Our country committed itself to the obligations dressing all forms of gender discrimination [5].

December 1979 is the main instrument for addressing gender discrimination against women adopted on 18 December 1979. The ratification of the given document by the state presupposes the official recognition of the fact of gender inequality, declaration of this state as illegal, and readiness to take all measures to counter all discrimination practices.
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The Convention obliges all states parties to “ensure to women, on equal terms with men, the right ... to participate in the formulation of government policy and the implementation thereof and to hold public office and perform all public functions at all levels of government (Part II, Article 7); and “... the right to free choice of profession and employment, the right to promotion, job security and all benefits and conditions of service ...” (Part III, Article 11) [5].

Once every four years, the states parties are obliged to submit reports about the measures taken and the difficulties in implementation of the provisions of the Convention. The United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women is the main body that watches over the implementation of the Convention and other legal-normative acts aimed at protecting women’s rights globally. In the Russian Federation, the activity of the organs of executive power in the sphere of gender equality is coordinated by the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection. The structure of the Ministry includes the Coordination Council on Gender Issues consisting of representatives of the Federal Executive Bodies and public organizations.

In his report at the 62nd Session of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (2015), First Deputy Minister A. Vovchenko noted that the priority areas within the sphere of gender equality in our country are connected, first of all, with ensuring economic equality and independence of women, and with creation of conditions for realization of their professional and personal potential. According to him, Russian women are characterized by a high level of education (higher than that of men) and high economic activity, that “they are everywhere motivated towards full-time employment, career, and at the same time do not refuse from having a family and kids” [9]. This creative energy, reinforced, according to the Russian representative, by the conditions created for its realization, allows attracting many outstanding women-professionals to politics, to work in the organs of power, and to managerial positions.

However, our home researchers take the optimistic reports with a pinch of salt, stressing the declarative nature of equality [12]. Russian women do demonstrate high social activity, but they are rather inadequately represented in the political life of the country. This may be attributed to a number of factors:

- “Glass ceiling” and “sticky floor” barriers that keep women at the bottom of the job scale and prevent them from career advancement.
- Prejudice about inaptitude of women for management. According to the data provided by the Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VTsIOM), 17% of our fellow citizens believe that women should never take part in political activity. The others state that women could be most efficient in healthcare (60%) and education (50%) [14; 15]. These data reflect the ideas about gender separation of roles rooted in the Russian mentality. The functions of education and healthcare – both on the level of a separate family and the whole country – are perceived as traditionally feminine (in these terms, the appointment of Ol’ga Vasil’eva Minister of Education and Science corresponds to the existing requirement). Nevertheless, responsibility for strategic decision making, guarantee of security and protection from external threats are imposed by the Russian people on men.

- Low professional ambitions of the Russian women. Russian women themselves are often against women taking high positions, 13% of respondents saliently disapprove of women’s political activity [15]. This specificity has been subject to detailed analysis in special literature [4; 10; 11; 13].

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a standard tool of comparison of the standard of living in different countries. It is a composite index calculated annually to measure the standard of living, literacy, education and life expectancy as the basic characteristics of the human potential of the territory under observation. According to the data published in the Human Development Report of the UN Development Program on 21 March 2017, Russian Federation ranks 49th among 188 countries – between Montenegro and Romania. The index has been published in annual reports since 1990. The gender correlates of the Human Development Index are determined through the Gender Inequality Index (GII), which is a composite index used to measure loss of achievements in three indices of human development: reproductive health, expansion of rights and labor market.

Theoretically, the GII is variable from the zero (absolute equality between women and men) to the one (absolute inequality in all measurements). The world average GII score is 0.443, which signifies a 44.3% loss as a result of inequality between men and women in all three measurements. The best GII score is 0.04 for Switzerland. The five states leaders in the index include Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and Iceland. Gender equality and expansion of women’s rights have the rank of conscious state policy in these countries. The worst result (in terms of inequality of opportunities for women in comparison with men) is 0.767 for Yemen. Nowadays, Russia ranks 52nd in the rating list with the composite index of 0.271 [16]. The specific feature is that the Russian women have good education, demonstrate high labor activity, but are under-represented in leadership positions.
Our domestic sociology has a large number of researches dealing with analysis of the system of higher education in the context of gender inequality in the structure of the university academic staff [6, p. 170]. Though the proportion of women university teachers in Russia has shown the tendency to increase over recent years, approaching high-status positions demonstrates the “leaky pipeline” phenomenon – continuing decrease of women representation at all levels of scientific care – the higher the level, the lower the number of women. It is especially typical of big technical universities. At present, women are at the head of 16 out of 43 pedagogical higher education institutions, and 6 out of 22 higher education institutions of Sverdlovsk Region, whereas the number of women senior lecturers is 2–2.5 times as high as the number of men in the same position. Researchers speak of such ways of inclusion of women in the professional field of higher education as overcoming lack of self-confidence and indecisiveness, and mastering the unwritten rules of the game as it is played in Russia by men. For a woman, it is not enough just to be competent in her professional sphere – it is necessary to learn how to demonstrate this competence.

Motivation for a choice of the professional activity vector demonstrates the person’s ambitions and self-esteem. The reasons for choosing the career of a university teacher are the following:

In men:
1. High social status.
2. Stable income.
3. Intellectual development.

In women:
1. High social status.
2. Intellectual development.
3. Vocation towards pedagogical activity, calling [7].

The absence of the motivation component “stable income” in women may demonstrate low chances to take a high position and have stable income rather than altruism. The wide-spread female indicator “calling” and its absence in the system of male motivations show the stereotypical belief: education is the female sphere of activity; it is “decent” for a man only if he is a leader. The Rosstat data show that the proportion of men among university rectors is more than 90%; their percentage among senior lecturers is only about one third; whereas women constitute 54% of the university academic staff, and men – only 46%. This situation vividly demonstrates the fact that it is impossible to talk about reconsideration of curricula towards increase of the gender component without changing the approach to the staff policy of higher education institutions.

Improvement of the quality of university education in Russia is connected not only with the need to improve the level of professional knowledge of the students but also with creation of the corresponding intellectual and cultural atmosphere among the faculty. The gender component is under-represented in university disciplines; that is why, the development of one’s own gender competence is largely the matter of choice of each particular university teacher. It is no wonder that not all teachers demonstrate high knowledge of gender legislature, and use stereotyped vocabulary in communication. Active inclusion in international projects of such level as the World Women University Presidents Forum is a most important mechanism of development of the gender culture in higher education institutions [2].

In the most general sense, gender education may be defined as education of adequate evaluation of differences between people and understanding their equality irrespective of these differences [8]. Gender education in a higher education institution is a complex of educational programs on gender-related problems which facilitate the formation of the system of knowledge and value orientations determining social interaction practices between genders, overcoming negative stereotypes, and development of the gender culture of students and university teachers.

The main aspects of gender education are:
1. Cognitive – objective knowledge about physical, psychological and socio-cultural peculiarities of men and women in certain cultures, ethnic groups and layers.
2. Axiological – values and norms determined on the basis of the official state doctrine declaring men and women to be equal citizens in all respects.

Practical significance of gender education is determined by the fact that, firstly, it produces systemic knowledge about the historical nature and variability of relations between men and women. Secondly, it reveals to the person the hierarchy of factors on which these relations depend in a particular social system. Thirdly, it allows the person to regulate these relations to some extent and to soften their conflicting nature. Fourthly, it helps to build up a personal behavior strategy ensuring harmony in social and personal relationships. And, finally, it is a means of overcoming morally outdated stereotypes hindering self-realization of men and women in modern societies [1].

The tendencies towards fuzzy gender boundaries in education and professional sphere, open equal access to making managerial decisions seem to be the most urgent and necessary ones for the modern Russian socie-
ty. Today, men and women do not possess equal opportunities in the labor market. This is reflected in gender differentiation in payment, in horizontal and vertical professional segregation on the basis of gender, and in the nature of women unemployment. The main reasons of labor market inequality between men and women lie in the differences in the sphere of distribution of time by men and women, in women discrimination by employers (in terms of undesirable maternity leaves), and in differences between life aspirations of men and women [3]. In other words, the mechanism of discrimination on the basis of gender functions simultaneously with the mechanism of “lowering ambitions” brought about by women socialization.

It is quite clear that in smoothing out imbalance between equality de jure and the real labor market situation de facto, a significant role belongs to higher education. The level of gender culture and the culture of interaction on different hierarchy levels demonstrated by the faculty should be flawless. The development of a social mentality, in which respectful, ethical relations between partners irrespective of their gender will be normal, is a scientifically based manifestation of the gender approach to education.
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