

4 TIME DISTRIBUTION

Different time distribution structures predetermine different status of men and women in the labour market and in the economy. Despite high level of female labour activity in the second half of the 20th century, the unwritten «social contract» assigning certain distribution of gender roles in the family and in the labour market is still in force. Historically, women are responsible for housekeeping and education of children, while men are seen as breadwinners and money-makers. Taken women's high employment level in Russia, it results in that men's time is usually divided between work and leisure, while women's time — between work, leisure and household (Table 12).

Traditional «social contract» contradicts and does not conform with male and female new roles in the labour market. The levelling of gender status in labour activities should be supplemented with its levelling in the household. Public attitudes to this issue are quite contradictory. Though many men and women share the concept of family equality, market relations and recent social and economic processes resulted in conservative public attitudes. The research demon-

Time allocation structures do not depend directly on the level of economic development, but they reflect national and cultural peculiarities of gender roles in the household²⁵. Women's heavy housekeeping load cannot be «corrected» either by administrative or political or economic methods. Though emergence of mighty incentives in the labour market and the «substitution» effect compel women to devote less time to household duties, other things being equal, these duties still make them less competitive in the labour market. Both employers and women are well aware about it. As a result, household duties decrease women's value as labour force and prevent them from competing with men in the labour market. Women have to choose between children and work or put up with the necessity of combining housekeeping and work.

In the latter case, women's overall occupation in the labour market and in the household is broader than men's. On the average, women's working time exceeds men's by 25%, and the working time of able-bodied women is twice as long as men's²⁷. In evaluating gender distribution of family resources, including

Table 12. Distribution of duties in the households, % of respondents²²

	Women	Men
Wife does all or almost all household chores	21,4	11,5
Both spouses have certain responsibilities, but the wife does a bigger part of household chores	38,9	32,6
Husband and wife do most part of household work together or in turn	28,1	36,7
Each has one's responsibilities, but husband does a bigger part of household chores	5,2	12,0
Difficult to answer	4,3	5,1
Other	2,1	2,1

strates that the number of patriarchal family proponents among young men is growing. Men and women aged 16 to 30 reveal an almost twofold break in the number of proponents and opponents of «equal» family, while in their parents' generation these parameters differed slightly²³ (Table 13).

The recent statistics and research data do not allow for accurate evaluation of gender distribution of time. The latest budget surveys were carried out by RF Goskomstat in 1990. In 1994–1998 RLMS included questions about time distribution, but this data is inaccurate, as it does not take into account all household activities. Nevertheless, it allows for certain conclusions: women weekly spend on the average 30.3 hrs on household chores, men — 14.0 hrs²⁴.

Table 13. Actual allotment of time for household chores (for participants in these activities), hours per week, RLMS²⁵

	Men	Women
Employment in the labour market	43,0	38,4
Working on individual farms	15,4	13,0
Purchasing food stuffs	3,6	4,4
Cooking	5,2	13,8
Cleaning the apartment	2,6	5,7
Laundry and ironing	2,0	4,2
Care of children	15,0	31,5

²² I. D. Gorshkova, I.I. Shurygina. Violence against Wives in Modern Russian Families. M.: MAK Press, 2003, p.113.

²³ N.E. Tikhonova. Urban Poverty Phenomenon in Modern Russia. M.: Letniy Sad, 2003, p. 197.

²⁴ E. B. Mezentseva. Men and Women in the Sphere of Household Labour: Economic Rationality Logic against Gender Identity Logic? // Gender equality: Looking for Solution of Old Problems. ILO, M: 2003. In this case household activity included traditionally «female» types of activity, while «male» household activities were not taken into account.

²⁵ Thus, in Japan men spend only 3 hours a week on household duties.

²⁶ E. B. Mezentseva. Men and Women in the Sphere of Household Labour: Economic Rationality Logic against Gender Identity Logic? // Gender equality: Looking for Solution of Old Problems. ILO, M: 2003. p. 58.

²⁷ E. B. Mezentseva. Men and Women in the Housekeeping Work: Economic Rationality Logic against Gender Identity Logic? // Gender equality: Looking for Ways to Solve Old Problems. ILO, M.: 2003, p. 57–58.

time allocation, both men and women indicate that men have more opportunities to devote to work as much time and efforts as they consider necessary, and to spend their free time as they wish.²⁸

Thus, women not only have fewer opportunities in the labour market, but also less free time for investing in their human capital.

5 EDUCATION

Men and women do not differ much by their education level. Up to recent times men on the average had a slightly higher level of education, mostly at the expense of older age groups. Currently, in young and able-bodied age groups women's educational level is slightly higher than men's. This trend is reflected in the 1994 micro-census and confirmed by the latest data.

Women's high level of education is the legacy of Soviet times (Table 14).

On the whole, men and women apply different strategies to obtaining education and preparing for professional activities. Women are inclined to obtain secondary education in general schools, and are oriented at receiving top level professional training. Men are more prone to receiving incomplete general secondary education in schools and continuing studies in vocational training institutions³⁰ (Table 15).

Different strategies of receiving education reflect professional segregation and different returns on investment into the human capital among men

and women. Men's high level of employment in industry and in manufacture presupposes professional training in working specialities. For women, only university education can ensure higher wages. For men, even unskilled jobs, requiring specialised vocational training provide sufficient returns on education.

Gender disparities in educational level in the favour women reveal that the levelling of investments into the human capital does not provide for equality in economic or social status of men and women. Hidden discrimination mechanisms in the labour market devalue women's high educational level. One may say that women have to run faster than men do in order to reach the finish line simultaneously. Women's high level of education is excessive and results in different impact of educational signals on the two genders in the labour market. Potential employers set higher demands for educational level or other labour qualities of women as compared to men.

Table 14. Level of education of men above 15 y.o. per 1000 people²⁹

Years	University education	Incomplete university education	Secondary professional education	Secondary education	Universal primary education	Elementary education	No Elementary education
1959	32	13	58	63	261	398	175
1970	57	17	78	126	325	288	106
1979	84	18	113	222	318	191	53
1989	117	17	166	323	231	119	27
1994	138	20	190	327	216	92	17
2002	142	31	213	349	175	76	15

Table 15. Level of education of women above 15 y.o. per 1000 people³¹

Years	University education	Incomplete university education	Secondary professional education	Secondary education	Universal primary education	Elementary education	No Elementary education
1959	23	11	58	64	214	239	391
1970	44	13	88	121	253	204	274
1979	71	16	138	190	235	180	169
1989	110	17	214	233	192	137	97
1994	130	17	242	250	190	107	64
2002	144	30	262	272	156	99	35

²⁸ I. D. Gorshkova, I.I. Shurygina. Violence against Wives in Modern Russian Families. M.: MAKSS Press, 2003, p.112.

²⁹ Baskakova M.E. Men and Women in Educational System // Gender inequality in modern Russia through a prism of statistics. M.: Editorial URSS, 2004.

³⁰ M. E. Baskakova. Education in Russia. Gender Asymmetry in Development and Investments Efficiency // Gender Equality: Gender equality: Looking for Solution of Old Problems. ILO, M.: 2003.

³¹ M.E. Baskakova. Men and Women in Educational System // Gender inequality in modern Russia through a prism of statistics. M.: Editorial URSS, 2004.

Gender disparities in education have other negative social consequences. Young men with working specialities and without university education are most conservative about gender roles in the family

and adhere to patriarchal models³². Thus, gender differences in educational levels may reproduce and consolidate male attitudes and hinder effective social policies directed at gender equality.

6 OUTSIDE THE LABOUR MARKET: ECONOMIC INEQUALITY AND POVERTY

Different results of participation in the labour force, different level of wages and different returns on the human capital for men and women build the economic basis for gender inequality. In addition, gender inequality is affected by social and demographic factors. Women's low wages are often not regarded as a serious problem, as it is assumed that most women have access to other means through their husbands and other family members, and thus may work for low wages without falling into the poorest category. Economic inequality in incomes may be

smoothed at the expense of inter-family redistribution, but it may also grow stronger. In addition to wages there exist other income sources, but unequal access to them also contributes to gender inequality.

The report about poverty feminisation in Russia developed in 2000 by the order from the World Bank identified the increase of the share of women among the poor³³. Taking into account women's limited opportunities in the labour market, poverty feminisation develops mostly at the expense of two social groups: pensioners and incomplete maternal families.

6.1. PENSIONERS

Gender structure of the Russian population is radically different in older age groups. High mortality rate and low expected life span of men resulted in almost twofold (2,2 times) prevalence of women past able-bodied age above men of the same age (20,461,000 and 9,398,000 accordingly in 2002). In relevant age groups above 60 there are 1,9 times more women than men. Thus, 2/3 of pensioners are women. In oldest age groups (above 75) this gap grows 3 to 4 times (Table 16).

According to RF Goskomstat data, belonging to pensioners is not an increased poverty risk factor, but there is high probability of poverty primarily for a specific group of older people, namely, lonely pensioners above 65, which are mostly women³⁴. Thus, in the age group above able-bodied age, the number of poor women exceeds the number of poor men almost by 3 million. As a result, women live longer but due to this fact they are poorer. One may say that if men lived as long as women, gender differences in

poverty could have been much smaller, not because the number of poor women would have decreased, but because the number of poor men would have increased.

The poverty of female pensioners of the oldest age is also marked by extremes, as in the absence of other means except their pensions and physical ability for earning money or individual farming, they find themselves among the poorest population groups.

Unequal access of men and women to resources should be considered in the life span prospect, recognising women's individual and independent rights to resources, which would allow them to avoid economic subordination and extreme poverty, also in the old age. From this point of view and taking into account gender gaps in wages, the pension reform providing for transfer to accumulating pension elements will lead to further deterioration of the status of older women as compared to men³⁵.

Table 16. Amount and gender/age structure of people with incomes below subsistence level (based on random surveys of household budgets by RF Goscomstat data)

	Million people				% from number of people in relevant age groups				Distribution of overall amount of people with incomes below subsistence level			
	1992	1998	2000	2002	1992	1998	2000	2002	1992	1998	2000	2002
All people with incomes below subsistence level	49,7	34,2	41,9	35,8	33,5	23,3	28,9	25,0	100	100	100	100
Among them												
Women aged 31 to 54	8,6	7,2	8,7	7,6	34,4	28,0	32,9	28,4	17,4	20,9	20,9	21,3
Men aged 31 to 54	8,3	6,3	7,6	6,5	30,6	22,4	27,5	23,7	16,8	18,5	18,2	18,1
Women above 55	7,6	3,3	4,5	3,6	36,8	15,1	21,3	17,8	15,2	9,6	10,6	10,2
Men above 55	2,3	1,0	1,8	1,5	29,0	11,0	19,4	16,3	4,6	3,1	4,3	4,3

³² N.E. Tikhonova. The Urban Poverty Phenomenon in Modern Russia. M.: Letniy Sad, 2003, p. 198.

³³ Poverty Feminisation in Russia, M. 2000.

³⁴ Poverty Feminisation in Russia, M. 2000; L.N. Ovcharova, L.M. Prokofieva. Poverty Feminisation in Russia. Social and Economic Factors. //Economics and social policy: Gender dimensions. Ed. by M.Malyshcheva. M.: 2002.

³⁵ V.N. Baskakov, M.E. Baskakova. On Pensions for Males and Females: social aspects of the pension reform. M.: Moscow Philosophy Foundation, 1998.

6.2. INCOMPLETE FAMILIES

Incomplete families have fewer economic opportunities due to the burden of their dependants. Though in full families the average number of children is larger than in incomplete families (predominantly with one-child) and in half of full families there is one child per two parents, the dependants' burden in incomplete families facilitates their falling into the poor categories of the population³⁶.

High level of divorces, growing numbers of extramarital children and widowhood due to high mortality rate among men, decreased number of second marriages — all these factors increase the amount of incomplete families. According to the 1994 micro-census, incomplete families accounted for 13.4% of

all households and 17% of all families with children. At that, among incomplete families with one parent there were 90% of maternal incomplete families and 10% of paternal families (Table 17).

Considering women's limited opportunities in the labour market, especially when family burden cannot be divided among other family members, maternal incomplete families contribute considerably to poverty feminisation. The share of incomplete families among the poor is practically twice as high as among all families. Contrary to households headed by men, female-headed households more often fall into the poverty trap due to women's weaker positions in the labour market.

Table 17. Needy and poor families by categories (Goscomstat data, %)

	From among all amount households of relevant category						All needy and poor households		
	needy			poor			1998	1999	2000
	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000			
All households	30,4	42,3	32,7	7,1	12,7	7,5	100	100	100
Complete families	34,3	46,1	36,0	8,1	14,1	8,4	65,9	63,7	63,7
Among them									
Spouses without children	14,4	25,4	17,3	1,8	4,0	2,0	7,8	9,4	8,7
Spouses without children and other relatives	28,5	46,4	33,4	4,2	12,7	5,1	0,7	1,0	0,8
Spouses with 1–2 children	42,0	53,9	42,6	10,2	17,8	10,5	32,5	29,3	29,3
Spouses with 1–2 children and other relatives	46,4	58,4	48,7	12,6	20,6	13,0	8,5	8,1	7,9
Spouses with 3 and more children	67,1	75,6	68,9	29,8	40,3	29,9	4,6	3,2	3,5
Spouses with 3 and more children and other relatives	71,4	87,5	82,8	29,7	52,6	40,9	0,7	0,6	0,7
Incomplete families	40,1	55,7	45,1	9,7	18,5	10,9	24,9	24,8	26,0
Among them									
with 1–2 children	41,5	56,9	46,3	10,1	19,8	12,1	8,5	7,8	8,2
with 1–2 children and other relatives	53,6	71,4	59,6	15,0	28,3	16,4	5,0	5,1	5,2
with 3 and more children	79,6	86,1	88,3	40,1	52,1	52,3	0,7	0,4	0,6
with 3 and more children and with other relatives	80,1	84,8	89,0	39,9	54,5	40,6	0,3	0,3	0,3

6.3. MARGINAL STRATA

Analysis of gender aspects of poverty is usually conducted on the basis of Goskomstat data or research databases like RLMS. Still, specialists are well aware that such research does not include marginal groups: the richest and the poorest. Without the poorest, marginals and the social bottom the picture is biased and does not allow for developing adequate social policies.

For most part, such marginal groups include people without permanent or definite place of residence (BOMJ), or homeless.

According to various data, in 1996 the number of such people amounted to 4,200,000³⁷. At that,

70% of them are men and 30% — women. Such gender asymmetry is related to the homelessness structure. Thus, in St. Petersburg in 2002 it was as follows³⁸: imprisonment 32%, family disputes — 25%, individual choice — 22%, loss of housing — 7%, refugees — 5%, other reasons — 9%. Majority of former prisoners is men, which predetermines the gender structure of the marginal category.

Many homeless people have secondary education, and the share of homeless with incomplete secondary education is on the decline. The reason is that in 1990s this category was replenished not only by former prisoners, but also by those who lost their homes due to

³⁶ Poverty Feminisation in Russia, M. 2000

³⁷ N.M. Rimashevskaya. Pauperisation of the population and «social bottom» in Russia // Population, № 2, 1999.

³⁸ According to data available at SPb. Regional Charitable Public Organisation for support to Persons without housing residence «Nochlezhka», www.homeless.ru

real estate dealings. As for profession and qualifications, these are mostly working people (80%).

The homeless have various income sources: 59% have accidental and temporary jobs, 20% rely on their relatives and friends, 14% beg for money, 11% receive pensions and benefits, 7% collect bottles, and only 4% have permanent jobs. Those above 50 are in the most difficult situation: 11% do not have any source of income and 31% are beggars.

The low share of people with regular jobs is explained by the fact that enterprises (institutions, organisations) usually do not employ people without

residence registration and dismiss those who lost housing and registration.

Street children also make part of the marginal strata. They are not completely homeless, but due to various circumstances they spend life mostly in the street. According to expert evaluation of the gender structure, 20–25% are girls, 75–80% are boys.³⁹

Thus, gender-based social policy should consider the unsteady gender structure of different strata of poor population and men's status as the most unprotected and poorest.

6.4. ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND PROPERTY

Economic inequality cannot be reduced to poverty problems. The absence of gender disparities among the poor does not mean absence of gender inequality in their access to economic resources. Gender disparities among the middle class or the rich also predetermine gender inequality. The analysis of differences in access to economic resources is considerably complicated by two reasons. First, there is no relevant statistics or research data about gender aspects of property ownership in Russia. Second, information about property ownership and access to resources is based, as a rule, on the data related to households, but not on distribution of property within households. Thus, the survey of middle class in Russia did not reveal gender asymmetry because households in the chosen strata were mostly represented by full families⁴⁰ (Table 18).

Data about gender structure of entrepreneurship does not provide complete information about access to property. Experts usually indicate that 25 to 30% of entrepreneurs are women, but the concept of «entrepreneur» is not well formulated, and changes in the gender structure strongly depend on the definition. Entrepreneurs include employers using hired labour and possessing considerable financial resources, as well as economically independent active people, whose income is compatible to employ-

ees. RF Goskomstat data allows for identifying both employers and economically active people among entrepreneurs. The share of employers among men is twice as high as among women, while the share of self-employed is almost similar among both genders. I.e. men are better represented among entrepreneurs with large incomes.

RLMS data allows for assessment of male and female ownership of companies where they work. The share of male owners of such companies is 20–30% higher than the share of women (though in 1990s the share of male and female owners decreased).

RLMS data also reveals that men own bigger portions of property. Among them, the share of owners of over 10% of company stocks is nearly twice as high as among women (Table 19, 20).

Thus, women are not only underrepresented among entrepreneurs, but also own smaller portions of property (Table 21, 22).

KOMKON Company annually conducts in Russia representative public surveys of consumer behaviour and a wide range of social and economic issues. The collected data allows for analysis of the gender structure of property ownership. Thus, the data indicates that across the whole sampling gender asymmetry of savings and property types manifests itself only in the level of investments into one's

Table 18. Share of employers and self-employed, %

	Men						Women					
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Employers	1,6	1,4	1,1	1,2	1,8	1,5	0,9	0,9	0,5	0,5	0,9	1,0
Self-employed	3,2	3,2	6,9	6,9	5,0	5,5	2,5	2,4	7,6	7,4	5,0	5,2

Table 19. Share of company owners or co-owners, %, RLMS

	1994	1995	1996	1998	2000	2001	Total
Men	27,6	23,8	21,6	15,3	12,5	11,3	18,9
Women	19,6	17,7	16,5	12,5	10,1	8,8	14,2

³⁹ Analysis of the status of working street children in St-Petersburg. ILO Bureau in Moscow. St.-Pb. 2000.; Comprehensive analysis of working street children in Leningrad region, 2001. ILO. St.-Pb. 2002.; Analysis of the status of working street children in Moscow, 2001. ILO. M.:2002.

⁴⁰ Middle classes in Russia: economic and social strategies / E. Araamova et al. Ed. by T. Maleeva. Moscow Carnegie Centre. M.: Gendalf. 2003.

Table 20. Share of companies in ownership, % of respondents, RLMS

	1994	1995	1996	1998	2000	2001	сzero
Men							
Below 1 %	68,40	70,95	73,67	70,91	66,34	62,09	69,19
1–10%	20,04	16,97	14,42	18,64	13,86	12,80	16,77
11–50%	7,13	6,94	7,21	5,45	8,91	14,22	7,90
51–100%	4,43	5,14	4,70	5,00	10,89	10,90	6,13
Women							
Below 1 %	74,66	80,32	83,87	75,62	72,34	72,77	77,08
1–10%	18,80	14,19	6,81	18,41	19,15	16,23	15,36
11–50%	5,18	4,19	4,30	3,48	5,32	4,71	4,56
51–100%	1,36	1,29	5,02	2,49	3,19	6,28	2,99

Table 21. Types of assets and savings (Russia, people above 21, %)⁴¹

	Men	Women
Shares of financial companies, cheque funds, investment funds, shareholding investment funds	1,7	1,7
Shares of companies, where respondents work	2,9	2,4
Investments in companies, where respondents work	0,9	0,3
Shares of other enterprises	1,5	1,5
State securities (bonds)	0,6	0,6
Foreign currency (dollars, Euro, etc.)	8,8	5,8
Real estate (houses, cottages, apartments, dachas), cooperatives and condominiums	13,4	13,1
Plots of land	8,1	8,8
Valuable assets, works of art, antiques, memorable or other coins made of precious metals	1,2	1,3
Commodities for resale	1,2	0,7
Deposits in mutual assistance funds in companies	0,3	0,5
Deposits and savings in banks, saving certificates	15,4	18,4

Table 22. Types of assets and savings (Moscow, people above 21, %)⁴²

	Men	Women
Shares of financial companies, cheque funds, investment funds, shareholding investment funds	2,3	0,9
Shares of companies, where respondents work	3,1	1,0
Investments in companies, where respondents work	1,3	0,2
Shares of other enterprises	2,5	1,2
State securities (bonds)	1,4	0,8
Foreign currency (dollars, Euro, etc.)	16,1	10,3
Real estate (houses, cottages, apartments, dachas), cooperatives and condominiums	13,5	11,7
Plots of land	12,1	9,6
Valuable assets, works of art, antiques, memorable or other coins made of precious metals	2,2	1,6
Commodities for resale	11,1	0,4
Deposits in mutual assistance funds in companies	0,4	0,6
Deposits and savings in banks, saving certificates	22,6	26,8

⁴¹ Russian index of target groups, 2003. KOMKON–Media

⁴² Russian index targets groups, 2003. KOMKON–Media

company, amount of currency and commodities for resale.

In Moscow, the situation is quite different. Men prevail in all groups of owners of property and savings, except real estate and bank deposits.

At that, one should bear in mind that the size of real estate was not specified in the survey. Taking into account apartment privatisation and country houses with attached plots of 0.06 hectare, majority of the Russian population (both men and women) owns some property. Moreover, considering the prevalence of women among pensioners, privatisation of apartments resulted in a relatively higher share of women — real estate owners. Still, the size and the quality of real estate may be quite different.

In Moscow the share of men — their companies' stockholders — is 3 times higher than the share of women, stockholders of other companies — twice as high, stockholders of financial companies — 2.5 times higher.

In Moscow with the highest concentration of financial resources and stockholders in Russia, there is also a high concentration of male property owners.

One may conclude that gender inequality affects the access to economic resources and results in unequal property ownership. At the start of economic reforms, during privatisation of companies and state property women lost to men — heads of enterprises and organisations, which obtained access to the above due to selected privatisation tools. Now, women have fewer opportunities to join «wealthy» social groups other than by marriage.

One may assume that this inequality will continue to affect negatively women's rights and opportu-

nities and development of women's entrepreneurship. Absence of property restricts women's chances of receiving loans and necessitates the establishment of special machinery for insuring financial risks and support of women's entrepreneurship. Gender inequality in property ownership will also negatively affect political representation of men and women, because political structures primarily serve the interests of largest property owners.

There is no hope that women's insufficient involvement in business and entrepreneurship can be redressed in the near future by evolutionary means. Along with development of market economy in contemporary Russia more and more financial barriers emerge on the way of opening one's own business. Having lost at the start, during privatisation and accumulation of initial capital, women may again be restricted in access to economic resources and property. In this situation certain protectionist measures are needed to help develop women's business activities and to destroy barriers on the way of launching one's business.

* * *

Outside the labour market, social and demographic factors also increase gender inequality. Women have more chances to join the poorest categories of the population, while wealth and economic resources are mostly concentrated in men's hands. At the same time, men are better represented both among the rich and the poorest, marginal groups. Considering this fact, social and economic policies oriented at reduction of gender inequality should be well-targeted, they cannot be unilateral and focus only on overcoming negative social-economic implications.

7 GENDER EQUALITY AND HEALTH

Public health is one of major parameters of human development, included in the human development index. One of integral health indices is the expected life span. Recently, visible gender inequality as per this index emerged in Russia. Expected life span for men is 12–13 years shorter than for women — 58–59 years, while the biological gap in favour of women is nearly 5 years. Life-span difference relates to the Russian phenomenon of «extra-high» mortality rate among men, which became evident in 1990s.

The following factors, among others, strongly influence the differences in expected life-span of men and women and high male mortality rate: accident death rate, death rate from cardio-vascular diseases, high level of alcohol addiction and infectious diseases, primarily TB. Major differences in mortality rates of men and women are prominent in able-bodied age groups. In the age group of 15 to 59, men's mortality rate is 2,75 times higher than women's. No major gender differences were revealed

among children and elderly people. High mortality rate among men results from an integrated impact of many factors. Among other things, it may also be related to different male and female social roles and to different gender susceptibility to stress caused by economic, social and political events. Men's broader involvement in political and economic activities makes them assume greater risks associated with such activities⁴³. Gender segregation in the labour market also results in men's employment in industries with high injury and mortality risks (army, law-enforcement bodies, mining, etc.).

Thus, a complex image of social gender inequality emerges. Economically, men live better but much shorter. Women, on the contrary, live longer, but their quality of life is much worse. The structure of social gains and losses is symmetric across genders and does not testify to unequivocal benefits for one or the other gender.

However, passing on to indicators of healthy life span, one sees that health deterioration affects men

⁴³ Inequality and death rate in Russia. M.: 2000. p.23