

Perception of Women in Top Managerial Positions in Poland

Anna Górska¹

Submitted: 16.06.2016. Final acceptance: 16.09.16

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of the pilot study was to find out whether the perception of candidates for leadership positions differs along with the gender of the candidate in Poland.

Methodology: In order to answer the question, the author has conducted a preliminary experiment on 50 MBA students, which were experienced in recruitment. Two identical CVs were randomly distributed among the participants, with either a male or female version of the CV. Basing on the provided information, respondents were to decide on among others hireability, likeability and offered income to the given candidate.

Findings: The experiment revealed that the female candidate for the CEO position was perceived and evaluated differently than the male candidate. Thus, the experiment indicated that gender inequality may already appear at the phase of recruitment for higher positions.

Originality: The presented study analyzed perceptions of experienced recruiters, which may suggest that such behaviors and patterns may be repeated in a non-laboratory environment.

Limitations: A limitation of the pilot study is the low number of participants and therefore further research should be conducted.

Keywords: gender, top management, leadership, inequality, women, perception

JEL: M14, M12, J16

¹ Kozminski University

Correspondence address: Kozminski University, Jagiellonska 57/59 St., 03-301 Warsaw, e-mail: amg@kozminski.edu.pl

Introduction

Stereotypically, society views men and women as distinct identities, where women are from Venus and men from Mars, suggesting that men and women are so different that even communication between the two is difficult. Similarly, the idea that a woman manager is different from a men manager, creates the distinction and valuation of who is better and who is worse (Witek-Crabb, 2012).

“The best leadership is found by choosing leaders from the largest pool of talent, and that includes women” Eagly (2007), but still, women are underrepresented in leadership positions in Poland (Smulewicz, 2014). Throughout history, management was dominated by men, while women’s access was in large part limited. Perception of a good and adequate manager was therefore associated with masculinity.

At the same time, factors such as stereotypes and prejudice, traditions and norms are still limiting women’s access to high and prestigious positions (Eagly, 2002). Despite various research proving that women are by no means worse leaders, the bias that a leader should be male still persists (see: Eagly and Carli, 2007; Powell and Butterfield, 2013).

As cultural messages regarding women’s role in society could lead managers to present a gender-biased attitude towards a female candidate, the review on the historical role of a women and stereotypes in Poland was conducted.

This paper will focus not only on the results, which include the gender gap, less women on prestigious positions and longer promotion time, but most importantly it will research whether women have the same possibilities of getting a job and earning the same amount as men do, when having identical skills, education and background.

Within this pilot research, the conducted experiment will evaluate the hireability and likeability differences between male and female candidates for leadership positions.

Women in Poland

Women in Poland are still underrepresented on the top managerial positions and despite a significant increase in the employment of women over the last decade, there is still a persistent disproportion in the employment rate between the genders (Smulewicz, 2014). When it comes to middle management in Poland, the percentage of women in these positions is higher than the EU average, whilst the gender gap is still at the level

of 16% (European Commission, 2014). When looking at the data from the top management, there are even higher discrepancies. Firstly there are significantly less women than man and secondly they earn on average 20% less (Sedlak&Sedlak, 2011). In research conducted by Grant Thornton International it is presented that women constitute 37% of all managerial positions in Poland, which compared to Germany or Japan (14 and 8 perc. respectively), are a positive shift. In the same time, only 5% of them get promoted to top managerial positions, with the highest power and prestige (Forbes, 2015).

Official statistical data show that there is a higher unemployment rate among females, despite the fact that women are better educated and generally are more willing to increase their qualifications in comparison to men (Pieńczykowska, 2014). Moreover the unemployment rate is significantly higher for women even when looking at specific socio-demographic factors such as age, education and duration of unemployment. Women on the same position are better educated than men, similarly, unemployed women are better educated than unemployed men (GUS, 2014).

A study conducted by *Harvard Business Review Polska* and Hays Poland in 2013 presented the findings that a majority of CEOs have higher education with specialization in Finance or HRM, additionally the same data show that even though there are more women with those specializations, a great majority of CEOs are still men. It means that education may not necessarily be the obstacle for women to become a CEO. Additionally, it may be an example of the “glass escalator”, whereas in feminized sectors, where there are more women than men, it is still more likely that men will get promoted.

From the analysis by made Anna Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz in 2006 in her book *Women and Institutions (Kobiety i instytucje)* there are several factors influencing the situation of a women as an employee. Firstly, employers are hiring men more often than women and this tendency is ongoing despite the fact that parental leave is available for both genders. The author also emphasized the stereotypical attitude, that women are handling their lack of employment better than men, while in fact the duration of women’s unemployment is longer than men’s.

Literature Review

Hofstede Masculinity vs. Femininity MAS index analysis

In order to better understand business culture in Poland, the Hofstede MAS index has been analyzed. It verifies whether a given culture has a more masculine or feminine

approach. The index refers to the distribution of the roles and values in business culture and is a societal not an individual characteristic (Hofstede, 2011). Poland has scored 64 out of 100 points, which means that Poland is a masculine society and therefore typical masculine values are more appreciated. In comparison, Sweden has scored only 5 points. Masculinity in this regard refers to higher competitiveness and assertiveness in society, making goal-orientation, power, strength, material success and individual achievements more valuable (Hofstede, 1998). Additionally, a high score in this index means that emotions and social roles between genders are differentiated and are defined by the stereotypes (Hofstede, 2001). In highly masculine societies “Men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success; women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life” (Hofstede, 2001). The masculinity index is positively correlated with the individualism index, which means that the more masculine the society is, the more individualistic it is (values personal achievement rather than group achievement).

The fact that Poland scored high in this index is a sign, that gender roles and stereotypes play an important role in the business culture, moreover a women working in a highly masculine society, has to adapt those masculine characteristics, as they are demanded and respected. Women’s role in countries with a high score in this index, have to face stereotypes regarding their social role, emotionality and power, while men are favored in the business culture.

The index proves that in Poland the differentiation between genders is high and stereotypes are important. Further analysis is needed about what are the typical gender stereotypes in Poland and how it affects women’s role in the society.

Historical role of women in Poland

One of the reasons for the disproportion between the number of women and men in large companies are cultural and historical factors (Forbes, 2014). In Poland the situation of women was different than in the rest of the world, as women during the partitions of Poland, were put on a pedestal, being responsible for raising future patriots. Still, women had a well-defined social role, which did not include higher education or professional work, but maintaining the national spirit in young minds. At that time, the archetype of a “polish-mother” started to arise, where women were meant to sacrifice for the sake of the husband, children and patriotism (Titkow, 1995).

The influence that women had on the young patriots, created the responsibility on the national identity of society, which led to the creation of the first women schools

(in 1775), where women were taught how to be a good wife and mother, through the growth of their “talents” – such as piano lessons and French literature. As a result women had no real possibility to get an education sufficient for work, other than that at home (Walczevska, 2000). Only in 1825, women were allowed to study at the Jagiellonian University, but still only certain courses were available for women, and still they were not allowed to work at the Universities (thus leading to Maria Skłodowska having to eventually leave the country).

Before the First World War, during the formation of the new labor market, the gender division was very visible, as women were not prepared for the demands of the arising new economy. The segregation of women and men in the labor market was formed and as a result wage gaps were significant. Only in 1920 women were given equal political rights and unrestricted access to higher education in Poland (Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz, 2006). However, society still lacked acceptance for women which focused on their education or careers, instead of family and household (see: Śmiarowska, 1925).

In the interwar period, the lack of male employees influenced the activation of women on the labor market. However, due to the fact that women were not as well educated as men, women were tended to be used a source of cheap labor (Żarnowski, 2000). Additionally, married women, were perceived by society as ones that do not have to work, as its their husbands obligation to take financial care of the family and in many situations, married women were released from public institutions (Żarnowski, 2000). A lack of education and the negative attitude towards women employees, were reflected in their wages – whereas women earned on average 40% of men’s income and moreover, women with a higher education, were faced with an even higher wage gap – as they were offered only half of men’s remuneration.

After the Second World War, in the centrally planned economy, the full employment policy minimalized the division into feminine and masculine jobs, where women were working in typically physical, male jobs, but were still seen as a second choice employee. After the recovery from the war, women were “protected” from the hard physical work, as their role as a mother became crucial for the country’s future again. Maternity leave was created, as well as policies aimed at “protecting” women from “too much” work and encouraging women to become mothers. In 1983, the segregation into female and male work was very visible, whereas the majority of women worked in sectors such as health care, social care, primary education, whilst earning 30% less than men (Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz, 2006).

The fact that women earned less was seen as a norm, as their role was to take care of the family at home, while men should take care of the finances. This belief survived decades and is still visible in Polish “traditional” values (Titkow, 1995).

Stereotypical role of a women in Poland

Gender is a categorization which occurs instantly, as well as the division of men as different social identities, influencing social norms, roles and behaviors (Eagly, 2004). Women were referred to as the “other”. As no group could define itself without setting up the opposite, “other”, in many cases this was represented by women (Beauvoir, 1989). Out of the division of self and other, stereotypes arise, in order to explain and give meaning to the duality. Gender stereotypes place men and women as opposites, whereas the “behavior of the men is considered as a norm, while women’s as a deviation from this norm” (McClelland, 1975).

Generally, gender stereotypes create a more positive image of women than of men (Eagly and Mladinic, 1994) and what creates discrimination is the mismatch, “lack of fit” model which creates prejudice towards women (Heilman, 2001). Female stereotypical traits including warmth and niceness are inconsistent with the attributes connected with success. Thus, stereotypically nice women, when put in a leadership position, are perceived inversely – as not being nice.

In Poland gender stereotypes are deeply imbedded in the perception of women and men and their role in history, and now it is perceived as natural and obvious (Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz, 2006). Typically women and girls in the family are given responsibility for the private and emotional spheres, while men and boys are responsible for the financial support of the family. Working in the household became a “natural” domain of women, leading to a situation where 21% of adult men in a relationship in Poland, aged from 18 to 65, do not perform any household activities (Titkow, Duch-Krzyszczek and Budrowska, 2004). Further research proved that the employment of women does not change the division of tasks in a household, moreover, even when the husband is unemployed, while the wife works full time, still women are responsible for the majority of housework (Balińska, 2007).

From another perspective it is believed that women are “naturally” worse leaders, have more difficulties with decision making, and have typical predispositions to take care of children instead of taking care of the company. It is also believed that women do not have adequate traits and predispositions to hold high and prestigious positions, as being too emotional, chaotic and not assertive enough (Balińska, 2007).

Stereotypes may be especially important when talking about high, prestigious and powerful positions such as leadership roles. The way employees, subordinates and colleagues, perceive women who are in such positions, may be an indicator of their attitude and even performance.

Perception of women managers

Probably the single most important hurdle for women in management in all industrialized countries is the persistent stereotype that associates management with being male – Berthoin and Izraeli (1993)

Women's discrimination in managerial positions goes beyond barriers to enter higher positions. Generally, women are perceived as worse leaders, due to the long standing domination of this position by men, which have defined the styles that people have been used to and therefore the traits which are associated with being a good leader are typically masculine (Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). This belief fosters the situation in which men exercise more leadership (Eagly and Carli, 2001) and are seen as being a leader by default. Additionally, what creates an even more negative perception of the female leader is the lack of compatibility. "People have similar beliefs about leaders and men, but dissimilar beliefs about leaders and women" (Eagly, 2001). A typical leader should impose masculine traits, while women are feminine and this creates a not coherent picture of the person, as a result a negative performance expectations is created which leads to biased evaluation of the performance and the negative attitude towards a person (Eagly, 2008).

The consequence of the biases against women, is that people diminish the work of female managers, and in a situation when the value of work is impossible to be denied, people attribute success to external factors rather than women's abilities, and if even that is not possible, a female manager is disliked, rejected and seen as negative (Heilman, 2007).

The experiment at Harvard Business School by Professor Cameron Anderson and Professor Frank Flynn, showed how gender may encourage different attitudes towards successful individuals. Students were given the case study with the history of the successful female entrepreneur Heidi Rozen. Half of the respondents received the case with a real name, while the other half, with a fake male name – Howard. Even though the evaluation of the competences did not change with regard to the gender of the analyzed entrepreneur, the attitude changed significantly. Respondents considered Howard to be more likable, and an appealing colleague. At the same time Heidi was seen as selfish and "not a type of person you would want to hire or work for" (Flynn and

Anderson, 2003). This experiment proved that for women, they either have to be successful and competent or likeable, but rarely both, hence "success and likability are positively correlated for men and negatively correlated for women" (Sandberg, 2013).

Persistence of sex stereotypes led organizations to allocate women within management to a function that is strongly linked to female stereotypes. In this respect, assigning women to HRM offered a solution for organizations to deal with growing demands for enhancing diversity within management without giving up the traditional classification of female and male work (Reichel, Brandl and Mayrhofer, 2005).

Method

The following pilot study is aimed at informing on the possible causes of the gender disproportion in top managerial positions in Poland. This pilot study is aimed at testing whether cultural biases may be influential in the evaluation of identical candidates of different genders, whereas further research on a larger sample is needed.

The research method that has been chosen for this paper is due to show whether men and women have the same possibilities in terms of getting a job as men. Additionally it will provide information about differences in perception, employability, likeability and offered income. The author, basing on the previous experiment, reasoned that the pervasive cultural messages regarding women's role in society could lead managers to present a gender-biased attitude towards a female candidate.

Pilot CV experiment

The present pilot study sought to test differences in perception and treatment of equally qualified men and women, which are candidates for top managerial positions within the company. The experiment was conducted in the native language of the participants to minimize the error in the answers and not influence the results. The questionnaire was divided into 4 parts; a) hireability, b) offered income c) likeability d) comments.

Participants

The participants in this experiment were 52 MBA students from Kozminski University in Warsaw. All of the participants have managerial experience, thus they were familiar with the recruitment process. Participants were asked to read one time the story and CV of a randomly ascribed candidate, either male (Karol, n=26) or female (Karolina,

n=26). Thus, each participant saw only one set of materials, from either a male or female applicant, from which they were to evaluate the candidate.

Results

A sample of 52 respondents have evaluated the application materials of a candidate for a CEO position. All participants received the same materials, which were randomly assigned either with a male (n=26) or female (n=26) candidate. The gender of the candidate was the only variable that differed the candidates. 19 questions were analysed, out of which 8 indicated statistically significant differences ($p < 0,05$). In order to state whether the results between a male and female candidate for the CEO positions are significant, a student t – test was conducted.

The questionnaire was divided into 4 parts for the purpose of simplifying the analysis and all results are presented in the Appendix 1.

In part 1 participants rated a candidate's employability, adequacy for the positions, ability to cope on the position, chance for success and recommendation of the candidate to the company owner, on the scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 stood for NO and 5 for YES). Out of six questions, one was statistically significant ($p < 0,05$), that regarding becoming friends with the candidate.

On average, the male candidate was rated in this question 17% more favorably in comparison to women ($p < 0,05$). Additionally, the number of respondents that rated the candidate above 3 (rather yes and yes), was two times higher for the male candidate in comparison the female one. Moreover, the results indicated a negative correlation between the gender of the candidate and making friends with the candidate ($\text{corr.} = -0,23$), which point out that the desire to make friends is positively correlated for men and negatively for women.

The second part of the questionnaire, asked respondents about the offered income to the male or female candidate for the CEO position. In order to minimize personal bias, a fictional currency X was used in the description. In order to standardize data and give participants a reference point, they were provided with additional information which was minimum and maximum wage. The following part of the questionnaire indicated statistically significant results ($p < 0,05$) with regard to the gender of the candidate and therefore the gender of the evaluated candidate influenced responses.

On average, the female candidate was offered 2264 x, while male candidate 2684 x ($p < 0.05$), which indicates a 16% difference.

In the third part, respondents were asked to choose on the semantic differential, the extent to which they would rate a given candidate as likeable. Questions in this section were constructed with positive and negative adjectives on the opposite sides of the scale attitude. The middle value on the scale was 6, thus results below 6 indicated a negative attitude, while above 6 a positive attitude. In the following part there were 11 questions, out of which 5 were significantly influenced by the gender of the candidate ($p < 0.05$): perceived niceness, competence, friendliness, honesty and helpfulness. All of the statistically significant differences between perceived "likeability" of the candidate in relation of candidates gender were favorable to the male candidate.

The highest discrepancy and significance was observed in the perception on niceness of candidates, where women were evaluated as not nice (average 5,56) in comparison to men who were assessed as nice (average 7,12) ($p < 0.0001$). 92% of all negative responses (below 6) in regard to perceived niceness were ascribed to a female candidate, in comparison, a male candidate received only one negative evaluation. In the case of perceived competence, a male candidate did not indicate any negative responses, in comparison to 8% of negative respondents on a female's candidacy ($p < 0.05$). Moreover, 56% of respondents that were evaluating a male's CV rated him with a highest mark (10), while in the case of a female's CV there were allocated only 16% of the highest mark to her, which is a 40 percentage point difference in the favor of a male candidate.

In the honesty evaluation, a male candidate did not arouse any negative attitudes, in comparison to 12% of respondents who analyzed a female CV ($p < 0.05$). A female candidate was also evaluated less favorably in helpfulness perception, when compared to male candidate. Even though, on average a male and female candidate's helpfulness was still perceived in a positive way (average above 6), a female CV indicated 44% of negative responses, compared to 12% of males ($p < 0.05$).

The last, fourth part of the questionnaire, gave the respondents the possibility to verbalize their own attitude and opinion towards an evaluated candidate. Each opinion was analyzed and evaluated as positive (1), negative (-1) or neutral (0). The results indicated a high significance value ($p < 0.001$), which means that the gender of a candidate had a significant effect on the negative or positive attitude towards a candidate.

Results from the analyzed comments of the participants, indicated significant differences towards the candidates with regard to their gender. A female candidate elicited

a negative attitude, while the male one positive. On average, the male candidate had a more positive attitude from the participants by 257%. Moreover, a female candidate was evaluated in a negative way in 48% of the cases, whilst in comparison a male candidate had no negative comments. Similarly, 44% of comments towards males were positive, in comparison to only 20% for females. The evaluation in the case of a male candidate was in the majority neutral, while in the case of a female candidate it was negative.

When looking at the comments which were given to male and female candidates, it was visible that a female candidacy for the CEO position aroused more emotional responses, compared to a male's candidacy.

When it comes to the description of each candidate, males and females were evaluated on different aspects. Therefore, when a female candidate was positively evaluated she was described as: *loyal, hardworking and experienced*. Meanwhile, a male candidate who received positive responses was described as: *intelligent, skillful, professional, competent, nice and trustful*. Thus, a female candidate was appreciated for characteristics that are easily measurable, while a male candidate was appreciated for soft issues that are difficult to measure and verify. Among the negative characteristics allocated to a male candidate as: *indistinct, grey, fuzzy, without personality*, and therefore all negativity was built around his lack of personality. In the case of a female candidate, respondents were less sympathetic, describing her as: *not nice, no potential, no authority, closed, introvert, not a leader*. In comparison to the fuzzy picture of the male candidate, a female candidacy gave a bright, negative picture, where respondents were more judgmental and critical. A female candidacy aroused not only a more negative attitude, but most importantly, strong emotions between the respondents.

Discussion

As a controlled experiment, this pilot study is the base for a research to fill the gap in existing literature, which consists of experiments conducted among professors or students. The present pilot is unique in investigating a subtle gender bias on the part of MBA students, which are experienced in the field of management.

The pilot study informs about possible causes of the gender disproportion in top managerial positions in Poland. The results revealed that with no regard to the gender of the participant, respondents judged a female candidate less favorably in every evaluated and statistically significant aspect, in comparison to an identical male candidate. The research points out that females may be judged less favorably as CEO

candidates, be offered less income and overall arise negative attitude. Thus, the result suggests that gender bias against women on CEO positions prevails and may affect the underrepresentation of females on higher positions in non-laboratory environment.

It should be emphasized that female respondents were just as likely as male respondents to favor a male candidate and thus this suggests that bias against a female candidate was likely to be unintentional and generated from cultural stereotypes, rather than hostility.

Furthermore, the study has presented similar results to an experiment which evaluated the attitude towards a successful female entrepreneur at Harvard University (Flynn and Anderson, 2003). This similarly presented that a female on a higher position faces a less positive attitude and is judged as a 'non friend material'. The present study, differs from the Harvard experiment in evaluation of competence. As in the case of Harvard, there was no differences in the perceived competence between a male and female entrepreneur, while in the present pilot study, a female was evaluated as being significantly less competent. Differences in the results may arise from different factors, starting from the fact that in Harvard an entrepreneur was analyzed on features up to the differences in the respondents profile, which were undergraduate students in the previous study.

Another study that was evaluating gender bias in the recruitment process, conducted by C.A. Moss-Racusin et al. (2012), also presented results suggesting that males are favored in regard to hireability, competence perception and offered income. The study was conducted on Professors from the research intensive universities. Similar to the following pilot study, a female candidate was discriminated against in all sections, with no regard to the gender of the respondents.

The previous works presented that women are perceived differently and less favorably in professional settings, but none of the studies evaluated female candidates for a CEO position among managers. By providing this investigation of a bias against women for CEO positions, the pilot study may be helpful in conducting further research and to extend available research.

The presented findings raise concerns about the situation of women as CEOs, as although gender does not affect the employability rate, females are judged less favorably and are less likeable. As a result, when a leader arouses negative attitudes it leads to poorer overall performance, less authority over the subordinates, and reluctance towards the leadership (Eagly, 2001).

This study raises the question as to whether women opt out of top management careers in part because of negative attitude towards them?

Limitations

The fact that respondents were given a fictional story would have influenced the outcomes of the study. In non-laboratory situations, in deciding on the evaluation of the candidate for the CEO position, much more in-depth information are analyzed. In the last part of the questionnaire analysis, the subjectivity of the author in coding the comments as positive, neutral or negative could not be omitted. As the presented study was a pilot test, broader research is needed.

Conclusions

The underrepresentation of women in top managerial positions, reflects a wasted opportunity to benefit from the capabilities of the best professionals, with no regards to their gender.

Even though the glass ceiling in Europe and in United States is believed to be long broken, women still face various barriers in reaching top managerial positions in organizations. Despite the fact that women are better educated nowadays (also in management) and are as ambitious as men are, there are still only a few of them in the most prestigious and powerful positions in organizations.

As the pilot study suggests, a factor that may limit women from reaching high positions is the perception of females. Women in Poland are still facing stereotypes which divide men and women into stereotypical roles: home being a natural domain of a woman, and the company of a man. This deeply imbedded archetype of a women-polish mother, affects the situation of women on the labor market, as they are judged by the employer through the lenses of a *mother and wife* and therefore may be seen as a less efficient worker, due to additional non-paid work at home (Mazurkiewicz-Zachorowska, 2006). Additionally, the "adequacy" of payment for men and women varies, due to the stereotypical division of roles: as men are responsible for finances, therefore women do not have to be highly remunerated (Bartol, 1980).

The present pilot study found that the perception of a woman in society, may affect the way they are evaluated as a potential employee. Due to the fact that society may

not be used to female CEOs, the responses of participants towards female candidates indicated high (in majority negative) emotions. The pilot study suggests that respondents may not even be aware of the fact that their evaluation differs with regards to the gender of the candidate, due to the fact that there are no differences in the evaluation by women.

The perception of a leader, whether he/she is liked and accepted, directly influences how effective his/her work is. As a consequence, subordinates may refuse women's leadership, which will decrease the effectiveness, resulting in women themselves doubting their own abilities.

The wage gap, less women on the labor market and the low percentage of women in top management positions or boards of directors, are only the results of a distorted perception of the female role in society. In order to limit the discrimination of women on the labor market, the perception of women has to first be changed.

References

- Balińska, B. (2007). *Raport: Polityka równości płci*. UNDP Polska.
- Bartol, K.M. (1980). Female managers and quality of working life: the impact of sex role stereotypes. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 1: 205–221.
- Beauvoir, S. de (1989). *The Second Sex*. Vintage books.
- Berthoin, A.A. and Izraeli, D.N. (1993). A global comparison of women in management: Women managers in their homelands and as expatriates. In: E. Fagenson (ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity* (pp. 52–96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The power of Identity*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Centrum Praw Kobiet (2000). *Wpływ procesu prywatyzacji na położenie kobiet: kobiety polskie w gospodarce okresu transformacji – raport z badań*. Warszawa.
- Eagly, A. (2007). Female leadership, advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00326.x>
- Eagly, A. and Carli, L. (2007). *Through the Labyrinth. The truth how women become leaders*. Center for Public Leadership.
- Eagly, A. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *Leadership Quarterly*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.007>
- Eagly, A.H. and Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The Leadership Styles of Women and Men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00241>
- Eagly, A.H., Wood, W. and Diekmann, A.B. (2000). *Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current Appraisal*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A.H. and Mladinic, A. (1994). Are People Prejudiced Against Women? Some Answers From Research on Attitudes, Gender Stereotypes and Judgements of Competence. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 5(1).
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00326.x>

- Flynn, F. and Anderson, C. (2003). *Heidi vs. Howard: An Examination of Success and Likeability*. Columbia Business School and New York University.
- Forbes (2015).
<http://csr.forbes.pl/rosnie-rola-kobiet-w-hierarchii-polskich-firm,artykuly,200680,1,1.html>
- GUS (2014). *Kobiety i mężczyźni na rynku pracy 2014*,
http://stat.gov.pl/download/gfx/portalinformacyjny/pl/defaultaktualnosci/5821/1/5/1/pw_kobiety_i_mezczyzni_na_ryнку_pracy.pdf
- Heilman, M.E. (2001). Affirmative Action: Some unintended Consequences for working women. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 16: 125–169.
- Heilman, M. and Parks-Stamm, E.J. (2007). Gender Stereotypes in the workplace: Obstacles to women's career progress. *Social Psychology*, 24, [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0882-6145\(07\)24003-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0882-6145(07)24003-2)
- Heilman, M.E. and Eagly, A.H. (2008). Gender stereotypes are Alive, Well and Busy Producing Workplace discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1.
- Hofstede, G., *Masculine Index in Poland*, <http://geert-hofstede.com/poland.html> (25.01.2017).
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences*. Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). *Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context*, <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=orpc> (25.01.2017).
- European Commission (2014). *Przeciwdziałanie różnicy w wynagrodzeniu dla kobiet i mężczyzn w Unii Europejskiej*,
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/gender_pay_gap/140319_gpg_pl.pdf
- Kupczyk, T. (2009). *Kobiety w zarządzaniu i czynniki ich sukcesów*. Wrocław: Wyższa Szkoła Handlowa.
- Karau, S. and Eagly, A. (1999). Invited Reaction: Gender, Social Roles, and the Emergence of Leaders. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10(4): 321–327.
- McClelland, D. (1975). *Power: The Inner Experience*. New York: Irvington.
- Moss-Racusin, C., Dovidio, J.F., Brescoll, V.L., Graham, J. and Handelsman, J. (2012) Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students, *Proceedings of the National Academy Sciences of the United States of America*, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3478626/>
- Operario, D. and Fiske, S.T. (2004). *Stereotypes: Content, structures, processes and contest*. Social Cognition.
- Peterson, V.S. and Runyan, A.S. (1993). *Global Gender Issues*. Oxford: Westview press.
- Pieńczykowska, J. (2014). *Kobiety są lepiej wykształcone, ale wciąż zarabiają mniej*. [Polskatimes.pl](http://www.polskatimes.pl),
<http://www.polskatimes.pl/artykul/3358929,kobiety-sa-lepiej-wykształcone-ale-wciaz-zarabiaja-mniej,id,t.html>
- Powell, G.N. (1990). One more time: Do male and female managers differ? *Academy of Management Executive*, 12.
- Powell, G.N. and Butterfield, D.A. (2013). Sex, gender and aspirations to top management: Who's opting out? Who's opting in? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(1),
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.11.003>
- Reichel, A., Brandt, J. and Mayrhofer, W. (2005). *The strongest Link: Legitimacy of Top Management Diversity, Sex Stereotypes and the Rise of Women in Human Resources Management 1995–2004*, 21(3): 332–352.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean In: Women, Work and the will to Lead*. Deckle Edge.
- Schein, V.E. (2001). A Global look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4): 675–688.
- Sedlak&Sedlak (2011). *Ogólnopolskie Badanie Wynagrodzeń*,
<http://wynagrodzenia.pl/artykul/wynagrodzenia-kobiet-i-mezczyzn-w-2011-roku>

- Smulewicz, M., http://www.biznes.newseria.pl/news/w_polskich_firmach_ubylo,p1905735156
- Sherman, H.J. (1996). A holistic Evolutionary View of Racism, sexism and class inequality. In: W.M. Dugger (ed.), *Inequality; Radical Institutional Views on Race, Gender, Class, and Nation* (pp. 39–52). Westport, London: Greenwood Press.
- Śmiarowska, J. (1925). *Higiena kobiety we wszystkich okresach jej życia*. Lwów.
- Titkow, A., Duch-Krzystoszek, D. and Budrowska, B. (2004). *Nieodpłatna praca kobiet. Mity, realia, perspektywy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Titkow, A., Duch-Krzystoszek, D., Budrowska, B. (2006). *Polka i jej rodzina na tle Europy. Redystrybucja prac domowych: jej uczestnicy i konteksty*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.
- Titkow, A. (2003). *Szklany sufit. Bariery i ograniczenia karier kobiet*. Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- Titkow, A. (1995). Kobiety pod presją? Proces kształtowania się tożsamości. In: A. Titkow and H. Domański (eds.), *Co to znaczy być kobietą w Polsce?* Warszawa: IFiS PAN.
- Walczevska, S. (2000). *Damy, ryccerze i feministki: kobiecy dyskurs emancypacyjny w Polsce*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo eFka.
- Witek-Crabb, A. (2012). Wybory strategiczne kobiet i mężczyzn na najwyższych stanowiskach kierowniczych. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 260.
- Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz, A. (2006). *Kobiety i instytucje. Kobiety i instytucje. Kobiety na rynku pracy w Stanach Zjednoczonych, Unii Europejskiej i w Polsce*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Śląsk”.
- Żarnowski, J. (2000). Praca zawodowa kobiet w Polsce międzywojennej. In: A. Żarnowska i A. Szwarc (eds.), *Kobieta i praca. Wiek XIX i XX*. Warszawa: DiG.

Appendix

Table 1. Average and significance of the first part of the questionnaire

$$n_{\text{male candidate condition}} = 25 \quad n_{\text{female candidate condition}} = 25$$

	min-max	male average	female average	difference male-female	significance value
becoming friends with candidate	1–5	3,6	3	0,6	p<0,05
employability	1–5	3,32	2,8	0,52	p>0,05
adequate for position	1–5	3,2	3,08	0,12	p>0,05
ability to cope in the position	1–5	3,56	3,32	0,24	p>0,05
chance for success	1–5	3,8	3,64	0,16	p>0,05
recommendation of candidate	1–5	3,24	2,8	0,44	p>0,05

Source: author's own work.

Table 2. Average and significance value of the second part of the questionnaire

$$n_{\text{male candidate condition}} = 25 \quad n_{\text{female candidate condition}} = 25$$

	min-max	male average	female average	difference male-female	significance value
offered monthly income in X	0–3500	2684	2264	420	$p < 0,05$

Source: author's own work.

Table 3. Average and significance of the third part of the questionnaire

$$n_{\text{male candidate condition}} = 25 \quad n_{\text{female candidate condition}} = 25$$

	min-max	male average	female average	difference male-female	significance value
nice	1–10	7,12	5,56	1,56	$p < 0,0001$
competent	1–10	9,16	8,08	1,08	$p < 0,01$
friendly	1–10	6,36	5,2	1,16	$p < 0,01$
honest	1–10	9,12	8,16	0,96	$p < 0,05$
helpful	1–10	7,68	6,32	1,36	$p < 0,05$
interesting	1–10	6,84	6,04	0,8	$p > 0,05$
intelligent	1–10	8,76	8,48	0,28	$p > 0,05$
moral	1–10	8,08	7,32	0,76	$p > 0,05$
conflicting	1–10	3,64	4,28	-0,64	$p > 0,05$
career oriented	1–10	3,8	4,68	-0,88	$p > 0,05$
supportive	1–0	7,16	6,28	0,88	$p > 0,05$

Source: author's own work.

Table 4. Average and significance value of the fourth part of the questionnaire.

Scale: 1 represents positive attitude, 0 neutral and -1 negative attitude

$$n_{\text{male candidate condition}} = 25 \quad n_{\text{female candidate condition}} = 25$$

	min-max	male average	female average	difference male-female	significance value
attitude positive, neutral, negative	-1 to 1	0.44	-0.28	0.72	$p < 0.001$

Source: author's own work.