

Viktor Artemov, Olga Novokhatskaia

**Conditions and Way of Life
of the Rural Population in Siberia:
Trends of the 1990s***

Introduction

Social changes in different spheres of society can be generated by governmental decisions, foreign events and their influence on internal social processes. As a rule, these three "factors" are connected with each other.

Above all, we are interested in the everyday life of the majority of the population, their conditions, quality of life and needs. According to T. I. Zaslavskaia the lowest stratum accounts for 2/3 of the population with 9–12% of "the honest poor who live on or beyond the poverty line" [1, c. 55]. We view the rural population as an important indicative group showing the state and trends of everyday activity.

Longitudinal Survey of the 1970–1990s.

We are involved in a longitudinal study of the rural area of Novosibirsk *oblast* (region) as a typical rural area for both south-western Siberia and the country as a whole. (In particular, the data obtained in 1999 on comparable indicators of families' economic behaviour, value orientation, assessment of reforms are very close to the results of the all-Russian survey [2]).

In 1975–76, 1986–87, 1993–94, 1999 four bi-seasonal surveys about the living conditions, time use and everyday activities of the population were conducted. In every survey, apart from the last, 1,500 people were polled; due to organizational and financial difficulties only 1,170 people were polled in the last survey.

* Paper prepared for the XIX Congress of the European Society for Rural Sociology, Dijon, France, 3–7 September 2001.

There is no doubt that at present, the period 1986–1987 is the reference point for all changes which took place during the nineties. That was the beginning of significant and radical changes for both the state and society. The period 1993–1994 was the starting point of socio-economic stabilization with a sharp drop in living conditions for the majority of the population. 1999 was the year of the next bi- (or poly-) furcation state of the society with vague perspectives.

Methodology and Organization of the Survey

We aimed to eliminate to a maximum the influence of organizational and methodological causes on obtained empirical data. We have, therefore, undertaken “stabilization measures”.

Sampling of population. Before the beginning of our first rural survey, the three-factor socio-economic-demographic typology of rural communities had already been built and substantially described: by two classes of the urbanization factor, by three classes of the industrialization factor and by two classes of the natural population change factor.

In essence, we were the first to make use, in the formation of a sample 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. Zaslavskaja [3, 4]. The sample of rural settlements of different types was retained. So far, there has been no doubt in its representativeness with regard to the absolute number of rural places in the region or even in Russia as a whole, for that matter.

Another significant characteristic of the sampled population was the functional “subsystem of the rural side” and groups of the non-working 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 the base population and the need to survey small groups, a non-proportional sample was used. The selection of respondents was made from register books at random in several stages according to the predesigned quotas for groups.

The composition of used data. For the analysis of the dynamics, apart from time budget data, several kinds of information were used, i.e. the characteristic of the population itself, individual-household living conditions, information on behaviour, evaluation of particular activities given by rural residents themselves, and, finally, statistical data on the settlement and some characteristics of the residents.

Method and instruments. One method was used for collecting time use data, i.e. a retrospective survey about the previous day. Questionnaires, forms for collecting data on the settlements, instruction of interviewers in-

specting the coding personnel were stable, with minimum changes. This method is retrospective — they ask respondents for a time allocation of the previous day. It is proved empirically that the time diaries method gives reliable measurement, while other methods are unsatisfactory [5].

Organization of the survey. The composition of the research team was relatively stable which secured the conformity in the work of interviewers and coders. The time of the survey did not in fact differ: summer (not peak) — June — and winter months — November and December were constantly chosen.

Base period of time use analysis. The 7-day calendar week is the most convenient period for time use analysis. According to this, in surveys where the time record of respondents is kept for one or several days, a rated weekly budget of several types is introduced. 1) The budget of a seasonal calendar week was estimated on the basis of the number of work days and days off in the 7-day (winter or summer) week and the appropriate time budgets. 2) The budget of an average seasonal week is the average arithmetical week on the basis of winter and summer budgets. 3) Much less was used in an average annual week when work days and days off are recorded (including vacation, sick and other non-working days).

“Dynamic” arrays. In longitudinal studies it turns out very useful for statistical analysis to connect data relevant to different time points. Thus obtained “dynamic” arrays allow one to employ standard statistical packages of programmes for the implementation of comparative studies. Pulling together height arrays of rural surveys in 1970–1990 made it possible to carry out an additional analysis of the changes in the population’s use of time which occurred over the given period. “Dynamic” arrays allow considerable improvement, depth and statistical support, for the technical ease of the analysis of social shifts, in particular of changes in time use.

The results of our longitudinal survey concerning the working population calling our attention to the 1990s are presented below. Notice that the revealed trends are largely a consequence of the state of society and of its changes rather than a reflection of regional specifics.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Surveyed Population, Principal Changes in the Structure and Living Conditions of Rural Families in the 1990s

In our surveys we tried to preserve our sample along four parameters: total number, the share of residents living in villages with different types of urbanization and industrialization, the share of working and non-working pensioners, those producing homemade goods or working on private plots, the share of employees engaged in functional sub-systems of the village. To some extent, this worked well with the exception of the last bi-seasonal survey.

In our sample, in comparison with the statistical data from 1.01.1999, the share of those employed in public health, education and culture is twice as high, with the share of those working in agriculture, commerce, catering, consumer services, housing and communal services, being similar (Table 1).

Table 1
Some socio-demographic characteristics and living conditions
of the surveyed population

Characteristics, conditions	1975	1986	1993	1999
1. Socio-demographic characteristics				
Women, %	57	59	59	56
Average age	37.6	38.0	38.7	39.6
Married, %	84	88	85	84
Family size, persons per 100 families	398	372	375	370
Working family members, persons per 100 families	208	200	191	180
Number of pre-school and school age children per 100 families	147	141	138	125
Without secondary education, %	71	45	32	24
Live in urban settlements, %	57	68	65	56
2. Socio-professional characteristics				
Engaged in branch of the national economy, %				
In material production	64	59	62	60
Including agriculture	47	41	46	57
In institutions of public health care, education, culture, leisure	26	29	27	31
In commerce, communal service, everyday repairs and other services	9	10	9	7
In other branches	1	2	2	2
Average monthly salary, in roubles	114	158	18,600	347
3. Family living conditions				
Income per capita (without a private plot), roubles per month	74	99	11,000	233
Availability of household conveniences, % of families				
Mains water	25	41	67	79
Central heating	16	29	36	28
Hot water	4	7	13	12
Gas or electric stove	76	85	95	96

Over the last decade, the size of the share being more or less constant, its "structural elements" have undergone significant changes. In particular, one can see the decrease in the working population and pre-school children (from 47 in 1993 to 24 in 1999 people per 100 families, while in 1986 there

were 54), an increase in the non-working population from 16 to 22 (in 1986 — 5), the emergence of a new “structural element” — 7–17-year-old children who neither study nor work (6 people per 100 families). The number of pensioners remained almost unchanged. The average age of the surveyed working population increased significantly.

Table 2

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

Assessment	1987	1993	1999
We can afford everything, we have enough money for everything	10	1	< 1
Overall, we have enough money	42	13	4
We only have enough money for the necessities	39	45	41
We do not have enough money for the necessities	8	41	53
Uncertain	1	0	2

Judging from the self-esteem of the population, the material standing of families continued to deteriorate (Table 2). Taking into consideration the multi-oriented changes in the concept of “basic necessities of life”, it should be mentioned that on average, the level of these “necessities” decreased. In terms of numbers, the adequate provision of durable consumer goods in 1986–1999 has slightly changed. The number of families owning leisure goods such as musical instruments, sports equipment and books has decreased. However, the number of families who can afford vacuum cleaners, tape recorders, video cameras, video players (from 0 to 28%) and cars (from 21 to 36%) has increased significantly. As far as the purchase of *durable consumer goods* is concerned during the two years before the survey, in 1999 there was a reduction in the majority of goods in comparison with 1994 with the exception of TV-sets (increase from 12% in 1994 to 14% in 1999), cars (4% and 8%), and video players (almost 0% to 7%). The total number of those who bought nothing from the list of *everyday goods* given to the respondents over the last half-year before the survey remained unchanged (6%), but the number of those who bought goods has decreased. At the same time, the number of those who bought construction materials and medication increased.

The families of those workers who estimated their financial position as “we have enough money for everything” had a per capita income of 1,833 roubles in May 1999 (including 1,000 roubles from private holdings). Under estimation “overall, we have enough money”, their income accounted for 711 roubles. Those who considered that “we only have enough money for necessities” had an income of 391 roubles. The income of those, who said “we do not have enough money for the basic necessities” was 202 roubles.

There were no significant changes in the use of different ways of maintaining and improving material standing. The share of those with a more or less constant extra job was most stable (14–16%), the number of those willing to have an extra job increased 1.5 times (growth from 26% in 1993 to 39% in 1999). Being initially low, the activity of the families of people working in business (with the exception of private plots) providing them with an additional income or necessary services and goods including those for exchange has shown a downward tendency. The number of such families in 1999 as compared to 1993 halved (from 9% to 4%).

Table 3

How did the surveyed population assess changes in living conditions
(Percentage of response)*

Living conditions statement	1987		1993		1999	
	conditions of life 3 to 5 years ago were:					
	better	worse	better	worse	better	worse
Work conditions	48	8	n/a**		3	75
Transport, roads condition	64	8	17	50	15	63
Medical services	56	6	5	49	5	73
Convenience services, repairs	51	17	4	66	4	67
Upbringing and education of children	44	11	8	33	9	55
Shopping	40	26	25	46	48	35
Conditions for leisure and rest	22	19	9	37	10	

* The percentages do not add up to 100 because some respondents were unsure about the direction of change.

** n/a: no data available.

The workers' estimation of changes taking place in the *local living conditions* or in the family strongly influences on their internal state and their real behaviour. As P. A. Sorokin pointed out "poverty or the well-being of a person is not measured by what he possesses at a given moment, but what he possessed earlier and compared with the other members of the community" [6, p. 273]. In the 1990s, these estimates (Table 3) changed almost to the opposite compared with the 1980s. Over the last five years, the negative evaluation of changes in leisure conditions, the upbringing of children and education has increased. On the whole, only the changes in goods supply were positively estimated.

The estimates *of the personal state and state of mind*: health, certainty of the future, feeling of personal safety became more negative (Table 4). The changes in relations between people become less negative than in 1993.

The overall estimate of the outcomes of current "reforms" logically results from particular personal changes. In 1999 it remained the same as at

the end of 1994: 81% of the respondents estimated these results negatively, while 5% were positive and 14% had difficulty estimating it.

Table 4

How did the working population in rural areas assess changes in their statement and the family living conditions (Percentage of response)*

Living conditions, statement	1993		1999	
	conditions of life 3 to 5 years ago were:			
	better	worse	better	worse
Family housing conditions	29	18	11	33
Feeling of personal safety	3	32	2	40
Perceived state of health	3	44	2	49
Financial position	9	64	7	73
Certainty in the future	6	69	2	71
Degree of personal freedom	14	13	13	17
Relations between people	2	72	3	69

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

Some notable changes occurred in *value orientations*. The share of those who mentioned "health" (it has moved to second place after "family", having left behind "material well-being") "stable living conditions", "relations between people", "respect of associates, the feeling of self-esteem" was observed as rising considerably. Work, including skills and abilities on the collective farm dropped in importance.

According to the rural working people the importance of education has increased. If in 1994, 26% considered that good education had lost significance, in 1999 those of the same opinion accounted for 17%. 46% of the respondents suffered due to lack of education.

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 a predominantly extensive growth of the household plot was observed. At the end of the 90s, the trends of the beginning of the decade changed drastically (Table 5). The size of some elements of the household plot tended to increase (livestock of pigs increased 1.5 times), while others decreased in number (15% reduction of livestock of cows, other cattle — 1/3 reduction, the number of goats and sheep decreased to 250 heads per 100 families). However, the livestock population of horses as important "natural" means of production grew significantly. The importance of house-

hold plot for survival tended to increase. Given the decline in job opportunities and remuneration, the working members (33%) supposed that the family could only survive thanks to their household plot. At the same time, only 10% of the respondents consider it possible to survive without a household plot, while 86% found them vitally important.

Table 5

The cattle and poultry population on a household plot
(Heads per 100 surveyed families)

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

The signs of a tendency to greater efficiency of household production are seen in the real common and local socio-economic conditions. The household plots adapt to the deteriorating conditions and to the family labour potential and motivation.

The relative marketability and profitability of private plots has increased. In particular, in 1994, 7% of families sold more than half of their production for cash, in 1999 this figure almost doubled (13%). At the same time, the share of families who consumed all or shared part of the production with relatives declined considerably. According to the data, financial income from the plot during the month prior to the survey became comparable to the total wage paid to the working members of the family, whereas in 1993 it accounted for only 2%. The analysis on the basis of "budget" family data made by Goskomstat and World Bank surveys in the villages of Saratov region [7], revealed that in 1997–1998 the gross income of a rural family consisted of money including cash received from private holdings, which accounted for 33%, 2/3 of it "in kind" (28% — payment in kind and 39% — products of private plot). Moreover, production resources for cattle breeding prevailed in payment in kind. From 1/3 (according to the budget survey data) to 1/2 (according to the polling) of financial income was obtained from the sale of private plot products.

However, the share of those intending to reduce their private plot or give it up or those who found it difficult to give a definite answer because of unstable conditions to keep a private plot and realize production has slightly increased. The main reason for the tendency to decrease private holdings is

the lack of means to keep them, difficulties with fodder provision. Almost 1/3 (60%) of the respondents saw private plots as a *forced necessity*.

On the whole, the support from agricultural enterprises to household plots tends to decrease. Rarely do new forms of backing occur. In due time such an interaction between agricultural enterprises and plots was mutually beneficial with a clear feedback between the level of economic development of an enterprise and the quantity and size of private plots on the "territory of an enterprise" [8]. Studies of the end of the 90s show that the strategy for the family to survive largely depends on the level of socio-economic development of an enterprise: the lower the level, the greater the role of the household plot for family survival, with family intentions changing from "to become richer" (26%) to "to remain at the same level" (49%) and "if only to survive" (23%) in efficient enterprises, while in the enterprises with "destructive adaptation model" these figures correspond to 6%, 25%, 66% [9, p. 84–88]. It should be mentioned that in villages with effective agricultural enterprises a population growth or at least its preservation is observed, whereas in others a reduction process takes place.

Table 6

Use of services and "self-service"
(Percentage of response)

Kind of service	1986		1993		1999	
	services from the side	originally	services from the side	originally	services from the side	originally
Sewing, knitting, clothes repair	66	34	36	51	10	87
Sewing and shoe repairs	no data available				34	55
TV and radio repairs	84	8	78	17	56	21
Repairs of domestic appliances	77	9	71	23	41	20
Repairs of house, flat	4	94	3	96	2	96
Repairs of car, other vehicle	5	55	6	62	6	57
Transport service	72	27	66	30	47	30

The tendency to reinforce "self-service" can clearly be traced (Table 6). According to the last survey data, veterinary service was most widespread — 45% of the respondents used this service. According to the respondents, the reason for not using services listed in the questionnaire was "self-

service" (50% in 1994 and 66% in 1999) and lack of money (35% and 39% correspondingly). "Self-service" together with family and neighbourly mutual aid probably became more significant. On the whole, the reason is obvious — the reduction of the department of services in rural areas and the lack of money to pay for services. Perhaps, there is also a deep motion towards various and intensive "horizontal" interaction between families. The nature of mutual aid between rural families and their relatives living both in the village and in the town/city has changed considerably. Financial aid from rural relatives has doubled, while aid in the form of labour both from rural and urban relatives decreased. Rural families have reduced their labour aid in the village and their product aid to the urban relatives.

Changes in the Time Budget

Time indicators and the time-budget method to obtain data on the activities seem to be most effective especially if used in comparative dynamic studies including various moments of historical time with one indispensable condition — uniformity of this method.

After the survey, during the period 1993–1994, working time redistribution among principal activities was still in progress (Tables 7 and 8). Overcoming the extreme situation in the sphere of work, as we call it after the survey of 1986–1987, started at the beginning of the 90s. The 1999 survey revealed a continuation of this trend.

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 is taking place — the share of unskilled work for both agricultural workers and those employed in education is increasing.

Compared with 1986–1987, in an average seasonal week, the working time for women dropped by 8.2 hours and 10.2 hours for men with the simultaneous reduction — especially for women — of a total workload of 7.6 hours and 3.8 hours respectively. Men spent their "spare" time working on the household plot (5.5 hours), household duties and errands (1.8 hours), sleep, meals, personal care (2.2 hours). As far as women are concerned, their sleep and work on the household plot increased (though it decreased compared with 1993–1994). However, the main change is the increase of leisure time from 15.6 hours to 20.5 hours. The difference between male and female total workload reduced (from 13.2 hours in 1975–1976 to 8 hours in 1999). Russian Longitude Monitoring Survey data over the period 1995–1998 also testify to the reduction of both total workload and its three elements [10, p. 62].

Table 7

Time budget of the surveyed population
(Hours per "average" working week)*

Activities	Women				Men			
	1975- -1976	1986- -1987	1993- -1994	1999	1975- -1976	1986- -1987	1993- -1994	1999
Number	821	726	689	501	635	475	525	373
Working time	43,9	43,4	36,5	35,2	54,4	54,5	49,6	44,3
Time related to work	4,2	4,6	4,2	4,4	4,1	4,4	4,8	4,1
Household obligations and errands	23,3	24,5	25,7	24,1	5,0	5,0	5,4	6,8
Food preparation	8,9	9,8	10,5	11,1	0,9	0,6	0,7	0,9
Indoor cleaning	4,4	4,0	4,0	4,0	0,7	1,2	1,1	1,8
Laundry, ironing, clothes upkeep	3,4	2,9	4,1	2,7	0,4	0,1	0,3	0,1
Shopping	0,8	0,8	0,7	1,1	1,9	2,4	0,9	0,3
Work on private plot	12,9	15,2	18,6	17,6	9,4	13,9	17,1	19,4
work on household plot	4,7	4,8	6,1	5,6	3,2	3,1	3,6	3,1
care of livestock and poultry	6,4	7,6	10,0	8,5	4,1	6,6	9,2	11,4
other operations	1,8	2,8	2,5	3,5	2,1	4,2	4,3	4,9
Child care/contact with children	3,7	4,3	3,7	3,2	1,5	2,6	1,7	1,3
child care	2,2	3,0	2,4	1,8	0,7	1,1	0,6	0,5
Playing, talking with children	1,5	1,3	1,3	1,4	0,8	1,5	1,1	0,8
Personal needs	61,5	60,9	61,2	63,4	66,8	63,2	63,3	65,6
Sleep	51,0	48,9	48,6	50,2	55,7	51,5	49,7	52,0
Leisure time	17,7	14,7	16,4	19,1	25,9	23,7	24,3	24,6
Education and self-education	0,6	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,5	0,2	0,3	0,1
Watching TV	4,6	5,6	7,3	9,4	6,2	10,3	11,9	14,4
Entertaining or visiting friends	4,3	3,1	3,6	3,3	4,8	3,0	3,8	3,3
Reading	1,8	1,8	2,1	1,7	3,3	2,3	2,3	1,1
active rest and sport	0,8	0,4	0,3	0,2	2,6	3,0	1,6	0,9
Other	0,8	0,8	1,7	1,0	0,9	0,7	1,8	1,8
Total workload including child-care	86,8	90,7	87,4	83,1	73,6	78,9	77,5	75,1
Free time including contacts with children	18,9	15,6	17,7	20,5	26,7	25,2	25,4	25,4

* Time use in this table was averaged for summer (June) and winter (November).

** In bold print in this table noticed time expenditures changes of what are statistically significant relatively 1986-1987 simultaneously on criteria of Mann-Whitney and Kolmogorov-Smirnov with a probability of more than 99%.

Table 8

Time budget of agricultural workers living in rural areas
(Hours per "average" working week)

Activities	Women				Men			
	1975- -1976	1986- -1987	1993- -1994	1999	1975- -1976	1986- -1987	1993- -1994	1999
Number	278	211	233	166	376	263	322	287
Working time	48,1	45,1	40,1	38,6	60,4	60,1	54,7	45,2
Time related to work	5,1	6,1	5,5	6,1	3,8	4,5	4,3	4,3
Household obligations and errands	20,8	24,2	24,8	23,3	4,0	3,0	3,6	6,8
Work on the private plot	16,8	18,9	19,8	18,5	9,8	15,4	16,3	19,7
Child care/contact with children	3,4	2,7	3,6	2,0	1,2	1,7	1,5	1,0
child care	2,4	1,9	2,3	1,2	0,6	0,7	0,1	0,4
playing, talking with children	1,0	0,8	1,3	0,8	0,6	1,0	1,4	0,6
Personal needs	59,1	58,5	58,8	60,4	66,3	60,9	62,3	65,9
sleep	49,1	46,9	47,1	48,1	55,5	48,9	49,0	52,4
Leisure time	13,9	11,7	14,4	17,7	22,0	21,9	23,2	23,6
education and self-education	0	0	0	0,1	0	0	0	0,1
watching TV	4,3	5,5	6,2	8,7	4,7	9,4	11,7	13,7
entertaining or visiting friends	2,7	2,2	4,1	2,8	4,5	2,8	3,9	3,2
Other	0,8	0,8	1,1	1,4	0,5	0,5	2,1	1,5
Total workload including child-care	93,2	96,2	92,5	87,7	78,6	83,7	79,0	76,4
Free time including contacts with children	14,9	12,5	15,7	18,5	22,6	22,9	24,6	24,2

The changes seem positive, if judging from the criteria of the 60s — absolutely positive: workload reduction of agricultural workers, increase of "recreation" time, leisure time for women, evening out for working men and women's workload.

In comparison with the period 1975-1976 the working population share in the total workload in household production and private holdings per average seasonal week in 1999 increased by 10.7%, with the percentage of women (6.1% for women working in agriculture) being 57.7% (49.5%) from the duration of the total workload. For males these figures are 15.1 (16.9), 35.6 (35.2%) respectively.

For families working on household plots this is supposed to be second as far as duration is concerned, but the first essential and vitally important

work. If to sum up the working time on a household plot of only two main family members — a working woman and a working man — one can get 37 hours per average seasonal week or more than 1900 hours per year! However, the plot “doesn’t allow the average rural family to significantly improve their welfare, but provides them with the opportunity of balancing on the verge of poverty” [7, p. 17] and to keep body and soul together. As 40% of the workers consider their total workload excessive — “work at full stretch” — the joint family work only allowed 14% of families to improve their financial position (improvement of material standing over the last 5 years was marked by only 7% of the workers). Unfortunately, we failed to obtain the workload estimates in the previous surveys. But it should be pointed out that the share of those willing to use the supplementary leisure time for passive rest decreased by a third, while the duration of such rest increased 1.5 times for men and more than twice for women.

A slow process of the reduction time use differences in basic social working groups was observed: agricultural and social workers. The most notable evening out took place in the value of time expenditure at work on the household plot for women. The rural intelligentsia became more “peasant-like”.

As far as the non-working able-bodied population is concerned, it is relevant to mention some important changes. For men during the last period (earlier such a group was not distinguished and we didn’t allocate a sample quote to it) work on the household plot increased 1.5 times with an evident reduction of housework and leisure time. For women housework decreased largely due to the birth rate and the reduction of child-care; as a result, work on the plot increased (in 1993–1994 it reached its peak over the whole period under observation), sleep increased too.

The total workload of pensioners was observed to be gradually rising both in 1986–1987 and in 1993–1994. In the last period it decreased slightly for women with a considerable redistribution of work: on household plots it decreased for women, but housework continued to increase. Time for watching TV increased, while reading time — particularly for men — decreased. In the last period, there was more time for socializing, whereas it reached its minimum level in 1993–1994 over the whole period under observation.

Use of Leisure Time

According to the survey, the main functions of leisure time are rest and socializing. Compared to 1986, the cognitive-pragmatic function has lost its value. During leisure time one out of four workers manages to do something useful for the family; one in five gets to know something new and interesting. Few people mentioned health improvement as a function (other

than rest). As before, the developing function of leisure time has slackened and the TV nature of its use and information support has grown. In comparison with 1986–1987 the percentage of TV-watching has increased for women from 38% to 49%, for men — from 42% to 59%. In fact, a significant proportion of TV-watching time in the 90s was spent on watching useless and psychologically harmful TV commercials.

Satisfaction with the way of spending leisure time decreased from 46% in 1986 to 35% in 1999 and the percentage of the dissatisfied increased from 24% to 38%. A dramatic growth in dissatisfaction due to lack of financial means was observed (Table 9). The dependence between work on the household plot, tiredness with this work and leisure time dissatisfaction dropped significantly. On the whole, budget time changes correspond to the changes in response from the questionnaires about the frequency of particular types of leisure activities and visiting cultural, recreational and athletic facilities.

Table 9

What prevents spending free time as one would have wished
(main causes) (Percentage of response)

Causes, conditions	1986	1993	1999
Housework, private plot	22	46	15
Tiredness from primary and housework	9	26	11
Lack of means	4	14	36
Bad health	4	4	4
Insufficient conditions for leisure	23	28	28
Not enough free time	31	55	40
Inability to organize leisure time	2	1	1
Not enough skills, abilities	< 1	1	4
Other	6	3	5
Nothing prevents	32	10	< 1

Basically, out of four time points, leisure activities reached a peak in 1986–1987. These activities varied a lot: doing sport, reading specialized literature and fiction, newspapers, playing and talking with children, visiting cultural and public institutions. Still, it happened in the period of peak labour activity and the lowest amount of free time!

Conclusion

1. In the second half of the 80s, there was an upward tendency in work on the household plot, with working time on collective farms remaining the same for men and decreasing for women due to a reduction in leisure and sleep. A similar situation was observed in the beginning of the 90s. We

suppose that there were several reasons for changes in everyday activities and time use in the second half of the 80s — beginning of the 90s: family matters grew in importance, i.e. its welfare, the upbringing and education of children, a new socio-psychological atmosphere characterized by optimism, assurance that work can improve the financial position of the family, measures to support the family household, intuitive expectation of difficulties connected with changes, and finally, life difficulties in the early 90s. In the second half of the 90s, working time began to decrease dramatically, especially for men, the majority of whom were engaged in agriculture. Later, the total time spent working on household plots also declined.

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

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

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

5. It is necessary to conduct specific interdisciplinary research to study the revealed interdependence between changes in the time use of everyday activities and changes in such spheres as the socio-psychological state of the majority of the population in the 80–90s, the anti-alcoholism campaign of the mid-80s, criminal and demographic statistics (in particular, length of future lifetime), the formation of a market economy, government economic and social policy.

Bibliography

1. Zaslavskaja, T. I., Problema demokraticeskoi pereorientacii ekonomiki sovremennoj Rossii (Problem of Democratic Re-orientation of the Present Russian Economy). *Obschestvo i ekonomika* (Society and Economy). 1997, no. 1–2.
2. Konturi socialnoj politiki (obzor konferencii) (Outlines of Social Politics. Review of Conference). *EKO*. 2000, no. 10.

3. *Metodologija i metodika sistemnogo izuchenija sovetskoj derevni* (Methodology and Methods of System Research of Soviet Countryside). Zaslavskaja, T. I. (Ed.), Novosibirsk, 1980.
4. *Razvitie selskih poselenij* (Development of Rural Settlements). Zaslavskaja, T. I., Muchnik, V. (Eds.), M., 1977.
5. Juster, F. Tomas and Frank P. Stafford, The Allocation of Time: Empirical Findings, Behavioral Models, and Problems of Measurement. *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. XXIX (June 1991).
6. Sorokin P. A., *Sociologija revoljucii / Chelovek. Civilizacija. Obschestvo.* (Sociology of Revolution. Man. Civilization. Society.). M.: Politizdat, 1992.
7. Kutenkov R. P., Shabanov V. A., 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)*, 2000, no. 8, p. 15–18.
8. Kolosovskii P. A., *Territorialnie faktori ekonomicheskoj aktivnosti selskohozjajstvennih predpriyatij* (Territorial Factors of Economic Activity of Agricultural Enterprises. V sb.: Socialno-territorialnaja struktura goroda i sela. (In volume *Social-Territorial Structure of a City and Rural Area*) Novosibirsk: IEiOPP, 1982.
9. Kalugina Z. I., *Paradoksi agrarnoj reformi v Rossii: sociologicheskij analiz transformacionnih processov* (Paradoxes of the Agrarian Reform in Russia: Sociological Analysis of Transformation Processes). Novosibirsk: IEiOPP SO RAN, 2000.
10. Gvozdeva G. P., Neoplachivaemij trud kak faktor adaptacii rossijan v period krizisa (Non-paid Work as a Factor of Adaptation of the Russian people in the Crisis period). *Vestnik NGU, serija "Socialno-ekonomicheskie nauki", tom 1, vipusk 1* (Bulletin of the NSU, series "Socio-economic Sciences", Vol. 1), 2000, p. 55–68.