
Wesleyan Economics Working Papers

<http://repec.wesleyan.edu/>
N^o: 2002-001

What About Us? Men's Issues in Development

Joyce P. Jacobsen

May, 2002

WESLEYAN
UNIVERSITY



Department of Economics
Public Affairs Center
238 Church Street
Middletown, CT 06459-007

Tel: (860) 685-2340
Fax: (860) 685-2301
<http://www.wesleyan.edu/econ>

WHAT ABOUT US?
MEN'S ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT

Joyce P. Jacobsen

LAC Gender Team
Latin America and the Caribbean Region

May 2002

List of Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
DALYs	Disability-Adjusted Life Years
GAD	Gender and Development
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Foundation
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WID	Women in Development
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION: WHY ARE MEN’S ISSUES IMPORTANT IN DEVELOPMENT?	1
The Undertreatment of Men’s Issues	2
The Symmetries and Diversities of Men’s Issues	4
2. WHAT ARE MEN’S ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT?	6
Accumulation and Destruction of Men’s Human Capital.....	7
<i>Destruction of Men’s Human Capital</i>	7
<i>Accumulation of Men’s Human Capital</i>	14
Changing Roles and Identities for Men	17
<i>The Changing Structure of Work</i>	17
<i>The Changing Social Structure</i>	19
3. CONCLUSION: WHAT CAN BE DONE?	23
Foster Additional Data Collection and Disaggregation	24
Sponsor Research in Potentially Male-Issue-Relevant Areas.....	24
Continue to Incorporate Men into Gender Planning Initiatives.....	25
Fund Initiatives Related to Male Issues	25
Modify Existing Programs to Reduce Negative and Amplify Positive Effects for Men.....	26
Attempt “Alliance Politics” Where Possible in Order to Incorporate Men	27
4. REFERENCES	28

LIST OF TABLES

Summary Table	Distribution of Gender Differences for Various Indicators in Report Tables
Table 1a	Life Expectancy at Birth, Male and Female, 1999
Table 1b	Life Expectancy at Birth, Male Minus “Max Male”, 1999
Table 2	Change in Mortality Rates, Male and Female, 1960-1997
Table 3	Infant Mortality Rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2002
Table 4a	Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Birth, Male and Female, 1999
Table 4b	Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Age 60, Male and Female, 1999
Table 4c	Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Birth, Male Minus “Max Male”, 1999
Table 4d	Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Age 60, Male Minus “Max Male”, 1999
Table 5a	Deaths by Cause, Male and Female, 1999
Table 5b	Burden of Disease in Disability-Adjusted Life Years by Cause, Male and Female, 1999
Table 6	Percentage Male of Adults with HIV/AIDS, end of 1999
Table 7a	Fatal Occupational Injury Rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
Table 7b	Non-fatal Occupational Injury Rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
Table 8	Percentage Male of Criminal Offenders, by Type of Crime, most recent year available as of 2001
Table 9	Male/Female Prison Population Ratios, most recent year available as of 2001
Table 10	Percentage Male of Young Adult (ages 15-24) Homicide Deaths, most recent year available as of 1999
Table 11	Male/Female Suicide Rate Ratios, most recent year available as of 2000
Table 12	Primary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996
Table 13	Persistence to Grade Five, Male and Female, 1993
Table 14	Secondary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996
Table 15	Tertiary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996
Table 16	“Economically Active” Participation Rates, Male and Female, circa 1978 and most recent year available as of 2000
Table 17	Unemployment Rates, Male and Female, 1996-1998
Table 18a	Percentage Ever Married, 20-24 year olds, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
Table 18b	Percentage Ever Married, 45-49 year olds, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
Table 19	Percentage Male of Population Aged 65 and Above, 1999

Foreword

Until recently, most gender work has understandably focused on rectifying the numerous disadvantages faced by women around the world. The role of men, when discussed at all, was often framed in confrontational terms as an obstacle to be overcome in redressing gender imbalances, rather than as a worthy topic of study in and of itself.

It has become increasingly clear to many in the field, however, that good development work requires paying attention to the pressures, conflicts, and even disadvantages faced by men in their masculine roles. These issues merit investigation in their own right—the fact that men are responsible for a significant number of the problems faced by women does not mean that they do not face problems themselves. Moreover, the fact that many of the disadvantages women face are caused at least in part by men logically suggests that the role of men needs to be understood in all its complexity before improvements can be attained for women. Thus examining male roles and issues can be a “win-win” situation, helping to improve the human development of both men and women.

The goal in writing this report was to examine, through available literature and data, male gender issues and their relative importance in the field of gender and development. Although the main interest of the report is on the developing world, information is used from both developing and developed countries, in large measure due to the lack of information from developing countries on male issues. The report focuses on two areas: the destruction and accumulation of men’s human capital; and the changing roles and identities for men.

Among the report’s conclusions are that men face major disadvantages due to their masculine roles, particularly in the destruction of human capital through communicable disease, occupational injury, violence, substance abuse, and institutionalization. In the area of human capital accumulation, specifically in formal schooling, men also fare worse than women, although they may have advantages in informal accumulation, which is more difficult to measure. Changing social roles are also putting new strains on men’s work and family life, a challenge to which not all men are able to respond adequately. In terms of policy recommendations, the report suggests incorporating men into existing gender planning initiatives, designing new initiatives specifically for men, and generating more gender-disaggregated data to better analyze male issues.

This report was written with the objective of creating awareness about and stimulating discussion on a dimension of gender that has hitherto received relatively limited attention in the World Bank, that is, how gender roles and relations affect the lives of men. While the report was commissioned by the Latin America and the Caribbean Region of the World Bank – a region with high levels of male on male violence, alcoholism among men, and educational disparities to the disadvantage of boys in many countries – information here suggests that the findings of this report have implications for other regions of the world beyond Latin America and the Caribbean.

Guillermo Perry
Chief Economist
Latin America and the Caribbean Region

Abstract

This report examines male gender issues and their potential negative impact on male development. It finds that HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, occupational injury, violence, and incarceration and other forms of institutionalization disproportionately affect men. Moreover, changing work patterns have modified traditional male roles in the family and community, and not all men have been capable of adapting to the new social context. The report highlights the limitations of existing research on male issues, and also on the lack of adequate programs to address these issues on the ground. It concludes by recommending that existing development policies and programs incorporate men into their work, and that new ones be designed specifically to target male issues.

Acknowledgments

The Gender Team in the World Bank's Latin America and the Caribbean Region commissioned this report. Many thanks go to Maria Correia for conceptualizing this report and for furthering a different way of thinking on gender, of which this report is a part. I also wish to thank Wendy Cunningham for information and feedback; Gillian Brown, Lucia Fort, Andrew Mason, Janet Nassim, Fadia Saadah, and Wendy Wakeman for internal consultations; Paul Bloem and Judith Helzner for providing informational materials; Gary Barker, Mark Blackden, Peter Kilby, William Maloney, Karen Mason, Jim McGuire, Guillermo Perry, Peter Rutland, and Lincoln Williams for comments on the draft version; and Wei Kwan for exemplary research assistance.

1. INTRODUCTION: WHY ARE MEN'S ISSUES IMPORTANT IN DEVELOPMENT?

This report concerns men's issues in development. It considers what these issues are, substantiates their existence, and considers how they might be addressed by particular policy interventions within the broader gender-and-development agenda. The issues are treated in a global context to emphasize their consistency across developed and developing regions of the world. This is done not to de-emphasize their importance in the developing regions, but rather to emphasize the unmet needs of men throughout the world.

This report is meant to stimulate debate on this subject both within and outside the international development community. Hence the audience is assumed to be primarily those researchers and practitioners who have done some work in the area of gender issues in development, as well as those who are interested in development and/or men's issues more broadly.

The report was commissioned by the Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) Region Gender Team with the objective of better understanding gender trends and emerging male gender issues in the region in the areas of health, violence, education, and employment. Latin America and the Caribbean is the most violent region in the world in terms of homicide rates, with young men making up the bulk of perpetrators and victims. LAC also has the highest percentage of total deaths attributed to alcohol, with alcohol-related diseases and injuries mostly directly affecting men. Moreover, World Bank reports on gender for Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Central America, Colombia, and the Caribbean indicate that a large proportion of boys are falling behind in school due mostly to higher levels of school drop-out and grade repetition. And while women's labor force participation in the region has increased gradually over the decades, men's participation has decreased. Discovery of such patterns in these reports led the LAC Gender Team to commission this report in order to investigate similar issues for other world regions, as well as to put the LAC trends into the broader perspective.

The report is primarily descriptive, given its objective. It attempts to summarize what is available in terms of country-level data to illustrate men's issues, and also gives attention to some case studies. As such, it could be thought of as an annotated outline and suggestions for further research and potential policy interventions. There is an extensive set of tables for the report, that provides country-specific numbers where available. In addition, there is a Summary Table that describes the distribution of outcomes across countries, so that persons wanting a quick overview of the supporting statistics need not read through the full set of tables.

This introductory section of the report continues to address the question of why study men's issues. The central part of the report surveys relevant data and studies regarding men's issues in development. The concluding section offers a set of recommendations on how to move beyond this report in both research orientations and policy directions.

The Undertreatment of Men's Issues

Two important intellectual trends have developed over the last decade. One is the increased solidarity of the development community behind the clarification of what are the ramifications of research and consideration of gender issues for development policy. Gender activists may reasonably believe that not enough resources are devoted to implementation of the policies and practices they advocate. However, there has been a huge amount of literature, both internal and external to the large institutions in the development community, devoted to clarifying the role of gender in affecting both development policy implementation and distributional outcomes. In this literature, particular themes have arisen as essentially noncontroversial within the gender development community—the problem of domestic violence, the need for equal schooling and literacy rates for girls and boys, assertion of female control over reproductive decisions. The gender development community has been able to rally behind these and other themes and avoid a high degree of infighting regarding relative goals.

In addition, the level of supporting research for this coherent agenda has been high. The World Bank has been highlighting gender issues in its yearly *World Development Reports*. The Bank also recently published a thorough discussion of gender issues in development, advocating what should be done to improve matters (World Bank 2001). The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), through its yearly *Human Development Reports*, has done much to develop and publicize the statistical measurement of gender inequality, by such tools as its gender-related development index and its gender empowerment measure.

The second trend is the increased level of interest in men's issues and the concept of masculinity in a number of developed countries, in particular the United Kingdom and the United States, on both scholarly and popular levels. This interest has included economic concerns regarding increased male unemployment, in particular long-term unemployment; concerns regarding the reduced proportion of men in higher education, and concerns regarding how boys fare in primary and secondary education. It has also included social concerns regarding the high rates of male violence in societies, for violence is highly disproportionately enacted by men, and also disproportionately claims men (except for domestic violence) as victims. More recently it has also addressed fatherhood and men's reproductive health, with Australia's Department of Health and Family Services being a leading edge on the latter topic.

Many of the writers on men's issues are academic social scientists whose writings display familiarity with feminist approaches to social science issues. This vein of work is not anti-feminist, but rather seeks to extend the insights developed regarding female roles into a corresponding discussion of male roles. Works on men and masculinity include writings by numerous psychologists, including Pollack (1998 and other works) and Connell (1995 and other works). Sociologists (including Kimmel 1996, as well as several other single-author works and edited volumes) and organizational behaviorists (cf. Hearn 1992) have also weighed in, along with political scientists, anthropologists and literary criticism scholars. Numerous other recent works have appeared in a popularizing vein, including Faludi (1999). Fewer works have appeared by non-Anglo authors, but see Welzer-Lang (2000) for a recent set of contributions in French; Ghoussoub and Sinclair-Webb (2000) regarding male issues in the Middle Eastern

context; and a number of anthropological studies regarding masculinity in generally more narrowly focussed cultural contexts (cf. Gutmann 1996 regarding Mexican men).

The writings in this area in general have been of a more qualitative nature, often based on case studies, with no particular focus on maintaining representative sampling. This has not been inappropriate given the particular aims of the works in this area, namely to illustrate and illuminate in an exploratory way the issues that men face in conforming to—or attempting to conform to—particular normative versions of masculinity. Indeed, case studies have served to “give voice” to men and illuminate their lives in ways that were missing from the stylized picture of “a man” and “men” that appeared in many early gender studies works.

What has been in general missing is work that expands the substantial intersection between these literatures. Works that have conjoined these two intellectual trends are few and relatively recent. The recent nature of such writings is not surprising. Early “gender in development” approaches could in some cases be characterized as openly hostile to men and organized towards correcting and offsetting male bias in development (see Chant and Gutmann 1999, pp. 11-29 for a capsule history of different gender in development approaches). However, gender planning in development as currently conceptualized does not appear openly hostile to consideration of how policies might disproportionately affect men. For instance, Moser (1993) states that gender planning allows one “to recognize that because women and men have different positions within the household and different control over resources, they not only play different and changing *roles* in society, but also often have different *needs*” (p. 15).

Yet a reading of the relevant literature and websites produced by the gender groups in major international agencies makes it quite clear that almost no focus on male issues can be found therein. Oxfam UK is a notable exception, with several writings and projects focussing on male issues to be found among its publications (cf. Sweetman 1997, 2001b). At UNDP, the Gender in Development group has provided a recent “manifesto” towards considering masculine roles in development contexts (Greig, Kimmel, and Lang 2000).

Again, there are obvious reasons for why gender in development in practice continues to be, for the most part, women in development. There is no question that women are disadvantaged, both in an absolute sense and relative to men, in numerous ways throughout the developing world. This report in no way means to argue otherwise. However, there are specific areas of concern, some new and some very old, that relate to men. This report attempts to highlight these areas and argue that gender approaches to development could be profitably expanded to envelop these targeted issues as well.

While the focus of this report is on issues that have a direct impact on the well-being of men, it is also true that many of these issues are inseparable from the question of how the well-being of women is affected. While recognizing this second factor, the report will nonetheless argue that men’s issues should be considered for their direct effects. However, any formal analysis of the benefits and costs of particular policies should take into account indirect effects on the well-being of women (and sometimes children) as well. For instance, if there is less violence in a society, this will undoubtedly provide gains to all demographic groups. In addition, policies to aid males are not advocated herein in an “either or” sense. For example, arguments

that boys are underrepresented in subsets of the educational system are not arguments that their proportion in the system should be raised by reducing the representation of girls, but rather that their representation should be increased relative to their age cohort. Programs that reduce male unemployment at the expense of female employment would be similarly inappropriate. To the extent that development means expanding the pie so that everyone can have a bigger absolute part of a society's resources, paying attention to both male and female issues need not be inconsistent.

The Symmetries and Diversities of Men's Issues

There is remarkable symmetry in the way that women's issues have been discussed in both the developed and developing country contexts. To give just one example, concern about poor female-headed households has been developed using similar arguments and the problem approached using similar policies in different organizations and in different parts of the world. In apposition, the asymmetry of treatment of men's issues across the developed and developing country context is worthy of further investigation well beyond the level aspired to in this report.

While the recent interest in male issues and masculinity appears to come mainly from the developed world, in particular the United States and United Kingdom, a number of men's issues have remarkable consistency across countries, whether developed or developing. This is particularly true for issues in the area of health and violence, where researchers in developing countries, including in particular research from Brazil, Chile, and Mexico, have been on the leading edge.

Stating that there is consistency across the developed and developing contexts in men's issues is not the same as arguing that there is an essentialist nature to male patterns. Indeed, while there are biological differences that appear to contribute to these patterns, the very nonconstancy in statistical levels for measurements relating to men's issues across societies make clear that social context is critical.

However, the attention paid to men's issues is disproportionately skewed to developed countries. Many issues arise in the developed world's media that appear almost as "luxuries" to take up in a developing country context. But this is true for women's issues as well. Why is it the case that men's issues are more likely to appear only in the developed country context?

One possibility is that men's issues, to the extent that their impact is felt disproportionately among lower-status men (whether measured by income, caste, race, ethnicity, or social class), maintain higher invisibility in societies where lower-status persons are relatively more disenfranchised (even as they are more numerous). Indeed, it may be that lower-status males are in worse condition than lower-status women are in terms of relative enfranchisement within social and political support structures.

This is a controversial point that cannot be readily proved by currently available research. Indeed, many people have argued the opposite. For instance, García, in the introduction to a recent volume on poverty in developing countries (2000, p. 15), focuses on how women's experience of poverty is different from men's and in general makes the case that poor women are

systematically worse off than are poor men. Çagatay (1998, p. 3) also argues that women are poorer than men and that poor women are poorer than poor men. Poverty is generally measured on a household basis, a point Çagatay (1998, p. 4) emphasizes in order to argue that female-headed households are generally the poorest of the poor. However, this may mean that single persons, i.e., men who are unattached to any familial structure, might be disproportionately overlooked in the statistics. Indeed, a large number of female-headed households implies a large number of migrating, imprisoned, single, or dead men. These outcomes are not necessarily favorable to the male side of the equation.

The idea of “alpha” and “beta” males has come over to social science from animal biology, particularly the study of primates. Consider the notion that “beta” males may be systematically overlooked regarding their outcomes within the very social structures from which they are excluded (or lurk on the sidelines of). These may include the homeless, the alcoholic, the imprisoned, the mentally ill, the disabled, and the just plain socially inept. For a range of derogatory terms in English—“geek,” “loser,” “nerd”—the image summed up is generally male.

Indeed, much of the focus on gender inequality in contemporary societies comes from comparing the alpha, or “winner” males, with the outcomes for women. While it is true that the overall gender earnings ratio is skewed in favor of men in all societies, a proportion of that skewing comes from the disproportionately high earnings among the highest-earning males. Notably, in the United States, there is greater earnings inequality among men than among women (Jacobsen 1998, p. 51, as measured by the Gini Index). Many of the jobs that women aspire to wherein men currently comprise a majority are the high-earning jobs in society; for instance, much of the current media discussion regarding women’s progress in the United States is about how women can get around the “glass ceiling in management.” Other male-dominated occupations get little attention. Women (and men) aspire to be lawyers, doctors, business executives—i.e., high-paying prestigious occupations—not garbage collectors, miners, or butchers.

It is this potentially systematic invisibility of the marginalized men, an invisibility that can lead to their systematic omission from published statistics (so often not disaggregated by the various demographic subgroups that would lead to their uncovering), that is worrisome. While it may be that the statistics, if so disaggregated, would reveal that there is less of a problem than we think, without such knowledge, the potential problem continues undiscussed and unresolved.

This focus on different types of men, the “winners” and “losers” of the social structure, leads one to question whether there is a single entity of “maleness” or “masculinity.” Perhaps there is one normative masculinity, or male model, to which all men attempt to conform, but only those who reach close conformity can become the “winner” males. This model would include most critically for the current context, the notion that men do and should have power relative to women, and that they in general control the allocational and distributional functions of society.

The concern with defining, but then separating away from normative, or hegemonic, masculinity is a major theme in the writings on men’s issues. A focus on hegemonic masculine identity, to the extent it has been taken as coexistent with patriarchy, has led to researchers’

ignoring “the social importance of critical but subtle variations within ‘masculinity’, many of which work against men” (Sampath 1997, p. 48). However, as Connell points out: “To recognize diversity in masculinities is not enough. We must also recognize the *relations* between the different kinds of masculinity: relations of alliance, dominance and subordination” (1995, p. 37). Separation of the “role” of “hegemonic masculinity” from men per se allows one to critique masculinity but not necessarily men, so that it becomes clear that “it is not men per se, but certain ways of being and behaving, that are associated with dominance and power” (Cornwall 1997, p. 11). Indeed, looking at men themselves brings attention “to status, and to the connections between gender, age, race and class” (White 1997, p. 19). As one researcher notes: “Research into the effects of patriarchy on women has been relatively thorough, but this may have deflected attention away from the fact that men are dominated by other men, and are denied alternative expressions that could be more benign to women. It is only with a recognition of the potential for a range of identities that *the effect by men on men as well as women* can be appreciated” (Sampath 1997, p. 53).

An appreciation for the non-monolithic nature of the male experience leads one naturally to concern for those men who suffer less favorable outcomes in any society, developed or developing. The next section of the report attempts to identify some metrics that would highlight the men who are particularly disadvantaged within and across societies. Given the highly aggregated nature of much of the internationally comparable data, this is difficult to do. However, by organizing statistics in a way that spots cases where men apparently suffer disproportionately unfavorable outcomes relative to women, this may cast a light on areas where the less fortunate men are found.

2. WHAT ARE MEN’S ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT?

This report identifies two main issue areas for men. One is ongoing strains in the process of accumulation and destruction of men’s human capital, where human capital is herein broadly defined as anything increasing a person’s potential to be a capable, productive member of society. This includes measures of health, general education, job-specific training, and even additional years of life. The second is the changes in roles and identities within families, within the workforce, and within the society that men are currently facing, both in developing countries with the transition from preindustrial to industrial economic organization, and developed countries currently undergoing transition to postindustrial states. These areas are interrelated, but will be treated separately for organizational purposes. Development policies could conceivably affect one area with little effect on the other, although interrelationships would be important to consider in specific implementations.

A variety of international data sources are used to illustrate the various issues, with reference to particular illustrative country situations, both developed and developing, in cases where it is not possible to present a broadly-available data source. While there are many shortcomings with using currently-available data sources, they can still be useful in illustrating aggregate trends, even if individual country data sources are suspect.

Accumulation and Destruction of Men's Human Capital

The human male is, on most measures, more vulnerable than the female.
—“The Fragile Male,” Sebastian Kraemer (2000, p. 1609)

While “accumulation” occurs first in the title of this section, and indeed accumulation of human capital generally happens at a greater rate early in life, this report treats destruction of human capital first, and at greater length. Destruction of both men's and women's human capital occurs at an enormous pace in the developing countries. Destruction comes from numerous sources: disease, risk-taking, violence, occupational injury, and addictive/compulsive behavior. Arguably, men's human capital is destroyed at a greater rate than women's is. Accumulation will then be discussed, mainly in the context of the formal education sector. Here it appears that men's rate of developing human capital is slowing relative to women's. This is not necessarily a bad thing if it is because women are accumulating more, but in some cases it appears that men's rate of accumulation is slowing significantly. The expansion and preservation of human capital is herein viewed as a way of expanding human capability, but a broader view, a consideration of accumulation and destruction of human capability, could also be taken in which human capital is not the most important aspect or measure of human capability (cf. Sen 1989).

Destruction of Men's Human Capital

There is an increasing amount of evidence from the medical and scientific communities that men are disadvantaged relative to women in terms of relative robustness. This has led to greater interest on the part of the development community regarding health issues among men within the broader area of gendered patterns (cf. World Health Organization [WHO] 1998 for a recent statement regarding the topic of gender and health).

Destruction measured by life expectancy

A simple summary measure that illustrates the issue graphically is the relative life expectancy at birth for men as compared to women. Table 1a lists countries in decreasing order of the male-female differential on this measure. Russia leads the list, with the greatest discrepancy between male and female life expectancy (12.4 years). Remarkably, women have greater life expectancy in all but six countries, with a median difference of 4.6 years. What is perhaps more notable is the variety of values for this discrepancy (a 14-year range, from -12.4 years to +1.6 years), which again emphasizes how this figure is not biologically determinate, but affected by particular societal contexts.

Another way to illustrate this contention is shown in Table 1b, which shows the shortfall in male life expectancy across countries as compared to the currently observed maximum life expectancy for any country (77.3 years, for Japan). The median difference across countries is 10.8 years. The range here, from 40.3 years below the Japanese level (in Sierra Leone), is even more remarkable. This measure, more than any other in this report, illustrates the import of development for men. The developed countries are clustered near to Japan with the highest life expectancy, while African countries measure particularly badly on this scale.

Destruction measured by adult and infant mortality rates

Another way to consider both the effects of development on life expectancy rates and on the male-female gap in life expectancy is to look at changes over time. This is illustrated in Table 2, using the change in adult mortality rates by sex from 1960 to 1997, and then listing countries in declining order of the male-female differential in change. The good news is that most countries experienced a decline in both male and female adult mortality rates over this 37-year period. Notably, female rates generally dropped more rapidly than male rates, in large part due to enormous reductions in maternal mortality over this period. This has had the effect of causing the male-female differential in mortality rate changes to be positive for a majority of countries, with a median difference of almost 8 points (i.e., the female rate dropped by eight deaths per thousand adults more than the male rate dropped). Notable exceptions to this pattern include a number of Eastern European countries at the top of the list, where the male mortality rate has increased sharply (and in several cases the female mortality rate has risen as well). Another set of countries, generally in Sub-Saharan Africa, fills out the bottom of the table, where the male rate has dropped but the female rate has risen.

Large declines in infant mortality during this period have also benefited both sexes. However, as Table 3 indicates, there are still large differences in infant mortality rates by sex in most countries, with male children almost invariably having much higher mortality rates (with a median differential of almost 7 deaths per thousand between the male and female rates). The gender difference in mortality rates tends to shrink substantially in countries that achieve lower average infant mortality rates. A detailed examination of infant deaths for the U.S. shows larger numbers of male than female deaths from a wide variety of causes of death (U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services 2001), many of which appear to be generally preventable.

Can the gender difference in destruction rates be reduced?

These tables hopefully emphasize a point that is debated in the scientific literature as to degree, but is ceded in large part: much of the male life expectancy gap is due to environmental factors, another large part due to lifestyle factors, and only some left to heredity (see Lang et al. 1994 for general discussion of this point). However, a number of hereditary factors related to being male apparently affect not only death rates, but robustness more broadly defined. There are numerous potential medical explanations for this intrinsic robustness differential: females have two cell lines (i.e., two X chromosomes) with different potentials (Christensen et al. 2000), differential constituency of lipids in the body (Hazzard 1985), more resistance to cancer invasion (Micheli et al. 1998), lower iron load (Perls and Fretts 1987), slower metabolism (Perls and Fretts 1987), greater immune activity (Holder 1987); males have too much Y-chromosome, too much testosterone (Holder 1987). Notably, in almost all animal species (as observed in the wild), females live longer than males (Perls and Fretts 1998).

The relative lack of robustness shows up in other ways as well. Males go “downhill from conception to birth,” with a higher rate of miscarriage associated with male fetuses. Boys exhibit a higher rate of developmental and behavioral disorders, including reading delay, hyperactivity,

autism, clumsiness, stammering, and Tourette's syndrome, all occurring three to four times as often in boys as in girls (Kraemer 2000, p. 1609).

Kraemer (2000) points out that rather than parents' attempting to compensate for these disorders by treating boys more tenderly, "a typical attitude to boys is that they are, or must be made, more resilient than girls. This adds 'social insult to biological injury'" (p. 1609), causing his "inborn disadvantage" to be "amplified" (p. 1611). Indeed, society apparently continues to treat men as more resilient throughout their lifespan, subjecting them to a wider range of perils, as we shall see below.

Destruction measured by quality-adjusted life expectancy

The attempt has been made to adjust the raw measure of life expectancy for quality of life. One contention has been that females suffer disproportionately from reductions in quality of life (measured in medical terms). One such measure has been popularized recently by the Global Burden of Disease project (cf. Murray and Lopez 1996), namely disability-adjusted life expectancy. In essence, years of additional life, if lived with relative incapacity and/or suffering due to various non-fatal conditions, are weighted at less than one year. Tables 4a and 4b display, respectively, disability-adjusted life expectancy at birth and at age 60, for males and females. In each case countries are listed in increasing order of the male-female differential. Table 4a shows that these male-female differentials are only smaller than those found for the unadjusted life expectancies as shown in Table 1a (with a median of 2.9 years difference in the adjusted life expectancies as compared to 4.6 years in the unadjusted life expectancies), but still substantial, and still with a wide range across countries (13 years range as compared to 14 years in the unadjusted life expectancies). Hence men in general have substantially lower adjusted life expectancies than do women. Exceptions to this pattern are found for many Middle Eastern countries, while a number of African countries have very similar rates by sex. Table 4b shows that the male-female discrepancy, while in general smaller, persists into old age (with a median difference of 1.8 years additional disability-adjusted life years). Many Middle Eastern countries again appear in the bottom part of this table.

Tables 4c and 4d display the same data arranged in terms of the shortfall in disability-adjusted male life expectancy across countries as compared to the currently observed maximum life expectancy for any country (77.3 years, for Japan, from birth; 18.9 years, for Jamaica, from age 60). The range here, from 46.1 years at birth below the Japanese level (again in Sierra Leone), is even wider than the range in unadjusted life expectancies. Even for those surviving to age 60, there is a 15.3 year range of outcomes across countries. In addition, the median difference, of 13.3 years, is even greater than for the unadjusted life expectancies at birth (and the median is 7.4 years difference at age 60).

Particular causes of lower male quality-adjusted life expectancy

A related way of thinking about quality adjustment is to consider disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost to different causes (which can now include causes of disability as well as death). Table 5a displays the conventional measure of lives lost to different causes, while Table 5b illustrates this newer measure. Both measures illustrate the different gendering of disability

and death patterns. Men are more susceptible to perinatal conditions, and there are twice as many male cases of tuberculosis as there are female cases (Holmes, Hausler, and Nunn 1998). They are much more likely to die of injuries. There are also a number of noncommunicable conditions which are much more prevalent among men, including digestive diseases, congenital abnormalities, and respiratory diseases. Many of their causes of death appear preventable by changes in adult lifestyle, while a number of others are related to higher male infant mortality. Notably, men appear less likely to participate in the health care delivery system if it is noncompulsory; for instance, in the United States, men go to the doctor less often than do women, and also visit the dentist less often (U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services 2000, Tables 71, 80).

The following paragraphs highlight a number of areas in which men appear to have significantly higher incidence rates than women, all of which, given the variation in rates across countries, appear potentially reducible, potentially from policy interventions targeted specifically at men: human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS); occupational injury; violence (including warfare and suicide); and substance abuse and addiction.

HIV/AIDS: Of particular interest among communicable diseases is HIV/AIDS, a major epidemic in many parts of the world, but especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Table 6 shows the percentage male among those diagnosed with HIV/AIDS (see also Tables 5a and 5b, relevant lines). This disease is particularly prevalent among males (with males comprising a median of two-thirds of those diagnosed across these countries), although the male-female ratio is approximately one in a number of countries, particularly in Africa. Specific efforts have been made to target men and develop a male-sympathetic perspective in combating and treating this disease (Carovano 1995), partly because men are seen as the vector of infection even in cases where the male-female case ratio is less than one (Engle 1995). The gendered aspects of HIV/AIDS have been considered by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) (1999), with attention paid to issues such as men's vulnerability due to their high rates of rural-urban migration and correlation of unsafe sex practices with substance abuse.

HIV/AIDS is of particular concern in part because it is a major cause of death among middle-aged persons and therefore a major force in destruction of human capital for many societies, particularly in Africa. However, it is not yet the major cause of DALYs lost for this age range (15-44) among either sex. Depression is the major cause of DALYs lost in developing regions for both women and men in this age range. However, the other top ten causes of DALYs lost for each sex differ substantially. Road traffic accidents, violence, alcohol use, and war are much more critical causes of loss of DALYs among men than among women (who suffer large losses of DALYs from other STDs, musculoskeletal diseases, and maternal conditions).

Occupational Injury: Another source of death and disability that affects men at much higher rates than women is occupational injury. Tables 7a and 7b display respectively fatal and nonfatal occupational injury rates for the small number of countries where gender-disaggregated rates are readily available. Male-female injury rate ratios range from 1.2 to 19.6 for fatal injuries, and from 1.1 to 3.8 for nonfatal injuries. Clearly unsafe working conditions in both developed and developing countries heavily affect men.

Violence: Diseases and work-related injuries affect a broader group than just the stricken individual; the immediate family at the least. However, violence often affects entire communities and even countries. Of all the destructive forces aimed at destroying humans and human capabilities, violence is probably the most male gendered (although unsafe driving behavior also looms large). Breines, Connell, and Eide (2000), in their recent comprehensive overview of the gendered aspects of violence, state that average figures from Europe, the United States, and Australia show that “men stand charged for between 80 and 90 per cent of all violent crimes” (p. 15). Indeed, a look at a broader set of countries, as in Table 8, shows that the percentage male among criminal offenders for a wider range of crimes (including homicides, serious assault, theft, fraud, and drug offenses) is almost always greater than seventy percent, with median percentage male across countries ranging from 81 percent for fraud up to 90.0 percent for serious assault.

This higher prevalence of criminal behavior among men translates into higher incarceration rates. As shown in Table 9, men vastly outnumber women in all countries reporting the gender breakdown of their prison population (ranging from four to one in Mozambique, up to 142 to one in Malawi, with a median ratio of 22 to one).

Violence is male not only in perpetrator but also in victim (see Tables 5a and 5b). For instance, the majority of homicide victims are men, particularly throughout the Americas (Shrader 2001, p. 7). Male-on-male violence takes a particularly large toll among young men. Table 10 shows the percentage male among young adult (15 to 24) homicide deaths for all available countries; the range is from 55 to almost 95 percent male with a median of 76.9 percent male.

While violence appears to be universally associated with men (particularly young men—cf. Mesquida and Wiener 1996), this does not mean it is an essential feature of males. As Nisbett and Cohen (1999) point out, the variation in homicide rates within and among countries points out the critical role of culture. Their research shows that in small cities in the South and Southwestern United States, the homicide rate for white males is about double the level in the rest of the country. They argue provocatively that high homicide levels are related to a culture of male honor, and trace this back further to argue that cultures with animal husbandry have higher homicide rates, because it is important to come across as a man who will not take animal theft lightly. However, homicide rates were high in Central America and in the northern part of South America (especially Colombia and Venezuela)—predating the recent Central American civil wars, cocaine trafficking, etc. Conversely, in Argentina and Uruguay, rates were and continue to be much lower (Buvinic *et al.* 1999). This appears at variance with the Nisbett and Cohen’s pastoral argument, although the time frame is shorter, but nonetheless suggests that examination of within-Latin-America differentials in violence should be examined more closely, rather than researchers’ making blanket assumptions that all of Latin America operates under an “honor” and “machismo” culture.

In warfare situations, a variety of male responses occur, including aggression, resistance, pacifism, and cowardice. As Large (1997, p. 25) points out: “If we analyse men’s experience and identity in current war and disintegration, we find a complex identity issue which undermines any simplistic assumption that violence and war-making is inherently characteristic

of male human beings.” Interestingly, this gendered nature of war and the multiple roles that people play within war and within post-conflict societal reconfiguration has been discussed little. Such topics as how to demobilize soldiers effectively and reintegrate conflict participants (many of whom are men) into society have passed unrecognized for their gender-related aspects. Much of the gender-related literature on post-conflict issues has related to women’s roles, or to children *qua* children, not as differentiated by girl and boy.

If warfare is the form of violence that has the potential to affect the widest swath of society, other forms of violence, also gendered, can affect significant subsectors. Extrafamilial violence exists for a substantial proportion of adolescents, and again disproportionately affects males. For instance, in a study of Slovenian high school students, 29 percent of the boys and 17 percent of the girls reported having “been the victim of blackmail, intimidation or physical aggression from my peers” (Tomori et al 2000, p. 434). Not only the victims, but also the perpetrators are male; in four out of five cases in United States juvenile court, the suspected perpetrator is male (Mulrine 2001, p. 42).

Familial, or domestic, violence has been widely discussed in the gender context. Men are disproportionately the perpetrators; here women are disproportionately the victims. Not meaning to excuse the criminal, but it is notable that many perpetrators of domestic violence (and also many victims) come from a family background in which they witnessed or fell victim to domestic or extra-familial violence. Holter (2000, p. 63) describes a 1988 survey in Norway that found that “the main predictor of men’s acceptance of male domestic violence against women...was not men’s background relations to women, nor their type of masculine identity, but instead their background relations to other men. Two items were significant: having experienced bullying in childhood or youth...and having experienced violence in the family of origin.”

The most intensely personal type of violence is violence against oneself; in the extreme, suicide. Table 11 shows male/female suicide rate ratios for a wide range of countries (see also Tables 5a and 5b, relevant lines). In all but two of these countries (China and Kuwait), the male rate outweighs the female rate, by well over two to one in a majority of countries (with a median ratio of 2.9 to one). In the Chinese case, this reversal appears to be related to the high “success” rate of rural women, often accomplished by drinking pesticide, a highly effective method (Rosenthal 1999).

Substance abuse and addiction: One might argue that various forms of addictive or compulsive behavior also constitute violence against the self. However, addictions also carry a high cost for society more generally. For example, a study using Canadian data showed that alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use caused 21 percent of deaths, 23 percent of lost years of potential life, and eight percent of hospitalizations (Single et al. 1999). While this has been more of an issue in the developed country context, the burden of addictions, measured by decreased health may well grow as more people survive to middle age in developing countries. Much of the gender differential in mortality in Russia has been attributed to heavy male rates of alcohol and tobacco use (Shkolnikov, Field, and Andreev 2001).

Substance abuse rates, and related death and disability rates, as seen in Tables 5a and 5b, are substantially higher for men than for women (WHO 2000b, p. 24). Alcohol use has a

particularly noteworthy gender differential, both in usage, abuse, and rates of related diseases. In Latin America, there is a much higher prevalence of alcohol dependency for men among every age group and nationality that has been studied (Pyne 2002). Males account for nine out of ten alcohol and drug violations among juveniles in the United States (Mulrine 2001, p. 42). In Japan, alcohol consumption per capita has increased four-fold over the past four decades, and has led to increased male mortality rates from cirrhosis, even as the female mortality rates from cirrhosis have decreased (Makimoto et al. 2000).

Narcotic abuse rates are more similar by gender, although men still out-abuse women in this area. They also suffer severer consequences from their abuse, at least in the developed country context. In the United States, among persons treated at university medical centers for drug and alcohol abuse, women had lower rates than men of lifetime admissions, treatment days, and total cost of substance abuse treatment (Westermeyer and Boedicker 2000). Other U.S. studies show that women were more likely to remain abstinent after treatment for cocaine dependence (Weiss et al. 1997), and were more likely to complete drug abuse treatment programs (Kingree 1995, Hser et al. 1991).

Notably, female and male drug users have different psychosocial profiles. Female users tend to have lower self-esteem and more family and social problems, while men have higher rates of antisocial personality disorders and higher rates of prior homelessness (Kingree 1995, Weiss et al. 1997). Male drug abusers report more antisocial behavior, including vandalism, use of weapons, and setting fires (Goldstein et al. 1996). Notably, the least successful addicts at kicking drug dependency are disproportionately young unemployed unmarried men (Hser et al. 1991).

One area in developed countries in which men appear to be making real progress, particularly relative to women, is in reducing tobacco dependency. Men appear to have higher sustained quit rates after treatment programs, particularly those utilizing nicotine gum as a withdrawal aid (Bjornson et al. 1995). However, smoking remains a major cause of lower male life expectancy in developed countries. One five-country study attributed 2.4 years, or more than 40 percent of the total sex difference in life expectancy in 1970-74, to smoking; by 1985-89 it had dropped to 1.8 years, or 30 percent of the difference, unfortunately in large part because of the increase in the loss of female life expectancy (Valkonen and VanPoppel 1997).

In addition, there is no evidence that smoking rates are dropping in the developing world; rather they appear to be rising, particularly among the young. While the rates among women are rising, the rates among men are still much higher. For instance, in Bulgaria, men are more than twice as likely to smoke as are women (Balabanovaa et al. 1998). In Indonesia, there is a very low rate of women smokers even though they are relatively active in the tobacco growing and processing sectors (Barraclough 1999). Apparently cultural prohibitions against women's smoking, but neutrality or positive acceptance of men's smoking, continue to work in favor of women in this area.

A number of narcotics are widely used in developing regions but almost unknown in the developed countries except among immigrant groups. Two that receive widespread usage and that are indigenous to the developing world are betel and qat, both mild stimulants. Qat, which

plays a central role in Yemeni culture as well as being widely used in Somalia, Kenya, Eritrea, and Djibouti, is consumed primarily, though not solely, by men (Murphy 1992; Rushby 1995). Betel is widely used over much of Southeast Asia and New Guinea, with an estimated ten to twenty-five percent of the world's population chewing betel quid regularly (Pickwell et al. 1994). It is not clear if there is a strong difference in usage by sex in all regions where it is used; although one study in Kaohsiung, Taiwan found ninety-four percent of betel users to be male, and all daily users to be male (Chen and Shaw 1996) and several studies of junior high school students in a variety of countries found a much higher prevalence of betel chewing among boys than girls (Yang et al. 1996). Betel usage is associated with oral cancer, but the main issue with both betel and qat appears to be the time and money spent on their usage (Cooper 2000; Chang 1997).

A different type of addiction is gambling. This is a hard topic on which to get reliable figures, partly due to the illegal nature of the practice in many jurisdictions. In the United States, women and men are relatively equally represented among casino customers, with a slight skewing towards women (52 versus 48 percent) (Hoffman et al. 1999, p. 10). However, among heavy gamblers, it is clear that men are overrepresented. Men have a one-and-a-half to two times higher prevalence of at-risk, problem, and pathological gambling (Gerstein et al. 1999, p. 26). While many anecdotal reports from developing countries relate to a higher rate of gambling behavior among men, there are not as yet comparative statistics available allowing one to ascertain whether male prevalence among heavy gamblers is universal.

Summary regarding destruction/depreciation of men's human capital

We have now reviewed figures for a wide range of “depreciations” of human capital. The accumulation of evidence makes the case that men face serious problems in the broad area of destruction—often by their own hands—of their human capital. It is also clear that biological differences between men/boys and women/girls cannot account for the broad range of differential outcomes by gender across and within human societies (see WHO 2000b for additional literature review supporting this assertion). Hence there is clearly room for policy intervention to attempt to reduce destruction of men's (and women's) human capital on numerous fronts.

Accumulation of Men's Human Capital

Human capital accumulation is a rosier area for men, relative to women at least. However, a number of alarming trends have surfaced that indicate that men, in some countries at least, have slowed their rate of accumulation of human capital.

The main focus of this report will be on formal schooling. This is not to say that other informal types of accumulations are not also important, but in general they are harder to measure in the developing country context. While we know in the developed country context that measures of firm tenure and work experience are critical determinants of earnings levels, these types of studies are not yet available for developing countries, at least not for representative samples of workers from these countries. However, it is likely (by extrapolation from developed country studies, plus the knowledge that men have higher formal economic participation

rates—see Table 16 below) that men have a substantial edge on women in accumulations of human capital of these types. Whether these rates of accumulation are rising or falling is a hard question to answer. In areas where prime-age workers are particularly hard-hit by HIV/AIDS, it is possible that these accumulation rates are very low indeed.

Primary education: Table 12 shows gross enrollment ratios for males and females and lists countries by the differential between these enrollment ratios. There are only sixteen countries (out of 139) where the male ratio is lower than the female ratio, and another sixteen that have achieved the happy medium of equal (and generally close to 100) ratios; the median male-female difference is 2.0. Given that ratios are calculated relative to the “appropriate” age cohort, numbers greater than 100 are cause for concern, as are numbers less than 100. The countries with an imbalance in favor of girls generally have high ratios, often over 100. Lesotho, which leads off the list, is an interesting case, in that both schooling attainment and female literacy are substantially higher for women than for men therein (3.0 v. 2.4 years of schooling 84 percent v. 62 percent literate) (Sweetman 2001a p. 71).

Table 13 presents a different angle on attainment of primary education, showing persistence rates to grade five for males and females. Here, out of a smaller sample of countries where these data are available, there is a larger number of countries (24) where the female statistic is greater than the male statistic, and the median differential (-0.1) indicates a slightly lower persistence rate for men. Lesotho again leads off the list with the only double-digit difference, followed by a number of African and Latin American countries (and Bhutan).

Secondary education: On the secondary level, a much larger number of countries (60 out of 135) display higher enrollment ratios for girls than for boys, while only six (with widely varying enrollment ratio levels) achieve equal ratios (Table 14). A wide geographic range of countries is represented among the sixty. These countries tend, however, to have higher enrollment ratios on average than the countries at the other end of the scale, implying that this is a “problem” that arises only when educational attendance reaches a relatively high level; overall, the median male-female ratio difference is 1.0.

These numbers have not escaped notice in developed countries, where a number of related statistics have gained currency. In the United States, boys earn seventy percent of D and F grades, comprise two thirds of the students labeled as learning disabled, a majority of high school dropouts, and eighty percent of attention deficit disorder diagnoses; are outnumbered by girls in student government, honor societies, school newspapers, and debating clubs (Mulrine 2001, p. 42). Even in sports, where boys still have a substantially disproportionate representation, girls have rapidly increased their participation (thanks in large part to Title IX). In the United Kingdom, results from the General Certificate of Secondary Education examination, taken at age 16, “show a considerable gap between the sexes in scholastic achievement: 42.8% boys compared with 53.4% girls get grade C or above...and in lower social classes the gap is even greater” (Kraemer 2000, p. 1610); this pattern of girls outperforming boys on secondary school standardized tests is common across most of Western Europe (WHO 2000b, p. 19). Indeed, in the United States, the dropout rate, which is higher for males than for females (11.9 percent of males and 10.5% of females ages 16 to 24 are high school dropouts), is five times as high from families in the lowest income quartile relative to the highest (United States

Department of Education 2000: 1999 figures). Boys are more likely to repeat at least one grade: in the United States, of 16 to 24 year olds, 16.9 percent of the males and 9.6% of the females report having been retained for at least one grade (United States Department of Education 2000).

These phenomena are not confined to developed countries, however. For instance, higher grade-repeat rates have also been reported for boys in Mexico (Parker and Pederzini 1999). While the focus over the last few years regarding educational interventions has been on women, the development community is beginning to take note of these statistics. Stating its concern over the gender differences that are appearing to disadvantage boys in a number of countries (e.g., several Latin American and Caribbean nations), the World Bank (2001, p. 265) has called for potential “education interventions or other social policies that target males rather than females.”

Research on what is causing these differences has identified a number of factors that may work against boys’ achieving academically. These include learning disabilities affecting boys at a higher rate than girls, different socialization of boys and girls, differences in the way school environments affect boys and girls, and higher rates of working outside the home for boys than for girls (WHO 2000b, pp. 19-20). Again, there appears to be substantial room for program interventions that would improve academic outcomes for boys.

Higher education: At the tertiary, or higher-education level, as shown in Table 15, we see again a large number of countries (59 out of 114) where gross enrollment ratios are higher for women than for men; indeed, the median difference (-0.2) shows the leaning towards higher female enrollment. This is a common phenomenon in developed countries, including many European countries, the United States, Australia, and Canada. Meanwhile, countries with similar enrollment ratios by sex tend also to have relatively low enrollment ratios, and numerous developing countries have ratios that favor men.

In part these higher enrollment ratios for women in developed countries reflect higher rates of women going back to school to complete their degrees. However, this is not the whole story, and the numbers still imply that in a steady state, more women than men will receive higher education. Indeed, the pattern shows up already among new potential entrants to the tertiary sector. In the United States, while 51 percent of recent high school graduates are men, of these recent high school graduates, 61 percent of the men and 64 percent of the women enroll in college or other degree-granting institutions. This is not just a matter of men systematically delaying entry for a short time: 34.1 percent of all 18 to 24 year old males, and 37 percent of all females enroll. The net result is that 44 percent of students in degree-granting institutions are men (United States Department of Education 2000).

This does not necessarily imply that men are worse off because of this trend; they may have good earning prospects without entering college, including craft apprenticeships and computer work that does require a formal degree. However, a college degree remains an important ticket to higher lifetime earnings for both sexes.

Variance in outcomes for men and women

The gendered patterns seen in the area of education confirm a general statement about outcomes for men versus women: men are subject to a higher variance of outcomes. While they are disproportionately represented among high-achievers, they are also disproportionately represented among low achievers. This is true whether measured by achievement test scores, grades received, or incomes earned. However, this variation in outcomes is not due predominantly to genetic factors; otherwise the variation would be consistent across societies. Hence there is plenty of room for intervention that would reduce variation in men's (and women's) outcomes both within and between societies. Again, to the extent that human development is about pulling up the most disadvantaged, whether that relates to whole societies or segments within a society, the low-achieving men appear fully worthy of consideration and intervention in order to help them overcome their handicaps in the area of human capital attainment.

Changing Roles and Identities for Men

...in terms of cultural evolution men may well have done their job: they have pretty much set up modern civilisations and technologies; they may not be needed to keep them going.

—“The Trouble with Men,” *The Economist* (1996a, p. 19)

While this controversial and hyperbolic statement from five years ago in the *Economist* still reverberates, it is hopefully premature to declare half of the human race as obsolete. However, many of the trends noted in this editorial and the accompanying article, “Tomorrow's Second Sex” (*The Economist* 1996b), continue. These include the apparent reduced participation of men, at least relative to women, in “formal” economic work, the corresponding lack of increased male participation in the informal sector, including child care (leading to a net increase in the work performed by women), and strains on social and family structures caused by the apparent obsolescence of traditional male roles, with insufficient new male role definition to offset this trend in a positive manner. If the world changes, then gender roles—for both genders—need to change as well.

The Changing Structure of Work

Reconfigurations in the occupational and industrial structure of most developed countries that began in the 1970s, reached full force in the 1980s and 1990s, with reverberations into the organization of work in the industrial sector in developing countries. Unionized sectors, which were heavily male, lost ground in employment and wage setting. In the United States the female/male wage ratio, after a fairly stable period, began to rise steadily in the 1980s, mainly because male wages were falling. This trend was not seen in other developed countries, due in part to greater wage-setting and different timing of the passage of antidiscrimination laws. Women in developed countries moved into the labor force in increased numbers beginning in the late 1970s, and they moved into the growing sectors of the economy, while men, white men in particular, were disproportionately found in the declining sectors, including manufacturing, mining, and agriculture (Jacobsen 1991). The *Economist* article (1996b, p. 23) asserted that the increase in “knowledge-based” employment exacerbated the rising unemployment of men

relative to women. While women still display much less formal labor market involvement than do men, a number of indicators and studies, a few of which are highlighted below (participation, unemployment, reverse discrimination, migration), indicate their rising participation in the labor market and the changing nature of male participation.

Economic activity rates: The broad pattern of changing participation in formal employment can be seen in Table 16 for a broad set of countries, developed and developing. Table 16 contrasts the male-female differential in labor participation rates (using the “economically active” rates rather than the more narrowly-defined labor force participation rates, and allowing for a broad age range rather than the narrow “prime-age” worker range in order to be more inclusive) at the approximate start of the “post-industrial, knowledge-based economy, globalization” trend (taken as circa 1978) to the most recent rates available. Countries are organized to highlight those at the beginning of the table who had the largest change in the male-female participation rate differential over this period.

The vast majority of countries show a negative change in the male-female rate differential; in other words, the female participation rate has risen relative to the male rate. Hence, while the median male-female differential in participation rates was 24.6 percentage points in 1978, the median difference has fallen to 16.7 percentage points by 2000 (with the median country experiencing a 5.2 percentage point narrowing). In many cases, this is because the female rate has risen substantially while the male rate has fallen; in other cases the male rate has only risen slightly. Notable exceptions to this pattern include a number of Eastern European countries, including Russia, where female participation has fallen more rapidly than male participation.

Unemployment rates: Another interesting pattern is highlighted by Table 17, which organizes countries in declining order by the differential between the male and female unemployment rates. The majority of countries for which these data are available have a relatively higher female rate, but a number of countries, including a number of Asian economic powerhouses (Korea, Hong Kong, and Japan) have higher male rates. The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are also members of this group (in the United States, the rates have been quite close for several years now, with occasional inversion). In a number of other countries, both developed and developing, the rates are less than one percentage point apart, with a median difference of eight-tenths of a percentage point. These patterns imply continued weakness in the labor market for men, even as unemployment rates have finally fallen in Europe after years of double-digit figures.

However, unemployment rates, particularly long-term unemployment rates, which have been highlighted in the recent European experience, identify one potential group of men who are worse off relative to society as a whole. Just as with concern about female-headed households in poverty becoming even worse off, concern might be focussed on whether the “worse-off” men are getting even worse off (for some pioneering work in this area see Smith 2001 re disadvantaged men in the United Kingdom). For example, Arias (2000) analyzes recent household survey data for urban areas in Argentina, Brazil, and Costa Rica, and finds the greatest increases in unemployment incidence and duration among the “typical vulnerable ‘young, informal, and less educated’ group,” although he also finds increased duration of unemployment

among older and more educated men. Even in countries like the post-Soviet states, where unemployment may have affected women as much or more than men, there is concern that men's roles in the transition and post-transition society are weakening in both the public and private spheres (cf. Ashwin 2000).

Reverse discrimination: The question also arises as to what level of discrimination against male workers exists in the labor market. It may be that this type of discrimination takes its main form in hiring discrimination rather than pay discrimination. While a number of studies have established that numerous employers, particularly in the “maquiladora” sectors in developing countries, have a strong preference for women (cf. Ward 1990, Deyo 1989, Joekes 1987; Central American and Asian examples are most commonly given for this export-related phenomenon), it is hard to measure the effect on the overall labor market of these sectoral changes in the preferred workers (and note that preference does not automatically lead to highly positive outcomes for these employees).

A related question is to what degree the increase in women's formal labor supply has led to “crowding out” of men. Research on United States labor markets appears to show that women are a substitute for recent immigrants and minorities (particularly African Americans and Hispanics) (Hamermesh 1986, p. 463). To the extent that these are the relatively disadvantaged male members of the labor force, the increase in women's participation disproportionately affected the worse-off men.

Migration: One area for which systematic data are lacking, although there are many research efforts that add pieces to the puzzle, is the gendered nature of both internal and external migration. It is well known that migration patterns, particularly those relating directly to particular occupations, are generally imbalanced by gender. Men tend to migrate farther and are more likely to be external migrants (Momsen 1991, p. 21). Examples of gender-differentiated migrations include the flow of female domestics out of Asian countries into the Middle East, the current “gold rush” of male miners to mining operations in Africa (Lovgren 2001, Wilkinson 1987), and the general flow in Africa of men to urban centers, leaving women behind to maintain the village structure. This has led to urban-rural gender imbalance, with more women than men in Latin American cities, and the reverse situation in African cities (Momsen 1991, p. 21). While much of the feminist literature has centered on the issues relating either to female migrants or the women left behind, little attention has been given to the needs of male migrants or of the men left behind (often not married to the female migrants, but this exacerbates sex ratio imbalances in places like rural China).

The Changing Social Structure

Numerous social changes are occurring simultaneously with the changes in the structure of work. Disruptions in social ordering may be freeing for individuals or for groups, including potentially women. But they may also be highly jarring for other individuals or groups, particularly those groups who are least able to adjust to change or who are losing the most in the course of the change. These groups might well disproportionately include men. The obvious reaction to make, based on the feminist literature, is that a disruption in the social system of patriarchy will be hard on men—but who cares? However, another approach is to worry about

those people who have the most trouble staying connected to the social structure. Here the indirect effects on women become perhaps more notable as well; if men are disconnected from society, it is difficult to see how this will benefit women. This section highlights some concerns regarding men's participation in broadly-defined areas of social interaction (marriage, parenthood, and family and community involvement).

Marriage: Indeed, many of the trends that we have worried about in terms of how they impact women have a flip side relating to men which has been barely discussed. For example, one of the most controversial issues in much of Asia has been the vanishing of women due to a variety of anti-female practices, including selective abortion (Johansson and Nygren 1991, Coale 1991). This has led to extremely skewed sex ratios in many countries, notably China and India, which among other things increases the probability that many men in these countries will never marry, or will marry only late in life.

There is an increasing amount of evidence that marriage is “good” for men, good in terms of its apparent causation of better physical and psychological health, as well as higher income (Nock 1998; Waite and Gallagher 2000). Nock (1998) stresses the importance of the customary structure of men, arguing that “normative marriage” (by which he means “the institution of expectations, laws, beliefs, customs, and assumptions that are a part of every marital relationship” —p. 41) is “the only way by which *most* males can become ‘men’” (p. 6). Yet it cannot be taken for granted that all men have the opportunity to marry, or to marry at a young age.

For instance, consider some recent data on marriage markets as displayed in Tables 18a and 18b. Table 18a shows the percentage ever married among young adults, 20 to 24 year olds. These data display remarkable consistency across countries in that women are always (except in San Marino!) more likely to be married at this age than are men (with a 24.4 median percentage point difference between their marriage rates). This is generally taken as a sign that women are co-opted early in life, married to older men who can control them, and are unable to develop their own identity. However, to the extent that marriage is a desirable social state, at least for men, this also means that fewer men are able to enter it at an early age. To the extent that any form of stable partnership, including same-sex, has good effects on physical or psychological health, there is no evidence that men are entering into stable same-sex partnerships in lieu of marriage in developing countries.

Perhaps more tellingly, the shortfall in relative marriage rates continues later in life, as shown in Table 18b, the percentage ever married among 45 to 49 year olds. While men have caught up substantially to the marriage rate among women by this point, they are still less likely to be married than women are in a majority of countries (although with only a median difference of seven tenths of a percent). Of course this is not a cohort analysis on what will happen to the current 20 to 24 year olds; one expects that the marriage rates for men will be much lower as we enter an age in which there is a significance surplus of men relative to women in the usual marrying-age range of 20 to 44. Only a small part of the adjustment can occur by having women marry at younger ages. Interestingly, there are also a number of countries in which the male marriage rate at this age is higher than for the women. A number of Caribbean nations figure among this group, countries in which the marriage rates for both sexes are relatively low. Again,

to the extent that marriage is a desirable social state, Table 18b shows that men are less likely than women are to enter it.

In developed and developing countries alike, the apparent increase in the difficulty of setting up and maintaining a stable married-couple family is a clear indicator of social stress. This is to large degree related to the inability of young people, men in particular, to afford to marry. Wilson (1996) argued that the low rates of marriage among African Americans were due in large part to the weak labor market for African American men. He appears to be supported in this argument by the recent increase in marriage rate for the U.S. black community during a period of rising employment in the late 1990s.

Parenthood: Changes in marriage rates both reflect and create changing roles for men in the family structure. The role of the family itself has changed over time in a myriad of ways, but still serves multiple essential functions in both developing and developed societies. In developed societies, men find themselves simultaneously called upon to do more childcare-related tasks, albeit to fewer children per family, while at the same time (although not always the same men) finding their ties and claims on the family weakened, particularly in cases where they have been separated by divorce or partially disenfranchised by never having married the mother of their children at all. Fathers' degree of involvement with their children appears to be strongly influenced by the state of their relationship with the children's mother (Engle and Leonard 1995, p. 57). Even in intact families, there is ongoing discussion over the redefinition of the "household head" role (moving towards a dual head model), where control over household finances and decisionmaking is continually negotiated rather than settled on the man early on in the marriage. Similarly, division of labor, whether between market and non-market, or regarding the divvying up of household chores, is subject to implicit or explicit negotiation in many contemporary households. As women's paid work has increased, men have decreased their paid work hours (particularly in a lifecycle context rather than during prime working ages), but have not correspondingly increased their household work hours.

The literature, both popular and scholarly, on changing roles within marriages and families is much vaster for the developed country context than the developing country context. Marriages and families are treated in more of a dispassionate demographic context by researchers, and the focus has been more on women and their fertility histories than on men. There has been some recent corrective research by demographers. However, Newby and Biddlecom (1997) argue that the recent interest in men (after years of neglect) by demographic researchers, particularly related to fertility research, still tends to treat men from a "problem-oriented perspective" and as women's partners rather than as individuals with their own distinct reproductive histories.

Yet in order to arrive at a potential redefinition of fatherhood, that will carry men into the twenty-first century, men must be treated as integral to children's lives, and fatherhood as integral to many of their lives. For instance, in a recent report on men in children's lives, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (1997) treats this as an imperative, although more from the instrumental ground of thinking about how altered socialization of male children will improve women's lives in the long run (see also the earlier UNICEF consultation report, Engle 1995). There has been increased interest in this area in the U.S. regarding difficulties low-income men

have in maintaining connections with their children. The Center on Fathers, Families, and Public Policy is one new organization working in this area (www.cffpp.org). More attention is now being paid by researchers to understanding the roles that men, particularly as fathers, currently play in children's lives (Bruce, Lloyd, and Leonard 1995), including how they may facilitate children's intellectual and social development (Bernard van Leer Foundation 1996). It is helpful to think about the different ways in which men can be fathers. Swanson (1997, p. 3) lays out "three distinct roles for men as fathers": biological, economic providers for the family, and "social fathers." It appears to be the latter way that requires the most redefinition, although in the developing country context the provider aspect is critical as well.

Family and community involvement: As 'social fathers,' men are important within extended families; as 'social persons,' men are important within communities. Men's roles in extended families and communities have been changing as well, but not in ways that are thoroughly researched and well understood. While Putnam's (2000) recent work on reduced community ties within the United States at the end of the twentieth century is provocative, little comparable work exists in either the developed or developing country context. More work is needed to understand the web of ties within families and communities, the gendered nature of those ties, and the importance of those ties to men's and women's well-being. Formal and informal community involvement, including relations with peer groups, are all affected by the development and urbanization processes in ways that are only weakly understood. For example, the role of both formal and informal mentors in children's lives is only beginning to be studied systematically (cf. Tierney and Grossman 2000 for a generally positive evaluation of longer-term effects of the U.S. Big Brother/Big Sister Program).

Another area where we do not yet have good understanding of processes in either developed or developing countries is the treatment by family and community of troubled men and elderly men. To a large degree, they are removed from the community and society into isolation wards. Greater numbers of men than women reside in a variety of institutional settings, including mental hospitals, correctional institutions, chronic disease hospitals (including tuberculosis), and homes for the mentally handicapped (Schmittroth 1995, Table 149). For instance, in the United States, men outnumber women across these settings by over a million, outnumbering them in every age group except the most elderly (United States Department of Commerce 2001, Table 1).

Men also appear disproportionately in the socially disenfranchised form of the homeless. In United States urban settings, single men comprise some 44 percent of the homeless population (while families with children comprise 36 percent, single women 13 percent, and unaccompanied minors—many of whom are male—seven percent). Some 22 percent of homeless people are mentally ill; 37 percent are substance abusers; 15 percent are veterans (United States Conference of Mayors 2000, p. ii). In Latin America, most street children—children who live, work, and sleep in the streets, generally lacking regular contact with their families—are boys (Takahashi and Cederlof 2000).

To some degree, the problem of how to care for elderly men has been not considered a problem because there are disproportionately few of them in many countries. As we saw in the previous section of the report, this is not surprising given men's lower life expectancies. Table

19 illustrates this in another way by listing countries in rising order of what percentage of the population aged 65 and above is male. Russia leads off the chart with a mere 30.7 percent male of their elderly population. At the other end of the table, there are numerous Middle Eastern countries, where women's survival to elderly status is problematic. At the median, men comprise 43.9 percent of the elderly (65 and over) population, well below their representation at birth.

Much research remains to be done

This section of the report has highlighted a number of areas in which further investigation is warranted. Many of these topics have been difficult to analyze because of their subjective nature as well as the paucity of relevant systematic cross-country data. The previous part of the report covered a more objective set of topics on which more data were available. There a strong case could be made from available data that men suffer systematic disadvantages across societies that are often exacerbated in the developing country context. However, the relatively qualitative nature of this section should not be taken as a statement that the effects of changing social structure on men's lives is not equally important for affecting their well-being.

3. CONCLUSION: WHAT CAN BE DONE?

This report has laid out what is hopefully is a convincing case that attention should be paid to a variety of men's issues in *human* development. While much of the evidence presented comes from a broader range of countries than those that are usual subjects of articles on economic development, this is to underline the argument that a substantial proportion of men are disadvantaged even in developed countries. One must put aside arguments regarding essentialism or the naturalness of the existing patterns, just as they have been put aside when invoked to explain why women must continue to maintain an inferior position in human societies. Rather, compassion and the desire to raise human living standards in all areas where it is clear that it could be done should rule the day. Many men in developing countries lead lives that could be measurably improved by increased attention to, among other things, workplace safety, anti-violence initiatives, better health delivery, and anti-substance abuse programs. Many men in developed countries could also benefit from improved access to existing programs, as well as the imaginative development of new programs, both social and health-oriented, targeted to their particular needs.

One issue that may raise its ugly head at this point is the question of resources, the assumption being that if gender-oriented programs focus more on men, women will lose resources that were previously assigned to them. On the other hand, the opposite could be argued as well. By bringing men into gender programs in an integrated way as both clients and providers, more resources could be made available to be directed through these programs.

There is apparently widespread, if muted, support in the gender and development community for involving men in the work done by their programs. Chant and Gutmann (1999, Chapter 5) report on their interviews with "41 specialists in development and gender questions, representing nearly 30 organisations, agencies, foundations, and consultancies with broad

involvement in WID [Women in Development]/GAD [Gender and Development] projects” (p. 57). Of these thirty-three women and eight men: “all but three or four individuals expressed a strong desire for involving men in GAD work. That said, less than ten individuals were able to describe actual work done with men by their organisations. Further, nearly all people consulted conveyed serious concerns regarding how men should and should not be ‘brought on board’” (p. 57).

Apparently one question is how to move beyond lip service regarding the desirability of involving men, towards implementation of a variety of programs that both utilize men as service providers and have men as clients. Towards this goal six recommendations are offered. The first two advocate additional data collection, dissemination, and research in order to make more concrete many of the topics touched on in this report. The next four relate to implementation of programmatic changes within the development community.

All of these six recommendations would hopefully move the development community towards adoption of a more holistic approach towards gender issues in which explicit account is taken of how both men and women contribute to, participate in, and perpetuate the gender system. Hence, an overall goal, and a summary recommendation, is to move closer towards a more holistic gender framework that addresses gender as it pertains to both women and men, and examines gender as a system; i.e., focuses on the relational aspects of gender.

Foster Additional Data Collection and Disaggregation

Disaggregate existing data by gender whenever possible to highlight gender differences in *either* direction. A number of countries have made this a relatively routine requirement for publicly distributed data analysis. Canada, Sweden, and the Philippines are all good examples of how to treat the routine gender-disaggregation of official government statistics (Caiazza and Hartmann 2001).

Consider new types of data to be collected and disaggregated on a relatively regular basis. For example, Shrader (2001) makes interesting suggestions about how one might collect crime and violence statistics so as to elucidate their gendered nature.

Collect and disseminate more data regarding gender-related patterns for ethnic minorities and isolated communities within countries. Much detail is lost by publishing data only, or primarily, at a country-aggregated level. A good model is Canadian interest in patterns among its native peoples. There has also been a fair amount of interest regarding Hispanic patterns in the United States, including regional differences and differences between Hispanic groups.

Sponsor Research in Potentially Male-Issue-Relevant Areas

Many of the areas discussed above under the “changing social structure” heading would fall into this category. These would include, but are not limited to, the roles of men in socialization of children, interhousehold linkages of time and money, and the lives of single men. As mentioned above, more data collection, and associated research, regarding gender roles in ethnic minorities and isolated communities within countries is desirable.

In addition, research is needed on what types of interventions are most effective in dealing with men. While projects may be designed in well-meaning ways, if they require too much time and/or emotional commitment they may experience a high dropout or failure rate. For example, Islas (1999) describes a Mexico City organization's sessions with men involved in domestic violence, as "very confrontational" and also as having a high dropout rate (p. 146). A description of a similar program in Jamaica also indicated the challenging aspect of such programs for both the men and the facilitators involved (International Planned Parenthood Foundation [IPPF] Western Hemisphere Region 2001a). On the other hand, another program that used a CD-ROM to engage young men about male knowledge and attitudes ((IPPF Western Hemisphere Region 2001b) met with high approval by users, perhaps in part because they could use it in a relatively private setting and at a self-paced rate. There is need for incorporating a follow-up research phase on social interventions; the World Bank and other international agencies could encourage grant recipients to include plans for such follow-up in their proposals, or fund research proposals that are linked to action proposals but that take charge of the evaluation.

Continue to Incorporate Men into Gender Planning Initiatives

The incorporation of men can be done both at the higher (leadership) level and at the local level of gender initiatives. Bhasin (2001) provides a concrete discussion of a number of such workshops, both all-male and mixed-sex, in the South Asian context (Nepal, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh). Joshua (2001) provides a shorter but informative treatment regarding workshops in the East African context. Such workshops may work better with male trainers as active participants (both Joshua 2001, and Smith 2001, advocate this). This can also occur in specific contexts such as family planning (AVSC-Engender Health and IPPF 1999a, Helzner 1996).

Fund Initiatives Related to Male Issues

Fund various initiatives that target interventions aimed at reducing the problems that men face as identified in this report. In many cases, a direct analogy for the program can be drawn to existing social service interventions in developed countries. However, there are a number of direct models in developing country contexts as well. Examples of interventions include:

- Discussion of masculinity: *Salud y Género*, a Mexican group (described in Barker 1998 and EngenderHealth 2001b), runs workshops for men implementing a "participatory methodology" to help men "reflect about masculinity and male involvement and to find new ways of expressing themselves" (Barker 1998). They focus in particular on secondary school youth, men in prisons, and staff and volunteers with various health, education, community development, and rural development organizations. Alsop (2001) describes a number of other Mexican programs for men in this and related areas.

- Domestic violence: Many programs, of which a few were discussed above, work with men involved in domestic violence in an attempt to rehabilitate them. The role

of men and of men's organizations in ending domestic violence has been discussed recently in a UNICEF workshop (UNICEF 2000; see also www.mapev.org, the website of the organization Men as Partners for Ending Violence Against Women and Children).

- Health issues: UNICEF (1997, p. 32) discusses various initiatives that targeted men, including HIV/AIDS and syphilis awareness programs, and discussion of family roles in a Vietnamese program.

- Family planning: The Population Council (1998) sponsored a program in Bangladesh to involve men in family planning. EngenderHealth (2001a) has several examples on its web page of how men have been involved in this area in its programs. There appears to be increasing awareness of the need to involve men in discussions revolving around reproduction and reproductive health. Sternberg (2001) describes work with Nicaraguan men in identifying issues of concern to them in this area and understanding the stereotypes in their culture. AVSC-EngenderHealth and IPPF Western Hemisphere Region (1999b) describes programs in Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, and Colombia (as well as the work in Mexico by *Salud y Género*) that promote male involvement in family planning, including in some cases opening male-only clinics.

- Parenting: the Bernard van Leer Foundation (2001) has funded and documented a number of projects that examine the roles of the father in various societies (including Caribbean and Arab Israeli communities), as well as considering how to involve fathers more with children.

- Substance abuse: The World Bank has funded alcohol abuse-related health projects in Eastern Europe and Argentina (Pyne 2002, Annex II).

Based on these pilot program experiences, in general, consider the use of male counselors and trainers as well as (rather than instead of) female ones. In particular, consider their use for health initiatives and violence-reduction initiatives.

While male-focussed work has been initiated in many countries, the work tends to be marginal and underfunded within gender programs. For instance, *Salud y Genero* reports that its main problem is securing sufficient funding to maintain and expand its programming (Alsop 2001, p. 24). Thus, these programs and similar ones need to be strengthened, enhanced, and brought into the mainstream of gender work within each world region.

Modify Existing Programs to Reduce Negative and Amplify Positive Effects for Men

Consider explicitly how various development initiatives, whether or not they are gender development initiatives, affect men. In gender planning in development as outlined by Moser (1993) this would naturally occur along with a parallel exercise regarding women. In cases where clear tradeoffs exist between making women better off and making men worse off, consider other factors as well, such as disadvantaged (lower-class) status in society of the gendered groupings before making decisions as to whom to favor.

This may take the form at first of identifying and prioritizing needs for specific groups of men. For instance, WHO (2000a) coordinated a set of regional surveys around the world in which health promotion programs that worked with adolescent boys were asked to identify needs and consider effective settings and strategies for working with this age group. In the World Bank's own work, a number of projects (e.g., the Chile Municipal Development Project Two, the Panama Health Project, the Ecuador Modernization and Reform of the Health Sector Project) now have explicit targets for male participation or specific subprograms targeted at men.

Attempt “Alliance Politics” Where Possible in Order to Incorporate Men

Several writers who have addressed the question of how to include men in the discussion of how gender shapes society have suggested the strategy of mobilizing them towards a goal that is not gender-related at first glance, but turns out unavoidably to involve discussion of gender relations. Connell (1995) advocates *alliance politics*, where “the project of social justice depends on the overlapping of interests between different groups (rather than mobilization of one group around its common interest” (p. 238). He cites as example the environmental movement, which has forced activists to understand and come to terms with the gendered nature of human interactions with the environment.

Interestingly, this approach generally requires the men involved to reject explicitly notions of masculinity that would lead, say, to exploitation of the environment rather than its preservation in a relatively pristine state. In other words, alliance politics lead to antisexist politics, which “must be a source of disunity among men, not a sense of solidarity” (Connell 1995, p. 236). This stands in notable contrast to the general supposition that antisexist politics for women require development of a sense of unity and solidarity among women (although there have been counterarguments to that approach, particularly—unsurprisingly—coming from lower-class and racial and ethnic minority women).

One alliance, or potential umbrella area, is the quest to achieve better parenting. This requires careful evaluation of how boys and girls are raised differently, both from each other and by the different persons involved in their raising. Consider in particular “training” men in order to strengthen certain of their roles in the family and community. Just as we hope to provide training for women to enter the paid workforce, as with recent welfare-to-work programs in the United States, why not train men to take on new unpaid roles, like parenting, household maintenance, and volunteer leadership in the community? Rather than thinking that men cannot be coerced into taking on new tasks as their relative share of the world's paid work decreases, let us help them to meet this challenge instead of assuming that they will either learn such tasks on their own, or become increasingly irrelevant within their own families. This can be done in relatively informal settings at least in part, such as by providing spaces like discussion groups in which men can reflect on new social and family roles.

In conclusion, the unmet needs of men as well as women are numerous. In order for all persons to have a chance to realize full lives and control their own destinies, male issues, as well as female issues, in development need to be recognized and addressed.

4. REFERENCES

- Alsop, Bronwen. 2001. "Fatherhood and Masculinity Programs in Mexico: Identification and Analysis." Working Paper, World Bank Gender Team, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit, Latin American and the Caribbean Unit. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Arias, Omar. 2000. "Male Economic Marginalization in Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica." Working Paper. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Ashwin, Sarah (ed.). 2000. *Gender, State and Society in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia*. London: Routledge.
- AVSC International and IPPF/Western Hemisphere Region. 1999a. "Male Participation in Sexual and Reproductive Health: New Paradigms." Symposium Report. New York: AVSC/IPPF Western Hemisphere Region.
- _____. 1999b. "Five Case Studies for the Symposium on Male Participation in Sexual and Reproductive Health: New Paradigms." New York: AVSC/IPPF Western Hemisphere Region.
- Balabanovaa, Dina, Martin Bobakb, and Martin McKee. 1998. "Patterns of Smoking in Bulgaria." *Tobacco Control* 7: 383-385.
- Barker, Gary. 1998. "Salud y Género (Mexico): Participatory Workshops on Masculinity and Male Involvement." Draft Report, July 14.
- Barraclough, Simon. 1999. "Women and Tobacco in Indonesia." *Tobacco Control* 8: 327-332.
- Bernard van Leer Foundation. 1996. "The Role of Fathers in Child Development." Discussion Paper.
- _____. 2001. "Fathers Matter Too." *Early Childhood Matters: The Bulletin of the Bernard van Leer Foundation* No. 97 (February).
- Bhasin, Kamla. 2001. "Gender Training with Men: Experiences and Reflections from South Asia." In *Men's Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 20-34.
- Bjornson, Wendy, Cynthia Rand, and John E. Connett. 1995. "Gender Differences in Smoking Cessation after 3 Years in the Lung Health Study." *American Journal of Public Health* 85: 223-230.

- Breines, Ingeborg, Robert Connell, and Ingrid Eide (eds.). 2000. *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Bruce, Judith, Cynthia B. Lloyd, and Ann Leonard. 1995. *Families in Focus: New Perspectives on Mothers, Fathers, and Children*. New York: Population Council.
- Buvinic, Mayra, Andrew Morrison, and Michael Shifter. 1999. "Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Framework for Action." Inter-American Development Bank, Sustainable Development Department, Technical Study.
- Çagatay, Nilüfer. 1998. "Gender and Poverty." United Nations Development Programme, Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division Working Paper No. 5.
- Caiazza, Amy and Heidi Hartmann. 2001. "Measuring Women as if Women Mattered: Final Report from IWPR's Working Group on Social Indicators of Women's Status." Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Carovano, Kathryn. 1995. "HIV and the Challenges Facing Men." UNDP, HIV and Development Programme, Issues Paper No. 15.
- Chang, Leslie. 1997. "Juice Makes Taiwanese See Red in More than Saliva." *Wall Street Journal* (August 22): 1.
- Chant, Sylvia and Matthew C. Gutmann. 1999. "'Men-Streaming' Gender? Questioning New Currents in Gender and Development Policy." Draft Report for World Bank.
- Chen, J. W. and J. H. Shaw. 1996. "A Study on Betel Quid Chewing Behavior Among Kaohsiung Residents aged 15 Years and Above." *Journal of Oral Pathology & Medicine* 25(3): 140-143.
- Christensen, K., et al. 2000. "X-linked Genetic Factors Regulate Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Kinetics in Females." *Blood* 95(7): 2449-2551.
- Coale, Ansley J. 1991. "Excess Female Mortality and the Balance of the Sexes in the Population: An Estimate of the Number of 'Missing Females'." *Population and Development Review* 17(3): 517-523.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cooper, Christopher. 2000. "In Yemen, Some Try This Antidrug Message: Just Say No—to Qat." *New York Times* (December 28): 1.
- Cornwall, Andrea. 1997. "Men, Masculinity and Gender in Development." In *Men and Masculinity*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 8-13.

- Crossette, Barbara. 2001. "Living in a World Without Women." *New York Times* (November 4).
- Deyo, Frederic C. 1989. *Beneath the Miracle: Labor Subordination in the New Asian Industrialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Economist*. 1996a. "The Trouble With Men." *Economist* September 28: 19-20.
- _____. 1996b. "Tomorrow's Second Sex." *Economist* September 28: 23-26.
- EngenderHealth. 2001a. "Working With Men." Webpage [http://www.engenderhealth.org/ia/wwm/index.html].
- _____. 2001b. "Salud y Género Case Study: Participatory Workshops on Masculinity and Male Involvement." Webpage [http://www.engenderhealth.org/ia/wwm/emcase4.html].
- Engle, Patrice. 1995. "Men in Families: Report of a Consultation on the Role of Males and Fathers in Achieving Gender Equality." UNICEF. Webpage [http://www.unicef.org/reseval/malesr.html].
- Engle, Patrice L. and Ann Leonard. 1995. "Fathers as Parenting Partners." In *Families in Focus: New Perspectives on Mothers, Fathers, and Children*, Judith Bruce et al., New York: Population Council, pp. 49-69.
- Faludi, Susan. 1999. *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man*. New York: W. Morrow and Co.
- García, Brígida (ed.). 2000. *Women, Poverty, and Demographic Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerstein, Dean, et al. (1999). "Gambling Impact and Behavior Study." Report to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Ghousoub, Mai and Emma Sinclair-Webb (eds.). 2000. *Imagined Masculinities: Male Identity and Culture in the Modern Middle East*. London: Saqi Books.
- Goldstein, R. B., et al. (1996). "Gender Differences in Manifestations of Antisocial Personality Disorder among Residential Drug Abuse Treatment Clients." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 41(1): 35-45.
- Greig, Alan, Michael Kimmel, and James Lang. 2000. "Men, Masculinities & Development: Broadening our Work Towards Gender Equality." United Nations Development Programme, Gender in Development Monograph Series No. 10.
- Gutmann, Matthew C. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Hamermesh, Daniel S. 1986. "The Demand for Labor in the Long Run." In *Handbook of Labor Economics* 1, Orley Ashenfelter and Richard Layard (eds.), Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 429-471.
- Hazzard, William R. 1985. "Atherogenesis: Why Women Live Longer than Men." *Geriatrics* 40: 42-48.
- Hearn, Jeff. 1992. *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Helzner, Judith Frye. 1996. "Men's Involvement in Family Planning." *Reproductive Health Matters* (7): 146-154.
- Hoffman, John et al. 1999. "Analysis of the Casino Survey: Report to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission." Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Holden, Constance. 1987. "Why Do Women Live Longer than Men?" *Science* 238: 158-160.
- Holmes, C. B., H. Hausler, and P. Nunn. 1998. "A Review of Sex Differences in the Epidemiology of Tuberculosis." *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2(2): 96-104.
- Holter, Øystein Gullvåg. 2000. "Masculinities in Context: On Peace Issues and Patriarchal Orders." In *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, Ingeborg Breines, Robert Connell, and Ingrid Eide (eds.), Paris: UNESCO Publishing, pp. 61-83.
- Hser, Y. I., M. D. Anglin, and Y. Liu. 1991. "A Survival Analysis of Gender and Ethnic-Differences in Responsiveness to Methadone-Maintenance Treatment." *International Journal of the Addictions* 25(11a): 1295-1315.
- IPPF Western Hemisphere Region. 2001a. "Brothers for Change: Working with Male Perpetrators of Violence in Jamaica." *Forum* 15(1): 2-3.
- _____. 2001b. "Rock and Male Roles: Using Technology and Music to Teach Young Men About Gender Roles and Sexual and Reproductive Health." *Forum* 15(1): 4-5.
- Islas, Francisco Cervantes. 1999. "Helping Men Overcome Violent Behavior toward Women." In *Too Close to Home: Domestic Violence in the Americas*, Andrew R. Morrison and María Loreto Biehl (eds.), Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, pp. 143-147.
- Jacobsen, Joyce P. 1991. "Earnings and Employment Differences by Race and Sex, by Economic Sector." Dissertation, Stanford University.

- _____. 1998. *The Economics of Gender, Second Edition*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Joekes, Susan. 1987. *Women in the World Economy: An INSTRAW Study*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Johansson, Sten and Ola Nygren. 1991. "The Missing Girls of China: A New Demographic Analysis." *Population and Development Review* 17(1): 35-51.
- Joshua, Milton Obote. 2001. "Gender Training with Men: Experiences and Reflections from East Africa." In *Men's Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 35-43.
- Kimmel, Michael S. 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press.
- Kingree, J. B. 1995. "Understanding Gender Differences in Psychosocial Functioning and Treatment Retention." *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 21: 267-281.
- Kraemer, Sebastian. 2000. "The Fragile Male." *British Medical Journal* 321: 23-30.
- Lang, E., K. Arnold, and P. Kupfer. 1994. "Frauen Werden Alter." *Zeitschrift fur Gerontologie* 27(1): 10-15.
- Large, Judith. 1997. "Disintegration Conflicts and the Restructuring of Masculinity." In *Men and Masculinity*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 23-30.
- Lovgren, Stefan. 2001. "All That Glitters." *US News & World Report* August 13.
- Makimoto, K., H. Oda, and S. Higuchi. 2000. "Alcohol Effects on the Fetus, Brain, Liver, and Other Organ Systems—Is Heavy Alcohol Consumption an Attributable Risk Factor for Cancer-Related Deaths among Japanese Men?" *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 24(3): 382-385.
- Mesquida, Christian G. and Niel I. Wiener. 1996. "Human Collective Aggression: A Behavioural Ecology Perspective." LaMarsh Centre for Research on Violence and Conflict Resolution, Research Report No. 55 (July).
- Micheli, A. et al. 1998. "The Prognostic Role of Gender in Survival of Adult Cancer Patients." *European Journal of Cancer* 34(14): 2271-2278.
- Momsen, Janet Henshall. 1991. *Women and Development in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Moser, Caroline O. N. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mulrine, Anna. 2001. "Are Boys the Weaker Sex?" *U. S. News & World Report* 131(4): 40-47.

- Murphy, Kim. 1992. "Yemen Ritual Gives You Something to Chew On." *Los Angeles Times* June 23: p. 6.
- Murray, Christopher J. L. and Allan D. Lopez. 1996. *The Global Burden of Disease*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press for the World Health Organization and the World Bank.
- Newby, Margaret and Ann E. Biddlecom. 1997. "Absent and Problematic Men: Demographic Accounts of Male Reproductive Roles." Population Council Policy Research Division Working Paper No. 103.
- Nisbett, Richard E. and Dov Cohen. 1999. "Men, Honor and Murder." *Scientific American* Special Issue on Men's Health.
- Nock, Steven L. 1998. *Marriage in Men's Lives*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, Susan Wendy and Carla Pederzini. 1999. "Gender Differences in Education in Mexico." Working Paper. Washington, D.C.: World Bank
- Perls, Thomas T. and Ruth C. Fretts. 1998. "Why Women Live Longer Than Men." *Scientific American* Special Issue on Women's Health: 100-103.
- Pickwell, S. M., et al. 1994. "Betelmania — Betel Quid Chewing by Cambodian Women in the United States and its Potential Health Effects." *Western Journal of Medicine* 160(4): 326-330.
- Pollack, William S. 1998. *Real Boys: Rescuing our Sons from the Myths of Boyhood*. New York: Random House.
- Population Council. 1998. "Getting Men Involved in Family Planning: Experiences from an Innovative Program." Final Report.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Pyne, Hnin Hnin, Mariam Claeson, and Maria Correia. 2002. "Gender Dimensions of Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol-Related Problems in Latin America and the Caribbean." World Bank Discussion Paper No. 433. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Rosenthal, Elisabeth. 1999. "Women's Suicides Reveal Rural China's Bitter Roots." *New York Times* (January 24): 1, 12.
- Rushby, Kevin. 1995. "The High Life." *Geographical Magazine* 67(January): 14-17.

- Sampath, Niels. 1997. "‘Crabs in a Bucket’: Reforming Male Identities in Trinidad." In *Men and Masculinity*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 47-54.
- Schmittroth, Linda (ed.). 1995. *Statistical Record of Women Worldwide, Second Edition*. New York: Gale Research.
- Sen, Amartya. 1989. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Shkolnikov, Vladimir M., Mark G. Field, and Evgueniy M. Andreev. 2001. "Russia: Socioeconomic Dimensions of the Gender Gap in Mortality." In *Challenging Inequities in Health: From Ethics to Action*, Timothy Evans *et al.* (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 139-155.
- Shrader, Elizabeth. 2001. "Methodologies to Measure the Gender Dimensions of Crime and Violence." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2648. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Single, Eric, Lynda Robson, and Jurgen Rehm. 1999. "Morbidity and Mortality Attributable to Alcohol, Tobacco, and Illicit Drug Use in Canada." *American Journal of Public Health* 89(3): 385-390.
- Smith, Sue. 2001. "Tackling Male Exclusion in Post-Industrialized Settings: Lessons from the UK." In *Men’s Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 56-58.
- Sternberg, Peter. 2001. "Challenging *Machismo* to Promote Sexual and Reproductive Health: Working with Nicaraguan Men." In *Men’s Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 59-67.
- Sweetman, Caroline (ed.). 1997. *Men and Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- _____. 2001a. "‘Sitting on a Rock’: Men, Socio-economic Change, and Development Policy in Lesotho." In *Men’s Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 71-79.
- _____. (ed.). 2001b. *Men’s Involvement in Gender and Development Policy and Practice: Beyond Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Takahashi, Miki and Caroline Cederlof. 2000. "Street Children in Central America: An Overview." Executive Summary of forthcoming document. World Bank. Webpage [http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/external/lac/lac.nsf/6dd54801ceee52f2852567d6006ca780/19e661ab7bbb25de852568cf006ad8a8].

- Tierney, Joseph P. and Jean Baldwin Grossman. 2000. "Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters." Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures. [http://www.ppv.org/indexfiles/pubsindex.html].
- Tomori, Martina, Bojan Zalar, and Blanka Kores Plesnicar. 2000. "Gender Differences in Psychosocial Risk Factors Among Slovenian Adolescents." *Adolescence* 35(139): 431-443.
- UNAIDS. 1999. "Gender and HIV/AIDS: Taking Stock of Research and Programmes." UNAIDS/99.16E. Webpage [http://www.unaids.org/publications/documents/human/gender/una99e16.pdf].
- UNICEF. 1997. *The Role of Men in the Lives of Children: A Study of How Improving Knowledge About Men in Families Helps Strengthen Programming for Children and Women*. New York: UNICEF.
- _____. 2000. "Ending Gender Violence and Reaching Other Goals: What Do Men and Violence Have To Do with It?" UNICEF Workshop Report (March 23-24). New York: UNICEF.
- United States Conference of Mayors. 2000. "A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities 2000."
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2001. "Total Population in Households and Group Quarters by Sex and Selected Age Groups, for the United States: 2000." Webpage [http://www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/grpqr.html].
- United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. 2000. *Digest of Education Statistics, 2000*.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics. 2000. *Health United States—2000*.
- _____. 2001. "Deaths for 358 Selected Causes, by 5-year Age Groups, Race, and Sex: United States, 1999-1999." Webpage [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/vs00199table292.pdf].
- Valkonen, T. and F. VanPoppel. 1997. "The Contribution of Smoking to Sex Differences in Life Expectancy—Four Nordic Countries and the Netherlands 1970-1989." *European Journal of Public Health* 7(3): 302-310.
- Waite, Linda J. and Maggie Gallagher. 2000. *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York: Doubleday.
- Ward, Kathryn (ed.). 1990. *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR.

- Weiss, R. D., et al. (1997). "Gender Differences in Cocaine Dependent Patients: A 6 Month Follow-Up Study." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 44(1): 35-40.
- Welzer-Lang, Daniel (ed.). 2000. *Nouvelles Approches des Hommes et du Masculin*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.
- Westermeyer, Joseph and Amy E. Boedicker. 2000. "Course, Severity, and Treatment of Substance Abuse among Women versus Men." *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 26(4): 523-535.
- White, Sarah C. 1997. "Men, Masculinities, and the Politics of Development." In *Men and Masculinity*, Caroline Sweetman (ed.), Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 14-22.
- Wilkinson, Clive. 1987. "Women, Migration and Work in Lesotho." In *Geography of Gender in the Third World*, Janet Henshall Momsen and Janet G. Townsend (eds.), Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, pp. 225-239.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.
- World Bank. 2001. *Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- WHO. 1998. "Gender and Health." WHO Technical Paper No. WHO/FRH/WHD/98.16.
- _____. 2000a. "Working with Adolescent Boys: Programme Experiences." WHO/FCH/CAH/00.10.
- _____. 2000b. "What About Boys? A Literature Review on the Health and Development of Adolescent Boys."
- Yang, M. S. et al. 1996. "Prevalence and Related Risk Factors of Betel Quid Chewing by Adolescent Students in Southern Taiwan." *Journal of Oral Pathology & Medicine* 25(2): 69-71.

Summary Table

Distribution of Gender Differences for Various Indicators in Report Tables

	Median	IQR	Min	Max	Range
Table 1 (N=162): Life expectancy at birth					
Male-Female	(4.6)	3.5	(12.4)	1.6	14.0
Male-"Max Male"	(10.8)	18.9	(40.3)	0.0	40.3
Table 2 (N=161): Change in mortality rate, Male-Female, 1960-1997					
	7.9	17.4	(25.2)	73.0	98.2
Table 3 (N=101): Male-Female infant mortality rates					
	6.9	12.4	(4.4)	37.8	42.2
Table 4 (N=191): Disability-adjusted life expectancy					
Male-Female at birth	(2.9)	4.5	(11.0)	2.1	13.1
Male-Female at age 60	(1.8)	2.1	(5.1)	1.1	6.2
Male-"Max Male" at birth	(13.3)	16.7	(46.1)	0.0	46.1
Male-"Max Male" at age 60	(7.4)	5.0	(15.3)	0.0	15.3
Table 6 (N=115): Percentage male of adults with HIV/AIDS					
	67.0	32.0	42.0	94.0	52.0
Table 7: Occupational injury rate Male/Female ratios					
Fatal (N=13)	10.4	10.3	1.2	19.6	18.4
Nonfatal (N=10)	2.4	1.3	1.1	3.8	2.7
Table 8 (N=61, except for drug offenses N=56) Percentage male of criminal offenders					
Homicides	89.9	7.3	75.0	100.0	25.0
Serious Assault	90.9	8.7	66.8	100.0	33.2
Theft	90.7	7.0	69.8	98.8	29.0
Fraud	81.0	14.5	59.0	98.7	39.7
Drug Offenses	87.7	11.0	67.7	100.0	32.3
Table 9 (N=72): Prison population Male/Female ratios					
	22.0	15.6	4.1	141.9	137.8
Table 10 (N=23): Percentage male of young adult homicide deaths					
	76.9	9.8	55.0	94.5	39.5
Table 11 (N=94): Suicide rate Male/Female ratios					
	2.9	2.1	0.6	13.4	12.8
Tables 12 (N=139), 14 (N=135), 15 (N=114): Male-Female gross enrollment ratios					
Primary	2.0	9.0	(12.0)	60.0	72.0
Secondary	1.0	12.0	(25.0)	39.0	64.0
Tertiary	(0.2)	9.3	(27.3)	29.6	56.9
Table 13 (N=46): Male-Female persistence rates to grade 5					
	(0.1)	6.1	(15.2)	16.6	31.8

	Median	IQR	Min	Max	Range
Table 16 (N=87): Male-Female economically active participation rates					
1978	24.6	15.8	(0.7)	50.0	50.7
2000	16.7	12.8	0.3	45.6	45.3
2000-1978	(5.2)	10.5	(26.7)	8.9	35.6
Table 17 (N=72): Male-Female unemployment rates, 1996-98					
	(0.8)	3.9	(19.1)	4.2	23.3
Table 18 (N=191): Male-Female percentage ever married					
20 to 24 year olds	(24.4)	19.7	(68.8)	14.9	83.7
45 to 49 year olds	(0.7)	3.1	(14.9)	13.6	28.5
Table 19 (N=192): Percentage male of population aged 65 and above					
	43.9	5.5	30.7	72.9	42.2

Data are for most recent year identified as available at time of research unless otherwise noted.

Sources are given in the actual tables.

All tables are represented herein except Table 5, in which data are already presented in summary fashion.

Table 1a**Life Expectancy at Birth, Male and Female, 1999**
(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Russian Federation	60.1	72.5	(12.4)
Belarus, Rep. of	62.8	74.4	(11.6)
Kazakhstan	58.9	70.2	(11.3)
Latvia	64.3	75.6	(11.3)
Estonia	64.8	75.8	(11.0)
Ukraine	62.7	73.5	(10.8)
Lithuania	66.5	77.0	(10.5)
Bahamas	64.9	73.6	(8.7)
Hungary	66.8	75.4	(8.6)
Poland	69.0	77.3	(8.3)
Georgia	68.8	77.0	(8.2)
Guyana	59.3	67.5	(8.2)
Kyrgyzstan	63.4	71.4	(8.0)
Croatia, Rep. of	69.6	77.6	(8.0)
Slovakia	69.1	77.0	(7.9)
Brazil	63.9	71.8	(7.9)
France	74.5	82.3	(7.8)
Mauritius	67.3	75.1	(7.8)
Bulgaria	67.1	74.8	(7.7)
Republic of Korea	70.9	78.4	(7.5)
Uruguay	70.8	78.3	(7.5)
Moldova, Rep. of	62.8	70.3	(7.5)
Slovenia	71.5	78.9	(7.4)
Finland	73.7	81.0	(7.3)
Portugal	71.9	79.1	(7.2)
Spain	74.8	81.9	(7.1)
Argentina	69.9	77.0	(7.1)
Azerbaijan	67.7	74.8	(7.1)
Japan	77.3	84.1	(6.8)
Czech Republic	71.2	78.0	(6.8)
Colombia	67.8	74.6	(6.8)
Romania	66.5	73.3	(6.8)
Turkmenistan	62.5	69.3	(6.8)
Samoa (Western)	65.9	72.5	(6.6)
Luxembourg	73.9	80.4	(6.5)
Switzerland	75.6	82.0	(6.4)
Italy	75.2	81.6	(6.4)
Belgium	75.0	81.3	(6.3)
Germany	74.3	80.6	(6.3)
Austria	74.7	80.9	(6.2)
El Salvador	66.8	72.9	(6.1)
Chile	72.5	78.5	(6.0)
Mexico	69.8	75.8	(6.0)
Armenia	69.6	75.6	(6.0)
Haiti	49.4	55.4	(6.0)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Thailand	67.0	72.9	(5.9)
Uzbekistan	65.8	71.7	(5.9)
Tajikistan	64.5	70.4	(5.9)
Norway	75.4	81.3	(5.9)
Albania	70.2	76.1	(5.9)
Guatemala	61.9	67.7	(5.8)
United States	73.9	79.7	(5.8)
Venezuela	70.2	76.0	(5.8)
Cape Verde	66.0	71.8	(5.8)
Australia	76.0	81.7	(5.7)
Sri Lanka	69.3	75.0	(5.7)
Honduras	63.2	68.8	(5.6)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	76.7	82.2	(5.5)
Canada	75.9	81.4	(5.5)
Netherlands	75.3	80.7	(5.4)
Greece	75.5	80.8	(5.3)
New Zealand	74.8	80.1	(5.3)
Ireland	73.8	79.1	(5.3)
Malta	75.2	80.4	(5.2)
Suriname	67.8	73.0	(5.2)
Ecuador	67.6	72.8	(5.2)
Sweden	77.0	82.1	(5.1)
Turkey	67.0	72.1	(5.1)
United Kingdom	75.0	80.0	(5.0)
Barbados	73.9	78.9	(5.0)
Denmark	73.6	78.6	(5.0)
Peru	66.3	71.3	(5.0)
Dominican Republic	65.0	70.0	(5.0)
Malaysia	69.9	74.8	(4.9)
Myanmar	53.6	58.4	(4.8)
Costa Rica	74.5	79.2	(4.7)
Brunei Darussalam	73.6	78.3	(4.7)
Trinidad and Tobago	71.8	76.5	(4.7)
Nicaragua	66.1	70.8	(4.7)
Viet Nam	65.5	70.2	(4.7)
Iceland	76.8	81.4	(4.6)
South Africa	51.6	56.2	(4.6)
Panama	72.0	76.6	(4.6)
Cyprus	75.7	80.2	(4.5)
Paraguay	67.8	72.3	(4.5)
Cambodia	54.1	58.6	(4.5)
Singapore	75.2	79.6	(4.4)
United Arab Emirates	73.5	77.8	(4.3)
Congo	49.0	53.3	(4.3)
China	68.3	72.5	(4.2)
Bahrain	71.4	75.6	(4.2)
Macedonia, The FYR	70.9	75.1	(4.2)
Kuwait	74.3	78.4	(4.1)
Philippines	67.0	71.1	(4.1)
Jamaica	73.1	77.1	(4.0)
Mongolia	60.5	64.5	(4.0)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	68.6	72.5	(3.9)
Israel	76.6	80.4	(3.8)
Indonesia	63.9	67.7	(3.8)
Senegal	51.1	54.8	(3.7)
Morocco	65.4	69.1	(3.7)
Fiji	67.1	70.7	(3.6)
Bolivia	60.4	63.8	(3.4)
Benin	52.0	55.4	(3.4)
Central African Republic	42.7	46.0	(3.3)
Egypt	65.3	68.5	(3.2)
Mauritania	49.5	52.7	(3.2)
Equatorial Guinea	49.0	52.2	(3.2)
Lebanon	71.3	74.4	(3.1)
Oman	69.5	72.4	(2.9)
Algeria	67.9	70.8	(2.9)
Eritrea	50.4	53.2	(2.8)
Comoros	58.0	60.8	(2.8)
Sudan	54.2	57.0	(2.8)
Gambia	44.5	47.3	(2.8)
Guinea-Bissau	43.1	45.9	(2.8)
Belize	72.6	75.3	(2.7)
Angola	43.6	46.3	(2.7)
Djibouti	42.6	45.3	(2.7)
Ghana	55.3	57.9	(2.6)
Sierra Leone	37.0	39.6	(2.6)
Jordan	68.9	71.5	(2.6)
Congo, Dem. Rep. of the	49.7	52.3	(2.6)
Qatar	68.5	71.0	(2.5)
Bhutan	60.3	62.8	(2.5)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	51.9	54.4	(2.5)
Chad	44.2	46.7	(2.5)
Saudi Arabia	70.3	72.7	(2.4)
Tunisia	68.8	71.2	(2.4)
Gabon	51.4	53.8	(2.4)
Togo	50.4	52.8	(2.4)
Syrian Arab Republic	69.8	72.1	(2.3)
Madagascar	51.1	53.4	(2.3)
Yemen	59.0	61.2	(2.2)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	50.0	52.2	(2.2)
Mali	50.2	52.2	(2.0)
Swaziland	46.0	48.0	(2.0)
Mozambique	38.8	40.8	(2.0)
Papua New Guinea	55.4	57.3	(1.9)
Burkina Faso	45.1	47.0	(1.9)
Burundi	39.6	41.5	(1.9)
Kenya	50.4	52.2	(1.8)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	67.7	69.4	(1.7)
Cameroon	49.1	50.8	(1.7)
Ethiopia	43.3	44.9	(1.6)
Rwanda	39.1	40.6	(1.5)
Uganda	42.5	43.8	(1.3)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Guinea	46.6	47.6	(1.0)
India	62.4	63.3	(0.9)
Côte d'Ivoire	47.5	48.1	(0.6)
Niger	44.5	45.1	(0.6)
Nigeria	51.3	51.7	(0.4)
Botswana	41.6	41.9	(0.3)
Lesotho	47.8	48.0	(0.2)
Namibia	44.7	44.9	(0.2)
Bangladesh	58.9	59.0	(0.1)
Malawi	40.4	40.2	0.2
Pakistan	59.8	59.5	0.3
Nepal	58.3	57.8	0.5
Zimbabwe	43.2	42.6	0.6
Zambia	41.4	40.6	0.8
Maldives	66.9	65.3	1.6

Life expectancy measured in years

Source:

United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2001

Human Development Indicators 2001

Table: Gender-related Development Index

<http://www.undp.org/hdr2001>

Table 1b**Life Expectancy at Birth, Male Minus "Max Male", 1999**

(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Max Male", Max Male = 77.3 [Japan])

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Sierra Leone	(40.3)	Papua New Guinea	(21.9)
Mozambique	(38.5)	Comoros	(19.3)
Rwanda	(38.2)	Nepal	(19.0)
Burundi	(37.7)	Bangladesh	(18.4)
Malawi	(36.9)	Kazakhstan	(18.4)
Zambia	(35.9)	Yemen	(18.3)
Botswana	(35.7)	Guyana	(18.0)
Uganda	(34.8)	Pakistan	(17.5)
Djibouti	(34.7)	Russian Federation	(17.2)
Central African Republic	(34.6)	Bhutan	(17.0)
Guinea-Bissau	(34.2)	Bolivia	(16.9)
Zimbabwe	(34.1)	Mongolia	(16.8)
Ethiopia	(34.0)	Guatemala	(15.4)
Angola	(33.7)	India	(14.9)
Chad	(33.1)	Turkmenistan	(14.8)
Gambia	(32.8)	Ukraine	(14.6)
Niger	(32.8)	Belarus, Rep. of	(14.5)
Namibia	(32.6)	Moldova, Rep. of	(14.5)
Burkina Faso	(32.2)	Honduras	(14.1)
Swaziland	(31.3)	Kyrgyzstan	(13.9)
Guinea	(30.7)	Indonesia	(13.4)
Côte d'Ivoire	(29.8)	Brazil	(13.4)
Lesotho	(29.5)	Latvia	(13.0)
Equatorial Guinea	(28.3)	Tajikistan	(12.8)
Congo	(28.3)	Estonia	(12.5)
Cameroon	(28.2)	Bahamas	(12.4)
Haiti	(27.9)	Dominican Republic	(12.3)
Mauritania	(27.8)	Egypt	(12.0)
Congo, Dem. Rep. of the	(27.6)	Morocco	(11.9)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	(27.3)	Viet Nam	(11.8)
Mali	(27.1)	Uzbekistan	(11.5)
Kenya	(26.9)	Samoa (Western)	(11.4)
Togo	(26.9)	Cape Verde	(11.3)
Eritrea	(26.9)	Nicaragua	(11.2)
Madagascar	(26.2)	Peru	(11.0)
Senegal	(26.2)	Lithuania	(10.8)
Nigeria	(26.0)	Romania	(10.8)
Gabon	(25.9)	El Salvador	(10.5)
South Africa	(25.7)	Hungary	(10.5)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	(25.4)	Maldives	(10.4)
Benin	(25.3)	Thailand	(10.3)
Myanmar	(23.7)	Philippines	(10.3)
Cambodia	(23.2)	Turkey	(10.3)
Sudan	(23.1)	Fiji	(10.2)
Ghana	(22.0)	Bulgaria	(10.2)

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Mauritius	(10.0)	Brunei Darussalam	(3.7)
Ecuador	(9.7)	Denmark	(3.7)
Azerbaijan	(9.6)	Finland	(3.6)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	(9.6)	Ireland	(3.5)
Colombia	(9.5)	Barbados	(3.4)
Suriname	(9.5)	United States	(3.4)
Paraguay	(9.5)	Luxembourg	(3.4)
Algeria	(9.4)	Germany	(3.0)
China	(9.0)	Kuwait	(3.0)
Qatar	(8.8)	Costa Rica	(2.8)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	(8.7)	France	(2.8)
Georgia	(8.5)	Austria	(2.6)
Tunisia	(8.5)	New Zealand	(2.5)
Jordan	(8.4)	Spain	(2.5)
Poland	(8.3)	Belgium	(2.3)
Slovakia	(8.2)	United Kingdom	(2.3)
Sri Lanka	(8.0)	Singapore	(2.1)
Oman	(7.8)	Italy	(2.1)
Croatia, Rep. of	(7.7)	Malta	(2.1)
Armenia	(7.7)	Netherlands	(2.0)
Mexico	(7.5)	Norway	(1.9)
Syrian Arab Republic	(7.5)	Greece	(1.8)
Malaysia	(7.4)	Switzerland	(1.7)
Argentina	(7.4)	Cyprus	(1.6)
Albania	(7.1)	Canada	(1.4)
Venezuela	(7.1)	Australia	(1.3)
Saudi Arabia	(7.0)	Israel	(0.7)
Uruguay	(6.5)	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	(0.6)
Republic of Korea	(6.4)	Iceland	(0.5)
Macedonia, The FYR	(6.4)	Sweden	(0.3)
Czech Republic	(6.1)		
Lebanon	(6.0)		
Bahrain	(5.9)		
Slovenia	(5.8)		
Trinidad and Tobago	(5.5)		
Portugal	(5.4)		
Panama	(5.3)		
Chile	(4.8)		
Belize	(4.7)		
Jamaica	(4.2)		
United Arab Emirates	(3.8)		

Life expectancy measured in years

Source:

United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2001

Human Development Indicators 2001

Table: Gender-related Development Index

<http://www.undp.org/hdr2001>

Table 2

Change in Mortality Rates, Male and Female, 1960-1997

Country	Change in Mortality Rate, 1960 - 1997 (a)		Male - Female
	Male	Female	
Lithuania	74.3	1.3	73.0
Hungary	73.7	10.4	63.3
Ukraine	84.1	31.5	52.6
Latvia	40.6	(2.2)	42.8
Poland	16.7	(25.4)	42.1
Bulgaria	22.2	(15.7)	37.9
Puerto Rico	(5.2)	(42.6)	37.4
Sri Lanka	(23.6)	(58.4)	34.8
Russian Federation	62.5	30.5	32.1
Yugoslavia, FR (Serbia/Montenegro)	4.7	(27.0)	31.7
Estonia	19.5	(12.1)	31.6
Guyana	(15.3)	(42.1)	26.9
Mauritius	(35.2)	(62.0)	26.8
Albania	(39.3)	(64.0)	24.6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	(11.4)	(36.0)	24.6
Korea, Rep.	(48.5)	(71.6)	23.1
Seychelles	(42.0)	(65.0)	23.0
Portugal	(22.3)	(45.1)	22.7
Colombia	(29.5)	(51.5)	22.1
Brunei	(44.9)	(66.7)	21.8
Reunion	(47.5)	(68.8)	21.3
Mexico	(45.8)	(66.8)	21.0
Ireland	(25.0)	(45.9)	20.9
Spain	(29.9)	(50.4)	20.5
Belarus, Rep. of	31.0	10.6	20.4
Slovenia	(18.7)	(38.2)	19.5
Bahamas, The	(42.0)	(61.3)	19.3
Guadeloupe	(53.9)	(73.0)	19.1
Uruguay	(8.7)	(27.6)	18.9
Israel	(23.8)	(42.5)	18.7
Niger	(17.2)	(35.5)	18.4
Czech Republic	(10.8)	(28.7)	17.9
Sweden	(25.5)	(43.2)	17.6
Argentina	(23.8)	(41.3)	17.5
Venezuela	(42.0)	(59.4)	17.4
Denmark	(6.6)	(23.9)	17.3
Greece	(36.5)	(53.8)	17.3
Kuwait	(51.0)	(67.8)	16.9
Panama	(49.9)	(66.4)	16.5
Trinidad and Tobago	(37.8)	(54.2)	16.4
Thailand	(44.6)	(61.0)	16.4
El Salvador	(43.0)	(59.3)	16.3
Ecuador	(42.2)	(58.0)	15.8
Guinea-Bissau	(5.7)	(21.5)	15.8
Martinique	(62.1)	(77.8)	15.6

Country	Change in Mortality Rate, 1960 - 1997 (a)		Male - Female
	Male	Female	
Japan	(53.5)	(68.9)	15.4
Suriname	(34.3)	(49.3)	15.0
Guatemala	(42.4)	(57.2)	14.7
Netherlands	(16.0)	(30.3)	14.4
Kyrgyz Republic	(12.1)	(25.9)	13.8
Tajikistan	(7.6)	(21.3)	13.7
Italy	(36.8)	(50.0)	13.2
Georgia	(30.5)	(43.6)	13.1
Chile	(56.7)	(69.6)	12.9
Bahrain	(22.7)	(35.5)	12.8
Barbados	(34.2)	(46.9)	12.6
Jamaica	(43.8)	(56.2)	12.4
Luxembourg	(34.3)	(46.2)	11.9
Malaysia	(57.3)	(69.1)	11.8
Peru	(50.5)	(61.7)	11.2
France	(39.5)	(50.5)	11.0
South Africa	(54.0)	(65.0)	11.0
Switzerland	(38.7)	(49.5)	10.8
Cyprus	(46.9)	(57.4)	10.5
Nicaragua	(53.1)	(63.6)	10.5
Fiji	(50.7)	(61.0)	10.4
Germany	(31.8)	(42.1)	10.3
Equatorial Guinea	(24.3)	(34.0)	9.7
Paraguay	(15.4)	(25.1)	9.7
Honduras	(50.7)	(60.4)	9.6
Turkmenistan	(13.5)	(22.6)	9.1
Dominican Republic	(56.2)	(65.3)	9.1
Azerbaijan	(29.9)	(38.9)	9.1
Chad	(19.1)	(28.1)	9.0
Uzbekistan	(20.4)	(29.2)	8.8
Djibouti	(29.4)	(38.2)	8.8
Canada	(44.5)	(52.7)	8.2
Belgium	(32.0)	(40.2)	8.2
Armenia	(28.1)	(36.1)	8.0
Singapore	(55.4)	(63.3)	7.9
Cuba	(57.8)	(65.8)	7.9
Malta	(40.5)	(48.3)	7.8
Pakistan	(58.3)	(65.4)	7.0
Kazakhstan	3.4	(3.5)	6.9
New Zealand	(32.6)	(39.4)	6.8
Australia	(45.5)	(51.7)	6.2
Brazil	(31.5)	(37.5)	6.0
Korea, Dem. Rep.	(31.5)	(36.9)	5.4
Finland	(43.6)	(48.7)	5.1
Austria	(42.8)	(47.4)	4.6
Philippines	(55.5)	(59.7)	4.2
United Kingdom	(32.8)	(36.8)	4.0
Gambia, The	(30.1)	(34.0)	3.9
Indonesia	(60.3)	(64.2)	3.8
Swaziland	(52.0)	(55.8)	3.8

Country	Change in Mortality Rate, 1960 - 1997 (a)		Male - Female
	Male	Female	
India	(46.7)	(50.4)	3.7
Moldova, Rep. of	(8.4)	(11.8)	3.4
United States	(35.1)	(38.5)	3.4
Lebanon	(43.2)	(46.4)	3.3
Maldives	(52.8)	(55.9)	3.1
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	(50.6)	(53.7)	3.1
Morocco	(44.0)	(46.6)	2.6
Costa Rica	(52.4)	(54.8)	2.5
Mali	(29.4)	(31.8)	2.4
Vietnam	(55.5)	(57.9)	2.4
Angola	(27.3)	(29.4)	2.2
China	(76.1)	(78.3)	2.2
Norway	(28.8)	(30.6)	1.8
Central African Republic	9.2	7.8	1.5
Afghanistan	(33.1)	(34.4)	1.3
Guinea	(24.2)	(25.2)	1.1
Somalia	(40.5)	(41.2)	0.7
Oman	(66.2)	(66.8)	0.6
Sierra Leone	(7.0)	(7.4)	0.4
Ghana	(45.9)	(46.0)	0.1
Iceland	(37.4)	(37.3)	(0.2)
Mongolia	(57.4)	(57.1)	(0.3)
Papua New Guinea	(33.2)	(32.7)	(0.4)
Senegal	(20.5)	(20.0)	(0.5)
Benin	(35.5)	(34.6)	(0.9)
United Arab Emirates	(47.8)	(46.8)	(1.0)
Algeria	(53.4)	(51.8)	(1.6)
Haiti	(6.1)	(4.4)	(1.7)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	(63.9)	(62.1)	(1.7)
Zimbabwe	(21.4)	(19.5)	(1.9)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	(35.5)	(32.8)	(2.7)
Iraq	(49.3)	(46.2)	(3.1)
Cambodia	(36.6)	(32.9)	(3.8)
Cape Verde	(50.5)	(46.7)	(3.8)
Tunisia	(47.2)	(43.3)	(3.9)
Saudi Arabia	(59.2)	(54.9)	(4.3)
Mauritania	(41.4)	(37.0)	(4.5)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	(31.0)	(26.4)	(4.7)
Sudan	(39.0)	(34.3)	(4.7)
Bangladesh	(48.3)	(42.6)	(5.7)
Nigeria	(27.8)	(21.9)	(5.9)
Bolivia	(44.3)	(38.0)	(6.3)
Yemen, Rep.	(36.9)	(29.7)	(7.2)
Cameroon	(35.2)	(27.6)	(7.7)
Mozambique	(32.5)	(24.3)	(8.2)
Namibia	(33.3)	(24.9)	(8.3)
Lesotho	(28.9)	(20.4)	(8.5)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	(17.1)	(7.7)	(9.5)
Congo, Rep.	(20.4)	(10.3)	(10.0)
Nepal	(48.0)	(38.0)	(10.0)

Country	Change in Mortality Rate, 1960 - 1997 (a)		Male - Female
	Male	Female	
Burundi	(3.1)	7.5	(10.6)
Gabon	(28.6)	(18.0)	(10.6)
Botswana	11.6	23.1	(11.5)
Egypt, Arab Rep.	(41.2)	(29.3)	(11.9)
Kenya	(22.2)	(10.1)	(12.1)
Togo	(13.0)	1.2	(14.1)
Rwanda	7.2	21.8	(14.5)
Ethiopia	15.7	30.5	(14.8)
Qatar	(51.5)	(35.3)	(16.2)
Liberia	(14.1)	2.9	(17.0)
Cote d'Ivoire	(14.2)	3.0	(17.2)
Zambia	(15.7)	3.6	(19.3)
Burkina Faso	(7.8)	13.9	(21.7)
Malawi	(13.1)	9.4	(22.5)
Madagascar	(12.0)	11.9	(23.9)
Uganda	5.6	30.8	(25.2)

Source:

World Bank

World Development Indicators 1999

Series: SP.DYN.AMRT.FE

Mortality rate, adult, female (per 1,000 female adults)

SP.DYN.AMRT.MA

Mortality rate, adult, male (per 1,000 male adults)

Note:

(a) Numbers in brackets imply negatives, indicating improvements

Table 3

Infant mortality rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2002
 (Countries arranged in declining "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Cote d'Ivoire	130.3	92.5	37.8
Liberia	168.9	135.4	33.5
Gabon	73.6	48.9	24.7
Ethiopia	124.4	100.6	23.8
Burundi	97.1	74.2	22.9
El Salvador	81.1	59.7	21.4
Cambodia	102.8	82.2	20.6
Chad	119.6	100.0	19.6
Madagascar	108.7	89.5	19.2
Yemen	98.4	80.0	18.4
Nepal	101.9	83.7	18.2
Comoros	92.5	74.8	17.7
Togo	89.1	71.4	17.7
Zambia	116.3	99.3	17.0
Pakistan	102.1	85.5	16.6
Rwanda	98.4	82.1	16.3
Botswana	46.4	31.0	15.4
Burkina Faso	116.1	100.9	15.2
Central African Republic	109.2	94.1	15.1
Vietnam	42.0	26.9	15.1
Kazakhstan	62.0	47.3	14.7
Sri Lanka	39.6	24.9	14.7
Thailand	45.6	30.9	14.7
Indonesia	59.1	44.9	14.2
Mali	140.5	126.5	14.0
Haiti	96.5	82.6	13.9
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	100.8	87.1	13.7
Uzbekistan	50.2	36.7	13.5
Sudan	83.7	70.3	13.4
Eritrea	81.9	69.0	12.9
Benin	109.3	97.6	11.7
Guinea	112.3	100.6	11.7
Kyrgyz Republic	71.9	60.2	11.7
Morocco	68.6	57.4	11.2
Mozambique	153.0	141.9	11.1
Jordan	34.3	23.4	10.9
Ecuador	70.4	59.7	10.7
Cameroon	85.1	74.6	10.5
Niger	140.9	130.5	10.4
Namibia	66.6	56.5	10.1
Nicaragua	50.2	40.2	10.0
Malawi	117.1	107.9	9.2
Senegal	73.6	65.0	8.6
Colombia	28.5	20.1	8.4
Bolivia	77.6	69.2	8.4
Mexico	60.4	52.4	8.0
Kenya	74.5	66.8	7.7
Brazil	51.6	44.4	7.2
* Mauritius	23.8	16.7	7.1
Philippines	39.4	32.3	7.1
Zimbabwe	63.1	56.2	6.9
Ghana	64.4	57.9	6.5
Paraguay	39.0	32.6	6.4

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Peru	46.0	40.2	5.8
Turkey	51.0	45.5	5.5
Bangladesh	82.3	76.9	5.4
Nigeria	73.3	68.0	5.3
* Argentina	23.3	18.3	5.0
Dominican Republic	51.0	46.1	4.9
* Romania	22.6	18.3	4.3
* Moldova, Rep. of	22.6	18.6	4.0
* Bulgaria	16.3	12.4	3.9
* Latvia	16.9	13.0	3.9
India	74.8	71.1	3.7
* Lithuania	11.8	8.8	3.0
* Macedonia, The FYR	17.7	15.0	2.7
* Poland	13.4	10.9	2.5
Uganda	87.4	84.9	2.5
* Hungary	10.9	8.5	2.4
* Iceland	7.2	4.9	2.3
* Cuba	9.0	6.8	2.2
Guatemala	50.0	48.1	1.9
* Norway	5.0	3.2	1.8
* Italy	7.0	5.4	1.6
Tunisia	56.3	54.7	1.6
* Denmark	6.2	4.7	1.5
* Estonia	9.9	8.6	1.3
* France	5.4	4.1	1.3
Netherlands	6.1	4.8	1.3
United States	7.7	6.4	1.3
* Croatia, Rep. of	9.6	8.3	1.3
* Czech Republic	5.8	4.6	1.2
* Portugal	6.6	5.4	1.2
* Germany	5.4	4.3	1.1
* United Kingdom	6.4	5.3	1.1
* New Zealand	7.8	6.7	1.1
* Finland	4.4	3.4	1.0
* Canada	6.0	5.0	1.0
* Singapore	4.2	3.2	1.0
* Slovenia	5.7	4.7	1.0
* Ireland	6.4	5.5	0.9
* Spain	5.9	5.1	0.8
* Austria	5.3	4.5	0.8
* Greece	6.7	6.1	0.6
* Malta	6.7	6.1	0.6
* Japan	4.0	3.4	0.6
Egypt	55.0	54.5	0.5
* Sweden	4.0	3.6	0.4
* Israel	6.3	6.0	0.3
* Luxembourg	3.2	3.7	(0.5)
Trinidad & Tobago	28.4	32.8	(4.4)

All rates refer to deaths before age 1 per 1000 live births

Sources:

United States: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/pdf/nvsr49_08t.27.pdf

Netherlands: estimated from StatLine (Statistics Netherlands) on-line data for 2001

Countries marked with * : http://www3.who.int/whosis/whsa/whsa_table2.cfm

All others:

Measure DHS+

Demographic Health Surveys

<http://www.measuredhs.com/>

Table 4a**Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Birth, Male and Female, 1999**
(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Belarus, Rep. of	56.2	67.2	(11.0)
Russian Federation	56.1	66.4	(10.3)
Latvia	57.1	67.2	(10.1)
Estonia	58.1	68.1	(10.0)
Kazakhstan	51.5	61.2	(9.7)
Ukraine	58.5	67.5	(8.9)
Poland	62.3	70.1	(7.8)
Monaco	68.5	76.3	(7.8)
Brazil	55.2	62.9	(7.7)
France	69.3	76.9	(7.7)
Hungary	60.4	67.9	(7.5)
Mauritius	59.0	66.3	(7.3)
Croatia, Rep. of	63.3	70.6	(7.3)
Romania	58.8	65.8	(7.0)
Sri Lanka	59.3	66.3	(7.0)
Slovenia	64.9	71.9	(6.9)
Albania	56.5	63.4	(6.9)
Lithuania	60.6	67.5	(6.9)
Portugal	65.9	72.7	(6.8)
Finland	67.2	73.7	(6.5)
Bulgaria	61.2	67.7	(6.5)
Georgia	63.1	69.4	(6.3)
Guyana	57.1	63.3	(6.2)
Luxembourg	68.0	74.2	(6.2)
Slovakia	63.5	69.7	(6.2)
Grenada	62.4	68.5	(6.1)
Azerbaijan	60.6	66.7	(6.1)
Germany	67.4	73.5	(6.1)
Cape Verde	54.6	60.6	(6.0)
Moldova, Rep. of	58.5	64.5	(6.0)
Switzerland	69.5	75.5	(6.0)
Spain	69.8	75.7	(6.0)
Andorra	69.3	75.2	(5.9)
El Salvador	58.6	64.5	(5.9)
Belgium	68.7	74.6	(5.9)
Uruguay	64.1	69.9	(5.8)
Norway	68.8	74.6	(5.8)
Argentina	63.8	69.6	(5.8)
Saint Kitts and Nevis	58.7	64.4	(5.7)
Kyrgyzstan	53.4	59.1	(5.7)
Seychelles	56.4	62.1	(5.7)
Czech Republic	65.2	70.8	(5.6)
Austria	68.8	74.4	(5.6)
San Marino	69.5	75.0	(5.5)
Republic of Korea	62.3	67.7	(5.4)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Italy	70.0	75.4	(5.4)
Japan	71.9	77.2	(5.4)
Chile	66.0	71.3	(5.4)
Nauru	49.8	55.1	(5.3)
Saint Lucia	62.4	67.6	(5.2)
Mexico	62.4	67.6	(5.2)
Barbados	62.4	67.6	(5.2)
Colombia	60.3	65.5	(5.1)
United States of America	67.5	72.6	(5.1)
Mongolia	51.3	56.3	(5.0)
Dominica	67.2	72.3	(5.0)
Suriname	60.2	65.2	(5.0)
Bahamas	56.7	61.6	(4.9)
Antigua and Barbuda	63.4	68.3	(4.9)
Netherlands	69.6	74.4	(4.8)
Belize	58.5	63.3	(4.8)
Turkmenistan	51.9	56.7	(4.8)
Australia	70.8	75.5	(4.7)
Paraguay	60.7	65.3	(4.6)
Tajikistan	55.1	59.4	(4.4)
Guatemala	52.1	56.4	(4.4)
Denmark	67.2	71.5	(4.3)
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	62.9	67.1	(4.3)
Uzbekistan	58.0	62.3	(4.2)
Ireland	67.5	71.7	(4.2)
New Zealand	67.1	71.2	(4.1)
Malta	68.4	72.5	(4.1)
Greece	70.5	74.6	(4.1)
United Kingdom	69.7	73.7	(4.1)
Canada	70.0	74.0	(4.0)
Yugoslavia	64.2	68.1	(3.9)
Singapore	67.4	71.2	(3.8)
Macedonia, The FYR	61.8	65.6	(3.8)
Thailand	58.4	62.1	(3.7)
Sweden	71.2	74.9	(3.6)
Cambodia	43.9	47.5	(3.6)
Samoa	58.7	62.3	(3.6)
Trinidad and Tobago	62.8	66.4	(3.6)
Philippines	57.1	60.7	(3.6)
Nicaragua	56.4	59.9	(3.5)
Fiji	57.7	61.1	(3.4)
Armenia	65.0	68.3	(3.3)
Palau	57.4	60.7	(3.3)
Iceland	69.2	72.3	(3.1)
Vanuatu	51.3	54.4	(3.1)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	63.4	66.4	(3.1)
Papua New Guinea	45.5	48.5	(2.9)
Viet Nam	56.7	59.6	(2.9)
Costa Rica	65.2	68.1	(2.9)
Peru	58.0	60.8	(2.9)
Haiti	42.4	45.2	(2.9)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Tonga	61.4	64.3	(2.8)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	65.0	67.8	(2.7)
Sao Tome and Principe	52.1	54.8	(2.7)
Equatorial Guinea	42.8	45.4	(2.7)
Kiribati	53.9	56.6	(2.6)
Gabon	46.6	49.0	(2.5)
Israel	69.2	71.6	(2.4)
South Africa	38.6	41.0	(2.4)
Panama	64.9	67.2	(2.4)
Mauritania	40.2	42.5	(2.3)
Oman	61.8	64.1	(2.3)
Cook Islands	62.2	64.5	(2.3)
Honduras	60.0	62.3	(2.3)
Ecuador	59.9	62.1	(2.2)
Cyprus	68.7	70.9	(2.2)
Gambia	47.2	49.4	(2.2)
Senegal	43.5	45.6	(2.1)
China	61.2	63.3	(2.1)
Cuba	67.4	69.4	(2.1)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	45.0	47.1	(2.0)
Afghanistan	36.7	38.7	(2.0)
Brunei Darussalam	63.4	65.4	(2.0)
Niger	28.1	30.1	(2.0)
Micronesia, Federated States of	58.7	60.6	(1.9)
Angola	37.0	38.9	(1.9)
Indonesia	58.8	60.6	(1.8)
Pakistan	55.0	56.8	(1.7)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	51.4	53.1	(1.7)
Congo	44.3	45.9	(1.6)
Chad	38.6	40.2	(1.6)
Bolivia	52.5	54.1	(1.6)
Marshall Islands	56.0	57.6	(1.5)
Cameroon	41.5	43.0	(1.5)
Guinea	37.0	38.5	(1.5)
Mozambique	33.7	35.1	(1.4)
Comoros	46.1	47.5	(1.4)
Togo	40.0	41.4	(1.3)
Niue	61.0	62.2	(1.2)
Côte d'Ivoire	42.2	43.3	(1.1)
Jamaica	66.8	67.9	(1.1)
Bahrain	63.9	64.9	(1.1)
Somalia	35.9	36.9	(1.0)
Ghana	45.0	46.0	(1.0)
Sudan	42.6	43.5	(0.9)
Mali	32.6	33.5	(0.9)
Central African Republic	35.6	36.5	(0.9)
United Arab Emirates	65.0	65.8	(0.9)
Dominican Republic	62.1	62.9	(0.8)
Solomon Islands	54.5	55.3	(0.8)
Bhutan	51.4	52.2	(0.8)
Zambia	30.0	30.7	(0.7)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
India	52.8	53.5	(0.7)
Guinea-Bissau	36.8	37.5	(0.7)
Benin	41.9	42.6	(0.7)
Morocco	58.7	59.4	(0.7)
Kenya	39.0	39.6	(0.6)
Swaziland	37.8	38.4	(0.6)
Lesotho	36.6	37.2	(0.6)
Myanmar	51.4	51.9	(0.5)
Tuvalu	57.1	57.6	(0.5)
Liberia	33.8	34.2	(0.4)
Burkina Faso	35.3	35.7	(0.4)
Djibouti	37.7	38.1	(0.4)
Kuwait	63.0	63.4	(0.4)
Malaysia	61.3	61.6	(0.3)
Nigeria	38.1	38.4	(0.3)
Madagascar	36.5	36.8	(0.3)
Sierra Leone	25.8	26.0	(0.2)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	35.9	36.1	(0.2)
Nepal	49.4	49.5	(0.1)
Malawi	29.3	29.4	(0.1)
Syrian Arab Republic	58.8	58.9	(0.1)
Yemen	49.7	49.7	(0.0)
Ethiopia	33.5	33.5	(0.0)
Botswana	32.3	32.2	0.0
Burundi	34.6	34.6	0.1
Rwanda	32.9	32.7	0.1
Democratic Republic of the Congo	36.4	36.2	0.1
Iraq	55.4	55.1	0.3
Bangladesh	50.1	49.8	0.3
Egypt	58.6	58.3	0.3
Namibia	35.8	35.4	0.4
Uganda	32.9	32.5	0.5
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	59.7	58.9	0.8
Zimbabwe	33.4	32.4	0.9
Lebanon	61.2	60.1	1.1
Maldives	54.4	53.3	1.2
Saudi Arabia	65.1	64.0	1.2
Jordan	60.7	59.3	1.3
Tunisia	62.0	60.7	1.3
Qatar	64.2	62.8	1.4
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	61.3	59.8	1.4
Eritrea	38.5	36.9	1.6
Algeria	62.5	60.7	1.7
Turkey	64.0	61.8	2.1

Disability-adjusted life expectancy measured in years

Source:

World Health Organization

World Health Report 2000

Table: Health attainment, level in all Member States, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 4b**Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Age 60, Male and Female, 1999**
(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Monaco	16.4	21.5	(5.1)
Belarus, Rep. of	10.1	15.1	(5.0)
France	16.8	21.7	(5.0)
Norway	15.1	19.7	(4.6)
Estonia	11.2	15.8	(4.6)
Switzerland	16.0	20.6	(4.6)
Croatia, Rep. of	11.4	16.0	(4.6)
Latvia	11.4	15.9	(4.5)
Russian Federation	10.5	14.9	(4.4)
Netherlands	15.4	19.7	(4.3)
Kazakhstan	8.8	13.1	(4.3)
Poland	12.5	16.6	(4.2)
Germany	14.3	18.5	(4.2)
Finland	14.5	18.5	(4.1)
Japan	17.5	21.6	(4.0)
Ukraine	11.5	15.5	(4.0)
Slovenia	12.7	16.8	(4.0)
Luxembourg	15.8	19.7	(3.9)
San Marino	15.7	19.6	(3.9)
Hungary	11.7	15.5	(3.9)
Cape Verde	11.4	15.3	(3.9)
Albania	10.1	13.9	(3.8)
Belgium	15.8	19.6	(3.8)
Czech Republic	12.7	16.4	(3.7)
Andorra	16.3	20.0	(3.7)
Portugal	14.0	17.7	(3.7)
Italy	16.2	19.9	(3.6)
Botswana	6.1	9.7	(3.6)
Chile	14.3	17.8	(3.5)
Argentina	14.7	18.1	(3.5)
Austria	15.2	18.7	(3.5)
Australia	16.8	20.2	(3.4)
Slovakia	12.7	16.0	(3.4)
Spain	16.8	20.1	(3.3)
United States of America	15.0	18.4	(3.3)
Mauritius	10.2	13.5	(3.3)
Sri Lanka	12.7	16.0	(3.3)
Tajikistan	12.3	15.6	(3.3)
Seychelles	8.6	11.7	(3.1)
Zambia	7.6	10.7	(3.1)
Republic of Korea	12.1	15.2	(3.1)
Niger	6.6	9.6	(3.0)
Azerbaijan	12.7	15.7	(3.0)
Brazil	11.8	14.8	(3.0)
Uruguay	15.3	18.3	(3.0)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Denmark	14.2	17.2	(3.0)
Dominica	15.0	17.9	(3.0)
Bulgaria	12.2	15.1	(2.9)
United Kingdom	15.7	18.6	(2.9)
Sweden	16.8	19.6	(2.9)
Canada	16.0	18.9	(2.9)
Samoa	9.5	12.3	(2.8)
Kenya	9.2	12.0	(2.8)
Georgia	13.8	16.6	(2.8)
Kyrgyzstan	9.6	12.4	(2.8)
Lithuania	13.4	16.2	(2.8)
Grenada	14.1	16.9	(2.8)
Ireland	13.9	16.6	(2.7)
New Zealand	14.4	17.0	(2.7)
Romania	12.0	14.6	(2.6)
South Africa	6.8	9.3	(2.5)
Malta	14.8	17.3	(2.5)
Senegal	8.8	11.3	(2.5)
Mongolia	11.8	14.3	(2.4)
Costa Rica	14.2	16.6	(2.4)
Singapore	14.4	16.8	(2.4)
Yugoslavia	15.1	17.5	(2.4)
Mozambique	8.3	10.7	(2.4)
Antigua and Barbuda	14.4	16.8	(2.3)
Moldova, Rep. of	10.7	13.0	(2.3)
Nauru	3.6	5.9	(2.3)
Cameroon	9.6	11.9	(2.3)
Namibia	9.8	12.1	(2.3)
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	13.4	15.7	(2.2)
Mexico	14.7	16.8	(2.2)
Iceland	14.9	17.0	(2.1)
Congo	10.7	12.8	(2.1)
Philippines	10.3	12.4	(2.0)
Barbados	14.5	16.6	(2.0)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	9.6	11.6	(2.0)
Gabon	10.3	12.3	(2.0)
Greece	16.9	18.8	(2.0)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	13.3	15.3	(1.9)
Colombia	13.5	15.4	(1.9)
Cambodia	7.4	9.3	(1.9)
Uzbekistan	11.5	13.4	(1.9)
El Salvador	13.9	15.8	(1.9)
China	11.6	13.5	(1.9)
Trinidad and Tobago	12.0	13.9	(1.9)
Turkmenistan	9.0	10.9	(1.9)
Central African Republic	8.8	10.6	(1.9)
Angola	8.9	10.8	(1.8)
Gambia	9.9	11.7	(1.8)
Tonga	11.5	13.3	(1.8)
Macedonia, The FYR	11.7	13.5	(1.8)
Burundi	7.6	9.4	(1.8)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Mauritania	9.2	11.0	(1.8)
Paraguay	14.2	16.0	(1.7)
Palau	8.0	9.7	(1.7)
Bahamas	11.3	13.0	(1.7)
Saint Lucia	14.1	15.8	(1.7)
Equatorial Guinea	9.4	11.0	(1.6)
Belize	13.6	15.2	(1.6)
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12.8	14.3	(1.6)
Togo	9.5	11.0	(1.6)
Kiribati	9.4	11.0	(1.6)
Cook Islands	12.2	13.7	(1.6)
India	10.6	12.1	(1.5)
Fiji	8.3	9.8	(1.5)
Malawi	6.8	8.3	(1.5)
Oman	10.6	12.1	(1.5)
Lesotho	9.9	11.3	(1.5)
Somalia	6.1	7.5	(1.5)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	7.8	9.2	(1.4)
Cyprus	15.9	17.3	(1.4)
Nicaragua	11.1	12.5	(1.4)
Nigeria	8.7	10.1	(1.4)
Chad	9.2	10.6	(1.4)
Swaziland	8.1	9.5	(1.4)
Guyana	15.4	16.8	(1.4)
Israel	15.6	16.9	(1.3)
Mali	7.7	9.0	(1.3)
Pakistan	11.3	12.6	(1.3)
Bhutan	11.4	12.6	(1.3)
Zimbabwe	8.8	10.1	(1.3)
Burkina Faso	7.9	9.1	(1.3)
Uganda	6.2	7.4	(1.2)
Vanuatu	8.0	9.2	(1.1)
Guinea	8.5	9.6	(1.1)
Viet Nam	9.7	10.8	(1.1)
Ethiopia	7.5	8.6	(1.1)
Suriname	14.4	15.5	(1.1)
Guatemala	9.1	10.1	(1.0)
Niue	12.2	13.2	(1.0)
Armenia	14.5	15.5	(1.0)
Djibouti	6.9	7.9	(1.0)
Liberia	7.3	8.3	(0.9)
Bahrain	11.6	12.6	(0.9)
Comoros	8.9	9.8	(0.9)
Benin	9.6	10.6	(0.9)
United Arab Emirates	11.7	12.6	(0.9)
Guinea-Bissau	9.1	10.0	(0.9)
Côte d'Ivoire	11.9	12.7	(0.8)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	15.9	16.7	(0.8)
Cuba	15.4	16.1	(0.8)
Peru	12.3	13.1	(0.7)
Kuwait	11.1	11.8	(0.7)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Bangladesh	9.9	10.5	(0.6)
Haiti	7.4	8.0	(0.6)
Rwanda	6.9	7.4	(0.5)
Democratic Republic of the Congo	7.3	7.8	(0.5)
Papua New Guinea	8.2	8.7	(0.5)
Sudan	5.6	6.0	(0.5)
Marshall Islands	10.7	11.1	(0.4)
Micronesia, Federated States of	11.1	11.5	(0.4)
Solomon Islands	8.8	9.2	(0.4)
Ecuador	12.6	12.9	(0.3)
Sao Tome and Principe	11.4	11.7	(0.3)
Ghana	9.9	10.2	(0.3)
Syrian Arab Republic	9.7	10.0	(0.2)
Thailand	13.7	13.9	(0.2)
Brunei Darussalam	12.4	12.6	(0.2)
Panama	17.3	17.4	(0.1)
Saudi Arabia	12.7	12.8	(0.1)
Afghanistan	7.9	7.9	(0.0)
Egypt	11.8	11.7	0.0
Malaysia	9.7	9.7	0.0
Sierra Leone	6.0	6.0	0.0
Madagascar	6.7	6.6	0.1
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	8.9	8.8	0.1
Morocco	11.5	11.4	0.1
Nepal	10.3	10.0	0.2
Myanmar	12.5	12.3	0.2
Eritrea	8.2	7.9	0.3
Bolivia	11.6	11.2	0.3
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	9.7	9.3	0.4
Yemen	8.5	8.2	0.4
Indonesia	16.3	15.8	0.5
Jordan	9.5	8.9	0.6
Qatar	10.8	10.2	0.6
Maldives	12.1	11.5	0.6
Honduras	15.0	14.4	0.7
Jamaica	18.9	18.2	0.7
Tuvalu	10.3	9.4	0.9
Lebanon	10.1	9.2	0.9
Algeria	12.9	12.0	0.9
Turkey	16.2	15.2	0.9
Tunisia	11.2	10.3	0.9
Dominican Republic	17.1	16.1	1.0
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	11.9	10.9	1.0
Iraq	9.2	8.2	1.1

Disability-adjusted life expectancy measured in years

Source:

World Health Organization

World Health Report 2000

Table: Health attainment, level in all Member States, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 4c

Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Birth, Male Minus "Max Male", 1999
 (Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Max Male", Max Male = 71.9 [Japan])

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Sierra Leone	(46.1)	Gambia	(24.7)
Niger	(43.8)	Nepal	(22.5)
Malawi	(42.6)	Yemen	(22.2)
Zambia	(41.9)	Nauru	(22.1)
Botswana	(39.6)	Bangladesh	(21.8)
Mali	(39.3)	Mongolia	(20.6)
Rwanda	(39.0)	Vanuatu	(20.6)
Uganda	(39.0)	Myanmar	(20.5)
Zimbabwe	(38.5)	Bhutan	(20.5)
Ethiopia	(38.4)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	(20.5)
Mozambique	(38.2)	Kazakhstan	(20.4)
Liberia	(38.1)	Turkmenistan	(20.0)
Burundi	(37.3)	Guatemala	(19.8)
Burkina Faso	(36.6)	Sao Tome and Principe	(19.8)
Central African Republic	(36.3)	Bolivia	(19.4)
Namibia	(36.1)	India	(19.1)
Somalia	(36.0)	Kyrgyzstan	(18.5)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	(36.0)	Kiribati	(18.0)
Democratic Republic of the Congo	(35.5)	Maldives	(17.5)
Madagascar	(35.4)	Solomon Islands	(17.4)
Lesotho	(35.3)	Cape Verde	(17.3)
Afghanistan	(35.2)	Pakistan	(16.9)
Guinea-Bissau	(35.1)	Tajikistan	(16.8)
Guinea	(34.9)	Brazil	(16.7)
Angola	(34.9)	Iraq	(16.5)
Djibouti	(34.2)	Marshall Islands	(15.9)
Swaziland	(34.1)	Russian Federation	(15.8)
Nigeria	(33.8)	Belarus, Rep. of	(15.7)
Eritrea	(33.4)	Nicaragua	(15.5)
Chad	(33.3)	Seychelles	(15.5)
South Africa	(33.3)	Albania	(15.4)
Kenya	(32.9)	Bahamas	(15.2)
Togo	(31.9)	Viet Nam	(15.2)
Mauritania	(31.7)	Philippines	(14.8)
Cameroon	(30.4)	Latvia	(14.8)
Benin	(30.0)	Tuvalu	(14.8)
Côte d'Ivoire	(29.7)	Guyana	(14.8)
Haiti	(29.5)	Palau	(14.5)
Sudan	(29.3)	Fiji	(14.2)
Equatorial Guinea	(29.1)	Peru	(13.9)
Senegal	(28.4)	Uzbekistan	(13.9)
Cambodia	(28.0)	Estonia	(13.8)
Congo	(27.6)	Thailand	(13.5)
Ghana	(26.9)	Moldova, Rep. of	(13.4)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	(26.9)	Belize	(13.4)
Papua New Guinea	(26.4)	Ukraine	(13.4)
Comoros	(25.8)	El Salvador	(13.3)
Gabon	(25.3)	Egypt	(13.3)

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Micronesia, Federated States of	(13.2)	Argentina	(8.1)
Saint Kitts and Nevis	(13.2)	Bahrain	(8.0)
Samoa	(13.2)	Turkey	(7.9)
Morocco	(13.2)	Uruguay	(7.8)
Romania	(13.1)	Yugoslavia	(7.7)
Syrian Arab Republic	(13.1)	Qatar	(7.7)
Indonesia	(13.1)	Panama	(7.0)
Mauritius	(12.9)	Slovenia	(7.0)
Sri Lanka	(12.6)	United Arab Emirates	(6.9)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	(12.2)	Armenia	(6.9)
Ecuador	(12.0)	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	(6.9)
Honduras	(11.9)	Saudi Arabia	(6.8)
Suriname	(11.7)	Czech Republic	(6.7)
Colombia	(11.6)	Costa Rica	(6.7)
Hungary	(11.5)	Portugal	(6.0)
Lithuania	(11.3)	Chile	(5.9)
Azerbaijan	(11.3)	Jamaica	(5.1)
Jordan	(11.2)	New Zealand	(4.8)
Paraguay	(11.2)	Denmark	(4.7)
Niue	(10.9)	Finland	(4.7)
Bulgaria	(10.7)	Dominica	(4.7)
Lebanon	(10.7)	Cuba	(4.5)
China	(10.7)	Singapore	(4.5)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	(10.6)	Germany	(4.5)
Malaysia	(10.6)	United States of America	(4.4)
Tonga	(10.5)	Ireland	(4.4)
Macedonia, The FYR	(10.1)	Luxembourg	(3.9)
Oman	(10.1)	Malta	(3.5)
Tunisia	(9.9)	Monaco	(3.4)
Dominican Republic	(9.8)	Belgium	(3.2)
Cook Islands	(9.7)	Cyprus	(3.2)
Poland	(9.6)	Norway	(3.1)
Republic of Korea	(9.6)	Austria	(3.1)
Mexico	(9.5)	Israel	(2.7)
Saint Lucia	(9.5)	Iceland	(2.7)
Barbados	(9.5)	France	(2.6)
Grenada	(9.5)	Andorra	(2.6)
Algeria	(9.4)	Switzerland	(2.4)
Trinidad and Tobago	(9.1)	San Marino	(2.4)
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	(9.0)	Netherlands	(2.3)
Kuwait	(8.9)	United Kingdom	(2.2)
Georgia	(8.8)	Spain	(2.1)
Croatia, Rep. of	(8.6)	Italy	(1.9)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	(8.5)	Canada	(1.9)
Antigua and Barbuda	(8.5)	Greece	(1.4)
Brunei Darussalam	(8.5)	Australia	(1.1)
Slovakia	(8.4)	Sweden	(0.7)

Disability-adjusted life expectancy measured in years

Source:

World Health Organization

World Health Report 2000

Table: Health attainment, level in all Member States, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 4d**Disability-Adjusted Life Expectancy at Age 60, Male Minus "Max Male", 1999**

(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Max Male", Max Male = 18.9 [Jamaica])

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Nauru	(15.3)	Iraq	(9.7)
Sudan	(13.3)	Equatorial Guinea	(9.5)
Sierra Leone	(12.9)	Kiribati	(9.5)
Somalia	(12.8)	Togo	(9.4)
Botswana	(12.8)	Samoa	(9.4)
Uganda	(12.7)	Jordan	(9.4)
Niger	(12.3)	Cameroon	(9.3)
Madagascar	(12.2)	Kyrgyzstan	(9.3)
Malawi	(12.1)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	(9.3)
South Africa	(12.1)	Benin	(9.3)
Djibouti	(12.0)	Viet Nam	(9.2)
Rwanda	(12.0)	Malaysia	(9.2)
Democratic Republic of the Congo	(11.6)	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	(9.2)
Liberia	(11.6)	Syrian Arab Republic	(9.2)
Cambodia	(11.5)	Namibia	(9.1)
Haiti	(11.5)	Lesotho	(9.0)
Ethiopia	(11.4)	Bangladesh	(9.0)
Zambia	(11.3)	Ghana	(9.0)
Burundi	(11.3)	Gambia	(9.0)
Mali	(11.2)	Lebanon	(8.8)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	(11.1)	Belarus, Rep. of	(8.8)
Burkina Faso	(11.0)	Albania	(8.8)
Afghanistan	(11.0)	Mauritius	(8.7)
Palau	(10.9)	Nepal	(8.6)
Vanuatu	(10.9)	Tuvalu	(8.6)
Swaziland	(10.8)	Gabon	(8.6)
Eritrea	(10.7)	Philippines	(8.6)
Papua New Guinea	(10.7)	Russian Federation	(8.4)
Fiji	(10.6)	Oman	(8.3)
Mozambique	(10.6)	India	(8.3)
Guinea	(10.4)	Marshall Islands	(8.2)
Yemen	(10.4)	Congo	(8.2)
Seychelles	(10.3)	Moldova, Rep. of	(8.2)
Nigeria	(10.2)	Qatar	(8.1)
Central African Republic	(10.1)	Kuwait	(7.8)
Senegal	(10.1)	Micronesia, Federated States of	(7.8)
Kazakhstan	(10.1)	Nicaragua	(7.8)
Zimbabwe	(10.1)	Estonia	(7.7)
Solomon Islands	(10.1)	Tunisia	(7.7)
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	(10.0)	Pakistan	(7.6)
Comoros	(10.0)	Bahamas	(7.6)
Angola	(10.0)	Bhutan	(7.5)
Turkmenistan	(9.9)	Latvia	(7.5)
Guinea-Bissau	(9.8)	Sao Tome and Principe	(7.5)
Guatemala	(9.8)	Croatia, Rep. of	(7.5)
Kenya	(9.7)	Cape Verde	(7.5)
Mauritania	(9.7)	Ukraine	(7.4)
Chad	(9.7)	Uzbekistan	(7.4)

Country	Male - Max Male	Country	Male - Max Male
Morocco	(7.4)	Costa Rica	(4.7)
Tonga	(7.4)	Paraguay	(4.7)
Bolivia	(7.3)	Germany	(4.6)
China	(7.3)	Chile	(4.6)
Bahrain	(7.3)	New Zealand	(4.5)
Hungary	(7.2)	Singapore	(4.5)
Macedonia, The FYR	(7.2)	Antigua and Barbuda	(4.5)
United Arab Emirates	(7.2)	Suriname	(4.5)
Egypt	(7.1)	Finland	(4.4)
Brazil	(7.1)	Armenia	(4.4)
Mongolia	(7.1)	Barbados	(4.4)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	(7.0)	Argentina	(4.2)
Côte d'Ivoire	(7.0)	Mexico	(4.2)
Trinidad and Tobago	(6.9)	Malta	(4.1)
Romania	(6.9)	Iceland	(4.0)
Republic of Korea	(6.8)	Dominica	(3.9)
Maldives	(6.8)	Honduras	(3.9)
Bulgaria	(6.7)	United States of America	(3.9)
Cook Islands	(6.7)	Yugoslavia	(3.8)
Niue	(6.7)	Norway	(3.8)
Tajikistan	(6.6)	Austria	(3.7)
Peru	(6.6)	Uruguay	(3.6)
Brunei Darussalam	(6.5)	Cuba	(3.5)
Poland	(6.4)	Guyana	(3.5)
Myanmar	(6.4)	Netherlands	(3.5)
Ecuador	(6.3)	Israel	(3.3)
Slovakia	(6.2)	United Kingdom	(3.2)
Czech Republic	(6.2)	San Marino	(3.2)
Azerbaijan	(6.2)	Luxembourg	(3.1)
Sri Lanka	(6.2)	Belgium	(3.1)
Saudi Arabia	(6.2)	Cyprus	(3.0)
Slovenia	(6.2)	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	(3.0)
Saint Kitts and Nevis	(6.1)	Switzerland	(2.9)
Algeria	(6.0)	Canada	(2.9)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	(5.6)	Turkey	(2.7)
Lithuania	(5.5)	Italy	(2.7)
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	(5.5)	Indonesia	(2.6)
Colombia	(5.4)	Andorra	(2.6)
Belize	(5.3)	Monaco	(2.5)
Thailand	(5.2)	Sweden	(2.1)
Georgia	(5.1)	France	(2.1)
El Salvador	(5.0)	Australia	(2.1)
Ireland	(5.0)	Spain	(2.1)
Portugal	(4.9)	Greece	(2.0)
Grenada	(4.8)	Dominican Republic	(1.8)
Saint Lucia	(4.8)	Panama	(1.6)
Denmark	(4.7)	Japan	(1.4)

Disability-adjusted life expectancy measured in years

Source:

World Health Organization

World Health Report 2000

Table: Health attainment, level in all Member States, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 5a

Deaths by Cause, Male and Female, 1999

Population (000)	Males		Females		Males as % of Females	Male % as % of Female %
	(000)	% total	(000)	% total		
	3,002,288		2,959,340			
Total Deaths	29 158	100	26 807	100		
Communicable diseases, maternal and perinatal conditions and nutritional	8 734	30.0	8 645	32.2	101.0	92.9
Perinatal conditions	1 273	4.4	1 084	4.0	117.4	108.0
Infectious and parasitic diseases	5 178	17.8	4 809	17.9	107.7	99.0
Respiratory infections	2 046	7.0	1 993	7.4	102.7	94.4
Nutritional deficiencies	236	0.8	257	1.0	91.5	84.2
Maternal conditions	0	0.0	497	1.9	0.0	0.0
Noncommunicable conditions	17 039	58.4	16 445	61.3	103.6	95.3
Digestive diseases	1 241	4.3	808	3.0	153.6	141.2
Malignant neoplasms	3 915	13.4	3 150	11.7	124.3	114.3
Diseases of the genitourinary system	497	1.7	403	1.5	123.3	113.4
Congenital abnormalities	348	1.2	304	1.1	114.5	105.3
Respiratory diseases	1 897	6.5	1 678	6.3	113.0	103.9
Neuropsychiatric disorders	473	1.6	438	1.6	108.0	99.3
<i>of which: Alcohol dependence</i>	52	0.2	8	0.0	677.0	622.4
<i>Drug dependence</i>	5	0.0	1	0.0	614.9	565.3
Other neoplasms	53	0.2	49	0.2	106.5	97.9
Nutritional/endocrine disorders	155	0.5	151	0.6	103.0	94.7
Oral diseases	0	0.0	0	0.0	91.7	84.3
Cardiovascular diseases	8 059	27.6	8 911	33.2	90.4	83.1
Skin diseases	27	0.1	34	0.1	76.9	70.7
Diabetes mellitus	335	1.2	441	1.6	76.0	69.9
Musculoskeletal diseases	37	0.1	69	0.3	53.8	49.5
Sense organ disorders	1	0.0	2	0.0	41.6	38.2
Injuries	3 385	11.6	1 716	6.4	197.2	181.3
Unintentional	2 284	7.8	1 128	4.2	202.4	186.1
Intentional	1 101	3.8	588	2.2	187.4	172.2
<i>of which: Self-inflicted</i>	545	1.9	348	1.3	156.6	144.0
<i>Homicide and violence</i>	392	1.3	135	0.5	290.3	266.9

Source:

World Health Organization

World Health Report 2000

Table: Deaths by cause, sex and mortality stratum in WHO Regions, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 5b

Burden of Disease in Disability-Adjusted Life Years by Cause, Male and Female, 1999

Population (000)	Males		Females		Males as % of Females	Male % as % of Female %
	(000)	% total	(000)	% total		
TOTAL DALYs	751 600	100	686 555	100		
Communicable diseases, maternal and perinatal conditions and nutritional						
	296 674	39.5	318 431	46.4	93.2	85.1
Perinatal conditions	48 911	6.5	40 597	5.9	120.5	110.1
Respiratory infections	50 852	6.8	50 275	7.3	101.1	92.4
Infectious and parasitic diseases	175 376	23.3	178 463	26.0	98.3	89.8
<i>of which: STDs excluding HIV</i>	6 686	0.9	13 060	1.9	51.2	46.8
<i>HIV/AIDS</i>	42 623	5.7	47 196	6.9	90.3	82.5
Nutritional deficiencies	21 478	2.9	23 062	3.4	93.1	85.1
Maternal conditions	0	0.0	26 101	3.8	0.0	0.0
Noncommunicable conditions						
	322 583	42.9	299 159	43.6	107.8	98.5
Digestive diseases	23 809	3.2	13 020	1.9	182.9	167.0
Diseases of the genitourinary system	9 619	1.3	6 466	0.9	148.8	135.9
Skin diseases	495	0.1	359	0.1	137.8	125.9
Malignant neoplasms	46 145	6.1	38 355	5.6	120.3	109.9
Nutritional/endocrine disorders	7 998	1.1	6 669	1.0	119.9	109.5
Other neoplasms	733	0.1	633	0.1	115.7	105.7
Congenital abnormalities	19 562	2.6	16 995	2.5	115.1	105.1
Cardiovascular diseases	81 848	10.9	75 337	11.0	108.6	99.2
Respiratory diseases	36 038	4.8	33 980	4.9	106.1	96.9
Oral diseases	2 487	0.3	2 440	0.4	101.9	93.1
Neuropsychiatric disorders	77 771	10.3	80 950	11.8	96.1	87.8
<i>of which: Alcohol dependence</i>	16 512	2.2	2 231	0.3	740.2	676.2
<i>Drug dependence</i>	4 486	0.6	1 171	0.2	383.1	349.9
Diabetes mellitus	6 972	0.9	8 098	1.2	86.1	78.7
Sense organ disorders	5 390	0.7	6 614	1.0	81.5	74.4
Musculoskeletal diseases	7 783	1.0	13 134	1.9	59.3	54.1
Injuries						
	132 343	17.6	68 965	10.0	191.9	175.3
Unintentional	101 190	13.5	51 275	7.5	197.3	180.3
Intentional	31 153	4.1	17 690	2.6	176.1	160.9
<i>of which: Self-inflicted</i>	14 876	2.0	10 220	1.5	145.6	133.0
<i>Homicide and violence</i>	10 818	1.4	4 490	0.7	240.9	220.1

Source:

World Health Organization*World Health Report 2000*

Table: Burden of disease in disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) by cause, sex and mortality stratum in WHO Regions, estimates for 1999

<http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/statistics.htm>

Table 6

Percentage Male of Adults with HIV/AIDS, end of 1999
 (Countries arranged in declining percentage of men)

Country	Percent men among adults	Country	Percent men among adults
Australia	94	Uruguay	75
Malaysia	90	Costa Rica	75
Hungary	89	Peru	74
Canada	89	Sweden	73
China	88	France	73
Republic of Korea	87	Finland	73
Japan	87	Israel	71
Ecuador	86	Ireland	70
Colombia	86	Sri Lanka	70
Bangladesh	85	Nepal	70
Mexico	85	Ukraine	70
New Zealand	85	Italy	68
Venezuela	85	Jamaica	68
Bolivia	83	Switzerland	68
Chile	83	Bahamas	68
Paraguay	82	Guyana	67
Portugal	81	Suriname	67
Germany	80	Trinidad and Tobago	67
Greece	80	Haiti	67
Netherlands	80	Barbados	66
Viet Nam	80	Cambodia	66
United States of America	80	Belgium	65
Singapore	80	Myanmar	65
Pakistan	79	India	63
Latvia	79	Romania	63
Spain	79	Guatemala	61
Denmark	79	Panama	59
Moldova, Rep. of	78	Thailand	59
Austria	78	Philippines	58
United Kingdom	78	Dominican Republic	55
Norway	78	Papua New Guinea	50
Argentina	78	Lao People's Dem. Rep	50
Czech Republic	77	Honduras	50
Cuba	77	Senegal	47
Brazil	75	Botswana	46
Belize	75	Nigeria	46
Indonesia	75	Lesotho	46
Belarus, Rep. of	75	Zambia	46
Russian Federation	75	Djibouti	46
Nicaragua	75	Burkina Faso	45
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	75	Dem. Republic of Congo	45
El Salvador	75	Gabon	45

Country	Percent men among adults
Ghana	45
Uganda	45
Mali	45
Angola	45
Cote d'Ivoire	45
Congo	45
Gambia	45
Kenya	45
Togo	45
Ethiopia	45
Benin	45
Malawi	45
Sierra Leone	45
Mauritania	44
Chad	44
Niger	44
Cameroon	44
Guinea	44
Swaziland	44
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	44
Burundi	44
Equatorial Guinea	44
South Africa	44
Guinea-Bissau	44
Central African Republic	43
Namibia	43
Liberia	43
Rwanda	43
Zimbabwe	43
Mozambique	43
Madagascar	42

Source:

UNAIDS

Report on the Global HIV/AIDS epidemic - June 2000

Table: HIV/AIDS estimates and data, end 1999

Table 7a

Fatal Occupational Injury Rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
(Countries arranged in declining M/F ratio of fatal injuries)

Country	Fatal Rates of Injuries (per 100,000 workers)		Male/ Female
	Male	Female	
United Kingdom	1.6	0.0	--
Canada	9.8	0.5	19.6
Czech Republic (a)	7.5	0.4	18.8
Belarus, Rep. of	14.4	0.8	18.0
Sweden	3.1	0.2	15.5
Ukraine	17.1	1.3	13.2
France (a)	7.3	0.7	10.4
Kazakstan	16.4	1.7	9.6
Australia	9.0	1.0	9.0
El Salvador	58.3	7.6	7.7
Estonia (a)	14.6	2.0	7.3
Nicaragua	18.0	6.0	3.0
Russia	24.2	20.0	1.2

Per 100,000 workers

Source:

International Labour Office, Geneva

Yearbook of Labor Statistics 2000

Table 8B

Note:

(a) per 100,000 workers insured

Table 7b

Non-fatal Occupational Injury Rates, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
(Countries arranged in declining M/F ratio of fatal injuries)

Country	Non-fatal Rates of Injuries (per 100,000 workers)		Male/ Female
	Male	Female	
Kazakstan	184	49	3.8
Czech Republic (a)	3055	1001	3.1
United Kingdom	9926	3638	2.7
Russia	697	259	2.7
France (a)	6099	2483	2.5
Canada	3491	1558	2.2
Australia	2903	1325	2.2
Estonia (a)	648	334	1.9
Sweden	1047	759	1.4
Nicaragua	3899	3570	1.1

Per 100,000 workers

Source:

International Labour Office, Geneva

Yearbook of Labor Statistics 2000

Table 8B

Note:

(a) per 100,000 workers insured

Table 8

Percentage Male of Criminal Offenders, by Type of Crime, most recent year available as of 2001

Country	Offence				
	Homicides	Serious Assault	Theft	Fraud	Drug Offenses
Albania	98.0	96.0	100.0	94.0	--
Algeria	91.6	96.2	95.6	--	98.9
Andora	100.0	83.4	89.7	73.5	90.3
Argentina	88.8	84.4	93.4	78.5	85.5
Armenia	91.0	96.4	95.4	80.6	93.7
Austria	88.7	88.0	73.1	76.4	83.3
Azerbaijan, Rep. of	95.7	99.0	95.6	83.3	89.3
Bahamas	82.9	97.1	92.4	80.0	92.3
Barbados	96.7	90.0	92.8	68.6	93.0
Brunei	75.0	100.0	95.8	85.7	--
Bulgaria	90.4	93.5	90.2	80.0	92.0
Canada	88.0	83.1	78.7	70.9	86.1
Chile	89.5	92.6	92.6	84.0	83.2
Croatia, Rep. of	91.4	97.0	92.9	78.7	91.6
Czech Republic	87.6	92.4	89.4	77.9	--
Ecuador	93.0	93.2	94.5	87.3	88.0
Eritrea	80.8	90.1	86.0	92.7	80.0
Estonia	92.4	92.9	91.3	88.9	80.9
Ethiopia	91.7	86.9	83.2	94.3	80.3
Fiji	96.0	76.0	89.0	86.0	71.0
Finland	76.5	87.4	89.2	77.3	87.3
France	86.4	89.8	85.6	74.9	91.8
Germany	86.7	87.5	69.8	74.5	87.8
Greece	98.0	88.8	90.3	84.9	92.6
Guyana	96.0	85.0	93.9	76.3	87.5
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	81.0	88.2	74.2	77.9	85.3
Hungary	85.7	91.0	87.2	76.3	89.9
Ireland	100.0	94.0	86.0	78.0	90.0
Israel	94.8	80.6	--	84.4	90.4
Japan	83.7	92.7	71.9	86.9	80.8
Jordan	97.4	97.2	96.0	97.0	100.0
Kazakhstan	88.9	--	93.7	60.0	86.1
Republic of Korea	88.2	79.5	93.5	70.7	81.3
Latvia	89.9	87.4	89.3	81.1	79.9
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	97.0	97.8	98.2	98.5	99.5
Lithuania	89.9	85.5	91.7	80.9	77.0
Luxembourg	87.8	83.7	75.6	93.0	83.3
Mauritius	92.7	95.6	92.4	91.4	95.9
Monaco	100.0	94.2	85.4	97.3	67.7
Norway	--	94.0	73.0	71.0	80.0
Oman	96.0	96.5	98.8	96.0	99.4
Paraguay	84.0	69.0	78.0	59.0	81.0
Poland	85.6	92.3	93.7	82.8	87.3
Portugal	89.8	87.8	86.6	77.1	82.9
Qatar	77.0	96.1	91.9	96.6	--
Belarus, Rep. of	85.6	83.8	87.8	98.7	78.4
Romania	93.7	96.5	90.9	72.5	88.1

Country	Offence				
	Homicides	Serious Assault	Theft	Fraud	Drug Offenses
Russian Federation	87.7	87.4	90.4	60.8	85.5
Singapore	77.8	100.0	69.8	73.9	--
Slovenia	87.8	97.1	90.9	81.2	91.1
Spain	89.3	92.7	90.5	79.3	95.4
Swaziland	95.6	86.0	89.2	85.0	80.8
Switzerland	88.0	89.9	83.9	82.0	85.6
Tunisia	92.6	87.0	96.3	93.4	98.0
Turkey	92.1	93.7	92.5	90.7	96.2
Uganda	89.0	82.8	94.2	91.0	95.0
Ukraine	86.5	90.0	88.4	61.2	79.4
Union of Myanmar	95.1	66.8	88.3	73.3	81.4
United Arab Emirates	92.2	96.4	91.7	96.1	96.1
Uruguay	94.8	92.2	92.4	92.5	96.2
Uzbekistan	90.1	90.8	98.2	74.8	88.3
Yemen, Republic	98.6	96.5	98.2	97.8	--

Source:

International Criminal Police Organization

International Crime Statistics 1999

Table 9

Male/Female Prison Population Ratios, most recent year available as of 2001
 (Countries arranged in declining M/F ratio)

Country	Male/ Female	Country	Male/ Female
Malawi	141.9	Germany	21.2
St Kitts and Nevis	110.1	Czech Republic	21.2
Azerbaijan	75.9	Ukraine	20.7
Jordan	61.5	New Zealand	20.3
Pakistan	57.8	Greece	20.3
Mali	54.6	Malaysia	19.8
Nigeria	54.6	El Salvador	19.8
Albania	51.6	Denmark	19.0
Angola	49.0	Republic of Korea	18.6
Honduras	49.0	Sweden	18.6
Poland	44.5	Japan	17.9
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	44.5	Vietnam	17.2
South Africa	40.7	United Kingdom: England & Wales	16.9
Bahamas	37.5	Netherlands	16.2
India	36.0	Austria	15.9
Bulgaria	33.5	Australia	15.7
Lithuania	32.3	Switzerland	15.7
Madagascar	31.3	Colombia	15.7
Trinidad and Tobago	31.3	Guatemala	15.7
China	29.3	Bermuda	14.9
Indonesia	28.4	Belize	14.6
Turkey	26.8	Chile	13.3
France	26.0	Spain	11.3
Croatia, Republic of	26.0	Peru	11.3
St Lucia	26.0	Panama	11.3
Mexico	26.0	Singapore	11.2
Papua New Guinea	24.6	United States of America	11.2
Lesotho	24.6	Argentina	10.6
United Kingdom: Scotland	24.0	Portugal	9.2
Belgium	23.4	Costa Rica	8.3
Zimbabwe	23.4	Paraguay	7.8
Italy	22.8	Cayman Islands	6.4
Uganda	22.3	Bolivia	5.0
Namibia	22.3	Mozambique	4.1
Jamaica	22.3		
Dominican Republic	22.3		
Russia	21.7		
Brazil	21.7		

Source:

International Center for Prison Studies

World Prison Brief 2001

http://www.kcl.ac.uk/depsta/rel/icps/worldbrief/world_brief.html

Table 10

Percentage Male of Young Adult (ages 15-24) Homicide Deaths, most recent year available as of 1999
(Countries arranged in decreasing percentage male homicide deaths)

Country	Percent Male
Azerbaijan	94.5
United States	86.2
Argentina	84.7
United Kingdom	81.9
Italy	81.2
Kazakhstan	80.4
Singapore	80.0
Romania	78.6
Russian Federation	78.3
Armenia	77.8
Portugal	77.3
Israel	76.9
Lithuania	76.6
Norway	75.0
Canada	74.4
Estonia	74.1
Germany	70.5
Australia	70.4
France	69.4
Japan	66.2
Republic of Korea	57.7
Sweden	57.1
Hungary	55.0

Source:

World Health Organization

1997-1999 World Health Statistics Annual

Table: Mortality Data

<http://www.who.int/whosis/statistics/menu.cfm>

Table 11**Male/Female Suicide Rate Ratios, most recent year available as of 2000***(Countries arranged in declining M/F ratio)*

Country	Male/ Female	Country	Male/ Female
Belize	13.4	Panama	2.9
Bahrain	9.8	Germany	2.9
Guatemala	9.0	Croatia, Rep. of	2.9
Puerto Rico	8.4	Uzbekistan	2.9
Chile	7.3	Macedonia, The FYR	2.9
Belarus, Rep. of	6.3	Paraguay	2.8
Greece	6.2	France	2.8
Estonia	5.7	Malta	2.8
Ireland	5.5	Mauritius	2.8
Kazakhstan	5.4	Belgium	2.7
Mexico	5.4	Georgia	2.7
Russian Federation	5.4	Sri Lanka	2.7
Lithuania	5.4	Barbados	2.6
Poland	5.2	Switzerland	2.5
Slovak Republic	5.1	Jamaica	2.5
Romania	5.1	Denmark	2.5
Moldova, Rep. of	5.0	Bulgaria	2.5
Kyrgyzstan	5.0	Turkmenistan	2.4
Latvia	4.9	Sweden	2.4
Ukraine	4.9	Yugoslavia	2.3
Costa Rica	4.6	Thailand	2.3
Azerbaijan	4.6	Suriname	2.3
Venezuela	4.4	Guyana	2.2
Iceland	4.3	Republic of Korea	2.2
Armenia	4.3	Tajikistan	2.2
United States of America	4.3	Japan	2.2
Slovenia	4.2	Nicaragua	2.1
New Zealand	4.0	Cuba	2.0
Uruguay	4.0	Zimbabwe	2.0
Czech Republic	3.9	Netherlands	2.0
Canada	3.8	Ecuador	2.0
Australia	3.7	El Salvador	1.9
Colombia	3.7	Singapore	1.8
Finland	3.6	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	1.7
Brazil	3.5	Albania	1.7
Hungary	3.5	Saint Lucia	1.6
United Kingdom	3.4	Peru	1.5
Trinidad and Tobago	3.4	Philippines	1.5
Argentina	3.3	India	1.4
Austria	3.3	Antigua and Barbuda	1.0
Portugal	3.2	Dominican Republic	1.0
Israel	3.2	Honduras	1.0
Norway	3.1	Jordan	1.0
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	3.0	Saint Kitts and Nevis	1.0
Spain	3.0	St. Vincent and The Grenadines	1.0
Luxembourg	3.0	China	0.8
Italy	3.0	Kuwait	0.6

Source:

World Health Organization, Geneva, October 2000http://www.who.int/mental_health/Topic_Suicide/suicide_rates.html

Table 12**Primary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996**
(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Lesotho	102	114	(12)
Mongolia	86	91	(5)
Namibia	129	132	(3)
Nicaragua	100	103	(3)
Venezuela	90	93	(3)
Honduras	110	112	(2)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	93	95	(2)
Albania	106	108	(2)
Botswana	107	108	(1)
Bahrain	105	106	(1)
China	122	123	(1)
Kazakhstan	97	98	(1)
Finland	98	99	(1)
Sweden	106	107	(1)
United Kingdom	115	116	(1)
Yugoslavia	69	70	(1)
Kenya	85	85	0
Mauritius	106	106	0
Dominican Republic	94	94	0
Cyprus	100	100	0
Japan	101	101	0
Malaysia	101	101	0
Republic of Korea	94	94	0
Austria	100	100	0
Germany	104	104	0
Greece	93	93	0
Iceland	98	98	0
Norway	100	100	0
Slovakia	102	102	0
Slovenia	98	98	0
Australia	101	101	0
New Zealand	99	99	0
Madagascar	92	91	1
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	67	66	1
Costa Rica	104	103	1
Jamaica	100	99	1
Trinidad and Tobago	99	98	1
United States	102	101	1
Argentina	114	113	1
Colombia	113	112	1
Guyana	97	96	1
Uruguay	109	108	1
Georgia	89	88	1
Kuwait	78	77	1
Qatar	87	86	1
Croatia, Rep. of	88	87	1
Denmark	102	101	1

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Ireland	105	104	1
Italy	101	100	1
Malta	108	107	1
Moldova, Rep. of	98	97	1
Romania	104	103	1
Russian Federation	108	107	1
Spain	109	108	1
Samoa	101	100	1
Canada	103	101	2
El Salvador	98	96	2
Kyrgyzstan	105	103	2
Philippines	115	113	2
Saudi Arabia	77	75	2
Singapore	95	93	2
Sri Lanka	110	108	2
Tajikistan	96	94	2
Belgium	104	102	2
Bulgaria	100	98	2
Czech Republic	105	103	2
Estonia	95	93	2
France	106	104	2
Hungary	104	102	2
Netherlands	109	107	2
Poland	97	95	2
Macedonia, The FYR	100	98	2
Cape Verde	150	147	3
Mexico	116	113	3
Chile	103	100	3
Paraguay	112	109	3
Azerbaijan	108	105	3
Maldives	130	127	3
Uzbekistan	79	76	3
Lithuania	99	96	3
South Africa	135	131	4
Zimbabwe	115	111	4
Belize	123	119	4
Cuba	108	104	4
Peru	125	121	4
Oman	78	74	4
United Arab Emirates	91	87	4
Viet Nam	115	111	4
Belarus, Rep. of	100	96	4
Zambia	91	86	5
Brunei Darussalam	109	104	5
Indonesia	115	110	5
Lebanon	113	108	5
Latvia	98	93	5
Swaziland	120	114	6
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	102	95	7
Turkey	111	104	7
Portugal	131	124	7
Sudan	55	47	8
Tunisia	122	114	8

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Burundi	55	46	9
Cameroon	93	84	9
Mauritania	84	75	9
Ghana	84	74	10
Syrian Arab Republic	106	96	10
Algeria	113	102	11
Congo	120	109	11
Djibouti	44	33	11
Eritrea	59	48	11
Guatemala	93	82	11
Malawi	140	127	13
Niger	36	23	13
Senegal	78	65	13
Uganda	81	68	13
Papua New Guinea	87	74	13
Egypt	108	94	14
Iraq	92	78	14
Solomon Islands	103	89	14
Ecuador	134	119	15
Burkina Faso	48	31	17
Mali	58	40	18
Cambodia	119	100	19
India	109	90	19
Gambia	87	67	20
Mozambique	70	50	20
Côte d'Ivoire	82	60	22
Nigeria	109	87	22
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	123	101	22
Morocco	97	74	23
Ethiopia	55	30	25
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	86	59	27
Guinea	68	41	27
Afghanistan	64	32	32
Nepal	129	96	33
Guinea-Bissau	79	45	34
Chad	76	39	37
Benin	98	57	41
Togo	140	99	41
Yemen	100	40	60

Source:

UNESCO, World Education Indicators

World education report 2000

Country Tables: Table 4

<http://www.unesco.org/education/information/wer/htmlENG/tablesmenu.htm>

Note:

(a) The gross enrollment ratio is the total enrollment in primary education, regardless of age, divided by the population of the age group which officially corresponds to primary schooling.

Table 13

Persistence to Grade 5, Male and Female, 1993
 (Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Lesotho	71.8	87.0	(15.2)
Madagascar	23.4	31.9	(8.5)
Botswana	85.8	91.9	(6.1)
Swaziland	75.9	81.5	(5.6)
Nicaragua	51.9	56.5	(4.6)
Bhutan	80.6	84.1	(3.5)
Paraguay	69.7	72.9	(3.2)
Uruguay	92.9	95.8	(2.9)
Mexico	83.3	86.1	(2.8)
Costa Rica	86.7	89.3	(2.6)
Seychelles	96.3	98.9	(2.6)
Ecuador	75.5	77.8	(2.3)
Malaysia	98.1	99.6	(1.5)
Burkina Faso	78.3	79.7	(1.4)
Gambia, The	76.0	77.2	(1.2)
Denmark	98.1	99.2	(1.1)
United Arab Emirates	97.5	98.2	(0.7)
Macedonia, The FYR	94.9	95.5	(0.6)
Tunisia	91.4	92.0	(0.6)
Mauritius	98.8	99.3	(0.5)
Ireland	99.5	100.0	(0.5)
Oman	95.2	95.4	(0.2)
Belize	70.3	70.5	(0.2)
Korea, Rep.	99.4	99.5	(0.1)
Japan	100.0	100.0	0.0
Cyprus	100.0	100.0	0.0
Finland	99.9	99.9	0.0
Iceland	99.1	99.1	0.0
Norway	100.0	100.0	0.0
Ethiopia	51.4	50.6	0.8
Morocco	80.4	79.0	1.4
Syrian Arab Republic	90.5	89.1	1.4
Algeria	93.2	91.0	2.2
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	91.8	88.8	3.0
Eritrea	80.7	76.3	4.4
Mauritania	67.8	63.1	4.7
Benin	66.7	61.4	5.3
Cote d'Ivoire	76.9	70.5	6.4
India	61.5	55.0	6.5
Malta	99.1	92.2	6.9
Italy	100.0	90.6	9.4
Mozambique	48.3	36.1	12.2
Chad	33.0	20.8	12.2
Cambodia	55.7	41.9	13.8
Indonesia	95.9	80.9	15.0
Guinea	84.9	68.3	16.6

Source:

World Bank*World Development Indicators 1999*

Series: SE.PRM.PRS5.FE.ZS Persistence to grade 5, female (% of cohort)

SE.PRM.PRS5.MA.ZS Persistence to grade 5, male (% of cohort)

Table 14

Secondary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996
 (Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Sweden	128	153	(25)
United Kingdom	120	139	(19)
Mongolia	48	65	(17)
Finland	110	125	(15)
South Africa	88	103	(15)
Dominican Republic	47	61	(14)
Venezuela	33	46	(13)
Lesotho	25	36	(11)
Portugal	106	116	(10)
Estonia	99	109	(10)
Brunei Darussalam	72	82	(10)
Malaysia	59	69	(10)
Namibia	56	66	(10)
Nicaragua	50	60	(10)
Belgium	142	151	(9)
Ireland	113	122	(9)
Kazakhstan	82	91	(9)
Cuba	76	85	(9)
Colombia	57	66	(9)
Kyrgyzstan	75	83	(8)
Argentina	73	81	(8)
Azerbaijan	73	81	(8)
Spain	116	123	(7)
Bahrain	91	98	(7)
Botswana	61	68	(7)
Samoa	59	66	(7)
New Zealand	111	117	(6)
Lebanon	78	84	(6)
Chile	72	78	(6)
Sri Lanka	72	78	(6)
Luxembourg	85	90	(5)
United Arab Emirates	77	82	(5)
Guyana	73	78	(5)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	71	76	(5)
Belize	47	52	(5)
Cyprus	95	99	(4)
Slovakia	92	96	(4)
Belarus, Rep. of	91	95	(4)
Yugoslavia	60	64	(4)
Costa Rica	45	49	(4)
El Salvador	32	36	(4)
Czech Republic	97	100	(3)
Hungary	96	99	(3)
Slovenia	90	93	(3)
Lithuania	85	88	(3)

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Latvia	82	85	(3)
Moldova, Rep. of	79	82	(3)
Trinidad and Tobago	72	75	(3)
Mauritius	63	66	(3)
Paraguay	42	45	(3)
Denmark	120	122	(2)
Croatia, Rep. of	81	83	(2)
Cape Verde	54	56	(2)
Japan	103	104	(1)
Greece	95	96	(1)
Italy	94	95	(1)
Philippines	77	78	(1)
Maldives	59	60	(1)
Albania	37	38	(1)
Myanmar	29	30	(1)
Canada	105	105	0
Republic of Korea	102	102	0
Kuwait	65	65	0
Mexico	64	64	0
Ecuador	50	50	0
Madagascar	16	16	0
Australia	149	148	1
France	112	111	1
United States	98	97	1
Poland	98	97	1
Qatar	80	79	1
Romania	79	78	1
Bulgaria	77	76	1
Swaziland	55	54	1
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	6	5	1
Germany	105	103	2
Israel	89	87	2
Georgia	78	76	2
Oman	68	66	2
Macedonia, The FYR	64	62	2
Viet Nam	48	46	2
Guatemala	27	25	2
Austria	105	102	3
Iceland	105	102	3
Tunisia	66	63	3
Algeria	65	62	3
Sudan	23	20	3
Malta	86	82	4
Kenya	26	22	4
Ethiopia	14	10	4
Mozambique	9	5	4
Niger	9	5	4
Norway	121	116	5
Peru	72	67	5
Syrian Arab Republic	45	40	5
Comoros	24	19	5

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Djibouti	17	12	5
Nigeria	36	30	6
Papua New Guinea	17	11	6
Uganda	15	9	6
Netherlands	141	134	7
Indonesia	55	48	7
Zimbabwe	52	45	7
Eritrea	24	17	7
Solomon Islands	21	14	7
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	81	73	8
China	74	66	8
Saudi Arabia	62	54	8
Senegal	20	12	8
Tajikistan	83	74	9
Malawi	21	12	9
Mali	17	8	9
Egypt	80	70	10
Morocco	44	34	10
Cameroon	32	22	10
Mauritania	21	11	10
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	34	23	11
Gambia	30	19	11
Chad	15	4	11
Uzbekistan	100	88	12
Zambia	34	21	13
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	32	19	13
Guinea	20	7	13
Cambodia	31	17	14
Benin	26	11	15
Congo	62	45	17
Nepal	51	33	18
Côte d'Ivoire	34	16	18
Iraq	51	32	19
Turkey	68	48	20
India	59	39	20
Afghanistan	32	12	20
Armenia	100	79	21
Togo	40	14	26
Yemen	53	14	39

Source:

UNESCO, World Education Indicators

World education report 2000

Country Tables: Table 6

<http://www.unesco.org/education/information/wer/htmlENG/tablesmenu.htm>

Note:

(a) The gross enrollment ratio is the total enrollment in secondary education, regardless of age, divided by the population of the age group which officially corresponds to secondary schooling.

Table 15**Tertiary Education: Gross Enrollment Ratios, Male and Female, 1996**
(Countries arranged in increasing "Male - Female")

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Qatar	13.6	40.9	(27.3)
United States	70.6	91.8	(21.2)
Bulgaria	31.2	51.6	(20.4)
New Zealand	52.8	72.6	(19.8)
Norway	53.2	71.2	(18.0)
United Arab Emirates	4.9	20.7	(15.8)
Canada	80.7	95.3	(14.6)
Iceland	30.4	44.8	(14.4)
Sweden	43.5	57.4	(13.9)
Mongolia	10.4	23.8	(13.4)
Latvia	27.0	39.6	(12.6)
Lithuania	25.3	37.8	(12.5)
France	45.0	57.4	(12.4)
Finland	68.3	80.0	(11.7)
Barbados	23.0	34.5	(11.5)
Russian Federation	37.3	48.5	(11.2)
Portugal	33.4	44.4	(11.0)
Belarus, Rep. of	38.6	49.1	(10.5)
Slovenia	31.1	41.3	(10.2)
Denmark	43.4	53.1	(9.7)
Kuwait	14.6	24.0	(9.4)
Italy	42.3	51.6	(9.3)
Kazakhstan	29.2	37.5	(8.3)
Spain	47.4	55.6	(8.2)
Dominican Republic	19.0	26.8	(7.8)
United Kingdom	48.6	56.3	(7.7)
Estonia	38.1	45.7	(7.6)
Philippines	25.2	32.7	(7.5)
Poland	21.0	28.5	(7.5)
Australia	76.9	82.9	(6.0)
Cuba	9.6	15.2	(5.6)
Moldova, Rep. of	23.8	29.2	(5.4)
Cyprus	20.0	25.0	(5.0)
Yugoslavia	19.6	24.4	(4.8)
Georgia	39.7	44.4	(4.7)
Ireland	38.8	43.3	(4.5)
Malta	27.2	31.6	(4.4)
Macedonia, The FYR	17.4	21.7	(4.3)
Hungary	21.5	25.7	(4.2)
Albania	10.1	14.0	(3.9)
Namibia	6.3	9.9	(3.6)
Romania	20.8	24.3	(3.5)
Armenia	10.5	14.0	(3.5)
Brunei Darussalam	5.3	8.0	(2.7)
Myanmar	4.2	6.7	(2.5)

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Croatia, Rep. of	26.8	29.1	(2.3)
Belgium	55.4	57.3	(1.9)
Colombia	16.0	17.5	(1.5)
Kyrgyzstan	11.3	12.5	(1.2)
Nicaragua	11.3	12.4	(1.1)
Austria	47.8	48.8	(1.0)
Slovakia	21.6	22.6	(1.0)
Azerbaijan	17.1	17.8	(0.7)
Paraguay	10.0	10.7	(0.7)
Lesotho	2.2	2.6	(0.4)
Mauritius	6.0	6.2	(0.2)
El Salvador	17.7	17.9	(0.2)
Guyana	11.3	11.5	(0.2)
Swaziland	5.9	6.1	(0.2)
Macau	27.8	27.8	0.0
Djibouti	0.3	0.2	0.1
Lebanon	27.2	26.8	0.4
Madagascar	2.2	1.8	0.4
Mozambique	0.7	0.2	0.5
Czech Republic	23.8	23.3	0.5
Comoros	0.9	0.4	0.5
Malawi	0.9	0.4	0.5
Botswana	6.1	5.5	0.6
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	1.0	0.2	0.8
Chad	1.1	0.2	0.9
Burkina Faso	1.4	0.4	1.0
Ethiopia	1.3	0.3	1.0
Gambia	2.2	1.2	1.0
Greece	47.4	46.3	1.1
Uganda	2.6	1.3	1.3
Cambodia	1.9	0.5	1.4
Eritrea	1.7	0.3	1.4
South Africa	18.0	16.5	1.5
Mexico	16.7	15.2	1.5
Mali	2.3	0.6	1.7
Guinea	2.0	0.3	1.7
Oman	8.8	7.1	1.7
Netherlands	48.2	46.3	1.9
Saudi Arabia	17.4	15.3	2.1
Papua New Guinea	4.2	2.1	2.1
Honduras	11.0	8.8	2.2
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	3.9	1.7	2.2
Zambia	3.6	1.4	2.2
Jamaica	9.0	6.7	2.3
Trinidad and Tobago	9.3	6.9	2.4
Tunisia	15.0	12.5	2.5
India	8.4	5.3	3.1
China	7.3	3.9	3.4
Morocco	12.9	9.3	3.6
Benin	5.0	1.2	3.8
Chile	33.5	29.4	4.1

Country	Male (a)	Female (a)	Male - Female
Algeria	14.0	9.8	4.2
Togo	5.9	1.2	4.7
Mauritania	6.3	1.3	5.0
Syrian Arab Republic	18.2	13.1	5.1
Costa Rica	32.9	27.5	5.4
Luxembourg	12.4	7.0	5.4
Germany	49.9	44.4	5.5
Zimbabwe	9.4	3.9	5.5
Yemen	7.0	1.1	5.9
Indonesia	14.6	8.0	6.6
Côte d'Ivoire	9.5	2.9	6.6
Japan	44.4	36.5	7.9
Egypt	24.2	15.9	8.3
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	21.9	13.1	8.8
Turkey	26.5	15.2	11.3
Tajikistan	27.4	13.3	14.1
Switzerland	39.6	25.2	14.4
Republic of Korea	82.0	52.4	29.6

Source:

UNESCO, World Education Indicators

World education report 2000

Country Tables: Table 8

<http://www.unesco.org/education/information/wer/htmlENG/tablesmenu.htm>

Note:

(a) The gross enrollment ratio is the total enrollment in tertiary education, regardless of age, divided by the population of the age group which officially corresponds to tertiary schooling.

Table 16

"Economically Active" Participation Rates, Male and Female, circa 1978 and most recent year available as of 2000
(Countries arranged in increasing "Change in "Male - Female"")

Country	1978			2000			Change in "Male - Female"
	Male	Female	Male - Female	Male	Female	Male - Female	
Bolivia	51.2	14.4	36.8	47.4	37.3	10.1	(26.7)
Sudan	55.8	6.7	49.1	47.2	20.4	26.8	(22.3)
Mongolia	50.3	25.5	24.8	52.9	47.3	5.6	(19.2)
Uruguay	57.2	21.9	35.3	54.7	37.4	17.3	(18.0)
New Zealand	55.8	27.1	28.7	54.8	43.9	10.9	(17.8)
Colombia	44.6	14.6	30.0	56.1	42.9	13.2	(16.8)
Netherlands Antilles	52.6	26.5	26.1	48.7	39.2	9.5	(16.6)
Switzerland	63.2	32.0	31.2	63.6	48.4	15.2	(16.0)
Honduras	49.2	9.3	39.9	52.5	28.5	24.0	(15.9)
Brazil	49.5	13.6	35.9	58.9	38.7	20.2	(15.7)
Cambodia	47.2	31.7	15.5	44.9	44.6	0.3	(15.2)
Luxembourg	57.3	24.3	33.0	52.0	33.4	18.6	(14.4)
Ireland	53.0	20.9	32.1	54.1	36.1	18.0	(14.1)
Croatia, Rep. of	58.4	36.8	21.6	43.1	35.1	8.0	(13.6)
Peru	45.1	18.0	27.1	52.7	38.9	13.8	(13.3)
Netherlands	52.9	22.1	30.8	55.8	37.4	18.4	(12.4)
Egypt	50.3	6.0	44.3	44.3	12.3	32.0	(12.3)
United Kingdom	59.4	35.4	24.0	56.3	43.7	12.6	(11.4)
France	54.2	32.3	21.9	50.6	39.8	10.8	(11.1)
Norway	56.1	37.0	19.1	56.1	48.0	8.1	(11.0)
Spain	51.3	20.7	30.6	52.1	32.4	19.7	(10.9)
Kuwait	55.0	11.1	43.9	61.4	28.3	33.1	(10.8)
Greece	58.3	27.1	31.2	53.7	33.2	20.5	(10.7)
Germany	57.8	32.1	25.7	56.4	41.3	15.1	(10.6)
Ethiopia	57.4	36.8	20.6	54.9	44.7	10.2	(10.4)
Pakistan	52.1	4.3	47.8	45.9	7.6	38.3	(9.5)
Philippines	46.4	17.1	29.3	52.0	32.1	19.9	(9.4)
Belgium	54.1	30.7	23.4	50.1	36.0	14.1	(9.3)
United States of America	57.4	38.5	18.9	56.3	46.6	9.7	(9.2)
Ecuador	47.4	17.5	29.9	55.5	34.6	20.9	(9.0)
Chile	49.3	14.7	34.6	52.5	26.3	26.2	(8.4)
St. Helena	53.2	22.9	30.3	62.2	40.2	22.0	(8.3)
Portugal	58.0	35.9	22.1	56.7	42.6	14.1	(8.0)
Bahamas	48.4	36.7	11.7	49.6	45.8	3.8	(7.9)
Sweden	57.1	44.7	12.4	56.8	51.5	5.3	(7.1)
Iceland	59.6	43.3	16.3	61.3	51.4	9.9	(6.4)
Austria	55.2	32.5	22.7	56.6	40.1	16.5	(6.2)
Singapore	58.1	30.9	27.2	60.1	39.1	21.0	(6.2)
Italy	54.3	25.4	28.9	52.6	29.9	22.7	(6.2)
Trinidad and Tobago	53.2	23.8	29.4	55.9	32.5	23.4	(6.0)
Malta	60.0	20.0	40.0	55.7	21.5	34.2	(5.8)
Guatemala	51.9	8.5	43.4	48.9	11.1	37.8	(5.6)
El Salvador	47.0	20.5	26.5	50.7	29.7	21.0	(5.5)
Costa Rica	51.1	17.7	33.4	54.8	26.6	28.2	(5.2)

Country	1978			2000			Change in "Male - Female"
	Male	Female	Male - Female	Male	Female	Male - Female	
South Africa	49.5	24.9	24.6	49.7	29.8	19.9	(4.7)
Denmark	58.5	44.3	14.2	61.4	51.6	9.8	(4.4)
Bahrain	60.3	10.3	50.0	64.9	19.3	45.6	(4.4)
Morocco	44.4	7.9	36.5	54.4	22.2	32.2	(4.3)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	58.6	32.8	25.8	61.5	39.5	22.0	(3.8)
Sri Lanka	49.8	16.9	32.9	57.4	28.2	29.2	(3.7)
Israel	43.3	24.2	19.1	51.3	35.5	15.8	(3.3)
Suriname	36.8	12.4	24.4	44.0	22.9	21.1	(3.3)
Nepal	58.1	38.5	19.6	54.5	38.1	16.4	(3.2)
Finland	55.9	45.4	10.5	53.8	46.1	7.7	(2.8)
Tunisia	46.7	11.2	35.5	48.6	15.9	32.7	(2.8)
Indonesia	53.6	33.0	20.6	57.4	39.4	18.0	(2.6)
Bangladesh	53.0	41.2	11.8	55.8	46.0	9.8	(2.0)
Poland	57.4	45.4	12.0	56.7	46.5	10.2	(1.8)
Slovenia	56.1	44.5	11.6	53.8	43.7	10.1	(1.5)
Romania	62.8	49.1	13.7	54.1	41.9	12.2	(1.5)
Japan	60.1	36.6	23.5	65.2	42.9	22.3	(1.2)
Republic of Korea	46.5	28.9	17.6	59.4	42.7	16.7	(0.9)
Azerbaijan	47.5	40.8	6.7	49.7	43.9	5.8	(0.9)
Lesotho	53.7	30.8	22.9	52.5	30.1	22.4	(0.5)
Panama	48.2	34.9	13.3	54.1	41.1	13.0	(0.3)
Albania	50.1	34.8	15.3	57.2	42.2	15.0	(0.3)
Jamaica	48.3	40.6	7.7	56.2	48.7	7.5	(0.2)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	47.8	8.9	38.9	45.8	6.9	38.9	0.0
Syrian Arab Republic	41.2	8.0	33.2	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.1
Slovakia	55.2	44.2	11.0	53.1	42.0	11.1	0.1
Mexico	42.4	14.0	28.4	55.6	26.6	29.0	0.6
Ukraine	57.5	48.8	8.7	50.9	41.4	9.5	0.8
Hungary	54.4	41.1	13.3	55.6	40.9	14.7	1.4
Turkey	53.2	32.1	21.1	59.2	36.4	22.8	1.7
Puerto Rico	39.2	19.3	19.9	49.2	27.2	22.0	2.1
Lithuania	56.2	49.5	6.7	55.1	46.0	9.1	2.4
Russian Federation	53.9	46.2	7.7	53.2	42.8	10.4	2.7
Malaysia	47.4	26.0	21.4	52.1	27.9	24.2	2.8
Nicaragua	43.9	18.0	25.9	49.3	20.0	29.3	3.4
Algeria	39.5	3.8	35.7	47.0	7.2	39.8	4.1
India	51.3	26.2	25.1	51.6	22.3	29.3	4.2
Rwanda	54.6	55.3	(0.7)	56.2	52.2	4.0	4.7
Czech Republic	56.7	47.6	9.1	58.2	44.0	14.2	5.1
Thailand	51.1	45.7	5.4	59.4	48.0	11.4	6.0
Botswana	49.4	46.2	3.2	49.4	39.6	9.8	6.6
Dominican Republic	44.7	15.7	29.0	54.0	17.0	37.0	8.0
Armenia	50.0	43.8	6.2	53.8	38.7	15.1	8.9

Source:

International Labour Office, Geneva

Yearbook of Labor Statistics, 1978-1981, 1998-2001

Table 1A Economically Active Population

Economically Active Population 1950-2010, 4th Ed.

Table 17

Unemployment Rates, Male and Female, 1996-1998
 (Countries arranged in declining "Male - Female")

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
El Salvador	9.5	5.3	4.2
Algeria	26.9	24.0	2.9
Puerto Rico	14.4	11.8	2.6
Korea, Rep.	7.7	5.6	2.1
Lithuania	14.5	12.4	2.1
Estonia	10.4	8.6	1.8
Hungary	8.5	7.0	1.5
United Kingdom	6.8	5.3	1.5
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	5.1	4.0	1.1
Ukraine	11.9	10.8	1.1
Sweden	6.9	6.0	0.9
Ireland	8.1	7.4	0.7
Russian Federation	13.6	13.0	0.6
Australia	8.2	7.7	0.5
Bangladesh	2.7	2.3	0.4
Canada	8.5	8.1	0.4
Romania	6.5	6.1	0.4
Japan	4.2	4.0	0.2
Turkey	6.3	6.1	0.2
New Zealand	7.6	7.4	0.2
Thailand	3.4	3.4	0.0
Bulgaria	14.3	14.4	(0.1)
Singapore	3.2	3.3	(0.1)
Slovenia	7.6	7.7	(0.1)
Croatia, Rep. of	11.9	12.1	(0.2)
United States	4.4	4.6	(0.2)
Norway	4.0	4.2	(0.2)
Philippines	9.5	9.8	(0.3)
Honduras	3.8	4.2	(0.4)
Azerbaijan	0.9	1.4	(0.5)
Tajikistan	2.4	2.9	(0.5)
Austria	4.0	4.6	(0.6)
Chile	7.0	7.6	(0.6)
Latvia	13.5	14.1	(0.6)
Bolivia	3.7	4.5	(0.8)
Mexico	2.0	2.8	(0.8)
Paraguay	7.8	8.6	(0.8)
Switzerland	3.2	4.1	(0.9)
Israel	8.1	9.2	(1.1)
Mongolia	5.2	6.3	(1.1)
Slovak Republic	11.4	12.6	(1.2)
Finland	10.7	11.9	(1.2)
Germany	9.2	10.4	(1.2)
Indonesia	3.3	5.1	(1.8)
Czech Republic	3.8	5.8	(2.0)

Country	Male	Female	Male - Female
Netherlands	3.5	5.5	(2.0)
Denmark	4.5	6.6	(2.1)
Argentina	15.4	17.6	(2.2)
Portugal	3.9	6.2	(2.3)
Peru	6.5	9.3	(2.8)
Poland	9.1	12.3	(3.2)
Brazil	6.4	10.0	(3.6)
Costa Rica	4.4	8.0	(3.6)
France	10.2	13.8	(3.6)
Belgium	7.3	11.4	(4.1)
Venezuela, RB	9.8	14.2	(4.4)
Uruguay	7.8	13.0	(5.2)
Colombia	12.5	18.0	(5.5)
Nicaragua	8.8	14.5	(5.7)
Morocco	15.8	23.0	(7.2)
Italy	9.5	16.8	(7.3)
Trinidad and Tobago	11.3	18.9	(7.6)
Ecuador	8.4	16.0	(7.6)
Panama	10.7	19.7	(9.0)
Sri Lanka	7.1	16.2	(9.1)
Greece	6.6	15.9	(9.3)
Macedonia, The FYR	35.0	44.5	(9.5)
Armenia	4.9	15.0	(10.1)
Pakistan	4.2	16.8	(12.6)
Spain	13.8	26.6	(12.8)
Jamaica	9.9	23.0	(13.1)
Dominican Republic	9.5	28.6	(19.1)

Rates are given as percentage of the labor force

Source:

World Bank

2001 World Development Indicators

Table 2.4 Unemployment

<http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2001/index.htm>

Table 18a

Percentage Ever Married, 20-24 year olds, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
 (Countries arranged in increasing "Men - Women")

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 20-24		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Burkina Faso	17.1	85.9	(68.8)
Gambia	17.2	80.0	(62.8)
Congo	18.0	76.7	(58.7)
Mali	28.9	87.6	(58.7)
Bangladesh	31.6	89.5	(57.9)
Democratic Rep. of the Congo	34.0	89.1	(55.1)
Nauru	5.3	60.0	(54.7)
Afghanistan	36.5	90.7	(54.2)
Senegal	17.9	70.4	(52.5)
Mauritania	16.2	68.0	(51.8)
Côte d'Ivoire	19.2	69.6	(50.4)
Guinea	32.9	82.3	(49.4)
Chad	43.7	92.2	(48.5)
Liberia	23.0	70.9	(47.9)
Ghana	27.5	75.3	(47.8)
Niger	41.8	88.9	(47.1)
Eritrea	31.4	78.1	(46.7)
Nigeria	23.1	69.8	(46.7)
Zambia	31.7	78.0	(46.3)
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	29.5	75.5	(46.0)
Cameroon	28.0	73.6	(45.6)
Zimbabwe	26.5	71.6	(45.1)
Togo	18.4	63.4	(45.0)
Lesotho	25.9	70.4	(44.5)
Egypt	11.9	56.1	(44.2)
India	40.1	83.0	(42.9)
Kenya	22.6	65.1	(42.5)
Malawi	46.5	88.3	(41.8)
Angola	41.7	82.8	(41.1)
Equatorial Guinea	21.8	62.8	(41.0)
Albania	11.2	52.2	(41.0)
Sudan	14.8	55.2	(40.4)
Ethiopia	30.9	71.3	(40.4)
Oman	32.6	71.8	(39.2)
Syrian Arab Republic	25.4	64.5	(39.1)
Mauritius	12.6	51.5	(38.9)
Lebanon	11.9	49.1	(37.2)
Saudi Arabia	24.0	61.1	(37.1)
Montserrat	2.2	39.3	(37.1)
Algeria	10.7	47.7	(37.0)
Maldives	49.1	85.2	(36.1)
Occupied Palestinian Territory	27.9	64.0	(36.1)
Indonesia	28.3	64.3	(36.0)
Pakistan	24.7	60.6	(35.9)
Central African Republic	45.6	81.2	(35.6)
Yemen	36.5	71.9	(35.4)

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 20-24		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Bulgaria	37.0	71.6	(34.6)
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	34.2	68.6	(34.4)
Qatar	25.6	59.6	(34.0)
Solomon Islands	31.3	65.1	(33.8)
Sao Tome and Principe	28.0	61.7	(33.7)
Burundi	28.4	62.0	(33.6)
Turkey	28.2	61.8	(33.6)
Comoros	15.0	48.3	(33.3)
Cuba	40.5	73.5	(33.0)
Cyprus	18.1	50.8	(32.7)
Uganda	55.1	87.7	(32.6)
Kyrgyzstan	38.4	70.9	(32.5)
Tajikistan	45.2	77.3	(32.1)
Mozambique	57.6	88.8	(31.2)
Armenia	40.2	71.2	(31.0)
Gabon	17.0	47.9	(30.9)
Haiti	28.0	58.7	(30.7)
Romania	28.2	58.7	(30.5)
Switzerland	28.2	58.7	(30.5)
Jordan	11.8	42.1	(30.3)
Moldova, Rep. of	42.0	72.3	(30.3)
Uzbekistan	44.0	74.1	(30.1)
Slovakia	29.8	59.4	(29.6)
Georgia	29.9	59.3	(29.4)
Fiji	29.2	58.5	(29.3)
Poland	22.9	52.1	(29.2)
Croatia, Rep. of	14.9	44.1	(29.2)
Ukraine	41.7	70.7	(29.0)
Samoa	20.1	49.1	(29.0)
Honduras	40.0	68.3	(28.3)
Bahrain	12.8	40.9	(28.1)
Greece	8.4	36.3	(27.9)
Kazakhstan	35.7	63.3	(27.6)
Azerbaijan	25.4	52.9	(27.5)
Vanuatu	30.9	58.0	(27.1)
Sierra Leone	20.3	47.4	(27.1)
Gibraltar	33.4	60.3	(26.9)
Iraq (a)	32.0	58.6	(26.6)
Paraguay	27.4	53.5	(26.1)
Russian Federation	40.5	66.5	(26.0)
Kuwait	22.1	47.9	(25.8)
United Arab Emirates	26.6	52.2	(25.6)
Malaysia	14.3	39.9	(25.6)
Czech Republic	26.0	51.5	(25.5)
Belarus, Rep. of	39.0	64.3	(25.3)
Dominican Republic	30.1	55.3	(25.2)
Panama	30.9	55.9	(25.0)
Kiribati	40.0	65.0	(25.0)
Swaziland	15.6	40.0	(24.4)
Estonia	35.2	59.6	(24.4)
Nepal	61.7	85.9	(24.2)
Tunisia	3.7	27.7	(24.0)

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 20-24		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Lithuania	34.2	58.2	(24.0)
Hungary	20.8	44.0	(23.2)
Latvia	38.9	61.7	(22.8)
Slovenia	11.1	33.9	(22.8)
Sri Lanka	16.3	38.8	(22.5)
Marshall Islands	48.8	70.9	(22.1)
Uruguay	26.7	48.8	(22.1)
Costa Rica	29.6	51.5	(21.9)
Brazil	30.9	52.6	(21.7)
China	37.5	58.6	(21.1)
Guatemala	45.9	66.8	(20.9)
Colombia	31.5	52.3	(20.8)
Thailand	31.5	52.0	(20.5)
Ecuador	35.2	55.3	(20.1)
Malta	13.2	33.2	(20.0)
Portugal	18.9	38.6	(19.7)
Brunei Darussalam	18.6	38.2	(19.6)
Argentina	25.6	45.2	(19.6)
Viet Nam	37.4	56.9	(19.5)
Netherlands	6.7	26.2	(19.5)
Peru	32.9	52.3	(19.4)
Venezuela	31.3	50.6	(19.3)
American Samoa	16.0	35.0	(19.0)
Tuvalu	14.5	33.4	(18.9)
Denmark	23.7	42.1	(18.4)
Chile	25.4	43.8	(18.4)
Seychelles	18.9	36.7	(17.8)
Botswana	9.6	27.4	(17.8)
Cape Verde	14.7	32.3	(17.6)
Philippines	26.8	44.3	(17.5)
Bolivia	36.0	53.2	(17.2)
Wallis and Futuna Islands	8.8	25.8	(17.0)
Trinidad and Tobago	10.6	27.5	(16.9)
Italy	6.1	22.8	(16.7)
Cayman Islands	19.8	36.2	(16.4)
Turkmenistan	37.5	53.9	(16.4)
Guam	29.3	45.3	(16.0)
South Africa	12.9	28.7	(15.8)
Mexico	38.9	54.6	(15.7)
Tonga	17.8	33.4	(15.6)
Belgium	10.1	25.6	(15.5)
Singapore	5.7	21.2	(15.5)
Luxembourg	10.8	26.2	(15.4)
El Salvador	34.5	49.9	(15.4)
Guyana	12.1	26.6	(14.5)
Puerto Rico	32.9	47.3	(14.4)
Canada	10.8	25.1	(14.3)
Austria	11.5	25.7	(14.2)
Aruba	14.9	29.0	(14.1)
United States of America	19.3	33.2	(13.9)
Spain	8.9	22.2	(13.3)
Liechtenstein	6.7	19.8	(13.1)

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 20-24		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Republic of Korea	3.7	16.7	(13.0)
United Kingdom	12.0	24.9	(12.9)
New Zealand	9.7	22.4	(12.7)
Faeroe Islands	6.4	19.0	(12.6)
Réunion	6.9	19.4	(12.5)
Macau	9.9	22.3	(12.4)
New Caledonia	5.2	17.2	(12.0)
Isle of Man	10.4	22.1	(11.7)
Myanmar	23.3	34.8	(11.5)
Bahamas	13.9	25.2	(11.3)
Australia	10.6	21.6	(11.0)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1.3	12.2	(10.9)
Bermuda	6.0	16.8	(10.8)
United States Virgin Islands	5.5	15.5	(10.0)
France	5.5	15.2	(9.7)
Germany	5.2	14.8	(9.6)
Netherlands Antilles	6.4	15.8	(9.4)
Guadeloupe	2.6	11.7	(9.1)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	6.0	14.7	(8.7)
Greenland	3.7	12.2	(8.5)
Channel Islands	10.2	18.6	(8.4)
British Virgin Islands	7.3	15.2	(7.9)
Japan	6.4	14.0	(7.6)
Israel	32.4	39.5	(7.1)
Finland	5.1	11.7	(6.6)
Norway	3.1	9.0	(5.9)
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	1.8	7.6	(5.8)
French Guiana	3.2	8.7	(5.5)
Grenada	1.1	6.4	(5.3)
St. Kitts and Nevis	2.4	7.7	(5.3)
Cook Islands	12.1	17.4	(5.3)
Martinique	1.7	6.7	(5.0)
Antigua and Barbuda	3.1	8.0	(4.9)
Sweden	2.3	7.1	(4.8)
Barbados	2.3	6.7	(4.4)
Dominica	1.3	5.4	(4.1)
Ireland	2.8	6.6	(3.8)
Jamaica	2.4	5.5	(3.1)
Iceland	2.2	5.3	(3.1)
Belize	18.1	19.8	(1.7)
San Marino	67.8	52.9	14.9

Source:

United Nations, Population Division, Department of Economics and Social Affairs
World Marriage Patterns 2000

Table 18b

Percentage Ever Married, 45-49 year olds, Male and Female, most recent year available as of 2000
 (Countries arranged in increasing "Men - Women")

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 45-49		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Greenland	63.4	78.3	(14.9)
Montserrat	60.7	74.1	(13.4)
Faeroe Islands	83.7	95.4	(11.7)
St. Kitts and Nevis	51.1	62.1	(11.0)
Cook Islands	79.5	89.4	(9.9)
Sweden	76.0	83.5	(7.5)
New Caledonia	76.8	84.2	(7.4)
Ireland	83.8	89.9	(6.1)
Finland	81.9	88.0	(6.1)
Norway	86.7	92.3	(5.6)
Cuba	91.0	96.2	(5.2)
China	94.9	99.8	(4.9)
Equatorial Guinea	88.6	93.4	(4.8)
Denmark	89.9	94.7	(4.8)
Germany	88.8	93.5	(4.7)
Iceland	84.2	88.8	(4.6)
Dominican Republic	86.3	90.6	(4.3)
Panama	87.7	91.9	(4.2)
Uruguay	86.7	90.8	(4.1)
United Kingdom	91.2	95.1	(3.9)
Czech Republic	93.0	96.8	(3.8)
American Samoa	92.5	96.1	(3.6)
Liberia	93.4	96.9	(3.5)
Belarus, Rep. of	91.3	94.7	(3.4)
Belgium	91.3	94.7	(3.4)
Nauru	96.6	100.0	(3.4)
Gabon	87.2	90.6	(3.4)
Isle of Man	91.0	94.3	(3.3)
Honduras	92.3	95.6	(3.3)
Hungary	92.6	95.8	(3.2)
Australia	91.4	94.6	(3.2)
Afghanistan	95.9	99.0	(3.1)
Slovenia	89.2	92.3	(3.1)
United States Virgin Islands	85.4	88.5	(3.1)
Marshall Islands	91.8	94.8	(3.0)
Angola	92.5	95.4	(2.9)
Senegal	95.4	98.3	(2.9)
Bahrain	93.5	96.2	(2.7)
Seychelles	79.9	82.5	(2.6)
Belize	75.9	78.4	(2.5)
New Zealand	92.8	95.3	(2.5)
Vanuatu	94.5	97.0	(2.5)
Croatia, Rep. of	92.8	95.2	(2.4)
Jamaica	51.8	54.2	(2.4)
Italy	90.2	92.5	(2.3)
Samoa	94.2	96.5	(2.3)

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 45-49		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	97.1	99.3	(2.2)
Bulgaria	96.0	98.2	(2.2)
Poland	92.8	95.0	(2.2)
Puerto Rico	90.8	93.0	(2.2)
Japan	93.3	95.4	(2.1)
Oman	97.1	99.2	(2.1)
Gibraltar	93.3	95.4	(2.1)
Austria	90.3	92.4	(2.1)
Slovakia	92.7	94.8	(2.1)
Channel Islands	90.9	93.0	(2.1)
France	90.2	92.3	(2.1)
Réunion	82.1	84.1	(2.0)
Sudan	96.3	98.3	(2.0)
Spain	89.9	91.9	(2.0)
United States of America	91.9	93.9	(2.0)
Kiribati	94.0	96.0	(2.0)
Comoros	98.1	100.0	(1.9)
Nigeria	95.9	97.8	(1.9)
Sri Lanka	92.9	94.8	(1.9)
Albania	96.8	98.6	(1.8)
India	97.6	99.3	(1.7)
Uganda	96.9	98.6	(1.7)
Romania	94.8	96.4	(1.6)
Switzerland	94.8	96.4	(1.6)
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	92.5	94.1	(1.6)
Haiti	96.9	98.5	(1.6)
Guatemala	95.0	96.6	(1.6)
Luxembourg	91.9	93.4	(1.5)
Canada	91.5	93.0	(1.5)
Maldives	98.1	99.5	(1.4)
Indonesia	97.1	98.5	(1.4)
Latvia	93.4	94.8	(1.4)
Solomon Islands	92.8	94.1	(1.3)
Guyana	80.5	81.7	(1.2)
Malawi	98.2	99.3	(1.1)
Algeria	97.4	98.5	(1.1)
Burkina Faso	97.2	98.3	(1.1)
Ghana	98.9	100.0	(1.1)
Macau	95.0	96.0	(1.0)
Turkey	97.4	98.4	(1.0)
Netherlands	92.4	93.4	(1.0)
Côte d'Ivoire	98.4	99.3	(0.9)
Estonia	92.4	93.3	(0.9)
Greece	94.1	94.9	(0.8)
Togo	98.9	99.7	(0.8)
Guam	94.0	94.8	(0.8)
Tunisia	97.0	97.7	(0.7)
Swaziland	90.3	91.0	(0.7)
Mauritania	95.7	96.4	(0.7)
Turkmenistan	98.3	99.0	(0.7)
Argentina	90.6	91.3	(0.7)
Bermuda	89.2	89.9	(0.7)

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 45-49		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	98.3	98.9	(0.6)
Fiji	95.8	96.4	(0.6)
Burundi	97.5	98.1	(0.6)
Ethiopia	98.5	99.1	(0.6)
Democratic Rep. of the Congo	95.4	96.0	(0.6)
Kazakhstan	97.5	98.1	(0.6)
Yemen	98.2	98.8	(0.6)
Singapore	92.4	92.9	(0.5)
Lithuania	94.4	94.9	(0.5)
Trinidad and Tobago	78.8	79.3	(0.5)
Tonga	92.5	92.9	(0.4)
Zambia	98.9	99.3	(0.4)
Lesotho	96.4	96.8	(0.4)
Zimbabwe	99.1	99.4	(0.3)
French Guiana	53.9	54.2	(0.3)
Congo	92.9	93.2	(0.3)
Republic of Korea	98.7	99.0	(0.3)
Bangladesh	99.3	99.6	(0.3)
Mali	99.6	99.8	(0.2)
Niger	99.6	99.8	(0.2)
Kyrgyzstan	98.7	98.9	(0.2)
Malaysia	96.0	96.2	(0.2)
United Arab Emirates	98.3	98.5	(0.2)
Russian Federation	96.3	96.5	(0.2)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	98.5	98.6	(0.1)
Guinea	99.7	99.8	(0.1)
Uzbekistan	98.9	99.0	(0.1)
Egypt	98.6	98.6	0.0
Gambia	100.0	100.0	0.0
Pakistan	98.0	98.0	0.0
Chad	100.0	99.9	0.1
Tajikistan	99.0	98.9	0.1
South Africa	89.6	89.4	0.2
Mauritius	94.7	94.5	0.2
Sierra Leone	97.0	96.7	0.3
Kenya	98.8	98.3	0.5
Saudi Arabia	98.6	98.1	0.5
Ukraine	97.3	96.8	0.5
Venezuela	87.2	86.6	0.6
Nepal	99.1	98.4	0.7
Cameroon	99.2	98.5	0.7
Jordan	98.6	97.7	0.9
Syrian Arab Republic	97.8	96.9	0.9
Eritrea	99.0	98.1	0.9
Central African Republic	99.0	98.1	0.9
Iraq	97.0	96.1	0.9
Azerbaijan	98.5	97.5	1.0
Qatar	97.4	96.3	1.1
Lebanon	94.3	93.1	1.2
Liechtenstein	92.4	91.2	1.2
Mexico	94.4	92.9	1.5
Bolivia	94.2	92.7	1.5

Country	Percentage ever married, ages 45-49		Men - Women
	Men	Women	
Philippines	95.5	93.9	1.6
Colombia	89.6	87.9	1.7
Armenia	98.7	97.0	1.7
Brazil	93.7	92.0	1.7
Kuwait	96.3	94.5	1.8
Sao Tome and Principe	77.4	75.4	2.0
Thailand	96.8	94.8	2.0
Viet Nam	98.5	96.5	2.0
Moldova, Rep. of	98.8	96.7	2.1
Mozambique	99.3	97.1	2.2
Portugal	95.4	93.1	2.3
Grenada	59.8	57.4	2.4
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	60.7	58.3	2.4
Ecuador	91.7	89.3	2.4
Israel	97.5	95.0	2.5
Georgia	96.6	94.0	2.6
Cayman Islands	87.3	84.7	2.6
Guadeloupe	72.4	69.8	2.6
Bahamas	85.5	82.8	2.7
Chile	89.3	86.6	2.7
Barbados	62.8	59.8	3.0
El Salvador	89.4	86.3	3.1
Cyprus	97.2	94.0	3.2
Peru	99.0	95.7	3.3
Martinique	70.5	67.1	3.4
Dominica	63.4	59.7	3.7
Costa Rica	90.6	86.7	3.9
Brunei Darussalam	95.2	91.3	3.9
Paraguay	90.1	85.5	4.6
Aruba	83.9	79.0	4.9
Antigua and Barbuda	68.1	62.6	5.5
Netherlands Antilles	78.5	72.4	6.1
Myanmar	94.3	87.9	6.4
Occupied Palestinian Territory	99.0	92.4	6.6
Malta	88.2	80.7	7.5
Botswana	85.2	77.6	7.6
Cape Verde	85.5	77.7	7.8
British Virgin Islands	84.3	76.4	7.9
Tuvalu	97.2	87.7	9.5
San Marino	94.4	84.1	10.3
Wallis and Futuna Islands	90.8	77.2	13.6

Source:

United Nations, Population Division, Department of Economics and Social Affairs
World Marriage Patterns 2000

Table 19

Percentage Male of Population Aged 65 and Above, 1999

(Countries arranged in increasing percent male)

Country	Percent Male	Country	Percent Male
Russian Federation	30.7	Equatorial Guinea	41.2
Latvia	31.2	United States	41.2
Estonia	32.0	Tajikistan	41.2
Ukraine	32.5	Vietnam	41.2
Belarus, Rep. of	32.9	Chile	41.3
Kazakhstan	33.3	Macao	41.3
Korea, Dem. Rep.	33.6	Guadeloupe	41.5
Lithuania	34.1	Japan	41.5
Tonga	34.1	Spain	41.6
Slovenia	35.5	Denmark	41.6
Cambodia	36.2	Paraguay	41.7
Cape Verde	36.5	United Kingdom	41.8
Botswana	36.5	Rwanda	41.8
Kyrgyz Republic	36.6	Martinique	42.0
Germany	36.9	Mauritania	42.1
Georgia	36.9	Romania	42.1
Croatia, Rep. of	36.9	Central African Republic	42.2
Austria	37.2	Norway	42.3
St. Lucia	37.3	Nigeria	42.4
Moldova, Rep. of	37.4	Sweden	42.5
Finland	37.5	Canada	42.5
Hungary	37.7	Congo, Dem. Rep.	42.6
Poland	37.7	Sierra Leone	42.7
Korea, Rep.	37.8	Ireland	42.7
Reunion	37.9	Mauritius	42.8
Barbados	37.9	Mali	42.9
Azerbaijan	38.1	Grenada	42.9
South Africa	38.2	Bulgaria	42.9
Czech Republic	38.4	Israel	42.9
Luxembourg	38.4	Lesotho	43.1
Portugal	38.5	Puerto Rico	43.2
Turkmenistan	38.6	New Zealand	43.2
Slovak Republic	38.8	Eritrea	43.3
Uzbekistan	39.2	Congo, Rep.	43.3
Burundi	39.3	El Salvador	43.3
Armenia	39.8	Djibouti	43.4
France	40.0	Samoa	43.5
Bosnia and Herzegovina	40.3	Albania	43.5
Switzerland	40.4	Guyana	43.5
Belgium	40.4	Australia	43.6
Uruguay	40.4	Cyprus	43.6
Bahamas, The	40.6	Mongolia	43.6
Netherlands	40.7	Niger	43.7
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	40.7	Thailand	43.7
Italy	40.7	Yugoslavia, FR (Serbia/Montenegro)	43.7
Netherlands Antilles	40.8	Colombia	43.8
Malta	40.9	Brazil	43.8
Argentina	41.2	Ethiopia	43.8

Country	Percent Male	Country	Percent Male
Seychelles	43.9	Liberia	47.0
Greece	44.0	Iceland	47.2
Swaziland	44.0	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	47.3
Hong Kong, China (SAR)	44.2	Guinea	47.6
Nicaragua	44.3	Syrian Arab Republic	47.7
Jamaica	44.3	Cuba	47.9
Haiti	44.4	Guatemala	48.0
West Bank and Gaza	44.4	Burkina Faso	48.0
Mexico	44.5	India	48.2
Guinea-Bissau	44.5	Bhutan	48.3
Angola	44.6	Afghanistan	48.3
Madagascar	44.6	Panama	48.5
Togo	44.7	China	48.6
Gambia, The	44.7	Papua New Guinea	48.8
Gabon	44.7	Dominican Republic	48.9
Tanzania, U. Rep. of	44.7	Oman	48.9
Bolivia	44.8	Iran, Islamic Rep. of	49.4
Senegal	44.9	Sri Lanka	49.6
Singapore	44.9	Benin	49.8
Channel Islands	45.1	Comoros	50.0
Venezuela	45.1	Sao Tome and Principe	50.0
Suriname	45.2	Brunei	50.0
Namibia	45.3	New Caledonia	50.0
Ghana	45.4	Solomon Islands	50.0
Cameroon	45.4	Belize	50.0
Macedonia, The FYR	45.4	Dominica	50.0
Egypt, Arab Rep.	45.5	St. Kitts and Nevis	50.0
Turkey	45.5	Nepal	50.3
Sudan	45.5	Saudi Arabia	50.3
Peru	45.6	Pakistan	50.8
Philippines	45.6	Zambia	50.8
Malawi	45.6	Tunisia	51.1
Guam	45.7	Cote d'Ivoire	51.5
Virgin Islands (U.S.)	45.7	Bahrain	52.0
Ecuador	45.9	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	52.0
Somalia	45.9	Yemen, Rep.	52.4
Kenya	45.9	Kuwait	53.1
Zimbabwe	46.0	Chad	53.5
Malaysia	46.0	Mozambique	55.3
Lebanon	46.0	Bangladesh	55.3
Trinidad and Tobago	46.1	Jordan	55.8
Honduras	46.1	Vanuatu	59.3
Myanmar	46.1	Maldives	63.0
Indonesia	46.3	United Arab Emirates	65.6
Uganda	46.3	Qatar	72.9
Iraq	46.6		
Costa Rica	46.6		
French Polynesia	46.7		
Algeria	46.7		
Morocco	46.7		
Fiji	46.9		

Source:

World Bank

World Development Indicators 1999

Series:

SP.POP.65UP.FE.IN Population aged 65 and above, female

SP.POP.65UP.TO Population aged 65 and above, total