

DOI: 10.12731/2218-7405-2013-8-75

TRANSFORMATION OF FAMILY IN MODERN RUSSIAN SOCIETY

Otradnova O.A.

The article examines concept of family in Russian society, changes in interpretation of family, connected with modern tendencies and processes in different sociocultural spheres. The article is structured and has accurate limits of introduction, main part and conclusion. The relevance of the research is caused by present-day crisis tendencies connected with suicide actions, atomization and hedonization of society, value depreciation of family. The object of the research is to analyze the conception of family and its transformation in condition of modern Russian society. The tasks are to determine the term *family*, to analyze approaches to understanding of the family and its genesis, detect some peculiarities of modern Russian society, research the transformation of interpretation of family in modern society; the matter of investigation is modern Russian society, the subject is the transformation of family structures; the following methods of research are used: historical and cultural approach, typological method, existential method, common logic procedures. The research contains author's definition of the term *family*, historical and cultural analysis and typological explication of the approaches to interpretation of the problem, classification of family structures - which have been formed in Russian society- on the base of statistic and sociological data. Some interweaving of concept *family* with the most important existential values (love, freedom, responsibility) were investigated and some tendencies for further development of family relationship in Russian society were revealed, its problems and prospect were emphasized. The results of the investigation testify that modern types of matrimonial relationship differ in limitation of functionality, mutual

responsibility, thereby it is possible to state that interpretation of family in modern Russian society has transformed.

Key words: family, modern society, matrimony, love.

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ СЕМЬИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ РОССИЙСКОМ ОБЩЕСТВЕ

Отраднава О.А.

В статье исследуется концепт семьи в российском обществе, изменения в понимании семьи, связанные с современными тенденциями и процессами в различных социо-культурных сферах. Статья имеет сквозное, монолитное строение, но внутри структурирована и имеет четкие границы введения, основной части и заключения. Актуальность исследования обусловлена кризисными тенденциями современности, связанными с суицидальными практиками, аномизацией, гедонизацией общества, ценностной девальвацией семьи; цель - анализ понимания семьи и ее трансформации в условиях современного российского социума, задачи - определение термина семья, анализ подходов к пониманию семьи и ее генезису, выявление особенностей современного российского общества, исследование трансформации понимания семьи в современном обществе; объект исследования – современное российское общество, предмет - трансформация семейных структур; методы: историко-культурный подход, типологический метод, экзистенциальный метод, общелогические процедуры. Исследование содержит авторскую дефиницию термина «семья», историко-культурный анализ и типологическую экспликацию подходов к пониманию проблемы, классификацию семейных структур, сформировавшихся в современном российском обществе на основе статистического и социологического материала. Исследованы взаимосвязи концепта семья с важнейшими экзистенциальными ценностями (любовь,

свобода, ответственность), выявлены тенденции дальнейшего развития семейственности в российском обществе, обозначены его проблемы и перспективы. Результаты исследования показывают, что современные типы брачных отношений отличаются ограничением функциональности, взаимной ответственности, в силу чего можно утверждать о трансформации понимания семьи в современном российском обществе.

Ключевые слова: семья, современное общество, брак, любовь.

Introduction

Modern Russian society endures the phase of demolishing of the old soviet mentality model and shaping of the new man of Russia who is possessed of up-to-date system of values, priorities, attitudes towards himself, Another one, nature and the world. This phase is considered to be the most complex and controversial owing to the collision of several thought systems peculiar to different generations – soviet paternalism and post-soviet liberalism which form the image of modern Russian. In many case it will determine further existential subsistence and evolution of the individual in Russian society. Family plays the most important part in this process as it fulfils initial socialization of an individual, accustoms him to the achievements of culture and forms up axiological purposes which act as moral regulators of future behavior of a man.

Such destructive phenomena of nowadays as increase of suicide actions (especially in the environment of the teens and youth), increasing number of single men and women, aggressiveness, dystrophy of compassion, egocentrism, anomy, hedonism etc. are evidence of crisis tendencies in family sphere, its devaluation and functional transformation. Traditional, extended family and the one having many children having previously been the centre of socialization, property accumulation, delivery of status is slipping away while modern family tends to atomize, isolate from society and state, lose stability and transform. These disturbing tendencies require scientific attention and studying and determine the relevance of the present work.

Degree of working out. The interpretation of family has been researched since ancient times, this issue was worked out by Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, F. Bacon, T. Hobbes, J.J. Rousseau, J.A. Condorcet, I. Kant, G. Hegel and some others. J. J. Bachofen and L.H. Morgan studied family from perspective of evolutionism while P. Sorokin and T. Parsons from perspective of functionalism. A lot of approaches to interpretation of family conditioned by economic, pedagogic, psychological, demographic, value and other aspects have been formed in modern science. Here we should mention scientific works by A.G. Kharchev and M.S. Matskovsky, S.I. Golod, T.A. Gurko, V.A. Lectorsky, I.S. Kon, A.G. Vishnevsky, A.I. Antonov and some others. In Western philosophy – A. Giddens, A. Guggenbuhl-Craig, G. Navaitis, A. Bettler, J. White, D. Klane and some others.

The purpose of this research is to analyze interpretation of family and its transformation in modern Russian society. Based on the purpose the following main tasks are formulated: determinating the term family, analyzing approaches to interpretation of family and its genesis, researching transformation of interpretation of family in modern Russian society. The matter of the investigation is modern Russian society, the subject is family structures. As methods of investigation we have applied *historic and cultural approach* which allow to examine family in historic and cultural prospect, by means of *typological method* some approaches to interpretation of family have been analyzed and several types of family structures in modern Russian society have been formulated, *existential method* enables to fulfill interconnection of the concept *family* with such individual values as love, freedom, responsibility etc.; some common logic procedures have also been applied.

Concept “family”: conceptual theoretical analysis

Interpretation of family and matrimony is difficult and multifold in nature and contains legal, juristic, moral-ethics, economic, social political, psychological and other elements and dwells at “interdisciplinary crossroads” of appropriate sciences apiece to be limited in studying subjective part of family, connected with its own problem area. Sociology interprets family as social institution characterized with

definite social regulations, penalties, patterns of behavior, rights and obligations regulating relationship between conjoints, parents and children. [36, с. 314-315]. At that from perspective of sociology matrimony means socially confirmed union of a man and a woman engendering rights and obligations toward one another and children. [7, с. 62]. Sociologist A.G. Kharchev considers that family can be defined as historically specific system of relationship between conjoints, parents and children and as small social group whose members are tied by matrimonial or family relations as well by commonness of private life and mutual moral responsibility social necessity of which is stipulated by society demand for physical and mental reproduction of population. [40, с. 75].

From perspective of law family can be defined as a group of people bound by rights and obligations arising from matrimony, kindred, adoption or other forms of taking children for up-bringing and which are acknowledged to foster strengthening and development of family relationship [30, с.69]. G.F. Shershenevich stated: «Family is a constant cohabitation of a husband, wife and children in other words it is an union of people, bound by matrimony and people descended from them». At the same time he stressed that «both physical and mental way of family life is established unbeknown to law...Legal aspect is necessary and expedient in the domain of family members' privity» [42, с. 259].

From the point of view of psychology matrimony unites two (sometimes more) people binding them to the system of mandatory patterns of behavior for the purpose of supporting unanimity of family [29]. C. Jung regards matrimony as union of people with different mentality, but at the same time he considers matrimony to be a combination of machismo and feminine in the psychological whole of an individual [45. C. 209-224]. L.B. Schneyder considers conjoints relationship to be the most important component of matrimony and evaluation of this relationship by family members [43].

Philosophic dictionary defines family as «small social group, the most important form of private life organization based on matrimonial union and

relationship» [39. С. 361]. I. Kant defines matrimony as «joining of different sex individuals for permanent possessing of each other's sexual properties» [21, с. 191]. N. Berdyaev supposed essence of family to consist in its secular substance and necessity of creating it as institution of positivism collating the life of a kin [6]. I. Ilyin considers family division to be a matrimonial unit, created by mutual consent and parental-children institution provided by parental side: "family starts with matrimony and strikes up within it. But a man starts his life in the family he hasn't created himself, but in the one to have been established by his mother and father, where he entered being born long before he manages to realize himself and outward things. He gets the family as gift of destiny [20, с. 118].

As a whole examined aspects reveal peculiarities of interpretation of family as a combination of emotional, axiological, normative, valuable, domestic and some other factors which embodies difficulty in defining this phenomenon.

Besides specifically scientific approaches to interpretation of family (such as sociological, psychological, legal etc.) some authors' approaches can be marked out in modern science. So G. Navaitis emphasizes factological and logic approaches. According to the first approach family represents relationship hence the population is distributed to groups available for empirical treatment; while according to the second one the attention is focused not on the coverage of diversification of the groups but on peculiarity of social ties and features of stable relationship within family group. [28]. American sociologist R. Hill proposes 5 approaches to interpretation of family: institutional historic approach researches family in cultural historic context, examining its evolution component; structure functional approach interprets family under relationship with outer social world and inward life, limited circle of acquaintance and differentiates its functional peculiarities; interactive role approach investigates ties between members of family, their roles and authority; situation psychological approach focuses on value normative component of family; developmental approach touches upon phases of family existence and development. [41]. In the book by A.I. Antonov and V.M. Medkov one can meet other 5

approaches to interpretation of family: evolutionism, functionalism, biologism, empiricism and scientism. Evolutional approach rests upon studying genesis of family; functional approach is based on socio-cultural family members' roles and basic goals of its existence; biologism positions matrimony and family as species peculiarity; empiricism puts family to the separate specific group which has its own phases of appearance, blossoming and eclipse; scientist approach underlines interpersonal attitudes both within the family and outside it [2].

In our turn we propose historic cultural and value functional approaches to determination of family and matrimony. According to the first approach family means a group of people, united with particular relationship occurring in particular historical period and deterministic cultural legal standards and traditions of that period. Historic cultural approach enables to research family as an individual cultural historic phenomenon with its own periods of appearance, formation and development and different modifications. The most crucial and topical question in this case is not so much the moment of origin of a family as a phenomenon (scientists concur that family engendered in archaic period) rather than its initial look and solution of this question depends on number of ethnological theories, which in general come to three groups :

- patriarchal group which consider patriarchal organization to be the initial form of family with so called *father law* in the base of it and family to be led by agnates. Such views had been held by almost all scientists till 18-th century (Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, J.J. Rousseau, J.A. Condorcet) as well as H. Maine, K. Shtarke, A. Westermarck, E. Grosse etc. Aristotle writes: «Domestic animals ranks much more higher by nature than wild ones and all domestic animals had better obey the man – this is how they join to their good. In the same way the husband behaves towards his wife: he ranks higher by nature while she is lower, that is why the man dominates and the woman obeys. The same principle must inevitably prevail in all mankind.» [3, с. 383].

- matriarchal group adheres to the opinion that historically initial type of family relationship was based on *mother* law and family was formed by matriheritage. This point of view is supported by L.G. Morgan, F. Engels, J. J Bachofen, J. Mc.Lennon, J. Lubbock, J. Lafitau, M.O. Kosven, M.M. Kovalevsky etc. In his book “Ancient society” L.G. Morgan points out that «kin in archaic period consisted of reputed foremother and her children with her daughters’ children and her matriheritage endlessly. Her sons’ children and her agnate descendants were expelled from the kin [27, с. 196].

- binary group states that family initially contained two parallel ways of development – patriarchy and matriarchy, which took place in different ethnic groups. This perspective was supported by W. Schmidt, E. Taylor, W. Koppers, S.P. Tolstov, H.M. Dumanov, V.P. Alexeev, A.I. Pershitz. Ethnologist and archeologist S.P. Tolstov thought that preservation of matriarchal organization had been one of the most progressive ways of development of primitive society till the formation of state while patriarchal organization prevailed where the temps of transition to civilization was very slow.[38]. In the work by V.P. Alexeev and A.I. Pershitz “The history of primitive society” the following statement is given «sex and age organization existed in early primitive communalcy didn’t cause any inequality in relationship between adult men and women. All specialized in different and equally useful fields of labor activity. That’s why relationship of domination and obedience couldn’t exist in the status of sexes.» [1, с. 183]. E. Taylor admits presence of both patriarchy and matriarchy families in primitive society. [37].

Taking into consideration works by J. J Bachofen, J. Mc.Lennon, L.G. Morgan, F. Engels, E. Taylor, W. Rivers, M.O. Kosven modern science traces genesis of family back to promiscuity (chaotic sexual intercourse) through the dual kin matrimony (unification of two clans, providing interchange of their representatives for making new families which is caused by appearance of exogamy as prohibition for matrimony within one kin group) to the pair matrimony and to monogamy which

is the most admissible form of family life in modern civilized countries. [46, 27, 44, 25].

Now we see that historic cultural approach allows to research problems of genesis of family phenomenon, its different forms and real incarnation of these forms in historic ethnic social groups.

Another side of family studying concerns axiological aspect and its functional filling and propose definition of a family as social group, which fulfills definite set of functions and possessed of value imperative as totality of moral ethic and social standards. Here we can emphasize three basic value functional lines of family making:

- sexual, of a value here is corporal directed sexual conduct of male and female and the most important functions are connected with procreation. This policy, according to many scientists (A. Westermarck, A. Guggenbuhl-Craig, A.I. Antonov and some other) appears initial centrifugal link of family making in archaic period and during the existence of pre-class society [10, 14, 2]. Since the society developed the function of procreation has gradually lost its primary in family making in modern civilized countries which causes crisis tendencies in demography and creates extra relevance of procreation;

- socioeconomic line. Social stability and steadiness as well as property enrichment are as values here, while functions of family in this case are based on socialization of children on the one hand and accrual and assignation of property on the other. The most important axiological element of the family in this case is a set of sociocultural roles conditioned by matrimony, kinship and parenthood. Researching family in socioeconomic context E. Durkheim studied mechanisms of family cohesion, the role of each family member in overall picture of family life and also the interaction between divorces and suicides [17, 18]. The problems of motherhood and fatherhood are developed in the works by B. Malinovsky, who says that family is intended not so much for getting posterity rather than for «upbringing and building the base of citizenship and social» [26, c. 85], i.e. upbringing determines social

temper of nation. Moral ethics values are of a great significance in this direction of family existing, which is instilled in human together with social values and which further development of the whole culture and civilization is depended on. The very origination of moral is interpreted by some scientists as response to exogamy i.e. it is connected with dual ancestral organization of family. (J.I. Semyonov, S.P. Tolstov, A.M. Zolotarev, J.M. Boroday etc.). Hence promiscuity is characterized with absence of mental and ethical standards, dual ancestral organization – with engendering of morality apparent from pristine taboos, paired matrimony presupposes complication of moral standards, development of traditions and customs, monogamous matrimony improves moral values, reinforcing them with economic and later with legal obligations.

- emotional line. The main values here are love and psychological comfort between conjoints and functions tends to provide this comfort and partnership in family. W. Ogburn is considered the first to ascertain phenomenon of transition from the family based on conforming to sociocultural regulations to the one based on interpersonal preferences, according to terminology of A. Burgess it means transition from “family-institute” to “family-fellowship”. Such kind of a family has become popular only in modern society claiming to overcome patriarchy, equality of the sexes, absence of economic and social dependence of conjoints that engenders their partnership and family making is conditioned not by socioeconomic factors but by emotional intimacy and love. A. Giddens says about it pointing out that at the heart of the family in modern developed society there is a conjoints union (spouse) bound by feelings and emotional affection which either were lacking or auxiliary phenomena in traditional form of family: « The spouse took a central place in family life as its economic role decreased and love became the main reason of marriage» [11, с. 74]. According to S.I. Golod the main factor of uniting spouses which have been married for less than 10 years is mental and psychological consistency, than comes equitable distribution of household duties and at last sexual harmony [13]. Cordiality and psychological consistency within family becomes an essential factor

of matrimony and underlines a number of researches in modern psychology and sociology which has formed socionics - a new direction of science which according to C. Jung's typology distinguishes sixteen types of human mentality nature and studies principles of relationship between them. So A. Augustinavichutė one of those who pioneered socionics considers love to be a way of solving two human needs: sexual stress relief and establishing mental affection with another person [4]. Socionics sees mankind future in such reorganization of society due to which individual will choose a partner and elaborate a strategy of interpersonal relationship starting from his mental health and using knowledge about social types.

Thus value functional approach allows to research phenomenon of family in axiological perspective, deduce transformation of values around which family is made and functions as basic direction of family activity.

Family in modern Russian society.

Modern Russian society has experienced the process of democratization of family and its modernization in the likeness of Western pattern, it makes changes in the type of modern family both from historic culture and value functional perspective. Renunciation of patriarchate and heyday of sexual equality compete with traditional patriarchal monogamous family, one-parent family becomes a trend, different kinds of polygamy distribute, same-sex unions appear etc. As new tendencies of modern families one can enumerate following kinds: incomplete family, virtual family, trial matrimony, guest matrimony, open matrimony.

Incomplete family has become the most widespread, its peculiarity is it is a family without one of the participants of family relationship; it can be childless or single-parent. Certainly one shouldn't consider incomplete family modern phenomenon as such families existed in earlier historic cultural conditions, yet in previous epochs this phenomenon was forced and caused by particular circumstances (e.g. dowager family etc.) It is confirmed by the first general census of enumeration in Russian Empire 1897 that indicated that by the age of 50 almost all men and women were married the portion of those who had never been married by that age

was 4% for women and 5 % for men [48, с. 7-18]. Modern incomplete family is the result of divorces, deliberate renunciation of children or partners. All-Russian census of enumeration 2010 demonstrated clearly these changes: among the men over 16 who indicated marriage status almost 37% were unmarried, among women over 16 who indicated marriage status almost 47,6% were unmarried, such tendencies are typical both for urban (unmarried 37% of men and 48,7% of women) and for rural (unmarried 37% of men and 44,3% of women) population; both for central regions (in the city of Moscow among those who indicated marriage status 39,6% и 50,2% of men and women thereafter were unmarried) and in provinces (for example in the Republic of Komi the percentage of unmarried is 36,7% of men и 45,8% of women; in Karelia republic these data are 34,2% of men and 47% are unmarried) [33].

One of the types of incomplete family incidental to modern transformation only is childfree family, characterized with conjoints deliberately renouncing to bear children because of many reasons, which in general mean the following:

- fear of being a bad parent,
- unwillingness to change habitual way of living,
- fear of social and financial instability
- woman's necessity of rebuilding her value hierarchy and unwillingness to sacrifice her job and career.

According to data of census of enumeration 2010 280 children under 15 account for one thousand able-bodied citizens of Russia, i.e. 1 child is born for 4 adults [33]. "Atomization" of society and discharge of determination of society promote phenomenon of childfree families. A person has had a choice opportunity which didn't exist in traditional society and everyone makes this choice proceeding from his own system of values, underwent deformation towards straightening of egocentric principles.

In our opinion complete renunciation of procreation forms selfishness as ontological base of partners' life; as a result love is demolished as in integrity within family; concentration of a man's interests on his personality, understanding that birth

of a child is directly linked with responsibility, mental vulnerability of parents which shows up constant concern for his safety, health, upbringing and education prompt modern individual to alternative type of mutual relations excepting procreation. Such alternative brings danger for further viability of society, strengthening demographic crisis consisted in imbalancing between able to work population and retirement age people as well as between growing old North and advancing South and East. Hence we can reveal negative component of childfree family which lies in demographic deviation threatening with powerful geopolitical changes; also in axiological crisis, strengthening anomy, egocentrism, dying of family as the most important social institution, on the base of which social relations are formed.

Another type of incomplete family is a single-parent family, in modern variant it has a number of reasons for appearing:

- It constitutes after divorce of conjoints. As stated above, modern family is built in the base of partnership, emotional affection and love; these components are the most sought for conjoints and their absence causes emotional, sexual, psychological dissatisfaction one of the main reasons for divorces. Data of Russian Public Opinion Research Centre avouch that in estimation of Russians ideal family is first of all that where despite financial hardship mutual understanding, support and respect prevail (81%), where general family concerns are more important than its members' (78%) and where a husband and a wife have mutual interests and spend pastime together (77%) [32]. Divorce as the most frequent reason for occurring of incomplete family where a child remains with his mother (In estimation made by The Institute of Social and Economic Studies of Population of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Russia the portion of children remaining with fathers is less than 1%) [34, c. 48] – has a number of possible negative consequences both for the family and upbringing of the next generation and for the whole society. Such consequences may contain socioeconomic – poverty, mother's excessive employment, lack of attention paying to a child etc; psychological and pedagogical – anxiety, unrest, personal deformation of children, presence of pernicious habits, nervous instability,

depression, susceptibility to suicide, frequent disease etc.; state political – destruction of family as a social unit in negative way reflects in the whole state political system. Modern American philosopher and sociologist A. Battler considering the problem of family and its role in society points out the following dependence: «The more families in the state the lower its entropy is and vice versa. Therefore as soon as the quantity of divorces begins to exceed the number of marriages the state enters the phase of dying. It is doomed to downfall.» [8, с. 162].

- It forms as a result of a lonely woman's donor conception. Such family varies from divorced one in mother's responsibility, her confidence in desire to have a baby, material well-being, more comfortable psychological and social conditions. However the family where the conception is made by force of artificial impregnation or embryo implantation with the use of father-donor is not widespread in Russia due to high cost operation on conception and the number of moot points concerning legal support of biological and social parents. The phenomenon of donor maternity in our country, its influence upon social looks of the state and other consequences haven't been a subject of researches in the field of sociology or philosophy and need studying. As T.A. Gurko says «social and psychological consequences of «substitution maternity» haven't been studied in Russia yet. How new technologies affect parenthood; whether the parents who get a child with great difficulties differ from “usual” ones, which sex of a child is preferred in Russia – this is what lies ahead of studying » [15, с. 128].

Virtual family is a new simulated type of family relationship in modern society that means not only computer simulation of real life but any substitution of real action or relationship for the image regardless of applying computer technologies. The functions and goals of conjugal unit separate, tools and means of achieving these goals get independence and transform the face of the family making it virtual. We may deduce such metamorphoses in sexuality which in traditional unit is only the way of reproducing and intimate contacts are limited by procreation. Due to development of medical technologies in the area of contraception the connection

between sexuality and reproduction has been severed as a result sexuality became self-valuable and assumed the functions of communication and conjoints achieving psychological comfort, i.e. in modern family sexuality is not bound with procreation but serves hedonistic purposes. This fact is confirmed by modern demography: «Low fertility signifies almost absolute segregation of sexual behavior from procreative and thereby increases self-value of sexual behavior and its hedonistic component» [16, с. 74]. Sexual liberation results in distributing of sexual freedom reflecting at such phenomena as open matrimony, swingering, same-sex union etc. The very meaning of matrimony is virtualized, it isolates from religious and legal basis and is substituted for the term *partnership* that means mutually beneficial collaboration which is easy to break off at request. This type of relationship represents in cohabitation, civil or trial marriage which successfully compete with officially registered marriage. Another factor characterizing virtualization of family is changes in housekeeping; if conjoints don't live together without having mutual amenities and meet only for specific purposes while socialization of children is fulfilled by one of the parents time by time or in the distance, in this case parenthood and wedlock are simulated. Such relationship can be met in formally extended family where the parents have parted from each other but haven't legally divorced where a parent or a spouse works apart home and seldom communicate with his family and in complete families. The particular type of virtual substitution is cyber prosthetics in which family functions within the space of Internet. According to D.V. Ivanov union «Ego + PC» is an utmost form of virtual family «here the emotions getting in the process of communication with images generated on the computer screen make up the absence of one of classical partners – father (husband), mother (wife), child [19, p. 58]. So if we interpret family as a group of people bound with each other by matrimonial or kindred relationship, mutual moral responsibility and carrying out such functions as procreation, socialization of children, accumulation and assignation of property etc. different deviations from traditional relationship will be considered to be virtualization.

Open marriage is a form of modern conjugal unit which lets conjoints covenant on their sexual liberty and independence and position their relationship as humane and democratic, overcoming monotony of family life. However this liberty in many instances has negative consequences as renunciation of sexual exclusiveness leads to loss of intimacy in conjugal intercourse. I.S. Kon says about such union: «Sex of four together can be funnier than of two, but it quickly, annoys making increase the number of pairs or constantly change them and the rise of affection between members of different pairs will sure to undermine initial conjugal unions» [24, p. 231-232]. Another problem of liberal relationship in matrimony is complication of children upbringing and instilling them moral and ethics standards, assistance in existential and social self-identification.

In modern society *trial or civil marriage* has become a widespread phenomenon liberating conjoints from legal and pecuniary obligations and simplifying the procedure of family making and disintegration. Increasing number of civil marriages was mentioned by Russian Public Opinion Research Centre which in 2007 according to the results of public opinion poll registered 7-11 % of civil pairs in all age groups except old where people over 60 had only 2% of civil unions[32]. The civil marriage is especially popular among the young who use this form of cohabitation as a “rehearsal” before legal registering of relationship i.e. they consider official marriage to be more important undertaking in their lives, which require special training of partners and their mutual assuredness in each other while civil marriage is simpler and insignificant owing to easiness of its dissolution; we may notice increase of youth consciousness and responsibility for taking decisions on family making and it differs modern marriage from traditional one. Russian academic demographers also stresses that fact: «Union if a man and a woman has become more intimate and sometimes deeper, sometimes more superficial but it doesn't require outward official registering of marriage. Selectivity in searching of long-term partner in wedlock increases but requirements for short-term sexual partners decrease as affair with them doesn't turn into solid matrimony. Such affairs are perceived by

both partners themselves and their social environment as preparation for matrimony and seem to be episodes on the way of trial and error that didn't absolutely reside traditional marriage. It did not declare a right to mistake, and was registered in early age once and for all and often against the will of future couple [16, с. 74]. Among negative peculiarities of civil marriages one can point out absence of social status and solidity of conjoints' position, perception of such marriages by society as frivolous relationship, absence of moral and legal defense of children and property in such marriage.

Guest marriage is a family where conjoints neither live together nor keep common house. There are many reasons of such union: impossibility to bear each other's habits, and be next to each other; unwillingness to take constant care of a spouse, "to create family hearth"; idea of saving the liberty of personal preferences in everyday life; long-term preservation of novelty and romance of brief dates; impossibility of changing domicile or job etc., i.e. the basis of such marriage can be formed of "authorized" sexual relationship and obligations, but it is impossible to create some kind of nepotism or solid union in such marriage, as nothing but sexual intimacy binds conjoints, there is no any confidential relationship between partners as well as moral responsibility before each other and society.

Conclusion

Research of family in modern Russian society revealed significant transformation of interpretation and attitude towards family and matrimony which has experienced the evolution from traditional patriarchal union contained a number of generations headed by householder – father and husband, via nuclear family separated "small family" consisted of parents and their children to modern equal family where conjoints-partners participate in family life, distribute obligations and take decisions. We have mentioned the dependence of patriarchal family origin because of economic or another benefit while modern family proves to be the result of mental creative work of partners and its origin is one of the most significant steps for a person and mutual love is the most important reason for getting married. This

fact is verified by data of the survey held by Russian Public Opinion Research Centre, according to the poll a great deal of respondents regardless of age and marriage status considered intimacy to be the main reason for registering marriage.[32]. We have proposed the definition of family as a group of people, tied by marriage or cognate relationship, mutual moral responsibility and fulfilling of definite functions. We examined such types of modern family as incomplete (single-parent) family, virtual family, trial (civil) marriage, guest marriage, open marriage; revealed specific peculiarities of each of them and some positive issues and negative tendencies. In general it should be pointed out that modern types of matrimony are distinguished with limitation of functionality, mutual responsibility thereby they don't correspond with common definition of family contained vital, corporal, social, economic values as well as moral, ethic etc.

References

1. Alekseev V.P. Pershits A.I. *Istoriya pervobytnogo obshchestva* [Prehistory] Moscow, 2007.
2. Antonov A. I., Medkov V. M, *Sotsiologiya sem'I* [Sociology of the Family] Moscow, 1996.
3. Aristotel'. *Politika* [Politics]. Soch.: v 4 t. — Moscow, 1983. — T. 4.
4. Augustinavichyute A. *Dual'naya priroda cheloveka* [The dual nature of man]. Kiev: Izd-vo Mezhdunarodnogo instituta sotsioniki, 1992.
5. Bem. S. *Linzy gendera: Transformatsiya vzglyadov na problemu neravenstva polov* [The lenses of gender: Transforming the views on the problem of gender inequality]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004. – 336 p.
6. Berdyaev N.A. *Smysl tvorchestva. Opyt opravdaniya cheloveka* [The meaning of creativity. Human experience of justification.] Parizh, 1985.
7. *Bol'shoy tolkovyy sotsiologicheskiy slovar'* [Big Explanatory Dictionary of Sociology.] – T. 1. – Moscow, 1999.

8. Bettler A. *O lyubvi, sem'e i gosudarstve: filosofsko-sotsiologicheskii ocherk* [On Love, Family and the State: the philosophical-sociological essay]. Moscow, 2006.
9. Veyninger, O. *Pol i kharakter* [Sex and Character]. Rostov-na-Donu : Feniks, 1998. – 605 p.
10. Vestermark E. *Polovye voprosy* [Sexual issues]. Moscow, 2011.
11. Giddens E. *Uskol'zayushchii mir. Kak globalizatsiya menyaet nashu zhizn'* [Elusive peace. How globalization is changing our lives]. Moscow. 2004.
12. Giddens, E. *Transformatsiya intimnosti. Seksual'nost', lyubov' i erotizm v sovremennykh obshchestvakh* [The transformation of intimacy. Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies]. St. Petersburg : Piter, 2004. – 208 p.
13. Golod S. I. *Stabil'nost' sem'i: sotsiologicheskii i demograficheskii aspekty* [Stability of the family: a sociological and demographic aspects]. Leningrad, 1984.
14. Guggenbyul'-Kreyg A. *Brak umer — da zdravstvuet brak!* [Marriage dead - long live the marriage!]. St. Petersburg, 1997.
15. Gurko T.A. *Brak i roditel'stvo v Rossii* {Marriage and parenthood in Russia} Moscow, 2008.
16. *Demograficheskaya modernizatsiya Rossii, 1900-2000* [Demographic Modernization in Russia, 1900-2000], pod red. A.G. Vishnevskogo. Moscow. 2006.
17. Dyurkgeym E. *O razdelenii obshchestvennogo truda* [On the division of social labor.]. Odessa, 1900.
18. Dyurkgeym E. *Samoubiystvo. Sotsiol. etyud* [Suicide. Sociology etude]. St. Petersburg, 1912.
19. Ivanov D.V. *Virtualizatsiya obshchestva* [Virtualization of the society]. St. Petersburg, 2000.
20. Il'in I.A. *Put' dukhovnogo obnovleniya* [The path of spiritual renewal]. Moscow : Rus. kn. XXI vek, 2006.
21. Kant I. *Metafizika nravov v dvukh chastyakh* [Metaphysics of Morals]. T. part 2., Moscow :Mysl', 1965.

22. Kerdellan K., Greziyon G. *Deti protsessora: Kak internet i videoigry formiruyut zavtrashnikh vzroslykh* [Children of processor: How the Internet and video games shape tomorrow's adults]. Ekaterinburg, 2006.
23. Kon I.S. *Lunnyy svet na zare. Liki i maski odnopoloy lyubvi* [Moonlight on the crack of dawn. Faces and Masks same-sex love]. Moscow, 2003.
24. Kon I.S. *Seksologiya* [Sexology]. Moscow, 2004.
25. Kosven M. O., *Matriarkhat. Istoriya problemy* [Matriarchy. History of the problem]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1948.
26. Malinovskiy B. *Dinamika kul'turnykh izmeneniy* [The dynamics of cultural change]. Moscow, 2004.
27. Morgan L.G. *Drevnee obshchestvo ili issledovanie liniy chelovecheskogo progressa ot dikosti cherez varvarstvo k tsivilizatsii* [Ancient Society or the study of the lines of human progress from savagery through barbarism to civilization]. Leningrad, 1935.
28. Navaytis G. *Sem'ya v psikhologicheskoy konsul'tatsii* [Family in psychological counseling]. Moscow: NPO «Modek», 1999.
29. *Oksfordskiy tolkovyy slovar' po psikhologii* [The Oxford Dictionary of Psychology] pod red. A.Rebera. Moscow, 2002.
30. *Osnovy yuvenal'nogo prava* [Fundamentals of juvenile law: studies. Allowance]. Voronezh, 2001.
31. Platon. *Sobr. soch.* [Works]. Moscow, 1993.
32. portal VTsIOM [All-Russian Public Opinion Research Centre]. <http://wciom.ru> (data obrashcheniya 26.08.2012)
33. portal Vserossiyskaya perepis' naseleniya. Tom 2 «Vozrastno-polovoy sostav i sostoyanie v brake» [Portal National Census. Volume 2, "Age and sex composition and marital status»] http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol2/pub-02-05.pdf (data obrashcheniya 21.08.2012)

34. Rossiya. *Sotsial'no-demograficheskaya situatsiya* [Russia. Socio-demographic situation]. Moscow, 1995.
35. Sartr, Zh. P. *Allyuziya lyubvi* [Allusion love]. Moscow : Algoritm, 2008. – 240 p.
36. *Sotsiologicheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology]. – Moscow, 1998.
37. Taylor E. *Antropologiya* [Anthropology]. St. Petersburg, 1882.
38. Tolstov S.P. *Nekotorye problemy vseмирной istorii v svete dannykh sovremennoy istoricheskoy etnografii* [Some of the problems of world history in the light of modern historical ethnography], no 11 (1961).
39. *Filosofskiy slovar'* [Philosophical Dictionary] pod red. A. I. Rozentalya. Moscow, 1975.
40. Kharchev A. G. *Brak i sem'ya v SSSR* [Marriage and Family in the USSR]. Moscow, 1979.
41. Khill R. *Sovremennye tendentsii v teorii sem'I* [Current trends in the theory of the family], no 4 (1970).
42. Shershenevich G. F. *Uchebnik russkogo grazhdanskogo prava* [Textbook Russian civil law]. Moscow, 1915.
43. Shneyder L.B. *Psikhologiya semeynykh otnosheniy. Kurs lektsiy* [Psychology of family relationships. The course of lectures]. Moscow, 2000.
44. Engel's F. *Proiskhozhdenie sem'i, chastnoy sobstvennosti i gosudarstva* [The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State]. Moscow: Politizdat, 1986.
45. Yung K. *Brak kak psikhologicheskoe otnoshenie* [Marriage as a psychological attitude]. Moscow: Kanon, 1997. pp. 209-224
46. Bachofen J. *Das Mutterrecht*. Stuttgart, 1861.
47. Kinsey, Alfred C. Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. — Philadelphia : W. B. Saunders Company, 1948.
48. *Patterns of First Marriage: Timing and Prevalence*. N.Y.: United Nations, 1990.

49. Sorokin, P. *The American Sex Revolution*. Boston : Porter Sargent Publisher, 1956. – 186 p.

50. White J.M. Klein D.M. *Family Theories*. California: USA Library, 2002.

Список литературы

1. Алексеев В.П. Першиц А.И. История первобытного общества М., 2007.
2. Антонов А. И., Медков В. М, Социология семьи. М., 1996.
3. Аристотель. Политика // Аристотель // Соч.: в 4 т. — М., 1983. — Т. 4.
4. Аугустинавичюте А. Дуальная природа человека. Киев: Изд-во Международного института соционики, 1992.
5. Бем. С. Линзы гендера: Трансформация взглядов на проблему неравенства полов. Пер. с англ. – М.: РОССПЭН, 2004. – 336 с.
6. Бердяев Н.А. Смысл творчества. Опыт оправдания человека. Париж, 1985.
7. Большой толковый социологический словарь. – Т. 1. – М., 1999.
8. Бэттлер А. О любви, семье и государстве: философско-социологический очерк. М., 2006.
9. Вейнингер, О. Пол и характер / О. Вейнингер ; пер. с нем. В. Лихтенштадта. – Ростов-на-Дону : Феникс, 1998. – 605 с.
10. Вестермарк Э. Половые вопросы. М., 2011.
11. Гидденс Э. Ускользящий мир. Как глобализация меняет нашу жизнь. М. 2004.
12. Гидденс, Э. Трансформация интимности. Сексуальность, любовь и эротизм в современных обществах / Э. Гидденс. – СПб. : Питер, 2004. – 208 с.
13. Голод С. И. Стабильность семьи: социологический и демографический аспекты. Л., 1984.
14. Гуггенбюль-Крейг А. Брак умер — да здравствует брак! СПб., 1997.
15. Гурко Т.А. Брак и родительство в России. М., 2008.

16. Демографическая модернизация России, 1900-2000 под ред. А.Г. Вишневого. М., 2006.
17. Дюркгейм Э. О разделении общественного труда. Одесса, 1900.
18. Дюркгейм Э. Самоубийство. Социол. этюд. СПб., 1912.
19. Иванов Д.В. Виртуализация общества. СПб., 2000.
20. Ильин И.А. Путь духовного обновления. М. : Рус. кн. XXI век, 2006.
21. Кант И. Метафизика нравов в двух частях. Ч. 2//Кант И. Собр. Соч в 6-ти тт. Т. 4, ч. 2., М. :Мысль, 1965.
22. Керделлан К., Грезийон Г. Дети процессора: Как интернет и видеоигры формируют завтрашних взрослых / пер. с фр. А. Лушанова. Екатеринбург, 2006. С. 104.
23. Кон И.С. Лунный свет на заре. Лики и маски однополюсной любви М., 2003.
24. Кон И.С. Сексология. М., 2004.
25. Косвен М. О., Матриархат. История проблемы, М.—Л., 1948.
26. Малиновский Б. Динамика культурных изменений// Малиновский Б. Избранное: Динамика культуры. М., 2004.
27. Морган Л.Г. Древнее общество или исследование линий человеческого прогресса от дикости через варварство к цивилизации Л., 1935.
28. Навайтис Г. Семья в психологической консультации. М.: НПО «Модэк», 1999.
29. Оксфордский толковый словарь по психологии/Под ред. А.Ребера, 2002 г.
30. Основы ювенального права: учеб. пособие. – Воронеж, 2001. – Т.1.
31. Платон. Собр. соч. : в 4 т. / Платон ; под общ. ред. А. Лосева, В. Асмуса, А. Тахо-Годи. – М. : Мысль, 1993. – Т. 2.
32. портал ВЦИОМ. <http://wciom.ru> (дата обращения 26.08.2012)
33. портал Всероссийская перепись населения. Том 2 «Возрастно-половой состав и состояние в браке»

http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol2/pub-02-05.pdf (дата обращения 21.08.2012)

34. Россия. Социально-демографическая ситуация. М., 1995.
35. Сартр, Ж. П. Аллюзия любви / Ж. П. Сартр, С. де. Бовуар. – М. : Алгоритм, 2008. – 240 с.
36. Социологический энциклопедический словарь. – М., 1998.
37. Тайлор Э. Антропология. СПб., 1882.
38. Толстов С.П. Некоторые проблемы всемирной истории в свете данных современной исторической этнографии // Вопр. истории. 1961. № 11.
39. Философский словарь / под ред. А. И. Розенталя. – М., 1975.
40. Харчев А. Г. Брак и семья в СССР. – М., 1979.
41. Хилл Р. Современные тенденции в теории семьи // Социальные исследования. Проблемы брака, семьи и демографии. Вып.4. – М., 1970.
42. Шершеневич Г. Ф. Учебник русского гражданского права. – Т. 2. – М., 1915.
43. Шнейдер Л.Б. Психология семейных отношений. Курс лекций. М., 2000.
44. Энгельс Ф. Происхождение семьи, частной собственности и государства. — Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Избранные произведения. В 3-х т. Т. 3. — М.: Политиздат, 1986.
45. Юнг К. Брак как психологическое отношение// Юнг К. Конфликты детской души. М.: Канон, 1997. С. 209-224
46. Bachofen J. *Das Mutterrecht*. Stuttgart, 1861.
47. Kinsey, Alfred C. Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia : W. B. Saunders Company, 1948.
48. *Patterns of First Marriage: Timing and Prevalence*. N.Y.: United Nations, 1990.
49. Sorokin, P. *The American Sex Revolution*. Boston : Porter Sargent Publisher, 1956. – 186 p.

50. White J.M. Klein D.M. *Family Theories*. California: USA Library, 2002.

DATA ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Otradnova Olga Anatolevna, docent, Candidate of Philosophy of science,
Department of Philosophy

Astrakhan State University

20b, Tatishcheva st., Astrakhan, Russia

olgaotradnova@mail.ru

ДААННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Отраднава Ольга Анатольевна, доцент, кандидат философских наук

Астраханский государственный университет

ул. Татищева, 20б, г. Астрахань, Россия

olgaotradnova@mail.ru