Sanja Kalapoš

MANIFOLD IDENTITY OF A TERRITORIAL SUBCULTURAL GROUP FROM ZAGREB

The discussion of the terms youth, subculture and identity is in this paper based on an example of a territorial subcultural group from Zagreb; the author also questions the practical connection between these ethnological categories. The paper shows the complexity and the manifoldness of identity of members of such a group, as well as the ways this complex and manifold identity was manifested. The final part of the paper discusses the differences between the ethnological and sociological perspective in dealing with subcultures (not only the youth subcultures).

If we define identity as "a dynamic process of construction and reproduction over time, in direct relation or opposition to specific other groups and interests" (Löfgren 1991: 105), or as "the confirmation of existence, that something is exactly what it is, and not something else or something non-existing, what cannot be comprehended without the object it has been in relation with"[1] (Meštrović 1988: 435, according to Grbić 1994: 120), it is clear that "in modern and complex societies identity is also complex, and according to this, every individual can have a manifold identity. That phenomenon is in anthropology called *nested identity* and it implies the orientation of an individual in a wider cultural and even subcultural system" (Grbić 1994: 122). "We view identities as *achieved*, not fixed but negotiated products of the ongoing flow of interaction. By this, we mean that identities are features which people can occasion as relevant in their day-to-day dealings with each other" (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995: 131).

In this paper I would like to illustrate the manifold identity of the members of one of Zagreb's subcultures that was active during the 1960s and 1970s, and by viewing this example I would like to offer some new theoretical standpoints for examining the (youth) subcultures and their connections with identity.

The group that I studied[2] consisted mainly of boys, rarely of girls, from *Martićeva* Street in Zagreb, which gave the group its name - the *Martićevci*. The group was the most active during the 1960s and 1970s, and that was the time that I concentrated on the most. The young people would join the group approximately at the age of fourteen (i.e., after they have completed elementary school), although there were even some younger members of the group, and they would leave the group approximately at the age of twenty-five. That is also the age range that defines the term youth.

Almost every district of Zagreb situated on the north bank of the Sava river had such a group that 'defended district's interests' *(braniti interese kvarta)*,[3] which actually meant controlling the dancings, having loud night motorcycle rounds through their part of the city, using 'their territory' *(svoj teren)* to 'sponge off the money from the passers-by' *(žicati novac od prolaznika)*, etc. The other activities of the group usually included minor criminal actions on other groups' territory, such as breaking the shop-windows or robbing the news-stands, which was not motivated by the material reasons, but by revenge to the group whose territory it was. And, last but not least, there was the football cheering, the activity that played an important role in the lives of the *Martićevci*.

Most of the *Martićevci* completed the crafts' schools, some of them even spent some time in juvenile reformatories and almost all of them were from the working-class background. The sociological attitude emphasizes that "a problem common to all sub-cultural theories of delinquent behavior is that of explaining why not all inhabitants of the relevant neighborhoods appear to become delinquent. /.../ On the other hand it remains apparent that a certain proportion of juveniles in delinquent areas appear to be able to escape the coercive effects of their environment. A part of the answer probably lies in the detailed organization of the community" (Timms 1971: 18). At this point it has to be stressed that sociologists studied mainly the delinquent districts of different cities and by using this approach they reached their theory of residential differentiation, which cannot be applied in this case. As I have already stated, almost every district of Zagreb situated on the north bank of the Sava river had (or has) this kind of subcultural groups, but only a small number of the young inhabitants of these parts of town were (are) members of such subcultural groups.

Discussing the identities of members of the group, I shall begin with the interrelations between members within the group itself, and then move towards the identities they create in relation to members of the wider society, because "an understanding of the interrelationship between individuals, subcultural groups and society ought to be central in understanding youth subcultures" (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995: 52). Namely, the description of members of the *Martićevci* group that I gave above can only be applied to one part of the group. There were also boys of the same age living in the neighbor-

---

1   *All the quotations from the Croatian language were translated into English by the author.*
2   *The research was conducted within my graduate thesis during February 1994 and April 1995 in Zagreb. I talked to about fifteen informers between 35 and 45 years of age. The majority of them were members of the Martićevci group, but the check-research was done by talking both to members of the Martićevci group and members of other territorial groups that were active during the same period of time. All of my informers remained anonymous.*
3   *All the data in the following section come from my informers, their expressions are indicated by inverted commas, and the original expressions are given in brackets.*

hood, who belonged to the middle or upper-middle class, attended grammar schools and most of whom now have university degrees. The mutual relationship between the two subgroups of the same neighborhood was quite complex - both of them considered themselves to be the *Martićevci*, except that the latter were called 'the good kids' *(dobra djeca)* by the delinquents, while the "delinquent part" of the group considered themselves to be 'the *real* Martićevci.' The so-called 'good kids' were not actively present in the group, they were some kind of observers, but they liked to say that they were *Martićevci* too, while 'the real Martićevci' recognized them according to the circumstances. Sometimes the 'good kids' would get beaten up by members of other territorial groups, who would do this knowing that they were not able to defend themselves, and then 'the real Martićevci' would, as a rule, recognize their good counterparts and avenge them. The difference between these two subgroups is the first level of the differences in their identity - while the first were *being* subculture, the latter were merely *doing* subculture. As Widdicombe and Wooffitt say, "being a member /.../ can only be achieved by having the right grounds./.../ Shallow members are merely 'doing',/.../ they do not have the correct grounds or reasons./.../ The 'right' or genuine grounds for membership are tied to individualistic notions such as feelings, personal desires, intrinsic difference, and to personal motivation for realizing or expressing these feelings" (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995: 156- 157). This makes the first difference in the subcultural identities of members of such a group. From this point on I shall concentrate only on the members who *were* subculture, i.e., the ones that took active part in the subculture and on the identities that were present in their mutual subcultural activities.

Since this particular subcultural grouping had primarily territorial characteristics, and then all the others, I shall begin with the smallest spatial units - districts of town *(kvartovi)*. As I have already said, almost every district of town had its own subcultural group that was in rivalry with identical groups from other districts. The *district identity* was presented by the protection of one's territory, i.e., "possessing" parts of town where the group was from, as well as some places in other groups' districts. Those "distant places" were most usually disco clubs, busy street corners, etc.

The only way for members of one group to win such a place in other group's territory was to fight for it, while they almost never had to fight over places within their territory. Two neighboring groups would have a fight over some border area (a street, square, etc.), but it was not so often. Members of subcultural groups of that time were not able to express their mutual territorial identity visually, like their counterparts in Western Europe, especially in Great Britain, because travels abroad were reduced to minimum, and prices of trendy clothes were high above the purchasing power of working-class youth. Fashionable clothes that very few people in former Yugoslavia managed to get from abroad completely lost their original meaning and obtained a completely new one; for example, according to Widdicombe and Wooffitt, in Great Britain black leather jackets were the most important part of visual identity of the young who were low paid, unskilled manual laborers (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995: 9), while in the former Yugoslavia they were worn by the young of upper-middle class background, who attended grammar schools and universities.

Therefore, as a result of impossibility of achieving visual uniformity, *the district identity* was transmitted through some

kind of oral communication - members of subcultural groups of each district knew exactly who was a member of which group, who no longer took part in subcultural activities, which group "recruited" new members, and so on. This level of identity, spatially the smallest, was not expressed visually, but through activities and "legends", the so-called *creating one's name (stvaranje imena)*. In order *to belong to your district (pripadati svome kvartu)*, one had to fight to get the recognition. It meant to defend the district's interests, to get into a fight if necessary, and, the most important, to develop a feeling of unity and friendship with co-members of the group from the same district. This means that spatially the smallest level of identity was expressed through the activities of the group for which the members themselves say were most basic for creating the group and keeping it together.

The next level of identity is based on the opposition between the "original" inhabitants of Zagreb and the others. Although the most members of territorial subcultural groups were the first generation of Zagrebers of their families (most of which moved to Zagreb from small towns or rural settings), they feel significant superiority towards the ones who were not born in Zagreb but moved here during their lifetime. This level of identity is common to members of all Zagreb's territorial subcultural groups and it in a way equalizes all of them; it can be most easily observed through an activity common to all the groups - the football cheering.

There is also some visual expression of identity presented through the cheering iconography, such as T-shirts or scarves with the name of their favorite football teams. I have to emphasize that that kind of football cheering of the young from Zagreb had absolutely nothing to do with today's cheering group called Bad Blue Boys, which "celebrated their fifth anniversary in 1991, during the last championship game with the Belgrade club "Partizan", with special choreography and fireworks" (Radin 1991: 89), but still some of the basic characteristics and motivations of the cheering activity fro the past and present are identical. Some sociologists consider football supporters to be "a population that has its own 'codes' and its own rules of behavior" and therefore treat this kind of behavior "as a kind of youth subculture" (Žugić 1991: 64), although they themselves acknowledge that "their involvement in sports is only a part of the group of weekly activities" (Žugić 1991: 55) and that "the football supporters rarely contact inbetween the football games" (Radin 1991: 67).

Since "subcultures offer style, values, ideology and a way of life as elements of creating the alternative identity, and the substance of the term subculture implies a way of life of a lifestyle as a more permanent form of behavior, which is not present in football supporters, some define the supporters subculture as a situational subculture" (Fanuko 1991: 14). Besides, Perasović defines football supporters as "groups that think of the cheering and creating the supporting core as the means of identification, that most usually have their own names, that consider themselves an equal element which most usually (but no way only) chooses the sports playground as a place for social action" (Perasović 1989: 58), and as we can clearly see, the origin of the group name *Martićevci* defines a territorial, not a supporting group. I cannot treat football supporting activities and gatherings of the members of *territorial* subcultural groups as a special subculture, but only as common activities, perhaps as *situational* subculture (as suggested by Fanuko) which in this case presents spatially widest and most complex level of identity.

Let us start from the beginning. The Zagreb component of

their identities is observable during football games between football teams "Croatia" (called "Dinamo" at the time) and "Zagreb", both from Zagreb, and teams from other (Croatian) cities. Regardless of which of the two teams the members of subcultural groups support, they would visit the games of both of the teams from Zagreb (except when they play against each other), not only in Zagreb, but also in other cities, no matter how far they have to travel. When the Zagreb teams would have games with teams from smaller towns or even villages, the supporters from Zagreb would primarily show their urban identity. In showing it, Zagreb was not perceived as the capital of Croatia, but simply as a large city, an urban center.

Since my informers did not emphasize only their Zagreb, but also Croatian identity, it was important for them to attend the games of any of the Croatian football teams that played against any of the teams from any of the former Yugoslav republics, especially Serbia. For example, the supporters from Zagreb would very often travel to other former Yugoslav republics to see a game between "Hajduk", the team from Split and some other team. During the last couple of years of existence of football supporters' groups, there have even been created slogans that explicitly show this "friendship", such as "'Hajduk' and 'Dinamo' are two fraternal teams, the whole Croatia is proud of them"[4] (Lalić 1993: 195).

A number of my informers emphasized that "they had always been Croats, not only for the last five years", and that "they had never been afraid of showing that they were Croats". Their *Croatness* was mainly present at such inter republic football games, when, besides the usual supporting and insulting the other team, there were also insults based on each other's nationality. For example, "the Torcida's shouting 'We're Croats' was answered by supporters from Belgrade with 'Why are you complaining to us?'"[5] (Lalić 1993: 200), and "quite usual name given to Serbian players and supporters was 'Gypsies'" (Lalić 1993: 199). Of course, when the Croatian supporters went to other republics and insulted the hosts there (or vice versa, which happened on regular basis, i.e. much more often), they would very often end up in police stations where, besides having legal problems, they would often get beaten up. Nevertheless, they considered this kind of supporting to be their contribution to the solution of current political problems and a form of liberating their suppressed national feelings.

Since one of the major tasks of gathering of such groups from the level of city districts up to much wider levels was fighting, they always used every opportunity to get into a fight. If there was not any, they would provoke it, and occasional beatings at police stations did not seem a high price to pay. Since "during the communism the national issue was automatically oppositional, and the manifestations of emphasizing the national created a powerful political echo, it is not odd that the majority of supporters of important teams took over the national discourse" (Fanuko 1991: 20). "Football is an ideal situation for experiencing emotions, i.e., for creating and recreating animosities towards other teams, their players and

supporters" (Radin 1991: 75), and I would like to add that it also infers the supporters of different regional, cultural and national backgrounds.

It also has to be taken into consideration that the national intolerance or at least disagreements quietly existed during the 1960s and 1970s, and has today been intensified by the war "into a current social frame within which the relationship friend-enemy is created. This relationship is a constituent part of all the adolescent groups, so that the playground aggression was connected primarily to national reasons, but also to the supporting ones" (Radin 1991: 92). Although during that period of time there were no supporting groups in former Yugoslavia - except for Torcida, which is "the oldest supporting group in former Yugoslavia, founded in 1950" (Lalić 1993: 85) - a great number of sociological observances concerning today's supporting groups can also be applied to the supporters from 1960s and 1970s, although I have to emphasize again that the reasons for gathering of those subcultural groups were not supporting football teams and that the members were not primarily supporters. Supporting was one of their activities and an indicator of their urban (Zagreb) and national (Croatian) identity. This example shows that the subcultural identity, i.e., the identity of members of only one subcultural group is complex and manifold.

Besides football supporting, which was no doubt very important, the *Martićevci* engaged themselves in other activities as well. They would *control their part of town*, their disco clubs, etc. The rules of behavior were strict; a member of a subcultural group was not supposed to come to other group's dancing; if he did, he had to behave as a *guest* - in other words, he was not allowed to approach the girls from this *territory*, to choose songs from the juke-box, etc. On the other hand, when the group was on *their territory*, its members acted like the *bosses* - disc-jockey had to play the music according to their choice, they did not allow anyone to approach *their girls*, and very often they tried to start a fight. If there was no cause, they would make one up. Finally, their (as well as the members' of other groups) favorite pastime was motorcycles and fast, noisy, night - driving through the city.

Although the main reason for gathering of this particular group (and the other territorial subcultural groups of that time) was spatial or territorial one, we have to note the common age of the members of the group. Haviland says that "the institutionalization of age makes it clear that cultural rather than biological factors are of prime importance in determining social status", and that "theoretically speaking, membership in an age grade ought to be automatic: one reaches the appropriate age, and so one is included, without question, in the particular age grade. /.../ Sometimes, though, one has to buy one's way into the age grade for which one is eligible" (Haviland 1981: 257), and sociologist Brake[6] discusses the context of creating youth subcultures and says that "the young are subjected to professional, educational and economical changes in certain historical moments, and they experience those changes as a generation. That is why the majority of subcultures which are explicitly deviant are a part of the sub-

---

4 *Of course, the Croatian version of the slogan rhymes. Here is the original: "Hajduk' i 'Dinamo' dva su kluba bratska, sa njima se ponosi čitava Hrvatska."*

5 *Torcida is a supporting group from Split, Croatia, and the event took place at a game during the last couple of years of former Yugoslavia's existence.*

6 *This paper was published in a Belgrade magazine "Potkulture" (Subcultures). Unfortunately, when publishing a translation, the magazine didn't mention the name of the publication where the original had been published.*

culture of the working-class young. Namely, this group is the most sensitive towards the economical changes, and the issue that can be the usual class problem is experienced in a completely different way within the context of a new generation" (Brake 1986: 24).

There is an important reason for a careful use of the term *youth subcultures* - many members of subcultures who had built their subcultural identity as young people are in their thirties or forties today, and they have kept at least some part of the subcultural identity from their youth. As Widdicombe and Wooffitt say, with the emergence of the punk subculture in 1976 its followers were only the young, which was vividly and comprehensively documented by the mass media (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995: 11). However, since the emergence of punk it has been twenty years; many of punks from 1970s are no longer members of the punk subcultures, but some of them still are. The same, if not even more obvious, can be applied to members of hippie, heavy metal or Hell's Angels subcultures. Since the scholar researches of those subcultures began at the same time the subcultures developed, or perhaps slightly later, it was logical that they should be defined as *youth subcultures*. However, concerning the age of a part of subcultural population, this term is no more applicable. I therefore think that subcultures - territorial, music, or any other kind - cannot be treated merely as one of the young subcultures but as a subgroup or subculture of the society/culture as a whole.

We also have to be aware not only of theoretical, but also (and especially) of practical inseparability of the terms *subculture* and *identity*. Namely, I consider the creating of subcultural belonging to be a kind of a paradox - if we accept the definition of identity as a created, not inherited notion, and as a dynamic process that is constructed and reproduced over time in direct relation to other groups (which actually means to the other side of the opposition), clearly identity is based on differences. That means that the basis of each of our (manifold) identities is an opposition, i.e., the comparison with something else. The paradox appears when, wanting to be different, an individual searches for his own personal way of expressing the characteristic which he thinks makes him different, but at the same time (consciously or subconsciously) he accepts characteristics of a group of people that express their differences towards the dominant culture in the same or very similar way.

Of course, it raises many issues - whether the group identity is a sum of individual identities, whether it is created by the individuals and is it subjected to the changes which make the members of a subculture, or, once established by a group of (creative) individuals, it becomes relatively constant, so that the only task of new members is to accept or not to accept a (subcultural) identity. I agree with Hebdige who says that "the style no doubt made sense for the first wave of the self-conscious innovators on the level which is unapproachable for the ones that became the punks after the subculture made its appearance and intrigued the public. Punk is unique concerning this matter: there is a significant difference between the creators and the followers in every subculture" (Hebdige 1980: 119).

Sociologists dealt with subcultures much more often than

ethnologists (not only in Croatia), while there were no systematic researches of youth or any other subcultures in Croatia. [7] I therefore think that it is important to point out some of the essential differences in ethnological and sociological approach to subcultures.

Since the definition of sociology says that it is "the systematic study of behavior and human groups" and that "it focuses primarily on the influence of social relationships upon people's attitudes and behavior and on how societies are established and changed" (Schaefer 1989: 5), the sociologists have often defined subcultures as a reaction towards the class system, such as "the expressive forms that express the basic tension between the ones who have power and the ones who are determined to inferiority and second-class lives" (Hebdige 1980: 127) or "a segment of society which shares a distinctive pattern of mores, folkways, and values which differ from the pattern of the larger society" (Schaefer 1989: 79). According to this, "there are a number of ways that subcultures develop. /.../ Subcultures may be based on common age (teenagers or old people), on region, on ethnic heritage, or on beliefs (a militant political group). /.../ Subcultures often emerge because the dominant society has unsuccessfully attempted to suppress a practice regarded as improper, such as use of illegal drugs" (Schaefer 1989: 79). Perasović says that "there are no papers that make connection between football supporters and youth subcultures the way they exist in our cities. On the other hand, those contexts are all reserved for different variants of rock culture, and the discussion of football supporters' groups is very rare is such texts. /.../ In Great Britain there is an overlap between the football supporting subcultures and parts of rock subcultures. /.../ The football supporting subculture, which exists on its own, can be entered by members of certain types of rock subcultures, who can also keep their style and identity" (Perasović 1989: 57). In tune with his observances, I also have to note the same or similar tendency of non-accepting (or ignoring) the territorial subcultural groups in researches on subcultures (i.e., the approach that implies that the stylistic and music subcultures are the only one). Perasović showed the merge of supporting and music subcultures in some of their segments on the example of Great Britain, and my example proves that territorial subcultures that take part in the supporting activities (during the period of time when there were no organized supporting groups in former Yugoslavia, and the music subcultures were not mass movements, as I have already noted), and they have some of the characteristics of today's supporting groups, but the territorial aspect of their identities still remains the primary one.

In distinction to the sociologists, the ethnologists should examine the subculture in relation with the established ethnological categories, such as identity, age groups and age grades, territorial gatherings, etc. It is also very important to establish what is the real identity of members of the dominant culture and what are the differences between their identity and the identity of the members of a subculture within the same culture. Not paying attention to those similarities and differences could lead to a complete relativization of terms *dominant culture* and *subculture*. Anyway, as I have already emphasized, the most important characteristic of the *Martićevci* group was spatial, so that their common age or

[7] For example, the Croatian ethnologists who dealt directly with the youth subcultures were Maja Povrzanović (1984-1985), Ines Prica (1987, 1988), and, indirectly, Milivoj Vodopija (1976), who placed the high-school graduate ceremonies of Zagreb students in the context of van Gennep's theory of rites of passage.

social stratum were not so important (after all, there was also a part of the *Martićevci* group, although usually present only as passive observers, of the middle-class background).

That is why the studying of this type of subcultures requires comparison with bibliography on similar type of generational, but primarily spatial gathering of the young in rural settings. Jasna Čapo Žmegač writes about the boys' associations in Istria, Croatian Primorje, Dalmatia and Burgenland (Austria). In these places boys' associations are more formal, with a special ritual for admitting new members, while in the continental parts of Croatia those associations are informal groups without firmer organization. Regardless of the firmness of their organization, those associations tend to intervene into the life of their communities at the same moments, such as when a boy visits a dance in another village, courts with girls from another village or even proposes one. Boys from the girl's village, assuming that they have a claim upon girls from their village, try to discourage boys from other villages - they make fun of them, chase them away and sometimes even beat them up. The boys also act as morality keepers in their communities. So, the function of boys' associations is not only organizing the social life of men of a certain age, but also contributing to the social control of the community (Čapo Žmegač 1995). It is thus obvious that both in rural and urban settings that are not only spatially but also temporally different, there is the same pattern of behavior.

I wanted to show the complexity of manifold identity of a youth subculture, the construction of identity according to the inner relationships of the members of the group, the shift in the construction of the territory-based identity, and, finally, the essential differences between the ethnological and sociological approaches to this subject. I also tried to confirm the theoretical conclusions that I offered at the end of the paper by using the materials that are urban, spatially and temporally close to us.

REFERENCES CITED

- BRAKE, Mike 1986: Potkultura kao analitičko orude u sociologiji /Subculture as an Analitical Tool in Sociology/. In: Potkulture 2. Beograd. Pp. 14-26.
- ČAPO ŽMEGAČ, Jasna 1995: Seoska društvenost /Rural Sociability/. Manuscript. Zagreb.
- FANUKO, Nenad 1991: Okvir za razumijevanje ponašanja ekstremnih navijača /The Frame for Understanding of the Extreme Supporters' Behaviour/. In: Furio RADIN, ed. Zagrebački nogometni navijači: grupni portret s BBB u središtu /Zagreb Football Supporters: The Group Portrait with Bad Blue Boys in the Centre/. Institut za primijenjena društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Zagreb. Pp. 9-22.
- GRBIĆ, Jadranka 1994: Mnogostruki identitet: primjer Hrvata u Madarskoj /Manifold Identity: The Case of the Croats in Hungary/. In: Studia ethnologica Croatica. Vol. 6. Zagreb. Pp. 119-126.
- HAVILAND, William A. 1981: Cultural Anthropology. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York.
- HEBDIGE, Dick 1980 (1979): Potkultura: značenje stila /Subculture: The Meaning of Style/. Rad. Beograd.
- LALIĆ, Dražen 1993: Torcida. Pogled iznutra. /Torcida:

The View From Within/. AGM. Zagreb.
- LÖFGREN, Orvar 1991: The Nationalization of Culture: Constructing Swedishness. In: Studia ethnologica. Vol. 3. Zagreb. Pp. 101-116.
- MEŠTROVIĆ, Matko 1988: Kulturni identitet - izmedu egzistencije i utopije /Cultural Identity - Between Existence and Utopia/. In: Razvoj/Development 5/4. Pp. 435-448.
- PERASOVIĆ, Benjamin 1989: Nogometni navijači kao dio omladinske subkulture /Football Supporters as a Part of Youth Subculture/. In: Potkulture 4. Beograd. Pp. 57-64.
- POVRZANOVIĆ, Maja 1984-1985: Kultura mladih u Jugoslaviji, Pregled suvremenih etnoloških i socioloških istraživanja /Youth Culture in Yugoslavia: Overview of the Contemporary Ethnological and Sociological Research/. In: Etnološki pregled. Vol. 20-21. Beograd. Pp. 39-58.
- PRICA, Ines 1987: Beogradski šminkeri /Belgrade "šminkeri"/. In: Potkulture 3. Beograd. Pp. 37-43.
- PRICA, Ines 1988: Omladinska potkultura u Beogradu /Youth Subculture in Belgrade/. Master's thesis. Manuscript 1367. Insitute of Ethnology and Folklore Research. Zagreb.
- RADIN, Furio 1991: Navijači u svom prirodnom okruženju /Football Supporters in Their Natural Surroundings/. In: Furio RADIN, ed. Zagrebački nogometni navijači: grupni portret s BBB u središtu. Insitut za primijenjena društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Zagreb. Pp. 67-95.
- SCHAEFER, Richard T. 1989: Sociology. McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York.
- TIMMS, D. W. G. 1971: The Urban Mosaic. Towards a Theory of Residential Differentiation. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- VODOPIJA, Milivoj 1976: Maturiranje kao rite de passage /Graduating as the Rite of Passage/. Narodna umjetnost. Vol. 13. Zagreb. Pp. 77-92.
- WIDDICOMBE, Sue, and Robin WOOFFITT 1995: The Language of Youth Subcultures. Social Identity in Action. Harvester Wheatsheaf. New York.
- ŽUGIĆ, Zoran 1991: Mladi, sport i navijanje /Youth, Sport, and Supporting/. In: Furio RADIN, ed. Zagrebački nogometni navijači: grupni portret s BBB u središtu. Institut za primijenjena društvena istraživanja Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Zagreb. Pp. 53-65.

Sažetak

MNOGOSTRUKI IDENTITET ZAGREBAČKE TERITORIJALNE SUBKULTURNE SKUPINE
Sanja Kalapoš

Tekst je zasnovan na terenskome istraživanju u sklopu kojega je autorica proučavala jednu od zagrebačkih teritorijalnih subkulturnih skupina koja je bila aktivna tijekom 60-ih i 70-ih godina XX. stoljeća. Takve su se skupine uglavnom formirale u dijelovima grada na sjevernoj obali rijeke Save i dobivale su svoja imena prema gradskim četvrtima, ulicama ili trgovima. Ova je skupina, čiji su članovi uglavnom iz Martićeve i okolnih ulica, dobila naziv Martićevci.

Autorica govori o mnogostrukom identitetu Martićevaca, pri čemu kreće od razlika unutar skupine - naime, postoje dvije podskupine Martićevaca, od kojih su jedni aktivni sudionici subkulture, dok su drugi tek pasivni promatrači koji su s vremena na vrijeme (ovisno o okolnostima) prihvaćeni kao ravnopravni članovi.

Nakon razlaganja te razlike, autorica objašnjava prostorne pomake u konstrukciji identiteta, tj. pokazivanje kvartovskog, gradskog (zagrebačkog) i nacionalnog (hrvatskog) identiteta kroz aktivnost nogometnog navijanja. U tu svrhu konzultirana je literatura o navijačkim subkulturama; iako tadašnje subkulturne skupine nikako nisu bile prvenstveno navijačke (odnosno, nogometno navijanje bila je samo jedna od njihovih aktivnosti), neka se sociološka zapažanja o današnjim navijačima mogu primijeniti na tadašnje pripadnike subkultura.

Na kraju teksta autorica navodi najosnovnije razlike između sociološkog i etnološkog pristupa tematici subkultura i pri tome zastupa stajalište da etnolog mora proučavati subkulture u sklopu etabliranih etnoloških kategorija. Zbog toga je povučena paralela između teritorijalnih subkultura mladih u ruralnim i urbanim društvima.

Povzetek

MNOGOTERA IDENTITETA ZAGREBŠKE TERITORIALNE PODKULTURNE SKUPINE
Sanja Kalapoš

Besedilo je zasnovano na terenski raziskavi, pri kateri je avtorica preučevala eno od zagrebških teritorialnih podkulturnih skupin, ki je delovala v 60-ih in 70-ih letih dvajsetega stoletja. Takšne skupine so v glavnem nastale v mestnih predelih na severni obali reke Save in so dobivale svoja imena po mestnih četrteh, ulicah in trgih. Obravnavana skupina je dobila ime *Martićevci*, ker so bili njeni člani v glavnem iz Martićeve in sosednjih ulic.

Avtorica govori o mnogoteri identiteti *Martićevcev*, pri čemer izhaja iz razlik znotraj skupine. Obstajali sta namreč dve podskupini *Martićevcev*, izmed katerih so bili eni dejavni soudeleženci podkulture, medtem ko so bili drugi le pasivni opazovalci, ki so bili le od časa do časa (odvisno od okoliščin) sprejeti kot enakopravni člani.

Po razlagi te razlike avtorica pojasnjuje premike v konstrukciji identitete, tj. izkazovanje identitete četrti, mestne (zagrebške) in nacionalne (hrvaške) identitete skozi dejavnost nogometnega navijanja. V ta namen se je naslonila na literaturo o navijaških podkulturah. Čeprav takratne podkulturne skupine nikakor niso bile v prvi vrsti navijaške (nogometno navijanje je bila samo ena od njihovih dejavnosti), je mogoče uporabiti nekatera sociološka spoznanja o sodobnih navijačih za razumevanje tedanjih pripadnikov podkultur.

Na koncu besedila avtorica navaja najbolj temeljne razlike med sociološkim in etnološkim pristopom k tematiki podkultur ter pri tem zastopa stališče, da mora etnolog preučevati podkulture v sklopu etabliranih etnoloških kategorij. Zaradi tega potegne vzporednico med teritorialnimi podkulturami mladih v ruralnem in urbanem okolju.