

PH.D. IRINA E. KALABIKHINA
POPULATION DEPARTMENT
MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY BY M.V.LOMONOSOV

ADDRESS: 442 ROOM, POPULATION DEPARTMENT,
ECONOMIC FACULTY, LENINSKIE GORY, MSU, 119992, RUSSIA
TEL.: +7(095) 939-2928
FAX: +7 (095) 9393-0877
E-MAILS: IKALABI@EDUNET.RU; KALABIKHINA@MAIL.ECON.MSU.RU

Title: Reproductive behavior, reproductive health, time use and family violence in Russia: Are there some links?

The aim of study: to estimate level and types (physical, psychological, economical, sexual) of intra-family violence towards women in Russia using gender-relevant methodologies, to study violence influences demographic behavior and sharing time within the couple.

Data: In 2002 was provided the "field" work in 7 regions of urban and rural Russia. Respondents: married or cohabited men and women, 18-65 ages (N=2134, including N female =1076). SPSS format data used. Study supported by Ford Foundation Project on Family Violence in Russia.

Methodology: Quantitative (N=2134) and qualitative data (in-depth interviews and focus groups in difficult to understanding cases and regions) were obtained in this study.

We measured the following types and sub-types of violence: physical and psychological sub-types; economical and sexual types. The last types also could be both physical (pushed, massacred or hackneyed women) and psychological (abuse) home (family) violence. However to make picture more clear we stress economical, and sexual types of violence and especially physical sub-type of violence. Criteria of economic violence, in particular, defines decision-making process in income and wealth distribution, female labor participation, etc., including the menaces and interdictions on career and space mobility.

Results:

Level of violence. 50% of female respondents were suffered from physical violence (general physical violence group) [and 41 % (442 respondents) were hackneyed by husband (partner) as minimum one time]. More than half women were suffered from economical violence [and 19% (206) of female respondents suffered from hard form of economical violence] and 23% (246) – from sexual one.

Reproductive Attitudes.

The level of any type of family violence does not influence clearly female reproductive attitudes (number of wanted children): difference between victims' attitudes and total women's ones no more than 6%.

Reproductive Health and Abortion.

The level of any type of family violence influences abortion level. Mean number of abortions per woman to the moment of our survey: 1,1 for groups of women without physical violence, and about 2 for groups of women with any type of violence. 74% of women in group with violence made as minimum one abortion to the moment of survey, and 60% of women in group without any violence made as minimum one abortion to the moment of survey. Age variable does not influence on number of

abortion. This situation is caused by husband control on contraceptive consumption and refusal of husband to use "male line" of contraception.

Patriarchal relations influence also unwanted reproductive behavior: "secret" abortion (when woman did not say husband about abortion); abortion on husband's (partner's) request; child-birth on husband's (partner's) request.

Female (reproductive) health and morbidity does not have direct links with family violence, however, level of miscarriages is higher among victims of family violence (26% - in group of economical violence, 27,8% - in group of sexual violence, 28% - in group of physical violence, and 22% - in control group without physical violence, and 25% - in total).

Family Composition.

We have noted links between number of children and level of violence. Another types of family composition (two-generation household, husband' relatives household, family with more than two children) also influence family violence.

Time Use.

Labor distribution in household is asymmetrical in favor of men. Women not only waste more time on home work but their self-estimations are underestimated (in distinct from men). Family violence (mainly economical violence) obviously deteriorates this situation.

Such variables as age of woman, number of children, type of union, type of family, female employment status, household income, place of living influence gender time use distribution. Pressure on woman increases for elder woman, and in situation of more children, official marriage, husband' relatives family, unemployment status, rural region.

Gender distribution of income does not influence gender distribution of labor in household.

Conclusions:

- The level of family violence is very high in Russian families.
- The level of family violence does not influence clearly female reproductive attitudes (in low fertility country like Russia) and health.
- The level of family violence links with reproductive unwanted behavior.
- The level of family violence influences gender asymmetry of labor distribution in household.
- Gender distribution of income does not influence gender time using.
- Family composition and demographic variables influence level of family violence and patriarchal behavior (gender distribution of labor in household): home violence is more in married unions than in cohabited ones (and vice versa for labor distribution), more in families with more than two children, more in rural families.