Chapter 8
Gender and Culture: A Russian Perspective

Irina A. Shmeleva and Ludmila G. Pochebut

Introduction

Russia has always been, and still remains, a polyethnic and multicultural country. According to the most recent census of 2012 (GKS, 2012), the population of Russia numbered 142.86 million and comprised 189 distinct ethnic groups, including 66.2 million males and 76.7 million females. According to the Constitution of the Russian Federation, ethnic identity is determined by the person him- or herself, and is fixed during the National census. We need to stress here that the English term "Russian" has two meanings, indicating both ethnicity for ethnic Russians and nationality for Russian citizens (transliterated as Rossyjane). In this chapter, the term "Russian" will be used to refer to ethnic Russians, who make up 80.9 % of the country's population (111.02 million) and constitute the largest ethnic group. Tatars form the second largest group, accounting for 3.87 % of the population (5,310,000 people), followed by Ukrainians (1.41 %, or 1,928,000 people); Bashkirs (1.15 %, or 1,584,000 people); and Chuvash, Chechens, and the ethnic groups of Dagestan (Lezgins, Avars, Dargwa, and Kumyks), who make up 1.0 % of the population (from 1,413,000 to 1,501,000 people), (GKS, 2012).

According to Sikevich (2011), Russia is a uniquely asymmetric Federation, with a multitude of disparate ethnic groups residing within its borders, and almost no monoethnic geographical territories. This leads to unique kinds of interethnic and intercultural relations at the psychological level, and equally unique kinds of multinational relations at the political level. Russia is also a country that covers a vast territory, and, at the same time, has very low population density. There is a considerable gap in the level of economic development between the citizens of large cities and the provincial regions of Russia. The National Human Development Report for

I. A. Shmeleva (✉)
University of ITMO, Saint Petersburg, Russia
e-mail: irina_shmeleva@hotmail.com

L. G. Pochebut
Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia

the Russian Federation (2013) refers to significant regional disparities, with only 20% of the population living in more prosperous regions. This is one of the reasons for the large discrepancy between worldviews and social behaviors of people in different parts of Russia (Gefter, 2012).

As Russia is still in the midst of a profound social transition that began more than 25 years ago, it continues to face high levels of interethnic tensions, evident in ethnic conflict and aggression, internal migration, and ethnic prejudices (Soldatova, 1998). These processes are accompanied by interethnic struggles for power, prestige, and privilege, in which ethnic identity serves as a form of psychological defense (Sikevich, 2011).

Sikevich (2011) argues that the semantic notion of "culture" in the polyethnic context of Russia is not equal to that of "ethnicity." Culture, arguably, is the foundation or basis of ethnic self-consciousness and identity (Sikevich). Memories of the historical events of the nineteenth and twentieth century still influence multiethnic relations and interethnic tensions within the country. Gender and culture are interrelated. Expectations about attributes and behaviors of women and men, and the relations between them—in other words, gender—are shaped by culture (Williams, 2001; Best & Williams, 2001; OECD, 2012).

Gender research, amid the conditions of acute social change and upheaval that characterize Russian society right up to the present, has become particularly crucial. The UN Millennium Development Goals (2000), among other things, outlined the task of promoting gender equality and empowering women. In Russia, males and females of all ages have equal access to education, with 10% more women than men availing themselves of higher education (Women and Men in Russia, 2012). Nevertheless, positions of influence in government agencies reflect an imbalance in power along the lines of gender. A previous study (Shmeleva, 2013) found that between 2008 and 2011 only three of the 18 Federal Ministers were women, with only one remaining at the present time (i.e., 2014). Only two of the 54 Federal Agencies of Executive Power are headed by women. Only two of the country's 83 regions have female governors, and only 14% of senators and deputies in Russia's national assembly are women. This imbalance is evident in professional self-realization with regard to both salary differences and career prospects. Political participation of women in Russia remains very low compared with that of other European countries (UNDP, 2010).

Problems of gender inequality are not just women's issues in Russia; they affect the male population, as well, and are particularly acute. One of the most striking problems is the difference in life expectancy between men and women—women in Russia live 12.3 years longer than men (UNDP in Russia, 2011; Baskakova, Mezentseva, & Zotova, 2006). This difference in life expectancy is one of the highest in the world according to UN. Between 1991 and 2001, life for men expectancy in Russia fell from 68.5 to 58.5 years for men, climbing up to a little over 63 years in 2010. The UNDP in Russia, 2011 notes that Russia has been unable to overcome the high mortality rate among Russian men since the 1960s. The reasons for the low life expectancy of men in Russia, according to the report, are alcohol consumption, tobacco, road accidents, industrial accidents, physical trauma, and a high suicide and murder rate (UNDP, 2010; Shmeleva, 2013). Also the Gender Inequality Index in Russia is quite high according to the World Economic Forum (2013).Thus,

problems of gender in modern Russia need to be examined not only at the political but also at the psychological level. In the following section, we review studies on Russian Culture carried out by European and Russian researchers.

Studies on Russian Culture

From ancient times, Russia has attracted travelers, writers, and scholars as a uniquely enigmatic place (see, for example, *La Russie en 1839* by Marquis de Custine (Custine, 1996). George Gorer (1962), British anthropologist, also wrote a book on Russian culture (*The People of Great Russia: A Psychological Study)* examining characteristics of Russians and their cultural traditions. Margaret Mead (1932) and Clyde Kluckhohn (1992) also wrote about Russian cultural development. Western scholars, however, have not elaborated these compelling observations in any systematic way. In a work by a group of European and American authors devoted to the interaction between cultural and biological factors in ontogenetic development, the Russian context was not mentioned at all (Keller, 2002). At the same time, interest in the Russian cultural context arose at the end of the twentieth century and early twenty-first century in connection with global and European projects examining value systems, and employing methodologies outlined by Inglehart (1997), Hofstede (2001), Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) and Schwartz (2004). Furthermore, in the past few years, Western scholars have published research that examines Russian culture (Brandt & Henry, 2012; Gelfand, LaFee, Fahey, & Fenberg, 2013). Still, Russian ethnic and cultural diversity remains underrepresented in European and American psychological studies (Jurcik, Chentsova-Dulton, Solopieiva-Jurcikova, Ryder 2013). In order to delineate gender differences in the context of gender and culture, we need to focus first on the cultural dimensions of the problem that are specific to Russia

According to Hofstede et al. (2010), the cultural dimension scores for Russia are distributed in the following way: power distance 93; individualism 39; masculinity 36; uncertainty avoidance 95, pragmatism 81; and indulgence 20. Russia has one of the highest power distance scores (6th rank in the world) that are between those of Romania, Panama, Guatemala, and Slovakia. Russia's score on individualism/collectivism is below average on the scale and, therefore, it is more collectivistic society occupying place between Suriname and Croatia. As Barndt (2012) shows, the Russian scores for individualism are between those of Iran and Brazil, and for gender empowerment between Vietnam and the Philippines.

Ethnic and cross-cultural psychology studies began to appear only at the end of 1990s in Russia (Lebedeva, 1997). These covered a broad spectrum of topics including, the psychology of ethnic and national relations, social-psychological aspects of adaptation and migration, ethnic conflicts, values, interethnic tensions, and ethnic tolerance (Lebedeva, 2001; Pochebut & Shmeleva, 2005; Pochebut, 2012; Shmeleva, 2006; Sikevich, 2011; Soldatova, 1998). Unfortunately, gender issues were not the primary focus of these studies, and were not included in the publications mentioned above.

Studies by Russian researchers are not well represented in English speaking journals for several other reasons. They include language barriers (the papers are for the most part written in Russian); the underrepresentation of Russian psychology journals in Scopus and Web of Science databases (only three are indexed); and the country's long period of isolation from the global scientific community, especially in the social sciences. One of the aims of this chapter is to close this gap and to shed light on gender and culture studies in Russian psychology, which have been neglected in the literature at a global level.

Our chapter also aims to provide a survey of gender and culture studies in a polyethnic Russian context. We take as a starting point the perspective that the interaction of culture and gender is based on the intersection of multiple influences: biological differences and psychological characteristics, as well as cultural practices, and ecological, social, political, and historical factors (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002; Best & Williams, 2001). In our analysis, we will view gender differences from the perspective of a number of psychological constructs, in line with Best and Williams' work. The goal of this chapter is to present a comparative analysis of various ethnic groups living in Russia with regard to characteristics relating to gender issues.

Method

In this chapter, we employed the methodology of narrative meta-analysis (Kornilov & Kornilova, 2010) and systematically examined papers that studied gender differences in the context of ethnic groups residing in the Russian Federation. In contemporary Russia, psychological research and analysis of the interrelationship of gender and culture is limited. The studies are published primarily in the form of monographs (of which there are few), articles in peer-reviewed journals (there are no special journals for cultural, gender or cross-cultural psychology studies), and PhD thesis summaries (peer-reviewed by three "opponents").

A scholarly search of the Russian Scientific Electronic Database E-library (http://elibrary.ru/) in January 2014 by the authors, using the keywords "gender" or "gender research," yielded over 14,800 results. These were works published in Russian over a 15-year period, beginning in 1999. Of these, only 10 %, or just over 1480 articles, were studies related to the field of psychology. The rest covered such fields as sociology, philosophy, linguistics, etc. A search using the keyword "culture" led to over 602,502 results, but a combination of the keywords "culture" and "gender" led to just over 70 results. Only ten of these were related to the field of psychology. As the E-library database includes primarily papers and books published in Russian, we can only conclude that these issues have up until now received scant attention in Russian psychology.

In our view, one of the most promising and relevant sources for meta-analysis of culture and gender studies are PhD theses summaries, which are peer-reviewed publications of 25–30 pages. We argue that an analysis of PhD theses reveals the

most current tendencies in the development of this scholarly field. Of the 7676 psychology dissertations that were defended in Russia between 2000 and 2012, only 106 (i.e., less than 1.5 %) were devoted to gender research. According to Nazarova (2013), we can differentiate two major groups of studies. The first (57 %) focused on the study of gender traits in the personality over various ages and examined gender characteristics of the intellect and abilities, behavioral and leadership qualities, and gender perceptions and representations. We agree with the author that these studies are more concerned with sexual dimorphism than gender research itself. The second group (43 %) was more immediately concerned with the field of gender studies per se, and touched upon such issues as gender socialization, mechanisms of gender identity, the psychology of gender relations, and the applications of gender theory. Most of the participants in the gender research were adults, teenagers, and students, and only a few studies looked at gender issues in early childhood and late adulthood.

For our analysis, we selected 59 PhD thesis summaries published from 2000 to 2013 in the Russian National Library database featuring the keywords "gender" and "culture." Among them, 81 % were studies of gender issues in monoethnic groups, mostly Russians (80.9 % of the population), and only about 19 % could be described as cross-cultural research that compared different ethnic groups. In cross-cultural research, ethnic Russians were compared with other ethnic groups living in Russian Federation, among them ethnic groups of the North Caucasus (Ossetian, Ingush, Chechen, Lezgin, Avar, Kumyk), Siberia (Buryat, Yakut, Khaka), the Volga region (Tatar), and Komi living in the northwest of Russia. It is these groups that will be discussed in this chapter.

Of the research topics, those concerning gender socialization (20 studies) were most numerous, followed by professional self-realization and gender organizational behavior (18 studies); family relations (8 studies); gender roles in politics and the media (7 studies); and gender, culture, and aggression (6 studies).

The studies we selected for this chapter were then grouped according: family relations and family gender roles in various Russian ethnic groups; gender and culture differences in professional self-realization and organizational behavior; gender self-identification; gender and cultural differences in aggressive behavior; and gender and cultural stereotypes in the media, political discourse, and practices in current-day Russia. Our research involved both cross-cultural analysis and the study of the interactions between gender and culture within the framework of a single, predominantly Russian culture.

According to Berry et al. (2002), "most of the social behaviors studies still derive from the interests of Western psychologists, using concepts rooted in Western thinking about human behavior. There is a need for more indigenous approaches to these, and other, social behaviors, before we can say that the area as a whole is well understood" (p. 84). Apropos of the above observation, we made it a priority to select studies for the analysis on the basis of whether the authors were themselves representatives of the cultures they examine.

The methodologies the authors employed were based on Western concepts and research tools, although approaches specific to Russia were also used. The research methods derived from Western psychology are as follows: Bem Sex-Role

Inventory (Bem, 1987), Osgood Semantic Differentiation Scale (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957), Kelly Repertory Grid (Fransella, Bell, & Bannister, 2004), the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF) (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970), the Buss–Durkee Hostility Inventory (Buss & Perry, 1992) and others. One third of the research methods used were developed in Russia and have never been translated into other languages. These included several questionnaires concerning social and ethnic identity, types of aggressive behavior, and sociocultural adaptation (Pochebut, 2012).

In the meta-analytical study we present in this chapter, our main goal was to cite a broad sampling of research carried out in the polyethnic and multicultural environment of Russia, demonstrating that representatives of various ethnic groups exhibit both general and specific characteristics related to gender self-realization, identity, behavior, family and organizational relations, etc.

Meta-Analysis of Research on Gender and Culture

The Russian National Library Database shows that the gender research in Russian scholarship is multidisciplinary and concerns such fields as sociology, philosophy, linguistics, and psychology. Taking the field of psychology as a point of reference, we should make a few remarks concerning the notions of "sex" and "gender" in Russian psychology, in particular. The term "sex" appeared in Russian psychology texts for the first time at the beginning of the twentieth century in the works of Lazursky (1874–1917), Basov (1982–1931), and Blonsky (1884–1941) in the context of views on ontogenetic development (Shmeleva, 2002). In the mid 1960s, the study of sexual dimorphism or di-psychism continued in the research of Ananiev (1966), the founder of the St. Petersburg School of Psychology. Ananiev's research from the mid 1960s onward reveals the unequivocal influence of sexual dimorphism on the neuropsychological and general somatic development of the individual. He viewed sex as an integral trait of the individual and of the organization of the genotype, and tried to determine how sex influences the individual's psychological characteristics and behavior (Ananiev, 1980). The notion of "gender" appeared in Russian scholarship later, at the end of the 1990s, and from that moment on the distinction between the psychology of sexual differences and gender psychology has been maintained in Russian psychology, following the line of research of Western psychology.

Gender Studies of Family Gender Roles and Professional Self-Realization in Different Ethnic Groups

We assume that the family is considered to be one of the primary influences in gender socialization (Kon, 2003). Thus, we begin our description and analysis with the results of a recent and very detailed study of gender roles in family relations in different ethnic cultures (Khudalova, 2013). Khudalova's research focuses on

gender self-realization in the family in Russian and Ossetian cultures. The author herself is Ossetian. The participants of the study were 102 Russians and 254 Ossetians between the ages of 20 and 60, all residents of the city of Vladikavkaz, in the republic of North Ossetia-Alania (Northern Caucasus). The results point to a culturally specific difference that significantly influences self-actualization (the possibility to realize one's full potential) and the acquisition of gender roles in a family. The author identified this factor as "temporal orientation." This manifested itself as placing a high value on the past, and strong adherence to traditions and cultural norms, in Ossetian culture, and an orientation toward the future, innovation, and changing traditions and norms in Russian Culture. The study revealed that cultural differences were evident in benchmark notions of family self-realization, gender divisions of social roles in the family, and attitudes toward marriage. Ossetian culture encourages the dependent position of woman in a family and the dominance of a man; it restricts the aspirations for self-actualization in women. The author concluded that Russian culture, for the most part, supports egalitarian relations between spouses.

Gender and cultural differences between Ossetians and Russians were observed in the degree of self-realization of women in a family as opposed to professional self-realization. Khudalova's research also showed that up to the age of 40, Russian women are focused more on professional self-realization; only after the age of 40 do they shift their attention to the sphere of family. Before the age of 40, Ossetian women focus on self-realization in marriage, and after forty, their interest in professional self-realization increases. The Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (Northern Caucasus) is characterized by both monoethnic and mixed marriages (one third of all marriages). According to Sikevich, before 1991 (i.e., during the Soviet era) multiethnic marriages were not common, but at the same time were not conflictual. During the past 20 years, they have become more infrequent, and they break down more often. In light of these facts, examining the social representations and views of Russians and Ossetians, both men and women, in family dynamics become meaningful and urgent. It was important to establish the degree to which expectations in observing cultural norms correspond to the views and representations of women and men.

Thus, the Khudalova (2013) study examined the social representations of family relationships of Russian women about Russian and Ossetian men; of Ossetian women about Russian and Ossetian men; of Russian men about Russian and Ossetian women; and Ossetian men about Russian and Ossetian women. The participants were asked to express their views on the behavior of men and women within the family. The results of the study showed that Russian women view Russian men as capable of building family relations on egalitarian principles, respecting their wife's opinion, and sharing responsibility for financial wellbeing and security in the family on an equal basis. In childrearing, they respect the decisions and choices of their offspring, are faithful to their spouses in marriage, etc.

In contrast, Russian women perceive Ossetian men to dominate their wife and children, to base their relationships and childrearing practices on ethnic and cultural traditions, and not to adhere to egalitarian principles in family life. Ethnic Russian men have a positive attitude toward egalitarian relationships with Russian wom-

en, but claim that Ossetian women are not ready for egalitarian family relations. Ossetian men claim that Russian women aim to be a dominant force in the family, which distinguishes them from Ossetian women, who follow their husband's orders. In the view of Ossetian men, Russian women are prepared to take on the role of head of the family. They are not prepared to give up their careers for the sake of the family, are willing to take on the financial responsibility for the family, and strive to have their own savings, independent of their husband's. According to Ossetian men, Russian women usually do not pay sufficient attention to raising children in the spirit of national traditions.

The views of Ossetian women on Ossetian men are very close to the views of Russian women on Ossetian men within the family. They stress that Ossetian men do not recognize egalitarian relations, subordinate the wife and children to their will, try to raise their children according to national customs and traditions, and refuse to help their wives in household chores. In contrast, the views of Ossetian women on Russian men within the family suggest that men are willing to build egalitarian relationships and are even prepared to cede the role of head of the family to the wife. They respect the choices and decisions of their children, but do not cultivate sufficient respect for national customs and traditions in their childrearing practices. At the same time, they not hesitate to help their wives in the household chores.

Khudalova's research (2013) demonstrated that in the views of both ethnic Russians and Ossetians, Russian culture in family relations is considered more modern, and is characterized by more egalitarian norms. Furthermore, a certain masculinization of women and feminization of men in the family may be observed. Ossetian culture idealizes the subordinate position of the woman in the family, and the dominant role of the man. Ossetian family relations are deeply embedded in traditional cultural norms for gender roles, characterized by inequality in family relations.

Gender Research on Family Relations in the Context of a Single Culture

Another study (Boldyreva, 2006) suggests that attitudes toward gender determine the choice of family models. The participants in the study were Russian students, 176 men and 195 women, aged 17 to 22 years old, from several colleges and universities in the city of Voronezh. Nearly all the participants (97.4 % of the respondents) were raised in traditional families. Based on the findings, the author proposes six models of the family: (1) the partnership model; (2) the dominant-dependent model; (3) the patriarchal model; (4) the matriarchal model; (5) the sponsorship contract; and (6) the dependent contract (nonworking man and woman = relatives provide for the family). The results of the research revealed that attitudes toward gender influence the family model: 42.5 % of men and 36.6 % of women choose the partnership model; 53.5 % of men and 59.6 % of women choose the dominant-dependent model; 4 % of men and 3.8 % of women are not oriented toward family life. The study showed that the younger generation in the Russian provincial city is inclined to choose the dominant-dependent model of the family, and just over a third of the respondents are favorably disposed toward the partnership (egalitarian) model.

A study of the relations between spouses in monoethnic Russian families of entrepreneurs was carried out by Levkovich (2004). The participants were married couples from Moscow and the Moscow region, with both spouses aged 42 years or younger. The study looked at 26 families with an entrepreneur-husband, and 26 families with an entrepreneur-wife. The results of the study showed that the level of conflict in families with an entrepreneur-wife was significantly higher, and the stability of family relations significantly lower than in families in which the husband was the entrepreneur. In families in which the wife was an entrepreneur, husbands were dissatisfied that their wives did not pay enough attention to home and family; that they tried to shift the burden for caring for home and family onto the husband; that they did not share their problems and professional setbacks with the husband; and that they were too independent (i.e., they did not fulfill the roles that cultural norms assigned to them). In families with an entrepreneur-husband, lack of attention to family life on the part of the husband led to disruption in spousal relations, mutual mistrust, and feelings of anxiety, and psychological disturbance in the wife.

The three studies (Boldyreva, 2006; Khudalova, 2013; Levkovich, 2004) analyzed above indicate that gender roles in family relations are embedded in ethnic and cultural traditions, and that culture influences gender roles and relations. The culture of Russians seems to be more modern, whereas the culture of Ossetians tends to be more traditional when two cultures are compared. In comparison with Ossetian culture, Russian family relations seem to be more egalitarian, and Ossetian family relations more hierarchical (Khudalova). At the same time, in the choice of family models, preference is given primarily to the traditional hierarchical model over the partnership (egalitarian) model, even within the Russian ethnic group (Boldyrev). The third study cites cases of instability within families in which women try to combine family and professional roles (Levkovich).

Professional Self-Realization

The specifics of professional self-realization in an individual depend in large part on the expectations and requirements of a culture in the realm of self-realization and organizational behavior. This section examines the research carried out in North Ossetia, Dagestan, and Central Russia. Gadzhieva (2000) studied the influence of gender stereotypes on professional self-realization in Dagestanian and Russian culture. The participants were 250 government employees and researchers representing Dagestanian (the city of Makhachkala, Republic of Dagestan) and Russian (the city of Moscow) ethnic groups. The results showed that in Dagestanian culture, professional self-realization is governed by cultural norms, meaning that such notions as mastery, competence, and personal development are associated with gender and ascribed to men. According to Dagestanian cultural norms, professional self-realization is the privilege of men, and is connected with the ambition to achieve social recognition, freedom, and dominance in the community. The Dagestanian culture limits the professional self-realization of women. They are not allowed by their families to achieve professional self-realization and are expected to fulfill the

role of housewife. This stereotype about the woman's role solely as housewife is shared by both gender. In Russian culture, self-realization depends on individual needs and personal attitudes, involves ambition for creativity, and is motivated by an urge toward affiliation. Both genders share these views.

Here, we see once again how disparate cultural norms, more traditional versus more modern, influence gender-specific professional self-realization. In the traditional cultures of the North Caucasus (Ossetia, Dagestan), professional self-realization is limited for women, and tends to privilege men. In Russian culture, the norms are more egalitarian and hold equally for men and women.

Gender Stereotypes

A study by Mahakova (2007) examined the influence of gender stereotypes on the behavior of *Russians* and *Buryats* (an ethnic group native to Siberia) in commercial and business organizations, focusing on their management styles. The participants were 204 executives (102 males, 102 females), working in Moscow and Ulan-Ude (Republic of Buryatia). The results of the study suggested that the male executives were oriented toward the development of the company as a whole, and that the employees in these companies showed a greater readiness to accept the values of company culture. This tendency was amplified if male executives adhered to the behavioral stereotypes of the patriarchal leader. In organizations managed by men, women displayed the stereotypical behavior of the follower rather than the leader. In contrast, the female executives were oriented toward establishing favorable or positive relations with the personnel, and the stereotypical behavior of follower was evident to a far lesser degree. Female executives displayed paternalistic attitudes and behaviors (i.e., attitudes or actions of a person, organization, etc. that protect their subordinates, in this case the employees, and give them what they need, but do not give them responsibility or freedom of choice in their value orientations). According to Cheng (2014), paternalistic leadership (or *emic* leadership style) entails elements of an authoritarian, benevolent, and moral character, and is purported to be the dominant leadership style in Asia. On the whole, paternalism was more evident among ethnic Russian executives than Buryats. Cultural differences were also observed: Buryat executives are more inclined to patriarchal management styles than their Russian counterparts.

Pamfilova (2006) examined the perception of gender stereotypes in two ethnic groups: Tatars (an ethnic group from the Volga region) and Russians. The participants in the study were schoolteachers: 165 men (81 Tatars and 84 Russians), and 194 women (93 Tatars and 101 Russians) from the ages of 25 to 40. The study showed that the gender stereotypes held by the teachers were evident in their notions about ideal, or typical, women and men. Russians and Tatars expressed different gender stereotypes. For the Russian group, the masculinization of female and the feminization of male stereotypes and the integration or coalescing of images of male and female were evident. In perceptions of the *ideal* and *typical* Russian

woman, both by women and men, masculine traits dominated. In the stereotypical perception of a *typical* male among ethnic Russians, both men and women, masculine qualities predominated, whereas in the stereotypical perception of the *ideal* man, feminine qualities were dominated. For Tatar women, the masculine stereotype of woman was less attractive. Among Tatar women, feminine qualities predominated. For Tatar men, stereotypes signifying the masculine were attractive in men, but not in women. Among Tatar men, the stereotypes of the *ideal* and the *typical* man were not contradictory, the author concludes.

Grigorieva (2006) studied gender-specific leadership traits among students in Moscow. The participants were college students (341 women and 312 men) and 56 professionals, representing groups of ethnic Russians, several Northern Caucasus ethnic groups, and Tatars. The results revealed that both the official leaders (the class monitors) and the informal leaders (people with the ability to manage emotions in a student group) displayed an androgynous type of gender identity. According to the author, this facilitated socio-psychological adaptation[1] and the personality development of an effective leader. Male and female students, regardless of ethnicity, expressed their interest in fulfilling leadership roles and pointed out the possibilities of achieving them. Among college students, the traditionally masculine leadership role was also described in terms of traditionally feminine traits, such as sympathy or kindness and a readiness to offer help. There were no gender prejudices concerning gender and leadership roles. There were, however, prejudices concerning ethnicity. Students from the group of ethnic Russians expressed the undesirability for the formal leadership positions being occupied by those students representing ethnic groups from Caucasus. This indicates the clear presence of tensions in ethnic relations between these groups.

Gender identity

In the Siberian city of Irkutsk and the city of Ulan-Ude in the Republic of Buryatiya, the influence of gender identity on role behavior was examined by Byzova (2006). The participants were 93 women, Russians and Buryat, between the ages of 17 to 67, with higher or mid-level education. The results of the study suggested that women's gender identity covers a broad and flexible range of behavioral roles. These roles included the acceptance of masculine, feminine, and androgynous types of behaviors, on the one hand, and a blurring of the boundaries of effective behavior, which can lead to misunderstanding and conflict, on the other. The conclusion of the author is that both in contemporary Russian and Buryat cultures, traditional notions about gender roles are blurred. The study showed that androgynous gender identity is widespread among women who participated in the research, irrespective of their cultural identity. Such androgynous identity provides women with emotional comfort and self-confidence. Women of the androgynous type described them-

---

[1] Social psychological adaptation is understood (in Russian psychology) as a process and the result of interaction of a person with the social reality

selves from the perspective of both feminine and masculine characteristics. Their value orientation was directed both toward family welfare and social success. They aspired to internal as well as external comfort in life, and declared having the inner strength and reserves of energy necessary for achieving their goals.

Khabarov (2003) studied gender identity characteristics of modern adolescent Yakuts (indigenous ethnic community of the Far North). The participants were 128 boys and 150 girls between the ages of 14 and 17 residing in Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) in Siberia. The author observes that the leveling of traditional male and female gender roles in the Yakut rural community is a modern trend and argues that heretofore, due to the geographical location of this ethnic group, including the harsh northern climatic conditions and traditional culture of reindeer breeding and migration with the herd through the Tundra, traditional ethnic gender differentiation was important for survival. For this reason, masculinity in men was valued particularly highly. Governed by ecological factors and cultural traditions, Yakuts traditionally pay more attention to boys than to girls in childrearing and education. Both parents and teachers demand more of boys than of girls. However, a tendency toward the leveling of gender markers was observed, with boys displaying traditionally feminine traits and girls displaying masculine traits. Nevertheless, both girls and boys valued their mothers more highly than their fathers. They described their mothers in masculine terms, as being more responsible, communicative, and fair-minded than their fathers. They described their fathers as passive but cruel: aggressive from the point of view of boys, and irresponsible from the girls' point of view. The role of father in the rural Yakut family is becoming degraded due to a low level of education and high alcohol consumption. Today, the single-mother family is a widespread model in Yakutia. According to the author, a "strong negative" influence of female teachers on the gender identification of boys may be observed. The author argues that due to high representation of women in educational system, Yakut teenager boys do not develop a strong male gender identity (Khabarov). The study revealed that there is a trend toward androgyny in Yakut teenagers, characterized by a combination of both masculine features (such as independence, aggression, and self-confidence) and feminine features (cunning, credulousness, and inconsistency).

The above studies (Byzova, 2006; Khabarov, 2003) suggest that there is a trend toward androgyny as a form of gender identity in both women and men, irrespective of ethnic and cultural influences. It is worth noting that all three studies under consideration were carried out in Siberia—a geographical territory with harsh environmental and climatic conditions.

As we indicated in the introduction to this chapter, interethnic tensions (caused by high migration levels) and open ethnic conflict still exists over a large expanse of territory of the Russian Federation, especially in major urban areas. For this reason, examining gender and aggression among various cultures was especially compelling and important to us.

Gender and Aggression

An initial study on aggression was conducted by Isaeva (2008) among residents of the city of Makhachkala in Dagestan (North Caucasus), including both *Russians* and representatives of the peoples of Dagestan: the Avars and Kumyks. The participants were 314 girls and 316 boys, teenagers between the ages of 10 and 15 years. The results showed that latent (hidden, not demonstrated openly) aggression was characteristic of all the adolescents. Gender differences were evident in the demonstration of aggression. Boys acted out aggression more openly than girls, and physical aggression predominated in the structure of boys' aggressive behavior. Among the girls, verbal and oblique forms of aggression dominated. Cultural differences were evident among ethnic Russians and Avarian teenagers that were expressed in the form of a greater suspiciousness and tendency to take offense among the Avar boys. They did not express their aggression verbally, however. The Russian boys were more open and trusting, and less suspicious; they more often expressed their aggression verbally.

Gender differences in displays of aggression among adolescents were also studied in the Irkutsk oblast and in Buryatia, in the Siberia region (Ivanova, 2002). The participants were 200 girls and 180 boys, Russians and Buryats, middle and high school students between the ages of 11 and 17. Gender differences were evident: a heightened aggressiveness was observed among the girls, which manifested itself as rebellion against traditional views on femininity. The Russian girls actively engaged in masculine behavior, as well as oblique aggression, such as gossiping, spreading rumors, rejecting those who had offended or hurt them, breaking off relations, and open expressions of anger. In their reactions, the Buryat girls displayed more irritability, negativity, and more oblique aggression. Gender similarity was evident in the fact that no difference in displays of physical and verbal aggression between boys and girls was observed.

Nechepurenko (2009) examined gender differences in social views on aggression of the people of the Northern Caucasus, including, Ossetians, Ingushes, Chechens, Lezgins, and ethnic Russians. The participants were college and university students in Moscow, 852 women and 492 men. Uniformity in social attitudes toward aggression was observable. Both young men and young women considered aggression to be an evil. This was interpreted as the essence of social views about aggression. Gender differences were evident in the fact that aggression of individuals of the opposite sex was unequivocally interpreted as evil, while aggression displayed by members of one's own sex might not be an evil, but rather the consequence of an excess of emotion. The results showed that men display male aggression exclusively as a physical act, as the use of force to coerce another person in order to achieve a desired result, as a means of justifying oneself in a dispute, or to affirm one's superiority in striving to acquire social status. The women viewed female aggression as the use of force, assault, and pain. Such displays of aggression elicit fear in women, as results demonstrated. Emotionality and hypersensitivity were found to be significant characteristics of female aggression, but not of male aggression. A similarity in the young men and women's views about female aggression was evident.

All participants in all cultures considered aggression to be evil but different patterns and manifestations of aggressive behavior were observed in or ascribed to different cultures and different genders. Masculinity was correlated with the manner in which aggression was manifested according to gender roles.

Gender Stereotypes in the Russian Mass Media and Politics

The fact that ratings, surveys, and public statements all suggest that women are still virtually absent from Russian politics (Vartanova, Smirnova, & Frolova, 2013) informed our choice of this section in the chapter. This tendency goes against the global trend. According to the Human Development Report published by UNDP in 2014 (HDP, 2014), Russia ranked 57th in the Gender Equality Index. The current data of international organizations places Russia 84th in the number of women in politics. Russia comes in well behind not only the Scandinavian countries, but also a number of Latin American and African countries. We suggest that active deliberation and discussion of gender problems in the public sphere—in both society and politics—is essential for achieving serious change. Here, we believe, psychological research can play an important role.

Steinberg (2004) argues that there is hidden discrimination against women in Russian society. The author cites two reasons for this: (1) women were excluded from the ranks of candidates running for political office because they had fewer financial, organizational, and information resources at their disposal; and (2) there is no anti-discrimination legislation in the sphere of labor and family relations. Stubborn stereotypes that insist that it is normal for women to be confined to tending the hearth and raising children have taken root in the social consciousness. There is a gender imbalance in Russia in the professional sphere—teachers, nurses, and salespeople are primarily women, while executives and managers of almost any rank are typically men. Gradually, an attitude toward men as managers and bosses and toward women as guardians and service staff has taken shape. The notions of a leader and a male are strongly correlated in the Russian mind. However, women in Russia have a higher educational level than men.

We argue that the construction of gender identity takes shape through language, religion, education, and upbringing. Additionally, the mass media influence the formation of cultural and gender stereotypes, inculcating them in the social consciousness. Furthermore, the gender stereotypes that exist in the mass consciousness are reproduced by the mass media. A monograph by Selivanova and Mokronosov (2007) reveals how perceptions of gender are represented in the contemporary Russian media. The authors demonstrate that current-day media in Russia remains a mouthpiece for patriarchal gender culture, reinforcing the subordinate position of women. The authors view Russian gender stereotypes as twofold: patriarchal and contemporary. The patriarchal stereotype was prescribed in the Code of Daily Rules, Advice, and Instructions of the Novgorod Republic, later systematized by the

spiritual counselor of Ivan the Terrible (Ivan IV), and published as a book known as Domostroi (2012), or The Household System. In addition to instructions about faith and honoring the czar, Domostroi contained rules governing the principles of patriarchal organization in daily life, upholding the rights of despotic power of the head of the family, as well as the rules for raising children and advice on personal and social relations. The traditions of *Domostroi* became deeply rooted in the Russian collective unconscious, and echoes of it still reverberate today, as demonstrated by various scholarly studies. Later, patriarchal stereotypes reappeared in the nineteenth century Russian Orthodox-philosophical literary tradition, and in contemporary life they are reproduced by the mass media.

The authors elucidate the following principles in the patriarchal stereotypes: "The man is the head of the family," "A woman's place is in the home," "Children are the most important thing in a woman's life." At the same time, the authors note that the contemporary image of a woman in patriarchal mass consciousness is a collection of negative character traits, expressed, for example, in proverbs and sayings about women's intelligence: "A woman's hair is long, but her mind is short." At the present time it is common for Russian men to talk about "women's logic," as opposed to the "iron logic" of men[2].

In the media, such stereotypes connected to the role of women in politics are also evident: "Women and politics are mutually exclusive"; "Even the participation of women in power does not guarantee their equality with men"; "The dominant position of men in contemporary Russian society strengthens the stereotype of the effectiveness of male superiority." The authors of the study also observe that this fosters a problem of so-called gender technologies, which facilitate the acquisition of power by men and create barriers for women.

In analyzing news and talk shows on a number of different TV channels, the authors came to the conclusion that masculine domination in society is based in part on its representation on TV. Political activity is shown to be an exclusively masculine sphere of self-expression. Men express more relevant social ideas: issues concerning gender inequality are virtually ignored on TV shows. The image of women is discussed in patriarchal terms, creating an optimal model of female self-realization as mother, housewife, and companion of a famous man. The problems of the female population of Russia are viewed in TV shows exclusively from the perspective of motherhood and childbearing. The authors conclude that the woman, as a participant in social life, is forced into the background due to the valorization of the role of women and the exclusion of men from the process of childrearing. Shwalb and Shwalb (2014) also confirm the decline of the role of the father in families in their research. As Selivanova and Mokronosov (2007) conclude, mass media in Russia perpetuates patriarchal representations of the role and image of women. At the same time, citing the linguistic research of Goroshko (1999), they showed how the gender

---

[2] The meaning of this expression "women's logic," as opposed to the "iron logic" of men is that men have a very "logical" clear mind and logic, logical consequence, but women's logic is different, the logical consequence they use does not correspond to the rules of logic (logical science), it is not clear to men how women make decisions, what arguments they use and so on. It is a very popular point of view in everyday life in Russia. Of course, no scientific evidence was ever found.

differences are reflected in the lexical structure of the Russian language, using the notion of the "Russian woman" as an example. They point to a dearth of negative qualities among words expressing this notion. In fact, there was a high incidence of positive lexemes: self-abnegation, self-sacrifice, and goodness[3]. The image of the Russian woman in linguistic consciousness is consistent with descriptive representations by both men and women, and, on the whole, offers a positive view of the image of women. Thus, a paradox is evident: the negative gender stereotypes that are deeply rooted in mass consciousness contradict the positive characteristics of the image of women in the Russian lexicon. These findings are born out in the following study.

Vartanova, Smirnova, and Frolova (2013) carried out an analysis of gender issues in the mass media during the election campaigns of 2007 and 2011. The study was based on the content analysis of texts published in mass-circulation Russian newspapers and magazines in 2011. The data they gathered supported the hypothesis about gender inequality in Russian political power structures. At the same time, they noted a shift in the political activity of women in Russia. The results of the study showed that the issue of gender in pre-election campaigns of seven parties that ran in the 2011 Russian Duma elections came to light primarily in social programs promoted by the parties: family, motherhood, and children; women's rights under labor law. The authors found the party programs to be effectively archaic and lagging behind current social realities. Russian politicians still perceive the social role of women within the framework of traditional patriarchal culture: tending the family hearth, bearing and rearing children, working outside the home, but not playing a significant role in society, politics, or in government. In the mass media, however, the number of articles that make a connection between political realities and gender equality issues has increased in volume, which, in the opinion of the authors, suggests that the potential for democratic development is growing in society.

Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to demonstrate that in the multicultural environment of Russia, representatives of ethnic groups have specific characteristics in terms of gender roles. We have shown that Russia is a diverse canvas that has absorbed multiple cultural features of various ethnic groups residing throughout Russia. As we made clear in our introduction, a number of gender problems exist in modern Russia that needs to be examined also at the psychological level. Gender and culture are interconnected, and gender and cultural traits from a psychological perspective are characterized by a multifactor interdependence that is interwoven into a broader sociological and political context.

---

[3] According to the Russian culture <self-abnegation, self-sacrifice> are considered to be positive characteristics of a person.

Russian culture, according to Hofstede et al. (2010), is more collective than individualistic, more feminine than masculine, with a rather high level of power distance. Over time, changes in the cultural values in Russia articulated on the basis of Schwartz' (2004) methodology have been observed (Lebedeva, 2001; Shmeleva, 2006). This trend in changing values takes the form of aspiration toward greater independence and self-direction, and lower conformity and traditionalism. This can be explained by the ongoing period of social transition that began in Russia 25 years ago. Data obtained from the European Values Survey 2007 also shows a decrease in the level of conformity and traditionalism (Magun & Rudnev, 2010) in Russia. This trend is reflected in our chapter on the case of ethnic Russians. Other ethnic groups, residing in the North Caucasus, Siberia, Volga and northwest regions, demonstrate higher levels of adherence to traditional cultural norms in gender relations in the family, professional self-realization, organizational behavior, and gender self-identity.

Our meta-analysis demonstrates that although the traditional patriarchal norm is still dominant among Russians, the major ethnic group in Russia, there are indications of the preference for egalitarian gender relations in families and organizations. Russians increasingly express egalitarian attitudes and behavior, although traditional stereotypes still exist. In comparison with traditional cultures of the other ethnic groups, Russian culture is more modern.

The traditional cultures of ethnic groups from the North Caucasus (Ossetians, Dagestanians) are still strongly embedded in traditional norms and behaviors. The representatives of these groups show a preference for traditional hierarchical and patriarchal family norms in culture. These norms indicate that men dominate women in family relations, and enjoy freedom of opportunity in their professional self-realization. Women's gender roles are largely limited to family and childrearing, where no professional self-realization is allowed. These cultural norms militate against egalitarian gender roles, relations, and behavior. As it was shown, the opportunities for self-realization among Russian and Ossetian women differ. Within Russian culture, the ambition of women for professional self-realization, and on far greater egalitarian principles, is acknowledged and appreciated by men. An intracultural conflict of values is evident in Ossetian culture, in which the attitudes toward professional self-realization of men and women differ. The professional self-realization of men is highly valued, but the professional self-realization of women is limited. In Ossetian culture, women are more inclined to fulfill their roles as housewife and to pursue professional self-realization only after the age of 40. Ossetian men are generally not supportive of career advancement in women.

Members of ethnic cultures from the northwest of Russia, the Volga region, and Siberia demonstrate their preference for traditional gender roles. The femininity of women and masculinity of men help individuals, primarily women, avoid interpersonal conflicts and achieve success. Views on the attractiveness of traditional gender stereotypes expressed by Tatars and Buryats differ from the views of Russians. At the same time, in spite of cultural differences, androgynous features in gender identification are highly valued as adaptation strategies in the contemporary everyday life of Yakuts and Buryats. Therefore, the regional policy for Yakutia,

where the indigenous people of the Far North reside, should take into account the importance of the traditional cultural values and practices of this ethnic group.

Uniformity in negative social attitudes toward aggression was observed among the ethnic groups of Russians and Ossetians, Ingushes, Chechens, and Lezgins (North Caucasus). At the same time, all cultural groups demonstrated differences in latent (hidden) levels of aggression, correlating to gender differences in how this aggression was expressed. These findings are of great significance in light of the high migration levels from peripheral republics and regions to the center of Russia, primarily to large cities, where the level of ethnic tension and conflict remains high.

We conclude that the social-individual nexus in gender relations in Russia is characterized by an inherent contradiction. A profound and visible contradiction exists between individual trends toward modern culture in gender relations and the patriarchal gender stereotypes that still prevail in social discourse, politics, and on the societal level, and which are reinforced by mass media. Not only is there support in Russian media for patriarchal gender stereotypes, but also gender problems are underrepresented and misrepresented, or not discussed at all. Russian women are underrepresented on the political and decision-making levels, although they demonstrate a preference for egalitarian relations.

More psychological research is needed to understand the specificity of gender and cultural interrelations from the perspective of the polyethnic and multicultural development of modern Russia. These studies should take into account the ecological dimension, including the geographical regions of residence—rural versus urban, small versus big city, provincial versus capital city (Moscow or Saint Petersburg)—and the imbalances in regional economic development.

References

Ananiev, B. G. (1966). Chelovek kak predmet poznanija. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo LGU.

Ananiev, B. G. (1980). *Izbrannye psychologicheskie trudy*. Moscow: Pedagogika.

Baskakova, M., Mezentseva, E., & Zotova, E. (2006). Gender Issues in Morden Russia. Based on formal statistics. World Bank Working Paper 71534. Moscow.

Bem, S. L. (1987). Probing the promise of androgyny. In M. R. Walsh (Ed.), *The psychology of women: Ongoing debates*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Berry, J. W., Pootinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen P. R. (2002). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Best, D., & Williams, J. (2001). Gender and culture. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *Psychology and culture*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Boldyreva, O. I. (2006). Vlijanie gendernyh ustanovok na vybor studentami modeli sem'i: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Kursk.

Brandt, M. J., & Henry, P. J. (2012). Gender inequality and gender differences in authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(10), 1301–1315.

Buss, A. N., & Perry M. (1992) The aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63,* 452–459.

Byzova, L. V. (2006). Vlijanie gendernoj identichnosti na social'no-psihologicheskuju adaptaciju zhenschin: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Yaroslavl'.

Cattell R. D., Eber H. W., & Tatsuoka M. M. (1970). Handbook of The Sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16PF)—Campaign Illinois.

Cheng, B. S. et al. (2014). Paternalistic leadership in four East Asian societies: Generalizability and cultural differences of the triad model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*(1), 82–90.

Custine, M. de. Rossija v 1839 g. (1996). Izdatel'stvo im. Sabashnikovyh. Moscow.

Domostroi. (2012). Editor and translator V.V. Kolesov. Izd-vo Olma-Media Grupp. Moscow.

E-library Scientific on-line library http://elibrary.ru/defaultx.asp.

Fransella, F., Bell, R., & Bannister, D. (2004). A Manual for Repertory Grid Technique (2nd Ed). Chichester, UK: John Willey & Sons.

Gadzhieva, R. G. (2000). Dinamika gendernyh stereotipov i ih vlijanie na professional'nuju samo-realizaciju lichnosti: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Gefter. (2012). Mentalnost Rossiiskoi Molodezhi: politicheskaya orientatziya I kumiri. www. gefter.ru/archive/8369. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

Gelfand, M., LaFee, G., Fahey S., & Feinberg, E. (2013). Culture and extremism. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(3), 495–517.

GKS. (2012). Social'no-demograficheskij portret Rossii, (Socio-demographic portrait of Russia). http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/portret-russia.pdf. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

Gorer, G., & Rickman, J. (1962). *The people of great Russia: A psychological study*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Goroshko, E. I. (1996). Osobennosti muzhskogo i zhenskogo rechevogo povedeniya (psyck-holingvisticheskii aspect): avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Grigor'eva, N. N. (2006). Gendernye osobennosti projavlenija liderstva u studentov: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Hofstede, G., (2001). *Culture's Consequences, Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of minds*. Revised expanded 3d edition. New York: McGraw Hill.

Human Development Report. (2014). Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerabilities and building resilience. UNDP UN http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-summary-en.pdf. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 464 p.?

Isaeva, M. A. (2008). Gendernye i etnicheskie razlichija v projavlenijah agressivnosti podrostkov: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Ivanova, E. A. (2002). Gendernye razlichija v projavlenii agressivnosti u detej podrostkovogo vozrasta: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Irkutsk.

Jurcik, T., Chentsova-Dulton, J., Solopieiva-Jurcikova, E., & Ryder A. (2013). Russian in treat-ment: the evidence base supporting cultural adaptation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 69,* 774–791.

Keller, H., Pootinga, Y. H., & Scholmerich, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Between culture and biology: Perspectives in ontogenetic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khabarov, I. P. (2003). Gendernye osobennosti sovremennyh podrostkov v uslovijah nivelirovani-ja tradicionnyh otnoshenij: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Khudalova, M. Z. (2013). Etnopsihologicheskie osobennosti samorealizacii lichnosti: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. St.Petersburg.

Kon I.S. (2003) Rebenok I obszhestvo. Moscow: Academia.

Kornilov, S. A., & Kornilova, T. V. (2010). Meta-analytic studies in psychology. *Psychological Journal, 31*(5), 5–17.

Lebedeva, N. M. (1997). Social'naja psihologija akkul'turacii jetnicheskih grupp http://www.dis-sercat.com/content/sotsialnaya-psikhologiya-akkulturatsiya-etnicheskikh-gruppdiss. doctora psychologicheskih nauk.

Lebedeva, N. M. (2001). Value-motivational structure of personality in Russian Culture. *Psihologicheskij zhurnal, 22*(3), 36–51

Levkovich, V. P. (2004). Vzaimootnoshenija v sem'jah predprinimatelej. *Psihologicheskij zhurnal, 25*(5), 24–31.

Mahakova, L. S. (2007). Vlijanie gendernyh stereotipov personala po otnosheniju k rukovoditelju na prinjatie cennostej organizacionnoj kul'tury: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

Mogun, V., Rudnev, M. (2010). The life values of the Russian population. *Sociological research, 49*(4), 3–57.

Nazarova, S. A. (2013). Gendernye issledovanija v sovremennoj rossijskoj psihologii. Sborniki NIC: Sociosphera & Vedecko vydavatelske centrum Sociosfera—CZs.r.o.

Nechepurenko, T. V. (2009). Gendernye razlichija v projavlenijah agressivnosti studentov: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Moscow.

OECD Report. (2012). Culture, gender, equality and development. www.oecd.org/socail/gender-development/1896320.pdf. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

Osgood C. E., Sici G. J., & Tannenbaum P. H. (1957) The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, USA: University of Illinois Press.

Pamfilova, S. A. (2006). Osobennosti gendernyh stereotipov pedagogov razlichnoj etnicheskoj prinadlezhnosti: avtoref. dis. …kand. psihol. nauk. Samara.

Pochebut, L. G. (2012). *Kross-kulturnaya I etnicheskaya psychologiya*. St Petersburg: St Petersburg University.

Pochebut, L. G., & Shmeleva, I. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Kross-kulturnaya psychologiya: aktualnye problemy. Collection of papers*. Saint Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Publishing House.

Schwartz, S. H. (2004). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In V. Vinken, J. Soeters, & P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: Dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp. 43–73). Leiden: Brill.

Selivanova, O. S., & Mokronosov, G. V. (2007). SMI i gender: obraz zhenschiny v reprezentativnyh praktikah sovremennoj rossijskoj kul'tury. Ekaterinburg. UGTU–UPN.

Shmeleva, I. A. (2002). Developmental psychology: History, theory and practice from Russian perspective. *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin, 36*(1), 13–26.

Shmeleva, I. A. (2006). *Psikhologiya ecologicheskogo soznaniya*. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersrburg University Press.

Shmeleva, I. A. (2013). Social Aspects of Sustainable Development- Problems and Strategies: The Outcomes of Rio + 20. In S. Bobylev & R. Perelet (Eds.), *Sustainable Development in Russia*. Berlin-St. Petersburg, 182–189.

Shwalb, D. W., & Shwalb, B. J. (2014). Fatherhood in Brazil, Bangladesh, Russia, Japan and Australia. *Online Reading in Psychology and Culture, 6*(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1125.

Sikevich, Z. V. (2011). Vlijanie etnicheskogo factora na sovremennoe Obshhestvo. *Journal sociologii i socialnoi antropologii volume XIV, 2*(55), 41–58.

Soldatova, G. U. (1998). *Psihologija mezhjetnicheskoj naprjazhennosti*. Moscow: Smysl.

Steinberg, A. G. (2004). Gendernye aspekty social'nogo upravlenija v organizacijah. Habarovsk: FESTU. 157 P.

UNDP. (2010). Enhancing women's political participation. A policy note for Europe and CIS. http://issuu.com/undp_in_europe_cis/docs/enhancing_womens_political_participation. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

UNDP in Russia. Doklad or razvitii chelovecheskogo potentziala v RF 2011/ Edited by A. Ausan & S. Bobylev (2011). Moscow, UNDP. www.undp.ru/documents/nhdr2011rus.pdf. Accessed 30 sept 2014.

United Nations Millennium Declaration. (2000). http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm. Accessed 25 Sept. 2014.

Vartanova, E. L., Smirnova, O. V., & Frolova T. I. (2013). Women in Russian policy: Media shows, where gender parade comes from// *Voprosi teorii I practiki jurnalistiki*, № 3, pp. 49–63.

Women & Men in Russia. (2012). http://www.gks.ru/wps/wcm/connect/rosstat_main/rosstat/ru/statistics/publications/catalog/doc_1138887978906. Accessed 30 Sept 2014.

World Economic Forum. (2013). The Global Gender Gap Report. Geneva, Switzerland http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GenderGap_Report_2013.pdf. Accessed 25 Sept 2014.

Irina A. Shmeleva is an associate professor with the University ITMO, Saint Petersburg, Russia; director of the NGO "Institute of Sustainable Development Strategy." She is a member of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology and a member of the Russian Psychological Society, Saint Petersburg Branch. Her scientific interests focus on social psychology, cross-cultural psychology, psychology of gender, environmental psychology, and interdisciplinary field of sustainable development. She is the scientific supervisor of MA and PhD students. She was a visiting scholar at the University of Osnabruck, Germany; Free University of Berlin, Germany; Free University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands; University of Stockholm, Sweden; University of Fribourg, Switzerland; Central European University, Budapest, Hungary and Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, and University of California, Berkeley, USA.

Ludmila G. Pochebut is a professor of psychology with Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. She is a member of the Russian Psychological Society, Saint Petersburg Branch. She is the scientific supervisor of MA and PhD students. Her scientific interests focus on social psychology, cross-cultural psychology, and psychology of gender. Ludmila Pochebut is the author of many books in Russian: Social Psychology (with I. Meizhis) (2013), Cross-Cultural and Ethnic Psychology (2012), and Cross-Cultural Psychology: Modern Problems (2005) edited by L. Pochebut and I. Shmeleva.