on the turn towards agency which, it is argued, is just beginning. It is concluded that the issues addressed in the paper are some of those which will concern the emerging generation of feminist sociologists.

INTRODUCTION

Feminist sociology has come of age. It is more than twenty-one years since the publication of Oakley's *Sex, Gender and Society* (1972), more than eighteen years since 'Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science' edited by Millman and Kanter (1975), more than seventeen years since the Barker and Allen edited collections 'Sexual Divisions and Society' and 'Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage' (1976a and b), and it is exactly eighteen years since Smart's 'Women, Crime and Criminology' (1977). Whether the significant anniversary is that which allows membership of Parliament (21), voting rights (18), the acquisition of a driving

licence (17) or heterosexual sex (16), feminist sociology has passed the first flush of youth.

But from a feminist perspective the coming of age metaphor is inherently problematic. Coming of age celebrations exist within a patriarchal, ageist, and heterosexist society and exist to mark passage into activities valorized by such a society. On reaching each of these socially constructed 'significant ages', a young person gains certain rights but also accepts social and legal obligations and constraints. And, as the work of feminist political theorists has so amply demonstrated, the nexus of obligations that form the social contract into which young people are deemed to enter, is profoundly gendered. The terms of the contract were drawn up by men and serve the interest of men as a social group (Pareman 1983).

The use of the metaphor could also rightly be criticized for historical inaccuracy: suggesting that feminist sociology began in 1972 (or 1975, 1976 or 1977) serves only to perpetuate the invisibility of our intellectual foremothers. Undoubtedly the sociological tradition is rooted in the work of the founding fathers and it is structured, as Stacey (1981) suggests, by discourses centring on 'the two Adams' – Adam of Adam and Eve, and Adam Smith. Yet, as the work of Spender (1983) and a recent article by Delamont (1992) suggest, almost a century ago there existed a considerable number of feminists engaged in sociological research, particularly in the USA. Delamont focuses on 'the lost women of the Chicago School, who between 1892 and 1920 were important actors at Chicago and whose scholarship was concerned with issues of gender. The work of women such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Jane Addams, Marion Talbot and Edith Abbott has been written out of the history of American sociology, the knowledge they produced has been subjugated, and the fact obscured that women sociologists have long been concerned with feminist questions.

However, these problems notwithstanding, the coming of age metaphor retains its uses; it captures something of significance and raises important questions for feminist sociologists. The past twenty years have seen an incredible flowering of feminist sociology. From a slow trickle of books and articles in the mid-1970s to a continuous torrent today, through which even the most determined reader struggles for a foothold, feminist sociology is being produced and published as never before. Courses on gender, more or less feminist, are ubiquitous, and as some sociology departments now even employ more than one feminist, both more specialized courses on gender are introduced and the mainstreaming of gender issues into compulsory courses proceeds. It is possible to identify a generation of feminist sociologists in their forties and fifties entering senior positions within the academy (Becoming Readers, Professors and even Pro-Vice Chancellors!), and at the same time a new generation of feminists is being appointed to junior lectureships.

The coming of age of feminist sociology

I would like to suggest that this is an achievement to celebrate. It is the product of many years of individual and collective struggle, much hard work and considerable bravery in the face of oppositional forces. However, in signalling a maturation of the feminist project within sociology, this coming of age brings with it certain responsibilities. Collectively, we are no longer quite the outsiders we once were.

This is not to deny the problems faced by feminists within universities, which remain severe.¹ Nor is it to ignore the processes by which certain groups of women are particularly marginalized and excluded. Although there is little available quantitative data on the representation of black women (or men) in academic posts within British higher education in general, or within sociology, in particular, as Michele Barrett (1994) has pointed out, it is clear that they are underrepresented. But it is not just numbers that matter; as Marshall (1994), Marchbank, Corrin and Brodie (1993) and Kitzinger (1990) have argued, the experience of being a black woman, or a lesbian, in the academy is often, at best, one of loneliness and marginalization, and at worst, direct discrimination.²

These qualifications aside, I wish to suggest that many of the issues that currently face feminist sociologists and many of those that will concern us over the next twenty years will be due to our relative success thus far. This article explores the implications of this coming of age of feminist sociology. It does not attempt a comprehensive review of the current state of feminist sociology in Britain;³ rather it engages in reflection and speculation, firstly, about the current and future practice of feminist sociology and its positioning within the academy, and secondly about the current and future theoretical orientations of feminist sociology. Above all I am concerned with the responsibilities resultant on our exercise of agency within the discipline of sociology and the structures of the university.

THE PRACTICE OF FEMINIST SOCIOLOGY

There are two issues I wish to address under the rubric of the practice of feminist sociology. The first is the positioning of feminist sociology within the academy, *vis-à-vis* the discipline of sociology and the area of women's studies. The second is the current folk-devil, 'political correctness'.

Between a rock and a hard place: the location of feminist sociology within the academy

In a recent article the feminist philosopher Marilyn Frye (1992) discusses the current popularity of 'curriculum integration' in US universities, posing it in opposition to her preferred project of

'multiculturalism': 'Curriculum integration' is the integration (not just the addition) of work by women and people from minority groups into the standard college curriculum. 'Multiculturalism', on the other hand, seeks not to transform the mainstream but to enhance the position of the autonomous academic enterprises of women's studies, African-American studies, and lesbian and gay studies.

Frye's objection to curriculum integration is twofold (1992: 789). Firstly, she points out that the process tends to result in tokenism: a handful of works and writers become canonized as the representatives of all those who are to be integrated. Secondly, she suggests that integration may actually constitute a process of colonization, similar to that enacted by European nations on the cultures of those they conquered and resulting in a similar transformation of the colonizing culture.

In fact, many 'integrated' cultures did not survive to the day when their members might benefit from seeing themselves reflected in the media and the arts of the transformed culture (nor would those hapless individuals have recognized their reflection). I am concerned that women's studies, African-American studies and other ethnic or area studies – academic cultures that are providing the dominant academic culture with its 'new' subjects, materials, and methods – might likewise not survive the transformation of the traditional curriculum'. (Frye 1992: 789)

Multiculturalism, in contrast, supports the production and transmission of knowledge within 'relatively autonomous, mutually respectful and appreciative cultures' (Frye 1992: 790). It may, she suggests, eventually encourage the rediscovery of the locatedness of the traditional curriculum so as to rescue it from 'being an exercise in cultural chauvinism' (1992: 791).

The politics of knowledge and culture I favor is a practice that minimizes adversarial, coercive, and/or reformist engagement (struggle) with established institutions and disciplines and frees one's energy for maintaining, strengthening and creating other knowledges A person situated roughly as I am . . . is not well advised to try to reform the 'traditional curriculum' of universities or of western culture. (Frye 1992: 792)

Whilst the environment in British universities is not identical to that in the USA and the issues that we face are differently nuanced, the general problem raised by Frye is one that has long been of concern to feminist sociologists in the UK. The tension between integration into the mainstream and radical separatism/autonomy is felt by many of us in our academic lives. However I would suggest that we feel this tension so acutely precisely because the integration/separation dualism is a false dichotomy.

Many feminist sociologists, like other feminists within the academy, move continuously between and across the boundaries of our discipline and women's studies. We teach mainstream courses which are compulsory elements of undergraduate sociology degrees and we also teach our own relatively autonomous courses, both as options within sociology degrees and within women's studies. Similarly in our research and reading the boundaries of feminist sociology are extremely fuzzy. We write at times for a mainstream sociology readership, at others for a feminist audience, often for both simultaneously, drawing on theoretical tools from both and seeking to contribute to both areas. In part this results from the politics of our location and the fact that there are very few lectureships located entirely within women's studies in Britain; women's studies has always been constituted by the coming together of feminist academics from across departmental boundaries. However, many of us would choose this 'two homes' existence. Whilst recognizing the importance of the contribution of, for instance, feminist literary scholars and feminist political scientists to women's studies, and indeed using their work to inform by own, I personally retain some of the Comtean arrogance that suggests that sociological perspectives on gender have unique, and indeed superior, contributions to make to feminist knowledge.

None the less, the integration/separation tension takes new forms as feminist sociology becomes more established. It is my perception that certain ideas, concepts and areas of study that until recently were largely confined to the arena of feminist scholarship are suddenly in vogue within sociology as a whole. Examples of this are the study of the body and of sexuality, which have recently captured the attention of some of the grandmasters of the discipline (e.g. Turner 1987; Giddens 1992; Bauman 1992). My unease about this process parallels that expressed by Frye. Whilst I am pleased to see this implicit recognition of the importance of subjects of study so central to feminist scholarship, I fear that we may be witnessing a gradual process of colonization whereby our ideas are appropriated without acknowledgement and then transformed beyond recognition.

Within the teaching of sociology a similar problem arises. Feminists have long bemoaned the absence of a feminist revolution within sociology (Stacey and Thorne 1985; Acker 1989), and in particular the lack of attention paid to feminist theory by those doing 'sociological theory'. Yet unless we are to convert every sociologist into a feminist (an unlikely project even if agreement could be reached on what constitutes 'a feminist'), or unless we are to do all the teaching ourselves, the integration of feminism into the sociology curriculum would require the teaching of feminist ideas by those hostile to them. Whilst the vast majority of sociologists are probably of the highest intellectual integrity and do not in their teaching seek to ridicule the

work of others, as feminists we know the falsity of claims of objectivity in teaching, as in research.

The question then is, do we want feminist knowledge transmitted to students by colleagues who are hostile to it, as just another position or theory, another element in the canon? Do we want the complexities and debates and contestations within feminism smoothed out, taxonomized and presented to students as just another dish on the sociological menu? If feminist sociologists agree on little else, do we not agree that feminist sociology is above all a project committed to the transformation of knowledge and thereby the transformation of gender relations? What then are the implications of treating feminist knowledge as just another theoretical perspective on x or y? Does the mainstreaming of feminist sociology undermine its radicalism and lead to its perception by students as part of the disciplinary apparatus of power? Is feminist sociology in danger of incorporation (or indeed has it already been incorporated simply by existing within the confines of the academy, as early critics of academic feminism suggested would happen)? Should we therefore deliberately confine ourselves to the margins of the academy?

These are not, of course, entirely new questions. Indeed we ourselves engage in more or less gross simplifications of different feminist positions in our teaching and writing, and it is often hard to avoid presenting feminist ideas as 'just another perspective', given the conventions that govern undergraduate teaching. However, there is a new urgency to the questions as the relative success of feminist sociology means that those previously oblivious to our existence increasingly feel the need to 'include feminism' in their teaching.

Frye's preference for the 'multiculturalist', which is in effect the separatist alternative, is not, I would suggest, an adequate response for feminist sociologists in Britain. Most pragmatically this is the case because women's studies, whilst expanding phenomenally at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels in the education marketplace of the early 1990s (Adkins and Leonard 1992), is institutionally far weaker and less established than in the USA. Career paths for feminists within the disciplines may be broken, strewn with obstacles, and poorly mapped, but, as the recent refusal of chairs to two leading academics who have made their academic lives primarily within women's studies indicates, prospects within women's studies are even worse.⁴ It just is not possible for us to reject 'reformist engagement' with our discipline.

Such considerations aside, to abandon the integrationist/trans-formative project in favour of the postmodern co-existence of a 'plurality of centers' as suggested by Frye would constitute the abandonment of the attempt to create 'more adequate knowledge', in our case, better sociology. Epistemological debates within feminism, in particular the tensions between feminist standpoint epistemology's

desire for a 'successor science' and feminist postmodernism's insistence on the unavoidable existence of a multiplicity of knowledges, are implicit in this issue.⁵ My belief that feminist sociologists must work both within and outside sociology, integrating feminist knowledge into the discipline and thus transforming it, and creating relatively autonomous feminist knowledge (and I stress 'relatively') within women's studies, is grounded in the epistemology suggested by Haraway (1988). She argues, recognizing the strength of the post-modern challenge, that whilst feminist knowledge is inevitably partial and situated, and therefore never universal and singular, 'the goal is better accounts of the world, that is, "science"' (Haraway 1988: 390). The implication, it seems to me, is that our scholarship should seek to transform 'science', including sociology, rather than being satisfied with co-existence with its patriarchal truth claims.

My conclusion on this issue is then that feminist sociology should continue its double-life, difficult though this may be, and that we should recognize that our strength draws from both homes.

The threat of 'PC' – the backlash

Although not yet reaching the status of national bogey to the extent it has in the USA (Cockburn 1991), the past two years have seen 'political correctness' enter the lexicon of British academics, journalists and cultural commentators (the chattering classes). Hundreds of newspaper articles have been written about the phenomenon of 'PC', which is represented either as already sweeping the country or as poised to do so, like a transatlantic tidalwave, unless its progress is halted. In the dominant discourse of the moment, 'PC' is universally deplored for infringing free speech and politicizing scholarship. Its aim is to 'undermine Western culture from within'.⁶ As Frye (1992) points out, so hegemonic is the construction of 'political correctness' as negative and totalitarian that it is no longer possible to use the term non-ironically. And at the same time, the origins of its ironic usage amongst feminists and radicals, teasing each other for self-righteousness, have all but been obliterated.

The critics of 'PC' do not distinguish between the integrationist and the separatist feminist projects within the academy: both the reconstruction of the canon within mainstream courses and the existence of relatively autonomous women's studies courses (and in the USA, African-American studies) are taken as indicative of the feminist and radical take-over of universities. If proof were needed of the revolutionary potential of the co-existence of the two strategies, it is there in the current backlash (see Cockburn (1991) on how few students do these courses). The demonization of 'political correctness' is above all a counter-strike by and on behalf of the traditional 'explaining classes' in a power-struggle over the production of

knowledge (Cockburn 1991). Over the past twenty years the academy has been the site of considerable open conflict over gender (and race), and as Walby (1988, 1993) has argued feminist movements invariably provoke patriarchal backlash.

The form taken by this particular response to the impact of liberation movements on academic institutions can be conceptualized as reversal.⁷ The discourse of 'PC' inverts the real power relation between feminism and the academy, constructing feminism as dominant and the western tradition as under siege. Even in the USA, where public funding is available for curriculum integration work and where affirmative action programmes in the recruitment of faculty and students are most developed, let alone in the UK, this is clearly a misrepresentation of reality. The structures and cultures of the academy have far more power to silence us than we have over them. A glance at university employment statistics assures us of this. In the USA in the mid-1980s, 11.7 per cent of full professors were women (Cockburn 1991). In 1992 in the UK, 5 per cent of professors, 9 per cent of senior lecturers, 19 per cent of lecturer Bs and 33 per cent of lecturer As in the old universities were women.⁸ Women are less likely than men to be promoted above lecturer level and are disproportionately located in the growing casualized sector of higher education (Aziz 1990). Even in sociology, women were only 26 per cent of lecturers in institutions surveyed by John Gubbay in 1991.⁹

These statistics notwithstanding, the fact that 'PC's construction of feminism as all-powerful has taken such a firm hold is surely significant. I would argue, like Kessler-Harris (1992), that the 'PC' phenomenon is indicative of the success of feminism within the academy. Structurally we may remain relatively weak, but we occupy the intellectual high-ground. Feminist sociology cannot, of course, take all the credit for this. But a considerable amount of the praise is due to us. In the coming years, however, we must be aware that the backlash may intensify and take new forms. Self-congratulation must not slip into complacency.

THE THEORETICAL CONCERNS OF FEMINIST SOCIOLOGY

The second part of this paper deals with the substantive concerns and direction of feminist sociology. I review recent developments within feminist sociology and suggest a major area for future research.

The postmodern/poststructuralist turn

It has been remarked that feminist theory has recently undergone a poststructuralist turn, or a 'turn to culture' (Barrett 1992, Barrett and Phillips 1992, Franklin, Lury and Stacey 1991,

The coming of age of feminist sociology

Nicholson 1990), Barrett (1992), drawing on Foucault, neatly sums this up as a movement from concern with 'things' to concern with 'words', from the material oppression that structures women's everyday lives to the discursive construction of gender identities. This postmodern 'takeover' has affected feminist sociology as much as any other branch of academic feminism. If in the 1970s British feminist sociology primarily drew upon and was engaged in conversation with marxism, in the 1990s poststructuralism has replaced marxism as the dominant influence. Marxist feminist sociology is all but dead and buried, reappearing only in our teaching taxonomies; feminist postmodernism is in vogue and constitutes the new orthodoxy. I wish to make two points about this poststructuralist turn in feminist sociology.

Firstly, this development could be seen as countering my argument about the increasing maturity of feminist sociology, as a head-long rush for the security blanket of theoretical frameworks produced by men (e.g. Brodribb 1992). Jackson (1992) has argued that feminist postmodernism is, in many respects, 'reinventing the wheel' (p.27), calling upon the work of male theorists to sanction trends already extant within feminism. For instance, feminist postmodernism's insistence on the historical contingency and unstable construction of 'woman' (e.g. Riley 1988), on the fracturing of identities by race and ethnicity (e.g. Spellman 1988), are far from new ideas within feminism. And the ferocity of the challenge to essentialism, which is seen as far more ubiquitous in feminist theory than it ever has been, seems misplaced, given that feminist sociology has been resolutely social constructionist since its earliest days.¹⁰ Bordo (1990) argues that one of the most problematic aspects of feminist postmodernism is its 'gender-scepticism', which disallows specific focus on gender relations 'as in principle essentialist and totalizing' and demands instead 'affirmation of difference' of race, class and gender (1990: 139).

I would suggest that to the extent that the postmodern turn within feminist sociology does undermine our ability to analyse gender relations, and to the extent that it denies 'significant structuring of power' through an over-emphasis on fragmentation (Walby 1992) and a mere valorization of difference for its own sake, it is indeed a problematic development within feminist sociology. However, the foregrounding of social complexity and the problematization of the concepts of experience, subjectivity and identity for which feminist postmodernism is largely (though not uniquely) responsible (e.g. Scott 1992; Butler 1990), constitute important developments for feminist sociology, and are indicative of its increasing maturity.

My second comment on the poststructuralist turn within feminism suggests that we should not become so caught up in the (supposed) novelty of this body of work, and its attention to the constitution of subjects through discourse, that we lose touch with the materiality of

gendered social life and experience.¹¹ As Barrett (1992) argues, poststructuralism's critique of the materialist assumptions within feminist social science has been one of its most important contributions, but the 'words' versus 'things' issue is far from resolved. I would suggest that in the pragmatic, quotidian conduct of feminist sociology, the years to come will witness a tendency for researchers to combine the insights of feminist poststructuralism regarding the importance of culture and discourse to the constitution of gender, with more 'old-fashioned' attention to 'the material'. Such research may well contribute to a re-conceptualization of the meaning of 'the material', and the re-shaping of feminist theory by a transcendence of the modernist/postmodernist and words/things dichotomies that currently loom so large.¹²

The turn towards agency

More recent than the postmodern turn within feminism another trend is identifiable: a turn towards agency. Whilst this development is not yet as advanced within feminist sociology as elsewhere within feminist thinking, it is my contention that the theorization of women's agency will be one of the most important areas of work for feminist sociologists in coming years.

Historically, feminist sociology has been better at exposing, naming and analysing the structural oppression of women than it has been at theorizing and tracing the contours of women's agency and resistance. Surprisingly little has been written by feminist sociologists about women's movements and feminist campaigns (leaving the area largely to feminist historians) or about feminist consciousness and empowerment.¹³ In her recent trend report on the state of feminist sociology Maynard (1990) noted a change from portrayals of women 'as the passive victims of a mechanistic and deterministic system' to increasing recognition of 'the possibility of struggle, resistance and active defiance' (1990: 274). But work by feminist sociologists focusing on women's agency, on the interplay between men and women as individual and collective actors, and exploring the duality of agency and structure remains rare.¹⁴

However, concern with women's agency is beginning to take off. It can be seen particularly in the feminist tradition within cultural studies, where there has been considerable attention paid to the agency of the reader/viewer (Gledhill 1992), in recent feminist work on violence against women (e.g. Kelly, Regan and Burton 1994, Stanke 1990), and in work on sexuality (Jackson (1994), for instance, explores the possibilities of, and limitations on, women's heterosexual agency, and Wilton (1993) takes up earlier feminist arguments that lesbianism is 'one of the strategies by which women have historically resisted male power', and that it therefore 'challenges biological,

psychological, religious, medical and juridical discourse concerning the "naturalness" of women's passivity, dependence and subordination' (Wilton 1993: 173). The concepts of 'negotiation' and 'bargaining' have become increasingly popular in feminist sociology, to facilitate the exploration of the ways in which women resist and challenge, as well as take part in, their own subordination (e.g. Kandiyoti 1988; Anghas and Yuval-Davis 1993). The turn towards agency cuts across the modernist/postmodernist, humanist/poststructuralist division within feminism. It is theorized differently by for instance, Butler (1992), who sees agency as a function of discourse rather than as the inherent possession of human subjects, and Hartsock (1990), who rejects Foucauldian conceptions of agency and argues for analysis of the historical, political and theoretical (discursive) processes by which we constitute *ourselves* as subjects of history (1990: 170).

There are signs too of an emerging debate within feminist sociology about the growing emphasis on agency, particularly in relation to feminist poststructuralism. Some feminists are critical of feminist appropriations of Foucault, arguing that his work lacks a notion of a human subject with agency, and therefore cannot allow the theorization of women's empowerment (Ramazanoglu and Holland 1993). Others defend Foucauldian feminism by stressing the emphasis in his theory of power on resistance (Ransom 1993; Hekman 1990; Smart 1992). This very emphasis on resistance is then challenged by Bordo (1993), who argues that Butler and other poststructuralist feminists have vastly over-emphasized the possibilities of women's creative agency, particularly in relation to the politics of the body, where Foucault's earlier concern with the social conditioning of bodies is more illuminating than his focus on resistance.

The turn towards agency, and the debate that it is generating, whilst still in its early stages within feminist sociology, is also indicative of our maturation. Feminism, within and outside the academy, is the best exemplar of women's agency and demands that we theorize agency as well as oppression, resistance as well as domination. The elaboration of theoretical understanding of the possibilities of liberation and the transformation of gender relations must be rooted in empirical attention to agency.

CONCLUSION

In a recent review of the state of feminist scholarship across the disciplines, Kramarac and Spender (1992) point out that women's studies has now moved through more than one generation. Yet their volume contained no contributions from young women, which they acknowledged in their editorial

Where are all the young women? What does this mean about ageism? About social movements and time frames? About the transmission of information to the next generation? (Kramarae and Spender 1992: 15)

My response to Kramarae and Spender, and my conclusion to this paper, emphasizes that there is a new generation of feminist scholars. Many of us were born at the same time as the women's liberation movement and were attracted to sociology by the exciting ideas that had been developed within the discipline by those who now constitute the older generation of feminist sociologists. They fashioned a dynamic and challenging intellectual environment into which we have been drawn to further the creation of feminist knowledge. In a post-marxist era our academic influences have been different from those of the generation that preceded us (so we may be more interested in sexuality than in employment, for instance), but our work grows out of their struggles and achievements.

The issues that face feminist sociology in the next twenty years, both those related to its practice within the academy and issues of theoretical orientation, which have been discussed in this paper, are to a large extent the product of its success, the fruits of our agency. To ensure that a further generation of feminists will want to enter the discipline in twenty years time, we must address these challenges and continue to work, individually and collectively, to keep feminist sociology at the cutting edge of both social and feminist theory.

(Date accepted: April)

Sasha Rosenell
School of Sociology and Social Policy
University of Leeds

NOTES

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1993 British Sociological Association Conference, Essex University.

1. See, for example, Ramazanoglu (1987) and Wise Harris (1991) on harassment and violence against women, and particularly against feminists, in universities.

2. Anecdotal evidence from within the Women's Caucus of the British Sociological Association (at BSA conferences in 1993 and 1994) also suggests that women entering academic life late, having been mature students, find it particularly difficult to secure a foothold in full-time lecturing posts. This is a

hypothesis worthy of further investigation.

3. For reviews of the state of feminist sociology see Rosenell (1994), Abbott (1991), Maynard (1990), Oakley (1989) and Stanley (1992).

4. See J. Brookman, *The Higher*, 27 December 1991. One of these, Mary Evans, has since been awarded the first British Chair in Women's Studies, at the University of Kent (*The Higher*, 20 August 1993).

5. See Harding (1986) and (1991), Leslie, from whom this quotation is taken, *Daily Mail*, 17 September 1992. Also Kimball (1990) for an extended diatribe

The coming of age of feminist sociology

against PC and newspaper articles by E. Lucas, *Independent on Sunday*, 9 June 1991, and in *The Higher*, 15 January 1993.

7. The concept of reversal is used by McNeil (1991) in her discussion of the construction of new oppressed groups by the new right - parents, fathers, foetuses and tax-payers become the new oppressed; their oppressors are women, particularly teachers, social workers and mothers, especially young, unmarried mothers.

8. Source: UK Special Survey, compiled by Association of University Teachers, 1993.

9. See C. Sanders, *The Higher*, 15 January 1993.

10. See for example discussion of Helen Woolley of the turn of the century Chicago School in Rosenberg (1988). See also Rosenell (1993).

11. I do not wish to suggest that all feminist postmodernists deny the existence of material reality, merely that their attention is elsewhere.

12. A similar point is made by Harstock (1990). The project of reconceptualizing the meaning of the material is discussed by Adkins and Lury (1992).

13. Exceptions include Banks (1981), Gerson and Peiss (1985), Dobash and Dobash (1992), Ryan (1992) and Rosenell (1992, 1993).

14. Examples of feminist concern with agency outside the boundaries of feminist sociology include Harstock (1990), Mahoney and Yngresson (1992) and Butler (1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, P. 1991 'Feminist Perspectives in Sociology' in J. Aaron and S. Walby (eds) *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*. London: Falmer.
- Acker, J. 1989 'Making Gender Visible' in R. Wallace (ed.) *Feminism and Sociological Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Adkins, L. and Leonard, D. 1992 'From Academia to the Education Marketplace: United Kingdom Women's Studies in the 1990s', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 1992: 3 and 4.
- Adkins, L. and Lury, C. 1992 'Gender

and the Labour Market: Old Theory for New?' in H. Hinds, A. Phoenix and J. Stacey (eds) *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*. London: Falmer Press.

Anthias, F. and Y. Val-Davis, N. 1993 *Racialized Boundaries*. London: Routledge.

Aziz, A. 1990 'Women in UK Universities - the road to casualization?' in S. S. Lie and V. E. O'Leary (eds) *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*. London: Kogan Page.

Banks, O. 1981 *Faces of Feminism: A Study of Feminism as a Social Movement*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Barker, D. L. and Allen, S. (eds) 1976a *Sexual Divisions and Society: Process and Change*. London: Tavistock.

Barker, D. L. and Allen S. (eds) 1976b *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*. London: Longman.

Barrett, M. 1992 'Words and Things: Materialism and Method in Contemporary Feminist Analysis', in M. Barrett and A. Phillips (eds) *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Barrett, M. 1994 'Destabilizing Sociology: Changing Disciplines in a Changing World', Presidential Address, British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of Central Lancashire, Preston.

Barrett, M. and Phillips, A. (eds) 1992 *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. 1992 'What is Postmodernism?', Centre for Cultural Studies Lecture Series, University of Leeds.

Bordo, S. 1990 'Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism' in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.

Bordo, S. 1993 'Feminism, Foucault and the Politics of the Body', in C. Ramazanoglu (ed.) *Up against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. London: Routledge.

Brodbick, S. 1992 *Nothing Mat(ers): A Feminist Critique of Postmodernism*. Melbourne: Spinifex.

Butler, J. 1990 *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

- Butler, J. 1992 'Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of "Postmodernism"', in J. Butler and J. W. Scott (eds) *Feminist Theorize the Political*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. and Scott, J. W. (eds) 1992 *Feminist Theorize the Political*. New York: Routledge.
- Cockburn, A. 1991 'Bush and P.C. - A Conspiracy So Immense ...', *The Nation* May 27, 1991.
- Delamont, S. 1992 'Old Fogies and Intellectual Women: an episode in academic history', *Women's History Review* 1(1): 39-61.
- Dobash, R. E. and Dobash, R. P. 1992 *Women, Violence and Social Change*. London: Routledge.
- Eisenstein, H. 1991 *Gender Shock*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Franklin, S., Lury, C. and Stacey, J. (eds) 1991 *Off-Centre: Feminism and Cultural Studies*. London: Harper Collins.
- Frye, M. 1992 'Getting It Right', *Signs* 17(4): 781-93.
- Gerson, J. M. and Peiss, K. 1985 'Boundaries, Negotiation, Consciousness: Reconceptualizing Gender Relations', *Social Problems* 32(4): 317-31.
- Giddens, A. 1992 *The Transformation of Intimacy*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Gieddhi, C. 1992 'Pleasurable Negotiations', in F. Bonner, L. Goodman, R. Allen, L. James and C. King (eds) *Imagining Women: Cultural Representations and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Haraway, D. 1988 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-99.
- Harding, S. 1986 *The Science Question in Feminism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Harding, S. 1991 *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Hartsock, N. 1990 'Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women?', in L. Nicholson (ed.) *Feminist Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Hekman, S. 1990 *Gender and Knowledge: Elements of a Postmodern Feminism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jackson, S. 1992 'The Amazing Deconstructing Woman', *Trouble and Strife* 25: 25-31.
- Jacksoff, S. 1994 'Heterosexuality as a Problem for Feminist Theory', paper presented to BSA Conference, University of Central Lancashire, Preston.
- Kandiyoti, D. 1988 'Bargaining with Patriarchy', *Gender and Society* 2(3): 274-90.
- Kelly, L. 1988 *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kelly, L., Regan, L. and Burton, S. 1994 'The Victim/Survivor Dichotomy: Beyond an Identity Defined by Violation', paper presented to BSA Conference, University of Central Lancashire, Preston.
- Kessler-Harris, A. 1992 'The View from Women's Studies', *Signs* 17(4): 794-805.
- Kimball, R. 1990 *Tenured Radicals: How Politics has Corrupted our Higher Education*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kitzinger, C. 1990 'Beyond the Boundaries: Lesbians in Academe', in S. S. Lie and V. E. O'Leary (eds) *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*. London: Kogan Page.
- Kramarac, C. and Spender, D. 1992 *The Knowledge Explosion: Generations of Feminist Scholarship*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McNeill, M. 1991 'Making and Not Making the Difference: the gender politics of 'Tractionism'', in S. Franklin, C. Lury and J. Stacey (eds) *Off-Centre: Feminism and Cultural Studies*. London: Harper Collins.
- Mahoney, M. A. and Yngvesson, B. 1992 'The Construction of Subjectivity and the Paradox of Resistance: Reintegrating Feminist Anthropology and Psychology', *Signs* 18(1): 44-78.
- Marshall, A. 1994 'Sensuous Sapphires: a study of the social construction of black female sexuality', in M. Maynard and J. Purvis (eds) *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Marchbank, J., Corrin, C. and Brodie, S. 1993 'Inside and "out" or outside academia: Lesbians working in Scotland', in M. Kennedy, C. Lubelska and V. Walsh (eds) *Making Connections: Women's Studies, Women's Movements, Women's Lives*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Maynard, M. 1990 'The Re-shaping of Sociology? Trends in the Study of Gender', *Sociology* 24(2): 269-90.
- Millman, M. and Kanter, R. M. (eds)

- 1975 *Another Voice: feminist perspectives on social life and social science*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Nicholson, L. (ed.) 1990 *Feminist Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Oakley, A. 1972 *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Temple Smith.
- Oakley, A. 1989 'Women's Studies in British Sociology: to end at our beginning?', *British Journal of Sociology* 40(3): 442-70.
- Parsons, C. 1988 *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ramazanoglu, C. 1987 'Sex and Violence in Academic Life or You Can Keep a Good Woman Down', in J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (eds) *Women, Violence and Social Control*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. 1993 'Women's Sexuality and Men's Appropriation of Desire', in C. Ramazanoglu (ed.) *Up against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions between Foucault and Feminism*. London: Routledge.
- Ransom, J. 1993 'Feminism, Difference and Discourse: the limits of discursive analysis for feminism in C. Ramazanoglu (ed.) *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism*. London: Routledge.
- Riley, D. 1988 *Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History*. London: Macmillan.
- Rosenberg, R. 1988 *Beyond Separate Spheres*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rosenell, S. 1992 *The Origins of Women's Collective Action: The Case of Greenham*. University of Leeds Department of Social Policy and Sociology Research Working Paper, No. 1.
- Rosenell, S. 1994 'Gender', in Haralambos (ed.) *Developments in Sociology*. Ormskirk: Causeway Press.
- Rosenell, S. (1995) *Disarming Patriarchy: The Granham Common Women's Peace Camp*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.
- Ryan, B. 1992 *Feminism and the Women's Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Scott, J. 1992 'Experience' in J. Butler and J. W. Scott (eds) *Feminist Theorize the Political*. New York: Routledge.
- Smart, C. 1977 *Women, Crime and Criminology*. London: Routledge.
- Smart, C. 1992 *Regulating Womanhood: Historical Essays on Marriage, Motherhood and Sexuality*. London: Routledge.
- Spelman, E. 1988 *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Spender, D. 1983 *Women of Ideas (and what men have done to them)*. London: Ark.
- Stacey, J. and Thorne, B. 1985 'The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology', *Social Problems* 32(4): 301-16.
- Stacey, M. 1981 'The Division of Labour Revisited or Overcoming the Two Adams' in P. Abrams, R. Deem, J. Finch and P. Rock (eds) *Practice and Progress: British Sociology 1920-80*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Stanko, E. A. 1990 *Everyday Violence*. London: Pandora.
- Stanley, L. 1992 'The Impact of Feminism in Sociology' in C. Kramarac and D. Spender (eds) *The Knowledge Explosion*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Turner, B. 1987 *The Body and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Walby, S. 1988 'Gender Politics and Social Theory', *Sociology* 22(2): 215-32.
- Walby, S. 1992 'Post-Post-Modernism? Theorizing Social Complexity' in M. Barrett and A. Phillips (eds) *De/dahizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Walby, S. 1993 "'Backlash" in Historical Context' in M. Kennedy, C. Lubelska and V. Walsh (eds) *Making Connections*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Wilton, T. 1993 'Queer Subjects: Lesbians, Heterosexual Women and the Academy' in M. Kennedy, C. Lubelska and V. Walsh (eds) *Making Connections*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Wise Harris, D. 1991 'Keeping Women in Our Place: Violence at Canadian Universities', *Canadian Women Studies* 11(4): 37-41.