

GENDER DIVERSITY IN THE DEANS OF BRAZILIAN UNIVERSITIES: CAREER TEMPORAL EVOLUTION, PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE AND OF HUMAN RESOURCES

DIVERSIDADE DE GÊNERO NAS PRÓ-REITORIAS DE UNIVERSIDADES BRASILEIRAS: EVOLUÇÃO TEMPORAL DE CARREIRA, PRODUÇÃO DE CONHECIMENTO E DE RECURSOS HUMANOS

DIVERSIDAD DE GÉNERO EN RECTORES UNIVERSITARIOS BRASILEÑOS: EVOLUCIÓN TEMPORAL DE CARRERA, PRODUCCIÓN DE CONOCIMIENTO Y RECURSOS HUMANOS

CAROLINA ANDREA NODARI

Mestre em Educação em Ciências pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Assistente em Ciência e Tecnologia da Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brasília – DF.

carolina.nodari@gmail.com

CLAUDIO CELSO SOARES DE OLIVEIRA

Mestrando em Avaliação e Monitoramento de Políticas Públicas pela Escola Nacional de Administração Pública (Enap). Analista em Ciência e Tecnologia da Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Brasília – DF.

claudio.oliveira@capes.gov.br

MARCIA CRISTINA BERNARDES BARBOSA

Doutora em Física pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Professora Titular do Instituto de Física da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) – Porto Alegre – RS.

marcia.barbosa@ufrgs.br

Recebido em: 30/06/2022

Aceito em: 16/05/2024

Publicado em: 03/09/2024

Abstract

Women are underrepresented in positions of power and leadership in higher education and the challenges faced by women in order to reach these senior positions in academia are complex and have received considerable attention in recent years. In this work, we quantify gender diversity in Brazilian academia using three types of indicators: production of knowledge, temporal evolution in the career, and training of human resources to study in detail the profile of the Deans of Research and Graduate

Studies in 215 Higher Education Institutions in the year of 2019. Our analysis shows that around only 36% of positions were occupied by women, a percentage that is not consistent with the number of women professors in Brazilian higher education. Using the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development Lattes' Platform databank, we show that men and women in dean positions publish roughly the same number of paper/scientific articles per year and present almost the same time elapsed in the career path, while women produce more human resources. The fact that women occupy only 1/3 of the positions of dean of research and graduation reveals that for women to reach the top, it is necessary that they adapt to the same metric intended for men while facing additional challenges indicating a persistent glass ceiling.

Keywords: Gender. Women in higher education. Glass ceiling. Academic leadership inequity.

Resumo

As mulheres estão sub-representadas em cargos de poder e liderança no ensino superior e os desafios enfrentados pelas mulheres para alcançar esses cargos superiores na academia são complexos e têm recebido atenção considerável nos últimos anos. Neste trabalho, quantificamos a diversidade de gênero na academia brasileira usando três tipos de indicadores: produção de conhecimento, evolução temporal na carreira e formação de recursos humanos para estudar detalhadamente o perfil das Pró-Reitorias de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em 215 Instituições de Ensino Superior no ano de 2019. Nossa análise mostra que apenas cerca de 36% dos cargos eram ocupados por mulheres, percentual que não condiz com o número de docentes mulheres no ensino superior brasileiro. Utilizando o banco de dados da Plataforma Lattes do Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, mostramos que homens e mulheres em cargos de pró-reitores publicam aproximadamente a mesma quantidade de artigos por ano e apresentam quase o mesmo tempo decorrido na carreira, enquanto as mulheres produzem mais recursos humanos. O fato de as mulheres ocuparem apenas 1/3 dos cargos de pró-reitora de pesquisa e graduação revela que, para que as mulheres cheguem ao topo, é necessário que se adaptem à mesma métrica destinada aos homens, enfrentando desafios adicionais que indicam um teto de vidro persistente.

Palavras-chave: Gênero. Mulheres no ensino superior. Teto de vidro. Desigualdade na liderança acadêmica.

Resumen

Las mujeres están subrepresentadas en puestos de poder y liderazgo en la educación superior y los desafíos que enfrentan las mujeres para lograr estos puestos más altos en la academia son complejos y han recibido una atención considerable en los últimos años. En este trabajo, cuantificamos la diversidad de género en la academia brasileña utilizando tres tipos de indicadores: producción de conocimiento, evolución temporal en la carrera y formación de recursos humanos para estudiar en detalle el perfil de los Vicerrectores de Investigación y Posgrado en 215 Instituciones de Educación Superior en 2019. Nuestro análisis muestra que sólo alrededor del 36% de los puestos estaban ocupados por mujeres, porcentaje que no coincide con el número de profesoras en la educación superior brasileña. Usando la base de datos de la Plataforma Lattes del Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico mostramos que hombres y mujeres en cargos de vicerrectoría publican aproximadamente la misma cantidad de artículos por año y tienen casi el mismo tiempo transcurrido en sus carreras, pero las mujeres producen más recursos humanos. El hecho de que las mujeres ocupan sólo 1/3 de los cargos de vicerrectoría de investigación y postgrado revela que, para que las mujeres lleguen a lo más altas, es necesario que se adapten a la misma métrica destinada a los hombres, enfrentando desafíos adicionales que indican un techo de cristal persistente.

Palabras clave: Género. Mujeres en la educación superior. Techo de cristal. Desigualdad en el liderazgo académico.

1 Introduction

Science and education, which can lead to advances and discoveries, are considered two of the main structures which modern societies are based on and result in guiding norms, behaviors and actions that influence societal dynamics. An analysis of the distribution of power in these fields can also reflect an analysis of the distribution of power in the social field, in which we can say that the opposite is also valid (ARÊAS; SANTANA; BARBOSA, 2020; LIMA, 2017). Schiebinger describes the space for women to build a career inside or outside academic life as limited and this restricted access to a scientific career occurs, among other reasons, due to a social structure around male interests and power: “attitudes toward gender are not peripheral to science but structure key aspects of both the institutions in which science is produced and the knowledge issuing from those institutions” (SCHIEBINGER, 1999).

The instruments of domination identified by Pierre Bourdieu, as well as his theoretical framework, have been used in the literature to explore the multidimensional nature of power and leadership in a higher education environment (ARÊAS, 2019; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021; ARÊAS; SANTANA; BARBOSA; 2020; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2023; BEATTIE, 2018; LETA; MARTINS, 2008; LIMA, 2017). Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic fields refers to autonomous fields understood as social spaces of domination and conflict, with their own rules and hierarchical structures. Far from being a purely epistemological process, the field is a product of the social factor coexisting with a diverse set of interests, conflicts, needs for legitimation and domination.

Scientific capital is described by Bourdieu as a particular kind of symbolic capital, which is founded on the acts of knowledge and recognition, and consists of the recognition, or credit, attributed by the set of peers-competitors within the scientific field (BOURDIEU, 1975; CATANI, 2017):

As a system of objective relations between positions already won (in previous struggles), the scientific field is the locus of a competitive struggle, in which the specific issue at stake is the monopoly of scientific authority, defined inseparably as technical capacity and social power, or, to put it another way, the monopoly of scientific competence, in the sense of a particular agent’s socially recognized capacity to speak and act legitimately (i.e. in an authorized and authoritative way) in scientific matters (...) Because all scientific practices are directed towards the acquisition of scientific authority (prestige, recognition, fame, etc.), intrinsically two-fold stakes, what is generally called “interest” in a particular scientific activity (a discipline, a branch of that discipline, a method) is always two-sided; and so are the strategies tending to bring about the satisfaction of that interest (BOURDIEU, 1975, p. 19).

In his book *Homo Academicus* (1984), Bourdieu analyzed the French university system inspired on the events of may 1968 and portrayed the logic of the university field in relation to the foundations of the categories generated there that structure it and enable its permanence or change. The academic and scientist produces a specific type of knowledge and, therefore, exercises a social practice that is legitimized and recognized as such. Symbolic capital, which is characterized by the agent's position in the capital distribution structure and, above all, how it is perceived by their peers, equally endowed with perception and appreciation schemes to act in this space, occurs through their career evolution and ends up positioning it in the space constructed of differences (BOURDIEU, 1975; AZEVEDO, 2017; CATANI, 2017; BOURDIEU, 2019).

In the academic field that interrelates research centers, scientific associations, state funding agencies, legitimacy is built and ends up reflecting in the spaces and intricacies in which academic activity can take place. The field of higher education is seen, then, as a space of struggles, circulation and distribution of public and common goods where the exchange of symbolic goods takes place, including objects of value to the academic field such as prestige and recognition (BOURDIEU, 1975; CATANI, 2017; HEY, 2008; AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2017; HEY; RODRIGUES, 2017; BOURDIEU, 2019). For Beigel, “specific processes of accumulation of academic capital have a direct incidence in the distribution of symbolic prestige” (BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023).

Within the scope of Brazilian higher education, the battles generated in the space of academic production from Bourdieu's perspective were analyzed by Hey:

The imposed agenda means that the dominant discourse on the social world not only has the function of legitimizing domination, but also the task of guiding the action aimed at perpetuating it in order to transmit a moral and morality, a direction and guidelines to those who direct and execute this domination. This is why the dominant discourse needs to impose itself as a realistic policy, or better yet, as an action project with chances of success, insofar as it itself imposes a biased - because partial and interested - and realistic vision, that is, capable of imposing its own need on all those who place themselves at the point of view from which it is taken, in the manner of a perspective vision (HEY, 2008, p. 32, translated by the authors.).

As a consequence of this dominant structure, women are underrepresented in positions of power and leadership, not only in science (BEIGEL, 2023), but in almost all activities and this lack of women in senior positions has received considerable attention in recent years. In

the business world, this has been studied extensively by companies that point out the economic harms of this underrepresentation (YPO; FINANCIAL TIMES; HEFORSHE, 2021; DIXON-FYLE *et al.*, 2020; HUNT; LAYTON; PRINCE, 2015, BEIGEL *et. al*, 2023). In academic careers, this has also been increasingly researched (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2020; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021). Despite this absence of women in higher and more prestigious positions, progress has been made. Today, in Brazil, women are already half of undergraduate (BRASIL, 2021b), master's and PhD students (BRASIL, 2021a) and correspond to half of the workforce (BRASIL, 2020). A study by the editorial group Elsevier indicates that half of Brazilian publications have women in their authorship and these advances seem to indicate that the system is moving towards becoming more equitable (ELSEVIER, 2017).

Despite recognizing the importance of general advances, it is essential to emphasize that serious gender inequalities persist in education and science, with negative impacts on the country's social, scientific, and economic development, as indicated in studies on the subject. This ongoing gender gap faced by women goes beyond issues of morality or social justice. Other spheres would be positively impacted, starting with the economy itself, which could be strengthened with a more egalitarian participation based on the stimulation of female potential. Gender parity could help leverage around US\$12 trillion to global GDP by the year 2025, according to a McKinsey Global Institute report (WOETZEL *et al.*, 2015).

While the area of education can be understood as an overrepresentation of women because the workforce is traditionally composed of more women (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021), this does not translate into gender equity in the teaching profession. While women represent 95% of pre-primary teachers, and 59% of secondary education, when it comes to higher education institutions (HEIs), they are still a minority, representing around 47%, although in a slightly higher proportion compared to the world average that reaches 44% (OECD, 2021).

The noteworthy progress in levels of education seen within the increase of women with undergraduate and graduate degrees in recent decades has also increased the pool of educated female talent. However, women continue to face significant challenges in career advancement and participation in the academic decision-making hierarchy. In the career path, women face different gender biases and encounter many social barriers, not only in the hiring process, but also in many other adjacent factors: in the way people refer to the professional by their first or last name, in the way laboratory instructions are formulated and the way scientific production is evaluated. Some of these barriers are often subtle and so much a part of the everyday way

men and women relate to each other that they may not even be noticed (AHMAD, 2017; ARÊAS, 2019; BIRD, 2011; ROSA; DREW; CANAVAN, 2020; SCHIEBINGER, 1999).

Different terms and expressions are used in the literature to illustrate the situation of gender inequality and the underrepresentation of women: leaky pipeline, glass ceiling, firewall, horizontal and vertical segregation, among many others that try to capture the complex phenomenon. The glass ceiling metaphor has been used since the late 1980s to describe the symbolic dimensions of the discriminatory processes that inhibit women and other groups from advancing to senior and executive management positions in organizations (BENDL; SCHMIDT, 2010). Similar to “glass ceiling” that refers to the invisible barriers that would prevent a group of people from ascending to the highest positions in their careers (LIMA, 2017; MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015), “firewall” refers to the systemic and dynamic forms of discrimination that make up the very structure of organizations and are everywhere (BENDL; SCHMIDT, 2010).

While leaky pipeline describes the progressive disappearance of women as they advance usually depicted with scissors graphs (AHMAD, 2017; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2020; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2023; VAN DEN BRINK; BENSCHOP, 2012; LIMA, 2017; ROSS *et al.*, 2022), “cultural sexism” is used by Savigny to describe the “significant, invisible and normalizing barrier to women’s progression in academia”. The author calculates that if the total number of teachers remains the same in the UK and if the rate of increase remains the same (0.75% per year), it will take more than 100 years for women to reach equal numbers (SAVIGNY, 2014; SAVIGNY, 2019).

The terms horizontal and vertical segregation are used to describe the unequal distribution of professionals according to sex in workspaces. Horizontal segregation indicates a higher proportion of one sex in some professional careers and in certain areas or sub-areas of knowledge (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021; LIMA, 2017; SCHIEBINGER, 1999). This horizontal segregation in the academic setting can be seen in different countries. In Brazil a persistent underrepresentation of women can be seen in certain areas of knowledge, study, and research, such as the STEM field, generally associated with more male characteristics (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021; LIMA, 2017; MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015). Schiebinger describes this horizontal segregation in the academic setting in the United States (USA) with a concentration of women in what are known as the “soft” sciences, which include the life and behavioral sciences, as well as social sciences, and where the salaries are lower. On the other hand, in the

“hard” or physical sciences, where prestige and pay are higher, fewer women are seen (SCHIEBINGER, 1999; BEIGEL, 2023). Computer Science is an example of a field that was dominated by women considering that at the beginning it required a lot of manual work with typing. As it became more automated and as the salaries increased its use, it became a male dominated field (SERRANO, 2017). Vertical segregation, on the other hand, describes situations in which the proportion of one sex is very high at one point in the hierarchy and very low at another, within the same area, career, or profession. Generally, the proportion of women is higher in entry-level, less valued positions, and extremely low in the highest and most prestigious positions.

Findings of Moschkovich and Almeida corroborate this hypothesis of a vertical exclusion in Brazilians academic setting. The study analyzed whether the greater equality of access to PhD and the increase in the number of women professors would have translated into greater equality of access to the leadership positions within the scope of the State University of Campinas (Unicamp). The study revealed a gender disparity, and women professors are more likely to be undergraduate coordinators, a lower-lever position. On the other hand, they are more excluded from more prestigious positions such as rector¹ and the university council. While men and women have similar numbers at the lowest level, the proportion of women professors is slightly lower than that of men at the intermediate level, around 40%, but significantly lower at the highest level, making it up to only 26%. The research also shows that until 2013, no woman had been provost and the first professor women to occupy one of the university’s six deans’ positions did so only in 2006, 40 years after its creation. In the University Council, between 2002 and 2011, among the 151 professors who acted as counselors, only 22.5% were women (MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015).

A study published by Leta and Martins, in 2008, on the scientific capital of women and men showed that of the 42 units in which Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) is divided into, only 16 were headed by women, and of these, the majority belong to areas of humanities, which are historically less targeted and prestigious. Considering the complexity of

¹ According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary a dean is the head of a division, faculty, college, or school of a university (DEAN, 2023) and a rector is the head of a university or school (RECTOR, 2023). In the same dictionary a provost is a high-ranking university administrative officer (PROVOST, 2023), and a chancellor is the titular head of a British university (CHANCELLOR, 2023). Dean is used in the USA/UK as responsible for specific activities of the University system, being usually a well-recognized specialist of this topic. In Brazil the function receives the name of “Pro-Rector”. Rector or president of the university is usually a more political job, and it is a person who oversees all activities of the university.

factors involved in gender relations in academia, they pointed out the imperative need to deepen research for more and better elements that can explain the “naturalized preferences” of women for certain areas, as well as for less prestigious positions in the academic environment and addressed the persistent blindness to sexism in academia that could still impact future generations (LETA; MARTINS, 2008).

The lack of women in senior positions within the academia portrayed in these studies has also been addressed by literature in other countries. As in Brazil, the differential in the career progression of women and men professors is a reality in the European Union. Recent research results show marked gender inequalities as women are not progressing at the same rate as men in their academic careers, especially regarding leadership positions: women made up only 24% of faculty members and 22% of the leaders of institutions in the higher education sector across the European Union (ROSA; DREW; CANAVAN, 2020).

A study showed comparable situation in the United Kingdom (UK), in 2014, where women in higher education made up 45% of the teaching staff, but they represented only 22% of faculty, 35% of deputy and pro vice-chancellors (PVCs) and 20% of vice-chancellors. The study also discusses whether the still significant gender gap is a case of absent structure or agency for women and findings show that:

(...) female academic managers are no less ambitious or likely to apply for a more senior management role than are their male counterparts. This implies that women’s missing agency is not in itself an adequate explanation for their continued underrepresentation at the top of higher education. Instead, talented, and ambitious women may be disadvantaged by a number of structural factors associated with the recruitment and selection process for senior posts, including lack of external career capital, conservatism and homosociability (SHEPHERD, 2017, p. 86).

In the USA, which also counts on the advancement of women in obtaining higher education degrees, at all levels, including PhD’s, and in the educational workforce, an analogous situation was found in different research and reports (BIRD, 2011; HILL *et al.*, 2016). It would be expected that women would also be occupying a large part of leadership positions in universities. But the reality is the same found in Brazil and women are still outside of academic leadership positions. There is an underrepresentation of women among full professors, precisely those who exercise a large part of decision-making power, as well as having the advantage of being able to prioritize research.

In science, the scenario repeats itself. Despite the increase in the number of women present in research, when analyzing 5.5 million articles and 27.3 million authorships, it revealed that men produce a greater number of articles, 70%, they also hold more first authorship, 66% (ELSEVIER, 2017). A very recent study published in the science journal Nature shows that this situation of the underrepresentation of women in science and faculty positions persists. This may be attributed to early discouragement among junior researchers once women are less likely to be recognized for their contributions being systematically left off the list of authors of scientific publications and patents. Results of this study showed that when regarding a reasonably successful paper, with the criterion of being cited 25 times, women are about 20% less likely than men to end up on the author list, especially regarding authorship on pivotal work. This all contributes to the leaky pipeline with women dropping out of research at higher rates at each stage of their careers and consequently, less likely to advance in their careers (ROSS *et al.*, 2022).

A study carried out by the Parent in Science Movement revealed an underrepresentation of Brazilian women in the recent ranking of the 100,000 most influential scientists in the world. Brazilian women represent only 11% of the “Top 100,000” ranking, which considers the career dataset, and only 18% of the “Top 2% - Single Year” category. This underrepresentation has a negative effect on women’s careers development, especially for those in leadership positions by reducing their visibility, which can potentially create a vicious circle. With a lower perceived academic performance women have less visibility, which in turn leads to more difficulties in increasing productivity (OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2021). A study on the relation between job level and productivity of Swedish researchers showed that underlying gender productivity differences, such as structural and behavioral factors, obstruct women’s academic careers, which can consequently lead to wasted talents (VAN DEN BESSELAAR; SANDSTRÖM, 2017).

The systemic labor deprivations faced by women in relation to men occur in practically all sectors of society: private initiative, public administration, government, including politics. In 2017, Brazilian women occupied an inexpressive 10.5% of the Chamber of Deputies seats, lagging far behind the already very low world rate, 23.6%. The situation repeats itself within strategic government positions and among the 28 ministers of state, only two were women, one of whom was effectively a minister of Human Rights, and the other only had ministerial status, holding the position of Attorney General of the Union (BRASIL, 2018).

Comparable to what happens in the academic environment, Brazilian public administration has a workforce composed of almost 50% of women. However, this expressive representation also does not translate into the occupation of positions of power and leadership (FERRARI *et al.*, 2018; MCINTOSH *et al.*, 2012; MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015; OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2021; VALENTOVA *et al.*, 2017). In the most prestigious positions of the Brazilian Federal Public Administration (APF), those of leadership and advisory, known as Direction and Superior Advisory (DAS), a glass ceiling is also seen. Currently, women make up 43% of the total of these positions, in contrast, the situation observed in the highest levels, DAS levels 4 to 6, they add up to only 33%, showing that women's access to these positions is still unequal (FIRMINO; SILVA, 2015).

The presence of women is even lower when it comes to the highest level, DAS 6, and women constitute only 19%, proving that access opportunities and their rates decrease as they reach higher and more restricted positions. This situation is aggravated by the fact that it means not only a difference in remuneration, but also in the prestige and status achieved, since there is a significant difference in the attributions and responsibilities of the position (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021; BRASIL, 2020; BRASIL, 2012; ESCOBAR; RIBEIRO; VIANA, 2020). This disparity in access to the highest positions still occurs even though 48% of women have higher levels of education (FIRMINO; SILVA, 2015).

In his theory of scientific and academic field and capital Bourdieu addressed that the investment needed by researchers depends both on the amount, measured by the time devoted to research, among other factors, and by its nature, which includes especially the degree of risk involved. It also depends on the amount of capital which they possess as well as on their positions in the field (BOURDIEU, 1975). As social constructions, gender norms do not dictate that women act in a certain feminine way or men the opposite. Political actors, however, traditionally composed of men, act as if sex and gender are associated with each other, leading to the establishment of a "gender logic of adequacy" within these institutional and scientific fields (CHAPPELL, 2006; CHAPPELL; WAYLEN, 2013). The problem resides in the fact that the homogeneity of the profile of those at the top, of those who hold the decision-making power in this academic environment, end up reproducing and perpetuating these metrics, rules, norms, and behaviors that exclude those who do not adapt. This homogeneity can also be understood as a lack of diversity, which in turn ends up limiting the stimulus to creativity and innovation.

The challenges faced by women in order to reach leadership positions in academic settings are complex and have been researched from different perspectives in different areas of knowledge (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2020, 2021; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2023; BEATTIE, 2018; FERRARI *et al.*, 2018; HILL *et al.*, 2016; HOWE-WALSH *et al.*, 2016; LIMA, 2017; MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015; SHEPHERD, 2017; VALENTOVA *et al.*, 2017; WALDMAN *et al.*, 2018). Authors have identified a range of factors that act as barriers to women working in higher education: the impact of formal and informal gendered practices as well as gendered institutional cultures, (ACKER, 1990; BENSCHOP; VERLOO, 2011; BIRD, 2011; VAN DEN BRINK; BENSCHOP, 2012; CHAPPELL, 2006; CHAPPELL; WAYLEN, 2013; MOSS-RACUSIN *et al.*, 2012; ROSA; CLAVERO, 2022) caring responsibilities (HIRATA, 2019; HEILBORN; RODRIGUES, 2018; STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2021), maternity (AHMAD, 2017; SANTOS MACHADO *et al.*, 2019; ROSA; CLAVERO, 2022; STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2021), and harassment (BRITO *et al.*, 2022; SCHIEBINGER, 1999).

The current configuration of the work organization process, which is structurally androcentric (STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2023; ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021), and the disparity in the use of time between men and women segregates and excludes women (WALLER, 2016) in the most diverse ways, devaluing their work and creating additional obstacles to their insertion in fields of knowledge and careers. Even today, it is possible to see the social roles assigned to men and women and the sexual division of labor regarding the role of caring for the home, children and family is still naturalized as a female role, which ends up overloading women. This adversity, not always obvious, translates, for example, into the double (or sometimes even triple) weekly work shift undertaken by many women (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2021). Brazilian women dedicated an average of 18.2 hours per week on homecare and/or childcare, while men spent almost half that time, on average, only 10.3 hours per week (BRASIL, 2018). This disparity is repeated even when women have a paid occupation, when they are heads of family and even when they receive a higher income (BRASIL, 2018; BRASIL, 2012; MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015). Even though in Brazil some academic women have the possibility of having a maid, data shows that they still have additional work when compared with men (MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015; STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2023).

Literature has shown the relation between motherhood and the maintenance or advancement of women's careers and how its consequences can create challenges (AHMAD, 2017; HILL *et al.*, 2016; HOWE-WALSH *et al.*, 2016; SANTOS MACHADO *et al.* 2019;

ROSA; CLAVERO, 2022; STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2021). For Staniscuaski *et al.*, “the impact of motherhood on women’s careers, concluded that the effect of children on women’s academic careers is so remarkable that it eclipses other factors contributing to women’s underrepresentation in science” (STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2021). In a survey led by the Parent in Science movement, findings showed that 81% of women scientists considered that motherhood had a negative impact on their scientific career (SANTOS MACHADO *et al.*, 2019).

Additionally, wage inequality is also still a persistent and universal problem faced by women. Despite considerable progress made by women in education and higher rates of women in the labor market in many countries, closing the gender pay gap remains a reality. According to UN Women data, the average salary of women is lower than that of men in almost all the countries in the world, and the situation is repeated in all levels of education, age groups, and in all sectors of work and it will take around 250 years to reach economic gender parity if it continues at this pace (UN WOMEN, 2020). In Brazil, recent studies have shown that, in general, men’s monthly income is almost 20% higher than that of women. But once again, the situation is aggravated when considering 12 years or more of education and men’s monthly income is 32.5% higher (BRASIL, 2020).

This study analyzed professors from federal and state universities, federal institutes, colleges, private universities, municipal universities, in addition to centers and institutes that have a research and graduate program. This includes, therefore, not only public servants but also professors from private institutions. Even though the salaries at the public universities at the same level does not depend on a specific sex, since women are underrepresented at the top-level positions, including as CNPq fellowship recipients (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2023), women’s average salary is lower than men’s salary.

In this work we examined the profile of 222 Brazilian Deans of Research and Graduate Studies during the year of 2019. Bringing Bourdieu’s discussion and reflection into the issue of gender relations in higher education and science, we seek to understand if one of the reasons for the continued underrepresentation of women at senior leadership levels in academic settings is the lack of equality, translated into stricter rules for women, or the lack of equity, a situation in which women who reach leadership positions comply with the same rules as men, which are incompatible with many other aspects of the dynamics of women’s lives.

2 Materials and methods

We examined the profile and distribution of both sexes of Deans of Research and Graduate Studies from 215 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) during the year of 2019. Data was requested from the Forum of Deans of Research and Graduate Programs (FOPROP). An electronic spreadsheet provided by FOPROP in Excel indicated the name of each of the Deans and their respective HEI information. The spreadsheet contained, in total, data referring to 244 institutions affiliated to FOPROP, among them: federal universities, state universities, federal institutes, university centers, colleges, private universities, municipal universities, in addition to institutes and research centers that have postgraduate studies.

The Deans of Research and Graduate Studies are located at the level immediately below the dean or vice-dean, constituting the second level of university management. Our findings confirm our initial hypothesis, because they show that there has not yet been a breakthrough in solving the problem of gender equity in the most influential leadership and hierarchical positions in the academic sector. Initially, we carried out an internet search to confirm that the names provided were correct and that the people indicated held the position during the period studied. For this, we consulted the websites of universities and institutions, as well as documents published in the Brazilian Federal Register (Diário Oficial da União in Portuguese). In this initial analysis, it was not possible to verify the deans of twenty institutions through the website or official documents. We contacted these HEIs by email and eleven institutions did not respond and, therefore, were excluded from the analysis.

Additionally, we excluded adjuncts and deputy deans, as well as those who did not occupy a position equivalent to a dean. Another seven institutions have two different deans, one for research and another for graduate studies, instead of just one, as is in most cases. The positions of these seven institutions were then considered individually. The spreadsheet also contained repeated data from three institutions that were excluded. Therefore, the final number of deans analyzed is 222.

We then proceeded to stratify the deans by sex. The first names were labeled manually, considering that in Brazilian culture first names are commonly gender specific. In the case of unusual first names, an internet search was carried out on websites such as Google Scholar, Curriculum Lattes platform, Research Gate, LinkedIn, institutional and university websites, to confirm the researcher's gender identity.

A more extensive survey was then carried out. The information was extracted through Curriculum Vitae Lattes (CV) on Lattes Platform during the year 2020 and the initial months of 2021. The platform is a virtual curriculum system created and maintained by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), through which it integrates a database of data from curricula, research groups and institutions in a single information system, in the areas of Science and Technology, in operation in Brazil.

As the object of study is the general profile of deans and how much time it takes them to reach the peak of their career, we chose not to analyze those who do not have a PhD. Another nine professors were excluded, five of whom were men and four were women, from nine institutions². Additionally, a dean with a PhD was excluded because he did not have a CV registered on the Lattes Platform.

The information extracted from the CV of each professor and computed into an Excel spreadsheet is the following:

- year of graduation, specialization, master's, and PhD completion.
- total number of complete papers/journal articles published in scientific journals.
- total number of books published or organized.
- total number of book chapters published.
- total number of participations in examining boards, including undergraduate, master's, and PhD.
- total number of supervised undergraduate students.
- total number of undergraduate students supervised in the Scientific Initiation Program (SI)³.
- total number of supervised master's students.
- total number of supervised PhD students.

We calculated the mean and standard deviation of the years elapsed between undergraduate and master's; master's and PhD; undergraduate and PhD; undergraduate and

² Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Farroupilha, University for the Development of Alto Vale do Itajaí, Federal University of Rondônia, Positive University, Facvest University Center, Presidente Antonio Carlos University, University of the Campaign Region, Federal Institute of Science and Technology of Amapá, Ingá University Center.

³ "Scientific Initiation" (SI) is a program offered by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), one of Brazil's main research funding agencies. It offers scholarships that are distributed among professors at the universities, and they select the undergraduate students who will work in their research projects. The students who receive this scholarship are referred to as SI students (FERRARI *et al.*, 2018).

position; masters and position; and PhD and position. In addition, we calculated the mean and standard deviation of the number of papers/scientific articles published; number of organized books and book chapters, work presentations, participation in an examination board including undergraduate, master's, and PhD; as well as the number of undergraduate students (including the SI), specialization, master's and PhD supervised.

We carried out an additional analysis of 14 higher education institutions to verify if the profile, trajectory of women and the distribution broken down by sex were maintained. The sample included the following HEIs: Federal University of Ceará (UFC), Paulista State University (Unesp), University of São Paulo (USP), Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Federal University of Goiás (UFG), Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE), University of Brasília (UnB), State University of Campinas (Unicamp) and Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCar). This analysis included 16 deans in total, since two HEIs have two different deans each, one for research and the other for graduate studies, instead of just one: UFRGS and Unesp.

Data from the two groups, universe (Universe, group 1, $n = 222$), and selected institutions (Selected, group 2, $n = 16$), were then tested for the "Sex" variable using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Wilcoxon, 1945) implemented in the *stats* package (*wilcox.test* function) available for the R programming language (R CORE TEAM, 2021). Data from the two groups were also presented in a box plot (or box-and-whisker plot), to visually indicate measures of central tendency and asymmetry of the data (DUTOIT, 1986; TUKEY, 1977; ROSS, 2004). The plots were created with the *ggpubr* package (KASSAMBARA, 2023), also available for the R programming language (R CORE TEAM, 2021).

3 Results

In this section we show the distribution by sex and categorize the profile of Deans of Research and Graduate Studies. We analyzed the trajectory of women compared to men, and this included the years elapsed between the obtained degrees of undergraduate, master's and PhD studies, as well as in relation to the occupation of the position in 2019. We also compared indicators between men and women regarding the publication of papers and scientific articles, books and book chapters organized; work presentations; participation in examining boards

including undergraduate, master's, PhD; as well as the number of supervisions of undergraduate, Scientific Initiation Program, specialization, master's, and PhD students. Our analysis was separated into three types of indicators: production of knowledge, temporal evolution in the career and training of human resources.

The indicators studied are separated into two groups: universe - all the HEIs analyzed, made up of 215 institutions and 222 professors; and selected - 14 selected universities with 16 professors. In the lower part of the graphs, the vertical line points to the lowest values, the upper part to the highest values, and the rectangle is divided into two parts: the second quartile and the third quartile, with the median being indicated by the line separating the two parts.

The results of the analysis of the distribution by sex of universe showed us a huge discrepancy regarding the number of women occupying the positions: only 82 women professors, while the number of men reached 140. This is equivalent to a representation of as little as 36.93% of positions occupied by women. When we analyzed the group of 14 selected universities, composed of five women and eleven men, we found that the percentage of women is even lower, representing only 31.25% occupying the positions.


This percentage of around 36% women as deans is related to the low percentage of women with the Research Scholarship (PQ) from CNPq (ARÊAS; BARBOSA; SANTANA, 2019), of women members of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences (VALENTOVA *et al.*, 2017) and of women professors in positions of postgraduate coordination's, directors of faculties and institutes, provosts and deans, as well as members of university council of Unicamp (MOSCHKOVICH; ALMEIDA, 2015). This numerical coincidence reflects a glass ceiling, a limiting factor for the advancement of women in the career, even when women represent half of PhD students and almost half of HEI professors in Brazil.

We first compared indicators of knowledge production. Chart 1 illustrates the distribution of the total number of papers/scientific articles published by women (blue) and men (yellow) Deans of Research and Graduation Programs with all the HEI at the left (Universe) and selected universities at the right (Selected). The solid line represents the data median and the region below the first quartile and the line above the third quartile. We found that there was a small difference (statistically non-significant) when we compared the publication of papers and scientific articles, as shown in Chart 1, between women and men, in both groups, Universe and Selected. We observed, however, a relevant difference between who publishes more and who publishes less, and this is due to several complementary factors: deans coming from

different areas with different publication standards, the profile of the person who assumes this type of position is not necessarily a person who preferentially dedicates himself/herself to research but may be an academic who also dedicates himself/herself to other activities related to the university, including administrative ones.

In Chart 1, the first group, Universe, has very close medians of women and men: 32 and 48.5 respectively (statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 6561$, $p\text{-value} = 0.07563$). The second group, Selected, has a slightly higher median publication of articles when compared to the first group, women – 90 and men – 103 (statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 26.5$, $p\text{-value} = 0.9548$), possibly because the sample includes only cutting-edge universities. The difference between men and women in this second group is also small when compared to the data dispersion. Another factor that also draws attention in this chart is a greater number of outliers, that is, people who publish a higher number of papers/scientific articles that differ from the productivity of the rest of the group. The number of publications of these outliers is higher in the case of men in the Universe group, which can possibly be explained by the fact that men have a more linear career and form larger collaborative networks than women researchers (AHMAD, 2017; BENSCHOP; VERLOO, 2011; BIRD, 2011; VAN DEN BRINK; BENSCHOP, 2012; HOWE-WALSH; TURNBULL, 2016; WIECZOREK-SZYMAŃSKA, 2020). For Beigel: “An unequal distribution of social capital is related to less opportunities for women to achieve academic legitimation and to access prestigious networks” (BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023). The similarity in the career path of the deans might be explained by the design of the promotion system in the public system which includes production as a requirement (SAITOVITCH, 2015).

Chart 1 - Number of papers/scientific articles published by deans.



Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).


The result of the analysis of the number of papers published seems to indicate that there is not an expressive difference between the number of publications by men and women who reach this position. A study on CNPq's Research Scholarship grantees (PQ) in physics reached the same result (ARENZON *et al.*, 2013). Although the profiles of men and women occupying the position of deans and PQ fellows are the same in terms of number of papers and scientific articles published, this does not mean that, in general, men and women have the same profile of publications. As it happens with the occupation of a dean's position, a PQ grant not only represents an important indicator of prestige in the academic and scientific career, but it also represents the gain of scientific capital, in the sense coined by Bourdieu (1975). It promotes visibility and recognition in the scientific community while providing researchers with a series of new accumulations and other opportunities, such as participation in advisory and judgment committees (FERRARI *et al.*, 2018).

Recent studies carried out by the Parent in Science group adds data to an existing literature that shows that the unbalanced division of domestic work and motherhood, among so many other factors closely related to gender, have a significant impact on women's scientific and academic careers creating additional barriers and challenges (SANTOS MACHADO *et al.*, 2019; OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2021; STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2021). We can conclude that, somehow, the women who reach these leadership positions are only those who manage to overcome these additional obstacles not faced by men.

Two other indicators of academic production analyzed were the number of books and book chapters organized and the number of works presented. In both cases, the medians are remarkably close in both groups showing us that when these two indicators are added to the number of articles published the profile of men and women in the dean's position are not very different regarding academic production.


To understand how this process of overcoming obstacles takes place, we analyzed the time elapsed in years dedicated to obtaining degrees, as well as from these to the occupation of the position in the year of 2019. The time elapsed between undergraduate degree and PhD awarded Chart 2 (Universe: statistically significant difference at 95%, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 4696$, $p\text{-value} = 0.03466$; Selected: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 21.5$, $p\text{-value} = 0.5311$); undergraduate degree and position in 2019 Chart 3 (Universe: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 5653.5$, $p\text{-value} = 0.993$; Selected: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 33.5$, $p\text{-value} = 0.532$); and PhD awarded and position in 2019 Chart 4 (Universe: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 6374$, $p\text{-value} = 0.1698$; Selected: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 38$, $p\text{-value} = 0.253$) also show a small difference in the average time of these intervals when comparing men and women, but this small difference, once again, can be despised when compared to the dispersion presented.

Chart 2 - Time elapsed between undergraduates' degree and PhD.




Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).

Chart 3 - Time elapsed between undergraduates' degree and deans' position in 2019.



Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).

Chart 4 - Time elapsed between PhD awarded and deans' position in 2019.



Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).


The difference observed between the indicators of career time when comparing men and women is, however, a surprising finding in this study. In the corporate world, where larger attention has been given to gender equity, it is already clear that women reach positions of power at an older age than men, which can be attributed to motherhood and domestic activities due to traditional gender roles. A recent study reveals the still-present gender gap and the barriers that hinder the presence and/or delay the advancement of women in high-level positions: 73% of women reported taking a leave of absence or deferring career advancement to meet family needs, while only 42% of men made the same choice. In addition, nearly half of the women noted that “cultural gender expectations” were an obstacle, while an unimpressive 2% of men reported having this perception. Another factor of concern for women in leadership is that for some positions there is an actual or expected age limit in the community which leads to an exclusion of these women from reaching the top (YPO; FINANCIAL TIMES; HEFORSHE, 2021). The lack of gender lens in the career path can possibly create situations in which women only reach the top-level positions if motherhood and homecare do not cause a negative impact in their productivity, indicating that, maybe, only women with a network of helpers are able to reach these positions.

Finally, we evaluated the indicators of human resources training, that is, the supervision of students. The medians found in the total number of supervisions of master's students as shown in Chart 5 (Universe: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 6412.5$, $p\text{-value} = 0.1448$; Selected: statistically non-

significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 19$, p -value = 0.363), and in the total number of supervisions of PhD students, in Chart 6 (Universe: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 6389.5$, p -value = 0.1437; Selected: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 32.5$, p -value = 0.6054), are not statistically different. This indicates that men and women professors produce basically the same number of human resources when it comes to these postgraduate modalities, as also found in study by Ferrari *et al.* (2018).


Chart 7 illustrates the number of undergraduate students supervised under the scientific initiation program (Universe: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 5051.5$, p -value = 0.1355; Selected: statistically non-significant difference, Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, $W = 12.5$, p -value = 0.1002). Women have a higher number (although not statistically different) of supervised SI students, especially in the Selected group, once again consistent with the findings of Ferrari *et al.* (2018) in which women professors have almost twice as many SI students. This phenomenon is explained in the study by the fact that men do not invest time in SI supervision, since they are only undergraduate students and, therefore, do not tend to develop competitive research and write papers that have the possibility of being published (FERRARI *et al.*, 2018).

Chart 5 - Number of master's supervisions.




Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).

Chart 6 - Number of PhD supervisions.



Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).

Chart 7 - Number of SI Program supervisions



Source: Elaborated by the authors with data from Lattes Platform (2020).

This behavior is also consistent with that portrayed by Bird, in which women professors are destined to develop activities considered of lesser value within universities (BIRD, 2011). The overrepresentation of women in lower academic positions or in positions with temporary contracts in findings by Van den Besselaar and Sandström shows that this leads to a vicious cycle that negatively impacts women's scholarly productivity, meaning this causes a scenario in which women have higher teaching loads and less access to funding, career perspectives, and research opportunities (VAN DEN BESSELAAR; SANDSTRÖM, 2017;

BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023). Therefore, a larger number of women professors dedicating time to these types of activities and supervisions, as we could also see in our study, can be the effect of gender bias and of a sustained existence of the glass ceiling in academic institutions. Despite some differences from the USA, a similar situation can be observed in Brazil, since obtaining scholarships and financing projects requires both time and dedication. A fellowship is highly regarded not just for the financial support it offers, but more importantly for the recognition and prestige it confers upon their recipients and those who primarily dedicate their efforts teaching, and extension activities might not receive the same level of recognition or prestige (BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023).

Considering so many important advances that could be noticed in the last decades in Brazil in relation to women's access to higher education and graduate studies and the substantial number of women present in the educational field, it was to be expected that they would be more present in positions such as that of Deans of Research and Graduate Studies. The fact that only 1/3 of the positions of dean of research and graduation are held by women is, however, consistent with the literature that brings findings in the same sense: the difficulty women face to occupy positions that accumulate greater power within universities, revealing a persistent glass ceiling. In addition, the small difference between all the results of the indicators (Charts 1 to 7) allows us to infer that for women to reach the top it is necessary that they adapt to the same metric intended for men. Even though women are able to understand the elements used in the creation, elaboration and maintenance of these metrics, the position of dean has a political element, which is also biased by the male world.

Additionally, it is possible to identify that the processes of vertical exclusion are still a very present and operative mechanism. For this cycle of perpetuation of inequities to be broken, it is necessary to continue investigating, not only the origins, but also the dynamics involved in these processes. In this work, by showing that the differences in the profiles between men and women in positions of power within universities were very similar, we identified that the central problem is not the lack of equality, given that both are treated equally, but a lack of equity generated by a design of a more masculine career that does not consider the reality of women.

A comparable situation occurs in the two main Brazilian funding agencies linked to science, research, and education, as well as in the Brazilian Academy of Sciences (ABC). A recent study showed an extremely low percentage of women members in the Academy, only

14% (FERRARI *et al.*, 2018). A study by Arêas *et al.* (2021) analyzed how the presence of women in leadership positions, evolved at the Brazilian Federal Agency for the Support and Evaluation of Postgraduate Education (CAPES) and the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) over the last 20 years. Findings show that there is a vertical segregation once the percentage of women in both agencies decreases as the positions provide higher salary, prestige, and decision-making power. A horizontal segregation was also perceived, in the sense that, there is a lower participation of women in the positions of CNPq, an agency linked to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations and associated with scientific research, than CAPES, which in turn is linked to the Ministry of Education and, in this case, more associated with an educational profile, traditionally more feminine.

There is also a large disparity between men and women in the representation of Brazilian scientists in the recent ranking of the 100,000 most influential scientists in the world. Brazilian female scientists represent only 11% of the “Top 100,000” ranking that considers the career dataset, and only 18% of the “Top 2% - Single Year” category (OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2021). Findings also revealed a disparity in the distribution of CNPq funding. In the agency’s universal calls, women scientists were targeted for smaller funds to carry out their research when compared to men scientists (GORZIZA; BUONO, 2023). Women are also more often represented among CNPq’s Research Scholarship (PQ) holders at the lowest levels of the research classification system. In contrast, men scientists were more often found at higher levels of PQ holders (VALENTOVA *et al.*, 2017; BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023).

The pipeline model portrayed in the literature explicitly favors men for demanding maximum performance in a short period, ignoring practices that result in a work climate that is often incompatible with the reality of women and reflects the real restrictions on women’s career choices, especially after being awarded with their PhD’s. The way this model is structured means that the non-participation of women in any of the career stages can be considered equivalent to giving up, making a subsequent return to the pipeline almost impossible or at least highly unlikely (AHMAD, 2017; SCHIEBINGER, 1999). The percentage of women applying to grants, for instance, the research fellowship from CNPq, is lower than their presence as professors at graduation programs (BEZERRA; STANISCUASKI; BARBOSA, 2022).

To be able to occupy more prestigious positions, as is the case of Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, women need to fit into a profile of success that has its metrics based on

the male world. This adaptation process is identified by Meyerson and Kolb as a strategy of “equipping women” (MEYERSON; KOLB, 2000). Women’s qualifications are adapted to minimize the existing differences between men and women, so that they can compete as equals in the labor market, according to rules that, presumably, men already know (BENSCHOP; VERLOO, 2011; VAN DEN BRINK; BENSCHOP, 2012; MEYERSON; KOLB, 2000).

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we quantified the diversity in terms of gender of Brazilian Deans of Research and Graduate Studies in the year of 2019. We showed that only 36,9% of the positions were occupied by women, when considering all the HEIs, and an even lower percentage in the Selected group, 31,25% - percentages that are not consistent with the number of women in higher education. We also compared and categorized the profile of women and men deans using three indicators: production of knowledge, temporal evolution in the career and training of human resources.

At first, we explored the possibility that women, in order to become a dean, usually viewed as a leadership position, would need to have a higher production than men. However, this was not the case. We showed that, except for a few small differences, men and women have a profile that differs very little. In pure academic positions, it was shown that women show a similar publication profile when compared to men (BEIGEL *et al.*, 2023; FERRARI *et al.*, 2018; ARENZON *et al.*, 2023). In political-academic positions, however, the percentage of women is even lower when compared to the academic positions (ARÊAS *et al.*, 2023). While in the pure scientific arena, the most relevant capital is the scientific capital. In the case of the political-scientific positions, both the scientific and the university capitals are relevant (CATANI, 2017; HEY, 2008; HEY; AZEVEDO *et al.*, 2017; RODRIGUES, 2017; BOURDIEU, 2019).

This means, then, that the requirements that women need to meet are the same, or at least very similar. This observation, however, does not allow us to affirm that there is gender equity, as the challenges faced by women differ fundamentally from those faced by men due to maternity issues, sexual division of labor, conscious and unconscious bias, which still entails a heavier burden of household chores for women, harassment, among so many others. For women to reach the same rates as men, do so in a condition of clear inequality.

A noticeable conclusion concerns the small difference observed in the indicators referring to the time elapsed in the career when comparing men and women that allows us to conclude that for women to reach the top, it is necessary that they adapt to the same metric intended for men. All this together allows us to conclude that, when it comes to leadership positions, Brazilian Higher Education is not diverse in terms of gender. The fact that only 1/3 of the positions of dean of research and graduate studies are held by women reveals additional challenges not faced by men indicating a persistent glass ceiling. One distinction between men and women is the ability of building networks (OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2021); due to additional familiar and social responsibilities, women compete in unequal conditions (STANISCUASKI *et al.*, 2023). This study suggests that the inclusion of another career path or compensatory measures can ensure women arrive at the same rate as men to the top positions that would lead to careers with equity instead of equality. This sometimes is compensated by equity measures developed in specific fields where women are a majority. This generates differences between fields where women are majority or minority (BEZERRA; STANISCUASKI; BARBOSA, 2023).

Finally, our results in this study show that equality without equity causes such effects that, in their career path, women need to deny their status, not as a way of creating a broader equity movement, but as a submission to an androcentrically designed model of success based on unformulated rules that do not take women's reality into account. To reverse this situation, it is necessary to adapt the metric for promotion and progression in the career to allow different timings and different profiles that in turn would consequently include women that take longer paths due to motherhood and other gendered issues that still permeate the academic environment.

Many of the problems women face in their career paths today, including those regarding leadership positions in higher education have deep historical roots and gender differences have been forged by these historical circumstances. The asymmetrical division of parenting and domestic tasks between men and women has a huge impact on women's careers once positions in leadership roles often involve working long hours and the reduced time dedicated to the paid workforce leads to fewer opportunities for advancement.

Bourdieu described this unequal and permanent struggle that takes place in the scientific field between agents, the dominant, who occupy the highest positions in the structure of the distribution of scientific capital, and the dominated, both equipped with proportional

specific capital in pursuit of the appropriation the product of scientific labor accumulated by previous generations (BOURDIEU, 1975). In the academic and scientific setting, this can be translated into the still very present misogyny that prevents the reality of women from being considered in the creation, elaboration and maintenance of metrics that govern the academic career. Recent comparison between physics and nursing research fellows from CNPq indicated that when women are majority the career design is changed to accommodate the maternity and other dynamics more present in the women's life (BEZERRA; STANISCUASKI; BARBOSA, 2022).

Higher education and research are powerful instruments of social change and universities can be strategic institutions for promoting gender equality, diversity, and inclusion, not limited to the context of its own context, but also to society at large. Despite not being a new field of study, it can be said that, both in gender studies and in studies on higher education, there is still an enormous field of work and research to be developed on the underrepresentation of women and the lack of diversity in these environments. Bringing data and dealing with this issue can help to explain the dynamics and mechanisms of segregation, exploitation, and inequality that reproduce a fraction of the social injustices faced by women that are still present today.

References

- ACKER, J. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. **Gender and Society**, v. 4, n. 2, p. 139-158, jun., 1990. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/189609>. Accessed on: 14 oct. 2023.
- AHMAD, S. Family or future in the academy?. **Review of Educational Research**, v. 87, n. 1, p. 204-239, feb., 2017.
- ARÊAS, R. **Pós-graduação: impactos, desafios e oportunidades sob a luz da equidade de gênero**. 2019. Tese (Doutorado em Educação em Ciências: Química da Vida e Saúde) – Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, 2019. Available at: <https://lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/215333>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.
- ARÊAS, R.; ABREU, A.; NOBRE, C.; BARBOSA, M. C.; SANTANA, A. E. Androcentrism in the scientific field: brazilian systems of graduate studies, science and technology as a case study. **Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências**, v. 95, p. e20211629, maio 2023. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aabc/a/vD6RsbDs8frc7xBJXXbfK4y/?lang=en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.
- ARÊAS, R.; BARBOSA, M. C.; SANTANA, A. E. Teorema de Emmy Nöther, 100 anos: alegoria da misoginia em ciência. **Revista Brasileira de Ensino de Física**, v. 41, p.

e20190017, maio, 2019. Available at:

<https://www.scielo.br/j/rbef/a/QMssdFcrHV33LkWhM3PL68K/>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ARÊAS, R. P.; NODARI, C. A.; CARDOSO, M.; SANTANA, A. E.; BARBOSA, M. C. Misogyny in Brazilian federal government agencies for science and high-education. **Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências**, v. 93, p. e20201389, 3 sep. 2021. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aabc/a/rCFc45xJCnFfCY9vgQ4GnfC/?lang=en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ARÊAS, R.; SANTANA, A. E.; BARBOSA, M. C. A discriminação da intelligentsia no campo científico brasileiro. **Revista Educação, Cultura e Sociedade**, v. 10, n. 3, 28 oct. 2020. DOI 10.30681/ecs.v10i3.3943. Available at: <https://periodicos.unemat.br/index.php/recs/article/view/8684>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ARENZON, J. J.; DUARTE, P.; CAVALCANTI, S.; BARBOSA, M. C. Women and physics in Brazil: publications, citations and H index. **AIP Conference Proceedings**, v. 1517, n. 1, p. 78-79, mar., 2013. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4794228>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

AZEVEDO, M. L. N. de; CATANI, A. M.; HEY, A. P. Circulação das ideias e internacionalização da Educação Superior: inferências a partir da teoria dos campos de Pierre Bourdieu. **Educação**, [S. l.], v. 40, n. 3, p. 296-304, 2017. Available at: <https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/article/view/28980>. Accessed on: 9 nov. 2023.

BEATTIE, L. Educational leadership: a nirvana or a battlefield? A glance into the higher education in the UK using Bourdieu. **International Journal of Leadership in Education**, v. 21, n. 5, p. 608-620, sep., 2018. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2017.1330490>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BEIGEL, F.; ALMEIDA, A. M.; GALLARDO, O.o; *et al.* Scientific production and gender inequalities in two academic elites: Brazil and Argentina. **Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines**, n. 42, p. 255-280, 2023. Available at: <http://journals.openedition.org/rhsh/8374>. Accessed on: 16 out. 2023.

BENDL, R.; SCHMIDT, A. From 'Glass Ceilings' to 'Firewalls'- different metaphors for describing discrimination. **Gender, Work & Organization**, v. 17, n. 5, p. 612-634, 2010. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00520.x>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BENSCHOP, Y.; VERLOO, M. Gender change, organizational change and gender equality strategies. In: JEANES, E. L.; KNIGHTS, D.; MARTIN, P. Y. (eds.). **Handbook of gender, work and organization**. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. p. 277-290.

BEZERRA, A. R. G.; STANISCUASKI, F.; BARBOSA, M. C. Brazilian research productivity fellows in physics and nursing under a gender lens: 17 years of data. **Cadernos de Gênero e Tecnologia**, v. 15, n. 46, p. 64, 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.utfpr.edu.br/cgt/article/view/15472>. Accessed on: 16 oct. 2023.

BEZERRA, A. R. G.; STANISCUASKI, F.; BARBOSA, M. C. B. O perfil das mulheres bolsistas de produtividade em pesquisa do CNPq de física e enfermagem: trajetórias acadêmicas distintas. *In: Anais do XIV ENPEC (to be published)*. Caldas Novas, Goiás.: [s.n.], 2023. Available at: <https://www.if.ufrgs.br/~barbosa/Publications/Gender/bezerra-ENPEC-2023.pdf>.

BIRD, S. R. Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: a case-study approach. **Gender, Work & Organization**, v. 18, n. 2, p. 202-230, 2011. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BOURDIEU, P. The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason. **Social Science Information**, v. 14, n. 6, p. 19-47, dec., 1975. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847501400602>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BOURDIEU, P. **Usos sociais da ciência**: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico. trans. by Denice Barbaro Catani. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2004.

BOURDIEU, P. **Homo Academicus**. Trad. Ione Ribeiro Valle; Nilton Valle. 2. ed. Florianópolis, SC: Edufsc, 2019.

BRASIL. Fundação Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. **Número de doutoras cresce 61% em seis anos**. Brasília: Capes, 2021a. Available at: <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/assuntos/noticias/numero-de-doutoras-cresce-61-em-seis-anos>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BRASIL. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. **Estatísticas de gênero**: indicadores sociais das mulheres no Brasil. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2018. Available at: <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/index.php/biblioteca-catalogo?view=detalhes&id=2101784>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BRASIL. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada. **Mulheres e homens em ocupação de DAS na administração pública federal**. Brasília: Ipea, 2012. Available at: <https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/handle/11058/7745>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. **Resumo técnico do Censo da Educação Superior 2019**. Brasília: Inep, 2021b. Available at: https://download.inep.gov.br/publicacoes/institucionais/estatisticas_e_indicadores/resumo_tecnico_censo_da_educacao_superior_2019.pdf.

BRASIL. Ministério da Mulher, da Família e dos Direitos Humanos. Secretaria Nacional De Políticas Para As Mulheres. **Relatório Anual Socioeconômico da Mulher (RASEAM) 2017/2018**. Brasília: MMFDH, 2020. Available at: <https://www.gov.br/mulheres/pt-br/central-de-conteudos/noticias/2023/abril/observatorio-brasil-da-igualdade-de-genero-retoma-producao-anual-do-raseam-2013-relatorio-socioeconomico-da-mulher/relatorio-anual-socioeconomico-da-mulher-2017-2018.pdf>.

BRITO, C.; BARBOSA, M. C.; PAVANI, D. B.; COSTA, A. B.; NARDI, H. C. Harassment in Brazilian universities: how big is this problem? The Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) as a case study. **Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências**, v. 94 (2),

e20201720, Apr., 2022. Available at:

<https://www.scielo.br/j/aabc/a/gThR3Njnbx4945tDm5SfzWd/?lang=en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

CATANI, A. M. *et al.* **Vocabulário Bourdieu**. Belo Horizonte: Editora Autêntica, 2017.

CHANCELLOR. *In*: MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM Online Dictionary. Merriam-Webster, 2023. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dean>. Accessed on: 18 oct. 2023.

CHAPPELL, L. Comparing political institutions: revealing the gendered “logic of appropriateness”. **Politics & Gender**, v. 2, n. 2, p. 223-235, jun., 2006. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/politics-and-gender/article/abs/comparing-political-institutions-revealing-the-gendered-logic-of-appropriateness/147F5FDFA61BA824CAB6DA049DED31BE>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

CHAPPELL, L.; WAYLEN, G. Gender and the hidden life of institutions. **Public Administration**, v. 91, n. 3, p. 599-615, 2013. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2012.02104.x>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

DEAN. *In*: MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM Online Dictionary. Merriam-Webster, 2023. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dean>. Accessed on: 17 oct. 2023.

DIXON-FYLE, S.; DOLAN, K.; HUNT, D. V.; PRINCE, S. **Diversity wins: how inclusion matters**. [S. l.]: McKinsey & Company, 2020. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-inclusion-matters>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

DU TOIT, S. H. C.; STEYN, A. G. W.; STUMPF, R. H. **Graphical exploratory data analysis**. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1986.

ELSEVIER. **Gender in the global research landscape**. 2017. Available at: https://www.elsevier.com/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1083945/Elsevier-gender-report-2017.pdf.

FERRARI, N. C.; MARTELL, R.; OKIDO, D. H.; ROMANZINI, G.; MAGNAN, V.; BARBOSA, M. C.; BRITO, C. Geographic and gender diversity in the Brazilian academy of sciences. **Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências**, v. 90, p. 2543-2552, jun., 2018. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aabc/a/8wVQQNCHBS9MDzyXVrd4Hnt/?lang=en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

FIRMINO, C. R.; SILVA, F. H. E. da. Desigualdades de gênero no serviço público do Poder Executivo federal. *In*: PALOTTI, P.; FREIRE, A. (eds.). **Servidores públicos federais: novos olhares e perspectivas**. Cadernos Enap. Brasília: Enap, 2015. Available at: <http://repositorio.enap.gov.br/jspui/handle/1/2563>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

GORZIZA, A.; BUONO, R. O efeito-tesoura para mulheres na ciência. **Revista Piauí**, São Paulo, jul., 2023. Available at: <https://piaui.folha.uol.com.br/o-efeito-tesoura-para-mulheres-na-ciencia/>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HEILBORN, M. L.; RODRIGUES, C.. Gênero: breve história de um conceito. **APRENDER - Caderno de Filosofia e Psicologia da Educação**, n. 20, dec., 2018. Available at: <https://periodicos2.uesb.br/index.php/aprender/article/view/4547>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HEY, A. P. **Esboço de uma sociologia do campo acadêmico**: a educação superior no Brasil. São Carlos: EdUFSCar; São Paulo, FAPESP, 2008.

HEY, A. P.; RODRIGUES, L. S. Elites acadêmicas: as ciências sociais na academia brasileira de ciências. **Tempo Social**, [S. l.], v. 29, n. 3, p. 9-33, 2017. Available at: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/ts/article/view/125964>. Accessed on: 9 nov. 2023.

HILL, C.; MILLER, K.; BENSON, K.; HANDLEY, G. **Barriers & Bias**: the status of women in leadership. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women (AAUW), 2016. Available at: <https://www.aauw.org/resources/research/barrier-bias/>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HIRATA, H. Entrevista: Helena Hirata. **Trabalho, Educação e Saúde**, v. 17, p. e0021138, maio. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/tes/a/zzPPBSkWHqgd9xBt5jLKWSN/?lang=pt>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HOWE-WALSH, L.; TURNBULL, S. Barriers to women leaders in academia: tales from science and technology. **Studies in Higher Education**, v. 41, n. 3, p. 415-428, mar., 2016. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.929102>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HOWE-WALSH, L.; TURNBULL, S.; PAPAVALASILEIOU, E.; BOZIO NELOS, N. The influence of motherhood on STEM women academics' perceptions of organizational support, mentoring and networking. **Advancing Women in Leadership Journal**, v. 36, p. 54-63, 2016. Available at: <https://awl-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/awl/article/view/21>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

HUNT, D. V.; LAYTON, D.; PRINCE, S. **Why diversity matters**. [S. l.]: McKinsey & Company, 2015. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/why-diversity-matters>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

KASSAMBARA, A. **ggpubr**: “ggplot2” based publication ready plots. 2023. Available at: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr>.

LETA, J.; MARTINS, F. Docentes pesquisadores na UFRJ: o capital científico de mulheres e homens. *In*: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep) (ed.). **Simpósio Gênero e Indicadores da Educação Superior Brasileira**. Brasília: [s. n.], 2008. p. 85-101. Available at: https://download.inep.gov.br/publicacoes/diversas/temas_interdisciplinares/simposio_genero_e_indicadores_da_educacao_superior_brasileira.pdf.

LIMA, B. S. **Políticas de equidade em gênero e ciências no Brasil**: avanços e desafios. 2017. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Sociais) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, 2017. Available at: <https://repositorio.unicamp.br/Acervo/Detalle/983803>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

MCINTOSH, B.; MCQUAID, R.; MUNRO, A.; DABIR-ALAI, P. Motherhood and its impact on career progression. **Gender in Management: An International Journal**, v. 27, n. 5,

p. 346-364, jan., 2012. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/17542411211252651>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

MEYERSON, D. E.; KOLB, D. M. M. out of the “Armchair”: developing a framework to bridge the gap between feminist theory and practice. **Organization**, v. 7, n. 4, p. 553-571, nov., 2000. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/135050840074003>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

MOSCHKOVICH, M.; ALMEIDA, A. M. F. Desigualdades de gênero na carreira acadêmica no Brasil. **Dados**, v. 58, p. 749-789, sep., 2015. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/dados/a/LgVhs5k7bhQNgnRyCvKBTRs/?lang=pt>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

MOSS-RACUSIN, C. A.; DOVIDIO, J. F.; BRESCOLL, V. L.; GRAHAM, M. J.; HANDELSMAN, J. Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students. **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences**, v. 109, n. 41, p. 16474-16479, oct., 2012. Available at: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

OLIVEIRA, L. de; REICHERT, F.; ZANDONÀ, E.; SOLETTI, R. C.; STANISCUASKI, F. The 100,000 most influential scientists rank: the underrepresentation of Brazilian women in academia. **Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências**, v. 93, p. e20201952, sep., 2021. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aabc/a/D5gw9F6w76KrGFPYNGn35nF/?lang=en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT. **Education at a Glance 2021**. [S. l.]: OECD, 2021. Available at: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/publication/b35a14e5-en>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

PROVOST. *In*: MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM Online Dictionary. Merriam-Webster, 2023. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/provost>. Accessed on: 17 oct. 2023.

R CORE TEAM. **R**: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2021. Available at: <https://www.r-project.org>.

RECTOR. *In*: MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM Online Dictionary. Merriam-Webster, 2023. Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rector>. Accessed on: 17 oct. 2023.

ROSA, R.; CLAVERO, S. Gender equality in higher education and research. **Journal of Gender Studies**, v. 31, n. 1, p. 1-7, jan., 2022. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2022.2007446>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ROSA, R.; DREW, E.; CANAVAN, S. An overview of gender inequality in EU universities. *In*: DREW, E.; CANAVAN, S. (eds.). **The Gender-Sensitive University**. [S. l.]: Routledge, 2020. p. 1-15.

ROSS, M. B.; GLENNON, B. M.; MURCIANO-GOROFF, R.; BERKES, E. G.; WEINBERG, B. A.; LANE, J.I. Women are credited less in science than men. **Nature**, v. 608, n. 7921, p. 135-145, aug., 2022. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-04966-w>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

ROSS, Sheldon M. **Introduction to probability and statistics for engineers and scientists**. 3rd ed. London: Elsevier Academic Press, 2004.

SAITOVITCH, E. M. B.; LIMA, B. S.; BARBOSA, M. C. B. Mulheres na Física: uma análise quantitativa. *In*: SAITOVITCH, E. M. B.; FUNCHAL, R. Z.; BARBOSA, M. C. B.; PINHO, S. T. R. de; SANTANA, A. E. de (eds.). **Mulheres na Física: casos históricos, panorama e perspectivas**. São Paulo: Editora Livraria da Física, 2015. p. 245-259. Available at: http://www1.fisica.org.br/gt-genero/images/arquivos/Mulheres_Pioneiras_livro-mulheres-na-fisica.pdf.

SANTOS MACHADO, L.; PERLIN, M.; COLLA SOLETTI, R.; KMETZCH ROSA E SILVA, L.; DOERDERLEIN SCHWARTZ, I. V.; SEIXAS, A.; KLEIN RICACHENEVSKY, F.; TAMAJUSUKU NEIS, A.; STANISCUASKI, F. Parent in Science: The impact of parenthood on the scientific career in Brazil. *In*: 2019 IEEE/ACM 2ND INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON GENDER EQUALITY IN SOFTWARE ENGINEERING (GE), may, 2019. **Anais [...]**. [S. l.: s. n.], may 2019. p. 37-40. Available at: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8819567>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

SAVIGNY, Heather. Cultural sexism and the UK Higher Education sector. **Journal of Gender Studies**, v. 28, n. 6, p. 661-673, aug., 2019. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1597689>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

SAVIGNY, Heather. Women, know your limits: cultural sexism in academia. **Gender and Education**, v. 26, n. 7, p. 794-809, nov., 2014. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.970977>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

SCHIEBINGER, Londa. **Has feminism changed science?**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

SERRANO, S. J. **Women used to dominate computer science. So what happened?**. 2017. Available at: <https://www.sysgen.com.ph/articles/why-women-stopped-coding/27216>. Accessed on: 30 oct. 2023.

SHEPHERD, S. Why are there so few female leaders in higher education: a case of structure or agency?. **Management in Education**, v. 31, n. 2, p. 82-87, apr., 2017. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020617696631>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

STANISCUASKI, F.; KMETZSCH, L.; SOLETTI, R. C.; REICHERT, F.; ZANDONÀ, E.; LUDWIG, Z. M. C.; LIMA, E. F.; NEUMANN, A.; SCHWARTZ, I. V. D.; MELLO-CARPES, P. B.; TAMAJUSUKU, A. S. K.; WERNECK, F. P.; RICACHENEVSKY, F. K.; INFANGER, C.; SEIXAS, A.; STAATS, C. C.; DE OLIVEIRA, L. Gender, race and parenthood impact academic productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic: from survey to action. **Frontiers in Psychology**, v. 12, 2021. Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663252>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

STANISCUASKI, F.; MACHADO, A. V.; SOLETTI, R. C.; REICHERT, F.; ZANDONÀ, E.; MELLO-CARPES, P. B.; INFANGER, C.; LUDWIG, Z. M. C.; DE OLIVEIRA, L. B. against parents in science hits women harder. **Humanities and Social Sciences Communications**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 1-9, maio, 2023. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-01722-x>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

TUKEY, J. W. **Exploratory data analysis**. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.

UN WOMEN. **Everything you need to know about pushing for equal pay**. 2020. Available at: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2020/9/explainer-everything-you-need-to-know-about-equal-pay>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

VALENTOVA, J. V.; OTTA, E.; SILVA, M. L.; MCELLIGOTT, A. G. Underrepresentation of women in the senior levels of Brazilian science. **PeerJ**, v. 5, p. e4000, dec. 2017. Available at: <https://peerj.com/articles/4000>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

VAN DEN BESSELAAR, P.; SANDSTRÖM, U. Vicious circles of gender bias, lower positions, and lower performance: gender differences in scholarly productivity and impact. **PLOS ONE**, v. 12, n. 8, p. e0183301, aug, 2017. Available at: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0183301>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

VAN DEN BRINK, M.; BENSCHOP, Y. Slaying the seven-headed dragon: the quest for gender change in academia. **Gender, Work & Organization**, v. 19, n. 1, p. 71-92, 2012. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2011.00566.x>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

WALDMAN, L.; ABREU, A.; FAITH, B.; HRYNICK, T.; SÁNCHEZ DE MADARIAGA, I.; SPINI, L. **Pathways to success: bringing a gender lens to the scientific leadership of global challenges**. [S. l.]: GenderInSITE, 2018. Available at: <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/20.500.12413/14324>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

WALLER, N. How men and women see the workplace differently. **The Wall Street Journal**, New York, sep., 2016. Available at: <http://graphics.wsj.com/how-men-and-women-see-the-workplace-differently/>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

WIECZOREK-SZYMAŃSKA, A. Gender diversity in academic sector - case study. **Administrative Sciences**, v. 10, n. 3, p. 41, sep., 2020. Available at: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3387/10/3/41>. Accessed on: 15 oct. 2023.

WILCOXON, F. Individual comparisons by ranking methods. **Biometrics Bulletin**, v. 1, n. 6, p. 80, 1945. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/3001968>. Accessed on: 20 oct. 2023.

WOETZEL, J.; MADGAVKAR, A.; ELLINGRUD, K.; LABAYE, E.; DEVILLARD, S.; KUTCHER, E.; MANYIKA, J.; DOBBS, R.; KRISHNAN, M. **How advancing women's equality can add \$12 trillion to global growth**. New York: McKinsey Global Institute, 2015. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/employment-and-growth/how-advancing-womens-equality-can-add-12-trillion-to-global-growth>.

YPO; FINANCIAL TIMES; HEFORSHE. **A Global imperative: gender equality in the c-suite**. [S. l.: s. n.], 2021. Available at: <https://www.heforshe.org/en/solutions/global-imperative-gender-equality-c-suite>. Accessed on: 14 oct. 2023.