

An Analysis of Feminist Methodology

Reema Bhatia

Associate Professor, Sociology, Miranda House, University of Delhi

Abstract-In this article we examine the ways in which feminist methodology has led to re-research. Feminist methodology led to new ways of seeing. The previously invisible aspects of social life were made visible. This also led to the introduction of gendered dimensions in research. Consequently, the dominant epistemes and existing knowledge structures were rearticulated.

Feminist methodologies in research believe that research should be reflexive and should aim for gender equality and social justice. These methodologies challenged traditional ways of knowledge creation and pointed out the close interlinkages with the power structures of society. Feminist research also stresses on the affective turn believing that emotions play an important part in re-researching the social world. Development of feminist methodology and theory cannot be seen independent of development of theory in sociology. The progress of sociological theory from a positivist approach to a more critical approach is also reflected in the development of feminist methodologies.

Key Words: Research, methodology, methods, feminism, visual

INTRODUCTION

Social science research is a way in which we develop new perspectives and ways of looking at society. Research or rather re-research is a way of re-doing and re-examining and re-interpreting the established norms and frameworks of society. It is a process of rediscovery. Re-research or a reinterpretation of ideas happens with a change in knowledge structures. Foucault's "The Archaeology of Knowledge," (Foucault, 1972) explores the systems of thought (epistemes) that underlie the knowledge and scientific discourse of different epochs. Foucault examines how statements, ideas, and discourses¹ are governed by rules that define what can be said and thought in different periods. He explores how these rules form the basis of knowledge and truth. The episteme determines the underlying conditions of knowledge

and intellectual culture that define the possibilities of knowledge and discourse in any given time and place. Research that happens under the given episteme is less a source of original creation and more a function of discourse. Foucault proposes a shift from the traditional history of ideas, which focuses on the continuity and development of thought, to an "archaeological" method that emphasises discontinuities, breaks, and the complex relationship between periods of thought. Knowledge systems are imbued with and shaped by power relations. The process of rediscovery and re-research happens with changes and challenges in the prevailing structures of society.

The episteme and the prevailing knowledge structures determine the research questions asked.

It determines the methodology used. Methodology refers to the overarching strategy and rationale of the research. It involves the theoretical analysis of the methods applied to a field of study. It encompasses the principles, theories, and values that underpin a particular approach to research. Methodology guides the choice and use of specific methods and links the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes. It includes considerations of how researchers understand and study the social world, including philosophical foundations of knowledge construction like positivism, interpretivism, or critical theory. The methodology provides a reasoned argument for the choice of methods, helping to ensure that the research approach is coherent and justified. Meanwhile, the methods are the concrete steps that allow researchers to systematically gather and analyse data to derive meaningful conclusions. The feminist movement led to new ways of seeing the social. Development of feminist methodology and theory cannot be seen independent of development of theory in sociology. The progress of sociological theory from a positivist

¹ Discourse according to Foucault is theoretically the most pervasive idea.

approach to a more critical approach is also reflected in the development of feminist methodologies.

This article analyses and discusses feminist methodologies and the ways in which it shaped research. The article argues that new ways of re-interpreting and re-searching also leads to new ways of seeing the social. The visualisation of the everyday and the ways in which we define and identify people are linked to the new ways of seeing gender. The article contends that though feminist methodology did begin with a focus on bringing women into research but it has changed and evolved over time. Section I of the article gives a brief overview of the feminist movement. Section II discusses the ways in which the feminist movement made women visible added new dimensions to research methodologies. Section III concludes the article.

Section I

The feminist movement aimed to achieve gender equality and challenge systemic inequalities faced by women. Originating in the late 19th and early 20th centuries with the suffragette campaigns for women's voting rights, the movement has evolved through various waves, each focusing on different aspects of women's rights. The first wave in the late 19th and early 20th centuries centred on legal issues, primarily gaining women's suffrage. The second wave in the 1960s and 1970s focused on broader issues including sexuality, family, the workplace, reproductive rights, and inequalities. The third wave, starting in the 1990s, sought to challenge the definitions of femininity and embrace diversity, questioning the earlier waves' definitions of femininity and their focus on white, middle-class women. The fourth wave, from around the 2010s, is characterised by a focus on intersectionality, sexual harassment, and the use of social media to combat inequalities.

Development of technology in the 20th century added an impetus to the feminist movement. The feminist movement began using the internet as a tool to strive

for equality. There were several campaigns launched by feminists across the world using the internet. The most prominent among these were the SlutWalk² in 2011 which used social media to organise the walk. Other initiatives include #MeToo Movement³ in 2006 and later again in 2017; Blank Noise⁴ project in 2012; also campaigns like #Delhi Braveheart⁵, against the 2012 rape of a medical student.

Section II

The feminist movement has made a significant impact on the ways in which we see society. This in turn has influenced and impacted the research methodology. The feminist movement led to a change in methodology in three interrelated and overlapping ways. Firstly we began to see things differently. It impacted the ways in which we see the everyday. The visualisation of the social changed. Many aspects of the everyday like domestic labour, child rearing and caring activities, gendered socialisation, women's contribution to the household economy through activities like vegetable growing in the kitchen garden, dairy related activities, food processing, garment making etc became visible. Feminist researchers have raised issues and concerns that have led us to re-examine and re-interpret the fundamental institutions of society. It challenged the existing methodologies. They gave us new ways of seeing and understanding the social. The way that we see society and the everyday is a part of the dominant episteme. The way that we see things in society is a cultural activity. It is a part of the everyday act of seeing and understanding things. Visuality is actually linked with structures of society which dictate the ways in which we see and think. Visualisation of history has to do with the ways in which the social was constructed and presented to us. Mirzoeff (Mirzoeff, 2011) looks at the process of visuality in terms of the ways in which people are named, categorised and defined. The ways in which people are defined and looked at becomes a part of the social and cultural fabric to such an extent that we

² The SlutWalk was organised for the first time in Ontario Canada in 2011. It was organised to protest against the labelling of women as sluts on the basis of their appearance.

³ #MeToo was started in 2006 by Tarna Burkes against sexual harassment of women. It was restarted in 2017 against sexual assault.

⁴ The Blank Noise Project was started in 2003 against sexual harassment on streets in India.

⁵ This was launched to seek justice for the rape of a medical student in Delhi in India in 2012.

assume it to be natural. The process of visualisation is so much an intrinsic part of our everyday life that it is often not even noticed. It determines the right to be seen and the right to look, which has to do with the ways in which society is organised. The complex of visibility is imbricated in the ways in which we think about society and its structures. It has substance as well as volume. In a very subtle way it controls our imagination and determines the way in which we live. Patterns of dissent emerge from these strict patterns of control and discipline. This leads to a new way of thinking and living. Individuals can claim autonomy to arrange things in a way in which they deem fit. Michelle de Certeau (2009) posits that we live by strategies and tactics. Strategies are long term and correspond to an overarching plan. Tactics on the other hand have to do with the everyday and the ways in which individuals function in the everyday. The feminists have used various strategies and tactics to challenge and change the ways in which we look. We began by focussing on women but theoretical shifts in methodology led to research not just on women but on gender. Gender is a more encompassing term and it includes not just women but also men, transsexuals and the entire gamut of gender.

Secondly feminist researchers advocated the importance of emotions and the affective turn. The affective turn in feminist research refers to a shift in focus towards emotions, feelings, and affective experiences as central components of analysis within feminist theory and practice. This turn emphasises how emotions are not merely private or individual experiences, but are deeply intertwined with social, political, and cultural contexts. It explores how affect influences identity formation, social interactions, and power dynamics, often challenging traditional boundaries between the public and the private, the cognitive and the emotional. In feminist research, the affective turn has encouraged scholars to consider how emotions like anger, joy, humour and fear play roles in resistance and compliance within gendered power structures. It also examines how affect is mobilised in movements for social justice, influencing both

individual participation and collective action. This approach has been instrumental in broadening the understanding of how gender operates not only through structures and representations but also through embodied experiences and emotional engagements. In recent years methodologically feminist scholarship has also stressed on the importance of emotion and embodiment. This is referred to as the affective turn which stresses on the impact of emotions on our everyday gendered lives. Affect has to do with the impersonal. They are the non subjective feelings and have to do with the impersonal and cannot be reduced to one person or thing (Masummi, 2015, 2002). It is a set of “embodied practices” and “indirect and non reflective thinking” (Thrift, 2008, 175). It is a set of habits, feelings and emotions that are a part of the subconscious mind. Ahmed (2014) contends that affect and emotions should not be separated since what an individual feels is an outcome of the social. Affects and emotions cannot be separated since they are interrelated and involved. Gender works affectively, emotionally and performatively through the unconscious structure of your mind (Ahmed, 2014). Affect is about how the world works. Affect is also about feelings related to the power structures. The very act of challenging everyday patterns of misogyny, patriarchal dominance, violence or gas lighting brings forth affects and emotions like anger, injustice and humour. This has led us into a terrain which is marked by affect. Even in the online cyber world there is affective resonance and affective solidarity. There is a shared affective experience. Social media has facilitated this engagement. The online and the offline world are interrelated to one another and cannot be clearly demarcated from each other. There is often a slippage between the two. Thus feminist researchers in both the online and offline worlds focus on the relationships between affect, knowledge and power.

The emphasis on the affective turn led to the third methodological shift towards reflexivity in feminist research. Reflexivity⁶ in feminist research involves a critical and ongoing examination of the researcher’s

⁶ Reflexivity in sociology can be traced to Alvin Gouldner (1970). Gouldner questioning the ‘objective’ approach to research posited that knowledge is always situated. The researcher’s standpoint impacts research. The research

questions asked and the way in which research is conducted is influenced by the location of the researcher. The researcher appears to be hierarchically superior to the research subject. “A

own role, biases, and the power dynamics involved in the research process. This concept is crucial in feminist methodology because it emphasises the need to consider how one's positionality—such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, and other social identities—shapes the research questions, interactions with participants, and interpretations of data. In feminist research, reflexivity extends beyond mere acknowledgment of a researcher's background and biases. It involves actively engaging with these elements to challenge power imbalances between the researcher and the participants. Feminist researchers strive to create more ethical and equitable research processes by being transparent about their motivations, the limits of their knowledge, and the potential impact of their findings. This can involve adjusting research methods and questions in response to participant feedback, recognising the co-constructed nature of knowledge, and being open to criticism that could lead to more inclusive and representative outcomes. Overall, reflexivity in feminist research is about fostering a research environment that is aware and sensitive to the complexities of power relations, which is key to promoting social justice and equality through scholarly inquiry.

In the succeeding sections we will discuss the ways in which feminists have created an alternative discourse in terms of research methodologies which in turn have shaped the ways that we see society.

The Emergence

It was only in the 1970's that the gendered aspects of society became visible. Prior to the 1970s it was almost as if women were invisible. Feminist methodology as it developed was within an androcentric framework. The challenge for the feminists was to develop a methodology which highlighted the fact that gender relations underline many aspects of social reality. The feminist methodology focused on producing an alternative way

Reflexive Sociology embodies a critique of the conventional conception of segregated scholarly roles and has a vision of an alternative. It aims at transforming the sociologist's relation to his work" (Gouldner, 1970, 495). Garfinkel (1967) following an ethnomethodological approach contends that researchers tend to fall back on what they know. The researchers methodologically tend to fall

of doing research. This alternative narrative was an outcome of the different ways in which they see society. The feminist argued that the ontology and the epistemology of the researcher determined the ways in which they did research. The fathers of sociology like August Comte, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx and Max Weber did not see society from a gendered perspective. Their focus was on the individual and the individual by default was male. It was assumed that there were no differences between men and women. Viewing women as independent entities, independent of the family was not done since they were invisible to the male researcher. Urging for a more gender based methodology researchers cited differences in perspectives in the case of social institutions like marriage and household work. Jessie Bernard (2013) for instance argued that the marriage of husband and wife were completely different. The androcentric perspective simply did not see this. Works by Davies (2013), Stanley and Wise (1990), Cockburn (2013), Hartmann (2013) and Witz (2013) and several others point out the differences of perspective of men and women in the context of socialisation, work and several other issues. The promise of value free sociology with an emphasis on objectivity was anything but value free. The values were one of an androcentric male centred universe. Feminist scholars and researchers argued that women were never the subject of any research; they existed on the margins and were always placed on the other side of truth, rationality and science.

The Feminist Critique of Androcentrism

It was in the 1970s that feminist scholars began critiquing the dominant androcentric framework used for research. The belief prior to this was that any research done on men was representative of all humans, including women. The idea of progress was limited to the universe of men only. Rene Descartes' well known theory of Cartesian Dualism became a standardised way of seeing men and women.

back on patterns that they are familiar with. Thus any knowledge that is generated is influenced by the social structures. Reflexivity for him refers to the interrelatedness of everyday appearances and underlying structures that influence our interactions. Bourdieu (2004) argues that the social scientists themselves are socially situated.

According to Cartesian dualism men were believed to be masters of their mind and thus they were rational and logical. Women on the other hand could not control their emotions and were passionate and intuitive. The feminists critiqued this perceived positivity and argued that this was not value free research rather it created an artificial division between mind and body. They contended that the validity of knowledge and knowledge construction was androcentric (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002; Harding, 1986; Smith, 1974). They further argued that traditional epistemologies simply did not see women and the universe that they occupied. Men and women occupied different social universes. Many generalisations made about society were from the point of view of men and from the perspective in which they saw society (Smith 1974; Molm, 1993; Harding, 1987, 1991). They contended that the social sciences were unreflective and viewed women from the standpoint of men. The masculine bias in the social sciences assumed that the feminist perspective was a part of the humanist and by extrapolation the masculine viewpoint. These early attempts to incorporate women into the research agenda involved just adding women within existing research frameworks. These feminists were the feminist empiricists.

Cancian (1992), Molm (1993), Dorothy Smith (1974) and Sandra Harding (1987) were critical of the empiricists. They argued that the categories of research and analysis used were androcentric. Molm (1993) and Harding (1987/ 1991) even critiqued the research questions asked. The formulation of the research topics and objectives too reflected the masculine bias. The issues researched were from a masculine standpoint with a focus on issues like stratification, industrialisation etc. The intersections of gender in each of the research areas was overlooked. The feminist scholars advocated for the feminisation of the social sciences. They contended that the epistemology and ontology of the social sciences thus far was elitist-masculine elitism. For instance, till the feminist scholars highlighted the importance of domestic work, we as a society remained blind to it. Despite the fact that it is an integral part of our everyday life. Sylvia Walby (2013) argues that the Marxian analysis of alienation and exploitation does not take into account the fact that a gendered division of labour predates capitalism. She contends that

housework is also work. It is based on the labour power of women and it is the production of labour power of the housewife for the members of a family. The wife/woman in the family has a relationship of production with her husband in return for which instead of wages she gets maintenance. The basis for these relationships of production is social and not economic. The maintenance that she gets may not be proportionate to the amount of work that is done by her. Further housewives constitute a class in a patriarchal system of production. The nature of work done by housewives may be domestic and unpaid but she is still a housewife who is exploited in the patriarchal system. For instance, cooking for the family by women is a part of the everyday world. But the process is gendered and is imbued with patriarchy. The identity of a woman often rests on her ability to feed her family hot and fresh food. It becomes a sign of her love for the family. There is an invisibilisation of her daily labour. Walby using Weber's theory of stratification constitutes a class of housewives and husbands. Women may also be working for a wage. In this case she will have a dual class position. Hartmann (Hartmann, 2013) investigated the links between labour and patriarchy from a historical perspective. For her capitalism and patriarchy reinforce each other and since women were in low paying jobs they could not do enough to be independent of men. Women do domestic chores in order to compensate their husbands in exchange for their maintenance. Before capitalism men had learnt how to control and organise society. Shulamith Firestone's 'The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution' (Firestone, 1970) argued that women's oppression was located in gender relationships in which men controlled women's bodies. For Firestone childbirth, pregnancy, breastfeeding child care and menstruation all tied down women. For her technological advancement would help women break out of men's control over reproduction. Critics like Abbott (Abbott et. al. 2016) argued that Firestone overlooked the fact that technological development was in an androcentric framework and also not all aspects of patriarchal control were rooted in biology. Many aspects of patriarchal control like child care and palliative care provided to be old were social in nature. The feminists fought for control of their own bodies through measures like the right to adopt contraceptives. Haraway (2017) contends that these issues need to be

understood in an embodied perspective which in turn is situated and locational. It depends on social factors like race, class and religion.

Standpoint Theorists

Western feminist scholars have been criticised by standpoint theorists who argue that all knowledge is situated (Harding, 1986). The social locus of the researcher gives us alternative ways of seeing the same reality. Nancy Hartsock (1983) believes that the Marxist ideas of the historicity and political nature of knowledge and truth need to be understood. The situatedness of women gives them a unique view of society hence it is important to understand that truth is always historically specific. For Hartsock it is not just a woman's standpoint but rather a feminist standpoint which is important. She feels that the situatedness of women does not give them the power to struggle for equality. It is important to have a feminist standpoint. Patricia Hill Collins (1990) like Hartsock believed that knowledge creation by black feminist should draw on the collective experience of subjugation not just of the blacks but also of other marginalised groups. Smith (1974) believes that it is important to have a sociology for women and such a sociology would take into account a woman's standpoint and not just a feminist point of view which would be impersonal and anonymous. Rather it should be one in which the experiences of the researcher as a woman and as a trained researcher provides us with an alternative way of seeing society.

According to Sandra Harding (1991) it's important to have a sociology of women. The sociology of women for Harding would start from a sociology that is organised around women and would allow for a relationship of equality between the researcher and the research. From the feminist standpoint knowledge has to be viewed from the point of view of its relationship with power and knowledge creation and the ways of things society are always tilted in favour of those who are in power.

Methodologically they argued it was important to do away with methods of research in which the researcher was placed hierarchically higher than the subjects of research. Harding (1991) and Smith (1974) argued for a research methodology in which women's experiences mattered. The feminist researchers felt that it was important to focus on the experience of the everyday world (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002;

Gorelick, 1991). Gorelick (1991) contended that it was important to understand that women just like the proletariat had to break out of a false consciousness. It was important for feminist research to highlight the hidden aspects of women's existence in society. For Gorelick it was important to share direct experiences which highlight the structures of oppression in society. Collectivisation of these experiences becomes important in order to reveal the hidden structures of oppression. Researchers further argued that situated analysis is important because it takes into account the experience of those who are being researched (Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002). This helps us understand and develop an alternative way of seeing society. Sandra Harding (1987) stresses on the importance of women's experience as a new resource for research. Feminist research originates not only in a homogenised category of women's experience but rather it is to be found in multiple and often contradicting identities. Each of these identities give us multiple ways of seeing society. Reflexivity in feminist research provides an alternative way of seeing the everyday. Women studying themselves or women studying their daily experiences, from the point of view of understanding the sources of social power becomes important. The epistemology and the ontology of the researchers become important for us in order to develop an alternative way of seeing society.

Post modernist and post structuralist theories

Post modernist and post structuralist theories have critiqued the standpoint theories for ignoring the fact that there are differences in the categories of women. Hekman (1997) believes that the standpoint theorists have been unable to take into account the post modernist and post structuralist prospectus. Bar On (1993) posits that these theories have tried to construct a vision of society from the point of view of the marginalised group depending on the distance from the centre of power. For Bar On there is no centre and the standpoint theorists have been unable to account for the effect of multiple intersecting oppressions. Standpoint theories do not account for the structural constraint faced by the marginalised group. They are guilty of foundationalism (Lazreg, 1994). Postmodern

feminists believe that research is always situated⁷. The postmodern way of knowing society is only one way of understanding society. Postmodern thinkers like Derrida and Foucault have influenced feminist methodology and thought. Postmodern feminists contend that all knowledge is epistemic and is influenced by social structures of power. Postmodern feminist have deconstructed traditional binaries like masculine/feminine; nature/reason that influenced knowledge construction. This is seen in the works of Butler (1990, 2017) who argues that gender is performative and this emanates from our social experiences. The researcher and the subject of research are always speaking and seeing society from a particular set of perspective. There are social and cultural restraints that fashion our existence.

In the 1990s, feminists began to question the gender binary and began to deconstruct the category of women. Butler (1990, 2017) questioned the sex gender binary and posited that sex and gender were not just biological but were also socially and culturally constructed. This opened up new perspectives for research. The concept of gender performativity by Butler also led to understanding gender diversity beyond the perception of normality of male and female categories and also heterosexuality. Gender embodiment expanded to include diverse identities like transgender and queer. Toril Moi (2001) advocated for research based on the situatedness of women which opened up avenues of different identities not just limited by biology. So an individual could biologically be a woman but could identify as a trans.

Queer Research

Queer research emerged with the emergence of poststructural methods and methodologies. The questioning of gender as a binary entity and the recognition that gender is performative and is fashioned by the social aids in this. Browne and Nash (2016) argue that it is important to keep the category queer as non normative and fluid. The fixing of a queer identity leads to the emergence of an informal

policing of the queer identity wherein some forms of 'queerness' are privileged more than the others. The research subject in this case is an unstable category and is understood spatially, both geographically and socially. The identity of the queer subject is fluid and intersecting. This is challenging to the binary ordering of gendered identities. It is also challenging in terms of heterosexuality or homosexuality. It unsettles existing categories like man, woman, homosexuals and heterosexuals.

The methods that we use for queer research often let us speak to the subjects on the basis of gender and/or sexuality and within frameworks that are non normative. These frameworks are also used by feminists, gay, lesbian and postcolonial researchers. The queer identity destabilises the epistemological and ontological assumptions about man, woman, lesbian, bisexual or homosexual. For the researcher too there is a destabilising of their gendered identities which may have been constituted using a binary framework. The methods of research used are qualitative and use standard research techniques like questionnaires, interviews and ethnographic methods. Quantitative data collection becomes a challenge since the identities are often blurred. Data collection strategies have to be contextualised and modified as per the social and cultural worlds which these research subjects occupy. There is no specific queer method but there is a need to understand the queer methodology.

The Critical Turn and New materialism

Critical theorists like Benhabib (1999), Hartsock (1983) and Harding (1991) argue that it is important to understand the importance of understanding that the project of women's emancipation is not yet complete. They stress the need to focus on the material reality that includes gender, class, nationality and class amongst other such factors. These factors are also intersecting. They argue that there is a need to go beyond modernisation's project of emancipation and progress and to include the gendered subjectivity in terms of the body, language and culture. Lived experiences of all individuals from different genders

also brought men into the ambit. The focus has been on men who have been oppressed by the dominant hegemonic masculine culture.

⁷ There has also been a shift in terms of researching men as the oppressed. The standpoint theories focus on production of knowledge from the margins. Their critical stance against the dominant episteme has

they argue matter. This also recognises that men too are gendered.

Theorists like Diana Coole and Samantha Frost (2010) contend that though the Cartesian dualism has been rejected we should not forget that gender is also embodied. They bring back the physical body into research. The body is the site for experiencing emotions and other experiences. They focus on incorporating ethics of care, empathy etc. into research. These influence our material reality. The new methodological turn also brings into focus the non humans and how interaction with these impacts our lives.

CONCLUSION

In this article we have explored the ways in which feminist methodology has developed. The development of feminist perspectives for research introduced the gendered dimensions in research. This led to new ways of seeing the social. Feminists were critical of the androcentric perspective. They contended that it was important to do research from a gendered perspective. The feminist perspectives for research led to change in the existing knowledge structures and in the dominant epistemes.

Feminist methodologies in research are distinct in their aim to explore, understand, and advocate for gender equality and social justice. These methodologies are not just about incorporating women and gender into research, but also about fundamentally challenging traditional ways of creating knowledge and interrogating the power dynamics that shape this process. Feminist research often employs an intersectional approach, acknowledging that gender intersects with other identity markers such as race, class, sexuality, and ability. This approach ensures a more comprehensive analysis of the ways in which various forms of oppression and privilege operate. This involves the researcher being critically aware and reflexive of their own influence on the research process, including how their biases, beliefs, and background shape their approach to the research topic. Reflexivity is crucial in feminist research to address the power imbalances between researcher and subjects and to strive for ethical integrity. Feminist methodology also stressed on the affective turn and the impact of affect on understanding the ways in which gender operates in society not just through institutions

but also through embodied experiences and emotional engagements.

Feminist standpoint theory argues that knowledge is socially situated. Marginalised groups have unique experiences that provide them with particular insights. Feminist researchers often prioritise the voices of women and other marginalised groups who are typically silenced or marginalised in conventional research paradigms. Feminist methodologies often utilise participatory research methods that involve subjects in the research process, aiming to empower participants and address power imbalances between the researcher and the researched. This can include collaborative data analysis, co-creation of research questions, and shared dissemination of findings. Feminist methodologies question the traditional notion of objectivity in research, arguing that all research is subjective and influenced by personal and cultural perspectives. Instead, feminist researchers advocate for "situated knowledge" that acknowledge the specific contexts in which knowledge is produced. These methodologies aim not only to improve the rigour of academic inquiry but also to make it more inclusive and directly engaged with social change. Feminist methodologies challenge the status quo and strive to create a research environment that promotes equality and the dismantling of patriarchal structures.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbott, P., Tyler, M., & Wallace, C. (2006). Work and Organisation. In *An Introduction to Sociology: Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 231-271). Routledge.
- [2] Ahmed, S. (2014). Afterword: Emotions and their Objects. In *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (pp. 204-233). Edinburgh University Press.
- [3] Bar On, B. A. (1993). Marginality and Epistemic Privileges. In L. A. Potter (Ed.), *Feminist Epistemologies* (pp. 83-100). Routledge.
- [4] Benhabib, S. (1999). Sexual Difference and Collective Identities: The New Global Constellation. *Signs*, 24 (No. 2 (Winter, 1999)), 335-361.
- [5] Bernard, J. (2013). The Husband's Marriage and the Wife's Marriage. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A Sociological reader* (pp. 207-219). Routledge.

- [6] Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Stanford University Press.
- [7] Browne, K., & Nash, C. J. (2016). Queer Methods and Methodologies: An Introduction. In K. Browne & C. J. Nash (Eds.), *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research* (pp. 1-24). Routledge.
- [8] Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge.
- [9] Butler, J. (2017). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. In C. R. McCann & S.-K. Kim (Eds.), *Feminist Local and Global Theory Perspectives Reader* (pp. 481-492). Routledge.
- [10] Cancian, F. (1992). Feminist Science: Methodologies that Challenge Inequality. *Gender and Society*, 6(4), 623-643.
- [11] Certeau, M. d. (2009). The Practice of Everyday Life. In S. Thornham, C. Bassett, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Media Studies: A Reader* (pp. 76-88). Edinburgh University Press.
- [12] Cockburn, C. (2013). Resisting Equal Opportunities. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A Sociological Reader* (pp. 180-191). Routledge.
- [13] Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. Harper Collins.
- [14] Coole, D., & Frost, S. (Eds.). (2010). *New materialisms: Ontology, agency, and politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822392996>
- [15] Davies, B. (2013). Becoming Male or Female. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A Sociological Reader* (pp. 280-290). Routledge.
- [16] Firestone, S. (1970). *The Dialectic of Sex by Shulamith Firestone 1970*. The Dialectic of Sex by Shulamith Firestone 1970. <https://www.marxists.org/subject/women/authors/firestone-shulamith/dialectic-sex.htm>
- [17] Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- [18] Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice Hall.
- [19] Gorelick, S. (1991, December). Contradictions of Feminist Methodology. *Gender and Society*, 1991, 459-477.
- [20] Gouldner, A. W. (1970). *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. Heinemann.
- [21] Haraway, D. (2017). A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s. In D. T. Meyers (Ed.), *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader* (pp. 501-531). Routledge.
- [22] Harding, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Open University Press.
- [23] Harding, S. (1987). Is There a Feminist Method? In S. G. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism & Methodology* (pp. 1-14). Indiana University Press.
- [24] Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Cornell University Press.
- [25] Harding, S. (2013). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- [26] Hartmann, H. (2013). Capitalism, Patriarchy, Job Segregation. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A Sociological Reader* (pp. 97-111). Routledge.
- [27] Hartsock, N. (1983). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In S. Harding & M. B. P. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology and Philosophy of Science* (pp. 283-310). Reidel.
- [28] Hekman, S. (1997). Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited. *Sign.* (Winter 22), 341-365.
- [29] Lazreg, M. (1994). Women's experience and Feminist Epistemologies: A Critical Neorationalist Approach. In K. L. Whitford (Ed.), *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives Epistemology* (pp. 45-62). Routledge.
- [30] Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the Virtual Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Duke University Press.
- [31] Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of Affect*. Polity Press.
- [32] Mendes, K., Ringrose, J., & Keller, J. (2019). *Digital Feminist Activism: Girls and Women Fight Back Against Rape Culture*. Oxford University Press.
- [33] Mirzoeff, N. (2011, Spring). The Right to Look. *Critical Inquiry*, 37, 473-496.
- [34] Moi, T. (2001). What is a woman? Sex, Gender and the Body in Feminist Theory. In T. Moi (Ed.), *What is a Woman? And other Essays* (pp. 3-62). Oxford University Press.

- [35] Molm, L. (1993). Toward Integrating micro and Macro, Structure and Agency, Science and Feminism. In P. England (Ed.), *Theory on Gender, Feminism on Theory* (pp. 301-312). Aldine de Gruyter.
- [36] Ramazanoglu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology, Challenges and Choices*. Sage publications.
- [37] Smith, D. E. (1974). Women's perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. *Sociological Enquiry*, 44(1), 7-13.
- [38] Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1990). Method, Methodology and Epistemology. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and epistemology in Feminist Sociology* (pp. 21-45). Routledge.
- [39] Thrift, N. (n.d.). *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. Routledge.
- [40] Walby, S. (2013). Gender, Class and Stratification. In *Gender: A Sociological Reader* (pp. 93-95). Routledge.
- [41] Witz, A. (2013). Patriarchy and the Professions. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A Sociological Reader* (pp. 122-132). Routledge.