

# *Institutional transformation of households in the epoch of new industrialisation*

Zaitseva Ekaterina

Institute of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship  
Ural Federal University  
Yekaterinburg, Russia  
e.v.zaitceva@urfu.ru

Bannykh Galina

Institute of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship  
Ural Federal University, Ural State University of economics  
Yekaterinburg, Russia  
g.a.bannykh@urfu.ru

Kostina Svetlana

Institute of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship  
Ural Federal University  
Yekaterinburg, Russia  
s.n.kostina@urfu.ru

**Abstract – The purpose of the research is to analyse the trends of changing the institute of a household under the influence of new industrialisation processes using the example of Russian society.**

**Currently, changes in households have become a source of irreversible social transformations in industrialized countries. Reducing the rates of marriage and fertility, increasing in the number of divorces and incomplete families led to a negative dynamics in the age and ethnic structure of society, “restructuring” the various vital areas of society – economic, social, political, etc.**

**The main methodological approaches for studying the object were the systems and the structural-functional. The theoretical basis of the study was an analysis of publications by foreign and domestic scientists who studied the problems of households and marriage, especially the transformation of the households during the period of modernisation and new industrialisation. The empirical base consists of statistical materials and own empirical studies.**

**Keywords – new industrialisation, household, human capital, nuclear family, few children family**

## I. INTRODUCTION

As the academician O.A. Tatarkin mentions, today's problem of Russia, and many other developing countries, lies not in building a post-industrial economy, but in the inevitability of its new industrialisation, which involves updating the technological basis of the economy and changing the ways of managing the national economy [1]. In his opinion, this process causes a mismatch between the technical, economic and socio-institutional spheres, affecting the entire system of social and political regulation. The goal of the new industrialisation should be not only an increase in the growth rates of macroeconomic indicators, but also an improvement

in the distribution of the results of such growth, expansion of equality of opportunities for all members of society.

The transition to the epoch of new industrialisation, new technological order inevitably led to the transformation of traditional social institutions, including the household (or family). The content of the new industrialisation is revealed through the lense of the penetration of the Internet into all spheres of the economy and society. The emergence of virtual reality and the possibilities of virtual connections and relationships significantly influenced the quality and structure of the traditional household. The economic independence of women has dramatically increased, through the reduction of "male" jobs. With the advent of technology, robots occupying traditional workers' specialties, the threat of reproduction of the majority of the population living in rural areas and small towns has increased.

The functional load of the household as a social institution has changed. This led to a crisis in family relations, which means an increase in divorces, an increase in the number of civil marriages, etc. However, a number of researchers believe that it is rather not a crisis, but a transition to a new family model. New economicisation not only economically “liberates” a woman, it also forms completely libertarian stereotypes regarding the family and marriage of modern youth, who “learn” from idols having extremely unstable family relations.

## II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND TRENDS OF HOUSHOLD TRANSFORMATION IN THE CONDITIONS OF NEW INDUSTRIALISATIONS

### A. *Main theoretical bases of studying the modern family*

From the works on the methodological problems of the family, it is necessary to mention such researchers as: R. Khil [2], A.I. Antonov, V.M. Medkov [3]. One of particular interesting work is the work of P. Sorokin [4], who, based on his own observations, described the crisis of the Russian family (houshold) in the process of beginning industrialisation of the early twentieth century. Introducing the concept of "family crisis," he argued that these processes could not and even be dangerous to stop or reverse, suggesting that when transforming, it mimics under social conditions.

In addition, the houshold as a social institution was studied by authors such as V.V. Elizarov [5], N.M. Rimashevskaya I., Malysheva, M.M., Morozova, T.V., Pisklakova-Parker, M.P. [6], G.G. Silaste [7] in a number of works devoted to the problem of social policy in the field of the family, including taking into account foreign experience. Studies of the stability of the modern houshold and the problems of divorce were conducted by S.I. Hunger [8], A.G. Kharchev, P. Amato [9].

Authors who study the transformation of the family work in various methodological approaches, which can be conventionally divided into three: objectivism, liberalism, alarmism. The transformation of the family institution under the influence of sociocultural factors is considered by O.A. Otradnova [10], and socio-economic factors, for example, D.Z. Muzashvilli [11]. The influence of modernisation processes on the transformation of the housholds was studied by E.P. Galkina, M.I. Kadnichanskaya [12], revealing the main trends and stages of the transformation of this social institution and emphasizing that by the beginning of the XXI century. the houshold went through several stages of development: patriarchal or traditional, child-centered or modern, married or post-modern, as well as incomplete and extra-marital.

Malimonov I.V. [13] studies the houshold institute in the context of the influence of globalisation processes. T.A. Gurko describes the typical changes in the modern family, as well as the changing role of spouses in the global economy, the non-linear development of the houshold institution [14]. S.M. Bianchi in his essay, reviews american works on the houshold, examining the issues of changing the family in modern conditions, its functions, environment, roles in the family, time structure, etc. [15].

The theoretical foundations of the formation of the neo-industrial model of economic development as an independent type of transformation of society were laid down in the works of J. Galbraith [16] and were developed in the ideas of D. Bell [17], E. Toffler about the "super-industrial civilisation", in the works of Russian scientists V. Inozemtsev, Yu. [18] and others.

William J. Goode [19] pointed out that industrialisation destroys large and extended families, determined that the nuclear family is the predominant

houshold model in the modern world. Janssens A. [20] considers the process of family change in the process of industrialization, applying retrospective analysis, defines that the most important function is economic.

### B. *The transformation of the institution of marriage*

The processes of new industrialisation, which went at a heightened pace throughout the twentieth century, led to a dramatic change in the way of life of the population. Based on the analysis of a number of studies, several factors can be identified that determined the current state of the family institution.

First, it is the transformation of the institution of marriage. The traditional view of the houshold is to represent the majority of the housholds as a family group, consisting of a married heterosexual couple with children. In primitive society, an internally weak pair marriage was originally approved, then, as social control increased (incest bans, various taboos on sexuality), the patriarchal monogamous family was affirmed. Such a houshold, along with the development of maternal rights as a father, receives, along with its economic functions and others, the place of the person in the social structure changes.

In post-industrial society, the institution of marriage is gradually losing the function of regulating sexual relations. First, premarital sex was legitimized; then, there is a legitimisation of extramarital sex through the institution of swingers (when spouses enter into controlled sexual relations with other partners with the consent of each other). In other words, if the industrial houshold relaxed feelings (made them a "personal matter" not subject to "kinship" and public control), then the postindustrial does the same with the purely sexual sphere.

Modern demographers talk about reducing the time spent in marriage, increasing the number of temporary marriage unions, but maintaining loyalty to their marriage partner. There was a formation of a new term – serial monogamy.

According to Rosstat, in 2016, 61.7% of marriages fell apart. In 2017, only 985 thousand marriages were entered into and 608 thousand divorces were registered. According to statistics, most often divorced couples who have lived in marriage for five to nine years. According to Rosstat, in 2016, 25.8% of marriages broke up precisely in this period. The next most frequent divorce group is families who have been married for 10 to 19 years (19.5% of divorces). A high percentage of divorces among couples who have been married for one or two years is 19.4%. Least of all divorces in couples who lived together for 20 years or more (13.2%) and up to a year of living together (4.7%). The main reasons for divorce are tensions in the moral, psychological and emotional relations of the spouses [21].

Unregistered cohabitation is becoming more common, especially among young people. They are more preferable for Russians who have received secondary vocational and secondary general education, city dwellers and non-religious. For generations born after 1970, trajectories are distinguished, where marriage is preceded by one or two

cohabitation (as trial marriages), as well as “layers” of those who have never been married and raise one or two children in the first or second cohabitation ( in this case it is long, the partners have at least one child, i.e. it acts as an independent union) [21].

In recent years, there has been a marked tendency to marry at a later age compared with previous decades. Historically, males are more likely to marry than women. In today's situation of legalising premarital relations, a man is even less interested in marriage than before. This is superimposed on an increased period of socialisation, social and economic development of the individual. In this situation, a man, seeking to respond to popular ideas of women about a strong man who can earn and adequately support his family, is delaying the decision to marry. As a result, many young men (and, increasingly, women), after coming out of adolescence, live long time as bachelors, which, of course, affects the nature of their sexual behavior [22].

For comparison – in 1960, 53.2% of men entered into marriage between the ages of 18 and 24, in 1980 - 62.6%, in 2000 - 45%, and in 2016 - only 18.8 % Today, the tendency to postpone marriage led to the fact that the main age group for marriage was 25–34-year-olds, this change occurred in 2004, when representatives of a group of 25–34-year-olds who got married exceeded the group 18 to 24 . Thus, the marriage rate over the past decade has almost halved, while in 1960 it was 12.5, then in 2016 it was only 6.7. For women, the trend is similar. So in 1960 the overwhelming number of women entered into marriage before the age of 24 years, their share was 64%, then in 2016 - 33.5%.

Despite modern realities, many women still regard the institution of marriage as a guarantee of stability and future security for themselves and their children. It is known that women are more positive about the idea of having a child, being in marriage, and, moreover, officially registered. This is confirmed by the data of Rosstat: almost 79% of children born in 2016 were born in a registered marriage.

According to Toffler, controversial new types of household arose in a period that is characterized by a high percentage of repeated marriages after a divorce. He described the so-called “common families” - those in which two divorced couples with children remarry, introducing children from both marriages (as well as adults) into a new, extended type of family. According to D. Malis, such families with “many parents” can become the main form of the family of the future. In such families, “economic polygamy” occurs - when two united families transfer money to each other for the maintenance of children or for other payments.

This is accompanied by ubiquitous examples from the Internet and TV: celebrities rarely live in one monogamous marriage, more often there is a change of partners, several marriages and children from different partners are the norm for stars.

At the same time, the data of the study conducted by the authors suggest that the values of marriage are quite common in Russian society [23]. For the majority of respondents, the value of marriage lies in maintaining a family

lifestyle (55%), psychological support for each other, and regular sex life. The importance of such a component of the purpose of marriage, as the provision of material well-being to children, is noted by 21% of respondents. In all age groups, the percentage of answers varies between 22-25%, only in the older age group this percentage is low - 15%, due to the lack of a family budget (68% of respondents in this group spend up to 80% on food) [22] .

#### *C. Transformation of gender roles in the households*

In the patriarchal household there was a strict distinction between male and female social roles. This heritage of our culture has much bigger grounds than just physiological differences between men and women.

However, the process of socialisation contributes to even more and often excessive exaggeration of biological features. As a result, strict determination of gender roles can hinder the full realisation of human potential and adversely affect self-identification. So, education, including the training of men and women in “adequate” forms of behavior, contributes to the strengthening of a number of traditional ideas. For example, the majority are accustomed to believing that a man should always act as an initiator of any activity, whereas a woman in the family is assigned only a passive role. All this imposes in the patriarchal family a huge responsibility on men, and also sharply limits the ability of women to discover the world of their own needs. At the present stage, it can be noted that the leader is not always the man, and the woman does not always do only homework. There is a growing degree of advancement of Russian families in the direction of egalitarian, equal relations. In recent years, there has been a noticeable evolution of those norms that have traditionally been associated with the qualities of an “ideal” husband and an “ideal” wife [22].

The attainment of economic independence by a woman made it possible for mass families to appear incomplete families, as well as “dynamic families” (when spouses part easily and look for new ones; some already consider changing their spouse for granted - just as they cannot work all their life in one place of work). Homosexual marriages are becoming common and legal in many countries.

Internet accessibility has had a significant impact on changing gender roles. Anonymity and diversity, freedom of behavior and choice on the Internet showed the Russians the opportunity not to follow the general rules, but to stand out. From TV screens and from the Internet models of free choice of gender, change of traditional roles, coming-outs, etc. are broadcast. The fashion industry also suggests a choice in favor of unisex or anti-sexism, while maintaining diversity and freedom of choice.

#### *D. Changing attitudes towards children*

The transformation of the household institution is associated with such a demographic trend as a downward trend in the total birth rate, a fall over the century was 5–6 times. Such a drop in the birth rate indicates a sharp change in the social norms, the sexual and reproductive culture of the population, a decrease in the economic need for children. The decline in fertility has been predetermined historically. This is

a global trend. The transition from high to low fertility is a common pattern for developed countries.

One of the symbols of the modern Russian household is small amount of children, which was the result of the transformation of the system of values and value orientations in the individual and public consciousness. With each decade, the indicators of the Russian family's family decline: one-child families and conscious childlessness are spreading, the number and proportion of large families are decreasing. So, families with one child make up 67.4%, with two children - 26.8%, with three or more - 5.8%. These statistics indicate the dominance of single-child families and the actual disappearance of large families. This testifies to the almost complete loss of the traditions of large families and the partial loss of average children in Russia [21].

In recent decades, a new social group has emerged that reflects the social trend of having children born out of wedlock, such as single-parent families. In general, the number of this group over the past decade has increased due to the fact that society has become quite tolerant of women who give birth to children outside of marriage. Previously, such behavior was taken only for women who had not been married by the age of 35-40, who decided to have a child "for themselves".

Today, such reproductive behavior is treated more calmly not at the personal, family level, but at the level of society. In Russia in 2016, 397,588 thousand children were born out of marriage. However, the trends here are somewhat controversial. During the second half of the twentieth century, as tolerance to extramarital childbearing increased, the number of this group increased. In 2000, the growth of extramarital births almost stopped, and then began to decline. For example, in 1990 the proportion of births among women who were not in a registered marriage was 14.6%, and in 2000, 28%; in 2005, 30% of the total number of children born. In 2016, the number of shares was 21.1%.

In fact, the changes are significant. If, in essence, the family is designed to educate and socialize children, the meaning of its existence is understandable. However, in pre-industrial societies, the family, having a large number of children, did not have a large economic burden. On the contrary, a small number of children deprived her of additional income, since child labor was used for a long time and only with the introduction of universal education did the state force families to abandon child labor. In an industrial society, the situation is reversed. Keeping children requires not only a lot of energy and time, which modern working mothers do not have, but also serious financial expenses.

Russia is one of the countries where there is a high level of employment for women. So, if the overall level of employment in the whole country is 76.6%, then the female one is 73.4% (the male one is slightly higher, 79.6%). A high proportion of working women aged 20-49 years old, in 2016 it was 75.6%. And this is the age when the family "grows up", children appear, parents are forced to pay them a lot of attention, educate and socialize them. Surely, it can be argued that children are born to working mothers and the whiter

fathers, this is confirmed by the structure of employment, 68.8% of working people are married, and the most numerically large working group is the age group from 30 to 39 years old. At the same time, not only domestic work falls on women's shoulders, but also equal work with men. So in 2016, 84.6% of women worked on a full working week (31-40 hours per week), the difference with men is insignificant, they are employed at full-time work in 85.7% of cases.

Today, the household is not only a social construct, but also an economic construct, only the situation in the process of industrialisation has become the opposite of the pre-industrial era, i.e. children in the family do not earn money, this is the family, "invests" in them. Moreover, the money correctly applied by parents is some kind of social elevator, a conductor of social mobility of their children - paid education, tutoring, elite universities, etc.

In the same time the function of socialising children in the household began to perform smart things - smart phones, child tracking devices, tablets, smart TV, and so on. They know how to educate, entertain and remove from parents their parental burden at one time.

If we compare the attitude towards children in modern and traditional societies, in modern it is much better. Among the middle class, parental responsibility towards children is higher than among people whose mentality has remained at a primitive level (as well as manifestations of alcoholism, crime, etc.). The current trend suggests that the family gradually loses those functions that are not related to the upbringing of children. First, the function of the "economic cell" was lost, now the sexual function is lost. It can be assumed that the family of the future will consist of several like-minded people (of either sex), united only by common interests and jointly raising children.

### III. TRANSFORMATION OF THE CONCEPT OF THE HOUSHOLD AT THE STATE LEVEL

Starting from the 1994 census, in the Russian census statistics the term "household" was used together, which means a group of people living in one dwelling or part of it, jointly providing themselves with food and everything necessary for life, i.e. fully or partially combining their funds. They may be related by kinship or not to be relatives, or to be both. A household can consist of one person living independently and providing himself with food and everything necessary for life.

The average household size in 2010 in Russia was 2.6 people, in the USA also - 2.6 people, on average in the European Union - 2.4 people. Everywhere the most common type is households of three or more people. At the same time, compared with the United States and Europe, in Russia the share of households of three or more people in the total population of households is significantly higher. If in Europe households of singles are the second most common, in Russia and the USA there are two-person households. The share of single households in Russia is lower than in the United States and Europe. Between the last population censuses (2002-2010), the average household size declined with an increase in

the total number of households (by 3.5 pp). This was due to an increase in the number of single households (an increase of 19.4%) and two-person households (an increase of 7.1%). In general, more than half of households recorded in 2010 consist of one or two people. At the same time, the main component of the growth in the number of households in the whole country was the growth of urban households, while in rural areas their number decreased while the average household size remained at the 2002 level (2.8 persons). Urban households have noticeably lost in terms of their average size (from 2.7 to 2.5 people).

According to the last census (2010), the structure of Russian households is as follows: the most common type of household is spouses with children (34.9%), followed by singles (25.7%), spouses without children (16.6%), single-parent families (15.6%) and other households. Thus, the vast majority (92%) of married couples without children are simple households, while at the same time a significant proportion (33%) of spouses with children live in complex households. Quite often (26%) in complex households live single-parent families.

The trends of the last decade mainly continue the trends of the previous one: the share of singles and spouses without children is increasing, the share of households of spouses with children and incomplete households is decreasing. Recently, however, the share of incomplete private households has stabilized. The number of complex multi-generational households also does not increase in the overall structure. The 2015 micro-census, compared with the 2010 census, recorded an increase in the proportion of households with two or more children, both among the full and among single-spouse households. In the structure of family cells, the proportion of spouses without children increases, the proportion of spouses with children decreases (mainly due to a decrease in the proportion of spouses with minor children), and the proportion of incomplete families also grows. Most often in complex households live single-parent families, especially for fathers with minor children, 2/3 of whom live with relatives.

Cohabitation with relatives (primarily with parents) allows fathers to actively use the help of relatives in raising young children. The share of paternal families in the total number of family cells in 2002 was small - 3%, and with young children even less - 1.6%, but it is growing, especially among family cells with children under 18 years old (in 2010 - 3.4 and 3.7% respectively). Single mothers with small children also mostly live with their parents or other relatives, which allows them to rely on the help of relatives in caring for their children, as well as to receive material support.

However, in the period between the 2002 and 2010 censuses, from 52 to 58%, the share of family units consisting of mothers with minor children in complex households increased. This may be explained by the fact that single mothers, due to their low income, are deprived of the opportunity to live separately, and also need help in raising their children. However, living together with relatives is typical not only for single-parent families, but also for married

couples. Complicated households have a third of married couples without children and almost a quarter of spouses with children [24].

As noted by Andreeva, currently in Russia there are the most bizarre family structures, including up to 4 generations, but often with the omission of families with the matrimonial core. The number of matrilineal families is increasing (transfer of traditions on the maternal line). In which the links of the "marriage" fall out or are replaced by cohabitation. In Russia, there is a clear predominance of the feminine in the families, which manifests itself in the structure of the family, and psychologically as the adoption of all major decisions [25]. At the same time, the difficult socio-economic situation in the country led to the emergence of "cultures of poverty", manifested in the emergence of an extended family, where effective help to the family is widespread.

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSIONS

As a result of the research, the following trends can be noted in the changing structure of the household in the context of new industrialisation:

- the massive nuclearisation of the households, a decrease in the proportion of families consisting of three generations, an increase in the proportion of elderly single people receiving care outside the families of their adult children;

- decrease in marriage rate and increase in the proportion of unregistered cohabitations and the proportion of illegitimate children in them, an increase in the proportion of single mothers, an increase in the proportion of fragmentation families with one parent and children, the spread of remarriages of men and to a lesser extent women and families where one of the parents is not blood-stricken and brings up an "other's" child, an increase in the proportion of mixed-type families with children from remarriage and from the first marriages of each spouse;

- mass households with few children or one child, caused by the need in one or two children, but not by any hindrances to the realisation of the "big" need for children.

All these are the results of globalisation, increased migration opportunities of the population, a higher level of education from generation to generation, an increase in social stratification – the main conditions of modern industrialisation.

In the modern period in Russia the transition to new types of household relations did not occur completely. In separate enclaves we can observe simultaneously various types of family relations – from practically patriarchal to modern matrilineal, from multi-generation to "fragmental". The causes of these phenomena mostly are in the socio-economic processes caused by the new industrialisation.

#### **Acknowledgment**

The reported study was funded by RFBR according to the research project № 19-011-00566 A.

## References

- [1] Tatarkin A.I. (2015). *New industrialization of the Russian economy: development deeds and/or time challenges*, *E'konomicheskoe vozrozhdenie Rossii*, No. 2 (44), pp. 20-31.
- [2] Hill R. (1970). *Current trends in family theory*. *Social'ny'e issledovaniya*, No. 4, pp. 124.
- [3] Antonov A.I. (1996). *Sociology of the family*. Moscow: Moskva.: Izd-vo MGU: Izd-vo Mezhdunarodnogo universiteta biznesa i upravleniya ("Brat'ya Karich"), 304 p.
- [4]. Sorokin P.A. (1916). *The crisis of the modern family (sociological essay)*, *Ezhemesyachny'j zhurnal*, No. 2., pp. 174-183.
- [5] Elizarov V.V. (1998). Demographic situation and problems of family policy, *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, No. 2., pp. 55-60.
- [6] Rimashevskaya N.M., Malysheva M.M., Morozova T.V., Pisklakovaparker M.P. (2016). *Domestic violence: assessment by Russian households*, No. 1. *Narodonaselenie*, pp. 103-115.
- [7] Silaste G.G. (1998). *Law at a dead end (The family should be protected from violence)*, *Nauchno-analiticheskij zhurnal – Obozrevatel Observer*, No. 2., pp. 52-54.
- [8] Golod S.I. (2008). *Sociological and demographic analysis of the state and evolution of the family*, *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, Vol. 7, No. 1.
- [9] Amato P. (2005). *Family change: Decline or resilience?* In Bengston V.L., A.C. Acocck, K.R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, D.M. Klein (Eds.) *Sourcebook of family theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [10] Otradnova O.A. (2013). *Transformation of family in modern Russian society*, No. 8 (28). *Modern Research of Social Problems*., DOI: 10.12731/2218-7405-2013-8-75.
- [11] Muzashvili D.Z. (2018). *Transformation of family institute in the conditions of globalization. European Scientific Conference*, pp. 88-90.
- [12] Galkina E.P., Kadnichanskaya M.I. (2015). *Transformation of the institution of family in today's modernization process*, No. 3. *Vestnik Omskogo universiteta. Seriya "E'konomika"*, pp. 193-200.
- [13] Malimonov I.V. (2015). *Family institution change in modern society*, No. 7. *Scientific Nauchny'j al'manax*, pp. 1235-1238. DOI: 10.17117/na.2015.07.1235.
- [14] Gurko T.A. (2011). *Family Institute in Post-Industrial Societies*, No. 4 (13). *Cennosti i smy'sly'*, pp. 26-44.
- [15] Bianchi S.M. The More They Change, the More They Stay the Same?: Understanding Family Change in the Twenty-First Century, *Contemporary Sociology* 42, 3 (Volume: 42 issue: 3, page(s): 324-331), April 12, 2013; DOI: 10.1177/0094306113484700.
- [16] D. Galbraith, "The New Industrial Society," *Favorites*, Lithuania, 2017, 1200 p.
- [17] E. Toffler "The Third Wave," *Public Education*, 2008, no. 2, pp. 55-61.
- [18] V.L. Inozemtsev "Modern post-industrial society: nature, contradictions," *Perspektivy*, 2008.
- [19] W.J. Goode, "World Revolution and Family Patterns," *New York: The Free Press*, 1963.
- [20] A. Janssens, "Family and Industrialization." *Family and Social Change: The Household as a Process in an Industrializing Community*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 1–30. *Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time*.
- [21] M.N. Klintsova, "Modern Russian family: major trends," no. 1. *University reports. North Caucasus Region. Social sciences*, 2018, pp. 20-24.
- [22] E.V. Zaitseva, *Sexual culture of the inhabitants of the modern metropolis. Yekaterinburg: USTU-UPI*, 2007, 207 p.
- [23] E.V. Zaitseva and V.V. Zapariy, "Demographic consequences of economic modernization in Russia in the past thirty years in the demographic transformation theory," *The 10th International Days of Statistics and Economics*, 2016, pp. 2077-2088.
- [24] A.A. Mironova and L.M. Prokofieva, "Family and household in Russia: demographic aspect," vol. 5, no. 2. *Demograficheskoye obozreniye*, 2018, pp. 103-121.
- [25] T.V. Andreeva, "The Family in Modern Russia: Structural and Functional Features," no. 2. *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 6. Politologiya. Mezhdunarodny'e otnosheniya*, 2006, pp. 80-87.