



Helen Law

Institut für Soziologie, Universität Tübingen, Germany

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9137-4582>

Joanna Sikora

School of Sociology, Australian National University, Australia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9676-8417>

Gender Stratification and Feminist Sociology: Why East-Central Europe Needs More Quantitative Gender Stratification Research

Summary

Unlike in Anglophone sociology, the sociological analysis of gender inequalities in East-Central Europe has not yet reached the status of a prominent subfield in stratification research. To address the key societal challenges of this century in East-Central Europe, we argue that the region is in need of a strong development in gender stratification research and a greater use of quantitative methodologies. Such advancement would strengthen not only stratification research but also feminist sociology in East-Central Europe. It would also facilitate the transfer of professional knowledge in stratification and feminist studies to the public. Drawing on the classical concept of Weber's ideal types, we further argue that gender stratification research, with its participation in academic and public debates, has the potential to not only reveal the differences in opportunities between males and females but also reduce such inequalities.

Keywords

gender stratification; feminist sociology; ideal types; public sociology; professional sociology

Introduction

The emergence of gender stratification research in Anglophone sociology dates back to the 1970s, with the 1990s marking the point when the field became not only legitimate but also prominent (Blumberg, 1984; England, 1999; Rosenberg, Howard, 2008). In contrast, in East-Central Europe¹ sociological analysis of gender inequalities

¹ Our understanding of East-Central Europe follows the distinctions made by the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (see: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/divisions.html>). East-Central Europe includes Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

in education, occupational status, wages, political power and health has not yet reached the status of a prominent stratification subfield². In this essay, we define gender stratification research as quantitative analyses of inequalities that affect people of different sexes and genders. Our goal is to discuss the beginnings of the sociology of gender and the related strands of feminist theory to argue that, in the future, they will benefit from greater inclusion of quantitative methodologies. Specifically, we call for more gender stratification research based on quantitative methodologies that originates in East-Central Europe, and communicates its findings, in English, to global readers. We posit that strong development of gender stratification research in this part of Europe will benefit the broad fields of stratification and feminist sociology as they seek to address the key societal challenges of the 21st century in the region. To achieve this end, more young sociologists need sound training in quantitative methodology and gender stratification research.

This essay contains three parts. First, we situate gender stratification research in relation to feminist sociology. Next, we make brief remarks on the potential for this type of research to contribute to Michael Burawoy's (2005) public sociology in the region. Finally, we draw on the classical concept of ideal types to argue that gender stratification research, with its ideal typical theories of patriarchy and established methodologies of data mining, has much unrealised potential. We finish by concluding that, to take its deserved place in the global sociological discourse, gender stratification research from East-Central Europe needs to grow in volume and reach more Anglophone readers across the world.

How feminist sociology relates to gender stratification research

The specific 'woman problem' in stratification research, i.e., a lack of satisfactory conceptual framework to incorporate gender meaningfully into the research on class structures, has been recognised since the 1980s (Szelenyi, 2001). The broader interest in gender inequalities is not much older, however, as these topics did not come to prominence in Anglophone sociology until the 1970s, when, as Paula England reminisces, a sociology doctoral student wishing to examine the literature on the sex pay gap could find no more than ten relevant papers (England, 1999). Back in the 1980s, the emergent

Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Montenegro, Poland, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine. We use labels "East-Central" and "Central-Eastern" as equivalent.

² This is indicated by ad hoc publication comparisons between flagship Anglophone sociology journals versus some East-Central Europe English language periodicals, e.g. *Polish Sociological Review* or *Czech Sociological Review*. The proportion of papers in which 'gender' or 'women' appeared in the title or abstract in *American Journal of Sociology* in the last decade was about 23% in contrast to about 10% in *Polish Sociological Review*. The proportions of articles that qualify as gender stratification research are considerably lower, but the ratio is similar.

branch of feminist sociology known as *the sociology of gender* took up the study of gender essentialism, i.e., the belief that inequalities between genders had biological underpinnings and were unavoidable. It refocused the interest from women's disadvantage to the category of gender where the masculine got as careful consideration as the feminine. Other focal points of feminist sociology were the study of patriarchy as a social system and the development of the theory of gender as structure (England, 1999; Risman, 2004). In contrast to the agenda of radical feminism (England, 1999), many sociologists strived to keep the normative statements (*what should be*) separate from empirical claims (*what is*), particularly within gender stratification studies.

The sociology of gender remained in a close and, at times, stormy relationship with other forms of feminist thought, as signalled by Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne (1985), who made the first critical assessment of feminist sociology in their essay titled "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology", followed a decade later by "Is Sociology Still Missing Its Feminist Revolution?" (1996) which credited feminist sociology with popularising the view that gender is a co-constitutive social structure intersecting class, ethnicity, race, age, sexuality and geo-politics. It is useful to bear in mind Judith Lorber's definition of feminism as "a social movement with the basic goal of achieving equality between women and men" (2012, p. 1). Feminist sociology cannot be fully disassociated from this definition but must be conceived as a body of knowledge and professional practice, which is informed by sociological theory and an interest in inequality in the distribution of power. Some examples of sociological concepts in the field of occupational inequalities are as follows: sociologists distinguish vertical gender inequalities which reflect unequal hierarchies of authority or pay (Charles, Grusky, 2004). By contrast, the horizontal dimension of occupational segregation reflects the concentration of men and women in different occupations. Within education, the vertical dimension of inequality captures the differentials in the level of educational qualifications while the horizontal dimension depicts disparities in fields of study that men and women typically choose e.g. software engineering versus primary teaching. These theoretical concepts stem from a comprehensive body of empirical research, which, in turn, gives rise to more developments in gender stratification theory. In recent years this paradigm gained more prominence in the English language literature from Central-Eastern Europe (e.g. Bieri, Imdorf, Stoilova, & Boyadjieva, 2016; Stoilova, 2012; Zawistowska, 2017) adding to older and sparser research that highlighted structural gender inequalities in the region (e.g. Wong, 1995). Thus, in this paper we demarcate gender stratification scholarship as the sociology of gender preoccupied with inequalities of power that relies on quantitative methodologies (Scott, 2010). In contrast, we treat the broader fields of the sociology of gender and feminist sociology as equivalents. We start from positioning all these types of research in relation to each other.

Are feminist sociology and quantitative methodology contradictions in terms?

Traditionally, the feminist opposition to quantitative methods stems from rejection of positivism. Gender stratification research is not always acknowledged as part of feminist sociology due to the prevalent misconception that quantitative sociologists make positivist claims and are given to interpreting any statistical data, regardless of their quality, as objective and scientific facts (Oakley, 1998; Scott, 2010). Even though the opponents of quantitative methods often equate them with positivism, it is “the attribution of objectivity, validity and generalisability to quantitative findings”, rather than the use of quantitative methods, that indicates whether a study adopts a positivist approach (Crotty, 1998, p. 41). Furthermore, John Goldthorpe (2007) successfully argued that quantitative research must be seen as post-positivist rather than positivist with the latter term belonging firmly in the past.

To some feminists, positivist research is synonymous with the patriarchal worldview while others argue that quantitative methodology introduces objectivity which is nothing else but “male subjectivity” (for reviews, see Oakley, 1998; Sprague, Zimmerman, 1993). Some criticise quantitative methodologies for “tendency toward dualism—between the subject and object of research, and between rationality and emotion” (for a review, see Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 8), assuming that non-emotive and objective research cannot represent women and women’s way of seeing the world. These criticisms either dismiss all quantitative research in principle, or, as Jacqueline Scott (2010, p. 223) points out, are instances of confusing “poor research design with inherent weaknesses of the method.”

More temperate voices have long called for the integration of quantitative and qualitative paradigms in feminist sociology (Sprague, Zimmerman, 1993). Specifically, Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook (1991, p. 8) argue “that carefully designed research grounded in feminist theory and ethics is more useful to understanding women’s experiences than an allegiance to any one particular method as more ‘feminist’ than another.” Joey Sprague (2005) seconds this stance by paying tribute to numerous quantitative studies that raise feminist research questions and advance feminist goals. The research on gendered opportunity structures in education, labour markets, migration, welfare state and politics has been flourishing. Some examples include studies of gender segregation in science at elite universities in the United States (Ecklund, Lincoln, & Tansey, 2012), the work of England and collaborators on wage penalty for motherhood and comparative worth (England, 1999), or studies of domestic division of labour which rely on time use data (Scott, 2010). The authors of these studies and their colleagues, too numerous to be all mentioned by name, produce not only comprehensive empirical evidence documenting persistent gender inequalities but also sophisticated theories which can be evaluated against the data to be further refined.

Is gender simply an ‘added variable’? Theory in gender stratification research

One particularly prominent line of criticism levelled at gender stratification scholars is their alleged propensity to eschew ambition to generate theory while mechanically incorporating the binary gender (often confused with sex) as “a variable added to quantitative analysis” (Acker, 1992; Stacey, Thorne, 1996; Williams, 2006). For example, Lorber (2006) criticises sociologists for simply using a binary gender variable, i.e., girls versus boys and women versus men, without an effort to recognise the multiplicity of genders and sexualities (for a similar argument, see also Geist, Reynolds, & Gaytán, 2017). Although this criticism is valid, the research oriented to exploring and documenting the diversity of genders (e.g. Kulpa, Mizielińska, 2016) and the research that documents gendered power differentials among the cis-gendered³ can be seen as complementary rather than contradictory. In fact, recent reformatory efforts towards gender equity in the workplace rely almost entirely on the latter type of evidence and have already contributed to altering the lives of diverse workers in various places in the world (Bohnet, 2016). Moreover, where gender equity goals are discussed in policy contexts, feminists themselves rely on employing gender as a variable in statistical analyses. Their purpose is to focus on the structural nature of implicit gender bias which affects individual outcomes. For instance, recent calls for affirmative action from feminist philosophers are based, in their great part, on statistical data in which gender is used as a variable to highlight discrimination in hiring and promotion practices within Anglophone philosophy departments (Hutchison, Jenkins, 2013).

Although mainstream stratification studies predominantly compare women with men or girls with boys, while seldom comparing other genders, this conventional approach goes a long way towards understanding inequalities in various domains of social life. In her 2006 presidential address to the American Sociological Association, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein (2007) argued that the social divide between males and females should be seen as most fundamental. The focus on this binary reveals overwhelming evidence that various forms of economic, political and health-related inequalities between men and women still exist even in the most economically developed, democratic and gender-egalitarian countries, despite young women being often more educated than young men.

The quantitative sociology of gender offers much more than empirical evidence. Cecilia Ridgeway, whom Christine Williams (2006) recognised as a leading quantitative feminist, demonstrated how the divide between males and females is a primary cultural frame for organizing social relations (2009). Using the study of sex segregation by field of study in 44 countries by Maria Charles and Karen Bradley (2009) as an example,

³ Cis-gendered refers to individuals whose cultural gender corresponds to their determinable biological sex.

Ridgeway posits that we cannot understand why gender segregation of study fields is stronger in advanced industrial countries than in developing and transitional countries by adopting economic and structural perspectives. Rather, she suggests that we must examine how cultural gender frames affect behaviour and lead to self-sorting and, hence, to segregation. Her argument, however, stems from empirical data and opens itself to further empirical investigation. Cultural gender frames are widespread social beliefs about men and women, which affect identity development of youth. Many girls who aspire to non-traditional roles in masculine domains while in their pre-adolescence tend to switch to more traditional feminine roles in their teens. Ridgeway and Lynn Smith-Lovin (1999) put this down to the development of gender identities which are not only personal but also social. As they put it, “[g]endered identity meanings develop in response to widely shared cultural beliefs about men and women” (1999, p. 208). What this theory calls for, are systematic comparisons of the extent to which culturally maintained identity frameworks still manifest themselves in the lives of young men and women in different parts of the world, including East-Central Europe.

In another exemplar of theoretical contributions which stem from empirical research on the male-female divide in resources, Barbara J. Risman (2004) regards gender as a socially constructed stratification system which intersects other forms of stratification. She conceptualises gender as a social structure: “Gender is deeply embedded as a basis for stratification not just in our personalities, our cultural rules, or institutions but in all these, and in complicated ways” (2004, p. 433). Intersectionality, that is differentials in gendered experiences dependent on the configuration of class, race and other forms of social structuration, manifests itself in individual identities, when young men and women aspire to different occupations and educational pathways and ‘do gender’, that is, act on the gendered expectations of others and their own. At the same time, intersectionality is evident in interactions, which present men and women with different sets of expectations even if they occupy comparable positions. Finally, within organisations, seemingly neutral resource allocation practices are gender-specific. Karen Esther Rosenberg and Judith A. Howard (2008) praise Risman’s theory of gender as a social structure as a powerful conceptual framework which logically organises large volumes of Anglophone research on gender.

Although many gender stratification studies do not consider non-binary genders and so remain cis-normative (Geist, Reynolds, & Gaytán, 2017), they show that the reasons behind the persistent male-female inequalities are anything but well understood. Thus, it is too early to abandon conventional binaries, although they need to be supplemented.

Feminist sociology and social stratification within it have been influencing the debate over gender equality not only within academia but also outside it, by involving wider publics. Paula England, Barbara Reskin, Cecilia Ridgeway and Amy Warton, singled out by Williams (2006) as quantitative feminists, are all scholars whose work inform public debates. Other work with considerable impact, such as Charles and Bradley (2009), is gender stratification research understood as professional sociology in Burawoy's sense of the term, which we discuss later. By 2018, gender stratification has become a large and diverse subfield within stratification studies, making the task of defining what does and what does not fall into the category of gender stratification research more challenging. England (1999) situates her research in the cultural feminist tradition, which views gender inequalities as not only fewer opportunities available for women, but also patriarchal cultures that teach individuals to undervalue economically as well as in other ways any characteristics or activities associated with femininity (England, 1999). Although liberal feminist work on gender stratification shows that capitalist class hierarchies benefit men more than women, liberal feminists do not challenge the existence of such structures (England, 1999; Rosenberg, Howard, 2008). In contrast, cultural feminists call for radical reforms to improve women's opportunities (England, 1999; Lorber, 2012).

Other gender stratification scholars, including Reskin and Ridgeway, get recognised as social constructionist feminists (Lorber, 2012). In Risman's work (2004), this label stems from her argument that gender as a social structure organises men and women into different roles while unevenly distributing resources available to role performers. Ridgeway (2011) owes her recognition to her conceptualisation of gender as a system of social practices. On the whole, social constructionist feminism focuses on examining the processes that create and reinforce gender differences, and construct gendered bodies and identities (Lorber, 2012). In sum, gender stratification scholarship comprises a vast body of theorising on inequality, which results from past data analyses and inspires analyses of future inequalities.

Comparative gender stratification – why we need more of it

Notwithstanding the differences in opinions on quantitative methodology, feminist sociologists and gender stratification scholars at times unite to call for more transnational research beyond the American context. A feminist sociologist Raka Ray (2006) points out that as stratification is one of the core fields in sociology in the United States, this leads to the considerably Northern American-centric approach which tends to dominate quantitative feminism. This detracts from the need to undertake comparative studies involving other geo-political and social contexts. Thus far, the body of comparative

gender stratification scholarship originates in the well-established OECD member countries with the overrepresentation of Western Europeans and North Americans. Reviews of research in specific subfields of gender stratification, such as horizontal stratification in higher education, echo this call, pointing out that the Anglophone literature lacks insights on how diverse national institutional arrangements may differentiate forms of horizontal stratification (Gerber, Cheung, 2008). Comparative gender stratification research highlights what features of entire societies and forms of economic or political organisation go hand in hand with greater gender inequalities and helps establish if particular inequalities are universal or context-specific (Wharton, 2012). But much of this scholarship still originates in Anglophone sociology produced outside of the region, even if the subject of study are societies in East-Central Europe (see, for example, Treas, Tai, 2016). There are obvious benefits that will accompany the development of strong East-Central European scholarship, generated locally, but communicated internationally through Anglophone academic outlets. One such benefit would be bringing the situation and voices of East-Central Europeans into a more central position in the conversation on the future of the gendered society, undertaken across international sociology by local and global publics.

East-Central European gender stratification research and Burawoy's professional sociology

From a largely North-American perspective, Michael Burawoy (2005) famously distinguished four types of modern sociology. Recognizing the need to answer two questions 'knowledge for whom?' and 'knowledge for what?', Burawoy (2005, p. 10) argued that *professional sociology* "consists first and foremost of multiple intersecting research programs, each with their assumptions, exemplars, defining questions, conceptual apparatuses and evolving theories," whereas critical sociology is "the conscience of professional sociology" as it attempts to awake professional sociology to its biases and omissions. The audience of professional and critical sociology is mainly academic. Alongside there are also policy-oriented sociology and public sociology which is predominantly engaged in presenting professional commentary in the media and creating the public image of sociology. Burawoy saw gender stratification as a form of 'professional sociology' while feminism is arguably closer to the ideal type of 'critical sociology'. However, as he notes it, neither public sociology nor policy sociology can exist without the support of their backbone, i.e., professional sociology. This stipulates two implications. The first is that the direct audiences for quantitative studies of gender inequalities comprise mostly methodologically savvy social scientists. The second is that, despite that, the messages

of this research should feed into public debates, blogs and commentary on social media, as gender stratification scholars put on hats of commentators and consultants. Importantly, these messages need to be communicated locally, but also globally, to the audiences that can access gender stratification research from East-Central Europe only through the medium of the lingua franca, i.e., English.

Gender stratification research aims to unveil the factors that contribute to the vertical and horizontal dimensions of gender inequalities, particularly in the labour market, education and health. Over the last few decades, gender stratification research has led to great advances in the understanding of gender inequalities and the underlying mechanisms. Similar to gender stratification research, feminist sociology also has its established research programs, distinct epistemology, theoretical perspectives and methodology, as well as is accountable to peer review, and therefore fulfils the conditions of being regarded as professional sociology (Rosenberg, & Howard, 2008)⁴. In addition, feminist sociologists and other feminists are engaged in public sociology. Over the last few decades, they have been bringing different aspects of gender inequalities to the attention of society, particularly through various social and political movements. Specifically, the debate on the gender wage gap and the underrepresentation of women in prestigious jobs and politics brought about changes to policies about family welfare and workplace, as well as the development in and legislation for equal rights between men and women in many countries. Thus, both traditions of gender stratification and feminist sociology have much to offer to inform the public about contemporary challenges and dynamics of gendered relations and structures in modern East-Central Europe.

Weber's ideal types as a methodological tool in gender stratification research

Gender stratification research is uniquely positioned to contribute scholarship that involves ideal types as a tool of analysis, since statistical analyses often rely on counterfactuals; that is, summaries of outcomes likely to occur for individuals, groups or organisations with particular configurations of pertinent characteristics. Quantitative researchers often work with predicted probabilities, which as such do not describe any individual real-life experience but highlight what is typical across different societies. As stratification research evolves to overcome its current focus on binary gender (Geist, Reynolds, Gaytán, 2017), it is likely that the use of Max Weber's ideal types by gender stratification scholars will serve to inform about not only cis-gendered but also gender-diverse populations.

⁴ For example, feminists have their own feminist standpoint epistemologies (O'Shaughnessy, Krogman, 2012).

The successful reliance on ideal types has been evident in that part of gender stratification research which is comparative macrosociology, that is, the comparative research across institutions and societies. Such an approach scrutinises the extent to which different national policies, cultural norms and institutional arrangements facilitate gender inequalities.

Before offering more remarks on how gender stratification scholars apply Weber's ideal types to their research, a short note regarding Weber's methodology is in order. We intend to introduce Weber's ideal types briefly for readers who are not familiar with his methodological tool. As Weber's ideal types are not the central issues of this essay, we suggest that readers who are interested in a deeper discussion of Weber's ideal types refer to a collection of essays in Weber, Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch (2017) and Weber, Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (2009). The discussion below is presented in the hope that it might be useful for readers who teach sociological methodologies and are interested in highlighting the links between Weberian ideal types and gender stratification research in their classrooms.

Weber's ideal types

The thought of Weber is often recognised as the foundation of interpretivism, although it is not clear that he himself would embrace this label (Crotty, 1998)⁵. Weber's concern with cultural significance inspired him to think of ideal types (Turner, 2010). The ideal type first appeared in Weber's "Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy," which he published in 1905 and was described as a methodological procedure used to prepare "the descriptive materials of world history for comparative analysis" (Gerth, Mills, 2009, p. 60). Weber felt the need for social scientists to use logical and unambiguous conceptions, commenting in his essay (1949 [1905], pp. 92-93) that "[h]undreds of words in the historian's vocabulary are ambiguous constructs created to meet the unconsciously felt need for adequate expression and the meaning of which is only concretely felt but not clearly thought out." Weber considered the ideal type essentially as "a mental construct for the scrutiny and systematic characterisation of individual concrete patterns which are significant in their uniqueness" (p. 100).

The ideal type is a "conceptual pattern [that] brings together certain relationships and events of historical life into a complex, which is conceived as an internally consistent system" (Weber, 1949 [1905], p. 90). In other words, as Gerth and Mills (2009, p. 59) put it, the ideal type "refers to the construction of certain elements of reality into a logically precise conception." An ideal type is "formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more

⁵ The interpretivist approach "looks for culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world" (Crotty, 1998, p. 67).

points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasised viewpoints into a unified analytical construct. In its conceptual purity, this mental construct cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality” (Turner, 2010; Weber, 1949 [1905], p. 90).

Ideal types are important because, according to Weber (1949 [1905]), we can make a theoretical concept unambiguously clear only through precise and ideal-typical constructs (p. 95). The ideal type serves several analytical purposes (pp. 90-92). First, it can educate about reality by examining whether ideal types have real equivalents and whether their characteristics can be made clear and understandable. Second, it is indispensable for heuristic and expository purposes. Third, while it is not a hypothesis, it helps form hypotheses. Fourth, while it is not a description of reality, it aims to provide unambiguous means, not an end, to facilitate adequate descriptions of reality. Fifth, it helps develop concepts of society by encouraging to form ideas about historically given societies.

Weber’s ideal-typical patriarchy

Weber’s work on patriarchy and power is relevant to the study of gender inequalities as it is concerned with the power of men over women in social relations. According to Weber, patriarchy exists in family, households, in organisations beyond the household, as well as in society. His description of an ideal-typical patriarchy was as follows:

Patriarchy is by far the most important type of domination the legitimacy of which rests upon tradition. Patriarchalism means the authority of the father, the husband, the senior of the house, the sib elder over the members of the household and sib; the rule of the master and patron over bondsmen, serfs, freed men; of the lord over the domestic servants and household officials; of the prince over house- and court-officials, nobles of office, clients, vassals; of the patrimonial lord and sovereign prince... over the ‘subjects’. (Weber, 2009, p. 296)

Weber appreciated that patriarchy formalises social relations and thus male authority becomes enshrined through historical tradition, which knew nothing else but power and authority reliant on male models in such a way that it is only natural to assume the domination of men and the subordination of women in social relations to be natural.

Ideal types in gender stratification research

The ideal type of gender stratification is evident not only at the individual but also at the societal level, particularly in comparative research. To construct such an ideal type, gender stratification scholars examine in what ways men and women have unequal access to resources and power in societies that vary with respect to political systems, religious traditions, economic power balances between genders, human capital and egalitarian

cultures. In empirical research, gender stratification scholars identify national policies and practices that perpetuate rigid inequalities and those that lead to relatively equitable outcomes. Empirical reality, rendered through statistical comparisons of, such as the patterns of housework (Treas, Tai, 2016), then gets contrasted with the ideal-typical construct of gender stratification. In this way, gender stratification scholars figure out which aspects of national policies, cultures and institutional arrangements contribute most to maintaining various forms of gender inequalities.

Gender stratification scholars who engage in comparative research construct ideal types to analyse different national cultures and welfare state regimes. For example, in the cross-national study of sex segregation by field of study, Charles and Bradley (2009) contrast an ideal-typical construct of advanced industrial societies to differentiate post-industrial and individual cultures prevalent in democracies and advanced economies from more communal and instrumental cultures of transforming and developing societies⁶.

Arguably the concept of gender stratification itself is an ideal type and so are the conceptions of domestic workers who 'do gender' (West, Zimmerman, 1987) through engaging in particular patterns of domestic labour that reflect the balance of power in their couple relationships (Treas, Tai, 2016). Working women who do not want children and those who do, according to the preference theory (Hakim, 1999), as well as young men and women who "indulge their gendered selves" (Charles, Bradley, 2009) exemplify the effective use of ideal typical representations within gender stratification research.

In summary, gender stratification researchers often use Weber's ideal types with rigour, theoretical depth and policy-relevant conclusions for understanding and informing the public about persistent male domination that reproduces institutional gender inequalities.

Conclusion

In this essay, we argued that, while emergence of gender stratification research in Anglophone sociology dates to the 1970s, in the Anglophone literature that originates in East-Central Europe, this tradition has not yet reached the status of a prominent stratification subfield. Therefore, we call for more gender stratification research based on quantitative methodologies in East-Central Europe to be made available in Anglophone academic outlets and popular media. Quantitative studies by researchers from East-Central Europe on societal conditions of gender inequality in the region will strengthen not only the field of stratification research but also feminist sociology in their efforts

⁶ In brief, their findings show that women and men in post-industrial societies are more segregated with respect to their field of education and occupations than women and men in other societies.

to transform the society. Gender stratification research can contribute important systematic insights gained through systematic analysis of recent data on complex educational, occupational, health-related and political inequalities in East Central Europe. This research, once it grows and becomes more than a marginal activity within sociology, has a potential to transform the professional body of knowledge into public sociology, in Burawoy's sense, by stimulating the current social debates about the gendered society. There are already promising signs that this is happening. Notable recent exemplars of East-Central European gender stratification research have been made available to Anglophone readers (Bieri, Imdorf, Stoilova, & Boyadjieva, 2016; Stoilova, 2012; Zawistowska, 2017) above and beyond the strong tradition of broader feminist research (Kulpa, Mizielinska, 2016; Lukić, Regulaska, & Završek, 2006). However, it is essential that more young scholars who are interested in gender inequality have access to sound methodological training in quantitative analyses and mentoring that steers them towards presenting their work to international audiences. Therefore, we hope that this essay will be of use to young scholars who themselves undertake or consider undertaking gender stratification research and to all sociologists who teach sociological methods to undergraduate and graduate students. Quantitative gender stratification research has much to contribute to the Weberian tradition of using ideal types as tools guiding empirical investigations. Without a stronger body of such research within the mix of qualitative and quantitative studies on men, women and gender diverse individuals, East-Central European sociology will miss out on its deserved place in the global discussion on addressing the key societal challenges of the 21st century. Gender stratification research from the region, communicated to broader Anglophone audiences through appropriate professional and popular outlets, has a strong potential to contribute to the sociology of inequality the analysis of the unique gendered opportunity structures that operate across East-Central Europe.

References

- Acker, J. (1992). From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21(5), 565-69.
- Bieri, F., Imdorf, Ch., Stoilova, R., & Boyadjieva, P. (2016). The Bulgarian Educational System and Gender Segregation in the Labour Market. *European societies*, 18(2), 158-79.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1984). A General Theory of Gender Stratification. *Sociological Theory*, 2, 23-101.
- Bohnet, I. (2016). *What Works: Gender Equality by Design*. Harvard University Press.
- Burawoy, M. (2005). For Public Sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), 4-28.

- Charles, M., Grusky, D. B. (2004). *Occupational Ghettos: The Worldwide Segregation of Men and Women*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Charles, M., Bradley, K. (2009). Indulging Our Gendered Selves? Sex Segregation by Field of Study in 44 Countries, *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(4), 924-76.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Ecklund, E. H., Lincoln, A. E., & Tansey, C. (2012). Gender Segregation in Elite Academic Science. *Gender & Society*, 26(5), 693-717.
- England, P. (1999). The Impact of Feminist Thought on Sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, 28(3), 263-68.
- Epstein, C. F. (2007). Great Divides: The Cultural, Cognitive, and Social Bases of the Global Subordination of Women. *American Sociological Review*, 72(1), 1-22.
- Fonow, M. M., Cook, J. A. (1991). Back to the Future: A Look at the Second Wave of Feminist Epistemology and Methodology. In M. M. Fonow and J. A. Cook (eds) *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, (pp. 1-15). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Geist, C., Reynolds, M. M., & Gaytán, M. S. (2017). Unfinished Business: Disentangling Sex, Gender, and Sexuality, in *Sociological Research on Gender Stratification*, *Sociology Compass*, 11(4), e12470.
- Gerber, T. P., Cheung, S. Y. (2008). Horizontal Stratification in Postsecondary Education: Forms, Explanations, and Implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 299-318.
- Gerth, H. H., Mills, C. W. (2009). Introduction: The Man and His Work. in H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, (pp. 1-74). London: New York, Routledge.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). *On Sociology Volume One: Critique and Program*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Hakim, C. (1999). Models of the Family, Women's Role and Social Policy: A New Perspective from Preference Theory. *European Societies*, 1(1), 33-58.
- Hesse-Biber, Nagy, S. (2007). Feminist Research: Exploring the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (ed) *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, (pp. 1-26). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hutchison, K., Jenkins, F, (eds.) (2013). *Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kulpa, R., Mizielińska, J, (eds.) (2011). *De-Centring Western Sexualities: Central and Eastern European Perspectives*, Farnham, Burlington, Ashgate.
- Kulpa, R., Mizielińska, J. (2016). *De-Centring Western Sexualities: Central and Eastern European Perspectives*. Routledge.

- Lorber, J. (2006). Shifting Paradigms and Challenging Categories. *Social Problems*, 53(4), 448-53.
- Lorber, J. (2012). *Gender Inequality: Feminist Theories and Politics*. New York, London: Oxford University Press.
- Lukić, J., Regulska, J., & Zaviršek, D. (2006). *Women and Citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- O'Shaughnessy, S., Krogman, N. T. (2012). A Revolution Reconsidered? Examining the Practice of Qualitative Research in Feminist Scholarship. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 37(2), 493-520.
- Oakley, A. (1998). Gender, Methodology and People's Ways of Knowing: Some Problems with Feminism and the Paradigm Debate in Social Science. *Sociology*, 32(4), 707-31.
- Ray, R. (2006). Is the Revolution Missing or Are We Looking in the Wrong Places? *Social Problems*, 53(4), 459-65.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ridgeway, C. L., Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). The Gender System and Interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 191-216.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2009). Framed before We Know It: How Gender Shapes Social Relations, *Gender & Society*, 23(2), 145-60.
- Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism. *Gender & Society*, 18(4), 429-50.
- Rosenberg, K. E., Howard, J. A. (2008). Finding Feminist Sociology: A Review Essay. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 33(3), 675-96.
- Scott, J. (2010). Quantitative Methods and Gender Inequalities, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 13(3), 223-36. (doi: 10.1080/13645579.2010.482258)
- Sprague, J., Zimmerman, M. K. (1993). Overcoming Dualisms: A Feminist Agenda for Sociological Methodology. In P. England (ed.) *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*, (pp. 255-80). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Sprague, J. (2005). *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Stacey, J., Thorne, B. (1985). The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology. *Social Problems*, 32(4), 301-16.
- Stacey, J., Thorne, B. (1996). Is Sociology Still Missing Its Feminist Revolution? Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter, 18(3), 1-3.
- Stoilova, R. (2012). The Influence of Gender on Social Stratification in Bulgaria. *International Journal of Sociology*, 42(3), 11-33.
- Szelenyi, S. (2001). The "Woman Problem" in Stratification Theory and Research, DB Grusky, *Social stratification: class, race, and gender in sociological perspective*, 681-88.

- Treas, J., Tai, T. (2016). Gender Inequality in Housework across 20 European Nations: Lessons from Gender Stratification Theories. *Sex Roles*, 74(11-12), 495-511.
- Turner, Ch. (2010). *Investigating Sociological Theory*. Los Angeles: London, Sage.
- Weber, M. (1949) [1905]. 'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy. In E. A. Shils and H. A. Finch (eds.), *The Methodology of the Social Sciences: Max Weber*, (pp. 49-112). New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, M. (2009). The Social Psychology of the World Religions. In H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, (pp. 267-301). London, New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M., Gerth, H. H., & Mills, C. W. (2009). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M., Shils, E. A., & Finch, H. A. (2017). *Methodology of Social Sciences*. London, New York: Routledge.
- West, C., Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-51.
- Wharton, A. S. (2012). *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research* (Second Edition). Chichester, West Sussex, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Williams, Ch. (2006). Still Missing? Comments on the Twentieth Anniversary of „the Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology”. *Social Problems*, 53(4), 454-58.
- Wong, R. S. K. (1995). Socialist Stratification and Mobility: Cross-National and Gender Differences in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. *Social Science Research*, 24(3), 302-28.
- Zawistowska, A. (2017). Is Entering Stem Socially Contagious? Contextual Factors in Women's Educational Decisions. *Polish Sociological Review*, (197), 205-226.

Citation:

Law Helen, Sikora Joanna (2018) *Gender stratification and feminist sociology: why East-Central Europe needs more quantitative gender stratification research*. "Fabrica Societatis", No. 1/2018, pp. 94-109 [access: day, month, year]. Available in Internet: www.fabricasocietatis.uni.wroc.pl, DOI: [10.34616/fs.18.1.94.109](https://doi.org/10.34616/fs.18.1.94.109).