METAMORPHOSES

ÉVA KOVÁCS

What's New in East-Central European Sociology? [1]

> "(…) three powers used to exist in Eastern Europe: the Soviet Army, Hungarian political economy and Polish sociology."
>
> Antoni Sulek

> *"The increasing diversity of sociology on the one hand, its success in the media, civil society and the state, its institutionalisation throughout the world, the quantitative increase of the sociological community on the other, means that sociology looks more solid and is certainly socially more visible now than in the heroic era of the pioneers. However, it is at the same time intellectually Balkanised."*
>
> Raymond Boudon

Hypotheses, historical background

It is nearly three years ago that the question in the title rose so sharply. We did not necessarily regard the idea of taking stock of the last ten years of sociological thinking in the region original or extraordinary – although we looked for similar approaches in both the Hungarian and the international literature in vain. Some kind of summary was found for economics, but that involved individual and methodologically different approaches concentrating only on Hungarian developments.[2] But our own points of

---

1   This summary is the English version of the introduction and concluding study in the book with an identical title Éva Kovács: *Mi újság a Kelet-Közép-Európai szociológiában? A lengyelországi, a magyarországi, a romániai, a szerbiai és a szlovákiai szociológia a kilencvenes években.* Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány (Regio Books), 2002. Other authors of the book are: Gyula Gombos, László Gyurgyík, György Horváth, Tamás Kiss, Árpád Kollár, József D. Lőrincz, Attila Z. Papp and Andrea Sólyom.

2   See Kovács, János Mátyás: "Örökség-utánzás-felfedezés. Közgazdasági gondolkodás Magyarországon 1989 után" (*Legacy-imitation-invention. Economic thinking in Hungary after 1989*). *Közgazdasági Szemle,* April 1996, 321–362.

view are still due to the latter initiative, since the triple interpretation *legacy-imitation-invention* first appeared there. The continuation of national, primarily post-1945 sociological thinking was called *legacy*, copying and adapting "western" sociology *imitation* and the creative use of our own scientific sources *invention*.

When planning our own research, besides the economic debate we also considered the then dying-down *"colonisation"* discussion, which had flared up in Hungarian sociology and which, although a Slovak sociologist took part in it, still did not spread to the countries of the former Eastern bloc.[3] Visiting former socialist countries and meeting East-Central European sociologists at international conferences we had the experience that while big changes had taken place everywhere since the fall of the iron curtain, there could be common features which would be worth looking into. In these meetings we realised how little we knew about *non*-west European (and *non*-North American) sociology. Slowly we formed an image of East European sociologists standing next to each other without looking at or even noticing one another, each separately contemplating the West on the far away horizon.

We would like to make what we have said more exact in three ways: we have used the terms Eastern Bloc or iron curtain while our own experiences suggest that scientific and political discourse did not necessarily change simultaneously. One of the goals of our research is to question the presumption of simultaneity. Hungarian sociology can be suspected to have faced the dilemma of imitation or invention in the 1980s, whereas the same happened to Romanian sociology only after the collapse of communism. Therefore we tried to maintain a broad time scale during the analysis.

Is it possible or worth talking about East-Central European sociology? Isn't it merely our common adoration of the West that creates an empty shell: East-Central Europe? Don't we simply want to fill in the white spots on our cognitive map with colours? And if this is not so, what makes Polish, Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak or Serbian sociology East-Central European? Do the shared socialist past and the consequent social similarities bind sociologies quizzing social phenomena? Or does the similarity of sociologists' roles create an East-Central Europeanness? Or does it show that our situation, com-

---

3   See issues of *Replika* No. 9–10. and No. 33–34. For decency's sake we must add that the debate was first published in English (*Replika*, special issue 1996). However, Polish, Czech, Serbian etc. sociologists did not react for reasons unkown to us or they may have not known about it.

pared to the mainstream, is identically peripheral – and from a bird's eye view our eastern Europeanness is related to Indian, Chinese and South American, etc. sociology? Or perhaps – and here we are getting into stormy waters – our theory-creating and methodology-developing skills are absent or international discourse (and market) is not receptive to them.[4]

The third weak point (and probably not the last) of our concept is that it not only concerns East-Central European sociologies but also national ones – what else could it do? That is, it studies certain countries' native language sociological discourse and draws such conclusions as, for example, "unlike east European sociologies Polish sociology went its own way and was freer than the others". Can we, however, talk about a national sociology?[5] Besides the paradox that universal sociology as a science can be approached via only one national language, English (a maximum of three if we include German and perhaps French), those defending the fame of the discipline will protest: science is universal; hence "national" sociology becomes worthy in so far as it overcomes its particularism. There are some who are for making peace and connecting the universal and particular, and some would say that while mankind lives in nation states social phenomena are manifested as particular in the sense that they are explored and described primarily in a national language and the results are utilised by the given society (and the state).

Our research covered five countries in the region (Hungary, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia). The Czech Republic, Slovenia and Croatia are absent from the list – financial and personnel conditions did not allow these three countries to be researched. At the start of the project three perspectives governed us. Primarily, unlike previous discussions, instead of exploring essay writing and medium-level models we wanted to make detailed lists of sociological discourses in the neighbouring countries. In order to do that we had to find the most important participants and institutions of the respective countries' sociologies. We started from the fact that universities and journals 'produce' and control the scientific discourse of sociology and thus main trends and changes can be seen in the curricula, the themes of thesis and PhD dissertations and in professional journals. (The following professional journals were put under scrutiny: Hungary: *Replika, Szociológiai Szemle,* Poland:

---

4   Saád, József: "Tíz széljegyzet Némedi Dénes tanulmányához és recenziójához", (*Ten footnotes to Dénes Némedi's study and review*). *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2001, No. 1., 65.

5   Némedi, Dénes:, "Reflexiók a társadalomelméletről", (*Reflexions on social theory*). *Szociológiai Szemle*, 2000, No. 4., 117–124, and Saád op. cit.

Kultura i Społoczeństwo, Studia Socjologiczne, Romania: *Altera, Revista de Cercetări Sociale,* Slovakia: *Sociologia,* Serbia: *Sociologija*.) The focus was on the change of sociology as a science, so the market and public opinion research institutes using the methods of applied sociology did not enter our sample, even though leading sociologists manage them (their scientific work – provided there was or is any – is available at universities and in journals). Thirdly, although we know that the state of our science is most often raised as an identity problem (where is sociology and the sociologist's place at the turn of the millennium in East-Central Europe?), we did not want to approach the question directly. However, we thought that we might be able to offer alternative answers to it by the end of our research.

As a first step, we reviewed the post-1945 history of the respective sociological discourses in order to check the validity of our interpretation scheme (legacy-imitation-invention) for further research.[6] As a second step, the selected journals were analysed according to simple quantitative elements. (These included the article's theme, author, its inter- or multi-disciplinary tendency and the structure of references, etc.) The quantitative analysis provided the features of sociological discourses in the respective countries important for us. As a third step, the debates published in the journals were closely examined: our purpose was to show what was happening in sociology in the past ten years, which themes stimulated discussion or at least generated thought in the journals. Professional literature on discourse analysis helped us to work out the methodology of qualitative analysis.[7]

The research was unorthodox from many points of view. It was not experts in the history of science and the sociology of knowledge who wrote the country studies, rather we ourselves set up a team whose members, albeit sociologists, had not conducted any research of this nature. Our intention was for these young scientists to look at the subject of the research with fresh and 'innocent' eyes. Thus, they should not be members of professional lobbies of their country, their pens should not be directed by their knowledge, interests and judgements, but they would be able submit themselves to the methodol-

---

6   Studies containing the hypotheses were published in *Regio,* 2000, No. 1.
7   Here only the latest are referred to: Schiffrin, D. – Hamilton, H. E. (eds.): *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2001, Wodak, R. (ed.): *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999, Stamenov, M. (ed.): *Language Structure, Discourse and the Acces to Consciousness*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998., van Dijk, T. A.(ed.): *Discourse Studies*, London: Sage, 1997.

ogy of our research. Their young age also provided a guarantee that they would be willing to read through and work on the selected journals carefully. However, it is clear that as a result of this choice certain contexts and informal knowledge were sacrificed on the altar of meticulous work. That the authors would thoroughly know the sociology of the researched country was another point in choosing our researchers: either that they were native to the country and did their university studies there or as undergraduates or PhD students chose to study sociology at a university of a respective country. Thus the authors of the volume are graduate sociologists, PhD students or recent doctors of sociology. The principle of "two heads are better than one" became our third point of orientation. Country studies were made in small group meetings or workshops. Those in charge of a country held several consultations and interviews with heads of departments there, as well as with noted sociologists.

Legacy stock-taking – or past heritage in the sociology of the present

The studies in our volume show in one sentence that sociology has changed in very different ways in the examined countries during the past decade. To look for the cause in the different legacies is unavoidable in the first instance. Antoni Sulek's ironic remark may not be far from reality: with the exception of Poland and Hungary sociology either got stuck in a lay-by or became significantly overpoliticised in the decades of socialism. Romanian sociology had its Sleeping Beauty dream till 1975 than, it measured its professionalism by its "good" relationship with the power establishment. Similar processes took place in Yugoslavia and Slovakia at the beginning of the 1970s. The 1960s and 1970s did not represent sociology's glory in Poland or Hungary either. However, there are basic differences between them and the other examined East-Central European countries. In Poland sociology could develop not only as a discipline but also as an author of social reform to arrive at its 'golden age' by 1980, and later, after the repression of Solidarity, at its moral dilemmas. In Hungary, after political economy praised by Sulek had lost its force of forming "public debate" by the beginning of the 1970s, sociology became the discipline that made it possible to postulate social problems in a language independent of power structures. Thus, while Romania's legacy contained the insistence on originality on the one hand and political competence on the other, Slovakia's tradition can be characterised by a consolidating inferiority feeling towards the Czechs and a sociology ideologically

changing into scientific socialism. While Serbia witnessed the transformation of the profession into a political monopoly, Poland's legacy featured the memory of western (emigrant**)** sociology of several decades. Hungary's tradition also included the discourse-making activity power elite.

Our analyses show that systemic change in sociology partly preceded political changes, partly it is still lagging behind. Already in the middle of the 1980s the influx of western methods and theories into the East-Central European region became stronger, which can be traced in 'imitation' and the more marked presence of quantitative and qualitative schools. (See Appendix Table 1.) Yet the region's sociologies still seem to be tackling their own legacies: the majority of the studies in the surveyed journals are digesting this legacy, trying to incorporate it into the *mainstream* and only a few original approaches could be identified. (See Appendix Table 2.) Perhaps only the Romanian journals provide an exception since, due to the peculiar position of the discipline under socialism, they are trying to make up for the shortages of the past by 'imitating' western methods and approaches. The proportion of studies that can be listed in the category of „invention" is strikingly low in all the examined journals. Looking at the matter from here, East-Central European sociologies all seem to be dissolved in the sociological discourses of the western world; more critically, they subordinate themselves to theories and methods appointed by the Grand Schools. If this is so, perhaps the large presence of legacy should not be denounced too much since – unlike copying – the characteristic sociological problems of the given societies may live on in those legacies.

From another perspective, the legacy is also shown by the thematic order of the articles published in the journals. (See Appendix Table 3.) The table also reveals that the journals have some kind of division of labour in the countries where two journals were considered worthy of analysis: while the old ones continue publishing traditional themes and open up to the *mainstream* only carefully and gradually, the new ones have become the mediators and followers of western fashions in full force. Our results, however, are consonant with the criticism, according to which the sociology of East-Central Europe is not famous for its theory-producing and innovative creativity.

If for a moment we accept Ken Kyle's hypothesis[8] concerning where the sociology of the (western) world is going, it is worth examining what the results show in the examined countries. According to Kyle, the majority of soci-

---

8   See Kyle, K.: "Commentary: The Fate of Critical Sociology in the 21st Century", 2001. *http://itc.utk.edu/sssp/newsletter/32-2/kenkyle.html*

ologists have submerged into the nostalgic past and/or eternal future. He thinks that sociology can choose between two kinds of future: between a *distopian* (i.e. anti-utopian) and a eu*topian* future. Critical sociology comes to an end in the former; it will be replaced by neo-liberalism, corporatism and professionalism. In the latter, eutopian image promoted by him, the discipline will continue to be able to pursue critical sociology and respond with the help of communitarianism, feminism, socialism and environmentalism to the challenges of society. If we cast an eye on the themes of articles published in the examined journals again, it can be seen that the sociology of the region is proceeding towards an anti-utopian future described by Kyle, although the topic of *gender* is not negligible in Polish and Hungarian publications.

Discourses and identities – or is there a common feature in the sociological thinking of the region?

In analysing the discourses in the journals we wanted to learn, on the one hand, whether "national" trends of sociology exist and, on the other, what specific social problems their trends represent.

Polish journals have shown that the political change in 1989 did not mean an essential breaking point in the sociological public debate. That is, Polish researchers are trying to make visible a several decade continuity of sociology. It also turns out that Polish sociology is not centralised, rather it is multi-centred, and furthermore, unlike in the other countries, anthropology and culture research became strong already in the 1960s, providing a suitable basis for new trends to emerge after the change of system. Poland seems to be the country where the struggle between quantitative and qualitative methods has sharpened the most; and for the time being qualitative methods look like having won the battle.

Four discourses have stood out to define the characteristics of the journals. Sociological research into regionalism is the first, which has managed with an interdisciplinary approach to reinterpret minority issues, religion and ethnicity. Concerning regionalism, the issues of interior colonisation and ethno-politics have been discussed in Poland, as also in Romania.

It is characteristically Polish that the new topic of *gender,* which was taboo before the political changes or there was no sociological research into it, has been included in public thinking by enlightened Catholic intellectuals. Opposing doctrinaire Catholic trends, they have started to be concerned with

the position of women, and secular sociologists have also joined the discourse. In the beginning they were strongly tied to western patterns and trends (extreme feminist views have also been present); however, by now *gender* studies might be said to have its own Polish trend.

Unlike in other East-Central European countries Polish sociologists have been divided by the prospects of EU accession. While sociologists in Hungary do not express EU scepticism, this is presentable in Poland and makes it possible to postulate a Polish 'originality'.

In 2000 the issues of modernisation and the marketisation of social science divided Polish sociologists, similarly to their colleagues in other East-Central European countries. The debate about so-called 'trivialisation', which unfolded in 2000, made "sociospeech", the spread of science becoming political, the object of criticism and a fierce attack was launched against media power and public opinion surveys. In this debate sociologists following either quantitative or qualitative methods are also confronted. Polish sociologists appear to be re-stipulating their professional identities in the trivialisation debate.

In the 1990s *Hungarian* sociology moved, on the one hand, towards a new type of institutionalisation (new journals and departments came into being, opportunities to participate in international projects rose), while, on the other, it had to face a fall in its social prestige achieved in earlier decades. On the basis of the few examined journals it can be stated that the main trend of publications involves technicality and methodological strictness, i.e. professionalism. Although this produced an important change in the profession, it also meant that while its public role was decreasing sociology withdrew from the broader public eye. Withdrawal was not without 'pain', its traces can be seen in the professional debates of the past decade. Hungarian sociology has remained centralised and 'top heavy': journals primarily publish research by sociologists in Budapest.

The debate, which first raised the question whether there was a chance in sociology to preserve some kind of central Europeanness and the role of interpreter between the east and west, lasted from 1991 to the end of the decade. Later this turned into a dialogue about methodology, i.e. it deliberated on the legitimacy of using quantitative and qualitative approaches in Hungarian sociology. Another aspect of the debate involved the role of sociologists and intellectuals, and yet another was concerned about the 'colonisation' of science, i.e. the existence of an asymmetric contrast between East and West.

These aspects naturally intertwined and the fibre of discourse was pointing at, sometimes covering, the problem of whether Hungarian sociology can be competitive under the changed Hungarian and international conditions, and if so to what degree. On the one hand, the question of competitiveness produced the challenge of adjusting to international standards and the prominence of quantitative statistical analyses. On the other, it brought about the pressure to be evaluated on the international scientific market: the mobilisation of knowledge capital, changing scientific achievements into products and establishing networks of connections. Some Hungarian sociologists experienced joining international research projects and sociological discourses as a type of colonisation. However, in a short while the alternative, promoting some kind of Central Europeanness implying the preservation of a special sociological language, turned out to gain a limited acceptance in the West, and that had an impact on how the competence of Hungarian sociology was judged.

The change of system meant a real change for *Romanian* sociology. It had to interpret itself in a world where it earlier had no place, at least in a formal and institutional way. Under the new conditions it primarily had to recreate its own tradition. Its main task was to rehabilitate the *Gusti* school defining it continuation – and this work is still going on. After the earlier decades, in which it was impossible for sociology to exist, the intelligentsia sensitive to sociology and political sciences engaged in a lively debate on the problems of transition, the roles of the elite and intellectuals, not only or not primarily in professional circles, which partly resulted in the reassessment of sociologists' roles and thus sociological knowledge became sellable on the political and media markets.

It may be due to this late comeback that, unlike in other East-Central European countries, interdisciplinary connection could become the topic of a debate and the specialisation or 'red taping' of sociology is characteristic only to a smaller degree. Moreover, it became an important theme of discourse. This is indicated by the fact that sociological debates are of an interdisciplinary character and the participants, the representatives of branch sciences and even a noted journal all attempt to be interdisciplinary (*Altera*).

Another feature of the Romanian discourse is its regional division and special regional networks, which only to an extent overlap with ethnic differences. Thus the Transylvanian professional discourse in Romanian joins sociological knowledge 'produced' in Bucharest, while Transylvanian Hungar-

ian sociologists work in their own professional workshops and partly with their own themes.

Romanian sociology, at least for the time being, does not seem to have been able to make its legacy a paradigm and has not been successful in adopting western methods either. It continues to insist on its methodological collectivism and "national" character.

For the 1990s Romanian sociological discourse can be summarised under the themes of centralisation/decentralisation/nation state, besides the relationship to tradition and opportunity of being interdisciplinary. These themes have been written about not only by local but also east and west European authors in the journals, and the debate has also had some direct political connotations. However, some contributors have included broader theories of civilisation and development in their ideas – thus signalling the transfer of a western scientific approach. The scientific public debate about centralisation and decentralisation also includes the themes of West and East, politics and ethnicity.

The war inflicted a severe blow on *Serbian* sociology. While in some neighbouring countries the process of redefining scientific abstractions and the roles of scientists had already started at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, in Serbia only their rediscussion took place. For a long time even the conditions of the science became questionable due to the crisis in research financing and research teams (there were no large-scale sociological surveys, social structure and strata analyses, migration research, etc.). Because of the war it is not surprising that sociological public debate is dominated by political sociology: issues of totalitarianism, democracy and nationalism are being discussed. The debate has concentrated on defining notions: can the Oxford Dictionary be used for the ex-Yugoslav phenomena or must a specific "Balkan Dictionary" be created?

The break-up of Yugoslavia is still a theme that has not been explored in sociological discourse. Researchers usually say no when asked whether they had seen it coming, and their explanations lead back to the economic crisis, ethnic conflicts and criticism of the earlier federal structure. Several authors also raised the narrow-mindedness, indifference to social conflicts and static social view of trivial sociology. Later, after 1995, sociologists made an attempt to interpret social conflicts, in a socio-psychological way (trauma and catharsis).

In Serbian sociology an entirely new phenomenon is presented by a *Marxizmusstreit*, which cannot only be interpreted as a debate between left

and right and the redivision of the Serbian political sphere, since the sociologist's role is also being re-examined. This is reflected in the fact that Russia and China remain important orientation points in the debate instead of the Central European regional concepts. The renaissance of Marxism and Titoism does not seem to be due only to the compulsion of looking for valid explanations but as if it represented a generation conflict and an identity crisis in Serbian sociology.

The most visible characteristic feature of *Slovak* sociology is the lack of reflection and debate: we could hardly find any articles connected to one another or reacting to another in noted sociology journals. This is recognised by Slovak sociologists themselves, who explain it by the small size of the profession, its specialisation and financial ebb. A significant number of sociological debates are conducted with broad publicity and not in professional circles, primarily with political arguments, but also with an orientation to Czech sociology. Thus discourses appear in chronological order and not in thematic stages.

In the three years following the political changes, facing the communist legacy was a determining factor and in parallel the old taboos were touched upon (primarily the one concerning 1968) with joint Czecho-Slovak efforts. How can the legacy be interpreted? How can Marxism be negated? What role should a sociologist take?

In the second phase between 1993 and 1998 the separation of the Czecho-Slovak state and 'Mečiarism' provided the main themes for Slovak sociologists and voices referring to the crisis of the profession became stronger. However, strictly professional approaches were also present in interpreting the separation, which supported the one-state-two-societies concept with survey results. These, just like the discourse on taboos, were published in Czech journals.

The third, post-1998 period can be regarded as the years of slow revival, the liberation from the Mečiar censorship and political pressure. Nevertheless, Slovak sociology does not seem to have woken up from its stagnation following the separation and does not seem to be able to accommodate professional debate: the more noted researchers do not publish in Slovak papers and do not conduct debates in the scientific circles at home but partly in the West and partly in opinion survey institutes.

***

The dominant discourses of the examined five countries take their own road. This means that, although we can identify the sociologies of individual countries, no sociology of the region exists. Country-specific discourses very rarely connect with a similar discourse in other East European countries. The virtual space occupied by them is penetrated rather by Western science than that of East Europe: and we sociologists listen to the West if not to ourselves.

Our analysis also shows that the profession partly has withdrawn itself from the publication fora of the discipline and the debates are conducted in the public or abroad. Disregarding a few exceptions, the reviewed journals primarily serve professional promotion, do not encourage professional debate and show a more static and conservative image of local sociologies than they are in reality.

The burden of transition is carried differently in each country. Perhaps two common features can be seen in the different professional debates: dealing with the socialist legacy and searching for new identities and ways of expression. These debates show a large degree of inertia: sociologists in east European countries have to clarify their relationship not only to their own past and Western science, but also to the political transition.

Meanwhile, it is as if they were not looking at the wider horizon and therefore they cannot explain their own "crisis" and "search for identity" in terms of the world-wide "crisis" of sociology as such.[9] Finding our own place and role in the enclosed world of East-Central Europe requires such an enormous effort that we do not see that *mainstream* science is also crying out for help.

---

9   In Western sociology the first danger signals were sounded already at the end of the 1980s, and a mass of professional literature was written about the present and future of the profession. Here only three significant critical texts are refered to: Boudon, R.: "European Sociology: The Identity Lost?" In Nedelmann, B. – Sztompka, P. (eds.): *Sociology in Europe – In Search of Identity*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993, 27–46., Wallerstein, I.: "The Heritage of Sociology, The Promise of Social Science. Presidential Address, XIVth World Congress of Sociology, Montreal, 26 July 1998". *Current Sociology*. 1999, Vol. 47(1): 1–37., Bauman, Z.: "A parvenü és a pária, azaz a modernség hőse és áldozata" (*The Parvenu and the Pariah – the hero and victim of modernity*). *2000*, 2001, July-August, 3–10.

APPENDIX 1 [10]

Table 1. The methodology of the article

Country	Hungary		Poland		Romania		Slovakia	Serbia
Methodology (%)	*Szociológiai Szemle*	*Replika*	*Kultura i Społeczeństwo*	*Studia Socjologiczne*	*Altera*	*RCS*	*Sociológia*	*Sociologija*
Quantitative	48.9	–	8	6.2	5.5	39.6	15.2	21.2
Qualitative	39.8	100*	71	53.8	90.4	55.7	52.5	73.6
Both	11.3	–	21	40	4.1	4.7	32.2	5.2

* We did not measure as a separate variant, but during the examined period no studies based on statistical procedures were published in the journal.

---

10 The tables were made by Attila Z. Papp, to whom I express my gratitude.

Table 2. The "trend" of articles

Country	Hungary		Poland		Romania		Slova-kia	Serbia
Trend (%)	*Szociológiai Szemle*	*Replika*	*Kultura i Społeczeństwo*	*Studia Socjologiczne*	*Altera*	*RCS*	*Sociológia*	*Sociologija*
Legacy	17.7	6.6	8.33	0	1.4	3.3	25.4	25.5
Imitation	15.2	39.5	24.31	29.2	97.3	88.4	11.2	46
Invention	7.6	5.3	4.17	1.5	–	–	7.2	14.4
Legacy+ Invention	17.7	5.3	8.33	6.2	–	–	7.6	–
Imitation+ Invention	18.2	11.8	27.78	30.8	–	3.3	10.1	–
Legacy+ Imitation	23.2	27.6	4.17	1.5	1.4	3.3	30.8	–
Legacy+ Imitation+ Invention	0.5	3.9	22.92	20	–	–	4	0.4
Could not be determined	–	–	3.47	9.2	–	1.7	–	13.7

Table 3. The themes of articles

Country	Hungary		Poland		Romania		Slova-kia	Serbia
Topic (%)	*Szociológiai Szemle*	*Replika*	*Kultura i Społeczeństwo*	*Studia Sojologiczne*	*Altera*	*RCS*	*Sociológia*	*Sociologija*
Theory	23.7	5.1	0.69	16.9	0	9.6	9.1	7.7
Methodology	15.2	5.1	18.75	20	0	6.8	13.9	3.9
Structure, stratification	14.1	30.8	10.42	9.2	0	5.6	19.2	16.8
Political Sociology	8.6	33.3	4.17	6.2	9.6	10.7	11.5	6.5
Sociology of Science	7.6	0	4.86	12.3	2.7	22	17.3	14.8
Economic sociology	7.6	0	13.19	1.5	0	11.9	12	5.5
Sociology of Agriculture	5.1	5.1	0.69	1.5	0	1.7	0.5	4.8
Gender	5.1	2.6	0	0	78.1	10.2	0	7.4
Lifestyle, culture, religion	5.1	3.8	13.19	4.6	9.6	13.1	4.3	20.3
Social policy, Poverty	3.5	3.8	12.5	3.1	0	2.3	1	3.9
Social psychology	2	0	2.08	12.3	0	0	0.5	3.2
Sociolinguistics, disourse-analysis	1	9	3.47	4.6	0	0	2.4	2.9
Ethnicity	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	0.5	1.3	5.56	7.7	0	2.3	6.7	2.3
Other	0	1.3	10.42	0	0	0	1.4	0

Table 4. The gender of the main author

Country	Hungary		Poland		Romania		Slova-kia	Serbia
Trend (%)	*Szociológiai Szemle*	*Replika*	*Kultura i Spoleczeństwo*	*Studia Sojologiczne*	*Altera*	*RCS*	*Sociológia*	*Sociologija*
Female	34.3	23.1	43.8	32.3	16.4	25	35.1	34.5
Male	65.7	76.9	56.3	67.7	83.6	75	64.9	65.5

APPENDIX 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HUNGARY *(Attila Z. Papp)*

Andorka R.: "Új elméleti orientációk a világ szociológiájában". *Valóság,* 1996, No. 2.
Andorka R.: "A nemzetközi társadalomtudományos együttműködés előnyei". *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.
Csepeli Gy. – Örkény A. – Scheppele, K. L.: "A kelet-európai társadalomtudomány szerzett immunhiányos betegségének tünetei". *Replika*, 1998, No. 33–34.
Csepeli Gy. – Wessely A.: "A közép-európai szociológia kognitív esélye". *Replika,* 1992, No. 1–2.
Gerő A.: "A tolmácsokról". *Replika,* 1992, No. 1–2.
Gábor K. – Balog I. – Matuz N.: "A 'közös nevezőben': az Ikszek?". *Replika,* 1992, No. 1–2.
Hadas M.: "Pegazus és Rosinante. Töredékes reflexiók Csepeli György és Wessely Anna írása kapcsán". *Replika,* 1992, No. 1–2.
Hadas M.: "Bartók, a természettudós". *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.
Hovanyecz L.: "Hol a szociológia mostanában? Beszélgetés Némedi Dénes szociológussal". *Társadalmi Szemle,* 1996, No. 3.
Kuczi T.: "Szociológia, ideológia, közbeszéd". In Kuczi T. – Becskeházi A.: *Valóság '70.* Budapest: Scientia Humana, 1992.
Kusá, Z.: "Szerzett vagy öröklött immunhiány?" *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.

Lemon, A.–Altschuler, D.: "Kinek a társadalomtudományát gyarmatosították?" *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.

Moksony F.: "Hozzászólás". *Replika*, 1993, No. 9–10., 64–71.

Némedi D. – Róbert P.: "A szociológia diszciplináris helyzete Magyarországon". *Szociológiai Szemle,* 1995, No. 4., 57–72.

Némedi D. – Róbert P.: *Sociology in Hungary.* Collegium Budapest (manuscript), 2001.

Pléh Cs.: Kognitív esélyek vagy kognitív feladatok. Hozzászólás Csepeli György és Wessely Anna tanulmányához. *Replika*, 1992.

Róbert P.: "A közép-európai szociológia változatai és a versenyképesség. Gondolatok Csepeli György és Wessely Anna írása ürügyén". *Replika*, 1992.

Saád J.: "Magyar szociológiatörténet: minek a története? Vázlat a magyar társadalomtani- szociológiai gondolkodás 1945 előtti történetéről". *Replika,* 1996, No. 23–24.

Tamás P.: "Egy szakma 'Sturm und Drang' után" (A magyar szociológia a nyolc-vanas években)". *Szociológia,* 1989, No. 4.

Tamás P.: "Kontinuitás és diszkontiunuitás a 90-es évek magyar társadalom-kutatásában. A Sturm und Drang emléke". *Magyar Tudomány,* 1993, No. 3.

Tamás P.: "A sündisznó és a súrolókefe. Szociológia és társadalmi gyakorlat az új Kelet-Európában". In *XXX 1963-ban alakult meg a Szociológiai Kutatócsoport* Buda-pest: MTA Szociológiai Intézete, MTA TKKK, 1994.

Tóth P. P.: "Fenyegetett helyzetben a szociológia?! Beszélgetés Cseh-Szombathy Lászlóval, Szelényi Ivánnal, Losonczi Ágnessel, Wessely Annával és Kovács Imrével". *Magyar Tudomány,* 1992, No. 5.

Wallerstein, I.: "The Heritage of Sociology, The Promise of Social Science. Presi-dential Address, XIVth World Congress of Sociology, Montreal, 26 July 1998" in *Current Sociology,* 1999, Vol. 47(1), 1–37.

Wessely A.: "Válasz helyett". *Replika,* 1993, No. 9–10.

Budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem: *KARI TÁJÉKOZTATÓK a szakokról és a szakirányokról,* Budapest 1999. április

http://www.bke.hu/tarskar.html

http://www.ceu.hu

http://www.elte.hu/elte/sociology

POLAND *(Gyula Gombos)*

Benedyktowicz, Z.: "Antropologia wobec zmiany". In Tarkowska, E. (ed.): *Antropologia wobec zmiany,* Varszawa: IFISPAN, 1995.

Czyżewski, M.: "'Niepokojąca współczesność' jako topos w dyskursie publicznym", *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 2000, No. 3.

Fatyga, B.: "Teksty krytyczne w naukach społecznych: o recenzjach". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1996, No. 1.

Gellner, E.: *Postmodernism, reason and religion*, London: Routledge, 1992.

Kaniowska, K.: "Antropologiczne propozyje badania przemian społecznych". In Tarkowska, E. (ed.): *Antropologia wobec zmiany,* Warszawa: IFISPAN, 1995.

Kłoskowska, A.: *Kultury narodowe u korzeni.* Warszawa, 1996.

Sowa (ed.): *Socjologia polska,* Rzeszów, 1998.

Kwaśniewicz, W. (ed.): *Orientacje teoretyczne we współczesnej socjologii*, Kraków: UJ IS, 1990.

Kwaśniewicz, W.: "Między ustrojowym przymusem a wolnością akademicką: polska socjologia w latach 1956–1989". In Keen, M.F. – Mucha, J. (eds.): *Socjologia Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej,* Warszawa: IFISPAN, 1995.

Mucha, J.: "Zmiana społeczna w perspektywie antropologicznej". In Tarkowska, E.: *Antropologia wobec zmiany,* Warszawa: IFISPAN, 1995.

Mucha, J. – Załęcki, P.: *The State of Sociology in Poland 1990–2000*, Draft, Collegium Budapest, 2001.

Narojek, W.: *Społeczeństwo planujące. Próba socjologii gospodarki socjalistycznej.* Warszawa: PWN, 1973.

Narojek, W.: *Interesy i ideały kultury. Struktura społeczeństwa i udział w kulturze.* Warszawa: PWN, 1987.

Pucek, Z.: "Charakter i źródła wątków antropologicznych w polskiej myśli socjologicznej". In Tarkowska, E.(ed.): *Socjologia i antropologia,* Wroclaw. 1992.

Sulek, A.: "A lengyel szociológia az átmenet időszakában". *Szociológiai Szemle,* 1992, No. 2.

Sulek, A.: "Laudacja Polskiego Towarzystwa Socjologicznego". *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 16 December 1997.

Szacki, J.: *Sto lat socjologii polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN, 1995.

Szacki, J.: "Stan obecny socjologii polskiej". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1995, No. 1.

Szacki, J.: 1990 "Socjologia współczesna a klasycy socjologii" in Kwaśniewicz 1990, 9.

Tarkowska, E.: *Powroty i kontynuacje*. Warszawa: IFISPAN, 1995.

Tarkowski, J.: *Socjologia świata polityki II. rész: Patroni i klienci,* Warszawa: IS PAN, 1994

Wyka, A.: "Ku nowym wzorom badań społecznych w Polsce". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1990, No. 1.

Włodarek, J. (ed.): *Między przeszłością a przyszłościa. Szkice o socjologii i społeczeństwie polskim w dobie przemian ustrojowych*. Poznań: UAM, 1998.

www.ifispan.waw.pl

"Trivialization"

Czyżewski, M.: "'Niepokojąca współczesność' jako topos w dyskursie publicznym", *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 2000, No. 3.

Ziółkiewski, M.: "Czy współczesnej (polskiej) socjologii grozi trywializacja?". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 2000, No. 3.

Fatyga, B.: "Teksty krytyczne w naukach społecznych: o recenzjach". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1996, No. 1.

Regionalism

Jałowiecki, B.: "Kwestia regionalna". *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1992, No. 1–2.

Łęcki, K. – Wódz, K. – Wódz, J. – Wróblewski, P.: "Rzeczywistość społeczna w doświadczeniu potocznym Górnoślązaków". *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1992, No. 3–4.

Łęcki, K.: *Świat społeczny Ślązaków : rekonstrukcja treści świadomości potocznej* Uniwersytet Śląski Katowice, 1992.

Szczepański, M. S.: "Region katastroficzny wobec wyzwań cywilizacyjnych. Przypadek Górnego Śląska". *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1995, No. 1–2.

Szczepański, M. S.: "Regionalizm górnośląski: między plemiennością a systemem globalnym". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1998, No. 1.

Szmeja, M.: "Historyczne i społeczne uwarunkowanie powstawania mniejszości niemieckiej i narodu śląskiego w Polsce". *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1998, No. 4.

Mucha, J.: "Polacy? Niemcy? Ślązacy?". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 2000, No. 4.

Gender

Domański, H. – Dukaczewska, A.: "Mąż i żona: czyja pozycja decyduje o identyfikicji z klasą społeczną?" *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1997, No. 2.

Danuta, T.: "Co powinna a czego nie powinna robić kobieta? Przekonania młodzieży na temat roli społecznej kobiet". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo,* 1991, No. 2.

Graff, A.: "Patriarchat po seksmisji". *Gazeta Wyborcza,* 1999, June 19–20.

Kwak, A.: "Niezamężna kohabytacja jako zjawisko społeczne". *Studia Socjologiczne,* 1995, No. 3–4.

Kryczka, P.: "Rozwód w opinii społecznej". *Studia Socjologiczna,* 1999, No. 1.

ROMANIA *(József D. Lőrincz)*

Bădescu, I.: *Sincronism european și cultură critică românească. Contribuții de sociologie istorică privind cultura modernă românească.* București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1984.

Papu, E.: "Protocronismul românesc". *Secolul XX*, 1974, No. 5–6.

Rebedeu, I.– Zamfir, C. (eds.): *Modul de viață și calitatea vieții,* București: Editura Politică, 1982.

Stahl, H. H.: *Teorii și ipoteze privind sociologia orînduirii tributale.* București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1980.

Teodorescu, A.: "A román szociológia 1965 után". *Replika,* 1991, No. 2–3.

Verdery, K.: *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu's Romania*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1991.

Wallerstein, I.: *The Modern World System*. Academic Press, Inc. 1974.

Zamfir, C. (ed.): *Indicatori și surse de variație a calității vieții*. București: Editura Academiei, 1984.

Zamfir, C. – Rebedeu, I.: (ed.): *Stiluri de viață. Dinamica lor în societatea contemporană*. București: Editura Academiei, 1989.

ROMANIA *(Tamás Kiss, Andrea Sólyom)*

Altera: 1–13

Revista de Cercetări Sociale (RCS): 1994–2000

Adreescu, G.: "De la problema transilvană la problema europeană". *Altera,* 1998, No. 8.

Bădescu, I.: *Sincronism european și cultură critică românească. Contribuții de sociologie istorică privind cultura modernă românească.* București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1984.

Bădescu–Zamfir–Zamfir (eds.): *Starea societății române după zece ani de tranziție,* București, Expert, 2000.

Capelle–Pogăcean, A.: "Chestiunea transilvană – dimensiune etnică și teritorială". *Altera,* 1998, No. 8.

Dungaciu, D.: "Conștiința etnică, conștiința civică și integrare europeană". In Bădescu–Zamfir–Zamfir 2000.

KAM: *Egy más mellett élés.* Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 1996.

Larionescu, M.: "The The State of the Romanian Sociology since 1989" Draft, Collegium Budapest, 2001.

Lengyel Gy.: "A kelet-európai gazdaságszociológiáról". *Szociológiai Szemle,* 1995, No. 4.

Magyari N.: "Előszó helyett: Mi(lyen) a szociológia ma? És mire való?". *WEB*, 1999.

Mihok, B.: "Situația romilor din județul Mureș și elaborarea unor strategii de sensibilizare". *Altera,* 1996, No. 6.

Molnár G.: "Az erdélyi kérdés". *Magyar Kisebbség,* 1997, No. 3–4.

Molnár G.: "Még egyszer az erdélyi kérdésről". *Magyar Kisebbség,* 1999, No. 2–3.

Patapievici, H.-R.: *Politice,* București: Humanitas, 1997.

Pecican, O.: "Műhelygyakorlatok". *Beszélő,* 2000, No. 9–10.

Fati, S.: "Regionalism prin descentralizare sau criză prin fragmentare?" *Altera,* No. 10.

http//www.ssees.ac.nk/gs1.htm

Zeletin, S.: *Neoliberalismul. Studii asupra istoriei și politicii burgheziei române,* București, 1927.

SLOVAKIA *(László Gyurgyík)*

Benkovičová, L. – Lubelec, L.– Roško R.: "Zastavíme strach z budúcnosti? (1)". *Nové slovo bez rešpektu,* 1994, No. 51, December 19.

Broklová, E.: "Česká a slovenská společnost. Skica srovnávací studie". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Bútorová, Zora: *Premyslené "áno" zániku ČSFR? Image strán a rozpad Česko-Slovenska očami občanov Slovenska. Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Csepeli Gy. – Örkény A. – Scheppele, K. L.: "A kelet-európai társadalomtudomány szerzett immunhiányos betegségének tünetei". *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.

Dianiška, I.: "Konsolidovaná *Sociológia* – malá, ale naša". In *Nad výsledkami jednej citačnej analýzy. Referát prednesený na II. zjazde slovenských sociológov.* Martin, 1989. oktober.

Guráň, P. – Filadelfiová, J. – Ritomský, A.: *Tradičné verzus moderné: zmeny a ivot súčasných rodín*. Sociológia, 1997, No. 1.

Köttner, M.: *Vývoj sociológie v českých zemích a na Slovensku.* Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně. 1981.

Köverová, Š.: "Dve poznámky k legitimizácie profesionálneho konania slovenských sociológov". *Sociologický zapisník,* 1995, No. 2.

Krivý, V.: "Slovenská a česká definícia situácie. Čas: 1992 január". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Kusá, Z.: "Quo vadis slovenská *Sociológia*?" *Sociologický zápisník,* 1993, No. 3.

Kusá, Z.: "Prvá republika v autobiografických rozprávaniach členov rodín pred-prevratovej slovenskej inteligencie". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Kusá, Z.: "Krátka poznámka o zabúdaní dobrých sociologických mravov". *Sociológia,* 1995, No. 3.

Kusá, Z.: "Pred čím zatvára oči ľavicová *Sociológia*?" *Nové slovo bez rešpektu,* 1995, No. 10.

Kusá, Z.: "Komunikácia na stránkach časopisu *Sociológia*". *Problémové polia slovenskej sociológie.* Bratislava: SS SAV, 1996.

Kusá, Z.: "Szerzett vagy öröklött immunitáshiány". *Replika,* 1998, No. 33–34.

Kvapilová, E.: "Diskusia k charakteru koncepcie rodinnej politiky na Slovensku". *Sociológia,* 2001, No. 4.

Laiferová, E.: "Výučba sociológie pre sociológov a nesociológov. Aktuálne podnety a ich vplyv na obsah, metodiku a ciele pedagogického procesu". *Sociologia,* 1999, No. 5.

Lentzová, T.: "K charakteru koncepcie rodinnej politiky na Slovensku". *Sociológia,* 2001, No. 4.

Macháček, L.: "Výzvy svetovej sociológie našej sociológii". *Sociológia,* 1998, No. 4.

Macháček, L.: "Slovenská sociologická spoločnos   pri SAV". *Sociológia,* 1999, No. 5.

Machonin, Pavel: "Česko-slovenské vztahy ve světle dat sociologických výzkumu". In Gál, F. et. al.: *Dnešní krize česko-slovenských vztahù.* Praha: Slon, 1992, 91–108.

Machonin, P.: "K sociologické komparaci české a slovenské společnosti". *Sociológia,* 1994, No. 4.

Matulník, J. – Pastor, K.: "Pokles pôrodnosti na Slovensku ako deviácia a ako výskumný problém". *Sociológia,* 1997, No. 5.

Musil, J.: "Česká a slovenská společnost. Skica srovnávací studie". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 3.

Musil, J.: "Češi a slováci 1918–1938". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Ondrejkovič, P.: "Poslanie Katedry sociológie výchovy a sociológie mláde e PdF UK". *Sociológia,* 1999, No. 5.

Ortega, y Gasset: *Vzpoura davù.* Praha: Naše vojsko. 1993.

Pašiak, J. – Macháček L.: "Sociológia na Slovensku: predpoklad či skutočnos ". *Sociológia,* 1998, No. 1.

Roško, R.: "Quo vadis slovenská sociológia". *Sociologický zápisník,* 1993, No. 3.

Roško, R.: "P. Machonin: K sociologické komparaci české a slovenské společnosti". *Sociológia,* 1994, No. 4.

Roško, R.: "K hypotéze o reziduálnej skupine". *Sociológia,* 1995, No. 3.

Šanderová, Jadwiga: "Vnímání dùsledkù transformace českou a slovenskou populací". *Sociologický časopis,* 1993, No. 1.

Sopóci, J.: "Quo vadis slovenská *Sociológia*?" *Sociologicky zápisník,* 1993, No. 3.

Sopóci, J.: "Hľadanie teórie v slovenskej sociologii". In Zborník Sociológia v meniacej sa spoločnosti, seminár k 70. vyročiu zalo enia odboru sociologie na FiFUK v Bratislave. Bratislava, 1995.

Stena, J.: "Reziduálna skupina v slovenskej politike". *Parlamentný kuriér,* 1994, No. 9.

Stena, J.: "Fenomén 'reziduálnej skupiny' v slovenskej politike". *Sociológia,* 1994, No. 4.

Stena, J.: "Strata komunikatívnosti?" *Nové slovo bez rešpektu,* 1994, No. 42., October 17.

Stena, J.: "Reziduálna skupina v hamletovskom objatí?" *Nové slovo bez rešpektu,* 1995, No. 17, February 13.

Stena, J.: "Viac ako sociálne zrkadlo". *Sociológia,* 1995, No. 3.

Szomolányi, S.: "Sociologie slovenská". In *Velký sociologický slovník II.* Praha: Univerzita Karlova Vydavatelství Karolinum, 1996.

Vaněk, A.: *Přehled dějín české a slovenské sociologie od roku 1945 do současnosti.* Praha: SPN, 1982.

Vehovszká, S.: "A szociológia Szlovákiában". *Szociológiai Szemle,* 1994, No. 1.

SERBIA *(György Horváth/Szerbhorváth)*

Baćević, L. J.: "Prilog za istorijat za politološka istra ivanja i javno mnenje" In Baćević, L. J. (ed.): *Javno mnenje.* Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1994, 267–290.

Bolčić, S.: "Sociologija i 'unutrašnji rat' u Jugoslaviji". *Sociološki pregled,* 1993, No. 1–4.

Cvetković, V. N. (ed): "Univerzitet u Srbiji". *Nova Srpska Politička Misao*, Posebna izdanja, 1998, No. 1.

Čolović, I.: *Politika simbola,* Beograd: Radio B92, 1997.

Gabrić-Molnár I.: "A szociológia helyzete Vajdaságban". *Szociológia,* 1996, No. 2.

Golubović, Z.: "Od dijagnoze do objašnjenja 'jugoslovenskog slučaja'". *Sociološki pregled,* 1993, No. 1–4.

Golubović, Z.: "Društvo u ratu". *Sociološki pregled,* 1992, No. 1–4.

Kostić, C.: *Vuk osnivač sociologije sela u srba.* In *Jugoslovenska sociologija sela*. Beograd: SANU – knjiga DLXXVIII, Odelenje društvenih nauka – knjiga 95. 1987.

Kovács T.: "A szociológia kialakulása és fejlődése Jugoszláviában". *Szociológia,* 1983, No. 3.

Lazić, M.: "Sociologija: između iluzija i stvarnosti". *Sociološki pregled,* 1993, No. 1–4.

Mad galj- akula, S.: "Društvo i rat – društvo u ratu". *Sociološki pregled,* 1992, No. 1–4.

Marković, M.: "Politički i socijalno-ekonomski preobra aj u Srbiji 1989–1995". In *Ciljevi i putevi društava u tranziciji* Beograd: Institut društvenih nauka, 1996, 47–64.

Milosavljević, O.: "Zloupotreba autoriteta nauke". In Popov, N. (ed.): *Srpska strana rata – Trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju.* Beograd: Republika, 1996, 305–338.

Mitrović, M.: "Sociologija i današnje srpsko društvo". *Sociološki pregled,* 1993, No. 1–4.

Popov, N.: "Univerzitet u ideološkom omotaču". In Popov, N. (ed.): *Srpska strana rata – Trauma i katarza u istorijskom pamćenju.* Beograd: Republika, 1996, 339–364.

Stanković, Đ. Dj.: "Beogradski univerzitet – političke i istorijske kontroverze". In *Marksistička misao.* 1983, No. 5.

Szerbhorváth, Gy. (ed.): *Viszolygás a várostól – A szerb társadalomtudomány Milošević Szerbiájáról.* Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány (Regio könyvek), 2002.

Vukotić, B.: "Strani sociološki časopisi u bibliotekama Srbije 1984–1993". *Sociološki pregled,* 1994, No. 1.

Vukotić, B.: "Bibliografija jugoslovenskih serijskih publikacija iz oblasti sociologije (1920–1994)". *Sociološki pregled,* 1994, No. 3.