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#### Abstract

The globalization processes taking place in modern economy shape new requirements for the development of managerial approaches aimed at ensuring the highest performance of companies. Gender diversity of top management can provide a comprehensive view of the top management of the company's development, improve its reputation and increase investor interest in the company. The purpose of this study is to analyze the gender aspects of the world and Ukraine's management practices. The paper analyzes a series of studies that prove the growing role of women in the top management of companies. The authors compare management styles of female and male managers. The specifics of gender issues in Ukraine are researched. The study has shown that employed women are more likely to be hired and, accordingly, they are more rarely employers and self-employed persons. Branches and activities that are mainly headed by women and those that are predominantly headed by men are highlighted. The authors came to the conclusion that under the conditions of the postindustrial economy there arise new factors of modern development, and the failure to consider them significantly reduces the efficiency of the functioning of companies and the state as a whole.
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## 1. Introduction

Globalization is the dominant feature of the development of the modern world economy. It is an objective process, which leads to increased interaction between countries, companies, strengthening of migration processes, increasing requirements for labor in almost all countries of the world. The market for skilled labor acquires global features, the global supply and global demand for highly trained professionals in different spheres of the economy, including highly skilled managers, is emerging. Global economic processes create new requirements for the development of managerial approaches to ensure the highest performance of companies. Informatization and intellectualization of labor lead to changes in the management system itself. At present, management processes take place at two parallel levels: a traditional in-house level, which involves direct managers and subordinates, and a virtual one, since much of the work is done by employees outside the office space and without the participation of their direct managers. Thus, firms outsource some of their functions, only concentrating their efforts on the core activities that are priority for them. Theoretical studies increasingly place more emphasis on non-financial aspects of the companies operations that influence managerial decision making. The ownership structure and the board of directors are of the greatest interest to the research community. Thus, the board of directors diversity, including the gender one, can provide the leadership with a comprehensive view of the company's development, improve its reputation and increase the interest of investors in the company. Hence, the analysis of the impact of social characteris-
tics of the persons involved in business processes on the general managerial efficiency, assumes paramount importance. Among such characteristics it is reasonable to consider the gender aspect and evaluate the peculiarities of "male" and "female" management. The purpose of this study is to analyze the gender aspects of the world and Ukraine's management practices.
Research analysis and publications problem solution is based on. The issues of gender diversity of the company top management have been investigated by a number of researchers, among which Karen Korabik, Donna Lero, Roya Ayman, Leow Kah Loong, Eagly A. H., Foldy E.G., Goleman D. and others deserve special attention. But given the dynamic changes taking place in the global economy: the emergence of new leaders who generate their own managerial approaches enhancing managerial performance, the issue of interdependence and the interplay of gender aspects and the company performance remains topical. General tendencies of the global economy, directed towards globalization, make the price of errors in the managerial decision making increasingly higher. Only the companies with effective management survive, while the others go bankrupt or get taken over by large corporations.

## 2. Statement of the main material

Main material and results. At the beginning of the XXI century, new trends in understanding leadership issues emerge. One of them is taking into account the gender factor and, as a result, the appearance of a new scientific field - gender psychology of leadership [17]. As part of this area, the following aspects began to be
explored: leadership functions; leadership style of men and women; criteria for success of different gender leaders.
It is worth pointing out that leadership qualities and possibility to realize one's potential as a manager depend on the country and mentality. In this context, it is appropriate to cite the results of the study by Karen Korabik, Donna Lero, Roya Ayman (2003) [17]. They analyzed data from 42 countries that were grouped into 10 cultural clusters. It turned out that women have higher rates by the "initiating structure" parameter (focus on the task) and the "attention" parameter (orientation to the relationship). However, these results were tracked mainly within the Western culture cluster, indicating a significant impact of the cultural factor on leadership qualities of top managers.
Similar studies were also conducted by Eastern scholars. Thus, Leow Kah Loong (2011) from Malaysia analyzed a sample of 961 people (auditors from 100 firms) [18]. 59\% of this sample were women, $41 \%$ - men; $82 \%$ - Chinese and $13.5 \%$ - Malaysians ( $4.5 \%$ were representatives of other ethnic groups). The study revealed that the main factors for ensuring and improving managerial efficiency are the factors of mentoring and positive relations with the manager. And that was confirmed, first of all, by women respondents. Yet, these criteria were also very important for men, which allows to identify additional characteristics of Eastern companies management.
The works of Eagly A. H. (2003) deserve particular attention [9]. To compare different management styles, transactional and transformational paradigms were used for studying organizational leadership. Transactional leadership is based on purely business relationships between a manager and subordinates. While, transformational leadership is based on the emotional component and involves improving the internal psychological settings of subordinates. In the latter case, the manager does not act as a business partner, but as a mentor or teacher. Studies have shown that women are more prone to transformational leadership, and men to transactional one. Therefore Eagly A. H. concludes that women leaders are more promising and successful in terms of achieving managerial effectiveness. It is also important to note the growing popularity of the transformational approach, which indicates a further increase in the number of female leaders. It is stated in the work by R. Ayman and K. Korabik (2010) [6].
The American researcher Foldy E.G. (2012) addresses the gender aspect along with racial and professional discrimination [11]. The findings of the research conducted in a number of companies indicate that gender discrimination is taking place - women and "nonwhite workers feel less confident than men and whites. And above all, solving the problems of gender equality depends on top managers who are responsible for developing a corporate culture and ensuring a normal psychological climate in the company.
Recently, due to the works by Goleman D. (2011), the attention of researchers has increasingly been attracted by such a component as the emotional intelligence and its impact on managerial performance [12]. According to the research conducted, female leaders significantly surpassed their colleagues by the level of overall emotional intelligence and interpersonal emotional intelligence based on the technique of D. Lioussine (2004) [20]. And the differences pertained not only to the indicators of emotional intelligence, but also to many other aspects of psychological effectiveness: the authority of the top /manager, job satisfaction, and motivation of the employees. Personal characteristics of women provided them with the advantages in performing their managerial activities.
At the same time, according to Koenig A.M (2011) [16], women have lower levels of self-monitoring. Lupano P.M.L., Castro S.A. (2015) [21] found that self-monitoring is a determinant of leadership for men, not women.
Therefore, both women and men have the ability to perform managerial functions. But the question remains why most of the top management positions are occupied by men? What are the barriers for women on their way to top management?

One of the main barriers is the presence of stereotypes that the leader should be a man. It is confirmed by a number of studies. Thus, Afolabi A.O. (2013) [5] examined the views of 250 workers (men and women) who assessed the work of their female top managers. It was confirmed that gender stereotypes strongly influence the perception of the work process by representatives of both genders. However, female subordinates evaluated achievements of women managers higher than male subordinates. On the whole, gender stereotypes were a reflection of existing cultural beliefs that a woman cannot manage a company.
Studies conducted by American researchers Thoroughgood C.N., Sawyer K.B., Hunter S.T. (2013) [25] have proven that stereotypes are directed not only against female top managers. A male top manager was perceived as a person who is not entitled to a mistake. The male leader who made a mistake was rated lower than the female leader by the leadership competency. Women were treated with greater tolerance, which in principle reduced the likelihood of conflict situations.
It should be noted that over the last decades there has been an increase in the average number of women on the boards of directors. Women now hold more than $20 \%$ of the board seats of the Fortune 1000 companies that costitute the Gender Diversity Index (GDI) [1].
In the 801 active GDI companies, the number of women currently holding $20.8 \%$ of the board seats, has increased from $19.7 \%$ in 2016 and $14.6 \%$ in 2011.
$19.8 \%$ of board seats of the companies ranked by total revenue in the 2017 F1000 were occupied by women. The list currently includes 980 active companies. In 2016, the proportion of women on the boards of directors in 967 active F1000 companies was $18.8 \%$ [1].
Larger companies continue to outpace smaller companies by the diversity of their boards of directors. In GDI F100 companies, $24 \%$ of the board seats belong to 272 women, which is on average 2.9 female directors per board. In GDI F500 companies, $22 \%$ of the board seats are held by 1051 women, which on average is 2.5 female directors per board, an increase as compared to 2.3 female directors last year. In smaller GDI F501-1000 companies there was no change in the number of female directors per board, with 677 women occupying $18.8 \%$ of board seats, on average 1.8 female director per board. Particularly interesting is the fact that $34 \%$ of the companies from the GDI list have $25 \%$ or more women on boards of directors, $19 \%$ have $30 \%$ or more, $4 \%$ have $40 \%$ or more, and only $1 \%$ of companies have parity [1].

Table 1: Breakdown of Fortune 1000 Showing F 1000, F100, F500 and F501-1000 [1]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FORTUNE <br> 1000 |  |  | N |  |  |
| \% Women on <br> Board | $19,8 \%$ | $18,8 \%$ | $20,8 \%$ | $19,7 \%$ | $14,6 \%$ |
| Total Women | 1979 | 1869 | 1728 | 1679 | 1440 |
| Total Directors | 9977 | 9947 | 8322 | 8537 | 9846 |
| Active compa- <br> nies | 980 | 967 | 801 | 810 | 951 |
| FORTUNE 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Women on <br> Board | $24,3 \%$ | $23,5 \%$ | $24,4 \%$ | $24,0 \%$ | $19,6 \%$ |
| Total Women | 284 | 284 | 272 | 273 | 233 |
| Total Directors | 1167 | 1210 | 1114 | 1139 | 1188 |
| Active compa- <br> nies | 98 | 100 | 95 | 95 | 100 |
| FORTUNE 500 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\%$ Women on <br> Board | $21,8 \%$ | $20,6 \%$ | $22,2 \%$ | $21,0 \%$ | $16,4 \%$ |
| Total Women | 1155 | 1097 | 1051 | 1020 | 888 |
| Total Directors | 5307 | 5316 | 4724 | 4856 | 5407 |
| Active compa- | 488 | 484 | 428 | 436 | 489 |


| nies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FORTUNE <br> $501-1000$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Women on <br> Board | $17,6 \%$ | $16,7 \%$ | $18,8 \%$ | $17,9 \%$ | $12,5 \%$ |
| Total Women | 824 | 772 | 677 | 659 | 554 |
| Total Directors | 4670 | 4631 | 3598 | 3681 | 4436 |
| Active compa- <br> nies | 492 | 483 | 373 | 374 | 462 |

Six sectors of 2017 GDI companies have retained an average of $20 \%$ or more female directors on their boards since 2016. The greatest advance in diversity was made by Consumer Cyclical, Industrials and Real Estate sectors. Six sectors in the 2017 F1000 companies list have more than $20 \%$ female directors on their boards, with one sector more than in 2016. Women increased their presence on boards in every sector, though in the Energy sector the diversity is much lower with only $15.2 \%$ GDI and $14.0 \% 2017$ F1000 female directors on the boards [1].

| Table 2: Sector Analysis [1] |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sector | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \text { Fortune } \\ 1000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | GDI |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & \text { on } \\ & \stackrel{1}{\delta} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Basic Materials | 69 | 16,4 \% | 59 | 18,0 \% | 17,5\% |
| Communication Services | 13 | 22,5 \% | 17 | 19,5 \% | 18,8 \% |
| Consumer Cyclical | 204 | 21,1\% | 161 | 22,1\% | 20,2 \% |
| Consumer Defense | 81 | 22,4\% | 66 | 23,7\% | 22,8\% |
| Energy | 53 | 14,0\% | 49 | 15,2\% | 13,9\% |
| Financial Services | 127 | 22,0\% | 115 | 22,0 \% | 21,3\% |
| Healthcare | 80 | 19,3\% | 67 | 21,3\% | 21,0\% |
| Industries | 187 | 17,9\% | 136 | 19,3\% | 17,7\% |
| Real Estate | 23 | 23,1\% | 12 | 27,1\% | 24,0\% |
| Technology | 101 | 18,8\% | 74 | 18,2 \% | 17,9\% |
| Utilities | 42 | 22,9 \% | 45 | 23,6 \% | 22,7\% |

There are several objective factors that explain the increasing presence of women on the companies' boards of directors: legislative quotas, global demographic and social trends. The minimum quotas for women on the boards of directors in one form or another are legally imposed in 22 countries of the world. Norway is an outstanding example among them, where in 2003 the quota for all public companies was set at $40 \%$. In 2012, an attempt was made to pass an analogous bill in the European Parliament, with similar laws in seven European countries. The quotas for women on the boards of directors exist not only in developed countries. Seats for women on the boards of directors of public companies are legally secured in India and Malaysia and for the companies with a government stake - in the Republic of South Africa, Kenya and the United Arab Emirates [7].
The presence of women in top management significantly affects the peculiarities of management and corporate culture. The work of Adams B. and Funk P. makes it possible to understand whether decisions made by women in managerial positions differ from the decisions of their male colleagues, based on the Schwarz value approach used in psychology [3]. The authors interviewed women who are senior managers or members of the boards of directors in Swedish companies. Having applied the regression analysis to the survey data, the authors were able to compare the attitudes of women and men to the following psychological values: achievement, power, security, conformism, tradition, non-violence, universalism, autonomy, encouragement, hedonism and risk. The results of the study indicate that women are less prone to conflict, conformism, and tradition than their male counterparts, though they are more predisposed to taking risks. At the same time, significant social differences were identified within the top management and board of directors: women are generally younger, less likely to have husbands and children. That allows the authors to
state that the behavior of men and women in managerial positions of Swedish companies varies considerably.
Psychological differences between men and women in managerial positions are highlighted in the work of Grant A. and Taylor A. (2014) [13]. They interviewed 20 men and 20 women with the same work experience as the top managers and members on boards of directors of American companies ranked in the Fortune 50 list. The authors concluded that men and women in managerial positions differ significantly in verbal and non-verbal means communications, the fact that can have an impact on the nature of management.
Levi M. (2013) and colleagues investigated the relationship between gender diversity on the board of directors and M \& A policies [19]. They came to the conclusion that the proportion of women on the board of directors negatively correlates with the company M \& A operations.
The quality of corporate management affects the company's efficiency, so the non-financial factor is of particular interest to investors and financial institutions which make up different ratings of corporate management efficiency.
The work of Adams R. et al. allows us to assess the response of investors to gender diversity [4]. The study was based on the data from the Australian Stock Exchange. The authors concluded that investors are positively responding to the inclusion of women on the Board of Directors. In addition, women more often have an academic degree or an MBA degree than their male counterparts. Of considerable interest is the work of Adams B. and Ferreira D. (2009) [2], which explores the impact of gender disparity on the boards of directors on the indicators of strategic efficiency of companies. The authors consider the interdependence of the board's gender diversity with the Tobin's Q and ROA indicators, which, in their view, reflect the long-term efficiency of the company. The researchers managed to show that the presence of women on the board of directors reduces absenteeism at the meetings among male directors and increases the amount of CEO compensation in the form of shares, though the main issue of the existence of a stable relationship between the proportion of women on the board of directors and Tobin's Q and ROA strategic efficiency indicators remains unanswered.
More significant results were obtained by Chinese researchers Liu Y., Wei Z., Xie F. (2013) [21]. Having examined 2,000 Chinese companies, the authors not only analyzed the impact of women on such indicators as ROE and ROA, but they also examined the relationship between women in top management and the company efficiency. Based on the calculations made, the authors have shown a significant positive effect of the presence of female directors on the performance indicators of the company.
Therefore, men and women in the company management positions may have different management approaches that influence decision making on such important issues as $\mathrm{M} \& \mathrm{~A}$ agreements, placement of securities on the stock exchange, the company's internal organization and its strategic performance measured by the Tobin's Q index. It should be noted that the more efficiently the company operates, the more innovative decision-making in the area of management and application of risky strategies it can afford. The presence of women in top management is one of such innovative decisions.
According to recent studies by the World Bank, the reduction in the difference in the economic activity of women and men was an important factor in economic growth, which increased the GDP in Europe by $13 \%$, in the United States by $9 \%$, in Japan by $16 \%$ [29]. This impact was due to the fact that, firstly, the promotion of gender equality is accompanied by an increase in labor productivity [14], and secondly, the elimination of gender discrimination in the choice of profession and labor compensation can help increase women's earnings [30].
Thus, in Latin American countries, the elimination of gender segregation and wage differentials could result in an increase in women's earnings by $50 \%$, with a slight impact on men's earnings and an increase in GDP by $3-9 \%$ [26]. The results of the study of
eight Latin American countries show that the elimination of barriers to increasing the representation of women in the workforce and giving them equal rights in choosing their occupational activities can help reduce poverty and raise income levels [24] In general, according to the UN expert assessments, restrictions on the economic activity of women may cost countries 42-46 billion USD a year [31].
However, international experts emphasize that economic growth is characterized by a positive correlation with the reduction of gender inequality, as a rule, in high-income countries [24]. This is due to the fact that in the countries with low income and weak activity of trade unions, companies have the opportunity to pay women lower labor compensation as compared to their labor productivity. That allows companies to earn extra profits in the face of intense competition among a significant number of women with appropriate qualifications for a limited number of jobs.
Gender issues are the issues of the global level. In September 2015, the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development and the Adoption of the Agenda for Development beyond 2015 [31] was held in New York in the framework of the 70th UN General Assembly. The outcome document of the Summit "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" approved 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 Targets. Among the goals of sustainable development, gender equality occupies an important place. Empowering women and reducing gender disparities in health care, education, labor market, etc. contributes to the reduction of poverty, the growth of economic development, the increase in productivity, etc.
Specifics of gender issues in Ukraine in general reflect the discrepancies in the situation women and men are in, and which are characteristic of the developed countries of the world. Thus, there are no visible gender imbalances in the access to basic social services for the population, opportunities for education and performing economic activities. At the same time, women have an average income lower than men, and perform most of the unpaid work on family responsibilities in households. Moreover, the impact of gender stereotypes results in the spread of such phenomena as occupational segregation of gender-based employment, inability to recognize gender-based discrimination, low awareness of the patterns of domestic violence and lack of usual practice of seeking help [23].
Particular attention needs to be paid to the problem of women's disproportionate representation in decision-making, management positions in institutions, organizations and enterprises. A number of studies indicate that women's leadership in economic life is an important factor in sustainable development and growth at the level of the country, community, or a particular company [15].
According to the State Statistics Service of Ukraine, the employment rate among women in Ukraine is lower than among men ( $52 \%$ and $62 \%$ respectively) [27]. The employment rate among women in Ukraine is comparable to that of the average in Europe, and the gap in the employment rate between women and men is lower than the average for the EU. The employment rate among women in Ukraine is close to the figure in such countries as Croatia ( $57 \%$ ), Italy ( $52 \%$ ), Greece ( $47 \%$ ), though it is lower than the EU average (65\%) [10].
Employed women are more likely to be hired and, accordingly, less likely to be employers and self-employed (compared with men). Thus, among employed women, $87 \%$ are hired (compared with $82 \%$ among men), $12 \%$ are self-employed (compared with $16 \%$ of men), and $0.8 \%$ are employers (compared with $1.5 \%$ of men). Hence, women constitute $42 \%$ of all self-employed people, and $32 \%$ among employers [9].
According to the results of the analysis of the data of the Unified State Register of Enterprises of Ukraine, the proportion of women top managers in general (among all active economic entities) is $40 \%$. But this level was achieved mainly due to the individual entrepreneurs, accounting for $63 \%$ of all economic entities: the proportion of women among active individual entrepreneurs is $46 \%$. At the same time, among legal entities, the proportion of
women top managers is lower: they head $30 \%$ of enterprises and organizations [28]. It means that in Ukraine women's opportunities to conduct their own business as individual entrepreneurs are almost equal to men's, though it is much less likely that a woman will head an enterprise or organization. There are industries and activities in Ukraine that are predominantly headed by women, and there are the ones that are predominantly headed by men (Table 3) [28].

Table 3: Distribution of managers and individual entrepreneurs within each section of the classification of economic activities [28]

| Section | Number <br> of men | Number <br> of wom- <br> en |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor <br> vehicles and motorcycle | 591613 | 535384 |
| Provision of other types of services | 139124 | 117361 |
| Professional, scientific and technical activities | 88293 | 61172 |
| Real estate operations | 62115 | 51976 |
| Activity in the field of administrative and sup- <br> port services | 71980 | 51398 |
| Hotel and catering | 36126 | 40000 |
| Education | 17128 | 39034 |
| Information and telecommunications | 112729 | 37799 |
| Processing industry | 121942 | 37233 |
| Health care and social services | 26039 | 21707 |
| Public administration and defense; compulsory <br> social insurance | 18941 | 20599 |
| Transport, warehousing, postal and courier <br> activities | 121573 | 19026 |
| Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries | 80854 | 18258 |
| Construction | 88458 | 14232 |
| Arts, sports, entertainment and recreation | 15652 | 12211 |
| Financial and insurance activities | 11351 | 6903 |
| Water supply; sewage, waste management | 7739 | 1946 |
| Supply of electricity, gas and air conditioning | 3184 | 589 |
| Mining and quarrying | 3416 | 458 |
| Activities of households | 52 | 56 |
| Activities of extraterritorial organizations and <br> bodies | 73 | 34 |
| As can see, editan |  |  |

As we can see, education is the only branch in which most managers (69\%) among legal entities and individual entrepreneurs are women. Branches with a high proportion of women top managers are public administration and defense; compulsory social insurance and hotel and catering sector. However, in these sectors, the proportion of women top managers is $52-53 \%$, which characterizes them more as gender-balanced.
Some types of activities, where the organizations are mainly headed by women, are accounting and auditing, tourism, beauty salons, concert halls, trade unions, and social services institutions (Table 4) [28].

Table 4: Types of activities (Class of the Classification of the Types of Economic Activities) of legal entities dominated by women headed organizations [28]

| Type of activities (Class of Classification of <br> the Types of Economic Activities) | Percentage <br> of women <br> top manag- <br> ers, $\%$ | Total <br> number <br> of legal <br> entities |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Activities of tour operators | 61 | 1959 |
| Activities of travel agencies | 62 | 3979 |
| Activities of trade unions | 62 | 25062 |
| Activities in the field of accounting and audit; <br> tax consultancy | 62 | 4526 |
| Functioning of theater and concert halls | 66 | 1349 |
| Education in the field of culture | 66 | 1431 |
| Regulation in the spheres of health, education, <br> culture and other social spheres, except for <br> compulsory social insurance | 68 | 1825 |
| Secondary education | 68 | 16575 |
| Providing services by hairdressers and beauty <br> salons | 77 | 1689 |

So, if we talk about the most widespread types of activities, women predominate (constitute more than $60 \%$ ) only in pre-school and secondary education, as well as in trade unions.
Let us determine the impact of the number of women top managers on the regional gross product in Ukraine with the help of pair correlation. The calculation of the pair correlation between the indicator of the number of women top managers (x) and the regional gross product (y) in Ukraine is given in Table 5. As a raw data, we have taken the relevant indicators by regions of Ukraine for 2016. Since we applied pair correlation, the representativeness of the sample is quite sufficient (at least 14 pairs of indicators are required for representativeness of the sample). The Pearson's cor-
relation coefficient ( $\mathrm{r} x y$ ) in our case is 0.9268 , which indicates a direct and close correlation between the number of women leaders ( x ) and the regional gross product ( y ).

Table 5: Calculation of the pair correlation coefficient between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine for 2016 [27, 28 ]

| $\begin{gathered} \text { № } \\ \text { 3/П } \end{gathered}$ | Region | Number of women top managers, people (x) | Regional gross product, mln. UAH (y) | $x-\bar{x}$ | $y-\bar{y}$ | $x^{2}$ | $y^{2}$ | $x \times y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Vinnytsya | 37126 | 74411 | -4270,28 | $21003$ $68$ | $\begin{gathered} 18235291, \\ 28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 441154573 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89691594, \\ 63 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 | Volyn | 22347 | 35744 | $19049,28$ | 59670, 68 | $\begin{gathered} 362875068 \\ , 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 356059005 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 113668349 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | Dnipropetrovsk | 73398 | 244478 | 32001,72 | $\begin{gathered} 149063 \\ , 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 102411008 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 222198733 \\ 69 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 477028262 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 | Donetsk | 71492 | 137500 | 30095,72 | $\begin{gathered} 42085, \\ 32 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 905752362 \\ , 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 177117416 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126658800 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 | Zhytomyr | 26743 | 47919 | $14653,28$ | 47495, 68 | $\begin{gathered} 214718614 \\ , 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 225583961 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 695967497 \\ , 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 | Zakarpattya | 29337 | 32390 | $12059,28$ | $63024,$ $68$ | $\begin{gathered} 145426234 \\ , 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 397211028 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | 760032263 |
| 7 | Zaporizhzhya | 46374 | 104323 | 4977,72 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8908,3 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24777696 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 79358165,2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44343122, \\ 63 \end{gathered}$ |
| 8 | Ivano- <br> Frankivsk | 26142 | 51404 | $15254,28$ | 44010, <br> 68 | $\begin{gathered} 232693058 \\ , 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 193693995 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 671351235 \\ , 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 9 | Kyiv | 50149 | 128638 | 8752,72 | $\begin{gathered} 33223, \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76610107 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110378899 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 290794417 \\ , 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Kirovohrad | 22339 | 46021 | $19057,28$ | 49393, $68$ | 363179921 | $\begin{gathered} 243973562 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 941309190 |
| 11 | Luhansk | 36356 | 31356 | -5040,28 | 64058, 68 | $\begin{gathered} 25404422 \\ 48 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 410351448 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 322873683 \\ , 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| 12 | Lviv | 51268 | 114842 | 9871,72 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19427, \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 97450855, \\ 76 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 377420762, \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 191781063 \\ , 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 13 | Mykolayiv | 36251 | 57815 | -5145,28 | 37599, $68$ | $\begin{gathered} 26473906, \\ 28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 141373593 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 193460881 \\ , 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| 14 | Odesa | 75933 | 119800 | 34536,72 | $\begin{gathered} 24385, \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 119278502 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 594643831, \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | 842188969 |
| 15 | Poltava | 32595 | 116272 | -8801,28 | $\begin{gathered} 20857, \\ 32 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77462529 \\ 64 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 435027797 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 183571113 \\ , 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 16 | Rivne | 23752 | 39469 | $17644,28$ | $55945$ $68$ | $\begin{gathered} 311320616 \\ , 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 312991911 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 987121242 \\ , 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 17 | Sumy | 23606 | 46287 | $17790,28$ | 49127, $68$ | $\begin{gathered} 316494062 \\ , 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 241352894 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | 873995183 |
| 18 | Ternopil | 21933 | 31072 | $19463,28$ | $64342,$ | $\begin{gathered} 378819268 \\ , 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 413998047 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125231959 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 19 | Kharkiv | 71866 | 154871 | 30469,72 | $\begin{gathered} 59456, \\ 32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 928403836 \\ , 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 353505398 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 181161742 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 20 | Kherson | 25392 | 38743 | $16004,28$ | 56671, 68 | $\begin{gathered} 256136978 \\ , 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 321167931 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 906989434 \\ , 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 21 | Khmelnytskiy | 26977 | 48859 | $14419,28$ | $\begin{gathered} 46555, \\ 68 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 207915635 \\ , 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 216743134 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 671299385 \\ , 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| 22 | Cherkasy | 23454 | 59412 | - | - | 321925411 | 129619296 | 645970165 |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline & & & & 17942,28 & 36002, & , 6 & 7 & , 3 \\ 68\end{array}\right]$

Let us determine the form of dependence and construct a mathematical model of the relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine (Table 6).

Table 6: Calculation of the parameters of the correlation relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { № } \\ 3 / \Pi \end{gathered}$ | Region | Number of women top managers, people (x) | Regional gross product, mln. $\text { UAH }(\mathrm{y})$ | $x \times y$ | $y^{2}$ | $x^{2}$ | $y_{x}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Vinnytsya | 37126 | 74411 | $\begin{gathered} 276258278 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 553699692 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13783398 \\ 76 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 79124,497 \\ 78 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 | Volyn | 22347 | 35744 | 798771168 | $\begin{gathered} 127763353 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49938840 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22745,852 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | Dnipropetrovsk | 73398 | 244478 | $\begin{gathered} 179441962 \\ 44 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 597694924 \\ 84 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53872664 \\ 04 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 217494,22 \\ 75 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4 | Donetsk | 71492 | 137500 | $\begin{gathered} 983015000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 189062500 \\ 00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51111060 \\ 64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 210223,25 \\ 53 \end{gathered}$ |
| 5 | Zhytomyr | 26743 | 47919 | $\begin{gathered} 128149781 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 229623056 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71518804 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39515,628 \\ 57 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6 | Zakarpattya | 29337 | 32390 | 950225430 | $\begin{gathered} 104911210 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86065956 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | 49411,17 |
| 7 | Zaporizhzhya | 46374 | 104323 | $\begin{gathered} 483787480 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 108832883 \\ 29 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21505478 \\ 76 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 114403,59 \\ 08 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 8 | IvanoFrankivsk | 26142 | 51404 | $\begin{gathered} 134380336 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 264237121 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68340416 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37222,945 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| 9 | Kyiv | 50149 | 128638 | $\begin{gathered} 645106706 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 165477350 \\ 44 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25149222 \\ 01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 128804,38 \\ 83 \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Kirovohrad | 22339 | 46021 | $\begin{gathered} 102806311 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 211793244 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49903092 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22715,333 \\ 85 \end{gathered}$ |
| 11 | Luhansk | 36356 | 31356 | $\begin{gathered} 113997873 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 983198736 | $\begin{gathered} 13217587 \\ 36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76187,116 \\ 55 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 12 | Lviv | 51268 | 114842 | $\begin{gathered} 588771965 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 131886849 \\ 64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26284078 \\ 24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 133073,12 \\ 81 \end{gathered}$ |
| 13 | Mykolayiv | 36251 | 57815 | $\begin{gathered} 209585156 \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 334257422 \\ 5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13141350 \\ 01 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 75786,564 \\ 56 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 14 | Odesa | 75933 | 119800 | $\begin{gathered} 909677340 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 143520400 \\ 00 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 57658204 \\ 89 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 227164,69 \\ 69 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 15 | Poltava | 32595 | 116272 | $\begin{gathered} 378988584 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135191779 \\ 84 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10624340 \\ 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61839,725 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| 16 | Rivne | 23752 | 39469 | 937467688 | $\begin{gathered} 155780196 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56415750 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28105,619 \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 17 | Sumy | 23606 | 46287 | $\begin{gathered} 109265092 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 214248636 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55724323 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27548,661 \\ 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 18 | Ternopil | 21933 | 31072 | 681502176 | 965469184 | $\begin{gathered} 48105648 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21166,532 \\ 84 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 19 | Kharkiv | 71866 | 154871 | $\begin{gathered} 111299592 \\ 86 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 239850266 \\ 41 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51647219 \\ 56 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 211649,98 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 20 | Kherson | 25392 | 38743 | 983762256 | $\begin{gathered} 150102004 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 64475366 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 34361,859 \\ 69 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 21 | Khmelnytskiy | 26977 | 48859 | $\begin{gathered} 131806924 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 238720188 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72775852 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40408,287 \\ 28 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 22 | Cherkasy | 23454 | 59412 | $\begin{gathered} 139344904 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 352978574 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55009011 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26968,814 \\ 46 \end{gathered}$ |
| 23 | Chernivtsi | 22204 | 21239 | 471590756 | 451095121 | $\begin{gathered} 49301761 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22200,338 \\ 44 \end{gathered}$ |
| 24 | Chernihiv | 22308 | 43362 | 967319496 | $\begin{gathered} 188026304 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49764686 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22597,075 \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ |
| 25 | City of Kyiv | 135565 | 559140 | $\begin{gathered} 757998141 \\ 00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 312637539 \\ 600 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18377869 \\ 225 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 454647,70 \\ 65 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Tota |  | 1034907 | 2385367 | 164014025 | 517450408 | 59950724 | 2385367 |


|  |  |  | 964 | 135 | 807 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /Average | 41396,28 |  | 656056103 | 206980163 | 23980289 | 9 |
| 9 | 95414,68 | 95414,68 |  |  |  |  |

The equation parameters of the correlation relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine are as follows:

$$
\begin{gathered}
a=-62,503.05 \\
b=3.81478
\end{gathered}
$$

Accordingly, the general equation form of the correlation relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine is as follows:

$$
y_{X}=-62,503.05+3.81478 \times x .
$$

Graphically, the form of the dependence is presented in Fig. 1.


Fig
.1: Empirical and theoretical distribution of relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine

Thus, the calculated equation of the correlation between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine shows that, with the increase in the number of female managers at the enterprises by 1 person, the regional gross product in Ukraine may increase by 3.815 million UAH under the influence of this factor.

## 3. Conclusions

Thus, under the conditions of the post-industrial economy, there arise new factors of modern development and the failure to consider them significantly reduces social, economic and institutional efficiency of functioning of the companies and the state as a whole. Gender structure of the company top management affects the efficiency of its activities, corporate culture, and the relationship with potential investors. Women are increasingly reaching key positions in top management and on boards of directors of the leading companies of the world. Among the objective factors that explain the increase in the presence of women on the companies' boards of directors one should first of all highlight legislative quotas, global demographic and social trends.
In Fortune's top companies, the number of women on the boards of directors is steadily increasing. The sectors with the highest gender diversity were Consumer Cyclical, Industrials and Real Estate sectors.
In Ukraine, the situation concerning gender diversity is slightly different. Gender imbalance is quite significant among the heads of organizations, at the same time there is almost no gender imbalance among individual entrepreneurs. This imbalance is associated, first of all, with the lower economic activity of women. The largest number of women top managers in Ukraine can be observed in education, while transport, construction, and agricultural sectors are mostly managed by men. There are also some types of activi-
ties where female top managers make up the majority: education and child care, social services, hotel and catering, food and clothing retailing, clothing, beauty salons, tourism, arts and recreation, accounting and audit.
Quantitative assessment of the effect of the number of women top managers on the overall indicators of Ukraine's economic development is possible by calculating the correlation coefficients between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine. The calculation was made on the basis of statistical data from 2016. Determining the closeness and the form of relationship between the number of women top managers and the regional gross product in Ukraine will allow us to conclude that with the increase in the number of women managers of enterprises by 1 person, the regional gross product in Ukraine may increase by 3.815 million UAH under the influence of this factor.

## References

[1] 2020 WOMEN ON BOARDS (2017). GENDER DIVERSITY INDEX, 2011-2017 Retrieved 11 August 2018. https://www.2020wob.com/sites/default/files/2020GDI2017Report.pdf
[2] Adams BR \& Ferreira D, "Women in the Boardroom and their Impact on Governance and Performance", Journal of Financial Economics, Vol. 94(2), (2009), pp. 291-309. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-11-2016-0208
[3] Adams BR \& Funk P, "Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Does Gender Matter?" Management Science, Vol. 58(2), (2012), pp. 219-235. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1110.1452.
[4] Adams RB, Gray S \& Nowland J, "Does Gender Matter in the Boardroom? Evidence from the Market Reaction to Mandatory New Director Announcements", Working Paper. (November 2, 2011). http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn. 1953152
[5] Afolabi AO, "Stereotypes against women: how do subordinates perceive the job performance and level of achievement of their leaders?", Gender and Behaviour, Vol. 11 (2), (2013), pp. 56985706. Retrieved 13 August 2018 from https://www.questia.com/library/journal//1P3-3147365101/stereotypes-against-women-how-do-subordinatesperceive
[6] Ayman R \& Korabik K, "Leadership: Why gender and culture matter", American Psychologist, 65(3), (2010), pp.157-170 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018806
[7] CWDI (2015). Report on Women Directors of Fortune Global 200: 2004-2014 Retrieved 10 August 2018 from http://globewomen.org/CWDInet/index.php/2015-cwdi-fortune-global-200-report/
[8] DSZU (2018). State Employment Service of Ukraine. Official site. Retrieved 15 August 2018 from https://www.dcz.gov.ua
[9] Eagly AH, Johannesen-Schmidt MC \& Van Engen ML, "Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Women and Men", Psychological bulletin, Vol. 129(4), (2003), pp. 569-591. https://doi.org/10.1037/00332909.129.4.569
[10] Eurostat (2017). State Statistics Service of EU. Official site. Retrieved 16 August 2018 from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/
[11] Foldy EG, "Something of collaborative manufacture: the construction of race and gender identities in organizations", Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 48(4), (2012), pp.495-524. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886312440041
[12] Goleman D, The Brain and Emotional Intelligence: New Insights. Northampton, MA: More Than Sound LLC, (2011), 72 pages.
[13] Grant A \& Taylor A, "Communication Essentials for Female Executives to Develop Leadership Presence: Getting Beyond the Barriers of Understating Accomplishment", Business Horizons, Vol. 57(1), (2014), pp. 73-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2013.09.003
[14] Hausmann R, Tyson LD \& Zahidi S, "The Global Gender Gap Report", World Economic Forum (2009). Retrieved 12 August 2018 from https://growthlab.cid.harvard.edu/files/growthlab/ files/wef_gendergap_report_2009.pdf.
[15] International Labor Organization (2015). Women in Business and Management: Gaining Momentum. Global Report. International Labour Organization, 2015. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_316450.pdf
[16] Koenig AM, Mitchell AA, Eagly AH \& Ristikari T, "Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 137(4), (2011), pp. 616-642. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023557.
[17] Korabik K, Lero D \& Ayman R, "A multi-level approach to crosscultural work-family research: A micro-and macro-perspective", International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, Vol.3, (2003), pp. 289-303. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595803003003003
[18] Leow Kah Loong. "The Organizational Commitment: The Study of Mentoring and Leader-member Exchange (Lmx) Among Auditors in Malaysia-moderating Effects of Gender", The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Annual Review, Vol.6(1), (2011), pp. 123-146. https://doi.org/10.18848/18331882/CGP/v06i01/51993
[19] Levi M, Li K \& Zhang F, "Director Gender and Mergers and Acquisitions", Journal of Corporate Finance, Vol. 28, (2013), pp.185200. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jcorpfin.2013.11.005
[20] Lioussine D. "Contemporary ideas about emotional intelligence", Social Intellect: Theory, Measurement, Research. Moscow, the Russian Academy of Sciences, (2004), pp.29-36.
[21] Liu Y, Wei Z \& Xie F, "Do Women Directors Improve Firm Performance in China?" Journal of Corporate Finance, Vol. 28(C), (2013), pp. 169-184. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2013.11.016
[22] Lupano PML \& Castro SA, "Intergroup anxiety, cultural sensitivity and socio-cultural diverse leaders effectiveness", The International Journal of Psychological Research, 8(1), (2015), pp.36-45. https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.643
[23] MEDITU (2017). Sustainable Development Goals: Ukraine. National Report, Kyiv, Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, 2017 Retrieved 15 August 2018 from http://un.org.ua/images/SDGs_NationalReportUA_Web_1.pdf
[24] Smith L and others, "The Importance of Women's Status for Child Nutrition in Development Countries", International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC, (2009), 187 p. https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/16526/1/rr030131.pdf
[25] Thoroughgood CN, Sawyer KB \& Hunter ST, "Real Men Don't Make Mistakes: Investigating the Effects of Leader Gender, Error Type, and the Occupational Context on Leader Error Perceptions", Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol. 28, (2013), pp.31-48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9263-8
[26] Tzannatos Z, "Women and Labor Market Changes in the Global Economy: Growth Helps, Inequalities Hurt and Public Policy Matters", World Development, Vol. 27 (3), (1999), pp. 551-569. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00156-9
[27] UN (2018). UNITED NATIONS Retrieved 14 August 2018 from http://www.un.org
[28] UKRSTAT (2017). State Statistics Service of Ukraine. Official site. Retrieved 14 August 2018 from http://ukrstat.gov.ua.
[29] USR (2018). The Unified State Register of Legal Entities, Individ-uals-Entrepreneurs and Public Units Retrieved 13 August 2018 from https://usr.minjust.gov.ua/ua/freesearch
[30] World Bank (2008). Measuring Knowledge in the World's Economies. KEI and KI Indexes Retrieved 11 August 2018 from http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website01030/WEB /IMAGES/KAM_V4.PDF
[31] World Economic Forum (2012). The Global Competitiveness Repot 2010-2011 Retrieved 14 August 2018 from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessRepo rt_2010-11.pdf

