DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Research Article

**Migration and union dissolution in a changing
socio-economic context: The case of Russia**

Magdalena Muszynska

Hill Kulu

Special Collection 6: *Interdependencies in the Life Course*,
edited by Hill Kulu and Nadja Milewski.

Table of Contents

Migration and union dissolution in a changing socio-economic context: The case of Russia

Magdalena Muszynska[1]

Hill Kulu[2]

Abstract

Previous studies show that family migration is usually to the benefit of the man's professional career and that it has a negative impact on the woman's economic well-being and employment. This study extends previous research by examining the effect of family migration on union dissolution. We use the event-history data of two retrospective surveys from Russia and apply hazard regression. The analysis shows that couples who move frequently over long distances have a significantly higher risk of union dissolution than couples who do not move or move only once. Our further analysis reveals that the risk of disruption for frequent movers is high when the migrant woman has a job. Frequent migrants had a high risk of union dissolution during the Soviet period but they faced no such risk during the post-Soviet socio-economic transition. We argue that frequent moving increases union instability through a variety of mechanisms, the effect of which may vary across socio-economic contexts.

[1] Duke Population Research Institute & Population, Policy, and Aging Research Center, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Duke University, 188 Rubenstein Hall, Durham, NC 27708, USA. E-mail: magdalena.muszynska@duke.edu
[2] Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Konrad-Zuse-Straße 1, 18057 Rostock, Germany. E-mail: kulu@demogr.mpg.de

1. Introduction

Previous studies show that family migration is usually to the benefit of the career of the male earner in the household and that family migration has a negative impact on the professional career and earnings of the women. Migrant women are less likely to be employed and they tend to have smaller incomes and work shorter hours than non-migrant women of similar characteristics (Sandell 1977, Mincer 1978, Cooke and Bailey 1999, Boyle *et al.* 1999, 2001, 2003, 2006, Cooke 2001, Clark and Davies Withers 2002). If women's economic well-being suffers from family migration, one would expect that family migration also exerts a negative influence on the quality of the relationship between the partners, and hence raises the propensity of union disruption. In their recent study, Boyle *et al.* (2006) show that family migration indeed raises union instability: Couples who move frequently have a significantly higher risk of union dissolution compared to non-moving ones or couples who move only once. The present study follows this research direction and examines the effect of migration on union dissolution among married and cohabiting couples in Russia.

Russia is an interesting case for two reasons. The level of divorce in Russia is among the highest in Europe (Council of Europe 2004), but it has been rarely examined and poorly understood. Most previous studies have been based on aggregated data (e.g., Andreev and Scherbov 1996, Avdeev and Monnier 2000, Becker and Hemley 1998, Mazur 1969); research based on individual level data has been conducted only recently (Scherbov and van Vianen 2001, 2004). Another reason is that Russia's recent history allows us to distinguish between two periods of different socio-economic contexts: of the planned economy and of transition to the market economy. While most research focuses on the consequences of family migration in the context of the Western market economy, we study whether or not patterns similar to the ones found in these studies also exist in Russia, i.e., a former socialist country that has experienced significant socio-economic and institutional changes in the past two decades.

2. Migration and union dissolution – theoretical considerations

Family migration is expected to increase the propensity of union dissolution due to the following reasons (Boyle *et al.* 2006). First, previous studies show that women's economic well-being and employment suffer from family migration, which is usually stimulated by the man's professional career (Boyle *et al.* 2003). Women's employment careers are frequently disrupted after the move, they occupy lower positions or they are paid less than in the jobs they had prior to the move (Mincer 1978, Shihadeh 1991, Cooke and Bailey 1999, Boyle *et al.* 2001, Cooke 2001, 2003, Clark and Davies

Withers 2002). This non-symmetrical gain and loss from family migration possibly exerts a negative influence on the quality of the relationship between the partners. A tied migrant might experience personal loss that is unexpectedly high when moving with a partner, and she may consider separating from him when an opportunity to do so opens up, i.e., when she can afford to maintain a separate household (Mincer 1978, Boyle *et al.* 2006).

Second, moving to a new place also leads to changing social networks. Social networks at the old place of residence might have constrained divorce, particularly the social networks shared by both partners, where kin relations play a major role (Boyle *et al.* 2006). This disruption entails the loss of a source of psychological and social support. As a result, migration may overload a couple, with one of the partners expecting from the other to fill in in terms of the psychological and social functions fulfilled previously by the members of the former networks (Sluzki 1998). The additional burden may increase union instability.

Third, changing the place of residence is stressful and this may precipitate divorce. This applies in particular to frequent movers (Boyle *et al.* 2006). A change of residence requires significant changes to a person's routines, roles, and identities, all of which are a major source of stress, and particularly so if it happens again and again. Similarly, the moving process in itself is stressful, particularly for families with children, who additionally have to organise child care and other child-centred activities.

Finally, the marriage market changes as the place of residence changes. New potential partners become available; these are likely to be partners with whom the mover is in contact with in everyday life, thus placing additional strains on the current relationship (South and Spitze 1986, Boyle *et al.* 2006).

There are reasons to believe that the effect of migration depends on the settlements of origin and destination. Migration from rural to urban areas entails a move to an environment where more liberal views dominate and divorce is less stigmatised (Boyle *et al.* 2006). Further, cities offer greater opportunities for a woman to find a job and maintain a separate household. Finally, as the marriage market in urban areas is larger, there is also a higher chance to find a better match there (South and Spitze 1986, Boyle *et al.* 2006). Couples who move from a rural to an urban area should thus have a considerably higher risk of union dissolution than those staying in a rural area, because of the effect of both the migration and the destination context.

While the migration process may lead to an increase in union instability for urban to rural movers, the improvement in environment and housing conditions after the move should significantly weaken the negative effect of other aspects resulting from the event of moving. In addition, these moves usually take place at a family stage at which union stability is high or they are made mostly by couples who accord priority to the family over the working career (Boyle *et al.* 2006, Kulu 2007). As a result, we can expect

migration from urban to rural areas to decrease the risk of union dissolution – urban-to-rural migrants should exhibit the disruption levels similar to those of rural stayers.

Thus, there are various reasons why we can expect long-distance moves (for most cases) to increase union instability and to lead to union dissolution. Although most of our previous reasoning draws from research on Western Europe or North America (for further details, see Boyle *et al.* 2006), we believe that, overall, similar mechanisms have operated in Russia and Eastern European countries that have a specific post-war socio-economic development. It is still interesting to compare the effect of migration on union dissolution in the context of a centrally planned economy and during the period of transition to the market economy. If women's economic well-being is of critical importance, as argued above, we should observe some differences across the two periods because of different employment opportunities for tied migrants. Under the centrally planned economy, when everyone enjoyed secure employment, it was easy for a woman to find a job after having moved with her husband to a new place. At first, this would suggest that the effect of family migration on the women's economic well-being might have been negligible during Soviet times as opposed to the transition period when employment opportunities for tied migrants were poor. In reality, however, just the opposite applied. While relatively good employment opportunities indeed existed for tied migrants during the Soviet time, frequent moving for the sake of the partner's career also brought along for tied migrants disruption of professional careers and usually lower positions than they had prior to the move as competition for better jobs was as strong as elsewhere. We believe that in this period it was existing employment opportunities that enabled women to maintain separate households and hence leave the partnerships that had become unsatisfactory to them after frequent moving. Employment opportunities decreased considerably in the transition period. When unemployment became a major concern, tied migrants also faced difficulties to find any job at the new place of residence. We thus expect that frequent migrants had higher risks of union disruption in the Soviet period than they had in the transition period and this effect resulted from the different employment opportunities for tied migrants in the two periods. We do not believe that possible changes in the essence of the migration processes played any additional role. Although the role of the state and other institutions was large in shaping employment opportunities and labour migration in the Soviet time (Sjöberg 1999), studies show that people still had enough room to exercise their employment and residential preferences (Buckley 1995, Tammaru 2000, Kulu 2003, 2004).

3. Data and methods

3.1 Data

Our study is based on data stemming from two surveys. The first, the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS), was conducted in Russia between June and August 2004 (for the description of the GGS Programme, see Vikat *et al.* 2007). The questionnaire included detailed partnership and fertility histories. The survey is based on a multistage probability sample of dwelling units (for a description of the sample, see Kosolapov 2004). As a result, 4223 Russian men and 7038 women between the ages of 18 and 79 were interviewed. Out of 7038 interviewed women, 5579 had ever been in union.

The second survey, the Education and Employment Survey (EES), was conducted in November 2005. Detailed information was collected on the employment, educational, and migration histories of the Russian population. The sample for the survey consists of GGS Survey respondents. After matching the GGS with the EES data files, there were 3074 women who had ever been in union.

The study subject was union, with the woman as the marker. Women were treated as being in union based on co-residence (and an intimate relationship) with a male partner for more than three months; co-residence with the same partner more than once was treated as two different unions.

As the union formation and dissolution patterns might differ across ethnic groups, we studied only the unions of women with a Russian, Belarusian, or Ukrainian ethnicity. We thus excluded 255 women who belonged to other ethnic groups. We also excluded women who provided incomplete data (e.g., a different year of birth in the two surveys or who misreported the date of union formation), thus leaving 2803 women in our final sample. Our data includes 2803 first unions (907 dissolutions), 597 second unions (203 dissolutions), and 78 third unions (30 dissolutions). The study period is 1967–2004. The year 1967 was the earliest year a union had been formed by our respondents.

Our major explanatory variable of interest was an individual's migration status. Using information on women's migration and partnership histories, we included in the analysis time-varying covariates as follows: 1) the number of union-specific inter-settlement moves (no migration, one migration, two or more migrations) and 2) the type of settlement of residence (regional centre, another city or town, urban-type village, village). There were 814 first union-specific migrations and 292 second and subsequent order union-specific migrations. (674 first migrations and 259 higher order migrations were at a distance of over 50 km.) When migration was recorded in the same month as union disruption, we assumed that the migration was the result of disruption and not its cause, i.e., that it occurred after disruption. This was done as the definition of union was

based on co-residence. We also checked whether or not the risk of union dissolution was stable right after migration – there was no evidence of a high risk in the few months following migration, suggesting that our definition and data set-up is reasonable to distinguish moves that lead to separation from the moves that followed separations.

Additional demographic and socio-economic variables were included in the analysis to control for the compositional differences between migrant and non-migrant couples. We included the following time-varying variables: union duration, age, educational level (in education, primary, secondary, higher), motherhood status in union (no child, one child, two or more children), partnership status (cohabiting; married, after cohabitation; married, directly), employment status (not employed or employed), and calendar period (1967–1989 or 1990–2004). The time-constant variables included in the analysis were: union order (first, second, third), parental divorce (divorced or not divorced), motherhood status at union formation (childless or mother). The distribution of risk-months and number of dissolutions across categorical variables is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: **Person-months (exposures) and union dissolutions (occurrences) by categorical variables**

Variable	Person-months	Union dissolutions
Union order		
First	398,442	907
Second	57,891	203
Third	5548	30
Parental divorce		
No	383,831	874
Yes	78,050	266
Educational level		
In education	159,766	427
Primary	40,910	98
Secondary	237,779	557
Higher	23,426	58
Motherhood status at union formation		
Childless	61,689	198
Mother	400,192	942

Table 1:   (Continued)

Variable	Person-months	Union dissolutions
Motherhood status in union		
No child	57,662	393
One child	174,344	590
Two or more children	229,875	157
Partnership status		
Cohabiting	57,807	320
Married, after cohabitation	104,872	286
Married, directly	299,202	534
Employment status		
Not employed	93,144	260
Employed	368,737	880
Period		
1967–1989	185,742	396
1990–2004	276,130	744
Migrations		
No migrations	355,387	926
One migration	73,402	139
Two or more migrations	33,092	75
Place of residence		
Regional centre	166,354	549
Another city or town	133,533	344
Urban-type village	37,947	63
Village	124,047	184
Migrant status		
Non-migrants in urban areas	151,023	487
Non-migrants in rural areas	33,399	65
Urban–urban migrants	92,609	260
Urban–rural migrants	81,961	110
Rural–urban migrants	56,255	146
Rural–rural migrants	46,634	72
Total	461,881	1140

Source: Calculations based on the Russian GGS and EES.

3.2 Models

We studied the dissolution of marital and non-marital unions. We considered the date at which the respondent reported the co-residence ended as the moment of separation. The observation was censored if the partner had died. We modelled time since union formation to separation, using hazard regression models (Hoem 1987, 1993, 2001, Blossfeld and Rohwer 2002). The basic model can be specified as follows:

$$\ln \mu_{ij}(t) = y(t) + \sum_k z_k (u_{ijk} + t) + \sum_l \alpha_l x_{ijl} + \sum_m \beta_m w_{ijm}(t) \quad , \tag{1}$$

where $\mu_{ij}(t)$ denotes the hazard of the jth union dissolution for individual i and $y(t)$ represents a piecewise linear spline that captures the impact of the baseline (i.e., union) duration on the hazard[3]. Parameter $z_k(u_{ijk} + t)$ denotes the spline representation of the effect of a time-varying variable that is a continuous function of t with origin u_{ijk} (e.g., a woman's age). Parameter x_{ijl} represents the values of a time-constant variable (e.g., parental divorce) and $w_{ijm}(t)$ denotes a time-varying variable whose values can change only at discrete times (e.g., migration status or place of residence).

4. Results

4.1 The effect of migration and the place of residence

Model 1 (see Table 2) shows that first migration does not change the risk of union dissolution, whereas changing the settlement of residence twice or more within a union increases the hazard of union disruption by 31% compared to non-moving couples. We also see that couples living in urban areas are more likely to experience union dissolution than those who live in rural settlements. Model 2 controls for the socio-demographic characteristics of a woman. The effect of migration and the settlement of residence do not change much: Frequent movers and couples living in urban areas have a significantly higher risk of union dissolution. Similar results were obtained when only inter-settlement moves over 50 km were included in the model.

---

[3] We used a piecewise linear spline specification (instead of the widely used piecewise constant approach) to pick up the baseline log-hazard and the effect of (other) time-varying variables which change continuously. Parameter estimates are thus slopes for linear splines over user-defined time periods. With a sufficient number of nodes (bend points), the piecewise linear specification can capture efficiently any log-hazard pattern in the data.

Table 2: **Relative risks of union dissolution by categorical variables and slope estimates of log-hazard for age and union duration**

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Union order			
First		1	1
Second or third		1.23*	1.23*
Parental divorce			
No		1	1
Yes		1.28***	1.29***
Educational level			
In education		1.05	1.07
Primary		1	1
Secondary		1.03	1.04
Higher		1.14	1.18
Motherhood status at union formation			
Childless		1	1
Mother		0.77**	0.77**
Motherhood status in union			
No child		1	1
One child		0.86*	0.86
Two or more children		0.42***	0.42***
Partnership status			
Cohabiting		2.21***	2.22***
Married, after cohabitation		1.27***	1.28***
Married, directly		1	1
Employment status			
Not employed		1	1
Employed		1.06	1.05
Period			
1967–1989	1	1	1
1990–2004	1.55***	1.32***	1.33***
Migrations			
No migrations	1	1	
One migration	1.01	1.06	
Two or more migrations	1.31**	1.37***	
Place of residence			
Regional centre	1.24***	1.15**	
Another city or town	1	1	
Urban-type village	0.67***	0.68***	
Village	0.60***	0.63***	

Table 2: **(Continued)**

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Migrant status			
Non-migrants in rural areas			1
Non-migrants in urban areas			1.71***
Urban–urban migrants			1.72***
Urban–rural migrants			0.96
Rural–urban migrants			1.88***
Rural–rural migrants			1.29
Migrations			
One migration			1
Two or more migrations			1.26*
Age			
15–19 (slope)		0	0
20–24 (slope)		−0.004	−0.005
25–29 (slope)		−0.001	−0.001
30–34 (slope)		−0.002	−0.002
35+ (slope)		−0.001	−0.001
Union duration (baseline)			
0–6 months (slope)	0.453***	0.478***	0.477***
6–12 months (slope)	−0.111***	−0.095***	−0.095***
12–36 months (slope)	0.014*	0.023***	0.023**
36–48 months (slope)	−0.029*	−0.021	−0.021
48–60 months (slope)	0.006	0.013	0.013
60–72 months (slope)	−0.038**	−0.025*	−0.025
72+ months (slope)	−0.002***	0.002	0.002
Constant	−8.059***	−8.376***	−8.807***
Log-likelihood	−7193.0	−7080.2	−7081.4

Source: Calculations based on the Russian GGS and EES.
Significance: '*'=10%, '**'=5%, '***'=1%.

Model 3 includes the origin and destination of migration. Couples who move between urban areas or rural settlements for the first time have a similar risk of separation as non-moving couples in urban or rural areas, correspondingly. Those who move from rural to urban areas exhibit disruption levels similar to non-migrants living in cities, while couples who move from urban to rural areas display dissolution levels close to non-movers in rural areas. Thus, the disruption levels of first-time migrants are similar to the levels of non-migrants at destination. Moving twice or more increases the risk of union dissolution, whatever the origin and destination of migration (the effects are proportional).

To gain a deeper understanding of the causes of union dissolution of migrant couples, we examined whether or not the effect of family migration depends on a woman's employment status after the move. When the employment status of a woman was included in the models, there was no difference between women who are employed and those who are not (see Table 2, Models 2 and 3). However, the effect of employment on union dissolution turns out to be significant for frequent migrants. For non-migrants and first-time migrants alike, the risk of union dissolution is similar when a woman works or does not do so, whereas the situation changes after the second migration (see Table 3). The risk of union dissolution is very high when a woman is employed, but relatively low when she is unemployed or inactive after the move.

Table 3: **Relative risks of union dissolution by number of migrations and employment status**

Employment status	No migrations	One migration	Two or more migrations
Not employed	1	1.11	0.96
Employed	1.04	1.09	1.52***

Source: Calculations based on the Russian GGS and EES.
Significance: '*'=10%, '**'=5%, '***'=1%.
Note: Controlled for union order, parental divorce, educational level, motherhood status at union formation, motherhood status in union, partnership status, period, place of residence.

We also studied whether or not the effect of migration on the risk of union dissolution varies in the two different historical periods. We see that during the Soviet period first migration did not change the risk of union dissolution, whereas the second and subsequent migrations increased the hazard of disruption by 53% (see Table 4). The risk of union dissolution has been higher in the post-Soviet period, but neither first nor second migration changes the risk level significantly. The value of the estimate is larger after second migration, but the difference to the estimate before or after first migration is not significant (the significance of the difference was tested in additional models, where the reference category was 'non-migrants in 1990–2004'). The effect of

migration on the risk of union dissolution thus depends on the socio-economic context of the movers.

Table 4:   **Relative risks of union disruption by number of migrations and period**

Period	No migrations	One migration	Two or more migrations
1967–1989	1	0.87	1.53**
1990–2004	1.33**	1.33**	1.46**

Source: Calculations based on the Russian GGS and EES.
Significance: '*'=10%, '**'=5%, '***'=1%.
Note: Controlled for union order, parental divorce, educational level, motherhood status at union formation, motherhood status in union, partnership status, employment status, place of residence.

4.2 The effects of other variables

The effects of other variables are largely as expected. The risk of disruption is the highest in the first months after union formation and decreases with union duration (see Table 2) (Becker *et al.* 1977, Becker 1993, Sayer and Bianchi 2000). The dissolution levels are higher for couples in the second and subsequent union and for those who experienced parental divorce during childhood (Hoem and Hoem 1992, Lehrer 2003). The existence of children in the household decreases the risk of union dissolution (Waite and Lillard 1991, Hoem and Hoem 1992, Becker 1993, Lehrer 2003). Couples who cohabit have a higher risk of union dissolution than those who are married, and couples who cohabited prior to marriage face a higher risk compared to those who married directly without prior cohabitation (Hoem and Hoem 1992, Becker 1993, Lehrer 2003, Boyle and Kulu 2006). The risk of union dissolution has also increased over historical time, as expected (Avdeev and Monnier 2000, Scherbov and van Vianen 2001). The dissolution levels, however, do not differ much across educational levels and employment statuses (even though the effect of the latter variable is significant among the frequent movers, as shown above) (cf. Becker 1993, Hoem 1997, Lehrer 2003). Overall, the results confirm that the patterns and determinants of union dissolution in Russia are similar to those in other European countries. We may, however, expect that there is some variation over historical time, particularly between the Soviet and the post-Soviet period (Muszynska 2006). A further analysis, however, is beyond the scope of this paper.

5. Summary and discussion

This study examined the effect of family migration on union dissolution in Russia. We used event-history data from two retrospective surveys and applied hazard regression. The analysis showed that couples who move frequently over long distances have a significantly higher risk of union dissolution than couples who do not move or who move only once. Our further analysis revealed that the risk of disruption for frequent movers is high when a woman has a paid job, and that frequent migrants had a high risk of union dissolution during the Soviet period, but not in the post-Soviet period. We also found that dissolution levels in urban areas are much higher than in rural areas, and that migrants exhibit disruption levels similar to non-migrants at destination.

We believe that while several factors account for the elevated risk of disruption among frequent migrants, economic and psychological factors play a decisive role. Family migration is usually to the benefit of the migrant man's career and has a negative impact on the woman's economic well-being (Cooke and Bailey 1999, Boyle *et al.* 2001). Therefore, when moving over long distances, many partnered women consciously or unconsciously subject themselves to traditional gender roles and sacrifice their professional career for the sake of the family's well-being. The costs that result from repeating this adjustment several times may turn out to be too high, however, and eventually women leave a union that has become unsatisfactory after a sequence of moves. The fact that frequent migrants have a particularly high risk of union dissolution when the woman has a job is consistent with the arguments suggesting that women leave an unsatisfactory relationship when they find work in a new place and are thus able to maintain a separate household. Anticipation of union dissolution, of course, may accelerate a woman's return to the labour market.

The question, however, arises why the increased risk of dissolution observed among frequent migrants in the Soviet period was not present in the transition period? We believe that this change in the relationship reflects differences in the socio-economic conditions prevalent in the two periods. During Soviet times, employment rights were guaranteed and it was relatively easy for a woman to find a job, even as a tied migrant. When she worked, it was easier for her to exit a union that had become unsatisfactory after frequent migrations for the sake of her male partner's career. In the post-Soviet era, however, employment is no longer secured and the opportunities of new employment are scarce. Moreover, salaries have been very low during the transition period owing to economic downturn. Being tied migrants, women thus face difficulties to find a well-paid job at the new place of residence and may not be able to exit an unsatisfactory union and maintain a separate household afterwards. If this is true, the patterns may change again when the transition in Russia ends and living standards improve. Whether frequent moving for the sake of men's career increases the

actual risk of union dissolution or not may thus depend much on whether or not and how easily women find paid jobs in a particular socio-economic context.

The higher risk of union dissolution in urban areas is as expected. An environment that is more liberal in the cities, greater employment opportunities there, and higher chances to find a better match are the factors that account for urban-rural differences in the disruption levels. The fact that migrants exhibit dissolution levels similar to those of non-migrants at destination is not surprising, either. This suggests that migrants adapt to the socio-economic and cultural environment at destination, although selectivity may also play a role, particularly for urban-to-rural migrants. Moves to rural areas are usually made at a family stage at which union stability is high or mostly by couples who accord higher priority to the family than to professional career (Boyle *et al.* 2006, Kulu 2007).

The results of our study on Russia are thus consistent with the findings of the previous study by Boyle *et al.* (2006) on Austria, suggesting that there are more general factors that increase the risk of union dissolution for frequent migrants. However, we observed some variation over historical time (across contexts) and this suggests that further research may benefit from cross-national comparisons of the effect of migration on union dissolution. Another important issue to consider is the role of unobserved migrant selectivity: Disruption-prone people may be over-represented among frequent movers. However, Boyle *et al.* (2006) modelled union dissolution and migration jointly, showing that the disruption patterns remained similar even when unmeasured characteristics of migrants were controlled for. Another extension would be the inclusion of the partner's characteristics, which would allow us to gain further insights into the nature and consequences of family migration. In addition, the union dissolution patterns of frequent migrants need further examination by origin and destination of migration. Our current study showed elevated risks of union disruption for frequent migrants whatever their origin and destination, but the sample was too small to explore the patterns in detail.

6. Acknowledgements

References

Andreev, E., and S. Scherbov. 1996. *Demographic Atlas of Russia*. Unpublished manuscript.

Avdeev, A., and A. Monnier. 2000. Marriage in Russia: a complex phenomenon poorly understood, *Population: An English Selection* 12: 7–50.

Becker, C. M., and D. D. Hemley. 1998. Demographic change in the former Soviet Union during the transition period, *World Development* 26: 1957–1975.

Becker, G. S. 1993. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Becker, G. S., E. M. Landes, and R. T. Michael. 1977. An economic analysis of marital instability, *Journal of Political Economy* 85: 1141–1187.

Blossfeld, H.-P., and G. Rohwer. 2002. *Techniques of Event History Modeling: New Approaches to Causal Analysis*. Second edition. Mahway: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Boyle P. J., T. J. Cooke, K. Halfacree, and D. Smith. 1999. Gender inequality in employment status following family migration in GB and the US: the effect of relative occupational status, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 19: 115–150.

Boyle, P. J., T. J. Cooke, K. Halfacree, and D. Smith. 2001. A cross-national comparison of the impact of family migration on women's employment status, *Demography* 38: 201–213.

Boyle, P. J., T. J. Cooke, K. Halfacree, and D. Smith. 2003. The effect of long-distance family migration and motherhood on partnered women's labour market activity rates in GB and the US, *Environment and Planning A* 35: 2097–2114.

Boyle, P. J., H. Kulu, T. Cooke, V. Gayle, and C. H. Mulder. 2006. *The effect of moving on union dissolution.* MPIDR Working Paper, WP–2006–002. Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research. http://www.demogr.mpg.de/papers/working/wp-2006-002.pdf.

Boyle, P. J., and H. Kulu. 2006. *Does cohabitation prior to marriage raise the risk of marital dissolution and does this effect vary geographically?* MPIDR Working Paper, WP–2006–051. Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research. http://www.demogr.mpg.de/papers/working/wp-2006-051.pdf.

Buckley, C. 1995. The myth of managed migration: migration control and market in the Soviet period, *Slavic Review* 54: 896–916.

Clark, W. A. V., and S. Davies Withers. 2002. Disentangling the interaction of migration, mobility, and labor-force participation, *Environment and Planning A* 34: 923–945.

Cooke, T. J. 2001. 'Trailing wife' or 'trailing mother'? Family migration, life course events, and the labor market participation of married women, *Environment and Planning A* 33: 419–430.

Cooke, T. J. 2003. Family migration and the relative earnings of husbands and wives, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93: 338–349.

Cooke, T. J., and A. J. Bailey. 1999. The effects of family migration, migration history, and self-selection on married women's labor market achievement, in P. J. Boyle and K. Halfacree (Eds.), *Migration and Gender in the Developed World*. London: Routledge, pp. 102–113.

Council of Europe. 2004. *Recent Demographic Developments in Europe 2004*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Hoem, B., and J. M. Hoem. 1992. The disruption of marital and non-marital unions in contemporary Sweden, in J. Trussell, R. Hankinson and J. Tilton (Eds.), *Demographic Applications of Event History Analysis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 61–93.

Hoem, J. M. 1987. Statistical analysis of a multiplicative model and its application to the standardization of vital rates: a review, *International Statistical Review* 55: 119–152.

Hoem, J. M. 1993. Classical demographic models of analysis and modern event-history techniques, *IUSSP: 22nd International Population Conference, Montreal, Canada*, Volume 3, pp. 281–291.

Hoem, J. M. 1997. Educational gradient in divorce risks in Sweden in recent decades, *Population Studies* 51: 19–27.

Hoem, J. M. 2001. Demographic analysis, a probabilistic approach to, in N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 14*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 3428–3432.

Kosolapov, M. 2004. *Preliminary Report: Sample of the Russian Federation*. Moscow: Demoscope.

Kulu, H. 2003. Residence and migration in post-war Soviet Estonia: the case of Russian-born Estonians, *TESG: Journal of Economic and Social Geography* 94(5): 576–588.

Kulu, H. 2004. Determinants of residence and migration in the Soviet Union after World War 2: the immigrant population in Estonia, *Environment and Planning A* 36(2): 305–325.

Kulu, H. 2007. Fertility and spatial mobility in the life-course: evidence from Austria, *Environment and Planning A* (advanced online publication).

Lehrer, E. L. 2003. The economics of divorce, in S. A. Grossbard-Shechtman (Ed.), *Marriage and the Economy: Theory and Evidence from Advanced Industrial Societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 55–74.

Mazur, D. P. 1969. Correlates of divorce in the U.S.S.R., *Demography* 6: 279–286.

Mincer, J. 1978. Family migration decisions, *The Journal of Political Economy* 86: 749–773.

Muszynska, M. 2006. *Woman's employment and union disruption in a changing socio-economic context: the case of Russia.* MPIDR Working Paper, WP–2006–027. Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research. http://www.demogr.mpg.de/papers/working/wp-2006-027.pdf.

Sandell, S. E. 1977. Women and economics of family migration, *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 59: 406–414.

Sayer, L. C., and S. M. Bianchi. 2000. Women's economic independence and the probability of divorce, *Journal of Family Issues* 21: 906–943.

Scherbov, S., and H. van Vianen. 2001. Marriage and fertility in Russia of women born between 1900 and 1960: a cohort analysis, *European Journal of Population* 17: 281–294.

Scherbov, S., and H. van Vianen. 2004. Marriage in Russia: a reconstruction, *Demographic Research* 10(2): 27–60. www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol10/2/default.htm

Shihadeh, E. S. 1991. The prevalence of husband-centred migration: employment consequences for married mothers, *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53: 432–444.

Sjöberg, Ö. 1999. Shortage, priority and urban growth: towards a theory of urbanisation under central planning, *Urban Studies* 36: 2217–2235.

Sluzki, C. E. 1998. Migration and the disruption of the social network, in M. McGoldrick (Ed.), *Re-Visioning Family Therapy: Race, Culture and Gender in Clinical Practice*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 360–369.

South, S. J., and G. Spitze. 1986. Determinants of divorce over the marital life course, *American Sociological Review* 51: 583–590.

Tammaru, T. 2000. Differential urbanisation and primate city growth in Soviet and post-Soviet Estonia, *TESG: Journal of Economic and Social Geography* 91: 20–30.

Vikat, A., Z. Speder, G. Beets, F. Billari, C. Buhler, A. Desesquelles, T. Fokkema, J. M. Hoem, A. MacDonald, G. Neyer, A. Pailhe, A. Pinnelli, and A. Solaz. 2005. Generations and Gender Survey (GGS): Towards a better understanding of relationships and processes in the life course, *Demographic Research* 17(14): 389–440. www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol17/14/default.htm.

Waite, L. J., and L. A. Lillard. 1991. Children and marital disruption, *American Sociological Review* 96: 930–953.