

MAREK NOWAK 
Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza
PIOTR LUCZYS 
Public Profits Sp. z o.o.

EMOTIONS IN *THE POLISH PEASANT...* RESEARCHER'S REMINISCENCES BASED ON THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF WŁADEK

Abstract

The article aims to answer the questions about the specificity of the presence of emotions in the classic autobiography of Władek, published in: *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918), by William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, a work which has inspired researchers for a hundred years. The authors presented the issues from three different perspectives: (a) theoretical assumptions of sociology by Znaniecki and Thomas, (b) cognitive orientation rooted in research questions and the image of the world of the early twentieth century, and (c) issues of autobiographical analysis interpreted in conjunction with contemporary assumptions of analysis formulated by Fritz Schütze. Apart from questions strictly related to the work of Thomas and Znaniecki, the analysis also includes elements of interpretation of the contemporary evolution of sociology of emotions, leading to the formulation of a simplified description of the evolution of biographical analysis. The conclusions aim to make an instrumental treatment of emotions both in the traditional Thomas and Znaniecki texts and in the contemporary example. This suggests, among other things, a certain level of incompatibility of studies on emotions to classical and selected contemporary research studies, but also allows us to conclude

PhD, Instytut Socjologii; e-mail: marek.nowak@amu.edu.pl (Post-doctoral degree.);
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1749-7669>.

MA; e-mail: luczys@amu.edu.pl; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7062-7461>.

about the status of *The Polish Peasant...*, not so much as a canonical work, but rather a breakthrough for both problems. In the latter case, the attention to emotions was directly related to the evolution of sociological reflection towards individualization (in terms of approach) and towards symbolic interactionism.

Keywords: W.I. Thomas, F. Znaniecki, sociology of emotions, biographical analysis, F. Schütze

INTRODUCTION

In 2018, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the publication of the work of William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki entitled: *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, one of the fundamental works inscribed in the achievements of the Chicago school, but also – a work of significant contribution to the development of the reflection of humanistic sociology and, in its domain, to the development of culturalism, whose prominent representative was the second co-author: Florian Znaniecki. It was a major breakthrough in a certain research tradition opening doors to a new tradition in sociology that is still practiced today – an approach that relies on bibliography within its own context rather than leaning on references. This said the paradigm in the book proposes to study the phenomenon of emotion. This paper aims to analyse the Znaniecki and Thomas approach from three perspectives:

- (1) The theoretical assumptions of the sociology of Znaniecki and Thomas and their conceptualisation;
- (2) Cognitive orientation rooted in research questions and the image of the world of the early twentieth century;
- (3) An autobiographical method that aims to interpret emotions in their connection with memory and autobiographical records.

Each of these areas requires a separate reflection, referring to separate sources in the literature. The starting point is a complex of theoretical assumptions tracing the relative continuity of the positions of the sociology of emotions with the tradition derived from *The Polish Peasant...* Only in this light can one fully visualise the full range of “historicity” in the work of Znaniecki and Thomas. The development of the methodological perspective of biographical analysis will be an illustration for overcoming the weakness of the position which affirms the autobiography as a source without on overreliance on the source material used in *The Polish Peasant...*

EMOTIONS AND SOCIOLOGY OF EMOTIONS VERSUS *THE POLISH PEASANT*..

The “reaction” process, in accordance with the canonical position of Thomas and Znaniecki, shares much with the mechanisms of memory functioning. It is worth mentioning that individual memory receives a separate status here from collective memory (recognized, for example in the memory studies, [cf. Ertl, Nünning 2008]), that dealt with cultural reconstructions, or directly with creation, e.g. the presence of “memory implants” [cf. Golka 2009]¹. Regardless of the nature of memory, whether it is shared by others or not, and to what extent, past events, though probably not all, “are subject to feeling” (emotional valuation) from the awareness of a physical sense of satisfaction or discomfort, and thus are remembered [cf. Talarico, Labar, Rubin 2004]. From it, emerge individual subjectivity and supra-individual regularities that take shape, for example, in autobiographical stories². The meaning of this perspective is illustrated by the specificity of the interpretation of sources as a record of events and feelings formulated by the respondents (through the texts they produce) which are related to the legitimacy of qualitative tools in sociology. The latter, in the proposed approach, is far from sociologism (and therefore a vision of a supra-individual being located in society *per se*) and is, according to the authors, a product of multiplication of “personal elements” that are interpreted through cultural glasses. As Thomas and Znaniecki say elsewhere:

And since concrete social life is concrete only when taken together with the individual life which underlies social happenings, since the personal element is a constitutive factor of every social occurrence, social science cannot remain on the surface of social becoming... [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 8].

The transition from the “surface” to the “social happenings” takes place through individual experience interpreted by the researcher on the basis of autobiographical entries (diaries) or texts prepared by respondents (letters, postcards, and other forms of communication with relatives). At the same time, it is not only about memory as a tool for reconstructing past events in terms of positive

¹ In the latter case, memory in the individual, neurobiological sense cannot be mentioned at all (because we are not talking about our own experience but rather about cultural reproduction and creation), however the message itself is subject to processes that can be rooted neurobiologically, can give them an emotional shade, e.g. pride or shame, and link this fact with specific consequences for the reproduction of the public message and for the collective reality.

² It is probably here that one should observe the deepest connection between contemporary concepts of emotions and the attitude to autobiography represented by Thomas and Znaniecki.

or negative feelings (emotional evaluation of what happened), but rather about the specificity of the “personal element” mechanism of decision/response in relation to the value that is perceived by both authors as a factor determining the chosen path of action (it also indirectly indicates, for example, the importance of the socialisation process as a space for the creation/reproduction of patterns). Such decisions entail, according to the interpretation by Thomas and Znaniecki, relatively far-reaching consequences and lead researchers to generalisations allowing them to grasp cultural specifics (values guided by social actors and direct representation of Polish peasants’ cultures). For this reason, the problem of emotions is not derivative of the image of social relations, which arises during the study of the “five-volume”, but to a significant degree, co-creates the whole, somewhat like a “punctum” in the image. A clear demonstration is the autobiographical story of Władek in volume 3.

To move on to the interpretation of autobiography, it is worthwhile to make theoretical reconstructions on the basis of the already extensive reflection on the sociology of emotions – referring to the two threads inscribed in the tradition initiated by *The Polish Peasant...*³ and an element that does not exist there.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF EMOTIONS IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF THOMAS AND ZNANIECKI

In order to understand the meaning of emotions in the work of Thomas and Znaniecki, an understanding of concepts such as personality, social personality, individual life, and social happenings, is crucial. Factors such as “individual” and “social” influence each other, and in the words of the authors themselves: “... individual consciousness and objective social reality” [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 5]. In relation to the phenomenon of emotions, understood as a “complex system of interactions between objective and subjective facts” [cf. Kleinginna, Kleinginna 1981: 355], the essence of thinking about the emotions of both authors can be captured when we juxtapose “temperament” and “character” in a theoretical description.

We may call temperament the fundamental original group of attitudes of the individual as existing independently of any social influences; we may call character the set of organized and fixed groups of attitudes developed by social influences operating upon the temperamental basis [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 18].

³ Cf. the classic position by Jonathan H. Turner and Jan E. Stets [Turner, Stets 2006] and the synthesizing and critical approach to the achievements of the sociology of emotions by Eduardo Bericat [Bericat 2016].

From this point of view, temperament is individual and “instinctive”; character is reflective and social. This does not mean, however, that each time a temperament is something unconscious (a drive that dominates us), but that it reveals itself especially when it is inhibited in a social context (our behaviour does not meet with approval, which has emotional consequences: a sense of shame, danger, etc.). As Thomas and Znaniecki said:

... the temperamental attitudes are not systematically organized and co-ordinated among themselves in the whole course of personal life but are only associated with each other by being repeatedly used together for the production of certain common results in certain conditions provided by the organism and its environment (...). A group of temperamental attitudes either finds its expression at a given moment by pushing others aside, or is pushed aside by some other group and is not expressed at all [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 19–20].

In the stories of Thomas and Znaniecki, in the biographical build-up of experiences, there is a kind of competition in making individual decisions, where what is “instinctive” competes with what is socially constructed. Emotions remain an instrument of regulation in the process of “creating” a social personality, at least to some extent. The regulatory sense of emotions is not directly visible. An example is the question of the need for recognition, strongly emphasized in the interpretation of Thomas and Znaniecki, typical for peasant culture, or more broadly for the culture of the lower classes. More precisely, the element of control is a refusal to recognize (example of Władek’s biography analyzed in the article). This regulation is done by refusing to respect and by denying the right to participate in the household (exile). Emotions can be seen when life decisions are woven into the mechanism of remembrance and into the structure of “building” biography (as a factor in constructing an attitude, e.g. marked with resentment). According to both authors:

The individual does not find passively ready situations exactly similar to past situations; he must consciously define every situation as similar to certain past situations, if he wants to apply to it the same solution applied to those situations. [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 26].

It is worth specifying on the basis of the interpretation of Władek’s autobiographical story that the work with this empirical material was not intended to serve the authors to achieve a cognitive goal, i. e., development of a specific theoretical position, its verification, or refinement of the method of biographical analysis, but to address questions about the sources of barriers to the social integration of Central European emigrants on American soil. About Władek’s autobiography that described him as a person not distinguished by special features or disposition, the authors wrote: “... we find in his temperament neither any

exceptional buoyancy which would push him to search continually for new experiences in any one line nor any exceptional depression that would lead to a too great stability” [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 401]. This suggests a certain level of mediocrity of interest to them, which gives grounds for treating this biography as typical. The key theme of the conclusions of both authors indicate that the factors shaping Władek as an emigrant were not “instinctive”, but

This dependence on the expression is a general feature of people with a relatively low intellectual development, and explains many sudden friendships and enmities, breaks and reconciliations. The inconsistency which we have noticed in Władek’s relation to his family depends on this in a large measure (...) the rapidly acquired pleasure or disgust in connection with a social milieu, etc. [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 406].

As one can easily realize, the indicated fragment of the summary interprets the status of emotions in social relations as an aspect of the social condition of the autobiographer. Emotions are not so much treated as an attribute – component of biography *per se*, but as a distinctive factor of a specific (peasant) location. This aspect consistently appears in the interpretative part, just as the more general perception of “emotionality” as a culturally understood social class of Władek. Accordingly, emotions were treated as a factor of social distinction. In a sense, therefore, the reflection of Thomas and Znaniecki could be a prototype of Pierre Bourdieu’s conclusion [cf. Bourdieu 1984], referring to the folk class. In opposition to this observation there is another generalisation:

in whatever he does there is a theatrical attitude, a strong cabotinism (histrionic) which he does not lose at the most important moments of his life, and which explains the lack of directness, of immediate sincerity in his emotions [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 408].

It indicates that the point of Władek’s life was to focus on convention and manipulation of the environment. The two images do not fully match, or at least this seems to be the case when he seriously takes the “typical character” of Władek as a representative of a particular class. Studying biography itself could be helpful, where it soon turns out that Władek is not a typical representative of the peasant class (he comes rather from the lowest segment of the petite bourgeoisie class). Fulfilling the professional role of an agricultural worker, that happens to him on his life’s way, he treats as a temporary declasation. The biography itself is characterized by a different level of emotionality of description. The first part is emotionally saturated, describing childhood and youth, followed by a description of “coping” with adventures and using emotions to achieve individual goals, fitting perfectly into the mechanism developed by Thomas and Znaniecki on the theoretical grounds: subjectively rational use of experiences in making decisions

concerning subsequent actions. Such ambivalence towards emotions has its roots in the historical specificity of looking at the phenomenon. It is also dictated by the goals that the analysis sets for itself, and is, therefore, a consequence of the attitude adopted by the researcher.

In the context of conceptualisation, it is worth not only to notice the influence of the intellectual atmosphere and research environment at the turn of the 19th and 20th century on Thomas and Znaniecki's analyses but also the controversial directions of their conclusions that serve as an inspiration for the development of sociology that acknowledges the importance of emotions in analyses of social dynamics and of biographical materials.

COGNITIVE ORIENTATIONS ROOTED IN RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND A WORLD IMAGE FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY

It should be borne in mind that the retrospective analysis of the approach of emotions on the basis of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* may succumb to the pressure of referring to the "great names of world sociology". However, between 1900 and 1920, American social sciences and their proper literature of that period were of completely different characters, different polemics and ways of conceptualizing theoretical and methodological positions.

American sociology, from the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century reduced emotions, feelings and related activities to "resentments", "affections" and the effects of instrumental conditioning. The tradition continued for many more years, especially in experimental psychology, taking the form of John Broadus Watson's early behaviourism and Burtus Frederic Skinner's late behaviourism, which denied the epistemic usefulness of studying mental states, and consequently – their emotional representations [Skinner 1938: 3–5, 263–264, 440–441; Skinner 2005: 29–31, 102–106, 143–145, 270–281, 372–379]. American sociology, however, by the end of the nineteenth century had a long history of fighting the physiological and biological approach to individual and collective emotions, which was expressed in the first-ever textbook on sociology [Small, Vincent 1894; Willcox 1894]. Edward C. Hayes, another of the pioneers of American sociology, regarded emotions as accompanying ideas, states of mind, collective actions, and analysed their concurrence with instincts and their causal or reactive roles in various social activities undertaken by groups [1915]. Sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists debated the boundaries of scientific disciplines. Many considered their involvement in exploring emotions solely as exploring the role

of physical existence in the creation of what is social [Ward 1899]. Emotions, thus, remained outside the main interest of sociologists as a topic that was used when it was convenient, but one that was never included in a theoretical framework or research methodologies.

A more detailed analysis of American sociology against the backdrop of social sciences reveals that the sociological approach to theorizing about or researching into emotions was excluded. For Lewis H. Morgan, an American anthropologist, emotions and imagination were the elements of human nature that were best articulated in religious images [Morgan 1877]. Their role was therefore subordinated to religiousness as one of the leading themes of anthropological research. Sociologists and philosophers embraced the same stance assuming emotionality as a denial of what was rational and socially constructive. Such thinking was evident in the works of John F. Crowell [1898], Newell L. Sims [1912], Robert M. MacIver [1917], and Henry P. Fairchild [1916] who justified their position by theses about “excessive emotivity” of women. However, this was not a bizarre case in American sociology of that period [Bascom 1887]. Daniel G. Brinton, an American ethnologist and archaeologist, saw the nature of such subordination of emotions in relation to religiousness in the very construction of the human mind, in which emotions had their “seat”, although the spectrum of their manifestation and experience was different for different people [Brinton 1902].

While emotions are universal, their individual types can only be known to certain groups of people, characters and personalities. Thus, they are not a cohesive force; they are individual characteristics. Frank W. Blackmar, the ninth president of the American Sociological Association, opposed such a notion. He believed a group experiencing emotions was one of the main forces shaping primitive human communities. He referred to these as instincts. Other emotions such as altruism and sympathy were the catalysts for social development and complex economic relations in society [cf. Blackmar 1890, 1926; Blackmar, Gillin 1917]. Theoretical considerations of Charles H. Cooley [1902] and the representatives of neoclassical economics [Carver 1905] followed in the same direction. Many sociologists, however, were of the opinion that emotions were depleted in instincts, that their origin was definitely zoonotic and that “unless emotions are guided by ideas they are blind” [Gillette 1916].

A small group of researchers considered emotions, will and soul as dynamic components of the mental forces of society [Ward 1883; Dealey, Ward 1905; Dealey 1909; Smith 1917; Dealey 1920]. From a contemporary perspective, they treated those as the components of attitudes – an idea that W.I. Thomas expressed in *The Polish Peasant...* Others, Edward A. Ross who coined the concept of “social

control”, among them, believed emotions were proper only to the behaviour of the crowd [Ross 1910]. Rowe labeled a crowd as “social masses” [Rowe 1916]. Among the “humanising” sociologies of that period that were closer to Znaniecki, emotions were treated as a constitutive element of social consciousness and/or as one of the manifestations of the “social mind” functioning [Giddings 1896, 1922; Todd 1918; Smith 1920]. At the crossroads of the two views were researchers who claimed that “collective emotions” lead to the perception of “others outside oneself” and thus to the formation of groups and entire communities [Moore 1916].

This attention to the socialising role of emotions is also present in the works of the functionalist sociologists in the tradition of Spencer organicism [Fairbanks 1902]. However, representatives of evolutionists, among sociologists, were restrained in their search for other sources of emotions than the biological ones [Davies 1917; Chapin 1920]. They assumed that emotions existed, but they did not treat those as a topic of interest in their studies or the domain of work of representatives of other disciplines [Ellwood 1910, 1915]. Interestingly, where sociological sub-disciplines were closer to “sociological social psychology”, e.g. the sociology of education of David Snedden [1920] or William E. Chancellor [1919], emotions were treated not so much as a circumstance accompanying the subjects of studies, but as a topic to be addressed in itself – to be defined and extracted in scope from other areas of social sciences and humanities. However, this approach of capturing emotions failed to make its way into the sociological mainstream of the period. Both, the behaviorists and American authors of sociology texts [Brown 1885; Stuckenberg 1903; Henderson 1911; Dow 1920] shared the assumption of pragmatism about the need for exploring socially relevant topics. These scholars differed radically in describing and evaluating individuals, often depriving them of their efficiency in defining problems and involuntarily objectifying their own, external view of the described communities. It is hard to ignore that a majority of sociology textbooks of that time were not written by sociologists but by art historians, political philosophers, economists, administrators and clergy – people never connected with academic teaching.

This state of affairs remained unchanged until George Herbert Mead’s concept was reworked and brought closer to sociologists in Herbert Blumer’s works. Mead and Blumer were the direct expressions of American pragmatism in sociology. Considering that Znaniecki qualified as a representative of pragmatism [Herbut 2007: 442], one can detect the affinity in their approaches. Many would argue that *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* established a bridge between psychologising social sciences and symbolic interactionism, which ultimately gave emotions a more sociological expression and a supra-individual perspective.

Just as culturalism should be combined with methodological individualism and the rejection of epistemological fundamentalism, so should the sources of “interactionism” be associated with the rejection of naturalism and cultural determinism [Hałas 2007: VII]. Thomas’s “definition of the situation”, which resounds both in symbolic interactionism [Woroniecka 2007] and in Goffman’s drama theory [Goffman 2010], has been open from the beginning to the exploratory potential of emotions in describing social situations [Ziółkowski 1981: 24–32]. In Blumer’s opinion, the observation of human behavior “comes in the form of a judgment based on sensing the social relations of the situation in which the behavior occurs” [Blumer 1969: 178]. His “sensitising concepts” indicate (in addition to definition) certain phenomena in their contextual location, the cognition (“perception”) of which is related to their experience by the researcher, and thus also to: their feeling; the reference to a specific impression on them and its interpretation [Hałas 2007: XV]. In this sense, emotions are no longer just a subject of reflection or research, but a fully legitimate component of autobiographical methodology, a frame of construction – the “personal elements” mentioned earlier. It is worth remembering that H. Blumer owes us a fundamental work-commentary to *The Polish Peasant...*, although the subject matter of emotions appears in very few fragments and, each time is presented as one of the motivations for action, mixed with biological needs, feelings, interests and ideas [Blumer 1939]. Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that it was only a complement to the definitions used by the author listing and not a separate subject of cognitive care or the framework of the analysis of this work. Did American sociology change its attitude to emotions after the publication of *The Polish Peasant...*? To some extent, the answer is in the affirmative as Elżbieta Hałas argues:

After the Second World War Blumer continued the legacy of the Chicago school together with Everett Hughes, Anselm Strauss and other scholars who are referred to as “the second Chicago school”. At that time, various forms of symbolic interactionism were developed, in which two main currents were singled out. The first, called sociological social psychology, was oriented towards the changes occurring in individuals as a result of interaction. Sometimes the whole theory was identified with this variant of symbolic interactionism. The second, on the other hand, focused on the role of communication processes in creating and changing the social order. The first direction of research was connected with the work of George Herbert Mead, a pragmatic philosopher, whose lectures in social psychology also had an impact on sociologists. The second with William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki and the impact of Robert E. Park’s concept [Hałas 2007: VII–VIII].

Embracing emotions in the context of communication has come a long way since the publication of “Introduction to the Science of Sociology” by R.E. Park and E.W. Burgess [1921], where their description referred mainly to Darwinian

“expression of emotions” and the concept of “social mind”. In the introduction to the Polish edition of this work, Znaniecki wrote:

One can disagree with the theoretical position of Professors Park and Burgess, emphasized in those parts of the book in which they express their own views; one can desire that contemporary sociology be in many respects different than it is: but one cannot deny that this work is such a faithful picture of its present state, which no purely individual work could have given.

And then:

the Anglo-American sociological literature is incomparably richer and much more scientifically valuable in general than any other literature [Znaniecki 1926: V–VI].

A sociologist who studies emotions may not agree with many of the authors' assertions, hence, a review of different positions deserves consideration. Moreover, it shows the direction in which sociological reflection on the role of emotions in social life took place soon afterward [Burgess 1926]. At the time of this writing, it is the progressive orientation towards communication processes that are considered by many researchers to be the reason for the introduction of hitherto secondary themes (e.g. love) to the leading discourse of contemporary sociology [Gdula 2006: 84]. On the other hand, however, the claims that sociologists did not undertake “systematic studies of emotions” until the 1970s [Turner, Stets 2009: 15] seem to be definitely exaggerated if we do not think only of emotions as a complex psychosocial-cultural phenomenon, with a neurophysiological background, but a bit more broadly – as an immanent element of interpersonal communication and the research method itself. Then, the conceptual and interpretive role of emotions, which are something more (constructivist understanding) than their image presented in the previous sentence (realistic understanding), comes to the foreground. Both Znaniecki's culturalist sociology and “early psychological sociology”, of which W. I. Thomas was considered a representative, strongly emphasized the socially constructed character of social reality *sui generis*, rejecting both nominal and realistic approaches. This approach to social reality is also close to pragmatism, which is a version of relativism “according to which the truth of cognition is determined not by the attitude to the object, but by the goal achieved by cognition” [Herbut 2007: 442].

In one word: somewhere between the end of the 1920s and 1937, when H. Blumer used the term “symbolic interactionism” for the first time, the first fully sociological understanding of emotions arose, which perhaps would never have seen the light of day without the contribution of the authors of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* to the legacy of the first and second Chicago school and symbolic interactionism.

**EMOTIONS IN THOMAS AND ZNANIECKI'S
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL METHOD AND CONTEMPORARY
ANALYSIS BY FRITZ SCHÜTZE**

The perspective used by Znaniecki and Thomas can be summarized in the assumptions of analytical induction, the essence of which is the belief in the existence of a limited number of types in social reality. The role of the researcher is to identify them not on the basis of statistical representativeness, or mapping the distribution of characteristics in the society (e.g. the so-called quota selection), but to capture the full possible set of different types. However, this is not a vision of measurement, some kind of a fixed memento of human personality.

The essential points, which cannot be here sufficiently emphasized, are that the social personality as a whole manifests itself only in the course of its total life and not at any particular moment of its life, and that its life is not a mere empirical manifestation of a timeless metaphysical essence, always the same, but is a continuous evolution in which nothing remains unchanged [...]. On the other hand, from the standpoint of nomothetic social science this total development should be entirely analyzable into elementary facts, each indefinitely repeatable and subordinated to a general law [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 11–12].

The subject of the research is not only individual “components” of the shaped personality but the whole biographies, and it is in their interpretation (or against their background) that the premises of grasping social regularities, lead to generalizations (criticizing simultaneously the tools investigating “mass” and “accidental” aspects of social life, such as survey research). Hence the conviction (already mentioned above) that autobiographical material is the most perfect source of analysis, because it offers something like a biographical generalization (which will make it easier to identify universalising types), while more precisely the subject of autobiographical analysis remains the aspects that are culturally distinctive (values, attitudes) in relation to universal ones. As it seems, some intellectual affinities with the concept of the ideal, Weber-type are clear, as Elżbieta Hałas points out [Hałas 1991: 108–118].

We are interested in the issue of the way emotions are researched, as long as linguistic expressions of emotions co-create autobiographical narration and are the subject of Thomas and Znaniecki's research inference. What seems obvious, and what is of key importance for the interpreters of the work of both authors: the narration is a verbal construction, however, and there is considerable freedom for the narrator to choose what to present and what to conceal in accounts of life [Ruth, Vilkkio 1996: 168]. Therefore, it is a form of creation that combines the influences of the experience itself, physical and biological, in the process of

life and interpretation of experiences by the subject. One can also suggest more: emotions are not only a part of the story, sometimes they are the story.

This is manifested in three ways. First, when emotions are treated as an aspect of the subject's activities, reconstructing its past in terms of specific components of the story, twists and turns, and the importance of certain moments, one deals with emotional texts. Second, when emotions shape an experience influencing the way a story is told, one may deduce the influence of emotions on memory [cf. Talarico, Labar, Rubin 2004], strengthening or masking certain moments. Third, when the reporter considers emotions to be significant not only to oneself but also to the anticipated recipient, it may make the text more credible [cf. Ruth, Vilkkko 1996: 167]. In the work of Thomas and Znaniecki, we are presented with all three ways of the presence of emotions mediated by memory, which is inscribed in the properties of the method, once again opening the field for its interpretation and criticism.

For a sociologist, a presence of emotions and manifestations of image creation overlap with the "collective" specificity of constructing a description of one's own life, which renders a near-perfect reconstruction of the concept of Pierre Bourdieu's "habitus", where social class and gender, play their roles [cf. Bourdieu 1984: 32]. Thus, one may draw conclusions about a specific type of biography; in literature, one finds such differences in interpretations. However, crucial for autobiographical analyses are:

subjective interpretations and reinterpretations, the individual meaning-giving process of life episodes, the experience of growing and aging, the social construction of the self, and the discourse by which emotional states are produced as well as the reciprocal act of telling and listening [por. Ruth, Vilkkko 1996: 170].

Referring to the previous observation, each of the indicated aspects (in total 4, the last one will appear in the further part of the text): (1) biographical experiences, (2) the social construction of oneself and (3) the aspect of communication in the context of one's own past, are marked by social distinctions, which is not insignificant for the very method based on the "humanistic coefficient"⁴ [Thomas, Znaniecki 1918], i.e. a tool of contextual, research interpretation of data having the character of autobiographical stories. Classicality, manifested mainly

⁴ In "The Methodological Note", a key fragment of the first volume of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, there is no explicit "humanistic coefficient", but the theory of Znaniecki's values and social activities on which he is founded is articulated [cf. Przystalski, Włodarek 2011: 32–34]. As the authors say: "The methodological concept presented here takes on a new, modified form in the *Introduction to Sociology* published four years later, i.e. in 1922. Znaniecki systematizes here the theoretical ideas and innovations introduced in *The Polish Peasant...*, giving his theoretical and methodological approach the name «humanistic coefficient»" [Przystalski, Włodarek 2011: 35].

by the level of emotionality of the notation, illustrates a specific attitude toward life, which is often perceived as fate or randomness, or using cause-and-effect schemes, that is attributed to a more developed reflectiveness, associated with the level of educational capital. The pressure of class position can, therefore, be seen in the context of interpreting the sense of perpetration and, in practice, its limitations when describing less privileged positions. Sensory deprivation or acts of discrimination can cause sadness, regret or anger. A similar profile of the story manifests itself in women and men, although in the interpretation of women's statements the generational perspective seems to play a greater role. This is related to the evolution of the emancipatory discourse, which significantly changes, not so much the level of emotionality, but changes the positions of women telling stories from passive to active [cf. Ruth, Vilkkö 1996: 170–171]. The shape of emotions is treated from this perspective as a consequence of an understanding of what might have happened, e.g. acts of violence or discrimination, and the changes faced by the subject; therefore, it is created at a discursive level based on the original experiences. Within a text, emotions serve as tools for openly displaying joy and sadness, or concealing behind metaphors.

It can be assumed that the meaning of any story, public or private, therapeutic or research, in English or Polish, modifies the way emotions are revealed. This indirectly indicates the importance of narrative conventions, from which it is difficult to disregard, especially when we refer to the tradition of organizing competitions for diaries initiated by Znaniecki⁵, and not, for example, the contemporary practice of narrative autobiographical interviews, based on the proposals of Fritz Schütze [cf. Kaźmierska, Schütze 2013; Schütze 2014]. Let us add that both authors in a certain way follow Thomas and Znaniecki, sharing the conviction of the value of autobiography for analysis in social sciences, partially deconstructing them⁶, introducing a conditional mode to the interpretation

⁵ The tradition of diary competitions continued in Poland, long after the publication in the early 1920s of *The Polish Peasant...*, among others in the Institute for Western Affairs in Poznań, where there are also archives containing source materials (*Metoda autobiograficzna w socjologii polskiej przed i po II wojnie światowej*, eng. Autobiographical method in Polish sociology before and after World War II), within the Archive of Western and Northern Lands, on-line information text: <http://www.iz.poznan.pl/azzip/konkursy-pamietnikarskie/> [access: 26.08.2019]).

⁶ Schütze takes the position that it is possible – due to the specificity of reconstructing biographical experiences – to capture moments of authenticity, and thus: the material written in the convention of autobiography to be published remains valuable, assuming of course the ability to reconstruct the specificity of “telling” by the researcher's interpreter. As he proves himself: “the extempore narrator is focused on the main story line, concentrating on what is conceived of as biographically relevant events – driven by the narrative drive and constraint to condense” [Schütze

of similar material. The approach means at least two things: to see an autobiography as more than the individual experiences (as the sense of cognitive analysis) and to separate the cultural context from the story to capture what is not relative to specific cultural models. Thus, it also means reconstructing, and to some extent, rejecting Znaniecki's culturalism, as well as reducing cognitive expectations regarding the identification of cultural differences and their consequences for the perspective of groups or classes.

This "de-cultural" approach to autobiography activates the last context of an autobiographical story, connected with the position (4) of the recipient-listener. Emotions, hence, attain a separate aspect of "sharing"; the reader becomes a participant and interprets the emotions in the context of his own experience or professional perspective. This is the case however insofar as it reflects the meaning of emotions both at the level of morphology of building autobiography of the subject (e.g. in the context of mechanisms of biographical memory) and their meaning in the story itself (of a specific person, in a specific context; in the text cited by Schütze: war experience), which here is no longer a purposeful creation because for the researcher it is a record of the "authenticity" of experience. Experiences that he himself had to work over cognitively and understand, in accordance with the recommendation of H. Blumer described earlier. As Kaźmierska and Schütze state: it allows us to recapitulate what we have experienced, at the same time giving an insight into the mechanisms of constructing biographies, which gains the status of the main research problem [cf. Kaźmierska, Schütze 2013: 126]. For the latter, the autobiography analysis procedure involves at least three steps and is first and foremost governed by the question of "authenticity of the text" and more precisely by the answers to the question of "authenticity of the text":

how much of the empirical text material is the result of authentic extempore narration of personal experiences (and not of pre-planned and calculated, mostly argumentative, presentation) [Schütze 2014: 230].

In this context, it seems important to point to the awareness of the tensions generated by building autobiography as a text, which reveals itself in a theoretical analysis of autobiographical material. Schütze, referring to his work from the early 1980s, indicates that:

background constructions are the result of the narrative drives and constraints of off-the-cuff storytelling. There are three of them: (1) the drive and constraint to condense, (2) the drive and constraint to go into details, (3) and the drive and constraint to close the textual forms [Schütze 2014: 236].

2014: 239]. Ergo, there is a possibility of separating in the narrative story what is authentic in it, in opposition to what is the effect of retrospective creativity.

To some extent, it can be said that the element of the mentioned “authenticity” remains a layer of emotions that constituted (marked) remembering, assuming, of course, that we accept (at least to some extent) the connection of emotions with the reconstructed history, precisely as a “punctum” of experiencing what was happening in the environment of the subject. It is worth emphasizing that terms that are indicators of emotions are treated definitely instrumentally in the analyses mentioned above which suggests their more general intention. The next steps concern a structural description of the text, understood as a distinguishing of specific parts of the text, aimed at grasping the structure of the story and analytical abstraction, leading to grasping what is detailed in relation to what is universal in the autobiographical story which gives grounds for grasping the uniqueness of the text in its key comparability with other text or texts, which in turn is essential for the Schütze concept:

detect various alternative socio-biographical processes and their features within the field under study, to depict the basic mechanisms and features common to all the alternative processes, and to delineate the theoretical variation of processes and their social frames within the topical field under study [Schütze 2014: 231].

The research reflection focuses not so much on the subject entangled in historical events, but on the individual process of building biographies based on the past, as a reference for events arranged in a causal sequence. The record is the result of individual, socio-cultural processing of “raw material” up to a specific (final) shape of the published autobiography. Thus, the researcher acts in a manner contrary to the practice of the author of the autobiographical statement. He separates what is primordial and experiential from what is built upon in order to reconstruct and theorize about the process that took place after the biography “arose” (from the moment of experience to the moment of taking the form of a textual statement and thus, in a sense, obtaining a “mature” shape).

It is probably worth emphasizing here that Schütze’s analysis, similar to the analysis of Thomas and Znaniecki, is subordinated to a specific utilitarian goal. Therefore, the aim is not only to reach the process of building a biography, as a universal mechanism but also to realize that the clinical goal of an autobiography may be therapeutic. Here the emotional status is not fully instrumental but becomes an element of interpretation serving a therapeutic action [Schütze 2007]. Thomas and Znaniecki formulated clinical goals in relation to *The Polish Peasant...*, understanding the factors determining biography in a completely different way. In a way, the “peasantry” of the Polish peasants was both an explanation and a social problem. What is important from the formal point of

view in Thomas and Znaniecki's works is to note an absence of any attempts to penetrate into the "authenticity" of experience, or structuring. Also missing is an in-depth reflection on the "work" that has taken place, or that of the creator of the biography, offering the reader its final shape.

In a sense however, Thomas and Znaniecki's analysis was not entirely unstructured because the function of the analysis tool was played here by footnotes (or, more precisely, notes at the bottom of the page), the content of which can be set within the analytical formula of the "pre-humanistic" coefficient, where – given their content – it is Znaniecki who translates the events described by Władek in a language resembling the story of an ethnographer or cultural anthropologist. He translates in this way, e.g. feasting behaviours and customs and points to their cultural and class background [cf. Thomas, Znaniecki 1919: 342–344], allowing us to understand a sequence of events or to place them in the context of contemporary historical events for Władek.

A slightly different status is given to the comments and remarks. These are formulated in the footnotes, concerning the specificity of Polish peasants' culture, being either references to earlier analyses or to scientific knowledge or even knowledge whose sources can be embedded in common notions such as prejudices based on social class. There is yet another set of remarks referring to explanations of specific behaviours showing normative tendencies, e.g. in the relationships between the sexes or in the primary group. More recently, this layer of the text could be a manifestation of a distinct phase of analysis and be subject to a separate structuring due to the object and analytical sense and due to the conclusions that existed in a separate subchapter immediately after Władek's autobiography [Thomas, Znaniecki 1919]. It is not surprising that emotions do not find their special place unless one considers that culture, just like Polish peasants, was characterized by an exceptional emotionality, which is unjustified. As a whole, even this disordered collection of comments directs the reader's interest in a different direction than Schütze does. Nevertheless, the form of notation is the nucleus of structuring, even without being aware of its methodological sense.

However, it must be stressed that Thomas and Znaniecki's analytical strategy did not focus on autobiographical material but on questions concerning social life in its cultural specificity; more precisely, it sets itself some application-related, some "clinical" goals, grasping cultural specificity and examining the differences between Polish peasants and Americans in emigration conditions. The key question is about the status of emotions in both cases. This approach enables one to detect the differences separating the beginning of experiences with the methodology of biographical analysis from the contemporary attempts.

As it seems, in both cases, it is not central, although in both texts emotions are a component of the interpretation of the dynamics of events at the initial stage of analysis. In the case of contemporary analysis, they mark the “authenticity” of the text and, in this sense, mark subsequent phrases/events in biography when something important for the subject (and for autobiography) happens. In the case of Thomas and Znaniecki’s analysis, they are perceived analogously in the key moments, although they are described rather as manifestations of inability to direct the fate of the subject under analysis, whether they directly play the role of an indicator of susceptibility to pathological behaviours or interpreted as dysfunctional. As has already been mentioned, in Thomas and Znaniecki’s works emotions have become, in a way, “hostages” of the widespread analytical context, typical of the period in which both authors lived. A context that did not fully belong to sociology (in any case, understood in relation to the interactionist tradition).

CONCLUSIONS AND INVITATION TO DISCUSSION

The proposed conclusions and invitation to discussion refer to the work of Thomas and Znaniecki in the context of emotions and are inspired by a specific autobiographical text and a specific analysis made over a hundred years ago. This clarification makes sense because of the attempt to juxtapose a specific autobiography from volume three with Schütze’s contemporary analysis. According to the authors of the article, the conclusions can be generalized into the whole work of Thomas and Znaniecki, provoking a discussion.

As it seems, the main observation allows us to recapitulate the unclear status of emotions and, in a sense, to separate these from their social context, e.g., contrasting temperament and character; inborn/personal and social attitudes. Emotions play the role of an indicator of distinction and not a tool or mechanism of the social functioning of an individual in a social environment.

Just as in the contemporary interpretation of the autobiographical text, they are an indicator of the importance of the event for the dynamics of the story and, indirectly, for the storyteller, so in the second case they are rather a testimony to the excess of the presence of the personal factor in the construction of the subject’s activity. This brings the understanding of emotions closer to the understanding of the factor distorting the subjective rationality of the process of building biography and undermines, at the level of a specific subject, the functionality of the socialisation process (understood as the process of an individual’s entering into social roles). This is probably due to two reasons that can be inscribed in the concepts of Thomas and Znaniecki. The first one can be described as “theoretical”. It is

connected with the “recognition” of memory as a factor of the present activity (and memory, as we know, has its own “mechanics” and, apart from neurobiological conditions, is subject to a number of interactions). The key status of biographical memory, present in the paper, can probably be attributed to the level of knowledge that accompanied the first years of sociology’s functioning. It can also be attributed to the specificity of the theoretical construction itself, which underlies one of the currents of academic sociology. As one might think, Elżbieta Hałas described this status well by juxtaposing the positions of Znaniecki and Weber on the pages of her book:

According to Znaniecki, the action is a dynamic system of values, shaped by the actor. Subjected to scientific idealization can be considered as a system of the second degree, i.e. super-structure on a colloquial system of experiences and activities [Hałas 1991: 111].

Emotions, e.g. as a causative factor of actions, would bring Znaniecki’s concepts of action closer to the vision of behaviour. It would also hinder the level of a meta-analysis of the researcher who subjects the autobiographical material to general reflection as material already preliminarily processed by the author, leading directly to generalisations. It can be said that there are no differences between the tradition determined by Thomas and Znaniecki and the contemporary analysis that we used in this article. What undoubtedly differs between the two research approaches is the goal and the sublimation of analytical tools. Here we can also treat the specificity of the contemporary way of dealing with text as a response to weaknesses, unstructured analysis of autobiographical material in Thomas and Znaniecki’s work, but also a solution to the problem of relations between the form of autobiography (autobiographical text) and the essence of autobiography as a process of constructing the identity of a subject based on past experience. An important lack in Thomas and Znaniecki’s analysis is the aspectual presence of emotions as a regulator of group behaviour which was probably the most aptly developed dramaturgical tradition within the interactive paradigm. In this case, the need for recognition and the consequence of the refusal to recognise it (one of the key motives for interpreting Władek’s behaviour) has been deprived of the symmetrical perspective of the broadcasters of the message. In a way, by failing to notice the regulatory sense of emotion, Władek’s family was deprived in the interpretation of his autobiography of the issue of shaping his “infantile” need for reciprocity and recognition (simply attributed by the authors to his “peasantry”). It should be remembered that *The Polish Peasant...* belongs to the works of the boundary period in American sociology, stretching between the periods of naturalisation and psychologisation of the subject of emotions

when the foundations of the sociological approach to the discussed issues arose and they were still far from their final articulation.

The Polish Peasant... does not offer direct answers but addresses the question of the interpretation of the initial material of the analysis. There is no satisfactory criticism of the source to be analysed which would allow us to determine the scope of usefulness, in this case Władek's autobiography, to formulate certain research generalizations. In relation to emotions, this would allow for an in-depth analysis of the text and indication, e.g. of key moments for biography, not on the basis of a normative vision of correct socialisation but on the basis of empirical material. Probably it is also worth paying attention to the way autobiography was created. It was created in parts and prepared for the research project of Thomas and Znaniecki. This casts a certain shadow, both on the shape of the content delivered to order and on the profile of the description itself, in which the recipient, even if not entirely intentionally, orders the description and then makes far-reaching abbreviations in it, leaving only brief mentions after the removed fragments.

It remains to summarise the proposed analysis with a thread from our introduction. According to the authors of the article, it is worth looking at the work of Thomas and Znaniecki not as a closed canon but rather as an opening of a path that did not lead to the success of Thomas and Znaniecki's paradigm but ennobled the individual process of creating social relations (culture or society) and on this background enhanced the building of a sociological narrative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bascom John.** 1887. *Sociology*. New York & London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Bericat Eduardo.** 2016. "The sociology of emotions: Four decades of progress". *Current Sociology* 64(3): 491–513.
- Blackmar Frank W., John L. Gillin.** 1917. *Outlines of sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Blackmar Frank W.** 1926. *History of human society*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Blackmar Frank W.** 1890. *The study of history and sociology*. Topeka: Kansas Publishing House.
- Blumer Herbert.** 1939. *Critiques of research in the social sciences: An appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish peasant in Europe and America"*. New York: The Social Science Research Council.
- Blumer Herbert.** 1969. *Symbolic interactionism. Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs: PrenticeHall.
- Bourdieu Pierre.** 1984. *Distinction a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brinton Daniel G.** 1902. *The basis of social relations. A study in ethnic psychology*. New York–London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

- Brown Edmund W.** 1885. *The life of society. A general view.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Burgess Ernest W.** (ed). 1926. *The urban community. Selected papers from the proceedings of the American Sociological Society 1925.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carver Thomas N.** 1905. *Sociology and social progress. A handbook for students of sociology.* Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Chancellor William E.** 1919. *Educational sociology.* New York: The Century Company.
- Chapin F. Stuart.** 1920. *An introduction to the study of social evolution. The prehistoric period. Second revised edition.* New York: The Century Co.
- Cooley Charles H.** 1902. *Human nature and the social order.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Crowell John F.** 1898. *The logical process of social development. A theoretical foundation for educational policy from the standpoint of sociology.* New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Davies George R.** 1917. *Social environment.* Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Company.
- Dealey James Q.** 1909. *Sociology. Its simpler teachings and applications.* New York: Silver, Burdett & Company.
- Dealey James Q.** 1920. *Sociology. It's development and applications.* New York & London: D. Appleton and Company.
- Dealey James Q., Lester F. Ward.** 1905. *A text-book of sociology.* London: The Macmillan Company.
- Dow Grove S.** 1920. *Introduction to the principles of sociology. A text book for colleges and universities,* Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Ellwood Charles A.** 1910. *Sociology and modern social problems.* New York: American Book Company.
- Ellwood Charles A.** 1915. *The social problem. A constructive analysis.* New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Erlil Astrid, Ansgar Nünning.** (eds). 2008. *Cultural memory studies. An international and interdisciplinary handbook.* Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fairbanks Arthur.** 1902. *Introduction to sociology.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Fairchild Henry P.** 1916. *Outline of applied sociology.* New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Gdula Maciej.** 2006. „Zmienne losy miłości w socjologii”. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo* 50(1–2): 79–103.
- Giddings Franklin H.** 1896. *The principles of sociology. An analysis of the phenomena of association and of social organization.* New York: Macmillan and Company.
- Giddings Franklin H.** 1922. *Studies in the theory of human society.* New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Gillette John M.** 1916. *Sociology.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Company.
- Goffman Erving.** 2010. *Analiza ramowa. Esej z organizacji doświadczenia.* Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.
- Golka Marian.** 2009. *Pamięć społeczna i jej implanty.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Halas Elżbieta.** 1991. *Znaczenia i wartości społeczne. O socjologii Floriana Znanieckiego.* Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Halas Elżbieta.** 2007. Herbert Blumer – socjolog negocjowanego ładu w społeczeństwie demokratycznym. W: *Interakcjonizm symboliczny. Perspektywa i metoda.* H. Blumer, VII–XX. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.

- Hayes Edward C.** 1915. *Introduction to the study of sociology*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Henderson Charles R.** 1911. *A study of social elements. Institutions, character, progress*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Herbut Józef.** 2007. Pragmatyzm. In: *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii. Tom 8: Pap – Sc.* A. Maryniarczyk et al. (eds.), 442–444. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Każmierska Kaja, Fritz Schütze.** 2013. „Wykorzystanie autobiograficznego wywiadu narracyjnego w badaniach nad konstruowaniem obrazu przeszłości w biografii. Na przykładzie socjologicznego porównania narracji na temat życia w PRL-u i NRD”. *Qualitative Sociological Review* 9(4): 122–139.
- Kleinginna Paul R. Jr., Anne M. Kleinginna.** 1981. “A categorized list of emotion definitions, with suggestions for a consensual definition”. *Motivation and Emotion* 5(4): 345–379.
- MacIver Robert M.** 1917. *Community. A sociological study being an attempt to set out the nature and fundamental laws of social life*. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Moore J. Howard.** 1916. *The universal kinship*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.
- Morgan Lewis H.** 1877. *Ancient society or researches in the lines of human progress from savagery, through barbarism to civilization*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Park Robert E., Ernst W. Burgess.** 1921. *Introduction to the science of sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ross Edward A.** 1910. *Foundations of sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Rowe Henry K.** 1916. *Society. Its origin and development*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Ruth Jan-Erik, Anni Vilkkö.** 1996. Emotion in the construction of autobiography. In: *Handbook of emotion, adult development, and aging*. C. Magai, S. McFadden (eds.), 167–181. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schütze Fritz.** 2007. Biography analysis on the empirical base of autobiographical narratives: how to analyse autobiographical narrative interviews – part I and part II. INVITE – Biographical Counselling in Rehabilitative Vocational Training – Further Education Curriculum. <http://www.zsm.ovgu.de/Das+Zentrum/Forschungsprojekt+INVITE.html?highlight=invite> [access: 26.08.2019].
- Schütze Fritz.** 2014. “Autobiographical accounts of war experiences. An outline for the analysis of topically focused autobiographical texts – using the example of the “Robert Rasmus” account in Studs Terkel’s book, “The Good War””. *Qualitative Sociological Review* 10(1): 224–283.
- Sims Newell L.** 1912. *A Hoosier village. A Sociological study with special reference to social causation*. New York: Columbia University.
- Skinner Burrhus F.** 2005. *Science and human behavior*. Cambridge: B.F. Skinner Foundation.
- Skinner Burrhus F.** 1938. *The behavior of organisms. An experimental analysis*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, Inc.
- Small Albion W., George E. Vincent.** 1894. *An introduction to the study of society*. New York: American Book Company.
- Smith Samuel G.** 1920. *Social pathology*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Smith Walter R.** 1917. *An introduction to educational sociology*. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Snedden David.** 1920. *A digest of educational sociology*. New York: Teachers College of Columbia University.

- Stuckenberg John H.W.** 1903. *Sociology. The science of human society*. New York & London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Talarico Jennifer M., Kevin S. Labar, David C. Rubin.** 2004. "Emotional intensity predicts autobiographical memory experience". *Memory & Cognition* 32(7): 1118–1132.
- Thomas William I., Florian Znaniecki.** 1918. *The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Monograph of an immigrant group. Volume I: Primary-group organization*. Boston: The Gorham Press.
- Thomas William I., Florian Znaniecki.** 1919. *The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Monograph of an immigrant group. Volume III: life record of an immigrant*. Boston: The Gorham Press.
- Todd Arthur J.** 1918. *Theories of social progress. A critical study of the attempts to formulate the conditions of human advance*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Turner Jonathan H., Jan E. Stets.** 2006. "Sociological theories of human emotions". *Annual Review of Sociology* 32(1): 25–52.
- Turner Jonathan H., Jan E. Stets.** 2009. *Socjologia emocji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ward Lester F.** 1883. *Dynamic sociology, or applied social science, as based upon statical sociology and the less complex sciences*, vol. 1–2, New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Ward Lester F.** 1899. *Outlines of sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Willcox Walter F.** 1894. "Reviewed work: *An introduction to the study of society* by Albion N. Small, George E. Vincent". *The School Review* 2(9): 570–571.
- Woroniecka Grażyna.** 2007. Interakcja a świat społeczny. O programie metodologicznym Herberta Blumera. W: *Interakcjonizm symboliczny. Perspektywa i metoda*. H. Blumer, XXI–XXVIII. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.
- Ziółkowski Marek.** 1981. *Znaczenie, interakcja, rozumienie. Studium z symbolicznego interakcjonizmu i socjologii fenomenologicznej jako wersji socjologii humanistycznej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Znaniecki Florian.** 1926. Przedmowa do polskiego przekładu. W: *Wprowadzenie do nauki socjologii. Tom I*. R.E. Park, E.W. Burgess (red.), V–VII. Poznań: Fiszer i Majewski – Księgarnia Uniwersytecka.

Marek Nowak

Piotr Luczys

EMOCJE W „CHŁOPIE POLSKIM...” . REMINISCENCJE BADACZY NA PODSTAWIE AUTOBIOGRAFII WŁADKA

Streszczenie

Artykuł stawia sobie za cel próbę odpowiedzi na pytanie o specyfikę obecności emocji w klasycznej autobiografii Władka, opublikowanej w ramach pięcioksięgu „Chłop polski w Europie i Ameryce”, autorstwa Williama Thomasa i Floriana Znanieckiego. Praca ta w 2018 roku liczyła sobie sto lat od momentu wydania, co zainspirowało badawcze zajęcie się nią w kontekście współczesnym. Autorzy przedstawili tytułową problematykę w trzech ujęciach: (a) konkretnym kompleksie założeń teoretycznych socjologii Znanieckiego i Thomasa; (b) orientacji poznawczej zakorzenionej

w pytaniach badawczych i obrazie świata początku XX wieku oraz (c) zagadnieniach analizy autobiograficznej interpretowanych w powiązaniu ze współczesnymi założeniami analizy sformułowanymi przez Fritza Schütze. Analiza zawiera obok kwestii *stricte* dotyczących pracy Thomasa i Znanieckiego również elementy interpretacji współczesnej ewolucji socjologii emocji, prowadząc do sformułowania uproszczonego opisu ewolucji analizy biograficznej. Wnioski zmierzają do konstatacji instrumentalnego potraktowania emocji zarówno w tradycyjnym tekście Thomasa i Znanieckiego, jak i we współczesnym przykładzie. Sugeruje to poza innymi wnioskami pewien poziom nieprzystawalności studiów na temat emocji do klasycznych i wybranych współczesnych opracowań badawczych, ale również pozwala wnioskować o statusie „Chłopa polskiego...”, nie tyle, jako dzieła kanonicznego, ale raczej przełomowego dla obu problematyk. Z tym, że w tym drugim przypadku zwrócenie uwagi na emocje wiązało się bezpośrednio z ewolucją refleksji socjologicznej w kierunku indywidualizacji (w zakresie podejścia) i w kierunku interakcjonizmu symbolicznego.

Słowa kluczowe: W. Thomas, F. Znaniecki, socjologia emocji, analiza biograficzna, F. Schütze