



International Labour Organization



Research Report on the Retirement Age Issue

退休年龄问题

研究报告



退休年龄问题研究课题组
刘伯红 郭峰 郝蕊 执笔

2011年3月



退休年龄问题研究报告

退休年龄问题研究课题组
刘伯红 郭砾 郝蕊 执笔
2011年3月

版权所有 敬请留意
未经许可 不得转载

版权 © 国际劳工组织 2011 年

2011 第一次印刷

国际劳工局出版物享有《世界版权公约》第二项议定书中规定的版权。未经允许，在标明来源的情况下可以转载部分内容。如需复制或翻译，应向国际劳工局出版部门（版权和许可）申请复制权和翻译许可，地址：International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, 或发邮件至：pubdroit@ilo.org. 国际劳工局欢迎此类申请。

已在复制权组织注册的图书馆、机构及其他用户可根据许可复制。请访问复制权组织国际联盟网站 www.ifro.org 得到本国复制权组织相关信息。

国际劳工组织，2011

退休年龄问题研究报告

ISBN 978-92-2-025226-0 (print)

ISBN 978-92-2-025227-7 (web pdf)

国际劳工局出版物使用的名称符合联合国惯例，其内容不代表国际劳工局对任何国家的法律地位、区域或领土及其当局、或边界划定发表意见。

署名文章、研究报告和其它文稿，文责由作者自负，出版发行并不构成国际劳工局认可其观点。

提及的企业和商业产品和生产的名称不意味其得到国际劳工局的认可，而未提及的企业和商业产品和生产也并非得到不认可。

国际劳工局出版物可以通过大型书商，或国际劳工组织设在当地的办公室获得，抑或直接联系国际劳工局出版部门，地址：Publications Bureau, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. 新出版物的图书目录或清单可以从上述地址免费索取，或通过电邮索要：pubvente@ilo.org

欢迎访问我们的网站： www.ilo.org/publns

中国印刷

目 录

鸣谢

退休年龄问题研究报告

一 研究背景及目的.....1

二 调查的基本情况.....2

三 主要发现.....4

 (一)被访者的基本情况.....4

 1.被访者年龄.....4

 2.被访者受教育程度.....5

 3.被访者婚姻状况.....5

 4.被访者的家庭月收入情况.....6

 5.被访者月收入占家庭月收入的比例.....6

 6.被访者家庭经济状况的自我评价.....7

 7.家中是否有需要照顾的人.....7

 8.被访者健康状况的自我评价.....8

 9.被访者工作单位类型.....9

 10.被访者行政级别.....9

 11.被访者获得专业技术职称的情况.....10

 12.被访者单位的经济效益情况.....10

 13.被访者的福利待遇情况.....11

 (二)被访者对现行退休年龄规定的看法.....12

 1.现行退休政策年龄规定的执行情况.....12

 2.被访者对现行退休政策年龄标准的评价.....14

3.现行退休政策的负面影响.....	15
(三) 被访者对现行退休年龄看法的原因.....	17
1.经济原因.....	18
2.工作环境原因.....	21
3.家庭原因.....	25
4.观念原因.....	26
(四) 被访者对改进退休年龄规定的需求.....	35
1.对女工人退休年龄的建议.....	35
2.对女干部(含专业技术人员)退休年龄的建议.....	37
四 结论与建议.....	39
(一) 基本结论.....	39
1.谁同意同龄退休?	39
2.谁不同意同龄退休?(或谁同意提前退休?或差别年龄退休?).....	39
3.她/他们为什么“同意”同龄退休?	39
4.她/他们为什么“不同意”同龄退休?	40
5.现行的差别年龄退休政策的负面影.....	41
6.现有退休政策关于年龄的规定亟需改进.....	41
(二) 主要建议.....	42
1.转变政策制定者的观念.....	42
2.针对不同人群,制定循序渐进的有针对性的不同政策.....	43
3.创造平等就业的工作环境.....	44
4.进一步加强退休年龄的研究.....	45
参考文献.....	45

Research Report on the Retirement Age Issue in China

I. Background and purpose.....	48
II. Brief description of the survey.....	49
III. Main findings.....	50
(A) Basic information about the respondents.....	50

1. Level of education.....	50
2. Civil status.....	50
3. Monthly family income.....	50
4. Proportion of monthly income of the respondents in their total monthly family income.....	50
5. Self-evaluation of economic status.....	50
6. People need care at home.....	51
7. Self-evaluation of health status.....	51
8. Types of working units of respondents.....	51
9. Administrative levels.....	51
10. Professional and technical titles.....	51
11. Economic status of establishments.....	51
(B) Views of respondents on the current retirement age provisions.....	52
1. Implementation of the current retirement age provisions.....	52
2. Comments on the existing policy standards on the retirement age.....	53
3. Negative effects of the current policy of different retirement ages.....	54
(C) Reasons for the respondents' views on the current retirement age policy	55
1. Economic factors.....	55
2. Working environment.....	58
3. Family.....	60
4. People's concepts and perspectives on the retirement age.....	62
(D) Demand of respondents to improve the regulations on the retirement age.....	69
1. Recommendations on the retirement age for female Workers.....	69
2. Recommendations on the retirement age for female cadres and female professionals.....	70
IV. Conclusions and recommendations.....	71
(A) Basic conclusions.....	71

1. Who agreed to the policy on the same retirement age for both sexes?	
.....	71
2. Who disagreed to the policy on the same retirement age for both sexes?	
.....	72
3. Why did they agree with the policy on the same retirement age?	
.....	72
4. Why did they “disagree” with the policy on the same retirement age?	
.....	72
5. Negative impact of the current policy of different retirement ages for men and women	
.....	73
6. Age provisions in the existing retirement policy need to be improved as soon as possible	
.....	74
(B) Main recommendations.....	74
1. Renewing the conceptual understanding of policy makers.....	74
2. Developing a progressive and targeted policy for different groups of people	
.....	75
3. Creating a working environment of equality in employment.....	76
References.....	77

附录

关于分群体、分阶段推进男女同龄退休的建议（提案）.....	79
关于退休年龄问题的调查问卷.....	84

鸣 谢

争取我国男女劳动者同龄退休的问题,既是保障妇女就业权利与发展权利的问题,又是重要的国计民生问题,受到妇女权益保护者和国际社会长期的关注、呼吁和推进。值此之际,国际劳工组织和挪威政府支持全国妇联妇女研究所开展了关于退休年龄问题的调查研究。本研究得到国际劳工组织北京局霍百安(Ann Herbert)局长、黄群项目官员和国际劳工组织亚太地区高级性别专家娜琳(Nelien Haspels)女士自始至终的指导和帮助。

本研究由全国妇联妇女研究所与黑龙江、江苏、江西、四川四个省级妇女研究所合作进行。黑龙江省妇女研究所郭砾所长领导的团队、江苏省妇女研究所沈美华所长领导的团队、江西省妇女研究所魏霁晖所长领导的团队、四川省妇女研究所刘恒所长领导的团队,认真组织了四地的问卷调查,黑龙江省妇女研究所的同事们对全部问卷进行了录入分析,并参加了总报告的撰写;全国妇联妇女研究所马冬玲助理研究员参加了本研究的方案设计和问卷设计,丁娟、姜秀花、张永英、董树颖、王庆红、魏慧乾、李亚妮、徐国平、隗艳、张兆田等同志参加了本研究的问卷讨论、组织协调、报告印刷等工作;同文翻译公司为本报告的英文版做了翻译,霍百安局长、黄群项目官员和段思宁女士为本报告的英文版做了校定;清华大学谢崇桥博士为本报告做了封面设计。

在此,特别向国际劳工组织和挪威政府,向各位专家、各位领导、各位研究者和工作人员表示崇高敬意和衷心感谢!

退休年龄问题研究课题组负责人

全国妇联妇女研究所副所长、研究员 刘伯红

2011年3月

退休年龄问题研究报告

退休年龄问题研究课题组 刘伯红 郭砾 郝蕊 执笔

2011 年 3 月

一 研究背景及目的

中国职工法定退休年龄的规定始于 1951 年。当年政务院颁布的《中华人民共和国劳动保险条例》规定：男职工的退休年龄为 60 岁，女职工为 50 岁。1955 年国务院颁布的《关于国家机关工作人员退休处理办法》将女干部的退休年龄确定为 55 岁。现行的退休政策修订于 1978 年。《国务院关于安置老弱病残干部的暂行办法》和《国务院关于工人退休、退职的暂行办法》（国发【1978】104 号）规定：企业职工退休年龄男年满 60 周岁，女年满 50 周岁，女干部年满 55 周岁。

针对县处级以上女干部和女高级知识分子的退休年龄，国发【1983】141 号和 142 号文件，中发【1982】13 号文件，人退发【1990】5 号文件，中组部组通字【1992】22 号文件，做出了县（处）级女干部和女专业技术人员退（离）休年龄延长到 60 岁的相关规定。但是，1993 年《国家公务员暂行条例》颁布的男年满 60 周岁，女年满 55 周岁退休的规定，在一定程度上冲击了县（处）级女干部和女高级知识分子与男性同龄退休的政策。

自 1989 年始，有代表在“两会”（全国人大、全国政协）上提出“男女同龄退休”或“男女公务员/专业技术人员同龄退休”的建议，

至今已 20 余年，均未被全国人大和政府相关部门接受或改正。此举引起相当数量的女干部、女专业技术人员甚至女工人的异议，以及国际社会对中国妇女人权状况的批评。

当妇女权益保障者或妇女组织向相关决策部门提出男女同龄退休的要求时，一个惯性的回答是“大部分妇女自己不同意男女同龄退休”。这种说法在大众传媒的相关辩论中也屡见不鲜。

本研究意图通过深入调查，弄清楚到底是哪些人主张男女同龄退休，哪些人不同意男女同龄退休，原因何在，不同性别、不同身份（工人、专业技术人员、干部）的人对退休年龄的想法和需求到底是什么，为退休政策的修改和完善提供切实可行的依据，促进我国经济与社会的和谐发展，促进男女平等事业和妇女人权事业的进步。

二 调查的基本情况

本调查主要采取问卷调查的方法，在黑龙江、江苏、江西和四川四省发放调查问卷共计 4500 份，剔除无效问卷后，共回收有效问卷 4188 份，回收率为 93.1%。其中黑龙江省代表老工业基地，江苏省代表经济发达地区，江西省代表经济欠发达地区，四川省代表西部地区，样本分布见表 1。

表 1 调查样本的地区分布

	发放问卷数	有效问卷数	占全部有效问卷的比例
黑龙江	1200	1110	26.5%
江 苏	1100	1078	25.7%
江 西	1100	1000	23.9%
四 川	1100	1000	23.9%
合计	4500	4188	100.0%

调查样本采取立意抽样的方式,^①考虑问卷填答者的性别、年龄、职业身份、所有制和单位效益的差异。其中,被访者中女性占 75.7%,男性占 24.3%,男性主要为决策者和管理者(见表 2);被访者的年龄分为 39 岁及以下、40—49 岁、50—60 岁以及 61 岁以上四组,调查重点在 40—60 岁的人群,占总体的 56.9%(见表 3)。女性被访者的职业身份分为干部、专业技术人员及工人,其占全部问卷的比例分别为:女干部(党政机关有行政级别的公务员以及其他单位有行政级别的管理者)占 21.7%,专业技术人员(具有初级及以上专业技术职称的人员)占 34.9%,工人(没有行政级别的职工或职员)占 19.1%(见表 4);抽取的工人样本来自不同所有制、不同经济效益的单位(包括好、一般、差三类);专业技术人员来自教师、医生、科研人员和编辑记者等不同职业。

表 2 调查样本的性别结构

	人数	所占比例
男	1018	24.3%
女	3170	75.7%
合计	4188	100.0%

表 3 调查样本的年龄结构

	人数	所占比例
39岁及以下	1775	42.4%
40—49岁	1760	42.0%
50—60岁	622	14.9%
61岁及以上	31	0.7%
合计	4188	100.0%

^①“立意抽样”又称“判断抽样”,是指根据调查人员的主观经验从总体样本中选择那些被判断为最能代表总体的单位做样本的抽样方法。当调查人员对自己的研究领域比较熟悉,对调查总体比较了解时采用这种抽样方法,可获代表性较高的样本。此方法多应用于总体小而内部差异大的情况,或在总体边界无法确定或因研究者的时间与人力、物力有限时采用。

表 4 调查样本的人群分布

	有效问卷数	所占比例
男性	1018	24.3%
女干部	909	21.7%
女技术人员	1461	34.9%
女工人	800	19.1%
合计	4188	100.0%

调查问卷于 2010 年 9 月初在黑龙江、江苏、江西、四川四省同时发放，9 月底回收之后，统一进行录入与分析。

三 主要发现

（一）被访者的基本情况

1. 被访者年龄

本次调查，重点关注年龄在 40 – 60 岁之间的人群。处于该年龄段的被访者占总体的 56.9%，他们正面临或即将面临退休问题。被访者中，男性、女干部以及女技术人员中 40 – 60 岁的被访者均占到一半以上。女工人法定退休年龄为 50 岁，被访女工人中 40 – 60 岁的比例不足半数，见表 5。

表 5 不同群体被访者的年龄情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
39岁及以下	42.4%	34.5%	35.0%	44.8%	56.4%
40 – 49岁	42.0%	44.7%	47.7%	39.2%	37.4%
50 – 60岁	14.9%	20.4%	16.3%	15.0%	5.9%
61岁及以上	0.7%	0.4%	1.0%	1.0%	0.4%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. 被访者受教育程度

被访者总体上受教育程度较高。64.5%是本科及以上学历，其中男性最高（77.6%），其次为女干部（74.3%）和女技术人员（69.2%），女工人的文化程度多集中在中专及大专水平，拥有本科及以上学历的占28.2%，见表6。

表6 不同群体被访者的受教育程度

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
初中及以下	3.4%	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%	11.4%
中专/技校/高中	12.1%	5.2%	4.7%	9.2%	34.3%
大学专科	20.1%	15.5%	19.6%	20.2%	26.1%
大学本科	47.1%	54.1%	60.0%	46.0%	25.6%
研究生及以上	17.4%	23.5%	14.3%	23.2%	2.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. 被访者婚姻状况

绝大部分被访者为初婚有配偶，占总体的82.3%。男性、女干部、女技术人员的婚姻状况差异很小。女工人由于整体年龄偏低，故未婚比例较其他群体高，见表7。

表7 不同群体被访者的婚姻状况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
未婚	10.0%	6.8%	6.7%	8.1%	21.1%
初婚	82.3%	87.5%	84.3%	83.4%	71.1%
再婚	4.0%	4.0%	4.5%	4.2%	2.9%
离婚	3.0%	1.0%	3.5%	3.6%	3.9%
丧偶	0.8%	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	1.0%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4. 被访者的家庭月收入情况

总体看，大多数被访者（56.6%）的家庭月收入在 5000 元以下。其中女工人中近三分之一的家庭月收入在 2000 元以下，5000 元以上的比例明显少于男性、女干部及女技术人员。女工人家庭月收入水平较低，一方面是其整体收入水平偏低，另一方面和女工人年龄普遍偏低、未婚比例较高有一定关系，见表 8。

表 8 不同群体被访者的家庭月收入情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
2000元以下	12.4%	7.7%	7.0%	9.5%	30.0%
2000 - 4999元	44.2%	45.2%	40.4%	44.5%	46.6%
5000 - 7999元	26.6%	30.9%	30.8%	27.4%	15.1%
8000 - 9999元	8.2%	8.9%	9.4%	9.2%	4.3%
10000 - 14999元	5.9%	5.1%	9.2%	6.3%	2.5%
15000元以上	2.6%	2.2%	3.2%	3.1%	1.5%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

5. 被访者月收入占家庭月收入的比例

调查显示，56.2%的被访者月收入占家庭月收入的一半，说明大部分家庭中男女共同担当养家人的角色。女干部月收入为家庭月收入一半的最多，达到 67%，其次为女技术人员、男性和女工人。和其他群体相比，男性中月收入比例远少于一半和可以忽略不计的最少（8.8%），远多于一半和几乎全部的最多（37.4%）；女工人恰恰相反，远少于一半和可以忽略不计的最多（42.9%），远多于一半和几乎全部的最少（13.1%），说明家庭中收入格局是男高女低，男性依然是最主要的养家者，而女工人个人收入明显偏低，见表 9。

表 9 不同群体被访者月收入占家庭月收入的比例

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
可以忽略不计	4.3%	1.5%	2.2%	3.4%	11.6%
远少于一半	19.6%	7.3%	16.3%	23.9%	31.3%
差不多一半	56.2%	53.9%	67.0%	57.8%	44.0%
远多于一半	9.7%	23.6%	5.1%	6.4%	3.5%
几乎全部	10.2%	13.8%	9.5%	8.4%	9.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

6. 被访者家庭经济状况的自我评价

有 58.7%的被访者认为其家庭经济状况处于中等及以上水平，41.2%处于中下及下层水平。一半以上的女工人（60.4%）认为其家庭经济水平为中下或下层，比例远高于其他群体，见表 10。

表 10 不同群体被访者的家庭经济状况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
下层	8.6%	8.4%	4.6%	6.7%	16.9%
中下	32.6%	31.9%	24.9%	31.9%	43.5%
中等	52.0%	50.9%	63.8%	54.4%	35.8%
中上	6.4%	8.4%	6.5%	6.5%	3.8%
上层	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7. 家中是否有需要照顾的人

只有 21.9%的被访者家庭中暂时没有需要照顾的人；平均有 52.3%的被访者家中有需要照顾的孩子，女干部比例稍高；平均有 60.2%的被访者家中有需要照顾的老人，男性比例略高；平均有 6.6%的被访者家中有需要照顾的病人，特别是女工人家庭；平均还有 1.9%

的被访者家中有需要照顾的残疾人,又以女技术人员和女工人的家庭为高,见表 11。各群体、男女被访者家中普遍都有如此之高比例的需要照顾的人,无疑给男女就业者普遍带来工作和家庭的冲突。

表 11 被访者家中需要照顾的人

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
暂时没有需要照顾的人	21.9%	18.9%	23.7%	20.9%	25.5%
孩子	52.3%	52.4%	54.7%	52.2%	49.6%
病人	6.6%	4.1%	6.4%	7.5%	8.5%
残疾人	1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	2.1%	2.1%
老人	60.2%	64.3%	54.6%	62.2%	57.5%
其他人	1.0%	1.6%	1.2%	0.9%	0.4%

8. 被访者健康状况的自我评价

认为自己健康状况良好的被访者占 41.9%,认为自己健康状况一般的占 49.7%,认为自己健康状况较差、很差以及说不清的所占比例较小。比较而言,男性对自己健康的评价最高,50.4%的认为自己健康状况良好,4.6%的认为自己健康状况较差或很差;女技术人员和女工人的健康评价相对较差,仅有 36.8%和 37.3%的认为其健康状况良好,同男性相比相差十几个百分点,有 9.6%和 9.3%的认为自己健康状况较差或很差,见表 12。

表 12 不同群体被访者自我评价的健康状况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
良好	41.9%	50.4%	44.8%	36.8%	37.3%
一般	49.7%	44.6%	48.2%	53.0%	52.1%
较差	6.7%	4.1%	5.7%	8.8%	7.3%

很差	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%	2.0%
说不清	0.8%	0.4%	0.8%	0.8%	1.4%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

9. 被访者工作单位类型

被访者中有 31.0% 来自党政机关/社会团体, 40.9% 来自事业单位, 23.9% 来自各类企业。其中, 男性来自党政机关/社会团体的比例最高, 女性来自事业单位比例最高, 见表 13。

表 13 分性别的被访者的工作单位类型

	总体 (N=4188)	男 (n=1018)	女 (n=3170)
党政机关/社会团体	31.0%	42.5%	27.3%
事业单位	40.9%	36.5%	42.3%
国有企业	15.6%	13.0%	16.4%
私营企业	7.4%	5.0%	8.2%
外资/合资企业	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
其他	4.3%	2.1%	5.0%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

10. 被访者行政级别

被访者中有行政级别的占 50.1%, 没有行政级别的占 49.9%, 被访者整体的行政级别不高, 在一定意义上较多地代表了基层干部的声音。三分之二以上的男性有行政级别, 半数以上的女性没有行政级别, 男性县处级及以上比女性高出 21.8 个百分点 (见表 14), 说明多数男性被访者居于领导者和管理者位置, 本调查在一定程度上代表了男性决策者和管理者对退休年龄的评价和看法。

表 14 分性别的被访者的行政级别

	总体 (N=4188)	男 (n=1018)	女 (n=3170)
地市厅局级	1.1%	1.6%	0.9%
县处级	17.7%	33.7%	12.6%
科级	21.9%	25.4%	20.8%
股级	5.0%	6.4%	4.6%
股级以下	4.4%	4.6%	4.3%
没有行政级别/不适用	49.9%	28.3%	56.8%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

11. 被访者获得专业技术职称的情况

被访者中 40.3%没有专业技术职称，18.2%拥有副高级及以上职称。由于女性来自事业单位比例最高，所以获得技术职称的比例高出男性 2.9 个百分点，但获得副高级及以上职称的比例却比男性低 3.9 个百分点，见表 15。

表 15 分性别的被访者专业技术职称情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男 (n=1018)	女 (n=3170)
没有专业技术职称/不适用	40.3%	42.5%	39.6%
初级	15.3%	11.3%	16.6%
中级	26.1%	25.0%	26.5%
副高级	13.3%	14.8%	12.9%
正高级	4.9%	6.4%	4.4%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

12. 被访者单位的经济效益情况

平均有 17.8%的被访者认为其单位经济效益比较好或非常好，不

到二成；平均有 38% 的认为经济效益一般，将近四成，其中女技术人员的比例最高；平均有 8.6% 的认为经济效益比较差、非常差和已经破产，其中以女工人群体所在单位的经济效益最差，比较差、非常差和已经破产了的分别占 12.8%、2.4% 和 0.3%，见表 16。

表 16 不同群体被访者单位的经济效益情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常好	2.3%	2.3%	0.3%	3.2%	3.0%
比较好	15.5%	15.9%	4.5%	21.5%	16.8%
一般	38.0%	30.5%	6.4%	56.2%	50.5%
比较差	7.6%	4.7%	1.5%	10.5%	12.8%
非常差(包括停产)	0.9%	0.5%	0.2%	0.8%	2.4%
已经破产	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
不清楚/不适用	35.5%	46.1%	86.9%	7.7%	14.4%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

13. 被访者的福利待遇情况

总体而言，在社会保险方面，即养老保险、失业保险、医疗保险、工伤保险，女工人群体所能享有的比例既高于平均数，又高于男性、女干部、女技术人员的比例；但在福利方面，即公费医疗、住房补贴/福利房、住房公积金、带薪休假等，女工人群体所能享有的比例既远低于平均值，又低于其他三个群体。换句话说，女工人群体享有社会保障但缺乏福利待遇，见表 17。

表 17 不同群体社会保障和福利待遇状况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
公费医疗	49.3%	55.7%	62.6%	53.4%	18.8%

医疗保险	73.6%	73.8%	67.9%	74.7%	77.8%
退休金	63.3%	65.0%	69.9%	67.1%	46.8%
养老保险	55.7%	54.4%	36.9%	57.6%	75.3%
失业保险	44.0%	39.4%	21.0%	52.3%	61.0%
工伤保险	38.4%	37.3%	25.1%	40.3%	51.6%
病假工资	52.8%	51.2%	60.8%	56.2%	39.6%
产假工资/生育费用	57.6%	35.8%	66.1%	68.2%	56.3%
住房补贴/福利房	39.4%	42.1%	43.0%	44.6%	22.6%
住房公积金	80.9%	85.6%	87.0%	85.2%	59.9%
带薪休假	64.0%	69.2%	74.9%	60.3%	51.8%
报销/补贴家属医药费	14.8%	14.3%	12.5%	17.2%	13.5%

（二）被访者对现行退休年龄规定的看法

1. 现行退休政策年龄规定的执行情况

调查显示,被访者所在单位在执行退休政策时掌握的年龄标准是不同的。

（1）被访者中平均约有 7.1%的人所在单位执行的是“男女同龄退休”的政策。这个数据首先说明了,对于现行退休政策年龄标准,各大单位有自己做出相应规定的自主权。其次也说明了,为数不多的单位在做出年龄规定时考虑到对男女平等就业权利与社会保障权利的尊重和保障。可惜的是,这样的用人单位太少,且多为党政机关/社会团体和事业单位,见表 18。从地区上看,黑龙江省男女同龄退休的比例最高,达 14.6%,四川省最低,为 1.8%,地区性差异明显存在。

（2）被访者中平均约有 15.5%的人其所在单位执行的是“一定级别的女性跟男性同龄退休”的政策。包括司局级以上和县处级以上（含高级职称）男女干部同龄退休。说明了尽管国发【1978】104 号文件规定了男女职工、男女干部不同的退休年龄,1993 年《国家公务员暂行条例》规定了男女公务员不同的退休年龄,但仍有一些单位

的确落实和执行了中发【1982】13号文件、人退发【1990】5号文件和组通字【1992】22号文件中关于县（处）级女干部和女专业技术人员退（离）休年龄延长到60岁的相关规定，为级别和职称较高女性的发展创造了重要条件，保证了这部分女性与男性平等的发展权利和就业权利。但是，执行这种政策的单位比例也不高，远不能满足女性劳动者的要求。其中，又以党政机关/社会团体和事业单位执行较好，分别占23.1%和17.1%，见表18。从地区上看，江苏省执行该政策的比例最高，达20.3%，四川省最低，为10.4%，存在一定的地区性差异。

（3）被访者中平均仍约有73.7%的人所在单位执行的是“女性比男性早退休”的政策（见表18）。较多的用人单位普遍执行的是国发【1978】104号文件和《国家公务员暂行条例》“一刀切”的差别年龄退休的政策，没有行使各大单位根据本单位情况自行决定退休年龄标准的自主权，也没有执行中发【1982】13号文件、人退发【1990】5号文件和组通字【1992】22号文件为级别职称较高的女性“开口子”的政策。同时也说明，较多的单位习惯执行“刚性”较强、贯彻起来比较省事又能避免“麻烦”的政策，换句话说，中发、人退发、组通字文件的“力度”尚不如国发【1978】104号文件和《国家公务员暂行条例》，执行起来也比较“麻烦”。这种状况提示我们，若想改变或完善目前男女差别退休年龄的政策，尚需级别较高的政策法规，各用人单位更习惯接受“力度较大”、“便于执行”的统一政策。

表 18 不同单位被访者现行退休政策年龄标准的执行情况

	总体 (N=4188)	党政机关/ 社会团体 (n=1297)	事业单位 (n=1713)	国有企业 (n=652)	私营企业 (n=310)	外资/ 合资企业 (n=37)	其他 (n=179)
男女同龄退休	7.1%	12.8%	6.4%	0.9%	3.5%	—	3.4%
女性比男性早退休	73.7%	69.2%	77.7%	84.5%	49.0%	59.5%	74.3%
一定级别的女性 跟男性同龄退休	15.5%	23.1%	17.1%	6.3%	1.9%	2.7%	5.6%

工作满一定年限后男女都可以提前退休	9.0%	13.6%	6.8%	6.7%	7.4%	8.1%	7.3%
不知道	11.9%	8.3%	9.6%	10.6%	38.4%	24.3%	15.6%
其他	1.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	3.2%	8.1%	1.1%

注：此题是多选题，故一些选项的实际比例可能略低于表中各项总体数据。

2. 被访者对现行退休政策年龄标准的评价

根据以往调查，不同性别、不同群体的就业者对现行工人和干部退休政策年龄标准的看法是不同的，故本调查专门设计了相关题目，请被访者对现行“工人退休年龄”和“干部退休年龄（含专业技术人员）”是否“合理”进行评价，结果如下：

（1）对现行男 60 岁、女 50 岁的职工差别年龄退休政策，有一半略多（51.1%）的被访者认为“不合理”，高于认为“合理”的比例（42.3%）。其中女干部、女技术人员认为不合理的比例最高，分别占 59.6% 和 55.1%，即使是男性，认为“不合理”的比例也占将近一半（49.8%）。因为涉及工人退休年龄，我们更关注女职工主体的感受，尽管她们认为“不合理”的比例最低，但也超过被访女职工的三分之一，达到 36.0%（见表 19），说明有相当数量的女工已经不认同现行退休政策的年龄规定。以往人们习惯说到的“女职工不同意同龄退休”的说法，开始有了变化，况且，三分之一并非小数。

但是，我们也看到，仍有平均 42.3% 的被访者认为该政策“合理”。其中女工人认同的比例最高，占女工人的一半以上，达 56.4%，高出女干部 21 个百分点（见表 19），部分女职工对男女退休政策持不同意见的看法在这组数据中得到印证，女职工的自身感受值得我们高度重视。

表 19 不同群体被访者对工人现行差别退休年龄政策的评价

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
合理	42.3%	40.5%	35.4%	40.2%	56.4%
不合理	51.1%	49.8%	59.6%	55.1%	36.0%
说不清	6.5%	9.7%	5.0%	4.7%	7.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(2) 对现行男 60 岁、女 55 岁的干部（含专业技术人员）差别退休年龄政策，平均有 47.3% 的人认为“合理”，平均有 43.0% 的人认为“不合理”，认为“合理”的比例略高于认为“不合理”的比例。若从女干部和女技术人员的主观感受看，她们当中认为差别退休“不合理”的比例均超过“合理”的比例，分别为 54.2% 和 48.5%，女干部和女技术人员自身的态度更值得我们重视。我们不难看出，女工人和男性认同比例最高，均超过半数，分别为 57.8% 和 51.2%，是这两个群体的高认同率导致了平均“合理”数字超过“不合理”数字。

表 20 不同群体被访者对干部（含专业技术人员）现行差别退休年龄政策的评价

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
合理	47.3%	51.2%	38.6%	44.4%	57.8%
不合理	43.0%	36.4%	54.2%	48.5%	28.6%
说不清	9.6%	12.4%	7.2%	7.0%	13.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. 现行退休政策的负面影响

认为现行男女工人差别 10 年退休“不合理”的被访者认为，女工人提前 10 年退休有如下负面影响：认为“影响了男女平等的就业权利和机会”的平均达 70.6%，认为“早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验”

的平均占 50.1%，认为“早退休影响女性经济收入”的平均占 49.0%，认为“早退休影响女性职业发展”的平均占 43.0%。其中，女干部认为负面影响的比比例均远高于平均值，男干部认为负面影响的比比例远低于平均值，存在明显的性别差异；此外，女职工认为负面影响的比比例除个别选项外，也普遍低于平均值，存在一定的群体差异。见表 21。

表 21 认为现行工人退休政策“不合理”的被访者对其不利影响的看法

	总体 (N=2142)	男性 (n=507)	女干部 (n=542)	女技术人员 (n=805)	女工人 (n=288)
男女应有平等的工作权利和机会	70.6%	63.9%	77.9%	71.4%	66.7%
早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验	50.1%	41.0%	60.0%	52.5%	41.0%
早退休影响女性经济收入	49.0%	33.3%	55.0%	53.8%	51.7%
早退休影响女性职业发展	43.0%	30.8%	52.0%	46.2%	38.5%
男女身体状况差别不大	36.8%	27.4%	46.9%	39.6%	26.4%

认为现行男女干部（含专业技术人员）差别 5 年退休“不合理”的被访者认为，女干部提前 5 年退休有如下负面影响：认为“影响了男女平等的就业权利和机会”的平均达 83.2%，认为“早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验”的平均占 60.0%，认为“早退休影响女性职业发展”的平均占 52.9%，认为“早退休影响女性经济收入”的平均占 46.8%，4 项比例的平均值均超过对工人负面影响的平均值，意味着被访者认为这样的政策对女干部的负面影响更大，感受更强烈。其中，女干部认为负面影响的比比例均远高于平均值，男干部认为负面影响的比比例低于平均值，存在明显的性别差异；此外，女职工认为负面影响的比比例，也普遍低于平均值，存在一定的群体差异。见表 22。

表 22 认为现行干部退休政策“不合理”的被访者对其不利影响的看法

	总体 (N=1802)	男性 (n=371)	女干部 (n=493)	女技术人员 (n=709)	女工人 (n=229)
男女应有平等的工作权利和机会	83.2%	80.6%	86.8%	82.2%	82.5%
早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验	60.0%	51.5%	66.7%	61.5%	55.0%
早退休影响女性职业发展	52.9%	41.8%	63.1%	54.6%	43.7%
早退休影响女性经济收入	46.8%	31.8%	55.2%	51.1%	40.2%
男女身体状况差别不大	39.7%	33.4%	48.7%	40.9%	26.6%

（三）被访者对现行退休年龄看法的原因

已有的相关研究已经表明,影响人们是否选择提前或推迟退休的因素是复杂的、多方面的。为了深入了解哪些因素影响了被访者对现行退休政策的评价和看法,问卷设计了个人因素、家庭因素、经济因素、工作环境因素、观念因素等相关问题对被访者进行询问,以尽可能弄清影响被访者退休态度的多重制约因素。

我们以被访者是否同意男女工人同龄退休、是否同意男女干部(含专业技术人员)同龄退休分别为因变量,以被访者的性别、年龄、教育程度、月收入(占家庭月收入的份额)、家庭负担、身体状况、工作单位类型、行政级别、在单位中的位置、专业技术职称、所在单位提供福利待遇、单位经济效益、退休年龄对升迁的影响、退休后收入的增减以及单位工作环境等有关因素为自变量进行 Logistic 回归分析,因素入选的判别水准为 0.05,剔除水准为 0.10。

Logistic 回归分析显示,在 $\alpha=0.05$ 水准上,依照 OR 值,影响被访者对工人现行退休政策看法的因素由大到小顺序为工作单位类型、月收入占家庭收入的份额、退休后收入的增减、是否对单位工作环境满意、受教育程度以及性别(见表 23);影响被访者对干部现行退休政策看法的因素由大到小顺序为退休年龄影响升迁、行政级别、退休

后收入的增减、是否因为兼顾家庭与工作而感觉身心疲惫、受教育程度以及性别（见表 24）。具体分析如下。

表 23 同意男女工人同龄退休因素回归分析

变量	回归系数	标准误	Wald χ^2	自由度	P 值	OR
工作单位类型	0.103	0.040	6.664	1	0.010	1.108
被访者月收入占家庭月收入的份额	-0.089	0.037	5.755	1	0.016	0.914
退休后收入的增减	-0.175	0.031	32.209	1	0.000	0.839
是否对单位工作环境满意	-0.264	0.090	8.570	1	0.003	0.768
受教育程度	-0.281	0.041	47.044	1	0.000	0.755
性别	-0.631	0.086	54.342	1	0.000	0.532

表 24 同意男女干部同龄退休因素回归分析

变量	回归系数	标准误	Wald χ^2	自由度	P 值	OR
退休年龄是否影响升迁	0.093	0.041	5.151	1	0.023	1.097
行政级别	0.069	0.031	4.881	1	0.027	1.071
退休后收入的增减	-0.135	0.031	18.598	1	0.000	0.874
是否因为兼顾家庭与工作而感觉身心疲惫	-0.286	0.079	13.041	1	0.000	0.751
受教育程度	-0.292	0.042	48.161	1	0.000	0.747
性别	-0.555	0.089	39.213	1	0.000	0.574

1. 经济原因

尽管影响人们选择提前或推迟退休年龄的因素是多方面的，但是，调查显示，经济因素无疑是至关重要的，无论是部分女干部、女

技术人员希望同龄退休，还是部分女工人愿意提前退休，其根本原因均与经济因素密切相关。

男女不同龄退休使得男女两性在经济收入和福利待遇上有明显差别，特别是女干部和女技术人员。与计划经济时代人们退休与在职收入差别不大的情况不同，目前干部与技术人员退休后的收入与在职收入差别较大。我国目前干部退休金制度规定的是 35 年工龄以上按 90% 计发、30 – 35 年工龄按 85% 计发、20 – 30 年工龄按 80% 计发。这样就出现了女干部、女技术人员学历越高，工龄越短，工资收益损失越大的情况。本次调查 74.3% 的女干部和 69.2% 女技术人员为大学本科及以上学历，如果比男性提早 5 年退休，把退休以后扣减相应的职务工资和津贴工资、在职可多获得的 2 – 3 级职务工资和一级级别工资、在职每年度考核合格的公务员可增发一个月基本工资和由于工龄均不满 35 年整个退休期间减少的收入加在一起，剔除工资增长因素，女性平均比同样年龄、受同样教育、同时参加工作的男性，一生至少要少收入约 16.85 万元。如果是金融、电信等高收入行业的女干部或女技术人员，在收入和社保上的经济损失更大。

调查显示，在回答“按照本单位目前的退休政策，退休后的收入增减情况”的问题时，回答退休后收入“差不多”的人平均为 13.2%，而回答“有所降低”和“降低较多”的人平均高达 61.5%。其中，女技术人员、男性和女干部的比例均高于平均值，依次为 68.8%、65.9% 和 65.2%，与此形成鲜明对照的是，女工人退休收入“有所降低”和“降低较多”的比例仅为 38.4%，见表 25。

调查还显示，女工人退休后收入增减的情况与女干部、女技术人员有明显的不同。一般说来，“退休金”应低于在职人员工资，但在工人群体中，情况并非如此。在退休后收入“有所提高”的被访者中，女工人高达 10.5%，远高于其他三个群体，在退休后收入“提高很多”的被访者中，女工人的比例也是四个群体中比例最高的；有 38.4% 的女工人退休后收入会有所降低和降低较多，是四个群体中比例最低的，见表 25。

表 25 不同群体按照本单位目前的退休政策退休后收入增减的情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
提高较多	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	1.1%
有所提高	4.8%	4.0%	3.5%	3.1%	10.5%
差不多	13.2%	14.6%	16.9%	10.3%	12.5%
有所降低	39.6%	45.8%	50.9%	37.9%	22.0%
降低较多	21.9%	20.1%	14.3%	30.9%	16.4%
不清楚	20.0%	15.0%	14.0%	17.6%	37.5%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

进一步分析可以看出,本次被调查的女工人有 30.0%家庭月收入在 2000 元以下,46.6%的人在 2000 – 5000 元之间;高达 66.0%的女工人所在单位经济效益一般、比较差、非常差乃至已经破产。在本次调查的座谈中我们发现,某市 2010 年 9 月的月最低平均工资为 960 元,但该市月最低退休金为 1150 元,月最低退休金高于月最低平均工资 190 元。对于经济效益不好的单位,早退休早拿到高于工资的退休金,对于女工及其家庭而言确实是非常重要的经济支持。因此,企业效益低下的女工人反对同龄退休的理由看起来非常实际:工资收入偏低,工作辛苦,提前退休甚至能够拿到比在职工资还多的退休金。如果延长退休年龄,对她们则意味着较低的收入和更大的生活压力。

本次调查还设计了有提前退休意愿的被访者,退休后打算做什么的问题,以考察经济因素、家庭因素等与退休态度的关系。结果发现,打算退休后继续从事有酬劳动的平均比例达 28.7%,其中,女工人的比例为 28.4%。在座谈中发现,企业效益不好的女工人希望提前退休,其实是为了得到“双保险”(既有一份退休保障,又能打份工获得额外收入)的更多的经济收益,是“退而不休”,并不意味着真正退出劳动力市场。

调查还发现,男性和女技术人员也有较高比例的被访者打算提前

退休后继续从事有酬劳动，分别为 33.3%和 28.7%（见表 26）。一方面说明，他/她们希望利用自己的一技之长继续工作，以获得经济上的收益，补偿退休后的经济损失，防止老年生活水准下降；另一方面也说明，他/她们仍具有实际的工作能力，包括工人在内，退休年龄较早和“退而不休”的情况较为普遍地存在着。

表 26 不同群体愿意提前退休的被访者退休后的打算

	总体 (N=2375)	男性 (n=538)	女干部 (n=475)	女技术人员 (n=851)	女工人 (n=511)
从事有酬劳动	28.7%	33.3%	24.0%	28.7%	28.4%
参与公益事业	28.3%	27.3%	32.6%	29.5%	23.3%
照顾家庭	48.0%	32.7%	56.0%	51.4%	51.3%
享受生活	57.1%	54.3%	65.1%	60.4%	47.4%
保健养生	42.7%	34.0%	48.4%	49.0%	36.2%
其他	2.5%	3.0%	3.8%	1.4%	2.5%

2. 工作环境原因

调查表明，工作环境中的性别平等状况、工作单位对劳动者的评价与认可、劳动者对工作的兴趣、单位的凝聚力等，对被访者的退休意愿也有一定的影响。

（1）工作单位性别平等的状况。调查显示，有 42.6%的女干部、43.6%的女技术人员和 41.9%的女工人认为，工作单位存在同等条件下男性提升比女性快的现象，也就是说男性的发展机会多于女性，女性的发展空间小于男性，有 21.8%的男性被访者也认为存在这种现象。调查也显示，有平均 36.7%的人认为，在技术要求高的岗位上男性比女性多，其中，女技术人员、女工人认同此种说法的分别为 40.2%和 42.1%，被访男性和女干部对此的认同也分别达到 32.9%和 30.3%，说明用人单位普遍存在不利于女性专业技术发展的性别差异。调查还显示，有平均 28.0%的被访者认为，在职务晋升上工作单位对男女有

不同的年龄要求，其中女干部、女技术人员的感受更深，均超过平均值，分别为 34.1%和 29.3%，另有超过二成的被访男性和女工人也认为存在这种现象，见表 27。

表 27 不同群体对工作环境是否平等的感受

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
同等条件下男性提升比女性快	37.8%	21.8%	42.6%	43.6%	41.9%
在技术要求高的岗位上男性比女性多	36.7%	32.9%	30.3%	40.2%	42.1%
在职务晋升上对男女有不同的年龄要求	28.0%	21.7%	34.1%	29.3%	26.8%

在退休年龄上基于性别的区别对待，使得男女两性在职业发展的机会方面有显著差异。由于女性比男性提前 5 年退休，在提职晋级时，一般 50 岁左右的处级女干部就不再继续提拔；而同龄、同职的男性则不受影响。在问及“按照单位目前的退休政策，你的升迁是否会受到年龄影响”时，有 46.2%的女干部、38.9%的女技术人员、21.1%的女工人回答“有影响”（见表 28），可见，现行的差别退休年龄影响了女性的职业发展。进一步的调查还发现，在地方党政机关机构改革中，出现了离岗（内退）年龄层层递减的现象，省级和市（地）级党政机关在内退年龄的规定上，实行处级女干部 50—53 岁离岗，55 岁退休；而在基层县（区），大多数科级及以下女干部离岗（内退）年龄甚至提前到 47—50 岁，55 岁退休。之所以出现女干部随着地区行政级别降低而出现的内退年龄递减的现象，其根源均在于女性早于男性提前退休的差别对待政策。

表 28 被访者单位执行的退休政策对不同群体被访者升迁是否有影响

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
是	37.3%	39.8%	46.2%	38.9%	21.1%
否	18.7%	21.7%	17.3%	18.3%	17.3%
不清楚	44.0%	38.5%	36.5%	42.8%	61.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

在退休年龄上基于性别的区别对待,引起女性就业者对此政策的不满。当我们问到被访者“是否听说过本单位或其他单位的女性因为提前退休表示不满”时,有平均 41.5%的人“听说过”,其中,女干部的比例最高,达 53.5% (见表 29)。我们也在《中国妇女报》等媒体上见过多起涉及女性退休问题的个案,有的甚至以“自杀”抗议,既严重影响到女性的身心健康和社会地位,也影响到单位和社会的和谐与安定团结。

表 29 不同群体被访者是否听说过本单位或其他单位的女性因为提前退休表示不满

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
是	41.5%	33.6%	53.5%	46.9%	28.1%
否	58.5%	66.4%	46.5%	53.1%	71.9%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

这些数据和现象均说明,工作环境中还普遍存在诸多性别不平等的现象,单位不自觉地女性的提职与发展人为设置了障碍,女性更容易遭遇“玻璃天花板”现象,^①这些都直接影响着女性的职业期待、工作意愿和发展信心,进而导致她们失去工作兴趣,产生提前退休的

^①指组织机构内部普遍存在的没有明文规定、但却实际执行的限制女性提升进入中高级管理层的障碍,因其是一种不见于正式规定的顽固做法,故被称为“玻璃天花板”。“玻璃天花板”现象不仅影响女性的职业发展,也影响她们的工作表现和生活满意度,还影响该社会的文化和文明程度。

愿望。

(2) 对工作环境是否满意。调查用在工作中是否得到应有的升迁、工作的稳定性和安全感、对工作的兴趣以及对工作环境的满意情况等问题,了解调查对象对工作环境的满意程度。这种满意度将影响被访者对退休政策的看法和退休意愿。调查首先测试了被访者对工作的自我评价,结果有 88.6% 高比例的人认为自己“能高效完成工作任务”,被访者的自我评价良好。其中,男性和女干部的自我评价更高,分别达 91.9% 和 92.5%;女技术人员其次,达 88.2%;女工人相对较低,达 80.9%。尽管被访者的自我评价较高,但有三分之一以上的人(34.1%)认为自己“在工作中没有得到应有的升迁”,其中,女工人的比例最高,达 36.0%,其次是女技术人员 34.7%,均超过平均值。从一个侧面反映了被访者所在单位对劳动者激励和肯定的机制不够健全,相当数量的被访者认为自己的工作没有得到应有的评价和承认。

此外,还有平均 23.2% 的人感到自己的“工作缺乏稳定性和安全感”,其中女工人的比例高达 41.4%,高于平均水平 18 个百分点。另有平均 22.8% 的人对“单位的工作环境不满意”,其中,女工人和女技术人员的比例都超过平均值,分别为 31.5% 和 24.0%。

值得注意的是,有平均 14.0% 的人“对自己的工作不感兴趣”,其中,也是女工人的比例最高,见表 30。常言道:“热爱是最好的老师”,如果一个人对自己的工作不感兴趣,就很容易失去继续工作的动力。

整体而言,女工人群体对工作环境的评价是最低的。她们中四成以上的人感觉工作没有稳定性和安全感,对单位的工作环境和在工作中没有得到应有的对待不满意,有一定数量的人对自己的工作不感兴趣,还有近一半的人担心自己将来的养老问题,因此,她们选择提前离岗和退休就不足为奇了。

表 30 不同群体对工作环境是否满意的情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
能高效地完成工作任务	88.6%	91.9%	92.5%	88.2%	80.9%
在工作中没有得到应有的升迁	34.1%	33.1%	32.8%	34.7%	36.0%
工作缺乏稳定性和安全感	23.2%	16.6%	12.8%	24.4%	41.4%
对自己的工作不感兴趣	14.0%	10.5%	13.8%	14.0%	19.0%
担心自己将来的养老问题	32.9%	27.0%	18.9%	36.6%	49.8%
对单位的工作环境不满意	22.8%	19.1%	17.4%	24.0%	31.5%

3. 家庭原因

调查用工作与家庭的角色冲突情况、家庭中是否有需要照顾的人员、谁来承担家庭照顾的责任等问题，考察家庭因素对被访者关于退休政策的看法和退休意愿的影响。

（1）男女被访者都感受到家庭负担和双重角色冲突，女性被访者的感受更深。被访者普遍承担着工作和家庭的双重角色负担，四个群体中平均有 45.6%的人面临着“同时兼顾家庭与工作，感觉身心疲惫”的问题，将近一半的被访者是在身心疲惫的情况下坚持工作，特别是女技术人员和女工人，男性也不在少数；有平均 15.8%的人“为照顾家庭影响了工作投入”，以女技术人员和女工人为最；有四分之一的被访者“因为工作影响了家庭”，其中男性为最，占 27.2%，反映了男性对自己应该承担家庭责任的认知，其次是女技术人员，占 27.0%，反映了女技术人员双重角色的冲突，见表 31。

表 31 不同群体工作与家庭方面的双重负担情况

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
同时兼顾家庭与工作，感觉身心疲惫	45.6%	42.4%	39.8%	50.0%	47.9%

为照顾家庭影响了工作投入	15.8%	13.2%	13.1%	18.5%	17.1%
因为工作影响了家庭	25.0%	27.2%	20.2%	27.0%	24.3%
因健康原因经常请假	5.5%	2.9%	5.3%	6.2%	8.0%

(2) 多数女性被访者仍然承担着照顾家庭的主要责任。如前所述, 被访者中有 52.3% 的家庭有需要照顾的孩子, 60.2% 的家庭有需要照顾的老人, 8.5% 的家庭有需要照顾的病人和残疾人, 见表 11。

按照国际社会性别平等的理念和基本人权框架的要求, 男女应当共同承担家庭责任和社会责任, 政府包括用人单位也应该实施“以人为本”、“为劳动者创造友好的工作环境”的政策, 为所有有家庭责任的男女就业者创造平衡工作和家庭矛盾的各种条件。但改革开放以后, 很多与家庭照顾有关的公共服务由用人单位转向了市场, 托幼、养老和家庭服务业尚未明确纳入政府的公共服务范畴, 为有家庭责任的人群提供的基本公共服务明显不足。在传统角色分工的习惯之下, 人们包括妇女自身, 还是把照顾家庭的责任更多寄托在妇女身上。通过询问希望提前退休被访者退休后的打算可以发现, 女干部、女技术人员和女工人退休后较多的是要照顾家庭, 分别占 56.0%、51.4% 和 51.3%, 平均比男性高出近二十个百分点, 而男性被访者表示退休后照顾家庭的仅占 32.7%, 见表 26。

在座谈中我们发现, 一些女性希望提前退休照顾家庭, 不但要照顾家庭中的配偶或第一代子女, 还要或还准备照顾第二代的孙子女, 因为子女们的收入低, 购买不起照顾孩子的市场服务(雇不起保姆), 只有趁父母特别是母亲还不太老、干得动的时候, 请父母帮助带孩子。显然, 当与家庭照顾相关的公共服务不足、社会分工把家庭照顾责任寄托在女性身上时, 女性不得已提前退休, 的确是一种无奈的经济和理性选择。

4. 观念原因

“观念”在此处指的是人们对待退休年龄问题的看法和认识, 既包括政策制定的出发点和价值, 也包括就业者对政策的认同和接受态

度。人们的观念随着政治、经济、社会和文化的发展而不断变化，其主观性和多元性也使不同群体、不同境遇的人之间有一定的差异。依据我国社会历史和经济体制的演变，我们从“传统福利视角”、“社会利益视角”以及“社会公正与基本人权视角”三个方面，设计了一些与认识有关的问题，以分析人们对退休年龄规定的观念原因。

（1）基于传统的福利视角

我国的退休政策制定于共和国初建的 1951 年，当时人们的预期寿命仅有 35 岁，女性的预期寿命比男性略低。解放前妇女从事有酬劳动的数量十分有限，社会整体经济水平不高，妇女走出家门从事的社会生产活动主要以体力劳动为主，家务劳动主要由妇女承担，且女性生儿育女较多，家务劳动社会化的程度不高。基于社会主义制度所要求的“劳动光荣”、“多劳多得”、“按劳分配”、“妇女解放”的价值目标，本着社会主义制度尊重、照顾和保护“不同生理特点”女性的优越性，政府制定了女性早于男性 5 - 10 年退休的差别退休政策。这意味着女性劳动者可以比男性提前 5 - 10 年回归家庭并享受到养老金，受到这种政策优待的不仅有妇女，还有从事高空、高温等特殊工种的劳动者。它体现了社会主义制度对不同劳动者的关照，成为早期中国社会主义退休养老制度的一部分，在一定时期起到积极的作用，受到男女劳动者的欢迎。

这种退休政策是明显地建立在“男主外，女主内”的社会分工下，尽管那个时代毛泽东主席发出了“妇女能顶半边天”、“时代不同了，男女都一样，男同志能做的事，女同志也能做得到”的伟大号召，极大地冲击了封建社会所建构和通行的“男尊女卑”、“男主外，女主内”观念，但不发达的社会生产力和有限的男女平等观念，使人们更多地认同了“差别对待”的保护性和照顾性功能，而未能发现其所导致的将“男主外，女主内”传统角色分工永久性固定下来的可能性，以及建立在此社会分工之上的限制女性劳动权利和发展权利的可能性。

调查显示，持这种“保护性平等”看法的人，在被访者中还有一定比例。对“女同志家务负担重，早退休正好照顾家庭”，非常同意

(17.6%) 和比较同意 (26.8%) 的加起来占 44.4%，反映了现阶段我国百姓生活中“男主外，女主内”社会分工的现实，也反映了人们在这种社会分工下解决工作和家庭矛盾的惯性思路。对“女性早退休是对她们的保护和福利”，非常同意 (19.0%) 和比较同意 (25.0%) 加起来占 44.0%，说明了将女性主要定位于家庭，将提前退休视为对妇女的特殊保护，还是目前部分政策制定者和部分女性自身难以改变的一种理念。有意思的是，女工人对此类观点支持比例最高，均超过 55%，其次是男性，均超过 45%。比较而言，在劳动力市场上地位不高、企业效益不好、社会保障不健全、文化程度不甚高、在现实生活中认同传统角色定型（男主外，女主内）的女性，比较容易接受和坚持“被保护”、“被福利”的观念。

表 32 不同群体对“女同志家务负担重，早退休正好照顾家庭”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	17.6%	19.2%	13.0%	15.3%	25.3%
比较同意	26.8%	29.2%	21.5%	26.7%	29.9%
不太同意	30.7%	27.8%	36.2%	32.8%	24.3%
很不同意	13.0%	7.3%	18.5%	15.3%	9.8%
说不清	12.0%	16.6%	10.9%	10.0%	10.9%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

表 33 不同群体对“女性早退休是对她们的保护和福利”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	19.0%	18.8%	15.4%	16.5%	28.0%
比较同意	25.0%	27.9%	19.3%	24.2%	29.4%
不太同意	29.5%	28.1%	35.2%	31.1%	21.9%
很不同意	12.3%	6.9%	17.8%	15.1%	7.8%

说不清	14.2%	18.4%	12.3%	13.1%	13.0%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

调查还显示,但随着经济社会的发展,当人们看到女性从提前退休中获得的利益越来越有限,感受到传统福利政策中掩盖着女性权利的缺失,发现了这种保护强化了传统角色分工的时候,不愿接受“福利”和“照顾”,对传统福利政策不“同意”的人多了起来,对上述两个问题持否定态度的人均占到四成以上(见表 32 和 33),特别是女干部和女技术人员。另有一成以上的人持怀疑的“说不清”的态度,在一定程度上说明保护性的传统福利政策受到了质疑,走到了尽头。

(2) 基于社会利益的视角

所谓基于社会利益的视角,指的是主要从经济社会的发展考虑退休政策及其年龄标准的设定。很显然,我国的退休政策的年龄规定受到劳动力市场供大于求的就业压力、日益老龄化所带来的劳动力短缺、也受到养老金积累不足需要大量财政补贴的挑战。

解决上述经济社会问题,显然需要缩短或延长退休年龄。那么,缩短或延长退休年龄的利弊是怎样在不同性别中分配的?女性可否将此作为调整退休年龄的策略和理由?被访者对此有怎样的看法?

1) 在缓解就业压力的问题上,有 1/3 的被访者同意以女性早退休的方式解决就业压力。在我国劳动力供大于求的现实情境下,在计划经济条件下让女性早退休的照顾和保护性的价值目标,已经在很大程度上被“为了给年轻人腾出就业机会,女性应早退休”的想法所取代。对此,有 33.5%的被访者表示了同意的态度,说明在就业和人口压力下,人们仍习惯以首先牺牲女性利益的思维方式,以传统角色定型的分工来解决劳动力供大于求的经济和社会矛盾(见表 34)。

那么,减轻就业的压力是否应该由男女两性共同承担呢?对于“为了减轻就业压力,男女都应该同龄提前退休”的看法,有 37.1%的被访者持赞成态度,这些人可能是主张男女平等权利的中坚者,其中没有明显的性别、群体和地区差异,见表 35。

表 34 不同群体对“为了给年轻人腾出就业机会，女性应早退休”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	15.7%	14.6%	11.8%	14.2%	24.3%
比较同意	17.8%	20.4%	14.2%	18.6%	17.3%
不太同意	35.4%	37.5%	38.5%	34.7%	30.3%
很不同意	20.9%	12.1%	27.7%	24.6%	17.6%
说不清	10.2%	15.3%	7.8%	7.8%	10.6%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

表 35 不同群体对“为了减轻就业压力，男女都应该同龄提前退休”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	13.0%	14.2%	13.1%	12.0%	13.3%
比较同意	24.1%	22.4%	24.5%	24.0%	25.8%
不太同意	34.8%	32.5%	35.4%	36.8%	33.4%
很不同意	13.0%	13.9%	13.5%	12.8%	11.5%
说不清	15.1%	17.0%	13.4%	14.3%	16.1%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

在是否让女性首先承担就业压力或由男女两性共同承担就业压力的问题上，被访者态度自相矛盾。有 56.3% 的被访者不同意首先由女性承担就业的压力，又有 47.8% 的被访者不同意男女两性共同承担就业压力，那么解决就业压力的出路在哪儿呢？或许，这样矛盾的填答结果与题目的含义没有为被访者清楚地理解有关。

2) 在缓解老龄化带来的劳动力短缺问题上，有 28.4% 的人同意把“男女都应延长 5 年退休”作为“应对老龄化”的对策，习惯性地继续保留了男女间的年龄差别。老龄化带来的劳动力短缺需要适当延长劳动者的退休年龄，同意“为应对老龄化，男女都应延长 5 年退休”

的被访者近三分之一，且没有明显的性别、群体和地区间的差异。如同上海市，在拟行的弹性退休政策改革中，仍然保留了男女继续相差 5 岁的差别对待年限。说明人们在考虑延长退休年龄时，没有关注性别平等的问题，继续保留了男女差别对待的原则；或者说，女性在争取就业机会时，是通过所有人都延长就业年限获得的，而不是通过实现平等权利获得的。

相反，57.3%的多数人不同意把“男女都应延长 5 年退休”作为“应对老龄化”的对策，见表 36。在这些“不同意”的人中，是因为这一政策取向的性别不平等而持不同意见？还是因为根本就不支持用延长退休年龄的方式解决老龄化带来的劳动力短缺问题？通过上述对“为了减轻就业压力，男女都应同龄提前退休”和下述“为弥补养老金缺口，应该让女性延长退休年龄，跟男性一样退休”问题的回答来推定，两种原因都同样存在。

表 36 不同群体对“为应对老龄化，男女都应延长 5 年退休”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	8.7%	14.1%	7.3%	7.6%	5.4%
比较同意	19.7%	20.2%	21.6%	19.6%	16.9%
不太同意	34.2%	28.3%	36.3%	37.0%	34.0%
很不同意	23.1%	24.5%	17.8%	22.4%	28.5%
说不清	14.4%	12.9%	17.1%	13.3%	15.3%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3) 在弥补养老金缺口的问题上，多数人不同意以让女性延长退休年龄的方式来弥补养老金的缺口，即在弥补养老金缺口时同步解决不平等问题。弥补养老金的缺口，显然需要延长退休年龄，增加养老保障的积累，能否利用这个机会或政策，解决退休年龄不平等的问题？有 47.1%的人不同意“为弥补养老基金缺口，应该让女性延长退

退休年龄，跟男性一样同龄退休”，其中以女工人反对居多。但仍有35.4%的人“同意”或“比较同意”，其中，女性同意的比例明显高于男性，女干部和女技术人员的比例又成倍高于女工人。这原本属于女性的就业权利，只要还原给她们，就能为国家财政减轻巨大压力。但这样一个看似如此简单并与国家利益并行不悖的问题，却只得到略高于三分之一的被访者的支持。

表 37 不同群体对“为弥补养老金缺口，应该让女性延长退休年龄，跟男性一样退休”的看法

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
非常同意	12.9%	8.3%	18.3%	15.6%	7.6%
比较同意	22.5%	19.4%	28.2%	24.0%	17.4%
不太同意	28.8%	32.8%	24.1%	29.2%	28.1%
很不同意	18.3%	16.4%	15.0%	16.1%	28.5%
说不清	17.5%	23.0%	14.5%	15.1%	18.4%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

男女应该什么年龄退休，既是一个性别平等问题，也是一个中国即将面对的经济社会问题，有关政策调整必须为未来的挑战做准备，逐渐解决退休年龄偏低与人口预期寿命提高的矛盾、退休年龄固定性与人力资本周期性的矛盾以及退休年龄虚低与老龄劳动人口实高的矛盾。^①设计这些题目的原意在于，了解被访者是否倾向积极应对这些经济社会发展出现的新问题，进而据此策略为女性争取平等就业的机会。但数据显示，即使这样一个在现有社会性别分工和两性权力关系格局之内要求公平，目标是实现国家整体利益的政策取向，也遇到了不小的阻力。

（3）基于社会公正和基本人权的视角

退休涉及到公民的就业权、发展权、社会保障权、参政权和选择

^①绍国栋、聂素芳：“人口老龄化挑战我国传统退休制度”，中国经济信息网 2007 年 4 月。

权问题,涉及到一个社会如何使全体公民平等公正地参与社会发展和平等地分享社会发展成果的问题,也涉及到人类发展的和谐和可持续问题。根据我国政府 1980 年签署的联合国《消除对妇女一切形式歧视公约》、1997 年签署的联合国《经济、社会和文化权利公约》、2006 年批准的国际劳工组织 111 号《消除就业和职业歧视公约》,以及《中华人民共和国宪法》和《中华人民共和国妇女权益保障法》的相关规定,强制性的基于性别规定不同退休年龄是对妇女的歧视和不平等,是对妇女人权的侵犯。

据此,我们设计了体现社会公正和人权视角的一组问题:“男女不同龄退休侵犯了妇女的平等权利”,意在测试人们对退休所包含的妇女就业权、发展权、社会保障权的看法;“提前退休给女性造成了经济损失”,意在测试人们对退休所包含的平等的经济权、收入权、社会保障权的看法;“我国高层女性少,跟女性提前退休有关系”,意在测试人们对妇女职业发展权、参政权看法;“女性预期寿命长,应该比男性晚退休”,意在提示人们考虑日益明显的女性平均预期寿命和健康寿命提高后所应具有的更多的就业选择权利,^①参见表 38。

表 38 1981—2005 年分性别的平均预期寿命 (单位:岁)

年份	合计	男性	女性	女性高于男性
1981	67.77	66.28	69.27	2.99
1990	68.55	66.84	70.47	3.63
2000	71.40	69.63	73.33	3.70
2005	72.95	70.83	75.25	4.42

资料来源:国家统计局社会 and 科技统计司编,《中国妇女儿童状况统计资料 2010》,内部资料。

^①从 1949 年到 2005 年,中国人口平均预期寿命从 35 岁提高到 73 岁。1951 年规定的男 60 岁、女 50 岁退休,在当时几乎意味着每个公民都在终身工作。而 2005 年人均 73 岁的预期寿命,意味着人们的健康寿命也在延长。根据人权理念,健康则意味着有工作的能力,有工作能力就应该有工作权利。我国男性法定退休年龄为 60 岁,与 2005 年的男性平均预期寿命只有 10.83 年的差距,而女干部 55 岁退休,女工人 50 岁退休,与 2005 年的平均预期寿命分别有 20.25 年和 25.25 年的差距。退休年龄和平均健康寿命之间的差距加大,或者说明某个国家的福利对女性特别优惠,或者说明该国女性权利的缺失,使妇女发展潜能、选择和从事职业以及实现个人抱负的自由受到限制。

数据显示,有 40.8%的人认为男女不同龄退休侵犯了妇女的平等权利,但有 41.0%的人不认为这样做是侵犯了妇女权利;有 50.5%的人认为提前退休给女性造成了经济损失,认同此观点的人比例较高,但有 34.0%的人不同意这种看法;有 39.1%的人认为我国高层女性少,跟女性提前退休有关系,但有 35.6%的人不同意这种看法;有 13.3%的人(极少数)认为女性预期寿命长应该比男性晚退休,更有 69.6%的多数人不同意这种看法。此外,表示“说不清”的人也占有相当比例,分别为 18.1%、15.4%、25.3%和 17.1%,说明人们对妇女权利的认识是模糊和不确切的。

对这四项目人权问题的认识中,存在明显的性别差异,女性对这些权利的认识明显高于男性。同时,也存在明显的群体差异,女干部和女技术人员的认识明显高于女工人群体。其呈现的基本态势是,女干部和女技术人员的态度近似,男性和女工人态度相似,两极差异明显。

表 39 对基于社会公正和基本人权视角的观点的认识

	非常同意	比较同意	不太同意	很不同意	说不清	合计
男女不同龄退休侵犯了妇女的平等权利	15.3%	25.5%	27.5%	13.5%	18.1%	100.0%
提前退休给女性造成了经济损失	16.5%	34.0%	24.6%	9.4%	15.4%	100.0%
我国高层女性少,跟女性提前退休有关系	13.5%	25.6%	25.2%	10.4%	25.3%	100.0%
女性预期寿命长应该比男性晚退休	3.7%	9.6%	44.8%	24.8%	17.1%	100.0%

上述调查数据一方面说明,我国男女公民的平等意识和人权意识不断增强,有一定比例的被访者明确地认识到现行的退休年龄政策有悖于基本人权和《宪法》的要求,也说明我们的政策到了应当修改的时候。

另一方面也说明,这样一个在国际社会毋庸置疑的问题,在我国还有一定规模的模糊看法。强制性的男女不同龄退休已成为国际公认的性别歧视,违反了我国《宪法》的男女平等原则,同时也违反了我

国加入的联合国《经济、社会和文化权利公约》和《消除对妇女一切形式歧视公约》中的非歧视原则，阻碍我国履行联合国《消除对妇女一切形式歧视公约》的义务。在我国的主流文化和传统文化中，尚缺乏“尊重和保障人权”、“反歧视”、“非歧视”、“自由”、“平等”的普遍认识和价值，特别是在巨大的人口和就业压力下尤其如此。

《中华人民共和国宪法》规定“中华人民共和国妇女在政治的、经济的、文化的、社会的和家庭的生活等各方面享有同男子平等的权利”。《中华人民共和国妇女权益保障法》也规定“男女平等是国家的基本国策。国家采取必要措施，逐步完善保障妇女权益的各项制度，消除对妇女一切形式的歧视”、“各单位在执行国家退休制度时，不得以性别为由歧视妇女”。我国目前执行的退休年龄政策已经成为一种制度性的性别歧视(男女区别对待)和身份歧视(干部工人区别对待)。这种歧视低估了女性的能力并僵化了男女两性的角色分工，造成了女性权利被侵害并且被构建到组织结构和组织文化中。但多数被访者并没有从这个视角看待问题。这种制度性歧视因其普适性和强制性，或许比观念性歧视更具危害性，令人无从逃避。

(四) 被访者对改进退休年龄规定的需求

本次调查专门征求了各个被访群体对退休年龄规定的需求和建议，下面将女工人和女干部(含专业技术人员)的政策建议分别描述。

1. 对女工人退休年龄的建议

调查显示，对工人退休年龄的要求是多样的，但性别平等的可选择的退休年龄设计(弹性退休)受到多数人的欢迎。

(1) 有 58.1%的人倾向于男女工人同龄退休，其中选择弹性退休年龄的比例达到 29.0%。男女同龄退休的含义包括：没有选择性的“男女工人同龄退休”，同意的人平均占 14.2%，在主要选项中是比较低的；有选择的弹性的“男女工人同龄退休，但是满一定工龄后，男女工人可以自主选择提前退休”，同意者平均占 29.0%，是主要选项中最高的；“根据工种和劳动强度确定退休年龄”，而不是根据性别决定退休年龄，同意者平均占 14.9%。这三个不是以性别为基础决定

退休年龄的选项加起来的比例是 58.1%。值得注意的是,女工人群体自身也有 48.4%的人倾向于这三种设计,与同意差别退休年龄的比例(50.6%)几乎持平。

需要强调的是,在这些选项中,弹性退休年龄制度设计的支持率最高,即使是较多支持差别退休年龄设计的女工群体也有四分之一以上的人投了赞成票。这说明,将工作和退休的“自主选择权”交给工人,在积累一定工龄的前提下,由男女工人根据自己的健康情况、经济状况、工种和劳动强度、家庭状况等做出是否退休的决定,是符合人性和人们多元化需求的政策改革方向。

(2) 有 41.2%的被访者、50.6%的被访女工仍坚持男女差别退休年龄,但希望减少差别年限的占四分之一左右。在四个被访群体中,仍有较高比例的人希望男女工人差别退休,但对差别年限的主张有所不同:26.8%的被访者赞成女工比男工早 5 年而不是早 10 年退休,而女工自身坚持早 10 年退休的人最多,占到 26.8%(占女工的 1/4 以上),为各主要选项之最。

尽管女工群体较多坚持差别退休、特别是差别 10 年退休的主张,但我们可以明显地看到,女工群体绝非固守差别退休的铁板一块,开始呈现多元化主张:逐渐缩短差别退休的时间、实现男女工人同龄退休、根据工种和岗位决定退休时间,特别是在男女同样享有基本权利的前提下自主选择是否提前退休。这提示我们,对工人退休政策的改革应考虑男女职工的多元化需求。

表 40 不同群体对男女工人退休年龄的建议

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
女工比男工早 10 年退休	14.4%	12.5%	8.8%	12.4%	26.8%
女工比男工早 5 年退休	26.8%	34.3%	21.9%	26.3%	23.8%
男女工人同龄退休	14.2%	14.5%	16.7%	14.6%	10.0%

男女工人同龄退休，但是满一定工龄后，男女工人可以自主选择提前退休	29.0%	22.3%	37.3%	30.9%	24.8%
根据工种和劳动强度确定退休年龄	14.9%	15.6%	15.0%	15.1%	13.6%
其他	0.7%	0.8%	0.3%	0.7%	1.1%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. 对女干部（含专业技术人员）退休年龄的建议

调查显示，与工人退休年龄的要求明显不同，支持男女干部平等退休主张的较多，支持男女干部差别退休主张的较少，可选择的平等退休年龄设计（弹性退休）更受欢迎。

（1）对女干部（含专业技术人员）退休年龄的制度设计，有 66.8% 的人倾向于男女干部同龄退休，其中选择弹性退休年龄的比例达到 46.8%。弹性退休年龄设计为“男女干部同龄退休，但是满一定工龄后，男女可以自主选择提前退休”。女干部和女技术人员更是有高达 54.9% 和 49.0% 的人倾向于这种设计，而男性也有 41.3% 的人倾向于弹性退休年龄设计。

从事体力劳动与脑力劳动的人，工作性质相差较大，但在劳动强度上，谁重谁轻，不宜一概而论。另外个体间存在的差异，不仅体现在性别上，也体现在身体健康状况、家庭负担、经济状况、个人工作观念等诸多方面，众多女干部和女技术人员希望与男性同龄退休，很多男干部也愿意提前退休（见表 41）。因此，理想的退休政策应该具有相对的灵活性和弹性，在规定的年龄段内（如 55 – 60 岁，未来可能是 60 – 65 岁）男女都可以选择个人合适的退休年龄和相应的退休待遇，让愿意工作的人更多地为社会做贡献，让希望换一种生活方式的人早一些退休。但毋庸置疑的是，男女应该具有同等的权利和选择的自由。^①

^①乔红：“不能只注意‘延长’忽视了‘平等’”，《中国妇女报》2008 年 12 月 26 日。

表 41 不同群体的被访者是否愿意提前退休

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
是	56.7%	52.8%	52.3%	58.2%	63.9%
否	26.6%	28.2%	30.4%	28.1%	17.3%
不清楚	16.7%	19.0%	17.4%	13.6%	18.9%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(2) 对女干部早于男性 5 年退休的差别退休政策, 平均仍有 31.9% 的人表示赞同。进一步分析, 赞同最高的群体是女工人, 支持率达 41.1%, 其次是男性, 达 35.8%, 均高于平均值; 而女干部和女技术人员赞成的比例最低, 分别为 25.0% 和 28.3%, 均低于平均值。如果我们采取的是可以自主选择的弹性退休政策, 这部分自愿提前退休的女干部和女科技人员的需求也能够得到满足。

表 42 不同群体对男女干部(含专业技术人员)退休年龄的建议

	总体 (N=4188)	男性 (n=1018)	女干部 (n=909)	女技术人员 (n=1461)	女工人 (n=800)
女干部(含专业技术人员)比男干部(含专业技术人员)早 5 年退休	31.9%	35.8%	25.0%	28.3%	41.1%
男女干部(含专业技术人员)同龄退休	20.0%	21.5%	19.6%	21.6%	15.5%
男女干部(含专业技术人员)同龄退休, 但是满一定工龄后, 男女可以自主选择提前退休	46.8%	41.3%	54.9%	49.0%	40.9%
其他	1.3%	1.5%	0.6%	1.1%	2.5%
合计	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

四 结论与建议

（一）基本结论

1. 谁同意同龄退休？

调查显示，对于男女工人同龄退休，有平均 58.1% 的人持同意的态度，其中有 69.0% 的女干部、60.6% 的女技术人员、48.4% 的女工人和 52.4% 的男性。除女工人群体外，其他三个群体认同男女工人同龄退休的比例都在一半以上，女工人的认同度较低，不到一半。

调查显示，对于男女干部同龄退休，有平均 66.8% 的人持同意的态度，其中有 74.5% 的女干部、70.6% 的女技术人员、56.4% 的女工人和 62.8% 的男性。所有群体认同的比例都在一半以上，其中女干部和女技术人员认同比例均在 70% 以上，整体的认同度较高。

2. 谁不同意同龄退休？（或谁同意提前退休？或差别年龄退休？）

调查显示，对于女工人早于男工人 5 – 10 年的差别年龄退休，有平均 41.2% 的人持同意的态度，其中有 30.7% 的女干部、38.7% 女技术人员、50.6% 的女工人和 46.8% 的男性。女工人群体的支持者略超过一半，其他三个群体的支持者均在一半以下。从主体方面说，有略高于一半的女工人不同意同龄退休。

调查显示，对于女干部（含专业技术人员）早于男干部 5 年的差别退休年龄，有平均 31.9% 的人持同意态度，其中有 25.0% 的女干部、28.3% 的女技术人员、41.1% 的女工人和 35.8% 的男性。从客体方面看，女工人和男性的支持比例较高；从主体方面看，女干部和女技术人员的支持度较低，均在三成以下。

3. 她/他们为什么“同意”同龄退休？

调查显示，被访者是否“同意”或“反对”同龄退休，与被访者的性别、社会身份（群体）、年龄、教育程度、家庭收入、经济状况、家庭负担、身体状况、工作单位类型、行政级别、在单位中的位置、技术职称、单位的经济效益、福利和社会保障情况、退休后收入增减

的情况等呈一定的相关关系。与婚姻状况、个人收入占家庭收入的份额关系不明显。

由此说来,赞成性别平等(包括男性)、年龄较长(50-60年龄段)、教育程度较高、家庭经济状况较好、家庭负担较轻、身体状况较好、公共部门、行政级别较高、处于领导地位、技术职称较高、福利和社会保障情况较好、退休后收入减少的人,赞成和支持男女同龄退休。

4. 她/他们为什么“不同意”同龄退休?

根据上述相关分析因素,一般说来,与被访者的性别平等意识不强(包括男女两性)、社会身份和地位不高、年龄较轻、教育程度较低、家庭收入和经济状况不好、家庭中有需要照顾的人员、身体健康状况不佳、非公共部门、无行政级别、在单位中的位置不高、无技术职称、单位的经济效益较差、福利和社会保障情况不佳、退休后收入有所增加的被访者,不同意同龄退休。

概括说来,影响被访者“不同意”同龄退休的多重因素有:1)个人因素:身体健康状况不佳,个人的教育投资不高,进而影响职业地位、社会地位和工作收入;2)经济因素:家庭收入和经济状况不好,单位的经济效益较差,没有安全感,福利和社会保障情况不佳,退休后收入有所增加,退休后还能有份工作补贴家用;3)工作环境因素:单位缺乏性别平等的环境,缺少对劳动者友好的工作条件,单位的凝聚力不强,缺乏体面工作环境和条件;4)家庭因素:家中有需要照顾的人,承担较重的双重角色负担;5)保障因素:工资福利和社会保障制度不健全;6)观念因素:将男性定位于主要养家者,将女性定位于家庭的主要照顾者和次要养家人,在就业矛盾不甚突出的时候,把她们当作弱者保护起来;在就业压力明显的时候,以照顾为名将她们“请出”劳动力市场。

在一定意义上说,部分人“不同意”同龄退休,是社会生产力水平发展不高,劳动者没有享受体面劳动,工资福利和社会保障制度不健全,社会全体成员不能平等参与社会发展并平等分享社会发展成

果，迫使她/他们不得不把“提前退休”当作其工作和生活的“权宜之计”。政策制定者不应该把这种社会发展水平不高和制度不健全所导致的“无奈之举”，当成部分工人或女工人群体的“自愿选择”。

5. 现行的差别年龄退休政策的负面影响

首先，对从业者本人而言，强制性的差别年龄退休政策，影响了她们的受教育权，教育的投资越多，成本越高，其就业的时间有可能越短、就业的总收入就有可能越少；影响了她们平等的就业权、发展权、参政权、社会保障权和她们在职业生涯和自身生活中的选择权。此外，教育及劳动力市场上累积性的不平等还有可能导致女性老年生活的贫困化。

其次，对于用人单位而言，强制性的差别年龄退休政策，影响从业者工作的积极性和创造性，进而影响单位的工作效率；影响对女性劳动者的职业培训和投资，有可能浪费人类一半的人才和智慧；形成不平等的企业文化，影响企业内部的安定和外部的形象。

第三，对于国家和社会而言，强制性的差别年龄退休政策，影响国家人才战略的发展，造成女性人才的严重浪费和流失；否定女性对经济发展的贡献，影响经济发展的速度和效率；造成经济的无序发展，一方面政府财政对退休金给予大量补贴，另一方面领取退休金的人又有另外的工作继续领取工资，一方面强制女性提前退休希望给新增就业者腾出位置，另一方面又有大量的退休者退而不休仍占据就业岗位，不如使有工作能力的人继续工作，把“暗退”陆续变成“明退”，把退休金补贴节省下来；影响《宪法》所赋予公民的平等权利，有悖人权和法律的严肃性和公正性；影响社会的和谐发展和安定团结；造成不平等的社会文化，并使之代代相传。

6. 现有退休政策关于年龄的规定亟需改进

前全国人大委员长彭真同志曾经说，一部法律，如果有百分之三十的人不同意或不遵守，这个法律就要修改了。本次调查证明，对现行退休年龄的持否定和质疑态度的人，不管哪个群体，都超过 30%，一些群体（女干部、女技术人员）甚至达到百分之七十以上，可见要

求之广泛、之强烈、之持久。

因此,亟需对现行的强制性的差别退休年龄规定进行改革,把女性的退休年龄逐步提高到和男性相同的年龄,并赋予男女从业者自主选择权。鉴于女性中存在着不同阶层,有不同的利益需求和生存状况,需要对女性整体的平等权利和不同阶层的特殊需求均加以考量,同样还要考虑男性的意愿和需求。因此,现有退休年龄的改进应有针对性的循序渐进地进行。

(二) 主要建议

1. 转变政策制定者的观念

首先,提高政策制定者的公民权利意识。2004年,我国《宪法》(第三十三条)明确规定:“国家尊重和保障人权”。而人权具有三个明显的特征与原则:平等、非歧视和政府责任。作为政府制定政策的部门和人员,应当明确认识到,强制性的基于性别的区别对待,有可能侵犯妇女权利并造成对妇女的歧视。2010年10月22日,联合国消歧公约委员会拟订了“关于保护老年妇女权利”的27号“一般性建议”,其中第17条规定:“法定退休年龄对男女可能有所不同,妇女被迫比男性提前退休,因此会导致对老年妇女的歧视。”清晰地指出了在我国尚存在争论的男女不同龄退休的性质和危害。政策制定部门和政策制定者,应顺应尊重和保障人权的国际潮流,尊重日益增长的公民意识和权利意识,认识到传统的福利型保护型政策,一旦脱离了历史发展条件,限制了公民的基本权利和自由,就有可能造成对公民权利的侵犯,违背平等、非歧视和政府责任的基本原则。政策制定部门和制定者,应通过政策法律的改革,临时特别措施的制定,教育和倡导,使公民权利意识和平等观念深入人心,使公民的各项基本权利得到保障,真正履行政府的责任和承诺。

其次,将性别平等意识纳入决策主流。社会性别主流化既是联合国提高妇女地位的全球战略,又是中国社会发展的基本国策。社会性别平等既不是“形式上的平等”,也不是“保护性的平等”,而是强调“实质性的平等”。它要求打破“男主外女主内”的传统社会分工和

角色定型，倡导男女共同承担社会责任和家庭责任，通过改进政策、法律和制度，提供支持性环境，使男女平等地参与社会发展，并平等地分享发展的成果，进而实现结果的平等、事实上的平等和实质的平等。2007年4月，我国政府有关部门写信支持国际劳工组织倡导的“体面劳动与中国国别计划”。胡锦涛主席指出：“让各国广大劳动者实现体面劳动，是以人为本的要求，是时代精神的体现，也是尊重和保障人权的重要内容。”作为国际劳工组织成员国和《消歧公约》缔约国，作为联合国第四次世界妇女大会的东道国，应将性别平等意识纳入决策的主流，特别是体面劳动国别计划的主流，保障和实现男女劳动者追求平等就业和平等待遇的基本权利。

2. 针对不同人群，制定循序渐进的有针对性的不同政策

首先，改进现有的女干部（含专业技术人员）的退休年龄规定。以女干部和女技术人员的现实需求为切入点，将相关退休年龄规定修订为：“男女干部（含专业技术人员）法定60岁退休，但在满一定工龄（25年或30年）的前提下，男女干部都可以自主选择提前退休。”即在保障平等权利的前提下，实行“弹性退休”政策。这样的规定，既保障了男女劳动者平等的权利，又赋予了男女劳动者平等选择的权利，既满足了男女劳动者平等就业的要求，又满足了由于各种因素不能继续工作或不愿继续工作选择提前退休的人的需求。

2010年10月15日，中央组织部下发文件，重申了处级以上女干部可以与男性同龄退休的规定。但不少地方人事部门认为，部委文件与法规相比缺乏法律效力，可以不执行。即使这个文件认真贯彻执行，也只能解决少数女干部的问题。我们认为仅此不够，仅此不妥。一方面，没有保障大多数女干部和女科技人员平等工作的权利；另一方面，又与党和政府号召各级干部面向基层，支援基层与偏远地区的政策背道而驰。

目前政府的人事制度改革和积极促进就业的政策方向是鼓励干部、大学毕业生和专业技术人员到基层工作，但现行的退休制度尤其是离岗/内退政策却从相反方面阻滞这项改革的推进。基层女干部、

女专业技术人员由于级别和职称限制,而比男性提前5—10年离岗内退,严重挫伤了基层工作女性的积极性。因此,应规定所有女干部和女技术人员均与男性同龄退休。即使首先解决了县处级女干部的问题,相关的男女干部和技术人员同龄退休的政策也应继续跟进,不宜耽搁过久。

其次,对女工人退休年龄适度放开。考虑到目前中国社会复杂的经济背景和社会背景,对男女工人退休年龄实行适度放开的弹性退休制度。即“男工60岁,女工人可以延长到55岁退休,但是满一定工龄后,男女工人都可以自主选择提前退休”和“根据工种和劳动强度确定退休年龄”。这样,可以为那些有意愿、有能力、效益较好单位的女工创造继续工作的条件,也可以照顾到根据自己意愿选择提前退休的人的需求。到底满多长工龄为宜,工种和劳动强度如何确定,需要相关领域专家进行更进一步的深入研究。

3. 创造平等就业的工作环境

首先,创造体面劳动的工作和生活环境。我们应当看到,在国家经济体制转轨、社会保障体系不完善、企业经济效益不佳、个人生活前景不明朗的前提下,企业女工甚至男工希望越早退休越好。这背后是因为缺乏体面劳动的基本条件,出于对基本生活保障的担心不得已对工作权利的放弃。这是女工人“无奈的选择”,而不是“自由的选择”。所以,政府和用人单位应当尊重和保护劳动者的劳动权利和生活权利,提高劳动者的工资收入和社会保障水平,让劳动者在充分的劳动标准和生活保障的前提下,有尊严的、体面的工作和生活。

其次,消除工作场所的性别歧视。保障男女两性追求平等就业机会和平等待遇的基本权利,保障女性在职业选择、收入待遇、学习培训、提职晋级、劳动保护、集体谈判、民主管理、退休等方面不受歧视和轻视,提升女性的职业期待和工作信心。

再次,关注和满足有家庭责任的男女劳动者平衡工作与家庭的现实需求。将保育事业、养老事业和家庭服务事业纳入政府的公共服务范畴,大力发展和促进多种形式的家庭照顾服务,为有家庭责任的男

女劳动者提供可获得的、人性化的、有质量的、负担得起的家庭照顾服务和便利。^①

4. 进一步加强退休年龄的研究

退休年龄问题是一个长期争论不休、悬而未决、多方面关系人民群众利益、涉及多个主管部门的政策性很强的复杂问题，目前的研究还远远不够。应将这一敏感的政策研究结合积极促进就业、完善社会保障制度、应对老龄化问题、弥补社会基金缺口、平均寿命和健康寿命增长带来的就业需求、尊重和保障人权、完善与建构社会主义核心价值观等重大政治、经济、社会、文化问题深入研究，拿出老百姓和管理者都能普遍接受、有说服力、有针对性和可操作的政策方案来。

从世界各国退休制度发展的趋势看，男女两性退休年龄已经逐渐呈现趋同倾向。我们政府应当顺应历史趋势和劳动者的愿望，认真履行国际人权公约，不断改进各项政策法律制度，努力消除性别歧视，最大限度地满足各项公民权利的要求，促进我国经济社会的和谐发展，推动我国的人权保障事业健康有序地发展。

【参考文献】

- 1.联合国：《经济、社会和文化权利公约》。
- 2.联合国：《消除对妇女一切形式歧视公约》。
- 3.国际劳工组织：《消除就业和职业歧视公约》（第 111 号公约）。
- 4.国际劳工组织：《有家庭责任的男女工人机会和待遇平等》（第 156 号公约）。
- 5.Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, *General recommendation No. 27 on older women and protection of their human rights*, 18 October, 2010.
- 6.薛宁兰：“退休年龄性别差异政策与立法的检讨”，转引自郭慧敏主编《社会性别与劳动权益》，西北工业大学出版社 2005 年版。
- 7.樊明等著：《退休行为与退休政策》，社会科学文献出版社 2008 年版。
- 8.蔡定剑：“男女平权退休是宪法权利”，《南方周末》2009 年 6 月 4 日。

^①刘伯红、张永英、李亚妮：“工作和家庭的平衡：中国的问题与政策研究报告”，国际劳工组织研究报告，2008，北京。

- 9.杨燕绥等：“论职工弹性退休的平滑效应”，《中国劳动》2010年第12期。
- 10.高庆波、潘锦棠：“中国企业职工养老保险制度转变前后性别利益的比较分析”，《妇女研究论丛》2007年第5期。
- 11.潘锦棠：“世界男女退休年龄现状分析”，《甘肃社会科学》2003年第1期。
- 12.潘锦棠：“养老社会保险制度中的性别利益——兼评关于男女退休年龄的讨论”，《中国社会科学》2004年第8期。
- 13.郭武伟：“男女同龄退休问题网民意研究——对新浪、新华两大门户网站的专题评论的统计分析”，《甘肃社会科学》2005年第5期。
- 14.刘玮：“对男女同龄退休的探讨”，《中南民族大学学报》2005年12月。
- 15.杨艳、危珊珊：“老龄化与男女同龄退休”，《重庆工学院学报》2006年第3期。
- 16.陈卫民、李莹：“退休年龄对我国城镇职工养老金性别差异的影响分析”，《妇女研究论丛》2004年第1期。
- 17.刘军、蒋永萍、张李玺、冯媛、丁娟、荣维毅：“关于‘男女公务员同龄退休问题’的讨论”，《妇女研究论丛》2003年第6期。
- 18.桑敏兰：“论中国妇女法定退休年龄的界定与调整”，《宁夏党校学报》2003年第6期。
- 19.彭希哲：“社会政策与性别平等——以对中国养老金制度的分析为例”，《妇女研究论丛》2003年第2期。
- 20.覃福晓：“男女退休年龄的法理思考”，《学术论坛》2002年第5期。
- 21.李珍：“关于退休年龄的经济学思考”，《经济评论》1997年第1期。
- 22.刘明辉：“退休年龄变革之我见”，妇女观察网（www.womenwatch-china.org）2008年12月30日。
- 23.王竹青、吴道霞：“女性专业技术人员退休问题探析”，转引谭林、姜秀花主编《社会性别平等与法律：研究和对策》，社会科学文献出版社2007年版。
- 24.刘伯红主编：《社会性别主流化读本》，中国妇女出版社2009年版。
- 25.许晓茵：“养老金制度中的社会性别偏向”，转引自全国妇联妇女研究所主编《妇女/性别理论与实践（下册）》，社会科学文献出版社2009年版。
- 26.乔红：“不能只注意‘延长’忽视了‘平等’”，《中国妇女报》2008年12月26日。
- 27.广东省总工会课题组：“关于‘男女同龄退休’问题的调查报告”，《工运研究》2004

年第 20 期。

28.中国社会科学院“退休年龄研究”课题组谭深：“同龄退休的制度选择和意愿调查”，北京大学法学院妇女法律研究与服务中心妇女观察网

<http://www.womenwatch-china.org/PageInfo/ShowNews.aspx?ID=20090823000054>

29.绍国栋、聂素芳：“人口老龄化挑战我国传统退休制度”，中国经济信息网 2007 年 4 月。

30.刘伯红、张永英、李亚妮：《工作和家庭的平衡：中国的问题与政策研究报告》，2008 年，北京。

31.中国社科院妇女研究中心：“关于男女公务员同龄退休的系列研究”，“社会政策与性别平等——男女公务员同龄退休问题研讨会”资料。

32.社会性别与发展（GAD）每月聚会：“男女同龄退休问题资料集——政策、案例与观点”，2009 年 2 月，北京。

Research Report on the Retirement Age Issue in China

Research Group on the Retirement Age Issue

Written by LIU Bohong, GUO Li and HAO Rui

March 2011

I. Background and purpose

China's retirement policy making process began in 1951 and took shape in 1978. The retirement age is the prescribed age at which workers can retire. Some countries set a minimum age for allowing workers to retire. Other countries, including China, oblige workers to retire at certain ages. According to the provisions issued at that time, including the *Provisional Measures of the State Council on the Resettlement of Sick, Venerable, Senior and Handicapped Cadres* and the *Provisional Regulations of the State Council on the Retirement and Resignation of Workers* (GF No. 104 [1978]), the retirement age of enterprise employees was set at 60 for men, 50 for female workers and 55 for female cadres.

As for female cadres and female intellectuals above the county level, the retirement age of county/division-level female cadres and female professionals was extended to 60 years in accordance with a set of circulars^① issued by government agencies. However, the *Provisional Regulations on State Civil Servants* issued in 1993 promulgated the ages of 60 for men and 55 for women as the ages for mandatory retirement, which institutionalizes the practice of different retirement ages for men and women.

Since 1989, there have been voices from representatives in the "two sessions" (the National People's Congress - NPC and the Communist Party People's Congress – CPPCC) proposing the same retirement age for all men and women or for male and female civil servants/technical professionals. However, neither the National People's Congress nor the relevant government departments have accepted this proposal, nor have they taken any remedial actions. When the protectors of women's rights or women's organizations request the relevant decision-making departments to set the same retirement age for men and women, the conventional answer is that "the majority of women do not agree to the same retirement age for both sexes," and this is

^① [No. 141 and No. 142, 1983] issued by State Council; [No. 13, 1982] issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China; [No. 5, 1990] issued by the Ministry of Personnel; and [No. 22, 1992] issued by the Organization Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

also a common statement in related debates across the mass media.

This study intends to answer the following questions through in-depth investigation: who are for and against the same retirement age for men and women, and why?; and what are the perspectives and demands with regards to the retirement age of people from various occupational groups (workers, technical professionals and cadres respectively) by gender and identity? In this way, the study aims to provide a practical and feasible basis for the modification and improvement of the retirement policy both for China's economic and social harmony as well as for progress towards greater gender equality and respect for women's human rights.

II. Brief description of the survey

The major research approach consisted of a quantitative survey through a questionnaire backed up by in-depth qualitative research through discussions with relevant key informants. A total of 4,500 questionnaires were issued in Heilongjiang, Jiangsu, Jiangxi and Sichuan provinces. A total of 4188 valid questionnaires were retained, excluding invalid questionnaires. This represents a retention rate of 93.1 per cent. The four provinces sequentially represent the old industrial bases, the developed areas, the underdeveloped regions and the western regions. The sample distribution is provided in Table 1.

Table 1 Geographical distribution of survey samples

	Copies of questionnaire distributed	Valid questionnaires	Proportion of valid questionnaires (%)
Heilongjiang	1200	1110	26.5
Jiangsu	1100	1078	25.7
Jiangxi	1100	1000	23.9
Sichuan	1100	1000	23.9
Total	4500	4188	100.0

Purposive sampling was applied in the survey to consider the differences between questionnaire respondents by sex, age, occupational status, and the economic state of their employers' establishments. Female and male respondents accounted for 75.7 per cent and 24.3 per cent respectively, and the men were mainly policy makers and managers. The respondents were divided into four age categories: 39 and under, 40-49, 50-60 and 61 and above, and the survey focused on the 40-60 age group, which accounted for 56.9 per cent of the total. The occupational status of female respondents was divided into three categories: cadres, technical professionals and workers respectively, amounting to 21.7 per cent, 34.9 per cent and 19.1 per cent of the total. The samples of workers were drawn from different types of enterprises in both public and private sectors with different economic benefits. The selected

technical professionals (hereafter referred to as professionals or professionals) included teachers, doctors, researchers, editors, reporters and some other occupations.

The questionnaire was distributed in Heilongjiang, Jiangsu, Jiangxi and Sichuan simultaneously in early September 2010. Subsequently, the returned questionnaires were checked, recorded and analyzed by the end of September.

III. Main findings

(A) Basic information about the respondents

1. Level of education: 64.5 per cent of the respondents were at the undergraduate level and above; the highest educational levels were found among men (77.6 per cent), followed by female cadres (74.3 per cent) and female professionals (69.2 per cent). The majority of female workers had secondary or tertiary education and those with a bachelor degree or above accounted for 28.2 per cent.

2. Civil status: Most of the respondents were in their first marriage with a spouse, with this group accounting for 82.3 per cent of the total. Male and female cadres and female professionals differed little in their marital status. As female workers were generally young, the proportion of unmarried people in this group was higher (21.1 per cent) than in the other groups.

3. Monthly family income: 56.6 per cent of the respondents had a monthly family income below 5,000 yuan. 30 per cent of the female workers had a monthly family income below 2,000 yuan while only 23.4 per cent had a monthly income of more than 5,000 yuan. This was significantly lower than the proportions of men (47.1 per cent), female cadres (52.6 per cent) and female professionals (46.0 per cent) with monthly incomes over 5,000 yuan.

4. Proportion of monthly income of the respondents in their total monthly family income: 56.2 per cent of the respondents indicated that their own monthly income accounted for half of their total family income, showing that in most families both men and women played the role of breadwinner. Among this group, female cadres took the lead, as 67 per cent or more than two-thirds of them contributed half of the family income, followed by the female professionals, men and women workers. However, on the men's part, the percentage of those with a monthly income that was far less than half of their family income or was negligible only, amounted to 8.8 per cent, while the percentage of men who earned far more than half of the family income reached 37.4 per cent. In comparison, 42.9 per cent of the women contributed far less than half or a negligible amount to the family income and only 13.1 per cent of women earned far more than half of the family income. This indicates that in terms of contributing to the family income, men outperformed women, and more men than women were the main breadwinners in their family.

5. Self-evaluation of economic status: 58.7 per cent of the respondents rated the economic status of their families at the middle level and above, while 41.2 per cent rated it as lower and under the average. More than half of female workers (60.4 per cent) considered that their families belonged to the sub-middle and lower levels, and this proportion is much higher than the percentages of those who rated their economic

status at the lower levels among the other three groups, amounting to 40.3 per cent of the men, 29.5 per cent of the female cadres and 38.6 per cent of the female professionals respectively.

6. People need care at home: Only 21.9 per cent of the respondents currently did not have family members in need of care. Among the other respondents, 52.3 per cent had to take care of their children, 60.2 per cent needed to care for elderly family members, 6.6 per cent had to look after patients at home, and 1.9 per cent had to tend to disabled family members. In all the groups, regardless of sex, a high proportion of respondents had family members in need of care, which means that they needed to balance their career and family responsibilities.

7. Self-evaluation of health status: Of all the respondents, 41.9 per cent considered themselves in good health, 49.7 per cent considered that their health was so-so, while smaller proportions were found among the remainder of the group, respectively poor health (6.7 per cent), very poor health (0.9 per cent) and no idea (0.8 per cent). In comparison, men gave a higher self-evaluation of their health, while female professionals and female workers produced a lower self-evaluation of their health status.

8. Types of working units of respondents: 31 per cent of the respondents came from the party and government organs, 40.9 per cent from public institutions, and 23.9 per cent from companies. Among them, 42.5 per cent of the men came from the party and government organs while 42.3 of the women worked in public institutions.

9. Administrative levels: Among the respondents, those with and without an administrative title accounted for 50.1 per cent and 49.9 per cent respectively, their administrative level as a whole was not high and in a sense represented the voice of cadres at the grass-roots level. More than two-thirds of the men had an administrative title, and more than half of the women did not have any administrative titles, men above county/division level were 21.8 per cent higher than women above county/division level, indicating that the majority of male respondents were leaders and managers. Thus, among the male respondents, the survey reflects the opinions of decision makers and managers.

10. Professional and technical titles: 40.3 per cent of the respondents did not have any professional title, while 18.2 per cent had an associate title or above. Given that the proportion of women from public institutions was higher than men, the proportion of women with technical titles outweighed men by 2.9 per cent, however, the proportion of women with associate titles or above was 3.9 percentage points lower than that of men with associate titles.

11. Economic status of establishments: On average, 17.8 per cent of respondents believed that their work units were in a very good or fairly good economic state while 38 per cent thought that their establishments had generally acceptable returns, with a large proportion of female professionals in the latter group. 8.6 per cent of respondents considered that their units were in a poor or very poor economic position, or had even become bankrupt already. Women workers formed the majority of respondents in this category, with ratings for poor and very poor economic status and bankruptcy respectively accounting for 12.8 per cent, 2.4 per cent and 0.3 per cent of

the female workers' responses.

(B) Views of respondents on the current retirement age provisions

1. Implementation of the current retirement age provisions

(1) An average of 7.1 per cent of the respondents indicated that the policy on the same retirement age for men and women was followed by their employers. First, the data showed that some employers have set their own policies based on the present standards for the retirement age. In making their policies, some employers had considered, respected and protected gender equality in employment and in social security rights in their requirements on the retirement age. However, unfortunately, the proportion of such employers was not large, and most of them belonged to party and government organs and public institutions.

(2) An average of 15.5 per cent of the respondents stated that their employers followed the policy on the same retirement age for men and women from a certain level onwards, including male and female cadres above the county/division/department level (including senior professional titles). This indicates that some employers indeed followed the provisions of setting the retirement age at 60 for female cadres and female professionals as stipulated in the above-mentioned documents^①, which ensure equality in the development and employment rights of men and women at higher levels or with higher titles. However, the proportion of employers applying the same retirement ages between men and women at the cadre and professional levels was also not high. Again, party and government organs and public institutions performed better, with 23.1 per cent and 17.1 per cent of employers in these respective establishments following equal retirement age provisions for male and female cadres and professionals.

(3) On average, almost three-quarters or 73.7 per cent of the respondents mentioned that their employers followed the policy of obliging women to retire earlier than men. Thus, the majority of employers applied different retirement ages between the two sexes in accordance with the *Provisional Regulations on State Civil Servants*.^② They did not exercise discretion based on their own circumstances in deciding the standard retirement age nor did they provide alternatives for women with higher titles under the above mentioned documents^③.

Table 2 Employers' views on executing the existing policy standards on the retirement age by type of establishment

	Total (n=4188)	Party and government organs (n=1297)	Public institutions (n=1713)	State- owned (n=652)	Privately- run (n=310)	Foreign- funded (n=37)	Others (n=179)
Same retirement age for both sexes	7.1%	12.8%	6.4%	0.9%	3.5%	--	3.4%
Women to retire	73.7%	69.2%	77.7%	84.5%	49.0%	59.5%	74.3%

^① See footnote 1 on Page 2.

^② [No. 104, 1978] issued by the State Council.

^③ See footnote 1 on Page 2.

earlier than men							
Same retirement age for men and women at a certain level	15.5%	23.1%	17.1%	6.3%	1.9%	2.7%	5.6%
Allowed early retirement for both sexes after certain years of service	9.0%	13.6%	6.8%	6.7%	7.4%	8.1%	7.3%
No idea	11.9%	8.3%	9.6%	10.6%	38.4%	24.3%	15.6%
Others	1.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	3.2%	8.1%	1.1%

2. Comments on the existing policy standards on the retirement age

(1) Comments on different retirement ages for male (60) and female workers (50):

Slightly more than half of the respondents (51.1 per cent) considered that the policy on different retirement ages for men and women was inadequate, while 42.3 per cent considered that the policy was adequate (42.3 per cent). Among those who thought it improper, female cadres and female professionals formed the highest proportions, amounting to 59.6 per cent and 55.1 per cent respectively. Nearly half of the men (49.8 per cent) considered the different retirement age to be inadequate. Since this question involved the retirement age of workers, the research team was particularly interested in the feelings and opinions of female workers. While the proportion of respondents who believed that the policy was inadequate was the lowest among the female workers, more than one-third (36.0 per cent) of them had this opinion (see Table 3). This means that a considerable number of female workers could not agree to the current retirement age policy and it indicates that the past saying of "women workers do not agree to retire at the same age as men" has now changed.

However, the research team also notes that an average of 42.3 per cent of the respondents considered that the different obligatory retirement ages for men and women were adequate. This was the view of more than half of the female workers (56.4 per cent), as compared to slightly more than one-third of the female cadres with this opinion (35.4 per cent) amounting to a difference of 21 percentage points between these two groups (see Table 3). Thus, these figures show that different views on the retirement age policy exist among different groups of women, which confirms the importance of paying attention to the views of female workers themselves.

Table 3 Comments on the existing policy standards on different retirement ages for male and female workers

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Proper/Adequate	42.3%	40.5%	35.4%	40.2%	56.4%
Improper/Inadequate	51.1%	49.8%	59.6%	55.1%	36.0%
No idea	6.5%	9.7%	5.0%	4.7%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(2) Comments on different retirement ages for male (60) and female cadres, including technical professionals (55): An average of 47.3 per cent of the respondents considered that the policy of different retirement ages for male and female cadres was adequate, which is slightly higher than the proportion of respondents who considered this policy to be inadequate (43 per cent). However, among female cadres and female professionals, the proportion of respondents who considered that this policy was inadequate surpassed the average, amounting to 54.2 per cent and 48.5 per cent, respectively. As female cadres and professionals belong to the groups that are directly affected by this policy, their views warrant attention. Higher proportions of female workers (57.8 per cent) and men (51.2 per cent) consider it proper to have a five-year difference in retirement ages between male and female cadres, which explains why on average the respondents who considered the policy as adequate outnumbered those who thought it was inadequate.

Table 4 Comments on the existing policy standards of different retirement age for cadres (including professionals)

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Proper/Adequate	47.3%	51.2%	38.6%	44.4%	57.8%
Improper/Inadequate	43.0%	36.4%	54.2%	48.5%	28.6%
No idea	9.6%	12.4%	7.2%	7.0%	13.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. Negative effects of the current policy of different retirement ages

According to the respondents who considered it improper to have the existing 10-year difference in the retirement age of male and female workers, the policy obliging female workers to retire 10 years earlier has the following negative impacts: "hinders equality of rights and opportunities for employment" (70.6 per cent), wastes women's

wisdom and experience" (50.1 per cent), "decreases women's economic income" (49.0 per cent) and "hinders career development of women" (43.0 per cent). Among these respondents, the proportion of female cadres listing negative effects was much higher than average, while male cadres were much lower than the average, showing significant gender differences. In addition, the proportion of female workers listing negative effects was lower than average, also showing significant differences between female groups.

Respondents who considered it improper to have the existing 5-year difference in the retirement age of male and female cadres (including technical professionals), felt that the policy obliging female cadres to retire 5 years earlier has the following negative impacts: "hinders equality of rights and opportunities for employment" (83.2 per cent), "wastes women's wisdom and experience" (60.0 per cent), "decreases women's economic income" (46.8 per cent) and "hinders career development of women" (52.9 per cent). The average proportions of persons affirming these negative effects on female cadres surpassed the proportions of those listing negative effects on female workers. This means that more respondents believed that this policy has greater negative impact on female cadres and professionals. Again, the proportion of female cadres mentioning negative effects was much higher than average, while the male respondents had completely different views, showing significant gender differences. In addition, the proportion of female workers listing negative effects was lower than average, also showing significant differences between female groups.

(C) Reasons for the respondents' views on the current retirement age policy

1. Economic factors

Although there are various reasons for people to choose an early or late retirement, the survey showed that economic factors are undoubtedly critical: Whether some female cadres and professionals preferred to retire at the same age as men, or whether some female workers preferred an early retirement, the root causes were closely related to economic factors. In relation hereto, it should be noted that in China the retirement age and the pensionable age, meaning the age at which workers are entitled to claim pension benefits, are the same.

The research findings indicate that the different retirement ages for men and women led to significant differences in income and benefits between the two sexes, and this was particularly true for female cadres and female professionals. Unlike the planned economy era when there were few income differences between the retired and those still in service, current cadres and professionals see a large gap between their working and post-retirement incomes.

At present, China's pension system for cadres provides for 90 per cent of the working income upon 35 years of service, 85 per cent upon 30-35 years of service and 80 per cent upon 20-30 years of service. In this case, for female cadres and female professionals, the higher the number of years of education and the resulting shorter length of service they have, the greater their wage loss will be.

74.3 per cent of female cadres and 69.2 per cent of female professionals surveyed in this study had an undergraduate education or above. If they retire 5 years earlier than

men at the same level, based on the assumption of no wage increase, they will earn 168,500 yuan less on average than men of the same age, education and years of service. As for female cadres and professionals in the financial sector, telecommunications and some other special industries, their economic loss in income and social security benefits was even greater.

According to the survey, in answer to the question on "changes in income upon retirement under the current retirement policy of your employer", 13.2 per cent of all respondents said their pre-retirement and post-retirement incomes would be "almost the same". In contrast, a much larger group, or 61.5 per cent of all respondents expected that their post-retirement income would "decrease" or be "much lower". Among them, the proportions of female professionals, male and female cadres were all higher than the average, amounting respectively to 68.8 per cent, 65.9 per cent and 65.2 per cent. However, only slightly more than one-third of the female workers or 38.4 per cent expected their income to decrease. (See Table 5)

The survey also showed that in terms of changes in income upon retirement, female workers differed significantly from female cadres and professionals. Among those women worker respondents, 10.5 per cent were getting increased income, which is much higher than the other three groups. Women worker respondents whose post-retirement income "increased a lot" made up the highest proportion of female workers among the four groups.

In one of the in-depth discussions in one of the cities surveyed, it was found that by September 2010 the average minimum monthly wage in a certain city was 960 yuan, while the city's minimum monthly pension was 1150 yuan, 190 yuan higher than the minimum monthly wage. In establishments with poor economic performance, early retirement with access to a pension rather than wage earnings indeed constituted a very important economic support for low-income female workers and their families. Therefore, female workers in such enterprises seem to have a practical reason for not retiring at the same age as men: low wages, hard work, and a pension after retirement that is higher than their wages. Extending the retirement age means a continuation of low income for strenuous work and heavier living pressures for this group. In such circumstances, early retirement becomes attractive not only for female but also for male workers.

Table 5 Changes in the post-retirement income among different groups according to the current retirement policy of their respective employers

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Increased to a large extent	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	1.1%
Improved	4.8%	4.0%	3.5%	3.1%	10.5%
Almost the same	13.2%	14.6%	16.9%	10.3%	12.5%
Decreased	39.6%	45.8%	50.9%	37.9%	22.0%

Decreased by a large degree	21.9%	20.1%	14.3%	30.9%	16.4%
No idea	20.0%	15.0%	14.0%	17.6%	37.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The survey design included a question for the respondents who intended to retire early on what they planned to do after retirement so as to explore the relations between economic factors, family factors and attitudes towards retirement. The results showed that 28.7 per cent of all respondents intended to continue to engage in paid work after retirement, whilst among female workers, there are 28.4 per cent who intend to do so. In the in-depth discussions, the research team members heard women saying that the best survival strategy in an enterprise with poor performance was to get a pension as insurance first and then retire to hunt for another job. In other words, in companies suffering a financial crisis, female workers wanted to retire early to get "double insurance" (a retirement benefit plus additional revenue from another job) to pursue more economic benefits. In such cases, "retirement" does not mean a real retreat from the labour market.

Relatively high proportions of men and female professionals also intended to retire early and continue to engage in paid work, respectively 33.3 per cent and 28.7 per cent (see Table 6). On the one hand, this indicates that they wanted to use their skills to carry on working for economic benefits as a compensation for economic losses upon retirement and to prevent a decline in living standards after retirement. On the other hand, it indicates that they considered that they remained competent for work. "Retirement without stopping work" is common among these groups, as for female workers.

Table 6 Post-retirement intentions of different groups of respondents willing to take early retirement

	Total (n=2375)	Men (n=538)	Female cadres (n=475)	Female professionals (n=851)	Female workers (n=511)
Engaging in paid work	28.7%	33.3%	24.0%	28.7%	28.4%
Engaging in public welfare	28.3%	27.3%	32.6%	29.5%	23.3%
Caring for the family	48.0%	32.7%	56.0%	51.4%	51.3%
Enjoying life	57.1%	54.3%	65.1%	60.4%	47.4%

Health care	42.7%	34.0%	48.4%	49.0%	36.2%
Others	2.5%	3.0%	3.8%	1.4%	2.5%

2. Working environment

(1) **Views on the status of gender equality in the workplace.** More than 2 of every 5 female respondents, as compared to around 1 out of every 5 male respondents (that is, 42.6 per cent of the female cadres, 43.6 per cent of the female professionals, 41.9 per cent of the female workers and 21.8 per cent of the men) believed that under the same conditions men get promoted faster than women.

More than one-third of all respondents (36.7 per cent) thought that in positions requiring high technical qualifications men outnumbered women: More than 40 per cent of female professionals and female workers agreed to this statement (respectively 40.2 per cent and 42.1 per cent) while almost one-third of male and female cadres thought that men outnumbered women in such jobs (respectively 32.9 per cent and 30.3 per cent). This shows that ideas about gender differences which are not conducive to women's professional and technical development are still quite common among men and women.

Moreover, 28 per cent of all respondents believed their employers had different age requirements in job promotion for men and women: More than 1 of every 3 female cadres had this view as compared to almost 1 of every 3 female professionals, more than 1 of every 4 female workers and 1 of every 5 men. (See Table 7)

Table 7 Views on the status of gender equality in the workplace

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Men get promoted faster than women under the same conditions	37.8%	21.8%	42.6%	43.6%	41.9%
In positions calling for high technical qualifications men outnumber women	36.7%	32.9%	30.3%	40.2%	42.1%
Different age requirements in job promotion exist for men and women	28.0%	21.7%	34.1%	29.3%	26.8%

Respondents also considered that gender-based discrimination in the retirement age led to significant differences between men and women in career development opportunities. In response to the question "in accordance with the current retirement policy of your employer, will your promotion be affected by your age?" 46.2 per

cent of female cadres, 38.9 per cent of female professionals, and 21.1 per cent of female workers replied "yes" (see Table 8). Therefore, we can see that the current retirement age difference has hindered women's career progress.

Table 8 Whether the retirement policy of the employers of the respondents would affect their own promotion

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Yes	37.3%	39.8%	46.2%	38.9%	21.1%
No	18.7%	21.7%	17.3%	18.3%	17.3%
No idea	44.0%	38.5%	36.5%	42.8%	61.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Awareness of women's dissatisfaction with regard to the obligatory early retirement ages for women varied among respondents depending on the type of work they did and their gender. When respondents were asked if they had ever heard their female colleagues expressing dissatisfaction with the early retirement policy, 41.5 per cent of all respondents answered "yes", with female cadres taking the lead as 53.5 per cent of them had heard about it. (See Table 9)

Women's discontent with the early retirement age is repeatedly reported in *China Women's News* and other media, with some women even committing suicide in protest. This not only seriously affects the physical and mental health and social status of women, but also has negative effects on the harmony, stability and unity of their working units and the whole community. In contrast, almost 3 out of every 10 female workers and 2 out of every 3 men were not aware of any dissatisfaction among female colleagues on this issue, indicating that these groups seem to be less concerned.

Table 9 If the respondents have ever heard of their female colleagues expressing dissatisfaction with the early retirement policy

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Yes	41.5%	33.6%	53.5%	46.9%	28.1%
No	58.5%	66.4%	46.5%	53.1%	71.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

(2) **Satisfaction with the working environment:** While the overall majority of respondents considered that their employers enabled efficiency at work, overall there was considerable less satisfaction with the working environment. Around one-third of all respondents (34.1 per cent) said they "had not obtained due promotion", including 36 per cent of the female workers and 34.7 per cent of the female professionals. This reflects a lack of recognition and incentive mechanisms. In addition, an average of 23.2 per cent of the respondents felt that their work "lacks stability and security", with 41.4 per cent of the female workers expressing this view, that is 18 percentage points higher than the response of all respondents. Another 22.8 per cent of all respondents felt "unsatisfied with their working environment", with the proportions of female workers and female professionals surpassing the average, amounting to 31.5 per cent and 24.0 per cent respectively. In addition, 14 per cent of all respondents felt "not interested in their work", including almost 1 of every 5 female workers. A saying goes like this: "interest is the best teacher". If workers are not interested in their own work, it is very easy for them to lose motivation to continue working. (See Table 10)

Overall, dissatisfaction levels with their working environment were the highest among female workers. More than one-third of them worked without a sense of stability and security and were unsatisfied with their working environment. As mentioned above, almost 1 in every 5 of these women were not interested in their work, so this confirms the earlier findings on their preference for early retirement.

Table 10 Whether satisfied with the working environment

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Able to complete tasks efficiently	88.6%	91.9%	92.5%	88.2%	80.9%
Not given due promotion	34.1%	33.1%	32.8%	34.7%	36.0%
Lack of stability and security	23.2%	16.6%	12.8%	24.4%	41.4%
Not interested in their own work	14.0%	10.5%	13.8%	14.0%	19.0%
Not satisfied with the working environment	22.8%	19.1%	17.4%	24.0%	31.5%

3. Family

(1) **Both male and female respondents felt the dual burden of shouldering work and family responsibilities, with higher proportions of female workers and professionals experiencing physical and mental exhaustion due to the struggle to find a balance between work and family.** 45.6 per cent of all respondents "felt physically and mentally exhausted due to struggling to balance work and family" but

these proportions increased to half among all female professionals and 47.9 per cent of all female workers, while they accounted for 42.4 per cent of all men and 39.8 per cent of all cadres. In all, 15.8 per cent of the respondents "were less devoted to work to take care of their families", again with higher proportions among female professionals and female workers; a quarter of respondents "saw their families impacted by work". (See Table 11)

Table 11 The dual burden of work and family

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Feel physically and mentally exhausted due to struggling to balance work and family	45.6%	42.4%	39.8%	50.0%	47.9%
Less devoted to work to take care of their families	15.8%	13.2%	13.1%	18.5%	17.1%
See their families impacted by work	25.0%	27.2%	20.2%	27.0%	24.3%
Frequent leave due to health problems	5.5%	2.9%	5.3%	6.2%	8.0%

(2) Most female respondents still bear the primary responsibility for caring for their family. As mentioned earlier in section III, 52.3 per cent of respondents had to take care of their children, 60.2 per cent needed to care for elderly family members, and 8.3 per cent had to look after patients and disabled family members. According to the gender equality requirements and the basic framework of human rights in the international community, men and women should work together to bear family and social responsibilities, and the government, as well as employers, should implement a people-oriented policy "to create a family-friendly working environment" for all men and women with family responsibilities, enabling them to balance work and family conditions through various supporting mechanisms.

However, in China, when the reform and opening up began, the responsibility for the provision of many family care services was shifted from the employer to the market. As child care, old-age nursing and family services were not yet covered under the government's public service system; the basic public services provided to workers with family responsibilities were inadequate. The conventional ideas about the gender division of labour still continue to prevail and both men and women themselves, take it for granted that women should take care of family responsibilities. Asked about the future plans of respondents who were eager to retire early, more than half of all female respondents (56 per cent of the female cadres, 51.4 per cent of the female professionals and 51.3 per cent of the female workers) planned to take care of their families after retirement as compared to less than one-third of the men (32.7 per cent). (See Table 6)

The interviews found that some women wanted to take early retirement to take care of their family, not only their spouse or children but also their grandchildren, because low income women cannot afford child care services, such as a nanny, for their children and have to take advantage of their parents, especially mothers, who are still not too old to do this. Obviously, given inadequate public family care services, and a social division of work where the duty of family care is entrusted to women, they are almost forced to retire early as it is the most rational and economic choice for them and their families.

4. People's concepts and perspectives on the retirement age

People's concepts and perspectives on the retirement age here refers to the starting point and values of policy formulation and the employee's attitude towards those policies. Respondents' views and conceptual understanding of the retirement age issue differed in relation to their perspective on the starting point and value of policy making and the policy recognition and acceptance of employees. According to China's history and the evolution of the economic system, the research team designed some questions to identify people's understanding of the three perspectives of "conventional welfare", "social interest" and "social justice and fundamental human rights", and to analyze the conceptual factors underlying the retirement age provisions.

(1) **Conventional welfare:** China's retirement policy was promulgated in 1951, right after the founding of the PRC, when the overall economy was underdeveloped, and the life expectancy amounted to 35 years only (slightly lower for women than for men). Before liberation, a very limited number of women were engaged in paid work, while those working outside in social production were mainly engaged in manual labour. Domestic work was mainly done by women, and a woman generally raised several children instead of one.

In line with the values of socialism, such as "glorious workers", "more pains, more gains", "distribution according to work" and "women's liberation", and with the reflection of the advantage of socialism regarding respect, care and protection for women, the government established a retirement policy providing that women should retire earlier than men by 5-10 years. This meant that female workers could return home and enjoy the pension 5-10 years earlier than men. This preferential treatment was applicable not only to women, but also to workers engaged in jobs involving high-altitude or high temperature performance and other special careers. It reflected the care and protection of workers in different walks of life under the socialist system, and was incorporated into the country's early retirement and pension system. This "protective equality" perspective which characterized the retirement age policy played a positive role for a certain period and was applauded by working men and women.

This retirement policy was clearly based on the social division of labour where "men take care of the external affairs while women handle the domestic ones." The underdeveloped social productivity and limited understanding of the concept of gender equality made people prone to prefer the protection and care provided by this "discriminatory" policy. However, people failed to recognize that this led to the potential risk of making the conventional division of labour between men and women

a permanent feature of society. There was also no understanding that this gender division of labour might possibly lead to curbing women's rights to employment and development.

According to the survey findings, a certain percentage of the respondents was still in favour of the "protective equality" perspective. In respect of the statement "women have heavier domestic burdens, so early retirement just serves to take care of the family," the proportion of respondents choosing "strongly agree" (17.6 per cent), and "generally agree" (26.8 per cent) totaled 44.4 per cent. This shows that the traditional views on the social division of labour where "men take care of the external affairs while the women handle the domestic ones" is still relatively common although 43.7 per cent disagreed with this statement. (See Table 12)

In reaction to the view "women's early retirement means protection and welfare for themselves", the proportion of respondents choosing "strongly agree" (19 per cent), and "generally agree" (25.0 per cent) totaled 44 per cent (see Table 13). This proves that part of the policy-makers and women themselves find it difficult to change their idea that, because women's role is mainly located in the family, they should retire early and that this is a special protection measure for women. It is interesting to note that 55 per cent of the female workers had this view, followed by more than 45 per cent of the men, as compared to 40.7 per cent of the female professionals and 34.7 per cent of the female cadres. This indicates that women who tend to accept and adhere to the concept of "protection" or "welfare" often belong to the groups without an advantageous status in the labour market, serving in work units with poor performance, suffering from inadequate social security, and accepting a low level of education and the conventional gender stereotypes in real life.

Table 12 Attitudes towards the view that "women have heavier domestic burdens, so early retirement just serves to take care of the family"

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	17.6%	19.2%	13.0%	15.3%	25.3%
Generally agree	26.8%	29.2%	21.5%	26.7%	29.9%
Slightly disagree	30.7%	27.8%	36.2%	32.8%	24.3%
Strongly disagree	13.0%	7.3%	18.5%	15.3%	9.8%
No idea	12.0%	16.6%	10.9%	10.0%	10.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 13 Attitudes towards the view that "women's early retirement means protection and welfare for themselves"

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	19.0%	18.8%	15.4%	16.5%	28.0%
Generally agree	25.0%	27.9%	19.3%	24.2%	29.4%
Slightly disagree	29.5%	28.1%	35.2%	31.1%	21.9%
Strongly disagree	12.3%	6.9%	17.8%	15.1%	7.8%
No idea	14.2%	18.4%	12.3%	13.1%	13.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The survey findings also show that with the economic and social development in society, once people see that women benefit less and less from early retirement, once they detect the lack of women's rights behind the conventional welfare policy and find that such protection only results in reinforcing the conventional gender division of labour, there will be an increasing number of people who are unwilling to accept the "welfare" and "care" and who say "no" to the traditional welfare concept. The respondents with a negative attitude towards such traditional views accounted for over 40 per cent of respondents (see Tables 12 and 13), made up mostly of female leaders and professionals. Another 10 per cent answered "no idea," which to some extent indicates that 1 in 10 respondents questioned the protective welfare perspective which was prevalent in the past.

(2) **Social interest:** This perspective refers to setting the retirement policy and the corresponding age standard mainly on the basis of economic and social progress. The age limit in China's retirement policy is increasingly challenged in the light of factors, such as employment pressures due to the oversupply of workers in the labour market, workforce shortages caused by the growing problem of an aging population and the lack of pension fund accumulation requiring huge financial subsidies. To address these economic and social contradictions, there is a clear demand to shorten or extend the retirement age limits in general. The survey, therefore, asked respondents about their views on these issues and their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages for each of the two sexes. For example, participants were asked to give their opinion on whether women should use such general factors as arguments for advocating adjustments to the retirement age policy.

a. Less than one-third of the interviewees agreed that the extension of the retirement age by 5 years for both men and women would help solve the problem of an aging workforce. Most of the respondents (57.3 per cent) did not agree to this approach, as shown in Table 14. The original intent in designing this question was to find out the extent to which respondents recognized that the solution to emerging economic and

social development problems shared by both sexes, such as the need to postpone the retirement age due to labour shortages caused by an aging population, would also be a strong argument in favour of fighting for an equal retirement age for women. Unexpectedly, only 28.4 per cent of the respondents agreed to delay retirement to cope with the problems of an aging population, without significant differences in responses between the sexes, occupational groups and regions.

Table 14 Attitudes towards the view that "the retirement age for both sexes should be extended by 5 years" to cope with one of the problems of an aging population- shortage of labour

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	8.7%	14.1%	7.3%	7.6%	5.4%
Generally agree	19.7%	20.2%	21.6%	19.6%	16.9%
Slightly disagree	34.2%	28.3%	36.3%	37.0%	34.0%
Strongly disagree	23.1%	24.5%	17.8%	22.4%	28.5%
No idea	14.4%	12.9%	17.1%	13.3%	15.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

b. The respondents were ambivalent in their responses on whether employment pressures should be shouldered primarily by women or shared by both sexes. In the context of labour oversupply, China's valued objective of early retirement for women as a care and protection measure under a planned economy has been largely replaced by the idea that "women should retire early to safeguard job opportunities for young people". One-third or 33.5 per cent of the respondents agreed to this statement, indicating that a considerable number of people tend to sacrifice the interests of women in addressing economic and social contradictions related to employment pressures. Then, should the duty of reducing employment pressures be shared by both men and women? Only 37.1 per cent of the respondents were in favour of this idea, and they may be the backbone of those who advocate equal rights for both sexes, without significant differences between sexes, occupational groups and regions. (See Table 16)

Table 15 Attitudes towards the view that "women should retire early to safeguard job opportunities for young people"

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	15.7%	14.6%	11.8%	14.2%	24.3%
Generally agree	17.8%	20.4%	14.2%	18.6%	17.3%
Slightly disagree	35.4%	37.5%	38.5%	34.7%	30.3%
Strongly disagree	20.9%	12.1%	27.7%	24.6%	17.6%
No idea	10.2%	15.3%	7.8%	7.8%	10.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16 Attitudes towards the view that "both men and women should retire earlier at the same age in order to reduce the employment pressure"

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	13.0%	14.2%	13.1%	12.0%	13.3%
Generally agree	24.1%	22.4%	24.5%	24.0%	25.8%
Slightly disagree	34.8%	32.5%	35.4%	36.8%	33.4%
Strongly disagree	13.0%	13.9%	13.5%	12.8%	11.5%
No idea	15.1%	17.0%	13.4%	14.3%	16.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

c. The majority of the respondents disagreed with closing the pension gap by extending the retirement age of women. 47.1 per cent, most of whom were women workers, did not agree that "the retirement age of women should be extended to be identical to men's in order to close the pension gap". Nevertheless 35.4 per cent of the respondents chose "agree" or "generally agree". Among those respondents, the proportion of women surpassed that of men, and the proportion of female cadres and female professionals are much higher than female workers.

Table 17 Closing for the pension gap by extending the retirement age of women

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Strongly agree	12.9%	8.3%	18.3%	15.6%	7.6%
Generally agree	22.5%	19.4%	28.2%	24.0%	17.4%
Slightly disagree	28.8%	32.8%	24.1%	29.2%	28.1%
Strongly disagree	18.3%	16.4%	15.0%	16.1%	28.5%
No idea	17.5%	23.0%	14.5%	15.1%	18.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The question as to the age at which men and women could or should retire is a gender equality concern that can be addressed simultaneously with efforts to resolve the economic and social problems confronting our country. Data from this study confirm that, in the context of traditional ideas on the labour division and the power relations between men and women, the policy intention with the aim of achieving equity and benefiting the overall national interests has encountered considerable resistance.

(3) **Social justice and fundamental human rights:** Retirement involves a number of important issues, including the employment, development and social security rights of citizens, the ability of a society to enable all citizens to engage in social development, the fair and equitable sharing of the outcomes of social progress, as well as harmonious and sustainable human development. According to the relevant provisions in the United Nations *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW, China became a signatory in 1980), the United Nations *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (China became a signatory in 1997), the ILO *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention* 1958, (No. 111) (ratified by the Chinese government in 2006), and the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China* and the *Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Women*, mandatory provisions for different retirement ages based on gender shall be viewed as unequal, as discrimination against women and as a violation of women's human rights.

Accordingly, the research team designed a group of questions to find out respondents' perspectives on social justice and human rights: The statement "different retirement ages for men and women constitute a violation of women's equal rights" was intended to identify people's views on the relation between the retirement age and women's rights in employment, development and social insurance. The statement "early retirement has caused economic loss to women" aimed at identifying people's views on early retirement and women's right to participate in the economy and to have

access to income and social security. The statement "China's small number of top-level women is partly due to the early retirement age for women" sought people's views on the early retirement age and women's rights to career development and political engagement. Finally, the statement "women with a longer life expectancy should retire later than men" was intended to prompt people to give their views on providing women with more job choices, given the increasingly clear signs of the higher average life expectancy and improved health among women.

The data in Table 18 show that 40.8 per cent of the respondents thought that different retirement ages for men and women constituted a violation of the equal rights of women, while 41 per cent disagreed with this opinion. Slightly more than half of the interviewees (50.5 per cent) believed that early retirement causes economic losses to women, indicating that a high proportion of respondents recognize this basic fact; however, 34 per cent still denied the validity of this statement. Almost 2 of every 5 respondents (39.1 per cent) believed China's small number of top-level women is partly due to the early retirement age for women, while 35.6 per cent did not think this was the case. Relatively few (13.3 per cent) of the respondents considered that women with a longer average life expectancy should retire later than men, while 69.6 per cent disagreed with this view. In addition, those who did not share their true feelings by indicating that they had "no idea" also amounted to 18.1 per cent, 15.4 per cent, 25.3 per cent and 17.1 per cent of respondents for the four respective statements. This is an indication of a vague and imprecise awareness of women's rights among almost 1 in every 5 respondents.

Table 18 Understanding of the social justice and fundamental human rights perspective

	Strongly agree	Generally agree	Slightly disagree	Strongly disagree	No idea	Total
Different retirement ages for men and women constitute a violation of the equal rights of women	15.3%	25.5%	27.5%	13.5%	18.1%	100.0%
Early retirement causes economic losses to women	16.5%	34.0%	24.6%	9.4%	15.4%	100.0%
China's small number of top-level women is partly due to the early retirement age for women	13.5%	25.6%	25.2%	10.4%	25.3%	100.0%
Women with a longer average life expectancy should retire later than men	3.7%	9.6%	44.8%	24.8%	17.1%	100.0%

Thus, the responses to the first three statements on the relation between the early retirement age and women's fundamental rights show a better sense of gender

equality and human rights awareness among many Chinese citizens, as 40 per cent or more of the respondents clearly recognize that the current retirement age policy is contrary to basic human rights laws and regulations, and that it is time to amend the policy.

(D) Demand of respondents to improve the regulations on the retirement age

The survey specifically solicited the demands and recommendations on the retirement age from all groups of respondents. The following part describes the policy recommendations for female workers, cadres and professionals.

1. Recommendations on the retirement age for female workers

(1) More than half or 58.1 per cent of the respondents supported the same retirement age for male and female workers; 14.2 per cent of all respondents favoured a mandatory "same retirement age for male and female workers"; 29 per cent were in favour of the "same retirement age for male and female workers, with the flexibility to choose early retirement backed by a certain length of service"; and 14.9 per cent considered that the retirement age should be determined on the basis of the type of work and the degree of labour intensity rather than on gender. It should be noted that, 48.4 per cent of the female worker respondents preferred one of these three options, while 50.6 per cent favoured retirement ages 5 to 10 year earlier for women.

It is worthwhile to note that the design of a flexible retirement age system gained the highest rates of support. While half of the female worker respondents expressed support for different retirement ages for women and men, more than a quarter of them voted in favour of a flexible retirement age. This finding is in line with the policy reform objective of "diverse needs and human nature", allowing employees to make an "independent choice" for work or retirement. In this scenario, after the accumulation of a certain length of service, an employee will be able to decide whether to retire or not based on their own health and economic status, their type of work, the degree of labour intensity and their family situation.

(2) In total, 41.2 per cent of all respondents, among them half of the female workers, still adhered to maintaining the gender differences in the retirement age, with 14.4 per cent of all respondents preferring women to retire 10 years earlier than men and slightly more than a quarter favouring women's retirement 5 years earlier than men. As can be seen in Table 19 below, among the four groups interviewed, more men, female cadres and female professionals supported a 5-year earlier retirement age rather than the 10-year earlier retirement age for female workers. However, more than a quarter of the female workers themselves were in favour of a 10 year earlier retirement age in their category of work.

It can be concluded that the group of female worker respondents had diverse views on the retirement ages for women and men. Over half of the female workers preferred to maintain the different retirement ages for men and women and most of them preferred to be able to retire and receive pension benefits 10 years earlier than men. At the same time, almost half of them considered that the retirement ages of women and men should be the same and one quarter of them were in favour of a flexible retirement age where both women and men have the right and the autonomy to choose whether

to retire early or not. This finding suggests that the diverse needs of male and female workers should be taken into account in the retirement policy reform for workers.

Table 19 Recommendations of different groups on the retirement age for male and female workers

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Female workers to retire 10 years earlier than male workers	14.4%	12.5%	8.8%	12.4%	26.8%
Female workers to retire 5 years earlier than male workers	26.8%	34.3%	21.9%	26.3%	23.8%
Same age retirement for male and female workers	14.2%	14.5%	16.7%	14.6%	10.0%
Same age retirement for male and female workers, with the possibility to choose early retirement after a certain length of service	29.0%	22.3%	37.3%	30.9%	24.8%
The retirement age determined based on the type of work and labour intensity rather than on gender	14.9%	15.6%	15.0%	15.1%	13.6%
Others	0.7%	0.8%	0.3%	0.7%	1.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. Recommendations on the retirement age for female cadres and female professionals

(1) In respect of the design of the retirement age system for female cadres and female professionals, two-thirds (66.8 per cent) of the respondents tended to choose the policy of the same retirement age for both sexes with 46.8 per cent preferring a flexible retirement age and 20 per cent considering that the same age should be mandatory. As in the case of the female workers, the flexible retirement age was defined as the "same age retirement for male and female workers, with the flexibility to choose early retirement backed by a certain length of service". More than half or 54.9 per cent of female cadres and almost half or 49 per cent of the female

professionals were in favour of the same flexible retirement ages for women and men, a view that was held by 41.3 per cent of the male respondents. Clearly, the ideal retirement policy should be relatively flexible and elastic, with the freedom for individuals to choose a proper retirement age and the corresponding retirement benefits within a specified age range (such as 55-60, possibly 60-65 in the future), so that people who are willing to work can contribute more to the community, while those who want to change their way of life can retire earlier. It is beyond doubt that men and women should have equal rights and be free to make their own choices.

(2) However, 31.9 per cent of all respondents still considered that female cadres should retire 5 years earlier than men. Further analysis shows that the highest support rates for this opinion were found among female workers (41.1 per cent) and men (35.8 per cent) with higher proportions than the average. In contrast, only one quarter of the female cadres and 28.3 per cent of the female professionals supported this opinion, both proportions being below the average. If a flexible retirement policy with freedom of choice is adopted, the demand of this small proportion of female cadres and professionals to retire earlier could still be met.

Table 20 Recommendations on the retirement age for male and female cadres and female professionals

	Total (n=4188)	Men (n=1018)	Female cadres (n=909)	Female professionals (n=1461)	Female workers (n=800)
Female cadres to retire 5 years earlier than male workers	31.9%	35.8%	25.0%	28.3%	41.1%
Same age retirement for male and female cadres	20.0%	21.5%	19.6%	21.6%	15.5%
Same age retirement for male and female cadres, with the possibility to choose early retirement after a certain length of service	46.8%	41.3%	54.9%	49.0%	40.9%
Others	1.3%	1.5%	0.6%	1.1%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

(A) Basic conclusions

1. Who agreed to the policy on the same retirement age for both sexes?

According to the survey findings, 58.1 per cent of all respondents agreed to have the same retirement ages for male and female workers, including 69.0 per cent of the female cadres, 60.6 per cent of the female professionals, 48.4 per cent of the female workers and 52.5 per cent of the men. (See Table 19)

Two-thirds (66.8 per cent) of all respondents were in favour of the same retirement ages for male and female cadres, including 74.5 per cent of the female cadres, 70.6 per cent of the female professionals, 56.4 per cent of the female workers and 62.8 per cent of the men. (See Table 20)

2. Who disagreed to the policy on the same retirement age for both sexes?

According to the survey findings, 41.2 per cent of all respondents considered that female workers should retire 5-10 years earlier than male workers, including 30.7 per cent of the female cadres, 38.7 per cent of the female professionals, 50.6 per cent of the female workers and 46.8 per cent of the men. This means that slightly more than half of the female workers did not agree to have the same retirement ages for male and female workers.

The survey findings also show that 31.9 per cent of all respondents consider that female cadres should retire 5 years earlier than male cadres, including 25 per cent of the female cadres, 28.3 per cent of the female professionals, 41.1 per cent of the female workers and 35.8 per cent of the men. The policy obliging female cadres to retire earlier than men had more support from the female workers and men while fewer female cadres and professionals were in favour of this policy.

3. Why did they agree with the policy on the same retirement age?

The research findings indicate that whether a respondent "agreed" or "disagreed" to retire at the same age as members of the other sex depended on certain factors, including the respondent's sex, social status (group), age, education, family income, economic status, family burden, health status, type of employer, executive level, position in the workplace, title, economic performance of the establishment/employer, welfare and social security, and expected post-retirement changes in income. However, the respondents' opinions and attitudes were not obviously linked to their marital status or share of personal income in the total household income.

Those who were in favour of men and women retiring at the same age included respondents with the following features: advocates of gender equality (including men and women), aged 50-60 years with a higher education, a relatively better economic status of the family, a lighter family burden, a healthier physical condition, employment in the public sector at a higher executive level with a higher technical title, and easier access to welfare and social security, and a significantly reduced income after retirement.

4. Why did they "disagree" with the policy on the same retirement age?

Overall, those who were against the same retirement ages for men and women included the groups with the following features: a poor sense of gender equality (including men and women), with a lower social status and identity, a younger age, a lower education, a relatively poor family income and a disadvantaged economic status, with dependent family members in need of care, poor health, employment in

the non-public sector, a lower position in the workplace, poor economic performance of the establishment/employer, a lack of welfare and social security, and an increased income after retirement.

In summary, the factors leading the respondents to "disagree" with the same retirement age between the sexes include: 1) personal reasons: poor health, inadequate personal investment in education, thereby affecting one's occupational status, social status and income; 2) economic factors: poor family income and economic status, poor economic performance of the establishment/employer, insecurity, lack of welfare and social security, an increased income after retirement made up of the pension benefit and the income from a private sector job after retirement to support one's family; 3) a working environment characterized by a lack of gender equality, an uncertain development future and inadequate cohesion in the workplace, a lack of a decent working environment and conditions; 4) family reasons: dependent family members in need of care and a heavier burden on women assuming the dual roles of income earning and carrying out most unpaid household duties; 5) human security factors: relatively low wages and benefits and imperfect social security systems; 6) gender concepts, norms and stereotypes: men are identified as the main breadwinners, women play the second fiddle in a dependent role and are viewed mainly as caregivers, who require protection as the weaker group. Women are the "buffer workforce". They have access to employment when there is less tension in employment market, but are "invited to exit" from the labour market when there is the huge employment pressure.

However, the reasons for some people against the policy on the same retirement age for both sexes include: the lower social productivity; workers not having decent work; underdeveloped social security system and wage and benefit systems; people not equally sharing the achievements and outcomes of social development, which lead them to use "early retirement" as a "quick fix" to their own work and life. Policy makers should not regard such "quick fix" as people's "voluntary choice".

5. Negative impact of the current policy of different retirement ages for men and women.

Employees themselves face negative impacts, affecting their rights in the following areas: first, education, as the more years they invest in education, the higher the cost will be, in terms of a shorter length of service and less total income; second, equality in employment; third, equal chances to development; fourth, equal political participation rights; fifth, equal access to social security; and sixth, equal choices in work and in life. In addition, the cumulative inequalities in education and in the labour market may also lead to the impoverishment of elderly women.

For employers, the mandatory policy of differentiated retirement ages may: 1) curb the enthusiasm and creativity of employees at work and hinder their performance and efficiency; 2) negatively affect vocational training for and the intellectual investment in female workers, thereby wasting half of human talent and wisdom; and 3) build a corporate culture of inequality, impacting the internal stability and the external image of the establishment itself.

For the state and society, the mandatory differences in the retirement age for men and women impede the development of an effective state strategy for human resources,

resulting in a serious waste and loss of female talents. It denies women's contribution to economic development, and hinders the speed and efficiency of growth.

Moreover, evidence from this study shows that it may lead to disorderly economic development, with large amounts of government financial resources spent on pensions while pensioners doing other jobs continue to receive wages. On the one hand, women are forced to retire early to open up jobs for newcomers; on the other hand, many retirees take up other posts upon retirement. So, it is better to gradually change "disguised retirement" into "true retirement", and thereby save pension funds. In addition, such a system is a violation of the equal rights of citizens conferred by the *Constitution* and, is thus, contrary to the human rights and justice based on the rule of law. Fifth, it disturbs social harmony and unity. Last but not least, it nurtures an unequal social culture passed from generation to generation.

6. Age provisions in the existing retirement policy need to be improved as soon as possible.

According to Peng Zhen, former chairperson of the NPC, a law must be modified if thirty per cent of the people fail to agree to or comply with it. The survey findings indicate that, irrespective of the occupational groups to which the respondents belonged or their sex, more than thirty per cent of all respondents questioned did not agree with the existing provisions on the retirement age; among the groups of female cadres and professionals the proportion of those who did not agree even topped 70 per cent, indicating a strong demand for correction.

Therefore, there is an urgent need to reform the existing provisions on the different mandatory retirement ages with a view to gradually extend the retirement age for women to the same level as men, and to give both men and women the right to a flexible retirement age and enable them to choose their retirement age within a certain age range. Given the existence of different socio-economic classes, living conditions, interests and needs among women, adequate policy responses should respect and promote the equal rights of women as a whole and take into account and address the special needs of women from different classes, with the wishes and needs of men also taken into consideration. Adjustments to the existing retirement age standards can be made in a targeted and progressive way.

(B) Main recommendations

1. Renewing the conceptual understanding of policy makers

First, the awareness of policy makers on civil rights should be improved, according to Article 33 of the *Constitution* (2004) "the state respects and protects human rights". Human rights have three distinct characteristics or principles, namely equality, non-discrimination and government responsibility. Policy makers from government departments should be aware that mandatory, direct discrimination on the basis of sex may result in violations of women's rights and discrimination against women. On October 22, 2010, the United Nations CEDAW Committee drafted the *General Recommendation No. 27 on Older Women and Protection of Their Human Rights*: Article 17 stipulates that "mandatory retirement ages may differ for women and men with women being forced to retire earlier, which may cause discrimination against older women". This clearly highlights the nature and hazards of the mandatory

retirement age difference. Policy makers should conform to the trend of safeguarding human rights and respect the growing awareness of civil rights among citizens; make use of policy and legal reforms, special provisional measures as well as education and advocacy geared at building the awareness of civil rights and equality; protect the fundamental rights of citizens; and, in doing so, genuinely carry out the government's commitment and responsibility.

Next, awareness of gender equality should be incorporated into the mainstream of decision-making. Gender mainstreaming is both a UN global strategy for the advancement of women and a basic state social policy of China. Gender equality does not mean formal equality only, and is not limited to protective equality. The emphasis is on achieving substantive equality. This requires an overturn of the conventional social division of labour and gender stereotyping such as "men take care of external affairs and women handle domestic ones"; advocacy on the sharing of work and family responsibilities between both sexes by improving policies, laws and institutions; as well as providing a supportive environment, so that men and women can equally engage in social progress and equally share the fruits of development; thereby achieving equality in outcomes, in fact and in substance.

China's tripartite constituents support the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme in China. As stated by President Hu Jintao, "Let workers across all countries work in a decent manner. This people-oriented approach reflects the spirit of the era and forms a critical aspect in respecting and safeguarding human rights." As a member State of the ILO, as a signatory to the CEDAW^① and the two international labour standards^② prohibiting discrimination in employment and setting out the fundamental rights of workers to equality, and as the host country of the Fourth World Conference on Women, China is in a position to incorporate the awareness of gender equality into the mainstream of its decision-making, especially in the mainstream of the government and party Programme, to secure and realize the basic rights of male and female workers in the pursuit of equality in opportunity and treatment at work and in life.

2. Developing a progressive and targeted policy for different groups of people

First, the existing retirement age provision for female cadres (including technical professionals) should be modified based on the practical needs of these groups, with the corresponding provision modified as follows: "the statutory retirement age for male and female cadres (including technical professionals) shall be 60, with the freedom to choose an early retirement under the premise of a certain length of service (25 or 30 years)." This is a policy of "flexible retirement" under the premise of guaranteed equal rights and interests. Such a provision not only ensures the equal rights of men and women at work but also gives them an equal right to choose, meeting the requirements for equality in employment, including the demands of those who prefer to continue working and those who wish to retire early rather than continue their job.

On October 15, 2010, the Organization Department of the CPC Central Committee

^① UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women;

^② ILO labour standards here refer to Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No.100)

issued a document, reaffirming the provision for female cadres at the division level or above to choose a retirement age identical to that of men. The implementation of this document serves to solve some of the problems of female cadres, but the research team believes this alone is not sufficient.

The government's policy of personnel restructuring and active employment promotion is to encourage cadres, university graduates and professionals to work at the grassroots level. However, the current policy difference between the retirement ages of men and women still existing in some counties and divisions is blocking the reform. Grassroots female cadres subject to untimely retirement due to restrictions concerning their positions and titles find their enthusiasm in grassroots work seriously dampened. Therefore, there should be a stipulation that all female cadres and female professionals shall retire at the same age as men.

Moreover, the retirement age provision for female workers should be expanded in a moderate and gradual way. Given the current complex economic and social backgrounds in China, a moderately flexible retirement age policy for male and female workers should be carried out, namely, setting "the retirement age at 60 for male workers and at 55 for female workers, with the freedom for both sexes to choose early retirement under the premise of a certain length of service" and stipulating that "the retirement age is determined based on the type of work and the degree of labour intensity". This will make it possible for female workers with the ambition and capacity to continue working for their employers with good economic returns, and at the same time meet the requirement of workers to choose an early retirement if they wish. Issues such as what the length of service should be and how the type of work and labour intensity should be determined, require further in-depth research by the concerned departments and experts.

3. Creating a working environment of equality in employment

a) Creation of a decent working as well as living environment: The government and employers should respect and protect the rights of workers at work and in life, ensure their income and social security, and continue to create decent working conditions, so that workers can work and live in a decent manner with dignity under the premise of well-established labour standards and living wages and allowances.

b) Elimination of gender discrimination in the workplace: It is essential to safeguard the fundamental rights of both sexes to pursue equal opportunities and treatment in employment, with women neither discriminated against nor neglected in terms of career choice, income, treatment, training, promotion, labour protection, collective bargaining, democratic management, retirement and other aspects. The career expectations and confidence of working women should also be enhanced.

c) Work-family balance: Attention should be paid to the demands of both male and female workers with family responsibilities to help them strike a balance between work and family. Child care, old-age nursing and home services should be incorporated into the government's public service coverage to encourage family care services in various forms and provide accessible, personalized, qualified and affordable domestic service and convenience for this group of people.^①

^① Liu Bohong, Zhang Yongying and Li Yani "Balancing work and family: Research report on China's problems

A gradual convergence in the retirement age for men and women has been observed in retirement systems around the world. The Chinese government should catch up with this trend and meet the expectation of the workers, implement the international conventions to protect human rights, fulfill its international obligations on safeguarding human rights, workers' and women's rights, continue to improve its legal and policy systems, and spare no effort to eliminate gender discrimination and to meet all requirements of civil rights, so as to promote harmonious development of our economy and society as well as facilitate the progress of human rights development in China.

References

1. The United Nations, *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.
2. The United Nations, *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*.
3. The ILO's *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention*, 1958 (No. 111).
4. *The ILO's Equal Remuneration Convention*, 1951 (No. 100).
5. *The ILO's Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention*, 1981 (No. 156).
6. Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, General recommendation No. 27 on older women and protection of their human rights, 18 October 2010.
7. Xue Ninglan, "Gender-based differences in the retirement age: Policy and legislation review", cited from *Gender and Labour Rights* edited by Guo Huimin, Northwestern Polytechnical University Press, 2005.
8. Fan Ming et al, *Retirement Behaviors and the Retirement Policy*, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2008.
9. Cai Dingjian, "Equal rights to retirement for both sexes is a constitutional right", *Southern Weekend Magazine*, June 4, 2009.
10. Yang Yansui et al, "On the smoothing effect of flexible retirement for employees", *China Labour Magazine*, No. 12, 2010.
11. Gao Qingbo, Pan Jintang, "A comparative analysis of gender-based interests in the pension system of Chinese enterprises before and after the reform", *Collection of Women's Studies*, No. 5, 2007.
12. Pan Jintang, "An analysis of the status quo of retirement ages for men and women across the world", *Gansu Social Sciences*, No. 1, 2003.
13. Guo Wuwei, "On the public opinion of netizens towards the same retirement age for men and women: Statistical analysis of the thematic reviews on the portals of Sina and Xinhua", *Gansu Social Sciences*, No. 5, 2005.
14. Yang Yan, Wei Shanshan, "Aging and the same retirement age for men and women", *Journal of Chongqing Institute of Technology*, No. 3, 2006.
15. Chen Weimin, Li Ying, "An analysis of impacts of the retirement age on the gender-based difference in pensions of urban workers in China", *Collection of Women's Studies*, No. 1, 2004.

16. Liu Jun, Jiang Yongping, Zhang Lixi, Feng Yuan, Ding Juan, Rong Weiyi, "Discussion on the same retirement age for male and female civil servants", *Collection of Women's Studies*, No. 6, 2003.
17. Peng Xizhe, "Social policy and gender equality: Case study based on the analysis of China's pension system", *Collection of Women's Studies*, No. 2, 2003.
18. Liu Minghui, "My view of the retirement age reform", www.womenwatch-china.org, December 30, 2008.
19. Wang Zhuqing, Wu Daoxia, "An approach to the retirement issue of female professionals," cited from *Gender Equality and the Law: Studies and Strategies* edited by Tan Lin and Jiang Xiuhua, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2007.
20. Xu Xiaoyin, "Gender bias in the pension system", cited from *Women/Gender: Theory and Practice II* edited by the ACWF Women's Institute, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2009.
21. Liu Bohong, Zhang Yongying and Li Yani "Balancing work and family: Research report on China's problems and policy", ILO Report 2008, Beijing.
22. Women's Research Center under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, "Serial studies on the same retirement age for male and female civil servants", documents of "Social policy and gender equality: workshop on the issue of the same retirement age for male and female civil servants".
23. Monthly gathering on Gender and Development (GAD), "Data collection of the same retirement age issue: policy, cases and points of view", February 2009, Beijing.

附录

关于分群体、分阶段推进男女同龄退休的建议* （提案）

国发（1978）104号文件规定，男干部和男工人的法定退休年龄为60岁、女干部为55岁、女工人为50岁，男女退休年龄存在5到10年的差距。

1989年“两会”以来，有代表提出“男女同龄退休”或“男女公务员/专业技术人员同龄退休”的建议，至今已20余年，始终没有被全国人大和政府相关部门接受或改正。经常听到的一个理由是“大部分妇女自己不同意男女同龄退休”。

为了弄清到底是哪些人主张男女同龄退休，哪些人不同意同龄退休，原因何在，不同性别、身份（干部、专业技术人员、工人）的人对退休年龄的想法和需求到底是什么，为退休政策的修改和完善提供切实可行的依据，2010年9月，全国妇联妇女研究所与黑龙江、江苏、四川和江西四省妇女研究所合作，在上述四个省进行关于退休年龄的问卷调查，分别以男干部、女干部、女专业技术人员和女工人为调查对象，调查了他们对现行退休年龄的看法，收回有效问卷共计4188份。

1、对现行退休年龄规定的评价

调查显示，有51.1%的被访者认为现行男工人60岁、女工人50岁的差别年龄退休规定“不合理”。其中女干部、女专业技术人员认为不合理的比例最高，分别占到59.6%和55.1%，男性认为“不合理”的比例也近一半（49.8%）。因涉及工人的退休年龄，我们更关注女工

* 本提案（议案）经修改后，于2011年“两会”提交。在此，特向全国人大代表孙晓梅教授、全国妇联政协委员甄砚副主席表示衷心感谢！

人主体的感受,尽管她们认为“不合理”的比例最低,但也超过被访女工人的三分之一(36.0%)。2003年全国人大关于男女同龄退休的调查报告结论是:工矿企业中100%的女工人不赞同男女同龄退休。本次调查数据显示,赞成男女差别年龄退休规定的女工人比例已经大大下降,以往人们习惯说的“女工人自己不同意同龄退休”的说法,现在有了很大变化,特别是那些效益好的企业。

调查中有43%的人认为现行男干部60岁、女干部(含专业技术人员)55岁的差别年龄退休规定“不合理”,从女干部和女专业技术人员的主观感受看,她们当中认为“不合理”的比例均超过平均值,分别为54.2%和48.5%,女干部和女专业技术人员自身的态度更值得我们重视。

2、对理想退休年龄的建议

调查显示,对于理想退休年龄的要求,有平均58.1%的人同意男女工人同龄退休,特别是“男女都具有平等的法定权利,但是满一定工龄后,男女都可以自主选择提前退休”的政策。其中有69.0%的女干部、60.6%的女专业技术人员、48.4%的女工人和52.4%的男性。

有平均66.8%的人同意男女干部同龄退休,特别是“男女干部都具有平等的法定权利,但是满一定工龄后,男女干部都可以自主选择提前退休”的政策。其中有74.5%的女干部、70.6%的女专业技术人员、56.4%的女工人和62.8%的男性。

3、影响人们选择退休年龄的因素

调查显示,影响人们选择提前退休或同龄退休的因素是多方面的,退休年龄的规定是个牵涉面广且十分复杂的问题。相关因素分析显示:赞成性别平等(包括男性)、年龄较长(50-60年龄段)、教育程度较高、家庭经济状况较好、家庭负担较轻、身体状况较好、在公共部门就业、行政级别较高、技术职称较高、福利和社会保障情况较好、退休后收入明显减少的人,赞成和支持男女同龄退休;性别平等意识不强(包括男女两性)、社会身份和地位不高、年龄较轻、教育程度较低、家庭收入和经济状况不佳、家庭中有需要照顾的成员、身

身体状况不佳、在非公共部门就业、在单位中的位置不高、单位的经济效益较差、福利和社会保障不足、退休后收入有所增加的被访者，不同意男女同龄退休。

在一定意义上说，部分人“不同意”同龄退休，是社会生产力水平发展不高，劳动者没有享受体面劳动条件，工资福利和社会保障制度不健全，社会全体成员不能平等参与社会发展分享发展成果，迫使她/他们不得不把“提前退休”当作其工作和生活的“权宜之计”。政策制定者不应该把这种经济社会发展水平不高和制度不健全导致的“无奈之举”，当成部分工人或女工群体的“自愿选择”。

4、强制性差别年龄退休政策的负面影响

调查发现，现行的强制性差别年龄退休规定产生了很多负面影响。首先，对从业者本人而言，这种规定影响了她们的受教育权，教育的投资越多，成本越高，其就业的时间有可能越短、就业的总收入就有可能越少；影响了她们平等的就业权、发展权、参政权、社会保障权和她们在职业生涯和自身生活中的选择权。此外，教育及劳动力市场上累积性的不平等还有可能导致女性老年生活的贫困化。

其次，对用人单位而言，这种规定影响从业者工作的积极性和创造性，进而影响单位的工作效率；影响对女性劳动者的职业培训和投资，有可能浪费人类一半的人才和智慧；形成不平等的企业文化，影响企业内部的安定和外部的形象。

第三，对国家和社会而言，这种规定影响国家人才战略发展，造成女性人才的严重浪费和流失；否定女性对经济发展的贡献，影响经济发展的速度和效率；造成经济的无序发展，一方面，政府财政对退休金给予大量补贴，另一方面，领取退休金的人又有另外的工作继续领取工资，一方面，强制女性提前退休希望给新增就业者腾空位置，另一方面，又有大量的退休者退而不休，仍然占据就业岗位；影响《宪法》所赋予公民的平等权利，有悖人权和法律的严肃性和公正性；影响社会的和谐发展和安定团结；造成不平等的社会文化，并使之代代相传。

5、建议

根据调查我们建议,针对不同就业群体和不同就业岗位,制定循序渐进、有针对性、可操作的不同退休年龄规定。

首先,改进现有的女干部(含专业技术人员)的退休年龄规定。以女干部和女专业技术人员的现实需求为切入点,将相关退休年龄规定修订为:“男女干部(含专业技术人员)法定60岁退休,但在满一定工龄(25年或30年)的前提下,男女干部都可以自主选择提前退休”。即在保障性别平等权利的前提下,实行“弹性退休”政策。这样的规定,既保障了男女劳动者平等的权利,又赋予了男女劳动者平等的选择权利,既满足了男女劳动者平等就业的要求,又满足了由于各种因素劳动者不能继续工作或不愿继续工作选择提前退休的需求。

2010年10月15日,中组部下发文件,重申了处级以上女干部可以与男性同龄退休的规定。但不少地方人事部门认为,部委文件与法规相比缺乏法律效力,可以不执行。即使这个文件能够认真贯彻执行,也只是解决少数女干部的问题。我们认为仅此不够,仅此不妥。一方面,没有保障大多数女干部和女专业技术人员平等工作的权利;另一方面,又与党和政府号召各级干部面向基层,支援基层与偏远地区的政策背道而驰。目前政府的人事制度改革和积极的促进就业的政策方向是鼓励干部、大学毕业生和专业技术人员到基层、西部和偏远地区工作,但现行的退休制度尤其是离岗/内退政策却从相反方面阻滞这项改革的推进。基层女干部、女专业技术人员由于级别和职称限制,而比男性提前5到10年离岗/内退,严重挫伤了基层工作女性的积极性。

其次,对女工人退休年龄适度放开。考虑到目前中国社会复杂的经济背景和社会背景,对男女工人退休年龄实行适度放开的弹性退休制度。即“男工人60岁退休,女工人可以延长到55岁退休,但是满一定工龄后,男女工人都可以自主选择提前退休”和“根据工种和劳动强度确定退休年龄”。这样,可以为那些有意愿、有能力、效益较

好单位的女工人创造继续工作的条件,也可以照顾到根据自己意愿选择提前退休的工人的需求。到底满多长工龄为好,工种和劳动强度如何确定,需要相关领域专家进行更进一步的深入研究。

从世界各国退休制度发展的趋势看,男女两性退休年龄已经逐渐呈现趋同倾向。我国政府应当顺应历史趋势和劳动者的愿望,认真履行国际人权公约,不断改进各项政策法律制度,努力消除性别歧视,最大限度地满足各项公民权利的要求,促进我国经济社会的和谐发展,推动我国的人权保障事业健康有序地发展。

问卷编码: ☐☐☐☐☐

关于退休年龄问题的调查问卷

尊敬的被访者:

您好!我们正在进行关于退休年龄问题的调查,为完善相应的政策提供参考。本调查是无记名的,调查结果仅用于研究,您提供的信息完全保密。您对问题的回答没有对错,只要符合您的真实想法和实际情况。非常感谢您的支持与合作!

选择题请您在与您实际情况相符的选项上划“√”,如无特殊说明均为单选题。填空题请把答案写在横线上。

“退休年龄问题研究”课题组

2010年8月

一、基本情况

1.1 您的性别是: ①男 ②女

1.2 您的年龄是: _____周岁

1.3 您的受教育程度是:

- ①不识字或识字很少 ②小学 ③初中 ④中专/技校/高中
⑤大学专科 ⑥大学本科 ⑦研究生及以上

1.4 您的婚姻状况是:

- ①未婚 ②初婚 ③再婚 ④离婚 ⑤丧偶

1.5 您的家庭月收入大致为:

- ①2000元以下 ②2000-4999元 ③5000-7999元
④8000-9999元 ⑤10000-14999元 ⑥15000元以上

1.6 您的月收入占家庭月收入的比例是:

- ①可以忽略不计 ②远少于一半 ③差不多一半 ④远多于一半 ⑤几乎全部

1.7 您认为您的家庭经济状况在当地属于:

- ①下层 ②中下 ③中等 ④中上 ⑤上层

1.8 您家中是否有需要照顾的人(可多选):

- ①孩子 ②病人 ③残疾人 ④老人 ⑤暂时没有 ⑥其他人(请注明) _____

1.9 总的来说,您觉得您的健康状况如何?

- ①良好 ②一般 ③较差 ④很差 ⑤说不清

二、工作情况

2.1 您的工作单位属于以下哪种类型：

- ①党政机关/社会团体 ②事业单位 ③国有企业 ④私营企业
⑤外资/合资企业 ⑥其他（请注明）_____

2.2 您的行政级别是：

- ①地市局局级 ②县处级 ③科级 ④股级 ⑤股级以下
⑥没有行政级别/不适用

2.3 您在单位中所处的位置是：

- ①单位负责人/高层管理人员/企业主 ②中层管理人员
③基层管理人员 ④普通职工/职员 ⑤其他（请注明）_____

2.4 到目前为止，您获得正式专业技术职称的情况是：

- ①没有专业技术职称/不适用 ②初级 ③中级 ④副高级 ⑤正高级

2.5 您所在单位是否向您提供下列福利待遇：

	不提供	提供	说不清/不知道
①公费医疗			
②医疗保险			
③退休金			
④养老保险			
⑤失业保险			
⑥工伤保险			
⑦病假工资			
⑧产假工资/生育费用			
⑨住房补贴/福利房			
⑩住房公积金			
(11)带薪休假			
(12)报销/补贴家属医药费			

2.6 最近3年，您所在单位的经济效益如何？

- ①非常好 ②比较好 ③一般 ④比较差
⑤非常差(包括停产) ⑥已经破产 ⑦不清楚/不适用

2.7 最近3年您所在单位有以下情况吗？

	没有	有	不清楚
①同等条件下男性提升比女性快			

②在技术要求高的岗位上男性比女性多			
③在职务晋升上对男女有不同的年龄要求			

2.8 您所在单位的退休政策是(可多选):

- ①男女同龄退休 ②女性比男性早退休 ③一定级别的女性跟男性同龄退休
④工作满一定年限后男女都可以提前退休 ⑤不知道 ⑥其他(请注明)_____

2.9 按照目前单位执行的退休政策,您的升迁是否会受到年龄影响?

- ①是 ②否 ③不清楚

2.10 按照单位目前的退休政策,您退休后收入会:

- ①提高较多 ②有所提高 ③差不多 ④有所降低 ⑤降低较多 ⑥不清楚

2.11 A. 您愿意提前退休吗?

- ①是——→B. 您退休后打算干什么(可多选)?

- ①从事有酬劳动 ②参与公益事业 ③照顾家庭
④享受生活 ⑤保健养生 ⑥其他(请注明)_____

- ②否

- ③不知道/没考虑过

2.12 您的工作与生活中是否有以下情况:

	是	否
①能高效地完成工作任务		
②在工作中没有得到应有的升迁		
③工作缺乏稳定性和安全感		
④同时兼顾家庭与工作,感觉身心疲惫		
⑤为照顾家庭影响了工作投入		
⑥因为工作影响了家庭		
⑦对自己的工作不感兴趣		
⑧因健康原因经常请假		
⑨担心自己将来的养老问题		
⑩对单位的工作环境不满意		

三、对男女退休年龄规定的看法

3.1 您是否了解国家关于男女退休年龄的规定?

- ①了解 ②不了解

3.2A 您认为,现有政策规定女工人比男工人早10年退休合理吗?

- ①合理——→B 原因是(可多选):

- ①女性体力/精力不如男性 ②女性能力不如男性
 ③有利于照顾家庭 ④为他人腾岗位
 ⑤其他(请注明)_____

②不合理——→C 原因是(可多选):

- ①男女应有平等的工作权利和机会
 ②早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验
 ③早退休影响女性职业发展
 ④早退休影响女性经济收入
 ⑤男女身体状况差别不大
 ⑥早 10 年太长了, 最好早 5 年
 ⑦其他(请注明) _____

③说不清

3. 3A 您认为, 现有政策规定女干部(含专业技术人员)比同一级别的男性早 5 年退休合理吗?

①合理——→B 原因是(可多选):

- ①女性体力/精力不如男性 ②女性能力不如男性
 ③有利于照顾家庭 ④为他人腾岗位
 ⑤其他(请注明)_____

②不合理——→C 原因是(可多选):

- ①男女应有平等的工作权利和机会
 ②早退休浪费女性的智慧和经验
 ③早退休影响女性职业发展
 ④早退休影响女性经济收入
 ⑤男女身体状况差别不大
 ⑥其他(请注明) _____

③说不清

3. 4 您是否同意以下观点:

	非常 同意	比较 同意	不太 同意	很不 同意	说 不清
①为了给年轻人腾出就业机会, 女性应早退休					
②为应对老龄化, 男女都应延长 5 年退					

休					
③女性早退休是对她们的保护和福利					
④为了减轻就业压力,男女都应该同龄提前退休					
⑤女同志家务负担重,早退休正好照顾家庭					
⑥女性预期寿命长,应该比男性晚退休					
⑦男女不同龄退休侵犯了妇女的平等权利					
⑧为弥补养老基金缺口,应该让女性延长退休年龄,跟男性一样,同龄退休					
⑨提前退休给女性造成了经济损失					
⑩我国高层女性少,跟女性提前退休有关系					

3.5 您是否听说过本单位或其他单位的女性因为提前退休表示不满?

①是 ②否

3.6 关于男女工人退休年龄的安排,您最倾向于:

- ①女工人比男工人早 10 年退休
- ②女工人比男工人早 5 年退休
- ③男女工人同龄退休
- ④男女工人同龄退休,但是满一定工龄后,男女工人可以自主选择提前退休
- ⑤根据工种和劳动强度确定退休年龄
- ⑥其他(请注明) _____

3.7 关于男女干部(含专业技术人员)退休年龄的安排,您最倾向于:

- ①女干部(含专业技术人员)比男干部(含专业技术人员)早 5 年退休
- ②男女干部(含专业技术人员)同龄退休
- ③男女干部(含专业技术人员)同龄退休,但是满一定工龄后,男女可以自主选择提前退休
- ④其他(请注明) _____

3.8 您对国家或是本单位的退休政策还有什么建议?

以下由调查工作人员填写

调查员签字: 2010 年 月 日