

edited by

SELENIA MARABELLO, SAMUEL NTEWUSU

AFRICA TODAY

QUESTIONING DIGITALIZATION, GENDER AND HEALTH



Finanziato
dall'Unione europea
NextGenerationEU



Ministero
dell'Università
e della Ricerca



Italiadomani
PILLOLE DI PROSPETTIVA



UNIMORE
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI
MODENA E REGGIO EMILIA



Volume pubblicato con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Enzo Ferrari, nell'ambito del «Progetto ACHIEVE-IT – Academic Collaboration through Higher International Education for a Viable and Equitable Africa with ITaly». Codice TNE23-00071. Finanziamenti destinati a iniziative educative transazionali finanziate nell'ambito del PNRR - Missione 4 “Istruzione e ricerca” – Componente

1 “Potenziamento dell’offerta dei servizi all’istruzione: dagli asili nido all’Università”, Investimento 3.4 “Didattica universitaria e competenze avanzate”, sotto-investimento T4 “Iniziativa Transnazionali in materia di istruzione”, finanziato dall’Unione Europea – NextGenerationEU. Codice tipo progetto: PNRR_TNE_2023. CUP D91I23001030006.

Proprietà letteraria riservata
Copyright © 2026 editpress
Via Lorenzo Viani, 74
50142 Firenze - Italy
www.editpress.it
info@editpress.it

Prima edizione: maggio 2026
ISBN: 979-12-80675-97-2
e-ISBN: 979-12-80675-98-9
Printed in Italy

Permalink formato digitale:
<digital.casalini.it/9791280675989>

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
<i>Selenia Marabello, Samuel Ntevwusu</i>	
I. Towards a social foundation of land administration digitalisation in Ghana	15
<i>Peter Narh, Lamine Doumbia</i>	
II. The “biometric revolution”, Ivorian-style. Reflections on the National Registry of Natural Persons	39
<i>Armando Cutolo</i>	
III. Ethical concerns in cultures of family caregiving: evidence form a feminist ethnographic study of cancer in Ghana	61
<i>Deborah Atobrah</i>	
IV. “Goodbye. And I hope not to see you again”. Research relations to be forgotten	93
<i>Alessandra Gribaldo</i>	
V. Kinship, stigma and pursuit of safety experience of people livinh with HIV in Ghana within the contecxt of New Treatment Guidelines and UNAIDS 90-90-90 targets	107
<i>Benjamin K. Kwansa</i>	

VI. Healing from stigma, explanatory narratives and stigma reduction practices in the medical humanitarian activities of Médecines Sans Frontières <i>Umberto Pellicchia</i>	135
About the Authors	159

IV. “Goodbye. And I hope not to see you again”. Research relations to be forgotten

Alessandra Gribaldo

For a social science’s researcher going into the field means many things. Not least among these is the fact that the field provides experiences that endure over time, the forging of long-lasting bonds, and in some cases, friendships. In anthropology in particular, fieldwork – beyond mere rhetoric – has often the power to shape the researcher as an individual who puts themselves on the line, highlighting what is a fundamental aspect of ethnographic research: the relational dimension. Typically, over the years, anthropologists continue to maintain contact with the people they met in the field, with whom relationships are deployed on various levels – of familiarity, trust, and mutual interest – starting from (and despite of) the unequal power relations that often underpin the very possibility of research.

Anthropology, as is well known, is the discipline that, among all the social sciences, has most extensively addressed the ethical and relational dimensions: throughout the discipline’s history, the people contacted and encountered have evolved from figures to be recounted and remembered (beginning with Casagrande 1960) into indispensable individuals, called upon in various ways as co-authors – both individual (the informant) and collective (the community). It is impossible here to trace the various forms of co-authorship found in ethnographic research, from classic texts such as Shostack’s *Nisa* (1980) and Crapanzano’s *Tuhami* (1980) to Gay y Blasco and Hernández (2020), via Kopenawa and Albert (2013): however, it is worth noting that the process of reflecting on the meaning of the fieldwork has never come to an end and is an integral part of anthropological ethnographic research.

A comparison with Deborah Atobrah's work (in this book) on an ethnography of noncommunicable diseases allows me to revisit methodological issues in anthropology and the ethics of feminist methodology. It is particularly through its interplay with feminist theory and practice that ethnography has been able to highlight the importance for the researcher of recognizing her own position within the society from which she comes. This positioning, in fact, shapes the experience of research and ethnographic inquiry as well as the very definition of the object of study, requiring the ability to actively recognize power relations. As Haraway (2016) argues, research also entails active participation, achieved by formulating questions that one's interlocutors find genuinely interesting, the need to constantly recalibrate one's ability to perceive and respond, and to do all this with tact and kindness: thus, producing knowledge and positioning oneself means show responsibility to act at one's best. What this implies is an issue of ongoing debate within the field of anthropology.

The history of the debate on the ethics of ethnography and feminism is well known. Between the late 1980s and early 1990s, two essays with the same title, *Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?*, were published, written respectively by Judith Stacey, a sociologist, and Lila Abu-Lughod, an anthropologist. Based on her research, Stacey questions whether we can take for granted that research relationships in feminist ethnography are inherently more egalitarian and respectful; on the contrary, paradoxically, the risk is that it exposes the subjects involved to greater danger and exploitation compared to other research methods. Drawing on Strathern's (1987) reflections, the sociologist argues that the asymmetrical relationship inherent in ethnographic work cannot be entirely avoided and that, therefore, a "completely feminist" ethnography cannot exist: there can be "partially" feminist ethnographies. This means the researcher's awareness of the partiality of her own ethnographic vision and the need to question the ethical dimensions of the research with a specifically feminist sensibility regarding power imbalances, while accepting the risks inherent in the ethnographic method.

While one cannot disagree with her conclusions, however, as Atobrah notes, Stacey relies on a conception of the relationship between ethnography and feminism that fails to account for negotiations, flexibility in research design, and above all the communal dimension of research; she treats the subjects of research as isolated figures, thereby substantially underestimating the agency and objectives of the individuals involved and, more broadly, the powerful force of culture and community. Following Atobrah's argument, we could also cite two other examples: Dána-Ain Davis (2013) revisited the issues raised by Stacey based on her research experience among abused Black women in the United States. In a context marked by neoliberal policies, Davis notes how it became important for these women that their personal stories be collected and heard by people in positions of greater power in the pursuit of justice. A different experience concerns Ribeiro Corrossacz's (2019) research among Brazilian domestic workers' union members. In this study, the opportunity to share their biographical and political trajectories was seen as a way to strengthen the collective struggle for the recognition of paid domestic work and the subjectivity of Black women within a shared framework where researcher and workers are united around common political goals.

Recently, Tauber and Zinn (2021, p. 13) posed the following question, based on the observation that gender issues are no longer central to new publications and do not receive particular attention: "Have the insights of past critiques and experiments been absorbed to the point where discussion is no longer needed?". If we view the ethnographic narrative through the lens of the struggles, failures, and arguments produced by feminism, inevitably, as anthropologists, we are confronted with a Droste effect, or "tunnel of mirrors," which occurs when two mirrors (reflecting the identical image of the universal human being and the particular gender that constitutes it) are placed opposite one another. The image is repeated infinitely, creating a series of specular refractions that multiply endlessly, progressively

shrinking. The theme of gender, though present, is ultimately often sublimated; it fragments, becoming something else, as if it were no longer a central theme but rather a signal of a possibility to conceive the field in an alternative way, becoming a sort of “ghost theory” that has lost its object (Holbraad and Pedersen 2017; Heywood 2018). From this perspective, it is interesting to note that more than a decade ago, Graeber (2012), in his discussion of violence and the power of bureaucracy, found himself at a certain point (re)discovering feminist theory: at the end of his article, he refers to an early draft that was completely oblivious to the fact that he was proposing an argument that had already been developed historically and to which he could easily have referred. The nature of socio-sexual hierarchies and the ways in which they constitute institutions and relationality itself are no longer at stake in anthropological theory, as if they had exhausted their momentum: where is the *institution of gender*? (Mayblin 2019).

One might wonder why it is always necessary to periodically rediscover feminist politics and theory, when it has never ceased to generate critical thought – both within and outside anthropology – making a decisive contribution, starting with the crisis of representation highlighted by Abu-Lughod (1990), who rightly noted the contradiction inherent in the erasure of the female and feminist contribution to anthropological writing in the postmodern era. For Abu-Lughod, conducting feminist ethnography means creating a tension between ethnographic practice and writing, while also striving to write in a non-dominant manner, with care and engagement. It is rather paradoxical that the editors of a text that has had such an exceptional impact as *Writing Cultures* (Clifford & Marcus 1986) did not include feminist anthropologists among the authors, as their work was not deemed relevant or incapable of expressing experimental and unconventional forms of writing. The paradox lies in the fact that the feminist approach was the first to raise the issue of the partiality of the ethnographic gaze, power dynamics, and the necessity of positioning; despite

this, the statement «“truths are partial” is one that is habitually attributed to “postmodern” anthropology rather than to feminist anthropology» (Ribeiro Corossacz 2013 p. 95, *my translation*). Conversely, the accusation of partiality is the criticism constantly leveled at feminists, who are portrayed as those concerned with women rather than with general issues.

Perhaps it is not merely the tendency of most male anthropologists to avoid reading gender and feminist literature – to evade, skip over, or forget feminism in anthropology appears to be a position that deals with temporality; gender is systematically out of step with the times. Gender issues point to a temporal dimension and at the same time of emancipation making difficult to integrate them into a line of reasoning that easily connects to the history of scholarship. Gender cuts across research obliquely and often in tortuous ways, creating an ever-shifting morphing. The themes concerning feminist ethnography are undoubtedly stubbornly awkward within the discipline; they insist on issues that counterbalance any universalist tension, become entangled in personal histories, and point to different sensibilities. On these issues, Atobrah rightly points to the impossibility of generalization, the need to focus on and dwell upon individual encounters, and the importance of the relationship that is created – with care and commitment on the part of the researcher – leading to familial bonds and closeness over time, even after death. In this sense, Atobrah’s position aligns with Trinh Minh-ha’s 1989 proposal of the concept of “speaking nearby” – speaking while being close – which entails:

a woman’s voice, or a woman’s hand, which goes to meet things in the dark and pass them on without deafening, without extinguishing in the process. Intense but gentle, it holds words out in the direction of things or lays them down nearby things so as to call them and breathe new life into them. Not to capture, to chain them up, nor to mean. Not to instruct nor to discipline. But to kindle that zeal which hibernates within each one of us (Trinh Minh-ha, 1989, p. 132).

In relation to Atobrah's work, I will attempt here to draw parallels with my own experience, which – though starting from a similar approach – yields different results, likely because I was dealing with a topic – domestic violence – that has its own unique characteristics.

In my ethnography on intimate partner violence, I sought to situate it within a broader debate on gendered subjectivity, power, and agency. What interests me here is the type of relationship that emerges when working on a topic involving testimony and pain, navigating the interplay of possibility, necessity, and duty. Elsewhere, I have discussed the intimate contradictions that mark the field of domestic violence, the possibility of testifying, the duty to do so, and the pathologizing of the desire not to speak, on the part of women abused by an intimate partner (Gribaldo 2021). As recently argued: «anthropological writing has itself long been implicitly shaped by concerns with freedom of expression, including commitments to speaking truth to power, calling out epistemic injustice, or, in an older idiom, giving anthropological subjects voice» (Candea et al. 2025, p. 50). In this context, communication in the field and research ethics fall within the scope of an analysis of the «discursive engineering of the public contexts in which speech occurs and the ways in which communication is variously shaped, hindered, encouraged, and wrestled over by actors in different ways» (id, p.58). While, on the one hand, there is now a widespread discourse that emphasizes the need to speak out against gender-based violence – and thus the importance of diverse voices coming together to form a single, unified chorus that reflects a collective demand – on the other hand, the risks involved are less obvious, as demonstrated by the outcome of the “Me Too” movement's demands (Gribaldo 2019). At stake is a discourse of the therapeutic power of narrating, which can also be found in anthropological works on violence (Jean-Klein & Riles 2005, p. 178-179), that primarily identifies women as subjects who must speak out and tell their story. Declaring an experience of violence means claiming rights

and invoking change through reference to one's personal history. At the same time women who experience violence first-hand know that testifying in front of the institutions entails the risk of being marginalized, judged excessive, seen as playing victim, and thought of as manipulative: women do not speak, speak too little or too much, their testimonies are paradoxical in their very constitution. The act of "speaking violence" (Gribaldo 2021, p. 4) is a complex and partially contradictory endeavour. Women are flouting the law and, at the same time, ignoring feminists' calls to come forward. And, in various ways, they withdraw not so much from ethnographic research (even though many women refused to meet me for an interview, and only those women who were "following a programme" at the women's centre agreed to participate), but also from what I referred to at the outset as the specific dimension of ethnographic relationality that is intended to generate anthropological knowledge. That is, the dimension of collaboration, mutual interest and potential friendship over time. Being an insider, being part of the community, as we know, is not in itself a guarantee of a politically correct ethnography, just as identifying as a woman does not automatically mean one understands other women's positions better, nor does it result in a feminist ethnography. In the case of my research, I encountered difficulties similar to those faced by Deborah Atobrah during her research, precisely because I was so close to the subjects under investigation.

One afternoon, in the early days of research, upon entering the women's shelter in Bologna and going to the wrong floor, I found myself face to face with two staff members who insisted there had been a mix-up, that our appointment was at a different time; it was only after several minutes of trying to find a solution that would allow us to meet that I realized it was a case of mistaken identity. The person the staff were expecting following a phone call had not turned up (as, they told me, often happens in cases of women abused by their partners) and they had mistaken me for her, thinking it was an oversight or a delay. In

my appearance and manner, I was absolutely indistinguishable from an abused woman seeking an urgent consultation. On another occasion, the woman I was interviewing and I laughed because we were wearing the same shoes and a very similar jumper. On one occasion, in the midst of a torrent of words about the violence she had suffered and her partner's perverse methods of control, a woman I was interviewing – who, as she spoke, seemed to be studying my reactions – stopped and said to me: «What effect does it have on you?».

Once I had the chance to write about the research, I decided not to use the interviews and the conversations I had with abused women and focus mainly on the ethnography of court hearings, not only because I wanted to respect the anonymity of the women who agreed to speak. I had difficulties in addressing the imponderable diversity of women victims. Why one woman decided to press charges and invited me to go with her to a TV program to speak out, whereas another told me her story in a whisper, wondering what might ever lead a woman to press charges, was not straightforwardly correlated to class, origin, condition, level of violence, or family history. Moreover, the peculiarities of these events could only lead to generalizations that I had no intention of encouraging, given that these are precisely the kinds of narratives that easily become part of a shared, sensationalist and quickly forgotten collective imagination, which evidently concerns the “madness” or “perversion” of the partner in question. But, in addition to my wish to address structural issues that prevent women from expressing themselves in court and being believed, there was also my desire to engage with feminism and with the possibility of speaking nearby, of remaining silent, of reclaiming silence. If feminism poses a collective question of being there and making an impact on society, who should ask the questions and to whom?

As Atobrah points out, our conversations with women who face discrimination within their families because of their husbands should certainly not be treated as a topic for family discussion, a

political issue to be championed, or a subordinate position to be overcome. In the call to report abuse or, more simply, to speak out, women are placed in a position they have not necessarily chosen, and which fails to consider the consequences for those who speak out, particularly women in situations of contextual and structural vulnerability. The desire to protect oneself and one's children is recognized in feminist practice as legitimate and paramount by lawyers and staff at women's shelters, who provide all the necessary support to alleviate the guilt of those who do not wish to report the abuse, finding ways to ensure safety and a life free from violence. Who can afford to expose themselves and suffer for the cause of gender-based violence? Who can recount things that will often not be believed in court? Expressions such as «Do you understand what I am saying?» reflect the victims' own perception of the difficulty in being believed and the awareness of the possibility of a shared experience.

And yet my role as a researcher required, by definition, speech, testimony, memory, and the recounting of a toxic relationship that people wanted to forget – for a thousand reasons, not least to put the failure of their relationship behind them, to have the chance to reimagine themselves as different, free, and to start a new life. Listening to their testimonies led me to find a necessary nearby space, a sort of active listening in the face of different modes of expression, ranging from a torrent of words and demands, to broken sentences, suggestive silences, and tears. This understanding, listening and connection, which was obviously based in part on sharing a position of gender and "closeness", nevertheless just as inevitably evaporated immediately after the meeting. Even three-hour-long interviews, which likely represented an outpouring and a release, ended with a sigh of relief when I switched off the recorder. What was certainly missing in my relationship with the women I came into contact with was the continuity of the relationship, as is typically expected in the ethnographic tradition of anthropology. On the contrary, the women I met expressed a desire never to speak of these issues

again, either to me or to anyone else, and that the interview marked a point of closure. When saying goodbye, the farewell was often tinged with irony: we would smile and exchange awkward phrases such as “all the best for the future”, “hang in there” or “good luck”; one young woman told me quite openly that she hoped never to see me again. There is no circumstance in which I would have looked forward to a new meeting, a relationship, or even a recognition: on more than one occasion, I have happened to bump into a woman I had interviewed on the street and, together with her, pretended we had never met, ignoring one another.

As Atobrah suggests it is not productive to assume a homogenous ethnographic process, which suggests a unitary research ethic. In this sense, feminist ethnography does not claim to have a single set of ethical principles, a consistent approach, or purity of intent. The field involves negotiation: second thoughts, adopting stances different from those taken in everyday life, the discomfort of appearing and being different or of producing something that does not immediately correspond to our ideal, settling for an incomplete relationship. As a researcher I felt both too involved and at the same time not involved enough, not only because of privilege, but also simply because in health and not in a toxic relationship. Research intents twist confronting reality, contexts, the people we meet. To return to Trinh Minh's ha reflections: «language is at the same time a site for empowerment and a site for enslavement [...] the space of language and meaning is constantly interrupted or effaced by the gaps of non-senses, absences, and silences» (Minh ha in Chen 1992, p. 86). The relation with ethics and language is for a woman always more complex than expected as «to be a woman is to be in a situation» (Butler 2016, p. 298). When Atobrah writes about love and respect for the people she meets in the field, she explores a theme that remains crucial to the discipline regarding the entangled and uncomfortable merging of the personal and professional.

As is well known, Ruth Behar has passionately explored this topic suggesting that «anthropology has always been vexed about the question of vulnerability» (Behar 1996, p. 5). New questions arise regarding the possibility of conceiving involvement and pain as a space of knowledge, and research as a possibility «to risk proximity, to write from *within* it rather than *about* it» (Dantzer 2026). Can the power dynamics between those who conduct research as a profession and the research subjects be managed, addressed, re-enacted and re-examined on a day-to-day basis? To what extent does the field itself allow us to rethink the researcher's role and their own political stance? What and how much can we do in the field to accommodate our research participants, and when, in some cases, must we simply disappear from their lives? When is it not even appropriate to begin a research project?

Almost forty years ago (1987), Marilyn Strathern suggested that the difficult relationship between feminism and anthropology was the paradoxical result of a close connection, in that both disciplines concern the notion of difference: of gender in one case, of culture in the other. But whilst feminism combats its "other" in the form of patriarchy, anthropology has a different relationship with cultural difference, supporting, investigating and understanding its meaning. Anthropology and feminism produce a sort of mutual mockery in which anthropology criticises feminism's claims to address a single subject (women) and feminism criticises anthropology's relativist claims and its inability to see the power asymmetries in the ethnographic encounter. This tension has not dissipated over time: various anthropologists adopt postcolonial, Black, transnational, Indigenous and feminist perspectives to critique and intersect cultural differences with power, struggles, practices and change. Feminist movements continue to challenge the discipline of anthropology, just as anthropological approaches constantly engage with and challenge feminist, queer and trans movements and practices. It is precisely this "uneasy" relationship that creates a vibrant space for reflection. The feminist approach in anthropology has also

proved fruitful through works that do not necessarily focus on gender *per se*, but use the theories and practices of feminist reflection to engage with different areas of anthropological knowledge. There are few instances in which this is readily recognised. Feminist anthropology is therefore not something that can be strictly identified, even though one can, of course, be both an anthropologist and a feminist, as the author is. It is therefore necessary to conceive of the encounter between anthropology and feminism as a dynamic: “feminist anthropology” is one of the most productive paradoxes, and the ethnographic dimension is undoubtedly its field of experimentation.

References

- Abu-Lughod L., 1990, *Can there Be a Feminist Ethnography?*, in «Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory», vol. 1, pp. 7-27.
- Behar R., 1996, *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- Butler J., 2016, *Afterword*, in Strathern M., *Before and After Gender: Sexual Mythologies of Everyday Life*, HAU Books, Chicago, pp. 293-302.
- Candea M., Heywood P., Fedirko T., 2025, *Modalities of Free Speech*, in «Annual Review of Anthropology», pp. 49-61.
- Casagrande J., 1960, *In the Company of Man. Twenty Portraits of Anthropological Informants*, Harper.
- Clifford J., Marcus G.E. (eds.), 1986, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Crapanzano J., 1980, *Tuhami. Portrait of a Moroccan*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dantzer, A., 2026, *Anthropology that Breaks your Heart: The Risk of Proximity*, in «Anthropology that Breaks your Heart: The Risk of Proximity», edited by Alexandra Dantzer, Uyen Dang, and Emma Khan. American Ethnologist website, 27 March [https://american-ethnologist.org/online-content/anthropology-that-breaks-your-heart-the-risk-of-proximity-by-alex-dantzer/].
- Davis D., 2013, *Border Crossings: Intimacy and Feminist Activist Ethnography in the Age of Neoliberalism*, in D. Davis, C. Craven (eds.), *Feminist Activist Ethnography Counterpoints to Neoliberalism in North America*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, pp. 23-38.
- Gay y Blasco, P., Hernández L., 2020, *Writing Friendship: A Reciprocal Ethnography*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Graeber D., 2012, *Dead Zones of the Imagination: On Violence, Bureaucracy, and Interpretive Labor*, in «Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory», vol. 2, n. 2, pp. 105-28.
- Gribaldo A., 2021, *Unexpected Subjects: Intimate Partner Violence, Testimony, and the Law*, HAU Books, Chicago.
- Gribaldo A., 2019, *Hashtags, Testimonies, and Measurements. Gender Violence and its Interpretation*, in «Anuac», vol. 8, n. 1, pp. 7-30.
- Haraway D., 2016, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, Duke University Press, Durham.

- Holbraad M., Morten A.P., 2017, *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Heywood P., 2018, *After Difference: Queer Activism in Italy and Anthropological Theory*, Berghahn Books, New York.
- Jean-Klein I., Riles A., 2005, *Introducing Discipline: Anthropology and Human Rights Administrations*, in «PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review», vol. 28, n. 2, pp. 173-202.
- Kopenawa D., Albert B., 2013, *The Falling Sky*, Harvard University Press, Harvard.
- Mayblin M., 2019, *The Anarchic Institution*, in «Anthropology of this Century», n. 24.
- Minh-ha T., 1989, *Woman, Native, Other. Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Minh-ha T., Chen N., 1992, «Speaking Nearby»: *A Conversation with Trinh T. Minh-ha*, in «Visual Anthropology Review», vol. 8, n. 1, pp. 82-91.
- Ribeiro Corossacz V., 2019, *Molestie sessuali e oppressione di classe, sesso e razza. Una ricerca tra lavoratrici domestiche in Brasile*, in «About Gender. Rivista internazionale di studi di genere», vol. 8, n. 15, pp. 118-43.
- Ribeiro Corossacz V., 2013, *Per un'anatomia politica dei sessi: l'antropologia materialista di Nicole-Claude Mathieu*, in Garbagnoli S., Perilli V. (eds.), *Non si nasce donna. Percorsi, testi e contesti del femminismo materialista in Francia*, «Quaderni Viola», Alegre, Roma, pp. 93-100.
- Stacey J., 1988, *Can there Be a Feminist Ethnography?*, in «Women's Studies International Forum», vol. 11, n. 1, pp. 21-27.
- Strathern M., 1987, *An Awkward Relationship: The Case of Feminism and Anthropology*, in «Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society», vol. 12, n. 2, pp. 276-92.
- Tauber E., Zinn D. (eds.), 2021, *Gender and Genre in Ethno-graphic Writing*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.