



Vol. 4, No. 2, 2015

Agnieszka Gromkowska-Melosik

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan (Poland)

Women's Education and Professional Success. Paradoxes of Access and Exclusion

ABSTRACT. The article considers the paradoxes of dynamics of women's access to the higher education and the labour market. The prevalent assumption behind an educational gap between men and women is that of privileged men who enjoyed much greater access to all levels of education. However, most data on women's access to higher education is telling of an educational emancipation of women. It is difficult to talk about female discrimination in terms of numbers. On the other hand when we analyse labour market structure the position occupied by women and men differs to a significant extent when compared to the educational context. It turns out that the rule of meritocracy, which applies to women at the level of education, is not applied once they have graduated. The same diploma, which is a definite advantage for males, is a less significant advantage for females.

KEYWORDS: education, labour market, gender gap, success, access to higher education, exclusion

I would like to start with the assertion that social and educational discrimination of women used to be a common sense belief among millions of people. When talking about women's position in the educational system, categories of exclusion and marginalisation are brought up. The prevalent assumption behind an educational gap between men and women is that of privileged men who enjoyed much greater access to all levels of education. This translated into their professional opportunities, and even more so, the market has always preferred men, especially those holding high-salaried senior positions. However, something exceptional occurred during the last two decades, something which can be called an educational emancipation period for women or women's power. In developed countries, a good metaphor for capturing the increase in aspirations and educational attainments of women is the metaphor of an express train in motion, while boys changed from a fast train to a stopping train. And so, all macro tendencies point to the fact that women enter spaces traditionally reserved for men only in an inva-

sive way, an observation which is especially pertinent to the higher education sector.

Analysing women's access to higher education in 74 countries globally, allows us to conclude that in 51 countries women constituted the most numerous group among university students. In about 60 out of 74 countries women majored in pedagogical, humanist and art programmes, and in 50 countries they majored in programmes related to social sciences, law, and management. It is only in the area of engineering studies that women are in a significant minority (UNESCO, 2012). The data I'm drawing on can lead to somewhat surprising observations. In many countries, which are labelled as patriarchal, the participation of women in education is much higher than that of men (classic examples are Namibia, Israel, Jordan or Turkey).

Globally, for every 100 male student, there are 105 female students. Turning to a local perspective: in Western Europe and North America, there are 133 female students for every 100 male students, in Central and Eastern Europe the numbers are 125 and 100 respectively. In Latin America it is 112 and 100 respectively. The dominance of women in Arab countries, in this respect, is somehow amazing as for every 101 female students there are 100 male students. Only in Asia and Africa women constitute a significant minority.

Most data on women's access to higher education, then, is telling of an educational emancipation of women. It is difficult to talk about female discrimination in terms of numbers. In Western countries, populated by diverse races and ethnicities, minority women have absolutely dominated minority men. Women are gaining much better access to elite higher education institutions, which until recently were the bastion of sexual reproduction of the elites. Among the Harvard University students, women constitute over 48% of the student population, including 46% in the Law School and nearly 49% in the Medical School. Women are the majority at the undergraduate level (Degree Student Head Count: Fall, 2009). A very similar situation can be observed in Oxford, where women constitute almost 47% of the student population at the undergraduate level, and more than 45% at the graduate level (www.ox.ac.uk, 2015). Access to the doctoral degree is also on the increase which is clearly visible in the USA context. In 1978 doctoral degrees granted to women were a mere 27% of all the degrees, while in 2008 this number has soared to 46%, more specifically 53% in the medical studies and life sciences, more than 58% in the social sciences, 52% in humanities, and

more than 67% in educational studies (National Science Foundation, 2009). It could be claimed that in the developed countries, it's difficult to talk about female discrimination or excluding women from education. Predictions regarding women's access to education within the next 10 years are unambiguous and point to a radical increase placing men on the educational defensive.

A logical goal of university alumni is to use the degree on the job market – getting a high-salaried professional and social position. In this context, however, the position occupied by women and men differs to a significant extent when compared to the educational context. It turns out that the rule of meritocracy, which applies to women at the level of education, is not applied once they have graduated. The same diploma, which is a definite advantage for males, is a less significant advantage for females; in other words, this diploma might prove useless for women on the job market. Logically, if we take into consideration the fact that professional success is to a great extent a derivative of educational attainment, then the “increase in access to diplomas” for women should bring about changes in the domain of “gender parity” in the professional structure. However, this isn't happening: “the professional distribution of women and men has undergone a merely insignificant change”. Consequently, women occupy lower levels of the professional status pyramid – as compared to men. Analysis of the social praxis leads us to consider the validity of this claim: educated women are excluded from the access to professional success. What are the reasons, then?

At the outset I'd like to refer to the premises of neoliberalism. Without a shadow of doubt, it rejects the essentialist perception of an individual and exposes the idea of a “fair” fight for professional and educational success. In practice, the rule of “equal access” and “equal possibilities” (chances) comes to be seen as the political ideal. While critics of neoliberalism rightly emphasise the fact that this philosophy leads to the reproduction of cultural and economical inequity along with validating social inequity, within the meritocratic approach – which cannot be divorced from neoliberalism – gender equality (however idealistic it might be) has become a matter of common sense and everyday life. As a result women have been granted access to new spaces of emancipation; and even if this was – on a global scale – only an illusion, still the “impossible became possible”. In the Western societies, female upward mobility has been increasing with every decade – they've been receiving more and more university diplomas, and more prestigious diplomas,

they are “invading” professional domains which have been a male preserve until now. It seems then that we’re witnessing a return – although in a different social and ideological context – of an American idea of a “self-made man” – a man who should own everything to himself. In the current neoliberal version of reality the idea of a “self-made woman” is becoming more and more common, a woman who takes her own life in her own hands and rejects the attributes of the traditional femininity. In the context of neoliberal reconstruction of female identity a new label has been invented: “Thatcher’s daughters”, which refers to those young women who wish to be economically independent, climb the career ladder and at the same time don’t expect any support from men (Kimmel, 2004, p. 137-138).

Critics of neoliberal attitude claim that the job market functions within the frames of social development logic embedded within the ideology and structures of patriarchy. It can be metaphorically stated that “a big company is a man”. Logically, in such an institution, success and career can be pursued only by people who embody its “rules”, or to put it bluntly its – masculinity (inevitably in the traditional paradigm).

In this context, it’s worth adducing Jackson’s theory explaining gender inequity in accessing senior roles in big companies and corporations. The researcher discriminates between two approaches to this issue.

The first one assumes that employers are driven by the rules and regulations of the free market which substantially limit the scope of female discrimination. Employers behave rationally and don’t discriminate against women on the basis of their gender if they are in possession of relevant qualifications – such attitude is to benefit the employer. From this vantage point the reasons of women’s professional failure is to be found in themselves: less motivation, worse qualifications and stereotypically feminine personalities. The second approach assumes that the employer decisions are motivated by socially constructed prejudices referring to the ideas of gender asymmetry and the socio-biological primacy of men. Employers think that women are destined to give birth to and bring up children. It’s thought that women do not possess qualities required for senior roles. We can also observe the phenomenon of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Jackson contends that, at present, lower levels of professional hierarchy are dominated by rationalisation – a characteristic of the first approach – which denies discrimination against of women on grounds of profitability (Jackson, 1998, p. 125-126). This would account for an increase in the number of women taking up more senior positions.

Jackson, however, thinks that rationalisation didn't reach the most senior roles in the professional hierarchy, as the higher in the pecking order the more important are personal relationships and interests. At this point the rule of gender loyalty and identification of men with other men serving in the capacities of managerial positions kicks in. Additional context is provided by the lack of promoting women due to the fears of company heads that promoting women to senior roles will lead to their discrimination by the male majority and thus will render her ineffective. And so, discrimination starts being rational, while gender inequity is perpetuated on all levels of professional career – always to the benefit of men (Jackson, 1998, p. 14-105).

R.M. Jackson's conception is splendidly complemented by the analysis of the well-known concept in sociology – the oldboy culture, typical for the British society. In the UK, according to the centuries-old tradition, male members of the elite are still educated in public schools only to pursue further studies in either Oxford or Cambridge. During their studies they enter life-long friendships, reaffirmed by memberships in more or less formal associations or clubs. Thanks to this, a peculiar social order is born, which entails mutual support on the part of participating men in the future (Paczeński, 2006, p. 36; also Susan Vinnicombe states that industrial elites in the UK form “a bastion of male golf players”, who have finished public schools and one of the two universities, Vinnicombe & Colwill, 1996, p. 24). One matter of common interest for the mutually supporting men is sport, with football and women in particular, women who are excluded from the access to senior positions by loyal men.

We need to expose another, very “structural” in its nature, factor of excluding women from professional success – it is related to the sex segregation on the job market. Referring to Pierre Bourdieu, three gender aspects of the origin of this segmentation can be singled out. The first one is connected with the contention that female jobs are, in a way, a continuation of household chores; hence they take up roles in education, care, and services. The second aspect stems from the general submissive social role of women to this of men who also enjoy the social monopoly for positions imbued with authority. Finally, the third aspect which is premised on the assumption that only men can control machines and technical devices (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 112).

Sex segregation on the job market concerns situations in which women undertake jobs characterised by low prestige and thin chances of social promotion or gaining social power; men, in turn, occupy posi-

tions which provide them with such possibilities. Hiring structure of women reproduces, then, social inequities. That's how women are over-represented in less prestigious and low-salaried job, while men – in prestigious and high-salaried ones. This takes place irrespective of any changes, which are to boost women's access to education and job market (Gender Gaps, 1998, p. 85).

Among the mechanisms reconstructing sex segregation on the job market – following Barbara F. Reskin and Patricia A. Ross – we can adduce primarily sex desegregation. It occurs when an increasing number of women take up occupations which earlier were seen as typically masculine – and as a consequence these occupations lose their prestige and become relatively low-salaried (i.e. an increasing number of women within an occupation is either an evidence of its lowered prestige or contributes to the lessening of its prestige) (Domański, 1999, p. 36). With reference to Boudon's conception, it can be claimed that we're dealing here with the turn-against effect, i.e. outcome of deliberate actions of persons wanting to gain certain benefits, turn against the goals, which these persons tried to achieve (Boudon, 2008). Pierre Bourdieu writes about this phenomenon in the following way: “the increase of the ratio of women is an indicator of a certain general tendency within one occupation, and in particular, irrevocable or relative devaluation, which can stem from the changes in the nature of the organisation of work within a given occupation (...) or changes in its relative position in the social sphere” (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 109; see also Schriewer 2000, p. 247). Now, we're left with the question: how does cultural capital and symbolic power of occupations change under the influence of gender-related changes within a given occupation (Delamont, 1989, p. 196). Moreover, the phenomenon of men leaving jobs – precisely because of their feminisation – further contributes towards their devaluation (“snowball effect”) (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 109; see also Schriewer 2000, p. 247). We could recall, at this point, after Ulrich Beck, the mechanism of a “regularity of reversed hierarchy” – the more social importance is attributed to a given occupation, the fewer women take it up, and vice versa, domains labelled as marginal and deprived of any influence are populated by women (Beck, 2004, p. 156).

It can also be observed that there is a phenomenon of clear gendered division in terms of elite occupations. And so, men and women in the area of law, natural sciences, or architecture take up jobs in different sectors which enjoy different degrees of prestige and provide different

degrees of pay possibilities. Women are more involved in the sectors whose activities concern symbolic and cultural capital, and not material wealth. Female lawyers specialise in family law, female doctors pursue careers as GPs (also often become paediatricians). Men, however, enter areas which are vested with direct prestige and are profitable (Delamont, 1989, p. 214). This leads to yet another conclusion: both female and male lawyers, female and male doctors (and so on) take up drastically different social roles despite the fact that they possess the same professional qualifications.

At the same time – as has been observed by Eva Stina Lyon – on the sex-segregated job market, women predominate in the segments which are to a great extent susceptible to politically-motivated economic decisions. The researcher enumerates such parts of the public sector as the healthcare (nurses), education (teachers), and social care. Thus, political decisions (budget reshuffling) can – to a great extent – trigger sudden and dramatic turns in women's professional biographies; more than in the case of "men's segments" (Stina Lyon, 1996, p. 302). Women, as has been observed by P. Bourdieu, traditionally occupy positions of lower prestige, threatened by liquidation, those which fall prey to a state's neo-liberal politics connected with labour market deregulation (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 110).

At this stage, it's worth pointing out some general approaches to the phenomenon of professional discrimination against women, especially with reference to promotion to higher levels of professional hierarchy. And so, the metaphor of "glass ceiling" is used in order to describe the phenomenon of the impossibility of promoting women onto managerial positions. The glass ceiling symbolises here a formal-cum-legal possibility of potential promotion while at the same time signifying its impossibility. The concept of "sticky floor" is used with reference to the impossibility of promotion in the case of women in the lower social prestige roles (clerks, PAs, tailors, etc.). Another relevant notion – encapsulated in the metaphor of "glass escalators" – refers to a speedy and not objectively justified promotion of men in occupations dominated by women (Titkow, 2003).

Trying to account for blocking women's promotion to senior positions, it's useful to draw on the idea of "Queen Bee Syndrome"¹. It con-

¹ The concept was used for the first time by G. Staines, C. Tavis, T.E. Jayaratne, after: Blau & De Varo, 2006, p. 16.

sists in the appropriation of male standards and values by women achieving professional success and at the same time disrespecting and disregarding traditionally feminine values and other women². Such women underline their otherness and distance themselves from other women not feeling gendered belonging. They demonstrate, as described by K. Horney, an “escape from femininity”, which is – according to them – worse and deprived of values. Such women, once they’ve secured senior positions, lead a consistent policy of depriving other women of the access to professional promotion, explicitly favouring men in this respect (Mandal, 2003, p. 21).

Furthermore, mechanisms of self-exclusion from professional success, which are closely tied with modest aspirations, can also be discerned. One of these, noteworthy of further elaboration, is connected with the fear of masculinisation. Cynthia F. Epstein draws our attention to the conflict between traditional discourses of femininity in the West and those of a professional. If she’s to achieve success, she needs to possess “personality attributes” typical of men (especially as a doctor, manager or lawyer), and in particular, “unemotional assessment” emphasised by the author, as well as ruthlessness, drive to success, or competitiveness paired with high-level assertiveness (Epstein, 1973, p. 22-23). Referring once again to Epstein’s views, we could claim that “Women who work in occupations dominated by men (...) seem to be genderless”. Thus we arrive at a situation where “feminine and professional configurations of social roles (...) are mutually exclusive”. Many critics contend that the woman – in a position vested in power over other people and decision-making – finds herself in a peculiar “trap” of femininity and masculinity – social expectations which are contradictory. In such a situation many women quit their struggle for success in the male-dominate corporate world, just to secure and maintain their femininity (Epstein, 1973, p. 22-23).

Another paradoxical context of women’s emancipation can be derived from the context of masculinisation analysed above, and especially in situations where successful women identify with men. Women, who

² The following text provides interesting analyses of ‘queen been syndrome’ in the academic milieu (among female professors), Ellemers et al., 2004, p. 325-326 (women who have been successful researchers in domains perceived as masculine are more prone to oppose promoting other women in these domains; moreover, in their self-assessment, they dissociate themselves from their gender and show stereotypical perceptions of other women).

achieved professional success, on “men’s terms” and framed it in traditional masculine logic of companies, constitute on the one hand – in the neoliberal world – a symbol of emancipated femininity. Who could be a better exemplar of emancipatory dreams of equality? On the other hand, however, successful women confirm general androcentricity (and patriarchy) of the contemporary culture, and in particular the “organisational culture” not to mention the “corporate culture”. In a neoliberal society (seemingly gender-, ethnicity- or race-blind) women assume an identity of the dominant group – i.e. men – at the same time lose their traditional femininity. It’s also necessary to underscore one more problematic fact about the masculinisation of women in power. In contemporary societies, the woman is still perceived as a “sexual object”, as a “conquest space”. Thus, in order to recall P. Bourdieu’s views, women constitute “symbolic objects”, whose fundamental trait is to be exposed to the male (and female) gaze and the – associated with it – state of anxiety about their appearance. As a consequence, in the social perception of women, one of the most basic forms of stratification – between different groups – does not go along the traditional division axis (such as class, education or socio-economical status), but rather along peculiar socio-biological criteria related to sexual attractiveness (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 82). All research suggests that the sense of being attractive to men constitutes one of the most important components of every woman’s self-esteem. How, then, can women in power maintain being sexually attractive, and at the same time not lose power? Well, the most straightforward way is to assume the male way of being as well as exercising power, at the same time distance herself from her male colleagues (subordinates). The constructed image of: I’m a beautiful woman outside, but inside I’m a “tough man”. Masculinisation of identity, in such cases, seems unavoidable.

It’s also worth emphasising the second mechanism – one of self-exclusion – which is connected with motherhood and perceiving her degree as merely a “marriage credential”. Available American research shows that many women perceive quality education not only in terms of access to professional and social career but also as a symbol of emancipation (Schriever, 2000, p. 247). Their professional choices seem to refer to only one assumption: “I’ve got my degree, I’m emancipated, I can give birth to and bring up children”. An academic diploma – for them – is merely an emblem of their potential possibilities and a manifestation of their intelligence and knowledge. This diploma is a peculiar kind of per-

sonal capital, often useful – as the research says – when choosing the right partner. For many Americans, a degree from a quality higher education institution is treated as one of the important assets when seeking the best husband, the ideal being a Harvard graduate. This argumentation is inscribed in a broader, immensely significant issue of the contemporary professional woman, which is focused on the problem of choosing between being success-driven and bringing up offspring. For many of them children and family are absolutely most important and they quit their professional pursuits.

The neoliberal ideology also includes a broad cultural offer for the female body and identity, from which she can choose in order to reconstruct her identity as a successful person. While in the past women were socialised according to a clearly defined identity matrix, nowadays one might be under the impression that “everything is possible”. Hence, now it seems that the woman can construct and reconstruct herself in almost any way. Paradoxically, however, this unlimited liberty in terms of constructing herself and the cultural pressure on endless “recalibrations” according to the developing requirements concerning the shape of the body and identity can form a means of enslavement. Discourses of femininity are spinning faster and faster. The woman has, admittedly a historically unprecedented freedom of choice, however (again – paradoxically) her enslavement resides on the fact that she’s forced to constantly make choices. For instance, in the domain of body, fashion, advertisement, beauty industry and women’s magazines have one main message – “keep up with the trend”. The woman, thus, jumps from one image to another one. She reconstructs herself according to the changing – every year, every season, almost every moment – rhythm of change. Hence, on the contemporary feminine horizon, one can discern anorectics, body-builders, once-famous celebrities and women who find their fulfilment in rosary clubs.

The “tyranny of choices” concerns not only visual aspects of the female identity but also her personality. It is – in a way a paradox – but it seems that neoliberalism leads to situations where the woman – at least in the cultural aspect – needs to adapt to the social context, while at the same time, she is assumed to be free and responsible for her success in chasing the changes. In the logic of neoliberal thinking, one should ask the question: how can a woman feel fulfilled in her desire to be a superwoman (such issues are discussed more broadly in: Hansen-Shaevitz, 2015) desired by men, abound in “female appeal and charm”, and at the

same time attain social and professional success, a task which is undoubtedly not made easier if she wants to be and think in a charming and empathetic way. How can one be a mother, wife, perfectly manage a household, develop spiritually and her interests and at the same time ruthlessly climb the career ladder?

Sometimes one is under the impression that a neoliberal society conceptualises of the woman as if she was a radio – “tuning up” at a given moment to be appropriate for a given situation seems to be a prerequisite; she should possess unlimited potential in the domain of “tuning up”. She should – at the same time – be this, this, and that, and that other one. She should be everybody. However, she herself usually desires to be “a concrete” and well-rounded woman, not only a repository of the “named” and reconfigured” images.

In the neoliberal “cultural chaos” at the turn of the century, the woman more and more often feels like an Aborigine in the New York City streets – she doesn't know how to find a place of her own in the labyrinth of self contradictory images and desires, which society constructs in her. Give birth to a child or write a doctoral thesis? Accept a prominent position and travel the world or devote myself to the household chores and be happy when the husband likes my soup? Dress in an ethereal and feminine way and wear high heels or go for the male suit? Be empathetic, soft and good (and lose everything I can) or tough and determined (and become a lifelong single or a triple divorcee)? An increasing number of women seek clear answers to their dilemmas, clear answers to such questions as: who do I want to be? How do I want to be? How to think (Gromkowska, 2002)?

This type of a situation – a simultaneous cultural chaos and the tyranny of freedom with respect to choices regarding the construction of her identity – causes panic reactions in women, escape-like. Women run away from a complete ambiguity and a complete freedom. They try to imbue their lives with meaning; through assuming a certain rhythm, focusing on rituals with the view of arriving at cultural and psychological “certainty”, they have to erase this ambiguity, help to flee the haunting and internally contradictory questions, help to flee the haunting freedom. Who to be? Who to become? How to live? – these questions stopped irritating us with their banality. They, once again, take on an existential dimension.

Caught in a neoliberal freedom and responsibility net, women are fighting for adequacy. Many of them succeed, which is corroborated by

the data concerning educational, professional and personal successes. On the other hand, however, the growing pharmaceutical and psychopharmacological industry proves the existence of very destructive outcome of neoliberal freedom. In this context, the aim of pedagogy is to educate – since childhood – to develop critical distance from her own biography and socially constructed criteria of life success; it also concerns professional career as well as other aspects of structuring her own biographies.

Finally, I'd like to make an attempt at a macro forecast with respect to women's access to career, status and salary. It seems that in developed countries the possibilities of women's socio-professional success are determined – to a great extent – by economic and demographic factors which are susceptible to different ideologies. In a situation of a greater demand for workforce, the job market opens up to women who receive better possibilities with respect to getting employed and promoted. We need to add though that in countries with patriarchal fundamentalism, the ideology takes priority over the economic factor in the way that women do not have a chance for professional success as such a consent would strike at the very foundations of the existing social structures. In turn, in periods of increased unemployment (where many men seek work), there is usually a turn – at the level of social consciousness – to essentialism. Women are again perceived in terms of their traditional traits and attributes. There is an call for traditional femininity: the idea of the woman devoted to the roles of a mother and wife. The idea of the family crisis gets exploited as well as the decline of traditional values.

I'm personally positive that, irrespective of the economic and ideological situation, in view of substantial legal and consciousness changes it's not possible to substantially reverse the role of women in social life. The dynamics of access to the socio-professional success will be played out at the level of everyday pressure and choices, both on the part of women and the employers. Analyses of all possible tendencies – both at the level of education, and in spite of everything, on the job market – leads to formulating forecasts which are optimistic for women.

Acknowledgement

Parts of the article draw on research described in author's book: *Edukacja i (nie)równość społeczna kobiet. Studium dynamiki dostępu*. Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”. Kraków 2011.

REFERENCES

- BECK, U. (2004) *Spółeczeństwo ryzyka. W drodze do innej nowoczesności*. Warszawa: Scholar.
- BLAU, F.D. & DEVARO, J. (2006) New Evidence on Gender Differences in Promotion Rates: An Empirical Analysis of a Sample of New Hires. *Articles & Chapters*. June. p. 16, Paper 113, on-line: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles/113>.
- BOUDON, R. (2008) *Efekt odwrócenia*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- BOURDIEU, P. (2004) *Męska dominacja*. Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Degree Student Head Count: Fall 2009, http://www.provost.harvard.edu/institutional_research/Provost_-_FB2009_10_Sec02_Enrollments.pdf.
- DELAMONT, S. (1989) *Knowledgeable Women. Structuralism and the Reproduction of Elites*. London: Routledge.
- DOMAŃSKI, H. (1999) *Zadowolony niewolnik idzie do pracy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.
- ELLEMERS, N., HEUVEL, H. VAN DEN, GILDER, D. DE, MAASS, A. & BONVINI, A. (2004) The Under representation of Women in Science: Differential Commitment or the Queen Bee Syndrome? *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 43.
- EPSTEIN, C.F. (1973) *Woman's Place. Options and Limits in Professional Careers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gender Gaps. Where Schools Still Fail Our Children. Commissioned by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, Researched by the American Institutes for Research, Washington 1998.
- GROMKOWSKA, A. (2002) *Kobiecość w kulturze globalnej. Rekonstrukcje i reprezentacje*. Poznań: Wolumin.
- HANSEN-SHAEVITZ, M. (2015) *The Superwoman Syndrome*, <http://www.ox.ac.uk/about/facts-and-figures/admissions-statistics/undergraduate-admissions-statistics/gender>.
- JACKSON, R.M. (1998) *Destined for Equality. The Inevitable Rise of Women's Status*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- KIMMEL, M. (2004) The Birth of the Self-made Man. In: Adams, R. & Savran D. (eds) *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- MANDAL, E. (2003) *Kobiecość i męskość. Popularne opinie a badania naukowe*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.
- National Science Foundation, <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/nsf11306/appendix/excel/tab6.xls>, 2009.
- PACZEŚNIAK, A. (2006) *Kobiety w Parlamencie Europejskim. Przetłamywanie stereotypu płci w polityce*. Wrocław: Atla 2.
- UNESCO, World Atlas of Gender Equality in Education 2012, on-line: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/world-atlas-gender-equality-education-2012-en.pdf>.
- SCHRIEWER, J. (2000) *Discourse Formation in Comparative Education. Contributions and Challenges of Feminist Theory*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- STINA LYON, E. (1996) Success with Qualification: Comparative Perspectives on Women Graduates in the Labour Market. *Higher Education*. 31.
- TITKOW, A. (2003) Wstęp. In: Titkow, A. (ed.) *Szklany sufit. Bariery i ograniczenia karier kobiet*. Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- VINNICOMBE, S., COLWILL, N.L. (1996) *Kobieta w zarządzaniu*. Wrocław: ASTRUM.