

Viktor Artemov, Olga Novokhatskaya

Everyday activity of rural employees in Siberia

Abstract

The article presents the results of the fifth bi-seasonal survey conducted in 2004–2005 within the framework of the longitudinal study of the time use, everyday activity and living conditions of the rural population. The study is conducted on a sample group of villages representative of the south of Siberia in rather different historical periods. The emphasis is made on changes that have taken place in the rural everyday life and on the use of time during the last two decades; in particular, in the beginning of the new century. It presents the results of the analysis of the time budgets of working women and working men and their answers to questions concerning the facts of reality, their assessments and values. In the early 2000s the working time of men increased, while their time spent on private plot production and housework decreased. Similar situation was observed in the case of women; however, the time spent on household production increased. More pronounced changes were observed among agricultural workers, especially men (increasing working time and decreasing time of housework, sleep and leisure). On the whole, there was a noticeable redistribution of time between work in the house and household production and work in the agricultural enterprise being the source of the material well-being of the rural family. The male-female difference in the total work load and leisure time has decreased.

Keywords: everyday activity, social change, longitudinal study, working population, time use.

Introduction

Social changes in different spheres of society can be generated by governmental decisions, foreign events and their influence of internal social processes. As a rule, these three “factors” are operating in a certain combination with each other. Above all, we are interested in everyday life of the majority of the population, conditions and quality of their life and satisfaction of their needs. According to Zaslavskaya T.I. ‘lowest layer’ accounts for 2/3 of the population with 9–12% of ‘the honest poor who live on or beyond the poverty line’ (Zaslavskaja 1997: 55). We view rural population as an important indicative group showing the state and trends of everyday activity. In the 1990s, the changes in the most considered questions-responds appeared to be lop-sided. At the same time, the changes in the period of 1994–1999 in terms of numbers were significantly lower than in the period of 1986–1993; still, they became more apparent in 1999–2005.

Longitudinal survey of 1975–2005

We conducted the longitudinal study in the rural area of Novosibirsk oblast (region) as a typical rural area both for the south of Western Siberia and the whole country. In particular, the data obtained in 1999 on comparable indicators of families’ economic behaviour, value orientation, assessment of carried reforms are very close to the results of the All-Russian survey (Konturi socialnoj politiki 2000).

In the 1970–2000s, five bi-seasonal surveys of living conditions, time use and everyday activity of the population were conducted. The number of respondents in each survey ranges from 1200 to 1500.

The research includes the ‘spots’ of historical time relating to substantially different periods of the last quarter of the century that vary both in objective economic, social and political characteristics and in the people’s state of mind and real activities.

There is no doubt that; at the present time, the period of 1986–1987 is the reference point for all changes over the last 20 years. It is the beginning of significant and radical changes both for the state and society. The period of 1993–1994 is the starting point of social-economic stabilisation with the sharp decrease of living conditions to the level of survival for the majority

of the population. The 1999–2005 is the period of the next bi-(or poly-) furcation state of the society with vague perspectives.

We managed to conduct the last Russian survey of the 20th century (1999) and the first of the 21st century (2004–2005). We have created a united file of all 10 surveys conducted in the period from 1975 to 2005, with 12 main socio-demographical characteristics of the respondents and 52 time use of various aggregation levels being included.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the main aim of our research was to study the influence of macroeconomic changes in both economic and social policy on the everyday activity of the population, as well as, to fix and explain the changes in their living conditions, preferences, and activity on the most general level of the time budget structure and, what is the most important, the structure of work, especially, its division between the paid work and the work in household production and private plots.

Methods and organisation of the survey

We aimed to retain the organisational and methodological base of the survey to eliminate its influence on obtained empirical data. Before the preparation of our first rural survey began, the three-factor social-economic-demographic typology of rural communities had been already built up and substantively described: by two classes of the urbanisation factor, by three classes of industrialisation factor, and by two classes of the natural population change factor (*Metodologija i metodika sistemnogo izuchenija sovjetskoj derevni* 1980).

In essence, we were the first to make use of the formation of a sampling population of objects (in our case – rural settlements) in an empirical sociological study of computers and the cluster analysis algorithm, and of the typology of rural settlements developed under the direction of T.I. Zaslavskaya (*Metodologija i metodika sistemnogo izuchenija sovjetskoj derevni* 1980; *Razvitie selskih poselenij* 1977). The sample of rural settlements of different types was retained. So far, there has been no doubts in its representativeness with regard to the absolute number of rural places in the oblast or even in Russia as a whole, for that matter.

Another significant characteristic of the sampling population was the functional “subsystem of the rural side” and groups of nonworking population. The distribution of respondents among all these groups was

retained in the selection of respondents in 1986–87 and 1993–94. With constraints on the total size of base population and the need to survey small number groups, a non-proportional sample was used. The selection of respondents was made from register books randomly by several stages according to the predesigned quotas for groups.

The economic situation of agricultural enterprises strongly affects the living conditions of the population in rural areas. On average, the enterprises situated in the territory of the selected settlements seem to be better in comparison with the oblast as a whole due to the fact that one out of five enterprises belongs to the leading ones, whereas in oblast as a whole, there are a few of such enterprises.

Time aspect, playing a key role, presupposes the combination of value-needed, motivational and other aspects of human activities, which make it possible to gain more authentic view of the real state of individuals, their families and behaviour. Therefore, apart from time budgets, we used several types of questionnaire information: the characteristic of the population per se, individual-family living conditions, behavioural data, self-assessment of either activities or changes given by the rural population as well as statistical data on the settlements and agricultural enterprises and some other characteristics of the population.

One and the same method was used in collection time use data, i.e. retrospective survey about the previous day. The used questionnaires and forms for collection of data on the settlements, instruction of interviewers inspecting the coding personnel were constant, with minimum changes. This method is retrospective – respondents are asked for a time allocation of the previous day. It is proved, by means of an experimental way, that the time diary method gives the reliable measurement, while the other methods are unsatisfactory (Juster, Stafford, 1991).

The composition of the research team was relatively constant which secured the conformity in the work of interviewers and coders. In the last two surveys, in general, the stability was maintained by the head of the survey while the interviewers were the senior students of sociological department of Novosibirsk State University. The time of survey in fact did not differ: summer (but not peak) – June – and winter months – November and December were constantly chosen.

The calendar 7-day week is the most convenient period for time use analysis. Given this line of reasoning, in surveys, where time record of

respondents is kept for one or several days, a rated week budget of several types is introduced. 1) The budget of a seasonal calendar (work) week was estimated on the basis of the average number of work and days off in the 7-day (winter or summer) week and the appropriate time budgets. 2) The budget of average seasonal week is the average arithmetic week on the basis of winter and summer budgets.

Below are the results of our longitudinal survey concerning the *working* population calling our attention to the period of 1986–1999–2005. Notice that the revealed trends are, to a high degree, a consequence of the state of the society at large and its changes rather than the reflection of the regional specifics.

Social-demographic characteristics of workers, principle changes in the structure and living conditions of rural families in the 90s

In our surveys, we tried to preserve our sample at four parameters: total number, the share of residents living in rural settlements with different types of urbanisation and industrialisation, the share of groups of working and non-working pensioners and employed in household production as well as private plot, and the share of employees engaged in functional sub-systems of the village. To some degree it proved to be effective.

In our sample, in comparison with the statistical data, the share of public health, education and culture is twice as high with the share of agricultural workers, employed in commerce, public catering, consumer services, housing and communal services, being similar (Table 1).

Over the last decade, the composition and size of family changed. In 2005, in comparison with 1999, its 'structural elements' have undergone significant changes. In particular, one can see the decrease of working population and pre-school children (from 47 in 1993 to 24 in 1999 people per 100 families while in 1986 there were 54), the increase of non-working from 16 to 22 (5 in 1986), the emergence of a new 'structural element' – children of 7–17 years old who neither study nor work (6 people per 100 families). The number of the pensioners remained almost unchanged. The average age of the surveyed working population increased distinctly.

Judging from self-assessment of the population, material standing of families deteriorated drastically in the 1990s, then improved slightly though

it hasn't reached the level of 1986 (Table 2). Taking into consideration multi-oriented changes in the concept of 'basic necessities of life', it should be mentioned that; on average, the level of these 'necessities' decreased. Basically, in terms of numbers, the adequate provision with durable consumer goods in 1999–2005 has changed slightly. The share of families possessing musical instruments, sports equipment, libraries has decreased. However, the share of families who can afford vacuum cleaners, video cameras, cameras, especially personal computer (from 0% to 14%) and video players (from 0% to 28%) has increased notably. The number of families who can afford cars has increased (increase from 36% in 1999 to 49% in 2005). As far as the purchase of durable consumer goods is concerned over the last two years before the survey, in 1999 there was an increase in the majority of goods in comparison with 1999 and with exception of musical instruments. The share of those who bought anything from the list of everyday goods given to the respondents over the last half a year before the survey has increased significantly. In 1999, the share of those who were buying goods has decreased.

There were notable changes in the use of different ways to upkeep and improve material standing of families. Besides, one can see significant changes in the answers on the questions how the family tries to maintain or improve their material standing. The share of those respondents who worked in private plots decreased from 70 to 45%; the share of the respondents who admit to work more, including additional work, increased from 11% to 26%. There were cases of renting out the land as a source of profit.

The share of those having more or less constant secondary job was most stable (12–15%), the number of those willing to have the secondary job decreased (reduction from 40% in 1999 to 30% in 2005). Being initially low, the activity of the families of rural workers in businesses (except private plot and secondary job) providing them with additional money income or necessary services and goods including those for exchange has shown a downward tendency. The share of such families in 2005, as compared to 1999, decreased by one third (from 9% to 6%).

The workers' estimation of changes, which take place in the local living conditions or in the family, strongly influences their internal state and their real behaviour. As Sorokin P.A. pointed out 'poverty or well-being of a person is not determined by what he possesses at the given moment, but what he possessed earlier and comparing with the other members of the

community' (Sorokin 1992: 273). In the 90s, these estimates (Table 3) have changed to the opposite as compared to the 80s. Over the last five years, the share of negative estimates of changes in conditions of life has increased significantly and the changes in goods supply were positively estimated. The conditions of work and relations between people have the most negative estimates of changes. The assessments of personal state: health, certainty in the future, and a feeling of personal safety became more negative (Table 4). The estimates of living conditions of family became positive.

The overall estimate of the outcomes of current 'reforms' logically results from particular personal changes. In 1999, it remained the same as in the end of 1994: 81% of the respondents negatively estimated these results while 5% were positive and 14% found it difficult to estimate. In 2005, the estimate was less negative than in 1999: 24% of respondents estimated reform as positive, while 53% as negative.

There occurred some notable changes in value orientations. A family as value saves its first place (77% of answers). In 2005, the share of those who mentioned 'health' (56%), 'material well-being' (52%), 'stability of living conditions' (35%) has increased. But the value of 'good relations between people' sharply declined (from 28% in 1999 to 19% in 2005). The 'respect from the associates, the feeling of self-importance' was observed as noticeably rising.

In the opinion of the rural working people, the importance of education has increased. While in 1994, 26% considered that good education had lost its significance (34% in 2005), in 1999 those of the same opinion amounted to for 17% and in 2005 – 6%. In 1986, 31% of the respondents suffered from the lack of education necessary to fulfil their work duties and this share tended to increase (46% in 1999) which was likely caused by the significantly decreased possibilities for advanced training and professional growth. As much as 70% of the respondents suffered from the lack of education and skills.

Family production of goods and services (household production)

At the beginning of the 90s, as a continuation of the trends of the second half of the 80s, the predominantly extensive growth of private plot was observed: upsizing of almost all basic elements, work in the plot and share

of this work in total work load. In the end of the 90s, the trends of the beginning of the decade changed drastically (Table 5).

Working on private plot for the families of workers is supposed to be the second by work duration, but the first essential and vitally important work. If one sums up the working time in private plot of only two main members of the family – working woman and working man – one can get 32.5 hours per averaged seasonal week or more than 1690 hours per year (in 1999–1900)! However, private plot ‘doesn’t allow the average rural family to improve notably their welfare, but provides them with the opportunity to balance on the verge of poverty’ (Kutenkov, Shabanov 2000: 17) and to keep body and soul together.

Money income from private plots to cumulative wage of family members in 2005 amounted to for 27% as compared to 37% in 1999 (for the month preceding the survey – May). In 2005, in the quarter of the families, more than a half of the products obtained from private plots was sold (in 1999 – this figure was twice as little), whereas the share of those who consumed all the products, or the products were partly consumed by the relatives decreased from 65% to 45%.

In the beginning of the 2000s, the number of the main species of cattle decreased while the number of poultry increased. Thus, having taken into consideration money and work inputs, assistance of agricultural enterprises and profitability of the sold goods, agricultural workers have made their choice. The share of the respondents who supposed that it is possible to survive without private plots has doubled (from 10% to 22%).

The tendency of the 90s to increase the share of those who use various services – especially transport, redecoration of flats and house-building, car servicing – has continued. The share of those who do not make use of services decreased from 40% in 1993 to 18% in 2005. The tendency to reinforce self-service can be clearly traced (Table 6). According to the last survey data, the mostly widespread service was transport and hairdressers (almost a half of the respondents used these services).

The nature of mutual aid between rural families and their relatives living both in the village and in the town/city has changed a lot. Financial aid has increased while the aid in the form of work, both from rural and urban relatives, decreased. Rural families have reduced their work aid in the village but their product aid to the urban relatives has increased.

Changes in time budget of the rural population

Time indicators and time-budget method to obtain data on the activities seem to be the most effective especially if used in comparative dynamic studies including various moments of historical time under one indispensable condition – uniformity of using this method. After the survey, over the period of 1999, working time redistribution among principal activities was still in progress (Tables 7, 8).

The decline in large-scale agricultural production, production fund and resources resulted in the sharp reduction of employment as a whole and working time of the workers in particular. Besides, another process takes place – the share of unskilled work for both agricultural workers and those employed in education increases.

The process of overcoming of extreme situation in the sphere of work, as we call it after the survey of 1986–1987, has started in the beginning of the 90s. The survey of 2004–2005 revealed the continuation of this trend. Women's total workload continued to decrease mainly due to household work and work in private plots with some increase of working time. The decrease of birth rate and the number of children in a family resulted in the reduction of child-care time. It is important to mention that the time for sleep and personal care as well as free time has tended to increase. We consider all these changes to be positive. The similar although even more noticeable changes have been observed in males' total workload with the time for sleep, personal care and child-care time remaining the same in comparison with 1999, where free time has slightly increased due to the growth of active rest (fishing, hunting).

As compared to 1986–1987, in 1999 in an average seasonal week, working time for women decreased from 8.2 hours and 10.2 hours for men with the simultaneous reduction – especially for women – of total workload amounting to 7.6 hours and 3.8 hours correspondingly. Men spent their 'spare' time to the work on private plot (5.5 hours), household obligations and errands (1.8 hours), sleep, meals, personal care (2.2 hours). As far as women are concerned, their sleep and work on a private plot increased (though decreased comparing with 1993–1994). However, the main change is the increase of free time from 15.6 hours up to 20.5 hours. The difference between male and female total workload decreased (from 13.2 hours in 1975–1976 to 8 hours in 1999).

The changes seem positive, even more if taking into account the criteria of the 60s: workload reduction of agricultural workers, increase of 'recreation' time, leisure time for women, women workload.

As significant share of the workers considers their total workload too excessive – 'work at full stretch' – the joint family work allowed 18% (14% in 1999) of families to improve their financial position, but improvement of material standing over the last 5 years was marked by 28% of the workers (in 1999 only by 7% of the workers). Unfortunately, we failed to obtain the estimates of workload in the previous surveys. But it should be pointed out that the share of those willing to use the supplementary free time for passive rest increased again; the duration of such a kind of rest slightly decreased in 2005 as compared with 1999 for both men and women.

In comparison with the period of 1975–1976, working population share in the total workload in household production and private plot per averaged seasonal week in 2004–2005 increased on by 10.7 percentage points with the percentage point of woman-workers (on by 6.1% for agricultural woman-workers) being 57.7% (49.5%) from the duration of the total workload. For male these figures are 15.1%, (16%), 35.6%, (35.2%) correspondingly. Time budget of agricultural working woman has undergone other changes: working time continued to decrease and reached its maximum level during the observed period of working time in private plots (as it was with men's time budget). On the other hand, household work time appeared to be minimal. As a result, total workload turned out to be minimal – more than 10 hours less than in the 'peak' period of 1986–1987.

On the whole, there appeared a significant reduction of the difference between the working men and working women in terms of total workload, free time, personal care and sleep. In particular, total workload in 1986–1987 was maximal for both working women and working men with the women exceeding men on by 16.6 hours. In 2004–2005 this difference decreased to 5.3 hours. The duration of free time was minimal in that period with the difference in favour of men to 9.6 hours. In 2004–2005 the difference was reduced to 5.2 hours.

The similar situation occurred with the time spent on the satisfaction of physiological needs, in particular, sleeping time. Minimal figures were observed in 1986–1987 with the difference in 2.7 hours in favour of men. The period of 2004–2005 witnessed a minimal difference (0.1 hour), but this time, in favour of women.

On the whole, the changes mentioned above are supposed to be rather positive and testify to the fact that extreme difference between working men and women in terms of total workload and the structure of time use has been overcome.

In case of with the agricultural workers, these changes were even more drastic. In 1986–1987 women's total workload was 12.5 hours higher than that for men while their free time and time spent on satisfaction of physiological needs was 12.4 and 2.4 hours lower. In 2004–2005, total workload increased by 5.5 hours while free time and the time spent on satisfying of physiological decreased by 4.1 and 1.5 hours.

One could observe a slow process of the reduction time use differences in basic social working groups: agricultural workers and social sphere workers. Rural intelligentsia became more 'peasant-like'.

The reduction of personal care and child-care time (predominantly for preschool age children) was a direct consequence of the decrease in the number of children. Relatively, counting on one child, the child-care time has even increased.

Unfortunately, we do not possess the relevant statistical data to undertake computation of total time balance of the rural population of the region as it was done on the basis of 1975–1976 data. In that period, in the total value of time use in agricultural production, the shares of working time and the time spent on private plots and household production were almost equal. At the present time, the share of working time has significantly decreased.

As far as non-working able-bodied population is concerned, it is relevant to mention some important changes. For men over the last period (in the first and second surveys such group was not distinguished and we did not allocate sample quote to it) work on private plot decreased with evident reduction of household work and significant increase of free time. For women, household work decreased to a great extent due to birth rate and respectively reduction of child-care while work on private plot remained the same.

Use of free time

According to the survey, the main functions of free time are rest and socializing. As compared to 1986, cognitive-pragmatic function has lost its value. In leisure time, one out of five workers manages to do anything

useful for the family; one out of eight gets to know something new and interesting. Few people mentioned health-improvement function (except rest).

Satisfaction resulting from the way of spending free time increased from 35% in 1999 to 46% in 2005, the share of the dissatisfied decreased from 62% to 50%. A dramatic growth of money value as the reason for dissatisfaction was observed (Table 9). People became accustomed and resigned to the necessity of spending a lot of time working both at home and at work. On the other hand, in 1999, time possibilities improved especially for women, judging from the changes in their time budgets. Still, the 'attachment' to their own households was rather strong.

The dependence between the work on private plot and tiredness of this work and free time dissatisfaction significantly decreased. On the whole, budget time changes correspond to the changes in responds from the questionnaires about the frequency of particular types of free time activities and visiting cultural, recreational, and athletic facilities.

In 1994–2005, one could observe the growth of time devoted to socializing whereas it reached its lower level in 1993–1994 during the whole period of observation.

As before, developing function of free time slackens and TV-nature of its use and information support strengthens. In comparison with 1986–1987, the share of TV-watching in free time has increased for women from 36% to 50%, for men – from 23% to 55%. In fact, significant share increase of TV-watching time in the 2000s was spent on watching useless and even psychologically harmful for rural population TV commercials.

Judging by the responds of the parents, almost all types of leisure activities of children mentioned in the questionnaire notably decreased, particularly these regarding reading and arts. This trend has reflected on the decrease of the overall satisfaction of the parents with leisure activities of their children: the number of those who are satisfied with leisure activities of their children decreased.

Spending vacation has changed a lot. For a variety of reasons, 19% of the respondents did not have vacation in 1998 and 40% in 2004. The same share of the respondents as it was in the 1990s, spent their vacation in their settlements (85%, in 1986 such respondents amounted to for 77%). The share of those who visited relatives in other villages has reduced in time (from 11% in 1986 to 2% in 2004) and in the city (from 18% to

5%). It should be mentioned that during vacation, the share of those who concerned themselves with children increased (in 1999 – 3%, in 2004 – 8%, but in 1986 this figure amounted to for 18%). As far as other occupations are concerned, they remained unchanged including family household production where one can observe a slight decrease of activities in the 1990s.

Basically, out of four time points, free time activities reached its peak in 1986–1987. These activities varied a lot: going in for sports, reading special literature and fiction, newspapers, playing and talking with children, visiting cultural and public-service institutions. Still, it happened in the period of peak working activity and the lowest duration of free time!

Conclusions

1. In the second half of the 80s, work on the private plot showed an upward tendency, with the working time on collective farm for men remaining the same and for women decreasing due to free time and sleep reduction. The similar situation was observed in the beginning of the 90s. We suppose that there were several reasons for the changes in everyday activity and time use in the second half of the 80s – beginning of the 90s: family value increased, importance of its welfare standing, upbringing and education of children, new social-psychological atmosphere characterized by optimism, assurance that work can improve financial position of the family, measures to support family household, intuitive expectation of difficulties connected with changes, and, finally, life difficulties of the early 90s. In the second half of the 90s, working time began to decrease sharply, especially for men, the majority of whom were engaged in agriculture. Further, in the like manner, the total work time on private plot was also declining.

2. The reduction of total workload of rural workers in the second half of the 90s and in the beginning of the 2000s is related to the decrease in agricultural production resources, degradation of the majority of agricultural enterprises and social sphere, family choice of the size and structure of private plot respective to the production conditions, realisation of products, and survival level of the family, and, perhaps, the instinct of self-preservation.

3. The obtained data reveal contradiction of trends with the current situation. On the one hand, the real value of family household and its main component – private plot – became obvious, the tendency towards self-provision and certain independence of families also increased in the conditions of dramatic fall of public production and services. On the other hand, there is a tendency to reduce family households because of deteriorating keeping conditions or disparity between them and the needs of the rural population. The data show that the family makes a definite choice.

First, it reduces some elements of family households and increases the others. Second, it reduces and changes the structure of workload, which, first and foremost, concerns women. It takes place against the predominance of work inputs into the family households (private plots) with insignificant, but still growing capital share.

4. There is a transition from adaptation to changed living conditions (beginning of the 1990s) to adaptation to market relations (end of the 1990s-beginning of the 2000s). At the present moment, however there are consequences of this transition for individual families and for the country, the nation as a whole are far from clear.

Such an adaptation can cause definite threats that are of limited character, but still, it contributes to survival rather than development. A new routine reality appeared which is characterized by overall reduction of the share of skilled work in the total workload, certain equilibrium of work cost, size of private plots, money income and income in kind corresponding to maintenance level of the population.

Table 1. Social-demographic characteristics and living conditions of the rural workers

Characteristics, conditions	1975	1986	1999	2005
1. Social-demographic characteristics				
Share of women, %	57	59	56	56
Average age, years	37.6	38.0	39.6	41.8
Married, %	84	88	84	82
Family size, persons per 100 families	398	372	370	355
Including working family members, persons per 100 families	208	200	180	203
Number of pre-school and school age children per 100 families	147	141	125	89
Do not have a secondary education, %	71	45	24	18
2. Social-professional characteristics				
In material production	64	59	60	53
Including agriculture	47	41	57	40
In institutions of care of public health, education, culture, leisure	26	29	31	25
In commerce, communal service, everyday repairs and other services	9	10	7	23
In other branches	1	2	2	9
3. Family living conditions				
Availability of convenience, % of families				
Water-pipe	25	41	79	71
Central heating	16	29	28	32
Heat water	4	7	12	16
Gas or electric stove	76	85	96	91

Table 2. Self-assessment of family material standing: working population, %

Assessment	1987	1999	2005
We can afford everything, there is enough money for everything	10	<1	>1
Overall, we have enough money	42	4	16
There is enough money for necessities only	39	41	58

[204]

Table 2. Self-assessment of family material standing

Assessment	1987	1999	2005
There is not enough money for the necessities	8	53	24
Uncertain	1	2	1

Table 3. How did working population in the rural areas assess changes in living conditions compared to 3–5 years ago (Per cent of response)*

Living conditions	1987		1999		2005	
	Conditions of life 3 to 5 years ago were:					
	better	worse	better	worse	better	worse
Work conditions	48	8	3	75	8	39
Transport, roads condition	64	8	15	63	30	30
Medical services	56	6	5	73	16	17
Convenience services, repairs	51	17	4	67	15	23
Upbringing of children and education	44	11	9	55	14	21
Shopping	40	26	48	35	68	7
Conditions for leisure and rest	22	19	10	56	7	24

Table 4. How did working population in the rural areas assess changes in their statement and the family living conditions compared to 3–5 years ago (Per cent of response)*

Living conditions, statement	1993		1999		2005	
	Conditions of life 3 to 5 years ago were:					
	better	worse	better	worse	better	worse
Family's housing conditions	29	18	11	33	22	12
Feeling of personal safety	3	32	2	40	6	29
Perceived state of health	3	44	2	49	5	44
Financial position	9	64	7	73	28	24
Certainty in the future	6	69	2	71	11	41

Table 4. How did working population

Living conditions, statement	1993		1999		2005	
	Conditions of life 3 to 5 years ago were:					
	better	worse	better	worse	better	worse
Degree of personal freedom	14	13	13	17	12	10
Relations between people	2	72	3	69	5	49

* The percentage does not add up to 100 because some respondents were not sure about the direction of change.

Table 5. The cattle and poultry population at a private plot of the rural workers (heads per 100 families of workers)

Cattle, poultry	1975	1987	1993	1999	2005
Cows	66	63	97	84	80
Other cattle	45	67	105	71	69
Sheep, goats	294	467	540	295	284
Pigs	39	70	120	188	163
Poultry	1189	1164	1603	1749	2157
Horses	-	1	9	16	11

Table 6. Using of services and self-service (per cent of response)

Kind of service	1986	1993	1999	2005
	Services from the side	Services from the side	Services from the side	Services from the side
Sewing, knitting, clothes repair	66	36	10	18
Repair of TV and radio mechanics	84	78	56	} 19
Repair of domestic appliances	77	71	41	
Repair of house, flat	4	3	2	15
Repair of car, other vehicle	5	6	6	16
Transport service	72	66	47	48

Table 7. Time budget of the `working rural population (hours per `averaged` work week)*

Activities	Women						Men					
	1975- 1976	1986- 1987	1993- 1994	1999	2004- 2005		1975- 1976	1986- 1987	1993- 1994	1999	2004- 2005	
Number	821	726	689	501	545		635	475	525	373	420	
Working time	43.9	43.4	36.5	35.2	36.6		54.4	54.5	49.6	44.3	47.5	
Time related to work	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.2		4.1	4.4	4.8	4.1	4.3	
Household obligations and errands	23.3	24.5	25.7	24.1	20.7		5.0	5.0	5.4	6.8	6.2	
Prepare food	8.9	9.8	10.5	11.1	8.9		0.9	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.6	
Indoor cleaning	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.3		0.7	1.2	1.1	1.8	1.3	
Laundry, ironing, clothes upkeep	3.4	2.9	4.1	2.7	2.2		0.4	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	
Shopping	0.8	0.8	0.7	1.1	1.9		1.9	2.4	0.9	0.3	0.3	
Work on the private plot	12.9	15.2	18.6	17.6	16.5		9.4	13.9	17.1	19.4	16.0	
work on household plot	4.7	4.8	6.1	5.6	6.1		3.2	3.1	3.6	3.1	4.6	
care of livestock and poultry	6.4	7.6	10.0	8.5	8.6		4.1	6.6	9.2	11.4	8.8	
other operations	1.8	2.8	2.5	3.5	1.8		2.1	4.2	4.3	4.9	2.5	
Child care/contact with children	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.2	2.5		1.5	2.6	1.7	1.3	1.3	
child care	2.2	3.0	2.4	1.8	1.4		0.7	1.1	0.6	0.5	0.3	
Playing, talking with children	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.1		0.8	1.5	1.1	0.8	1.0	
Personal needs	61.5	60.9	61.2	63.4	66.0		66.8	63.2	63.3	65.6	66.0	
Sleep	51.0	48.9	48.6	50.2	51.8		55.7	51.5	49.7	52.0	52.3	

Table 7. Time budget of the \working rural population

Activities	Women					Men				
	1975–1976	1986–1987	1993–1994	1999	2004–2005	1975–1976	1986–1987	1993–1994	1999	2004–2005
Free time	17.7	14.7	16.4	19.1	20.0	25.9	23.7	24.3	24.6	25.3
Education and self-education	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Watching TV	4.6	5.6	7.3	9.4	10.5	6.2	10.3	11.9	14.4	14.4
Entertainment or visiting friends	4.3	3.1	3.6	3.3	3.8	4.8	3.0	3.8	3.3	3.8
Reading	1,8	1,8	2,1	1,7	1,1	3,3	2,3	2,3	1,1	1,2
Active rest and sport	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4	2.6	3.0	1.6	0.9	1.5
Other	0.8	0.8	1.7	1.0	1.5	0.9	0.7	1.8	1.8	1.6
Total workload including child-care	86.8	90.7	87.4	83.1	79.4	73.6	78.9	77.5	75.1	74.1
Free time including contacts with children	18.9	15.6	17.7	20.5	21.1	26.7	25.2	25.4	25.4	26.3

* Time use in this Table was averaged for Summer (June) and a Winter (November).

** In thick print in this Table noticed time expenditures 1999 changes of what are statistical significant relatively 1986–1987 and time expenditures 1999 changes to 2005 simultaneously on criteria of Mann-Whitney and Kolmogorov-Smirnov with a probability more 99%.

Table 8. Time budget of agricultural workers living in rural areas (hours per "averaged" work week)

Activities	Women					Men				
	1975-1976	1986-1987	1993-1994	1999	2004-2005	1975-1976	1986-1987	1993-1994	1999	2004-2005
Number	278	211	233	166	167	376	263	322	287	226
Working time	48.1	45.1	40.1	38.6	35.9	60.4	60.1	54.7	45.2	49.9
Time related to work	5.1	6.1	5.5	6.1	5.8	3.8	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.1
Household obligations and errands	20.8	24.2	24.8	23.3	20.5	4.0	3.0	3.6	6.8	5.2
Work on the private plot	16.8	18.9	19.8	18.5	22.2	9.8	15.4	16.3	19.7	20.2
Child care/contact with children	3.4	2.7	3.6	2.0	1.7	1.2	1.7	1.5	1.0	1.3
Child care	2.4	1.9	2.3	1.2	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.3
Playing, talking with children	1.0	0.8	1.3	0.8	0.7	0.6	1.0	1.4	0.6	1.0
Personal needs	59.1	58.5	58.8	60.4	62.8	66.3	60.9	62.3	65.9	64.1
Sleep	49.1	46.9	47.1	48.1	48.7	55.5	48.9	49.0	52.4	50.7
Free time	13.9	11.7	14.4	17.7	17.8	22.0	21.9	23.2	23.6	21.6
Education and self-education	0	0	0	0,1	0	0	0	0	0,1	0,1
Watching TV	4.3	5.5	6.2	8.7	10.3	4.7	9.4	11.7	13.7	14.6
Entertainment or visiting friends	2.7	2.2	4.1	2.8	2.8	4.5	2.8	3.9	3.2	2.0
Other	0.8	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.3	0.5	0.5	2.1	1.5	1.4
Total workload including child-care	93.2	96.2	92.5	87.7	85.3	78.6	83.7	79.0	76.4	79.8
Free time including contacts with children	14.9	12.5	15.7	18.5	18.5	22.6	22.9	24.6	24.2	22.6

Table 9. What prevents to spend free time as one could have wished (main causes) (Per cent of response)

Causes, conditions	1986	1993	1999	2005
Household work, a private plot	22	46	15	30
Tiredness from primary and household work	9	26	11	19
Lack of means	4	14	36	29
Bad health	4	4	4	2
Insufficient conditions for leisure spending	23	28	28	15
Not enough free time	31	55	40	37
Inability to organize a leisure	2	1	1	n/a*
Not enough skills, abilities	<1	1	4	n/a
Other	6	3	5	2
Nothing prevents	32	10	<1	<1

* no data available.

The source of all tables in the article: own research.

References

- Juster, F.Tomas and Stafford, Frank P. (1991) The Allocation of Time: Empirical Findings, Behavioral Models, and Problems of Measurement. *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. XXIX.
- 'Konturi socialnoj politiki' (2000) (obzor konferencii) [Outlines of Social Politics. Review of Conference]. *EKO*. No. 10.
- Kutenkov, R.P., Shabanov, V.A. (2000) Analiz strukturi dohodov selskih domohozjajstv po alternativnim istochnikam informacii [Analysis of Income Structure of the Rural Households on Alternative Sources of Information]. *Voprosi statistiki* (Questions of Statistics), No. 8.
- Sorokin, P.A. *Sociologija revoljucii//Chelovek. Civilizacija. Obschestvo.* (1992) [Sociology of Revolution. Man. Civilization. Society.]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Zaslavskaja, T.I. (ed.), 1980. *Metodologija i metodika sistemnogo izuchenija sovetskoj derevni* [Methodology and Methods of System Research of Soviet Countryside]. Novosibirsk.

Zaslavskaja, T.I., 1997. 'Problema demokraticheskoj pereorientacii ekonomiki sovremennoj Rossii' [Problem of Democratic Re-orientation of the Present Russian Economy]. *Obschestvo i ekonomika* [Society and Economy], Vol. 1-2.

Zaslavskaja, T.I., Muchnik, V. (eds.), 1997. *Razvitie selskih poselenij* [Development of the Rural Settlements]. Moscow.