

Table 2. Distribution of unemployed by duration of job search (RF Goscomstat, LFS data, %)

	1992	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Men (Total)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Including job searchers							
< 3 months	62,0	25,4	23,2	23,7	27,8	35,4	29,5
3–6 months	17,7	16,2	16,8	14,4	14,6	13,5	14,7
6–12 months	11,2	22,5	20,7	18,4	19,3	17,2	18,6
> 1 year	9,1	35,9	39,3	43,5	38,3	33,9	37,1
Average period of job search, months	3,9	8,5	8,9	9,2	8,6	7,8	8,3
Total women	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Including job searchers							
< 3 months	50,3	21,6	21,1	17,7	20,6	25,9	24,2
3–6 months	21,6	15,3	14,7	12,7	13,5	14,6	15,4
6–12 months	14,8	22,2	21,2	18,1	18,8	19,0	19,6
> 1 year	13,2	40,7	42,9	51,5	47,1	40,5	40,7
Average period of job search, months	4,9	9,1	9,4	10,2	9,7	8,8	8,9

3.3. WAGES

The level of wages is one of most important parameters. Considering the larger part of employed in Russia is hired workers, the wage level predetermines the level of prosperity of individuals and households and economic opportunities for investment into human development. Moreover, the wage level reflects efficiency of economic returns on the human capital. Gender equality of wages in many ways serves as a basis for alignment of family status of men and women, provides broader equal access to family expenses and creates the basis for women's economic independence.

Differences in wages received by men and women are usually explained by unequal gender distribution across professions and industries (horizontal segregation), unequal wages within professions and types of activity (vertical segregation), and low recognition of women's labour. If differences in qualitative characteristics of men's and women's labour were the main reason of unequal remuneration, one could expect that similar levels of labour activity and education would result in similar wage levels, which is not the case.

Until recently, systematic statistical data on gender-related wages was non-existent. The recent RF Goskomstat data allowed for assessment of gender gap in wages. Thus, in 1998 female average wages in economy made up 70% of male average wages, in 2000 — 63.2%, in 2001 — 63%, in 2003 — 64% (at large and medium-size enterprises only). Account

of small enterprises in statistical surveys would have, most probably, increased this gap. Small enterprises usually pay smaller wages and many risks are shifted off to workers, and women are mostly concentrated in service provision sectors and companies with few employees. The overall level of gender disparity in wages is compatible with the situation in many developed countries. Still, the increasing gender gap in wages is a disturbing trend.

RLMS data provides more detailed information and reveals a stable correlation of female and male wages amounting to 60% (Table 3).

In comparing wage levels one should take into account two factors. First, in 1990s non-payment and wage arrears were an acute problem in Russian economy, affecting men more than women. For this reason, wage differences should be modified and increased. Second, wage rates, as a rule, are compared at primary work places, though «moonlighting» (secondary employment) is widely spread in Russia. It is mostly men who have secondary jobs, and, other equal conditions provided, they receive higher wages than women do⁸. Thus, comparison of wages at all work places would also increase the gender gap in incomes.

However, comparison of average level of wages (an important indicator of male and female participation in the labour force) does not disclose the nature of such disparities. The existent gap cannot be explained only by women's less favourable positions

Table 3. Correlation between female/male wages (RLMS data), %

	1994	1995	1996	1998	2000	2001	2002
Wage at the primary job	58,31	63,26	60,59	64,67	61,62	60,13	63,39

⁸ Roshchin S.Y., Razumova T.O. Secondary employment in Russia: labor supply models. M. EERC, 2002.

in the economy as compared to men or only by discrimination. Qualitative characteristics of men's and women's human capital, employment modes and activity areas may differ significantly, which also adds to the gap in average wages.

Analysis of gender gap determinants in wages as per RLMS data for 2001⁹ reveals largest gender gaps in wages in professional communities with excess women's labour force, namely, professions requiring specialised secondary and university education: here, women make less than men by 47% and 45% on the average. Prior to retirement wages of men and women approximate, while the biggest gap is registered in the 41–45 age group.

Women much more often than men are employed half-time¹⁰ (13% vs. 4%), however, for both genders this ratio has diminished significantly during the last 5–6 years¹¹.

In 2001 a common trend was a relative advantage of working women related to the total duration of schooling (as per RLMS data, 12.9 years for women and 12.6 — for men). Still, men employed in high and medium positions (requiring university and specialised secondary education, clerks and public officials) surpass women by the duration of schooling, i.e. with regard to the level of education women are distributed more uniformly across professional groups.

Speaking about returns of investments into education, one should note that employees with complete or incomplete post-graduate education get biggest average wages at primary jobs; however, women with postgraduate education on the average make less than men with secondary education. Women with university education earn more than only one category of men — those with incomplete university education. At the same time in several regions of Russia women with incomplete secondary education make more¹² than women with secondary education.

As per RLMS data, in 2001 women's overall work record (excluding full-time schooling in universities or technical schools) amounted to 17.4 years vs. 17.1 years among men. However, these figures do not fully reflect the real situation, as the sampling is age-shifted due to different retirement age. The modified working record accounting for homogeneous distribution of workers of both sexes by age is 16.5 years among women vs. 19.7 years among men. The modified work record at the latest job, which speaks of specific human capital, is 7.6 years for women vs. 6.5 years for men.

Arrears of wages or payments of wages «in kind» to workers with low qualifications were common in 2001 and earlier. 42% of men with no certificate of

secondary education faced arrears of wages and/or payment of wages «in kind», i.e. by goods manufactured at their enterprises. On the average, this problem affected 20% of women and 23% of men.

Several important trends are noted in analysis of returns from investments into human capital in 2001. Benefits from university education remained intact both for men and women. For women, this positive trend emerged in mid 1990s. In 1996, the university diploma, other equal conditions provided, would increase the wages of women with secondary education by 34%, in 2000 — by 56%¹³. In 2001 the rate of returns from investments into university education for women amounted to 61% (with similar preconditions). However, since late 1990s the rate of returns from postgraduate training has been on the decline.

At the same time negative returns from women's secondary education became evident. Education in vocational schools, both with or without the certificate of secondary education, also affected women's wages negatively. Other equal conditions provided, education in technical schools or vocational schools increased men's wages by 12%, women's wages — by 10% (as compared to employees with incomplete secondary education). In mid 1990s the returns from this type of education were more tangible for women, while for men, on the contrary, they slightly increased only recently.

Women's wages grow with age, reaching the maximum at 44, then start declining. Men on the average face such a decline earlier, at 38. Analysing the given sampling as a «conventional generation», one may say that, contrary to men, women's wages do not change significantly with time. Female profile «age vs. wages» is lower than male and is more gentle. Gender gap in wages decreases on the verge of retirement.

Thus, one may conclude that differences in human capital reduce the gender gap in wages. Women had rather significant advantages in human capital dimensions, which helped somewhat reduce the gap: if women had similar characteristics with men, the gap would grow by 7.4%.

Distribution of arrears of wages, «in kind» payments and part-time jobs was also favourable for women in terms of gender differences in wages. However, these factors influenced gender differences 10 times less than difference in the properties of human capital.

In 2001, occupational segregation was a significant determinant of gender disparities; it accounted for 15% gap, or approximately one third¹⁴ of cumulative wage gaps. Impact of occupational segregation on gender gap is most demonstrative in that the lowest returns were visible in predomi-

⁹ Assessment of factors related to gender gap in wages was made by O.Gorelkina and S. Roshchin.

¹⁰ Less than 35 hours a week.

¹¹ S.Ogloblin: 1999, Gender Earnings Differential in Russia, Industrial and Labour Relations Review, Vol. 52, No. 4, p. 608

¹² For example in Moscow, Saint-Petersburg and Moscow region they earn almost twice as much.

¹³ Konstantinova Vernon V. Returns to Human Capital in Transitional Russia. The University of Texas at Austin. Working Paper, April 2002.

¹⁴ In mid- 1990s — over half, S. Ogloblin. Gender Earnings Differential in Russia, Industrial and Labour Relations review, 1999, Vol. 52, No. 4.

Table 4. Primary gender gap determinants in wages, 2001

Total differences	0,438
Positive contribution	0,276
Occupational segregation	0,150
Different work record	0,073
Enterprise owner	0,027
Health	0,026
Negative contribution	-0,069
Human capital, including	-0,058
Age	-0,026
Education	-0,029
Specific human capital	-0,003
Regional wage differences	-0,007
Wage arrears, natural benefits, reductions	-0,005
Unaccounted differences	0,230
Male gain	0,122
Female loss	0,108

nantly «female» professions, the highest — in traditional «male» professions. Thus, under other equal conditions the wages of industrial workers, operators, engine drivers are 35% higher than of

unskilled workers, while for professionals and specialists with university or specialised secondary education relevant parameters make up 31–32%. The advantage in wages of clerks and public officials is 13% only (Table 4).

Domination of women in public services and their scarcity in foreign companies made a positive, though insignificant contribution to gender gap in wages. If distribution by these sectors were absolutely uniform, the cumulative difference in wages would decrease by 2.7%.

Health factor (judging by respondents' self-rating) «explained» approximately the same share of gender gap in wages, namely, 2.6%. Good health ensured 16% growth of female wages vs. 7% growth of male wages.

Thus, primary determinants of gender disparities in wages in the Russian labour market in 2001 were gender discrimination¹⁵, occupational segregation, different types of company ownership (public sector or foreign company), which contributed to the gap positively. Also, differences in the quality of human capital (age, educational level, specific work record), distribution of arrears in wages, «in kind» payments, reduction of working time prevented increase of the gap by another 7%.

3.4. SEGREGATION

Gender segregation reveals itself in asymmetric distribution of men and women in different structures: departmental, occupational and functionary. At that, horizontal and vertical segregation are identified. Horizontal segregation manifests itself in different occupational groups, while vertical one — in the same occupational group. In view of that, departmental and occupational segregation may be called horizontal, and functionary segregation — vertical.

Statistical data allows for assessment only of departmental and occupational genders segregation. At that, occupational segregation should not be considered horizontal only. Distribution by 10 occupational groups reflects both horizontal and vertical segregation¹⁶.

Departmental segregation (by branch of industry). The overall conclusion is that women are mostly employed in public services (nearly 60 % of women vs. less than 30% of men). The expansion of public services during the last thirty years of the 20th century stimulated women's increased employment, amount of jobs and demand for female labour, but at the same time added to segregation of the labour market.

For a more detailed analysis we suggest the following approach: branches of industry with less than 33% of female labour are called «male», with more than 66% of female labour — «female». The remaining industries form a third, intermediary category.

From among 15 branches (in line with RF Goskomstat classification), from 1994 through 2002 no considerable changes occurred in 12. Thus, one may conclude that forestry (1/5 of women-workers), construction (the share of women never exceeded 25% during 9 years), transportation (the share of men stayed at approx. 75%) and «other branches» of industry may be classified as «male».

Such spheres as public health, physical culture and social security (male share never exceeded 20% during 9 years), education (nearly 4/5 of women), culture and arts (closer to the intermediary branch than other «female» industries, with the share of women 67.5% to 72.5%) and finances, credit and insurance (from 1994 to 2001 the share of women dropped from 74.5 to 69.3%) have seen the highest female concentration during the indicated period of time. Between 1994 and 2001, manufacturing industries, wholesale and retail trade, public catering, housing and communal services, non-productive public services, as well as science and research remained in the intermediary category. At that, during the 9 years the manufacturing industry saw a smooth decrease in female labour (by 4.3% from 1994 to 2002), while in the housing and communal services, non-productive types of public services, on the contrary, the share of women increased (by 3.9%). Early in this period wholesale and retail trade and

¹⁵ Part of gap in wages — 52% — cannot be explained by properties of the job, human capital or regional labour markets, which is more than similar estimations for other countries. Obviously, it cannot be explained only by discrimination, and it is affected by unknown factors.

¹⁶ E. g., heads (representatives) of all levels of government and management including heads of institutions, organisations and enterprises, highly qualified specialists; medium level specialists, office workers, workers, etc.