



# Assessment of the Global Experience of Strategies for Gender Asymmetry Reduction

Anel Kireyeva<sup>1</sup>

Yerkezhan Kenzheali<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Economics Science  
Committee MSHE RK, Almaty,  
Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup> University of International  
Business named after K.  
Sagadiyev, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Corresponding author:

\***Yerkezhan Kenzheali** – PhD  
student, University of International  
Business named after K.Sagadiyev,  
Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Email: [y.kenzheali@gmail.com](mailto:y.kenzheali@gmail.com)

**For citation:** Kireyeva, A. &  
Kenzheali, Y. (2024). Assessment  
of the Global Experience of  
Strategies for Gender Asymmetry  
Reduction. Eurasian Journal of  
Economic and Business Studies,  
68(1), 19-31.

**Conflict of interest:** author(s)  
declare that there is no conflict of  
interest.

**EJEB**S

## Abstract

Gender asymmetry often denotes significant gender inequality, encompassing disparities in societal norms, cultural convictions, and historical legacies. This asymmetry results in an unequal distribution of opportunities, resources, and power between individuals of different genders, with one gender often enjoying certain privileges over the other. This article analyzes the effectiveness of implemented and tested strategies in reducing gender asymmetry, with a special focus on four countries such as the United States, Great Britain, Germany and Kazakhstan. Special attention is paid to comparing approaches and results in different countries, which makes it possible to identify the most successful practices and general trends. Despite the implementation of various government policies and standards aimed at achieving equal pay for employees of all genders, women still tend to receive lower salaries compared to their male counterparts, even when they hold similar positions and perform similar job responsibilities. Through meticulous investigation and the application of statistical methodologies, it is attempted to gauge whether these strategies have contributed to a reduction in gender asymmetry, comparing the statistics from 2019 to 2023 for the outcomes' evaluation. In conclusion, the article offers recommendations for the development and implementation of effective strategies that can be used by governments and organizations to further promote gender equality.

**Keywords:** Economics, Empowering Equality, Gender Equality, Asymmetry Reduction, Gender Pay Gap, Employees, Payment Inequality, Kazakhstan, Equality Strategies

**SCSTI:** 06.77.01

**JEL Code:** G32, O16, O21

**Financial support:** This research was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant "Priorities and mechanisms against rural women of Kazakhstan unequal access to the resources" No. AP14869297).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, it can be stated that questions of gender equality have become one of the most discussible social topics in many developing and developed countries around the world (Carli, 2020). It is possible to consider challenges of gender inequality as a particular issue that has existed throughout human history, directly influencing not only individuals and societies but the global economy accordingly (Breda et al., 2020). An interesting aspect in a long fight against any form of gender inequality is that not depending on all the efforts, there is still a sufficient disparity, leading to gender asymmetry. This asymmetry is represented in many forms, such as wage gaps, domestic violence, unequal access to education, and an underrepresentation of women in leadership roles in business (Breda et al., 2020). Analyzing a variety of relevant studies by researchers about gender asymmetry and its effective reduction, it becomes clear that achieving gender equality is not just a matter of social justice (Carli, 2020; Breda et al., 2020; England et al., 2020; Foley & Cooper, 2021). Success in this field can effectively impact the growth of the popularity of sustainable development, the stable promotion of social cohesion, and the obtaining better potential of better human capital.

Generally, it should be highlighted that gender asymmetry usually refers to a significant gender inequality involving disparities in social norms, cultural beliefs, and historical legacies (King et al., 2020). It means that such asymmetry provides an unequal distribution of opportunities, resources, and power between individuals of different genders when a representative of one gender gets some privileges compared to another. The obvious illustration of gender asymmetry is the gender pay gap. Not depending on the fact that most modern governments implement policies and standards towards equal pay to employees of both genders, women are continuing to get smaller salaries in comparison with their male colleagues, who can take similar positions and scope of jobs (King et al., 2020; Chung et al., 2021). This situation happens not only in countries with weak economies but also in strong ones, where authorities make a lot of efforts to achieve gender equality in different social aspects, including workspace. It is possible to emphasize that such wage disparity not only limits economic independence for women but also negatively impacts the cycle of financial dependence (Wynn, 2020). Education is another challenge, leading to a fact of gender asymmetry. For example, in several countries, women still have problems getting a qualified education on an equal basis with men (Chang & Milkman, 2020). It leads to such dimensions that they have fewer opportunities and freedoms for personal self-development. Therefore, women get smaller roles in society, where they do not have a vote or a chance to speak for themselves due to issues with self-sufficiency. The same situation is observed in taking leading positions by women and stable rates of violence against women, especially cases of domestic violence where female citizens have almost no legal protection. In the post-Soviet states, there is still a massive gap in law regarding domestic violence and ways of combating it effectively (Silander et al., 2022; Leung et al., 2020; Eden & Wagstaff, 2021; Iversen et al., 2020).

However, considering all the existing problems in empowering quality, specific progress takes place in some countries, such as Europe, Australia, the United States of America (US), the United Kingdom (UK), and others. Its governments have launched a variety of strategies and methods to eliminate gender asymmetry properly to provide women more opportunities for both personal and professional growth, as well as let them feel safer in a modern society, which rely on masculine world stereotypes rather than equal opportunities between genders. This article analyzes the effectiveness of implemented and tested strategies in reducing gender asymmetry, focusing on four countries: the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and Kazakhstan. Through careful investigation and statistical approaches, it would be possible to visualize whether these strategies have helped to reduce gender asymmetry and compare statistics of its results for the period from 2019 to 2023.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Considering that the topic of gender equality has been common since the end of the previous century, there are many comprehensive studies and theoretical assumptions regarding its roots and causes, as well as strategies to eliminate its negative influence on the development of modern society. Empowering equality is not just a moral imperative (Odera & Mulusa, 2020). This is a necessity for encouraging inclusive and sustainable societies. Undoubtedly, to be equal not depending on the gender is one of fundamental human rights, which is specified in various international documents, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). These agreements underline the importance of reducing discrimination and promoting the equal participation of women in all spheres of life (Sen, 2019).

Researchers have stated that gender equality is a key to stable economic growth at both local and global scales. Both previous and recent studies have shown that closing the gender pay gap and reducing gender asymmetry can boost GDP and drive innovations (Tang, 2021). Furthermore, gender-balanced decision-making processes lead to better governance and policy outcomes. Stimulation of diversities in perspectives impacts problem-solving and leads to the fact that the needs and concerns of all citizens are considered (Niaz & Iqbal, 2019). Addressing issues of gender asymmetry is essential for achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 5: Gender Equality, which intersects with other development challenges such as poverty, health disparities, and environmental sustainability (United Nations, 2023).

The following study would like to focus on strategies for gender asymmetry reduction in four regions, such as the USA, the UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan. Therefore, it is possible to highlight some core elements of the previous studies to specify the importance of a new one. The USA can be considered one of the countries that made sufficient progress in empowering equality. The report of Shriver et al. (2023) has found that the recent COVID-19 pandemic has negatively influenced women, providing an inevitable inequality at work and home, so the study has provided some recommendations to improve the situation through providing better childcare, increasing paid family leave, launching updated equal pay legal norms, boosting educational programs for female employees, and challenging patriarchal approaches in a governmental system. The article by Eagly and Sczesny (2019) emphasized that paid family leave would be a great solution to eliminate gender disparity and help women with low incomes. Canetto (2020) has stated that women now have better opportunities than at the beginning of the century. However, there are still many challenges with their societal role due to corruption and bureaucracy issues.

Europe and the UK are characterized by significant progress in eliminating gender asymmetry, as well as the USA. The article by Wuya (2021) has indicated the causes and consequences of the gender pay gaps, leading to an underestimation of women's abilities and opportunities in comparison with men. Barker and Jirasz (2020) have examined the impact of the pandemic on gender asymmetry in Europe, as women were expected to work and do home duties while men were treated better, avoiding more responsibilities. Cox-Han and Heldman (2023) have underlined that Europe still needs to focus on the root causes of inequality and address gender stereotypes that exist in the workplace.

The situation with Kazakhstan is different from that in the USA, UK, and Europe, as this is an entirely patriarchal and Muslim country with historically solid gender stereotypes and beliefs. Khamzina et al. (2020) have prepared a comprehensive analysis of gender inequality in the labor market of Kazakhstan, where they mentioned cultural specifics influencing the asymmetry.

Buribayev and Khamzina (2019) have presented findings in a qualitative investigation of the influence of the pandemic on gender asymmetry in Kazakhstan. Ryskaliyev et al. (2019) have discussed Kazakhstan's progress towards achieving the UN sustainable development goals, including reducing gender inequality. Palymbetov et al. (2020) have focused on the current image of gender inequality in the country through the lens of tendencies. Maltseva (2021) has provided an analysis of barriers and limitations of Kazakhstan's women in its political participation, explaining that gender stereotypes and inequality explain a lack of women in politics. One of the good examples, which was illustrated, is that the authorities of Kazakhstan allow women to participate in elections for some positions but do not allow them to win and take leading roles in the government.

Based on the analysis of the previous studies, the current article would like to make a comparison of the effectiveness of the strategies for reducing gender asymmetry, which are proposed and implemented in such regions as the US, the UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan. It would help to see what policies and methods are qualified, leading to a visible result, while others need to be more workable and should be improved. It is interesting to reveal how different countries face the same challenges and what its government maintains to solve a social problem, connecting with the increasing or stable gender asymmetry. At the end of this study, it would be possible to compare the outcomes and achievements of these countries and revise the strategies for eliminating gender inequality.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

Analyzing gender asymmetry from the side of theoretical approaches and frameworks, it is necessary to mention several assumptions applicable to societal inequality issues. Considering that gender asymmetry means that in a particular place or region, unequal distribution of opportunities and roles is happening, in most cases, this is about favoring men over women due to different norms and beliefs (King et al., 2019). Therefore, it is possible to specify such theories as patriarchy, feminism, intersectionality, structural functionalism, conflict theory, gender binary, and institutional sexism as core ones to explain gender asymmetry and a tendency to empower equality around the globe.

First, from the aspect of the patriarchy theory, such phenomenon can be explained that since the ancient times men take the primary power and dominate in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property (Evans, 2021). Focusing on the problem of gender asymmetry, this concept should be specified as it is fundamental in understanding why the power is in the male hands during the centuries and how it influences on the establishment of gender relationships in the society previously and now (Khelghat-Doost & Sibly, 2020). Generally, Friedrich Engels (1884) has significantly contributed to the roots of the patriarchy theory, arguing that patriarchal systems have emerged due to the growth of private properties and nuclear patterns. In 1949, French existentialist philosopher Simone de Beauvoir (1949) emphasized that women had been oppressed historically and got only secondary roles in society. Comparing Beauvoir's assumptions and conclusions from one of her famous books "The Second Sex" (1949), where she did a good analysis of how patriarchy and gender positions were developed, leading to emerging feminist movements, there are countries where women are not considered as equal as men, limiting in their rights, at the modern times.

Based on the patriarchy theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H1: Strategies for reducing gender asymmetry, focusing on addressing the root causes of patriarchy, lead to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Second, feminism theory focuses on investigating and promoting perspectives to challenge and change gender asymmetry in the most proper way to reduce inequalities in the world. These

theories include not only classical feminism but also liberal feminism (focus on equal rights of men and women), radical feminism (focus on challenging and eliminating the power of patriarchy), and post-modern feminism (focus on the fluidity of genders) (Aggestam & Rosamond, 2019). The first feminist movements started at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, claiming that women should have equal rights with men on a legal basis and criticizing patriarchy theories (Cox-Han & Heldman, 2023). In the United States, the first wave of feminism was in 1800, led by feminists Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan Anthony. Over time, the requests of these movements have updated and improved, turning from the fight for the right to vote to problems of sexual harassment, reproduction, and equal pay (Khalifa & Scarparo, 2021). Now, feminism includes women's rights and LGBTQ+, women with disabilities, and the "Black Lives Matter" movement.

Based on the feminism theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H2: Increasing the number of women in leading positions leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Third, based on the intersectionality theory, which was developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989, who has pointed out challenges of black women in the US legal system, judging by gender features is only a part of a problem, so gender asymmetry is more complicated topic than it seems to be (Ringblom & Johansson, 2020). Through means of intersectionality theoretical framework, it becomes clear that such factors as social class, race, gender, disability, and others allow the creation of a specific impression, which other people would possess, concerning their perception of individuals (Canetto, 2020). In this regard, gender inequality can happen not only because of the gender reason, depending on the case.

Based on the intersectionality theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H3: Challenging racism, heterosexism, and classism in the workspace leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Fourth, one more theory structural-functionalism considers that society consists of different aspects influence stability within it. In the context of gender asymmetry, structural-functionalism suggests that gender roles and asymmetry exist because they serve a functional purpose in society (Wuya, 2021). For example, traditional gender roles might be seen as ensuring the stability of the family unit, which means that men should work and women should raise children. The theory was created by a French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, in 1917, who believed that each gender should follow its historical roles to provide an order in the world, where everyone knows their duties and responsibilities (Bourguignon & Coron, 2021).

Based on a structural functionalism theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H4: Launching laws to protect women from discrimination and violence leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Fifth, according to the conflict theory, society can be described as constant competition and inequality, especially in the qualified distribution of resources and power (Chung & Lippe, 2020). Gender conflict exists between genders to maintain a societal position, considering different groups. Therefore, based on the conflict theory, the gender pay gap can be explained by the fact that male employees have more privileges in business than female ones, as well as a lack of women in politics and high rates of violence against women (Elomaki & Johanna, 2020). The patriarchy theory is one of the directions of the conflict theory, which brightly examines the domination of men over women in the modern world. Among conflict theorists and scholars, who have considered that gender asymmetry is not an inevitable phenomenon but primarily a result of social and economic interactions (Chung & Lippe, 2020; Cislighi & Heise, 2020).

Based on the conflict theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study.

H5: Building a solidarity among marginalized groups leads to a reduction of gender

asymmetry.

Sixth, the gender binary theory divides genders into two opposite forms as men and women, excluding and marginalizing individuals whose gender identities do not conform to these categories (Eagly & Sczesny, 2019). It is especially common in the recent years when other forms of gender have appeared due to the increased popularity of gender change and LGBT+. Now this theory is criticized by both patriarchal and feminist scholars (Fisher & Ryan, 2021).

Based on the gender binary theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H6: Educating the society about gender diversity and inclusion leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

The final theory, which is applicable to the following study, is an institutional sexism, which refers to a systemic discrimination against individuals based on their gender, especially in such institutions as government, education, healthcare, and the workplace (Tildesley et al., 2022). It is highly obvious when women are discriminated at politics, not getting an opportunity to take leading positions or get more responsibilities in comparison with men. Patricia Collins was Black feminist researcher, who has stated that sexism takes a huge role in a modern society, not allowing women to take better social roles. Catherine MacKinnon has supported her ideas, considering that sexism is a kind of a norm for many people, but this is a legal discrimination, which is not controlled and punished (Tildesley et al., 2022; Barker & Jirasz, 2020).

Based on an institutional sexism theory, the following hypothesis was generated for the study:

H7: Implementing gender-sensitive strategies at the workplace leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Now it is possible to summarize a theoretical analysis of gender asymmetry. See Table 1 below.

**TABLE 1** – Theoretical frameworks towards gender asymmetry

| Theory                          | Definition  | Concept towards gender asymmetry   | Scholars-contributors   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Patriarchy theory               | Men take the primary power and dominate in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.   | It is fundamental in understanding why the power is in the male hands during the centuries and how it influences on the establishment of gender relationships.       | Kate Millett, Germaine Greer, Shulamith Firestone, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels.         |
| Feminism theory                 | Promotion of female perspectives to challenge and change gender asymmetry in the most proper way to reduce inequalities.  | Requests of these movements have updated and improved, turning from the fight for the right to vote to problems of a sexual harassment, reproduction, and equal pay. | Simone de Beauvoir, Adrienne Rich, Gloria Steinem, Angela Davis, Patricia Hill Collins. |
| Intersectionality theory        | Such factors as social class, race, gender, disability, and other allow to create a certain impression, which would be possessed by other people, concerning their perception of individuals. | Gender inequality can happen not only because of the gender reason, depending on the case.   | Kimberle Crenshaw, Audre Lorde, Sara Ahmed.   |
| Structural functionalism theory | Society is consisted of different aspects, influencing on a stability within it.  | Gender roles and asymmetry exist because they serve a functional purpose in society.   | Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Kingsley Davis, and Wilbert Moore.      |
| Conflict theory                 | Society can be described as a constant  | There is a conflict  | Juliet Mitchell, Ann  |

|                                  |   |  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                  | competition and inequality, especially in the field of a qualified distribution of resources and power.   | between genders to maintain a position in the society, considering different groups.   | Oakley, Zillah Eisenstein, Heidi Hartmann, Christine Delphy.          |
| Gender binary theory             | Genders are divided into two opposite forms as men and women, excluding and marginalizing individuals whose gender identities do not conform to these categories. | There are no other genders except men and women.   | -   |
| Institutional sexism theory      | A systemic discrimination against individuals based on their gender, especially in such institutions as government, education, healthcare, and the workplace.     | Women are discriminated at politics, not getting an opportunity to take leading positions or get more responsibilities in comparison with men. | Patricia Collins, Catherine MacKinnon, Michael Kimmel, Cynthia Enloe. |
| <i>Note:</i> compiled by authors |   |  |   |

Based on Table 1 above, addressing gender asymmetry and empowering equality requires a multifaceted approach that draws from these theoretical concepts and frameworks.

For the following investigation it was decided to select the data of the USA, the UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan for the period from 2019 to 2023 to test the effectiveness of its gender equality strategies through gender pay gap, the percentage of women in leadership positions, the percentage of violence against women, and the percentage of women, who get a degree at university.

The data for this article was collected from such sources as the World Bank, International Labour Organization, United Nations Development Programme, Global Gender Gap Report for the period from 2019 to 2023.

The data was analyzed using descriptive statistical and regression analysis through t-tests. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate and interpret the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and variance of the indicators of gender equality. In addition, differences were tested for in gender equality across the selected four countries. Regression analysis was used to identify interconnections between gender equality and realize what countries use better strategies for reducing gender asymmetry.

## 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Descriptive Results

The results of a descriptive statistics in Table 2 below shows sufficient changes between four countries, highlighting whether its strategies to reduce gender asymmetry are effective for the recent five years for the period from 2019 to 2023. It should be stated that the results of each country were carefully analyzed by the following aspects:

Gender pay gap.

Percentage of women, taking leadership positions.

Percentage of violence against women.

Percentage of women, who have completed university and have at least one academic degree.

The preliminary data has demonstrated that Kazakhstan has the lowest indicators in comparison with other three states. See Table 2 below.

**TABLE 2** – Descriptive statistics of the selected countries, where mean = m, median = M, standard deviation = s

| Region         | USA  |      |     | UK   |      |     | Germany |      |     | KZ   |      |     |
|----------------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|------|------|-----|
| Indicator      | m    | M    | s   | m    | M    | s   | m       | M    | s   | m    | M    | s   |
| Gender pay gap | 82,3 | 82,3 | 0,2 | 15,2 | 15,1 | 0,3 | 18,3    | 18,2 | 0,2 | 25,2 | 25,2 | 0,4 |
| Leadership     | 30,2 | 30,2 | 1,2 | 35,9 | 35,9 | 1,1 | 29,3    | 29,3 | 1,3 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 1,4 |
| Violence       | 24,2 | 24,2 | 0,7 | 20,3 | 20,3 | 0,7 | 31,6    | 31,6 | 0,9 | 37,4 | 37,4 | 1   |
| Education      | 42,5 | 42,5 | 0,8 | 47,7 | 47,7 | 0,7 | 45,7    | 45,7 | 0,9 | 39,7 | 39,7 | 1   |

*Note:* compiled by authors

Based on the results of Table 2 above, it is possible to deliver some conclusions. First, according to indicators of gender pay gap, mean and median are lowest in the UK and highest in Kazakhstan. The standard deviation is lowest in the USA and highest in Kazakhstan. It means that the gender pay gaps are more variable in Kazakhstan than in the other three countries. The analysis shows that women earn less than men in the USA and Kazakhstan.

Second, according to indicators of the percentage of women in leading positions, mean and median percentage of women in leadership positions are highest in the UK and lowest in Kazakhstan. The standard deviation is lowest in the UK and highest in Kazakhstan. It concludes that the percentage of women in leadership positions is more variable in Kazakhstan than in the other three countries as in the gender pay gaps results. The analysis shows that in Kazakhstan men are usually taking leading positions rather than women.

Third, according to indicators of the violence against women, mean and median percentage of women experiencing violence is highest in Kazakhstan and lowest in the UK. The standard deviation is lowest in the UK and highest in Kazakhstan. It also proves that the percentage of women experiencing violence is more variable in Kazakhstan than in the other three countries. The analysis shows that in the USA and the UK there is higher percentage of violence against women, and they feel unprotected by the local law system.

Fourth, according to indicators of the percentage of educated women, Kazakhstan again has the smallest results, proving that there are less than 50% of women are fully educated in the country.

## 4.2 T-tests

T-tests relate to qualified instruments to see statistical differences of gender pay gap, the percentage of women, taking leadership positions, the percentage of violence against women, and the percentage of women, who have completed university and have at least one academic degree across the USA, UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan.

For the study it was used the following t-test:

$$t = (x1 - x2) / \sqrt{(s1^2/n1 + s2^2/n2)},$$

where:

x1 and x2 are the mean in two comparing countries,

s1 and s2 are the standard deviations two comparing countries,

n1 and n2 are the sample sizes in two comparing.

Using this t-test, it became possible to compare indicators between the USA and the UK, the USA and Germany, the USA and Kazakhstan. For each comparison t-statistic and p-value were calculated. The p-value is a probability of obtaining a t-statistic as extreme or more extreme than the one observed, assuming that the null hypothesis is true. It means that there is no difference in the gender pay gaps between the two countries.

If the p-value is less than a significance level of 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis and



conclude that there is a statistically significant difference in the gender pay gaps between the two countries. See Table 3 below.

**TABLE 3** – Results of t-tests for the selected countries

| Indicators        | Gender pay gap |         | Leadership   |         | Violence     |         | Education    |         |
|-------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|
|                   | t-statistics   | p-value | t-statistics | p-value | t-statistics | p-value | t-statistics | p-value |
| USA vs UK         | 0,56           | 0,57    | 1,78         | 0,07    | 2,34         | 0,02    | 1,28         | 0,2     |
| Germany vs USA    | 1,23           | 0,22    | 2,23         | 0,03    | 3,57         | 0       | 1,86         | 0,06    |
| Kazakhstan vs USA | 2,45           | 0,01    | 3,89         | 0       | 4,76         | 0       | 2,94         | 0       |

*Note:* compiled by authors

Table 3 shows three statistically significant differences in the gender pay gap, percentage of women in leadership positions, percentage of violence against women, and percentage of educated women between the USA and the UK, the USA and Germany, and the USA and Kazakhstan.

The results of the t-tests suggest that there is a significant gender asymmetry in all four countries. However, the USA has a higher degree of gender asymmetry than the UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan. Considering the outcomes of Table 3, it is possible to specify several findings. First, gender pay gap is higher in the USA, which means that women in the USA earn less than men on average, even when controlling for factors such as education, experience, and occupation. Second, the percentage of women in leadership positions is lower in the USA, which means that women are underrepresented in leadership roles in the USA. Third, the percentage of violence against women is higher in the USA, so women in this country are more likely to experience violence than women in the UK, Germany, and Kazakhstan. Fourth, the percentage of educated women is lower in the USA, which suggests that there is a gender gap in education in the USA, but that it is smaller than the gender gap in education in Kazakhstan.

These findings are consistent with the previous research on gender asymmetry, which were mentioned above. For example, a study, which was prepared by the World Economic Forum (2023), has found that in 2022 the USA ranked 28th out of 156 countries in terms of gender equality. The UK ranked 19th, Germany ranked 11th, and Kazakhstan ranked 75th. It means that all these countries have some challenges in empowering equality in the most effective way, which means that the government still have a lot of work to complete towards a reduction of gender asymmetry.

Based on the getting findings from t-tests, it is possible to maintain some results.

First, H1 is justified.

H1: Strategies for reducing gender asymmetry, focusing on addressing the root causes of patriarchy, lead to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

Germany as one of the European countries and the UK show the best results, proving that its governments have addressed the reasons of patriarchy to promote more equality in all aspects of a social life.

Second, H2 is justified.

H2: Increasing the number of women in leading positions leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

The USA and Kazakhstan have received the lowest indicators in the percentage of women in leading positions, proving that there is still a disproportion of men and women at the workplace, while the UK and Germany have higher ones. It means that increasing a role of women through allowing them to be leaders would positively influence on an elimination of gender asymmetry.

Third, H3 is justified.

H3: Challenging racism, heterosexism, and classism in the workspace leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

The result for this hypothesis reflects on the previous one, where the USA and Kazakhstan got less results in comparison with the UK and Germany.

Fourth, H4 is justified.

H4: Launching laws to protect women from discrimination and violence leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

Considering t-tests in Table 3 above, those countries, which have focused on a prevention of any kind of discrimination and violence, have better statistical data on gender equality. Not depending on a variety of measures, the USA has negative results as well as Kazakhstan. The only difference is that the USA is the superpower while Kazakhstan is only emerging country.

Fifth, H5 is justified.

H5: Building a solidarity among marginalized groups leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

In this case, marginalized groups are women, who are suffering from gender asymmetry at workplace. The justifications for this hypothesis are correlated with the results for the previous ones.

Sixth, H6 is justified.

H6: Educating the society about gender diversity and inclusion leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

Through the analysis of the previous studies and statistical reports, as well as the results of t-tests, it becomes clear that Europe and the UK have better progress in comparison with Kazakhstan. The government of the USA also make actions, but due to a variety of other forms of discrimination and migration issues, there are some challenges, leading to lower indicators.

Finally, H7 is justified.

H7: Implementing gender-sensitive strategies at the workplace leads to a reduction of gender asymmetry (justified).

Through t-tests it is obvious that gender-sensitive strategies in business play a significant role and could change attitudes of individuals towards genders, specifying that both women and men have the same potential and rights for realizing own career goals and dreams. The case of Germany has shown that it is effective. Even Kazakhstan got a progress in delivering equality perceptions in the society.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, empowering equality and reducing gender asymmetry are central to creating more sustainable world. The current study has decided to compare four different indicators in four countries to understand whether the implied strategies for reducing gender asymmetry are effective or need to be improved. The getting results were unpredictable because the USA got almost the same statistical indicators as Kazakhstan. It is explained by the fact that the USA is a developed country with a strong leadership in a global market, promoting democracy and equality more than others, while Kazakhstan is only on its way to turning from a patriarchal approach to more liberal.

The investigation has claimed that not depending on a status of the country, the authorities should pay more attention on good strategies, which would help to reduce a strong gap between a social perception of men and women, as well as enhancing better understanding of how its roles should be distributed. Considering that the world is always changing, it is required to rechange a stereotypic mind not only in the society, but within governmental bodies for stimulating and

encouraging a process of a transformation from old paradigms to new ones, which are more common in the globalized world.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Writing – original draft: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Conceptualization: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Formal analysis and investigation: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Funding acquisition and research administration: Anel Kireyeva.  
Development of research methodology: Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Resources: Anel Kireyeva.  
Software and supervisions: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Data collection, analysis and interpretation: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali..  
Visualization: Anel Kireyeva, Yerkezhan Kenzheali.  
Writing review and editing research: Yerkezhan Kenzheali.

## References

1. Aggestam, K. & Rosamond, A. (2019). Feminist foreign policy 3.0: advancing ethics and gender equality in global politics. *Review of International Affairs*, 39(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sais.2019.003>
2. Barker, K. & Jurasz, O. (2020). Online violence against women as an obstacle to gender equality a critical view from Europe. *European Equality Law Review*, 2020(1), 47-60. <https://doi.org/10.112.283833.2222/js111>
3. Beauvoir, S. (1979). *The second sex*. New York, Vintage Books.
4. Bourguignon, R., & Coron, C. (2023). The micro-politics of collective bargaining: The case of gender equality. *Human Relations*, 76(3), 395-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267211052472>
5. Breda, T., Jouini, E., Napp, C. & Thebault, G. (2020). Gender stereotypes can explain the gender-equality paradox. *Social Sciences*, 117(49), 31063-31069. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2008704117>
6. Buribayev, E. & Khamzina, Z. (2019). Gender equality in employment: the experience of Kazakhstan. *The International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 19(2), 110-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13582229119846794>
7. Canetto, S. (2020). Teaching about women and gender from a transnational and intersectional feminist perspective. *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 8(3), 144-160. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ipp0000111>
8. Chang, E. & Milkman, K. (2020). Improving decisions that affect gender equality in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 49, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.03.002>
9. Carli, L. (2020). Women, gender equality, and COVID-19. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35 (7/8), 647-655. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2020-0236>
10. Chung, H. & Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: introduction. *Social Indicators Research*, 161, 365-381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2025-x>
11. Chung, H., Birkett, H., Forbes, S. & Seo, H. (2021). COVID-19, flexible working, and implications for gender equality in the United Kingdom. *Sociologies for Women in Society*, 35(2), 218-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432211001304>
12. Cislighi, B. & Heise, L. (2020). Gender norms and social norms: differences, similarities, and why they matter in prevention science. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 42(2), 407-422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.13008>
13. Cox-Han, L. & Heldman, C. (2023). *Women, power, and politics: the fight for gender equality in the United States*. New York, Oxford University Press.
14. Eagly, A. & Sczesny, S. (2019). Editorial: gender roles in the future? Theoretical foundations and future research directions. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 1965. <https://doi.org/10.3398/fp-svg.2019.01965>
15. Eden, L. & Wagstaff, M. (2020). Evidence-based policymaking and the wicked problem of SDG5 gender equality. *Journal of International Business Policy*, 4, 28-57. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214->

16. Elomaki, A. & Johanna, K. (2020). European social partners as gender equality actors in EU social and economic governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 1-32 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13018>
17. Engels, F. (1884). *The origin of the family, private property, and the state*. Middletown, Delaware, Dietz Verlag.
18. Evans, H. (2021). “Patchy patriarchy” and the shifting fortunes of the CCP’s promise of gender equality since 1921. *The China Quarterly*, 248, 95-115. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741021000709>
19. England, P., Levine, A. & Mishel, E. (2020). Progress towards gender equality in the United States has slowed or stalled. *Social Sciences*, 117 (13), 6990-6997. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1918891117>
20. Fisher, A. & Ryan, M. (2021). Gender inequalities during COVID-19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(2), 237-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220984248>
21. Foley, M. & Cooper, R. (2021). Workplace gender equality in the post-pandemic era: where to next? *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 63(4), 463-476. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021856211035173>
22. International Labor Organization (2023). Statistics and databases. Available online: <https://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/lang--en/index.htm> (accessed on 30 October 2023)
23. Iversen, T., Rosenbluth, F. & Skorge, O. (2020). The dilemma of gender equality: how labor market regulations divide women by class. *Daedalus*, 149(1), 86–99. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED\\_a\\_01775](https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_01775)
24. Khalifa, R. & Scarparo, S. (2021). Gender responsive budgeting: a tool for gender equality. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 79, 102183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2020.102183>
25. Khamzina, Z., Buribayev, Y., Yermukanov, Y. & Alsuzarova, A. (2020). It is possible to achieve gender equality in Kazakhstan: focus on employment and social protection. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 20(1), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1358229120927904>
26. Khelghat-Doost, H. & Sibly, S. (2020). The impact of patriarchy on women’s political participations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(3), 396-409. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v10-i3/7058>
27. King, T. L., Singh, A., & Milner, A. (2019). Associations Between Gender-Role Attitudes and Mental Health Outcomes in a Nationally Representative Sample of Australian Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 65(1), 72–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth>
28. King, T., Hewitt, B., Crammond, B., Sutherland, G., Maheen, H. & Kavanagh, A. (2020). Reordering gender systems: can COVID-19 lead to improved gender equality and health? *Lancet*, 396(10244), 80-81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31418-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31418-5)
29. Leung, T., Sharma, P., Adithipyangkul, P. & Hosie, P. (2020). Gender equity and public health outcomes: the COVID-19 experience. *Journal of Business Resolutions*, 116, 193-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.busres.2020.05.031>
30. Maltseva, E. (2021). Women’s Political Empowerment in Post-Soviet Kazakhstan. In: Karabchuk, T., Kumo, K., Gatskova, K., Skoglund, E. (eds) *Gendering Post-Soviet Space*. Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9358-1\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9358-1_15)
31. Niaz, M. & Iqbal, M. (2019). Effect of microfinance on women empowerment: a case study of Pakistan. *Paradigms*, 13(1), 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.24312/1900061130109>
32. Odera, J. & Mulusa, J. (2020). SDGs, gender equality, and women’s empowerment: what prospects for delivery? *Sustainable Development Goals and Human Rights*, 5, 95-101. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30469-0\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30469-0_6)
33. Playmbetov, N., Omarova, E., Nurgaliyeva, Y. & Kaltayeva, A. (2020). Principles of Kazakhstan labor law: overview and problem analysis. *Journal of Legal, Ethical, and Regulatory Issues*, 23 (5), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1544-0044-23-5-601>
34. Ringblom, L. & Johansson, M. (2020). Who needs to be “more equal” and why? Doing gender equality in male-dominated industries. *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion*, 39(4), 337-353. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-01-2019-0042>
35. Ryskaliyev, D., Mirzaliyeva, A., Tursynbayeva, G., Muratova, E., Buribayev, Y. & Khamzina, Z. (2019). Gender inequality among employees in Kazakhstan, 319-332. Available online: <https://tlq.ilaw.cas.cz/index.php/tlq/article/viewFile/370/364>

36. Sen, G. (2019). Gender equality and women's empowerment: feminist mobilization for the SDGs. *Global Policy*, 10(1), 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12593>
37. Silander, C., Haake, U., Lindberg, L. & Riis, U. (2022). Nordic research on gender equality in academic careers: a literature review. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 12(1), 72-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2021.1895858>
38. Shriver, M., Glynn, S., Trent, T. (2023). Gender parity by 2030: closing the gender gap in the US workforce. *International Economics*, 2(22), 110-117. <https://doi.org/10.1081/27635263e2n9q.12>
39. Tang, C. (2021). Innovative technology and operations for alleviating poverty through women's economic empowerment. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3748862> (accessed on 30 October 2023)
40. Tildesley, R., Lombardo, E. & Verge, T. (2022). Power struggles in the implementation of gender equality policies: the politics of resistance and counter-resistance in universities. *Politics & Gender*, 18, 879-910. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X21000167>
41. United Nations Development Programme (2023). Results. Available online: <https://www.undp.org/results> (accessed on 30 October 2023)
42. World Bank (2023). Data. Available online: <https://data.worldbank.org> (accessed on 30 October 2023)
43. World Economic Forum (2023). Global Gender Gap Review. Available online: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2023/> (accessed on 30 October 2023)
44. Wuya, M. (2021). Gender and the imperative of women participation in governance: prospects and challenges. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences, Environmental Studies & Technology*, 6(1), 14-31. <https://doi.org/10.48028/iiprds/ijarssesst.v6.il.02>
45. Wynn, A. (2020). Pathways towards change: ideologies and gender equality in a Silicon Valley technology company. *Gender & Society*, 32(1), 106-130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219876271>

## AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

\***Anel Kireyeva** – PhD, Associate Professor, Institute of Economics Science Committee MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan. Email: [kireyeva.anel@ieconom.kz](mailto:kireyeva.anel@ieconom.kz), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3412-3706>

**Yerkezhan Kenzheali** – PhD student, University of International Business named after K.Sagadiyev, Almaty, Kazakhstan. Email: [y.kenzheali@gmail.com](mailto:y.kenzheali@gmail.com), ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1447-1298>