

*Single Mothers—Clients or Citizens?*  
*Social Work with Poor Families in Russia*

---

ELENA IARSKAIA-SMIRNOVA AND PAVEL ROMANOV

INTRODUCTION

As the standard of living decreased during market reforms in Russia, the pressure on the social welfare system increased considerably. Due to the costliness and ineffectiveness of universalistic approaches, means-tested schemes became the dominant form of social support. That has led to a decrease in the number of groups eligible for welfare, and to the introduction of monetary benefits instead of social services and privileges (such as free public transport and reduced fees for communal services). The process of social policy liberalization in contemporary Russia is characterized by this shift to a market welfare system and the use of means-testing in the distribution of welfare and social support. The system of means-tested assistance (*adresnaia pomoshch'*) now depends, more than before, on social workers to determine the degree of need (*nuzhdaemost'*—neediness)<sup>1</sup> and reliability of the clients' applications. The procedures and techniques for checking "neediness" are not fully defined; nor are they or the legal status of such procedures clearly described. Thus this process was given to executors guided in this area by everyday life definitions, stereotypes, and informal organizational norms within the welfare services. Although means-tested assistance was supposed to increase the effectiveness of the social welfare system, it nevertheless has negative effects on the most vulnerable parts of the population, especially women with small children.

In the contemporary theory of social welfare, the concept of citizenship as formulated by T.H. Marshall (1998) is one of the key theoretical tools used to explore the distribution of rights and responsibilities among different groups in a society. In recent decades feminist scholars have provided an understanding of how various groups of a population (depending on their gender, race, and other categorical attributes) are included in or excluded from various spheres of social life (Bussemaker and van Kersbergen, 1994; Lister, 1997; Okin, 1992; Walby, 1994). They also emphasize that there is a direct connection between the discourses and practices of state welfare policies with respect to various population groups and how

these groups perform their role as citizens (Lessa, 2006). In this chapter we aim to examine the discourses created and reproduced through the interaction between single mothers and representatives of social services. In the process of interaction, clients tend to have similar perceptions of their social rights (opportunities and limitations), while social workers arrive at an understanding of the essence of the problems their clients experience and the criteria for inclusion into the client category.

The analysis is based on twenty-six interviews with single mothers and six interviews with social workers conducted in 2001–2003, and six interviews with single mothers and three with social workers conducted in 2006 in the Saratov region in Russia,<sup>2</sup> as well as official documents and the publications of other researchers. In our interviews with mothers, we focused on the issues of familial well-being and interactions with social services, while social workers were asked to discuss their experiences with clients.

A short overview of statistics and social policy terminology prefaces a discussion of how mother-headed families and state social policy interrelate and affect each other. The subsequent sections contain analysis of the interviews with single mothers who, as the heads of low-income households, interact with the social service system. The analysis demonstrates that single mothers are frustrated by inadequate assistance and the impossibility of improving their life situations. The discussion goes on to show that social workers, who are used to interpreting complex issues in the life situations of single mothers as individual psychological peculiarities, tend to blame the victim, thus ignoring important social conditions and imposing on women a responsibility for problems that are societal in origin.

#### ONE-PARENT FAMILIES IN THE RHETORIC AND PRACTICE OF STATE SOCIAL POLICY

The number of women who are raising their children without a spouse or a partner is increasing worldwide. The same process has been observed in recent decades in Russia, where the number of one-parent families has been steadily rising. By 1989 every seventh child under eighteen years old was living in a one-parent family (Brui, 1998, p. 73). Thirty years ago the proportion of out-of-wedlock births was hardly more than 10 percent, while by 2006, according to official statistics, the number of such births was 29–30 percent (UNDP, 2009, p. 47; see also Vishnevskii and Bobylev, 2009). In 1979 the proportion of one-parent families was 14.74 percent (Breeva, 1999, p. 103), while according to the census data, between 1989 and 2002

the ratio of one-parent families increased from 15.2 percent to 21.7 percent (Ovcharova et al., 2007).

In the lexicon of Russian officials, social workers, journalists, and teachers, the widespread expression “an incomplete family” reflects a vision of the nuclear family unit (mother–father–child/children) as the “complete,” “normal,” “full” family structure. It needs to be stressed that in a legal sense the term “single mother” in Russia refers only to women who have borne children out of wedlock. Such a status entitles a woman to some additional benefits from the regional government, which makes the single mother’s income dependent on the region’s economic wealth. The benefit is usually insignificant. For instance, as of January 1, 2008, in Saratov Oblast, the basic monthly child allowance for families with a per capita income below the subsistence minimum was 225 rubles (U.S. \$ 8.8) and 450 rubles (U.S. \$ 17.5) for a single mother, while the subsistence minimum was 4,125 rubles for an adult and 3,988 rubles for a child (U.S. \$ 160.5 and U.S. \$ 155.2 correspondingly).<sup>3</sup>

If a woman has been married or the fatherhood was recorded according to special procedures in a court or registry office (*Semeinyi kodeks...*, 1995, art. 48, 49), she is entitled to alimony, which is seen as an alternative to a state benefit. In a wider societal sense, single mothers are those who raise their children without a spouse, including those women who are divorced or widowed. As a rule, all such families are called “incomplete” (*nepolnye*) or “mother-headed families” (*materinskie*). Low-income “incomplete” families are entitled to receive support and services at local agencies. In the present chapter, the term “single mother” includes all households with a woman as a solo parent.

The needs of low-income families in the Soviet Union were recognized in 1974 when target monetary allowances were introduced. In the 1980s the state’s concern about the well-being of children in one-parent families was reflected in the establishment of some modest measures for their support, including some small monetary benefits and privileged access to childcare services. On the whole, the Soviet approach encouraged economic equality and gave women raising their children alone a degree of independence. However, the implementation of Soviet welfare policies worked against their intended purpose. Financial support provided to single mothers could not significantly improve their living standard and contributed to their stigmatization by separating them into a special group of the needy.

In the early 1990s both the level of real wages and the capability of households and individuals to cover their expenses seriously declined (Ovcharova and Prokof’eva, 2002), and the development of the labor mar-

ket was rather unfavorable for women (UNICEF, 1999). All this has played a major role in worsening the life situation of the majority of one-parent families. The decrease in the state social-protection programs, the lack of accessible childcare services, the shortage of options in the labor market, and gender inequality in career opportunities have put single mothers at a high risk of poverty. As a result, single-mother households came to have among the lowest economic status of any households in Russia (Lokshin et al., 2000; Ovcharova, 2008).

Three main factors hinder the full realization of the social rights of single mothers and limit their capacity to remain relatively autonomous economic actors and sustain an acceptable standard of living for them and their children. These factors are 1) limited access to the labor market and a low level of work performance due to the high pressure of combining waged work and childcare; 2) an inadequate level of support from registered fathers (alimony); and 3) a low level of state support and public transfers for the families of single mothers (Lokshin et al., 2000). Due to the decrease of public assistance during the economic reforms in Russia, single mothers have faced a higher risk of poverty and have therefore preferred to live with other adults or relatives.

According to the 2002 census, the majority of children under eighteen years old live in families with both parents (73 percent) and have at least one sibling (52 percent). Half of the rest of the children live in “incomplete” families with one parent, while the others live in households of a complex structure (Prokof'eva, 2007, p. 261). This means that every second single mother in Russia lives with her parents, adult siblings, or other adult relatives (Lokshin et al., 2000). The statistics show that in the 1990s and for a few years thereafter, the proportion of nuclear families in the population structure decreased from 80 percent to 70.8 percent (Prokof'eva, 2007, p. 261). In 2002 monoparental families comprised more than 25 percent of all families and 30 percent of families with children under eighteen (mostly headed by mothers). Quite often such families are parts of another household, as they live with relatives (41.9 percent). This is especially true of families with children under eighteen (53 percent) (ibid., p. 259). Although such a strategy has a range of advantages, it certainly results in a lack of autonomy and privacy.

The most recent changes in the structure of child allowance included an increase in the size of transfers, the introduction of a means-tested model of assistance and special support to children of single parents, and the stimulation of fertility rates by means of large lump sums for bearing children. However, if we take into account the existing budgetary restraints, the present situation is far from optimal. As the data show (Ovcharova, 2008;

Ovcharova and Prokof'eva, 2002), the welfare programs are inadequate to deal with the enormous poverty in Russia. Single mothers receive less public assistance than ever, while fathers often ignore their responsibilities with impunity. Almost 40 percent of single-mother families in Russia were below the poverty line in 1996, and this proportion continues to grow (Luniakova, 2001, p. 95). By the end of 2006, the poverty level in Russia was 12.8 percent, while the poverty risk for families with small children is two times higher (Ovcharova et al., 2007). According to the Generations and Gender Survey data, in 2007 "incomplete families" with children comprised 18.3 percent of all families with children, including 2.7 percent of families with one parent who is not working, 4.6 percent of families with one parent who is working for a wage below the subsistence minimum, and 5.7 percent of families with one parent who is working but earning below the subsistence minimum for one adult and one child (Burdiak et al., 2009, p. 148). The parental leave and income replacement have increased significantly in recent years and are now tied to previous incomes.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, the monthly child allowance available to low-income families has not been reconsidered and still provides no more than four percent of the subsistence minimum for a child. Therefore, if a woman fails to find a well-paid job with a wage above the subsistence minimum by the time her child is 1.5 years old, the life situation in such a family, especially a single-parent family, will be quite poor (Ovcharova et al., 2007).

The academic discourses on single mothers in various research areas have an impact on the political agenda. Works devoted to the financial circumstances of one-parent families are written from a neutral perspective (Kalabikhina, 2002, pp. 96–97; Ovcharova and Prokof'eva, 2002; Ustinova, 1992), while publications on upbringing contain moralizing, shaming, and blaming that serves to stigmatize single mothers and their children (Dement'eva, 2001, pp. 108–109). In the 1990s and a few years thereafter, several researchers problematized state policy toward one-parent families in Russia. They looked at discourses created through official documents and practices from the point of view of human rights and studied the diversity of life strategies of single mothers (Baskakova, 1998; Karimova, 2007; Kiblitkaia, 1999; Liborakina, 1999; Luniakova, 1998, 2002, 2004; Malyshева, 2001, pp. 325–326). Demographical data on the rapid increase of the single-parent population in Russia are sometimes overdramatized, which contributes to widespread societal concern about the crisis of the traditional nuclear family as a social institution and constructs a general image of mother-headed families as deficient, pathological, and a source of social problems. Moral arguments have tended to stigmatize single parents by

stressing their economic dependency as evidence of their inferiority (see the criticism of such approaches in Iarskaia-Smirnova, 1998; Iarskaia-Smirnova and Romanov, 2007, 2008).

In his 2006 presidential address, Vladimir Putin declared 2008 the Year of the Family in Russia, thus launching an extensive propaganda campaign. Numerous actions, celebrations, special days, and other symbolic activities have been arranged to highlight the pronatalist mission of the new family policy. Most recent publications that critically examine the new social policy initiatives (Chernova, 2008; Gurko, 2008; Maleva and Siniavskaia, 2007; Ovcharova et al., 2007; UNDP, 2009) conclude that the rhetoric of official documents dealing with the position of the family and children in many respects presumes the normality of the nuclear family unit. From the official viewpoint, single mothers continue to be rather “problematic” citizens.

#### SINGLE MOTHERS: THE DISCOURSE OF “UNWORTHY” CITIZENS

##### *Formal procedures: preconditions for exclusion*

The social welfare sector in Russia covers a variety of agencies that provide direct care and support to service users according to Federal Law No. 195-FZ (1995). The main component of family and child services is work with families, which encompasses family care centers, rehabilitation facilities for children with disabilities and children from families at risk, part-time day-care facilities, and nursing homes for mentally disabled children. The clients of the social services are predominantly women and include mothers of many children (*mnogodetnye materi*<sup>5</sup>), mothers of children with disabilities, and single mothers. Agencies such as departments of social security, centers for social services, departments (or centers) for the assistance of family, women and children, and family centers provide clients with various services, including means-tested assistance in kind, home care, psychosocial and social-medical care, and vouchers for free meals.

According to Decree N 60-P, issued by the Saratov Oblast Government on June 1, 2001 (Postanovlenie..., 2001), the criteria of eligibility for means-tested assistance are based on a combination of the following conditions: evidence-based confirmation of per capita income below the subsistence minimum; the absence of potential sources of income such as a mortgage, savings, or a plot of land; and a difficult life situation. The neediness of a family is to be identified in every individual case by the local social security agency.

In Russia the monthly base rate of aid per child is 6.4 percent of the minimum wage (as of March 2007) and less than 0.6 percent of the average monthly wage (UNDP, 2008, p. 56). According to the "Concept of Means-Tested Assistance for the Population of Saratov Oblast," "the neediness of a family and an individual living alone is defined by the social protection agencies at the place of residence in accordance with the Federal Law on State Social Assistance" (*Kontseptsiiia razvitiia sistemy adresnoi sotsial'noi pomoshchi naseleniiu Saratovskoi oblasti*, 2002). The social protection agencies have the right to check the accuracy of the information presented to them by any means that are not in contradiction with the legislation of the Russian Federation (Smirnov and Kolosnitsyn). As a consequence, the principles of means-tested assistance have introduced ambivalence into the professional identity of social workers: "But I feel hurt by this means-tested assistance" (Social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, 2002).

Until 1999, child allowances were officially allocated according to the universal principle, but in 1999 federal law introduced a means test. The right to receive a monthly child benefit was assigned to one of the parents in families whose income per capita was below the subsistence minimum. The idea of improved targeting was based on the assumption that "because they are spread over a large number of people, many of them not poor, average benefits are often very small. For example, basic child allowances range from only 70 to 105 rubles a month (U.S. \$ 2.7–U.S. \$ 4.1), which is not enough to have a significant impact on poverty" (World Bank, June 2007, p. 20). Child allowances were financed from the federal budget in 2001–2004, but the regions could use their own budgets to allocate child allowances more broadly. Since the introduction of Federal Law No. 122-FZ (2004), the size, rules of allocation, and transfers of child allowance have become the responsibility of the regional budgets.

While a great deal of social assistance in the country is still not targeted specifically at the poor, Russia has been developing targeted social assistance in three areas: child allowances, housing and utility allowances, and regional programs for the poor (*ibid.*). Targeted or means-tested assistance (*adresnaia pomoshch*) is a kind of service conducted under the jurisdiction of the regions of the Russian Federation. The value of monetary and in-kind assistance varies according to the size of budget allocation in the given territory. Regional and municipal legislation typically lists the categories of clients eligible for such a service (usually including low-income families), the types of assistance, and the documents to be submitted to prove eligibility. In addition to these documents, living conditions are assessed and documented by the agency. Apart from this kind of service, regular benefits

are provided on a universal basis and include non-recurrent transfers after the birth of a child, monthly transfers during maternity leave, and monthly child allowances up to eighteen months. The service users consider the most important benefit to be childcare, followed by child allowances and support to help the family get started after childbirth. Other targeted kinds of support are ranked lower (Trygged, 2009, p. 208).

The impact of the policy change from universal to means-tested child allowances on targeting efficiency and poverty reduction is not clear. Analysis (Gassmann and Notten, 2006, pp. 26–27) has shown that targeting is not perfect, that there are errors of exclusion, and that the very modest size of the benefits decreases their impact on the poorest households, in which children are disproportionately more numerous. A number of problems have been identified related to the design of targeted or means-tested “assistance programs, the measurement and verification of income, and insufficient cooperation among government bodies in sharing information” (World Bank, June 2007).

This model requires but does not have proper methods for income monitoring, which leads to significant errors of inclusion (entitling those who are not poor to a benefit) and errors of exclusion (refusing to entitle those who are poor). Women with small children must collect many documents<sup>6</sup> to establish their right to social assistance—to claim the benefits to which they have been guaranteed by the state, and which they often perceive as inadequate: “What can I buy with a hundred rubles, tell me? Nothing. Maybe two pairs of socks, which we will wear out in two months” (single mother Tatiana, Saratov 2002).<sup>7</sup> For rural inhabitants the procedure of registering for such an allowance is too expensive because they have to travel to a bigger town to access a welfare agency, and the ticket sometimes costs more than the allowance itself.

Schools in rural areas usually have their own garden plots, but these are not enough to provide meals to all children, in fact not even those legally entitled to be exempted from fees:

I am [entitled to it] as a single mother, my girl should get meals for free there. But here [at school] I’m supposed to give them food, fifty rubles per month [...] They have no finances [and tell us]—pay, that’s all! And if there is no money—they stop feeding [the child]. I say: wait, I’ll get a salary, I’ll get a children’s [allowance] and I’ll pay! Not at all—the month ends, and the child doesn’t get any food! (Single mother Maria, Lysye Gory, Saratov Oblast, 2006)



The state and local governments attempt to alleviate poverty by paying needy families a small benefit, but such assistance does little when a household budget cannot cope with the cost of living:

[...] they are far below the poverty line, they live in misery and nobody is going to help them. [They] just give them one thousand rubles per year, that's all.<sup>8</sup> Some children cannot even go to school because they have nothing to wear, let alone textbooks, notebooks, etc. (Social worker, Lysie Gory, Saratov Oblast, 2006)

For some single mothers, cheap assistance in kind seems to be another instrument of deprivation and social inequality. These feelings are usually connected to discussions about unequal access to certain resources among clients of different status—mothers of many children and single mothers:

There was help, once or twice, perhaps. It looked funny—a kilo of flour not of the best quality, a kilo of macaroni—all of this we can afford ourselves. My child never has fruit, but they bring us the same groceries that we buy ourselves—the cheapest, the worst. I know they provide help for children with disabilities, for families of many children, while single mothers are forgotten. (Single mother Natalia, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

In the quote above, the client compares her situation with that of other groups of “needy” people. Such a presumption—that some important resources are in the hands of the less worthy—is a traditional theme in narratives of social services clients. Inequality of status, doubtful and nontransparent criteria for division into worthy and unworthy—all of this raises inner conflicts and feelings of being outcasts. This is how the inspection procedures and size of the benefits are subjectively perceived by the clients, who in turn tend to look upon social workers and welfare organizations as alien forces. As Peter Blau (1960, p. 348) indicates in his study of a public welfare agency in a big American city, the clients were in dire need, since the assistance allowance, originally set low, never caught up with inflation. Needless to say, those who function as monitoring agents also feel alienated from the clients. Blau has shown that the new case worker was typically very sympathetic toward clients but that an internalization of bureaucratic constraints could limit the service. Lynne Haney (2000) has shown in her research on welfare restructuring in Hungary that the shift from the socialist-era universalist welfare regime to the (neo-)liberal regime of poverty regulation has

meant that all needs are now conceived of only in material terms, and social support has been reduced to poverty relief. New surveillance techniques and disciplinary welfare practices have been introduced, and social workers strive to increase the distance between them and their clients.

*Structural limitations and direct discrimination*

Lack of awareness is one of the common problems reported by the informants. It is related to a wide range of issues, from not knowing their rights to a lack of information concerning the existing services, certain benefits, and resources. Such a situation is most characteristic of small towns and rural areas, where formal networks are limited and informal networks are sometimes weak or have dissolved. Although the proportion of single-parent households in rural areas is lower than in urban areas, such households experience much higher levels of poverty. As earlier research has shown, in rural areas job opportunities are limited for women who are single mothers (see Golubeva, 2007; Urbanskaia, 2004). These limitations are the combined effect of structural problems in the rural labor market (remote areas, poor transportation, low wages, few job options, low territorial mobility, the seasonal nature of work), the traditional limitations on “women’s work” available there, and difficulties caused by the monoparental status of the household. All this increases the social isolation and deprivation of single mothers. As Iaroshenko (2004) has noted, monoparental families in rural areas are the most frequent users of public services because it is difficult for them to combine paid and unpaid work. The means of public assistance cannot compensate for their low incomes and help them overcome poverty.

The share of public and private transfers into the family budget is much higher for households with a single mother than for an average Russian household. In those where a single mother lives with her parents, the share of income from pensions is higher than the share of income from wages. At the same time, for single-parent households with children, the share of income from benefits is almost seven times lower than from wages (Lokshin et al., 2000). The meaning of all these statistical calculations is captured in a comment by one of our respondents in 2003: “Do you call seventy rubles a [sufficient] benefit? [laughing]” (single mother Marina, Balashov, Saratov Oblast, 2003).<sup>9</sup>

Due to the limitations outlined above, some of the informants living in small towns do not enter the field of social support. The role of a client is unacceptable to them not because they are able to manage on their own, but because the system does not have any significant effect on their lives.

When asked whether the Center of Social Services provides her with any help, one of our informants said: "I do not even know where it is located" (single mother Marina, Balashov, Saratov Oblast, 2003).

There are more working women among single mothers than among married women with children. In 1996, 81 percent of single mothers living with children were employed, compared with 71 percent of mothers in nuclear families (Lokshin et al., 2000). Our research supports data collected by Kiblitkaia (1999), who has shown that many single mothers face discrimination and violations of their rights in the area of employment, and humiliation and open rudeness in their interaction with officials. Our respondents also reported that they often encountered undisguised hostility or ultimate indifference from the bureaucratic structures:

Some time ago I was registered at the employment office. I remember it very well, I was coming to a job interview, and as soon they learned that I had two children, they immediately rejected me. For instance, in PTU [vocational school] No. 15 they said that when my children get sick, I will go on sick leave, and that is unprofitable for them. I said, "Well, write that and make it official—that you reject me for that reason." They did not put it in writing. I tried to work at the market as a shop assistant. But if I work the whole day, my kids are abandoned. (Single mother Liubov, Balashov, Saratov Oblast, 2003)

A similarly desperate situation may occur when single mothers attempt to enroll their children in childcare. For example, Irina, whose only source of income is a child allowance, reported that she was planning to get a job to improve her financial situation. However, the issue of employment was related to the need to place her three-and-a-half-year-old child in a kindergarten. Although single mothers have priority in getting a place that is supposed to be given to them free of charge, Irina was unable to resolve this issue on her own or through the authorities.

Combining paid work and the care of their children is one of the most crucial issues for single mothers. The work biographies of women reflect the cycles in their children's upbringing—the loss of a job or leaving university coincides for many with the birth of a child, while getting another job or moving from one workplace to another occurs as children grow up, enter kindergarten, school, and college. Single mothers lack support in the home, so such cycles have an especially powerful influence on their biographies.

Some women hope to improve their life situation as their children grow up:

Maybe some day [my life] will change. These [kids] will grow up and go to kindergarten. Mom will go to work, then the children will go to school, and Mom will also work.

(Single mother Irina, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

Older children in the family increase the probability that their single parents will be able to live more independently. According to census data, the proportion of nuclear monoparental families increases as the children grow up: 74 percent of monoparental families with children older than eighteen years do not include grandparents in the same household—this is close to the average number of nuclear families in Russia (Prokof'eva, 2007, p. 261). The oldest children can contribute to the household budget by taking paid jobs and caring for younger siblings in the family.

The ability of women to be independent economic subjects determines the degree to which they are able to enjoy their social rights. The status of single mothers, in their relations with the state and state services, is predominantly that of clients. The procedures of applying for state support, the structural conditions of the labor market, and the level of services and benefits foster the idea that single mothers are not “worthy” full citizens entitled to the same social rights as members of a “normal” nuclear family.

#### SOCIAL WORKERS: “THE SMELL OF POVERTY” DISCOURSE

##### *Formal procedures: who is poor?*

An important aspect of social work on poverty is the conceptual space in which the clients' problems are formulated. Single mothers from small towns have clearly defined themselves in interviews: “‘Poor’ is not a word. Now the word is ‘paupers’ (*nishchie*)” (single mother Natalia, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002). In the Russian context, the word *nishchie* is traditionally associated with beggars. In everyday life this word is used to express extreme need and deprivation. In our interviews, social workers admit that the incomes of those who come to the agency are “below the poverty line, and they are paupers rather than merely poor” (social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002). Another term, “people with limited resources” (*maloobespechennye*), is used in welfare agencies instead.

Besides lower incomes and the disadvantages of the labor market, living conditions in small towns present additional challenges. Many houses are not equipped with central heating, and the water supply and plumbing sys-

tem are in very poor condition. According to the survey data, the living space (in square meters per person) for more than one-third of families with children is below established norms and does not provide what can be considered a reasonable comfort level (Ovcharova et al., 2007). The decrease in production and the economic crisis have led to a significant pauperization of the population and the appearance of the so-called “new poor” (teachers, medical professionals, social workers) in both large cities and regional towns.

Social workers often live in conditions of poverty similar to those of their clients: “Our flat is not that different from this one” (social worker, Saratov, 2002). As a result, the decision about who is or is not “needy” is based on the subjective judgment of a person who lacks perspective. Social service workers earn about 60 percent of the minimum subsistence level,

[a salary] equivalent in size to a social benefit, which has contributed to the creation—alongside the traditional poor (the disabled, pensioners, families with many children, and single-parent families)—of an additional category that is characteristic in particular of Russia—the “working poor,” meaning employed persons whose earnings do not provide a minimum subsistence level. (Chekorina, 2002, p. 172)

This fact points up a new dimension in the relationship between clients and social workers, who are predominantly women. The marginalization of social-services employees negatively impacts the quality of their work. On the one hand, social workers accept the introduction of the means-tested assistance scheme, which gives them more power in terms of control over who receives the benefits and other forms of social assistance. On the other hand, deciding who is truly worthy of aid has proven to be very difficult. The social worker perceives him/herself as an agent of state bureaucratic control, which conflicts with the humanitarian purpose of social services:

And here you are really facing a dilemma—we provide them with help, but [they] will drink this money up, and the child will get nothing anyway. But when you visit them for an inspection and look into their eyes—it is hard.

(Social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

Social workers measure poverty by various means, including inspections of housing according to the government decree mentioned above (Postavlenie..., 2001). In order to cope with uncertainty in their everyday rou-

tine, social workers develop a discourse of poverty based on available professional concepts, common-sense values, and emotions. In interviews these codes of poverty are related to an evaluation of external characteristics of well-being that is usually done through comparison with the social worker's own conditions. According to a social worker in Krasnoarmeisk, the living conditions in such houses are hard, but comparable to those of social workers, who also receive a very small salary. The emotional encounter with poverty deeply affects social workers:

At first, I would just come home and say, God, how well we live here, my house is strong enough, although our flat is very small and many people live here, but I told myself, how happy I am living here! And now, I've been working for two years and still cannot adjust to the appearance [of poverty]... Recently, ten days ago, I was shocked by a family—migrants moved in, two boys, a girl and a baby—four [kids]. Mother was at work, they were heating a stove. [There was a lot of] smoke—as when wood doesn't burn well, such smoke and stench. There was a table—a box crudely cobbled together out of planks—and one bed—a frame without a mattress just covered with a torn rug. They are all sitting on this bed. The majority [of our clients] live like that. (Social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

In one case there was a similar emotional response in a little old wooden house with low ceilings and poor furniture consisting of a table, a bed, and a very old sofa “on which I was afraid to sit” (social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002). In another case it was an apartment undergoing major repair that was not going to be completed because the owner did not have enough money: “The repair work has been going on for several years now—bare, ugly walls, the bathroom is awful, of course” (social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002). In another there was a “dark and narrow entrance hall” in a “typical old ‘Khrushchev house’<sup>10</sup> that had not been repaired since it was built” (social worker, Saratov, 2003).

In yet another case the definitive trait was a specific smell of poverty and old things:

It smelled there. Yes, that is perhaps what made the most powerful impression, you know what I mean? Well, it was how it smells in houses full of a lot of old things—a special smell, not that it was bad, but such a smell, rather specific. In general, it smelled old, because of the lack of ventilation, perhaps. And as for the furniture, my impres-

sion was that it was all placed here long ago and never moved since then, as though it was not 2001 but rather 1980 or even earlier. That's the kind of furniture they had there. (Social worker, Saratov, 2003)

The untidiness of the dwelling plays an important role in descriptions and evaluations that later are extended to the appearance of the women clients: they all "looked gray," except for one, who "more or less takes care of herself."

Analyzing their remarks about poverty, we saw that these external signs of neglect influence the social worker's conclusion: "we at once see a person who cares and another who neglects herself [...] even rarely washes her face, it seems" (social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002). Our informants seemed to find special words to describe single mothers who keep up a neat appearance and elicit sympathy: "Not just clean but rather neat, well-groomed poverty" (social worker, Saratov, 2003). Social workers, who are authorized by the system of means-tested assistance to determine "neediness," construct their own "tacit knowledge" about poverty out of the repertoire of images from their own life experience.

### *Subjective categorizations*

The relationships that single mothers and other categories of clients have with employees of social services and employment services and educational institutions are built upon a complex ideology in which the state and the providing agency play an important role. Thus the specific (self-)definitions of people as clients have certain consequences both for individual biographies and on a structural scale. The reaction of service users towards the activity of the social work agency results in a classification of clients as "thankful" or "unthankful."

There was one woman with three children, an incomplete family. When we came to her for an inspection and later brought food to her—when you see her eyes, you understand, yes, we are useful, people need us. And sometimes it happens that [clients] come and are rude, but you smile in return, because otherwise the director will accuse you of being impolite.

(Social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

We are helping one woman, she is a teacher, [has] an incomplete family—her husband died long ago—well, they live so-so—and when provided with assistance, she feels ashamed, because she works. [...] And

she was so thankful—frankly speaking, it was pleasant. She was provided that help because it really went to the right place.  
(Social worker, Krasnoarmeisk, Saratov Oblast, 2002)

Such a form of “moral knowledge” could be seen as serving to justify professional practice, and it shapes the service providers’ everyday definition of social work. Poverty as explained by social workers places single mothers as social service clients into a separate group burdened with specific problems. In social service there is no attempt to analyze the causes of poverty:

The social worker just puts it down as a fact and thinks, “What can I do? For instance, do we have spaghetti today? Yes. We’ll give you some. All right, are you registered in [the division of] urgent social assistance—no? Well, we’ll do that.” But why [the person] is poor, what are the reasons—no leg, no arm, mentally deficient, why or how—[I] never heard social workers or clients talking about it, about poverty in general. (Social worker, Saratov, 2003)

By saving resources, government ideologies create a gap between clients and social workers, which may explain why clients view practitioners not as sources of help but as obstacles that must be overcome to get required services (Dominelli, 2004). Social welfare administration in Russia was inherited from the Soviet regime, with its central planning and rigid system of social security based in public institutions. The general modernization of the system of social welfare in Russia is an ongoing process nowadays, and it has had a contradictory effect on social work ideology. Rather than following the paternalist scheme of thought and action, social workers are gradually acquiring new knowledge and skills to effect social change in a democratic egalitarian way. Each successfully completed case—helping the client to find a job, to accumulate resources and networks—generates a more positive attitude towards the agency and the workers. It is important for the government, non-governmental organizations, and the academic community to focus more on critical issues in social welfare, the development of conflict resolution skills, and the development of social services research. Democratic egalitarian and non-discriminatory ideology is required in social services as well as in social work training (Iarskaia-Smirnova, 2011).

Social work that is reduced to checking neediness or to material assistance to the poor cannot be an effective means of solving the economic



problems of single mothers, and it does not remove the symbolic boundaries that exclude them from the category of “normal families.” Many of our social worker informants understand this. Describing the strategies of social work with clients, one informant emphasized the need to avoid complex issues when diagnosing and dealing with problems. Social service employees “prefer not to dig too deep, because they are afraid they might dig up something they think they might not be able to solve. Usually they do something but not all they could; they do the minimum possible” (social worker, Saratov, 2003). This reluctance is related primarily to the limited resources and possibilities available to social workers and agencies. It also reflects the lack of competence among social workers who have no professional training and are not confident in their ability to analyze and treat a problem correctly.

A client’s problems might stem from beliefs in traditional gender roles and traditional family definitions, which presume that women are unequal and subordinate. Because they often subscribe to such definitions, however, models of social work practice aggravate the condition of women. Moreover, not only in the mass media but even in social-work textbooks, single mothers are often portrayed as immoral or unfortunate and considered dangerous to their own children and to society as a whole (Iarskaia-Smirnova and Romanov, 2008). Furthermore, instead of bringing women with similar experiences together, which could provide group support, practitioners try to solve the problems of each woman separately. Dividing the poor into deserving and undeserving has proved to be a useful means for scientifically rationalizing resource allocation.

## CONCLUSION

Although single mothers in many countries of the world share the same problems, due to variations in social welfare systems and models of social policy and social work practice, the position of this social group differs from one nation to another. In Russia the families of single mothers confront some of the same transitional-society problems as several other population groups, including insufficient social assistance resources, a low level of state support, and the collapse of many social networks. At the same time, single mothers must deal with the additional negative factors of social isolation and stigmatization, relegation to the less prestigious sector of the labor market, and treatment as clients whose “neediness” is subject to scrutiny.

Our research sheds light on the role of state policies in forming the patterns of family structure and providing opportunities for a decent level of life. Whether single mothers secure their rights as citizens depends on how “friendly” the state is toward women in general and female-headed families in particular, as indicated by a widely developed network of public services, the availability of childcare, and opportunities for paid work. It is important for women to be able to choose either to provide care themselves or to delegate it to public services.

The experiences of social workers and their clients demonstrate that single mothers are stigmatized as clients whose claims to social rights may be invalidated by professional experts. As a result, because social work is trapped in existing stereotypes, rules of justification, and patterns of behavior, it helps sustain inequality in society. The discourses examined in the practice of social work with single mothers reflect the fact that some categories of people are perceived as “worthy” of social rights, while others are not. This idea is being internalized and legitimized by both sides of the social worker-client relationship.

The growing level of poverty among single parents in Russia, together with additional indicators of the decreasing quality of life in their families, shows how important it is to tackle this problem immediately at the political level by reconsidering the forms and procedures of social assistance. It is also necessary to improve single mothers’ ability to (re-) enter the labor market and to guarantee them non-discrimination in recruitment and career opportunities.

#### NOTES

- 1 The new term “neediness” (*nuzhdaemost’*) was invented in the late 1990s to convey the status of a person in need subject to regular checking before being entitled to a benefit or in-kind assistance.
- 2 Part of this research was conducted within an international project led by Rolv Lyngstad, University of Bodö, Norway (see Lyngstad et al., 2004).
- 3 The size of payments is calculated based on the currency rate in November, 2011.
- 4 Beginning on January 1, 2007, the child allowance is calculated as 40 percent of the average salary for the last twelve months prior to maternity leave but not less than 1,500 rubles per month for the first child, 3,000 rubles for the second (this minimum is also provided for a non-working woman). The maximum sum for such an allowance is fixed as 6,000 rubles (U.S. \$ 1 = 26.5 rubles in January 2007).
- 5 In contemporary Russia, as in the USSR, families with three and more children are classified in the special category “families with many children.” They are

- entitled to a number of services and privileges not available to other categories of families.
- 6 Birth certificate, income certificates for all household members, certificate of place of residence, divorce (or death of spouse) certificate, medical certificate (in the case of a child's disability), and inspection report.
  - 7 According to Law No. 134-3CO of Saratov Oblast of August 1, 2007, effective January 1, 2008, the monthly allowance for children in Saratov Oblast was increased from 100 to 225 rubles. A single mother receives twice as much (U.S. \$ 1 = 24.5 rubles on January 10, 2008).
  - 8 The citizens of Saratov are eligible for this transfer once a year if they find themselves in an extremely difficult situation. If the statement by a special commission determines that the applicant and family members do not demonstrate the initiative to provide for the family and that they lead "a parasitic way of life," material assistance is denied.
  - 9 Seventy rubles in 2003 (equivalent to U.S. \$ 2.50) was a universal child benefit. A single mother receives twice as much.
  - 10 A "Khrushchev house" is an apartment house built during the period of Khrushchev's housing policy; it is usually a five-story building with small apartments.

#### REFERENCES

- Baskakova, Marina. 1998. "Problemy i prava rabotnikov s semeinymi obiazannostiami" (Problems and rights of employees with familial responsibilities). In *Prava zhenshchin v Rossii: issledovanie real'noi praktiki ikh sobliudeniia i massovogo soznania (po resul'tatam anketnogo oprosa)* (Women's rights in Russia: A study of their observance and mass consciousness [based on a survey]), ed. N.A. Kochneva, 235–258. Moscow: MCGS, Institute of Socioeconomic Problems.
- Blau, Peter M. 1960. "Orientation toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5, no. 3: 341–361.
- Breeva, Elena. 1999. *Deti v sovremennom obshchestve* (Children in modern society). Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Brui, B. 1998. "Vliianie sotsial'nykh i mediko-demograficheskikh faktorov na uroven' rozhdaemosti v Rossii" (The influence of social and medico-demographic factors on the birth rate in Russia). *Voprosy statistiki* 1: 72–74.
- Burdiak, Aleksandra, Irina Korchagina, Lilia Ovcharova, Lidia Prokof'eva, and Oksana Siniavskaia. 2009. "Novye меры semeinoi politiki i ikh vliianie na material'no-imushchestvennoe polozhenie semei s det'mi" (New measures of family policy and their effects on the material status of families with children). In *Sem'ia v tsentre sotsial'no-demograficheskoi politiki* (Family at the center of social-demographic policy), ed. Oksana Siniavskaia, 127–160. Moscow: NISP.
- Bussemaker, Jet, and Kees van Kersbergen. 1994. "Gender and Welfare States: Some Theoretical Reflections." In *Gendering Welfare States*, ed. Diane Sainsbury, 8–25. London: Sage.

- Chekorina, Natal'ia. 2002. "Zhenshchiny i sotsial'naia politika v usloviakh rynochnogo reformirovaniia" (Women and social policy under market reforms). In *Gender i ekonomika: mirovoi opyt i ekspertiza rossiiskoi praktiki* (Gender and economics: world experience and an assessment of Russian practice), ed. Elena Mezentsева, 249–274. Moscow: Russkaia Panorama.
- Chernova, Zhanna. 2008. *Semeinaia politika v Evrope i v Rossii: gendernyi analiz* (Family policy in Europe and Russia: gender analysis). St. Petersburg: Norma.
- Dement'eva, Izabella. 2001. "Negativnye faktory vospitaniia detei v nepolnoi sem'e" (Negative factors of bringing up children in incomplete families). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 11: 108–113.
- Dominelli, Lena. 2004. *Social Work: Theory and Practice for a Changing Profession*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Federal'nyi Zakon No. 195-FZ (Federal Law No. 195-FZ). 1995. "Ob osnovakh sotsial'nogo obsluzhivaniia naseleniia v Rossiiskoi Federatsii" (On the basis of social service provision for the population of the Russian Federation), December 10, 1995.
- Federal'nyi Zakon No. 122-FZ (Federal Law No. 122-FZ). 2004. "O vnesenii izmenenii v zakonodatel'nye akty Rossiiskoi Federatsii [...]" (On introducing amendments into legislative acts of the Russian Federation [...]), August 22, 2004.
- Gassmann, Franziska, and Geranda Notten. 2006. "Size Matters: Targeting Efficiency and Poverty Reduction Effects of Means-Tested and Universal Child Benefits in Russia." *Global Action on Aging*, [www.globalaging.org/elderrights/world/russia.pdf](http://www.globalaging.org/elderrights/world/russia.pdf) (accessed April 24, 2011).
- Golubeva, Lidia. 2007. "Osobennosti zhenskogo truda v sel'sko-khoziaistvennom proizvodstve" (Peculiarities of female labor in agricultural production). *Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta* 5: 296–299.
- Gurko, Tatiana. 2008. "Alimenty: faktor kachestvennogo i kolichestvennogo vosproizvodstva naseleniia" (Alimony: a factor of the qualitative and quantitative reproduction of the population). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 9, no. 110–120.
- Haney, Lynne. 2000. "Global Discourses of Need: Mythologizing and Pathologizing Welfare in Hungary." In *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*, ed. Michael Burawoy, 48–73. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Iaroshenko, Svetlana. 2004. "Bednost' nezavisimosti" (The poverty of independence). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 7: 71–83.
- Iarskaia-Smirnova, Elena. 1998. "Problematizatsiia sem'i v sotsiologii" (Problematization of the family in sociology). *Rubezh* 12: 71–87.
- . 2011. "Professional Ideologies in Russian Social Work: Challenges from Inside and Outside." In *Social Work Education in Countries of the East: Issues and Challenges*, ed. Stanley Selwyn. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Iarskaia-Smirnova, Elena, and Pavel Romanov. 2007. "Gender in Russian Textbooks on Social Policy and Social Work, 1997–2004." In *Weibliche und mannliche Entwürfe des Sozialen*, eds. Elke Kruse and Evelyn Tegeler, 215–227. Opladen, Germany, and Farmington Hills, MI: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

- . 2008. "Gendering Social Work in Russia: Towards Anti-Discriminatory Practices." *Equal Opportunities* 27, no. 1: 64–76.
- Kalabikhina, Irina. 2002. "Teoreticheskie napravleniia gendernogo analiza domokhozaistva i nekotorye voprosy sotsial'noi politiki" (Theoretical perspectives of gender analysis of the household and some issues of social policy). In *Gender i ekonomika: mirovoi opyt i ekspertiza rossiiskoi praktiki* (Gender and economics: World experience and expertise of Russian practice), ed. Elena Mezentsseva, 88–105. Moscow: Russkaia Panorama.
- Karimova, Zilia. 2007. "Zhiznennye tsennosti odinokikh materei" (Life values of single mothers). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 6: 131–134.
- Kiblit'skaia, Marina. 1999. *Ispovedi odinokikh materei* (Confessions of single mothers). Moscow: Eslan.
- Kontseptsiiia razvitiia sistemy adresnoi sotsial'noi pomoshchi naseleniiu Saratovskoi oblasti* (Concept of the development of the system of means-tested assistance to the population of Saratov Oblast). 2002. Saratov.
- Lessa, Iara. 2006. "Discursive Struggles within Social Welfare: Restaging Teen Motherhood." *British Journal of Social Work* 36, no. 2: 283–298.
- Liborakina, Marina. 1999. *Zhenshchiny i privatizatsiia* (Women and privatization). Moscow: Fond "Institut Ekonomiki Goroda."
- Lister, Ruth. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Lokshin, Michael, Barry Popkin, and Kathleen M. Harris. 2000. "Single Mothers in Russia: Household Strategies for Coping with Poverty." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, no. 2300, [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=629150](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=629150) (accessed June 8, 2011).
- Luniakova, Larisa. 1998. "Materinskie sem'i: sobliudenie prav i garantii (na primere g. Rybinska)" (Mother-headed families: observance of rights and guarantees [the case of the city of Rybinsk]). In *Prava zhenshchin v Rossii: issledovanie real'noi praktiki ikh sobludeniia i massovogo soznania (po resul'tatam anketnogo oprosa)* (Women's rights in Russia: a study of their observance and mass consciousness [based on a survey]), ed. N.A. Kochneva, 259–284. Moscow: MCGS, Institut sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh problem, Vol. 1.
- . 2001. "O sovremennom urovne zhizni semei odinokikh materei" (On the contemporary living standard of single-mother families). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia* 8: 86–87.
- . 2002. "Uroven' zhizni i material'naia podderzhka gosudarstvom nepolnykh semei" (Living standard and material support of incomplete families by the state) In *Rossia: 10 let reform. Sotsial'no-demograficheskaia situatsiia* (Russia: 10 years of reforms. Social-demographic situation), ed. Natalia Rimashevskaiia, Moscow: ISEPN.
- . 2004. "Chem muzhika kormit', luchshe rebenka vospityvat' odnoi: sotsial'nyi portret materinskikh semei" (Why should you feed a man, it's better to raise a child by yourself: A social portrait of mother-headed families). In *Semeinye uzy: modeli dlia sborki*, (Family Bonds: Models to Assemble) ed. Sergei Oushakine, 2: 60–82. Moscow: NLO.

- Lyngstad, Rolv, Gunn Strand Hutchinson, Lisbet Lund, and Siv Oltedal, eds. 2004. *Single Mothers, Poverty and Social Work: Case Studies from Norway, Australia, Canada, Russia and USA*. Bodoe, Norway: Hoegskolen i Bodoe.
- Maleva, Tatiana, and Oksana Siniavskaia, eds. 2007. *Roditeli i deti, muzhchiny i zhenshchiny v sem'e i obshchestve* (Parents and children, men and women in family and society). Moscow: NISP.
- Malysheva, Marina. 2001. *Sovremennyi patriarkhat. Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie esse* (Modern patriarchy. Social-economic essays). Moscow: Academia.
- Marshall, Thomas H. 1998. "Citizenship and Social Class." In *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader*, ed. Gershon Shafir, 93–111. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Okin, Susan M. 1992. "Women, Equality, and Citizenship." *Queen's Quart. Kingston* 1, no. 90: 56–71.
- Ovcharova, Lilia. 2008. "Bednost' i ekonomicheskii rost v Rossii" (Poverty and economic growth in Russia). *Journal of Social Policy Studies* 6, no. 5: 439–456.
- Ovcharova, Lilia, Alina Pishniak, and Daria Popova. 2007. "Novye меры podderzhki materinstva i detstva: stimulirovanie rozhdaemosti ili rost urovnia zhizni semei s det'mi?" (New measures in support of maternity and childhood: stimulation of the birth rate or growth in the living standard of families with children?) *SPERO* 6: 5–30.
- Ovcharova, Lilia, and Lidia Prokof'eva. 2002. "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie faktory feminizatsii bednosti v Rossii" (Socioeconomic factors of the feminization of poverty in Russia). In *Ekonomika i sotsialnaia politika: gendernoe izmerenie* (Economy and social policy: The gender dimension), ed. Marina Malysheva, 36–63. Moscow: Academia.
- Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Saratovskoi oblasti (Decree of the Saratov Oblast Government), June 1, 2001, No. 60-P "O kontseptsii razvitiia sistemy adresnoi sotsial'noi pomoshchi naseleniiu Saratovskoi oblasti" (On the concept of the development of the system of means-tested assistance to the population of Saratov Oblast). 2001, [http://www.social.saratov.gov.ru/laws/detail.php?SECTION\\_ID=25&ELEMENT\\_ID=789](http://www.social.saratov.gov.ru/laws/detail.php?SECTION_ID=25&ELEMENT_ID=789) (accessed June 8, 2011).
- Prokof'eva, Lidia. 2007. "Domokhoziaistvo i sem'ia: osobennosti struktury naseleniia Rossii" (Household and family: specificity of population structure of Russia). In *Roditeli i deti, muzhchiny i zhenshchiny v sem'e i obshchestve* (Parents and children, men and women in family and society), eds. Tatiana Maleva and Oksana Siniavskaia. Moscow: NISP.
- Semeinyi Kodeks Rossiiskoi Federatsii* (Family Code of the Russian Federation). 1995.
- Smirnov, Sergei, and Igor Kolosnitsyn. 2000. "Sotsial'nye obiazatel'stva gosudarstva: sokrashchenie ili restrukturizatsiia?" (Social obligations of the state: Reduction or restructuring?) *Mir Rossii* 1, 139–181.
- The World Bank. 2007. "Developing Targeted Social Assistance in Russia." *Russian Economic Report* 14, [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRUSSIANFEDERATION/Resources/RE14\\_eng\\_p3.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRUSSIANFEDERATION/Resources/RE14_eng_p3.pdf) (accessed April 24, 2011) (June 2007).

- Trygged, Sven. 2009. "Social Work with Vulnerable Families and Children in 11 Russian Regions." *European Journal of Social Work* 12, no. 2: 201–220.
- UNDP. 2008. *Demographic Policy in Russia: From Reflection to Action*. Moscow: United Nations Development Programme.
- . 2009. *Doklad o razvitii chelovecheskogo potentsiala v Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2008. Rossiia pered litsom demograficheskikh vyzovov* (Report on human development in the Russian Federation, 2008. Russia faces demographic challenges). Moscow: United Nations Development Programme.
- UNICEF. 1999. *Zhenshchiny v perekhodnyi period. Regional'nyi monitoringovyi doklad No. 6*. (Women in transition. Regional monitoring report N.6). Florence: UNICEF.
- Urbanskaia, G. 2004. "Sotsial'no-demograficheskaiia situatsiia na sele" (Social-demographic situation in rural areas). *Ekonomika sel'skogo khoziaistva* 2: 432.
- Ustinova, Mara. 1992. "One-Parent Families in the USSR: Ethnoregional Specificity." In *One-Parent Families*, ed. Ulla Björnberg, 7–11. Amsterdam: SISWO Publication.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1994. "Is Citizenship Gendered?" *Sociology* 28, no. 2: 379–395.
- Vishnevskii, Anatolii, and Sergei Bobylev, eds. 2009. *Russia Facing Demographic Challenges: National Human Development Report; Russian Federation 2008*. Moscow: United Nations Development Programme.

