

Family and marriage values devaluation as the reason of decrease in birth rate

Oksana Vyacheslavovna Ustinova and Nursafa Gafurovna Khairullina

Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, Volodarskogo Str., 38, Tyumen, 625000, Russia

Abstract. The family inevitably reflects essential tendencies of public transformations in the progress. It is not simply affected by powerful influence of social dynamics factors, but it defines and reproduces these factors itself. At the present stage the designated processes led to the crisis of the matrimonial relations, being shown in the destruction of moral family principles, loss of the vital family values. The results of poll of URFO inhabitants are presented in the article reflecting family and marriage values devaluation.

[Ustinova O.V., Khairullina N.G. **Family and marriage values devaluation as the reason of decrease in birth rate.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(8s):469-472] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 103

Keywords: family, marriage, family values, family and marriage crisis, reproductive behavior, birth rate

Introduction

The reproductive behavior as the basis of expanded reproduction of the population depends on socially steady ideas of norms of birth rate, motivation to their implementation and condition of major social institute created for the purpose of a family reproduction as well. It is evident that scientists define devaluation of family values as one of the main reasons for demographic crisis in Russia.

The family is not the only major social and legal notion which is protected by the state, but also the sociocultural phenomenon satisfying the personal psychological needs in love, care, communication, self-realization and self-affirmation. One of the main functions of a family as a special microstructure is the birth and bringing up children. Thanks to a family the reproduction as the most important function is realized. It does not only solve population reproduction problems but also development of spiritual and moral values of the personality, transfer of family, patrimonial, national traditions and cultural heritage of the nation. Family is the social group in which there is an initial formation of the human person, the foundation of main moral values including a certain model of reproductive behavior.

For the last decades in many countries of the world and in the end of the 1960th in Russia particularly, the family formation problems and other valuable orientations are actively investigated. Along with empirical researches there was a set of the theories explaining transformation of family values, for example: the theory of additional needs of R. F. Uincha [1], "Incentive - Value - the Role" B. Myursteyna [2], formation Levis' dyad [3], Senter's tool theory [4].

There is an interesting F. Klakhon's theory according to which the valuable orientations are the result of various cultures people decision of the same problems with limited number of alternative decisions. [5]

In Russia the problems family and other valuable orientations were investigated by A.I. Antonov [6] and V.A. Borisov [7], N. G. Markovskaya [8], V. B. Olshansky [9], V. N. Arkhangelsky [10], etc. N. G. Hayrullina investigates the problems of an interethnic marriages of indigenous people living in the Tyumen region [11].

Main part

The changes in family values noted by modern researchers as the phenomenon is widespread everywhere and affects Europe, North America, Russia, CIS countries, etc. [12, 13] However there is still a dispute among sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, whether to consider these changes as a sign of a crisis of a monogamous family or natural evolutionary transformation of this social formation.

Speaking about family and the matrimonial relations crisis and its influence on population depopulation, it should be noted that it does not proceed similarly in different countries. M. A. Klupt, investigating features of demographic crisis in countries of Western Europe, notes that family and birth rate crisis in Northern part differs from the countries of the Southern part of the European continent. [14]

Particularly for the family crisis in Northern European countries (Sweden, Holland, Norway, Switzerland) the considerable distribution of illegitimate relations, a large percent of illegitimate children (more than 30%), the percentage of children leaving families for the reasons which are not connected with marriage (middle age – 18-20 years), weakening of intra family relations, large prevalence of divorces (more than 30% of marriages break up within 10 years) are widely spread.

Relatively small percent of illegitimate relations and the number of illegitimate children (less than 20%), the number of children living with their parents, 80% of marriages in mature age (after 30

years old), less number of divorces and a large percent of those people who does not want to marry and to have children (i.e. celibacy and childlessness) are features of the family crisis in the Southern European countries (Italy, Spain, Cyprus).

Thus if in the first case (the "Dutch" option) family crisis proceeds in the form of weakening family relations and relations between generations, in the second case (the "Italian" option) the main features of family crisis are celibacy and childlessness as well as strong family relations.

The main feature of reproductive behavior of Russian people is the birth of children in marriage. In other words, the marital status is the most important factor of birth rate [15]. In this regard it is possible to assume that family and marriage values devaluation affects on birth rate.

Technique. The author conducted a survey of 5330 inhabitants of the Ural federal district including Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, Kurgan and Tyumen regions and also Yamal-Nenets and Khanty-Mansi autonomous areas in order to research the problems of family and marriage values devaluation in Russia. The accommodation of the Ural federal district population in towns and countryside and their gender structure were taken into consideration. The proportional shift was observed only in the age structure – larger percent (62,5%) was among respondents from 15 to 35 years old.

The results of the opinion research of respondents about their attitude to the marriage and family forms are presented in the table 1.

According to the table. 1, nearly a third of respondents is officially married (35,4%). Another third of respondents plans to marry (33,7%). The analysis of marital status of respondents showed that the majority of people who were not married, had an experience of family life: so 73,2% are divorced and another 9,4% lost their spouses (widowers, widows).

The vast majority of respondents (66,9%) considers the official marriage is stronger than the unregistered marriage. Investigating gender differences in answers of respondents it is possible to note that women trust and rely on official marriage more than men (72, 77% - women, 607% - men).

It is believed that the difference in men's and women's opinions are connected with legal features of marriage and family in Russia. Divorced Russian men are more vulnerable in the situation concerning with property and guardianship.

The majority of respondents prefer to marry. So 36,2% of respondents prefer marriage registration in the registry office, 21,7% support church wedding.

The results of poll showed that the Russian society is rather tolerant to informal family forms– the one fifth part of respondents prefers informal

cohabitation (20,2%). 15,6% are indifferent to marriage forms. 6,3% found it difficult to answer.

Table 1. Answers of respondents about acceptable forms of marriage and family, %

Indicator	Total		Men		Women	
	People	%	People	%	People	%
1. Are you married or are you going to marry?						
- yes, I am married	1885	35,4	814	33,3	1071	37,1
- I am not married yet, but I am going	1794	33,7	677	27,7	1117	38,7
- no, I am against of official marriages	1007	18,9	530	21,7	476	16,5
- I find it difficult to answer	645	12,1	423	17,3	222	7,7
2. What form of marriage do you prefer?						
- registration in the REGISTRY OFFICE	1930	36,2	802	32,8	1128	39,1
- wedding	1155	21,7	442	18,1	713	24,7
- unregistered marriage (cohabitation)	1074	20,2	604	24,7	470	16,3
- indifferently	833	15,6	423	17,3	410	14,2
- I find it difficult to answer	338	6,3	174	7,1	165	5,7
3. Do you think that the official marriage is stronger than unregistered one?						
- yes, it is undoubtedly	1739	32,6	631	25,8	1108	38,4
- yes	1826	34,3	836	34,2	990	34,3
- no	1227	23,0	667	27,3	560	19,4
- I find it difficult to answer	538	10,1	310	12,7	228	7,9
Total	5330	100	2444	100	2886	100

In 2011 N. G. Hairullina carried out the questionnaire and found out the Tatar population representatives relation to unregistered marriages. The analysis of answers showed that about a half of respondents (46,2%) are positive to unregistered marriages. The neutral attitude to unregistered marriages was shown by every fifth participant of questionnaire. Thus every fourth respondent (26,2%) is negative to unregistered marriages.

The analysis of answers allowed to reveal some tendencies. The positive relation to unregistered marriages is stated by the inhabitants living in rural areas. Representatives of the senior age groups are often negative to unregistered marriages. The positive relation to unregistered marriages is stated by respondents at the age of 35-36 years.

Respondents from 18 till 35 years are indifferent to unregistered marriages. It is revealed that men are more conservative. They often state the negative relation to unregistered marriages. Women, on the contrary, support unregistered marriages [16].

The data obtained during the research is different from the statistics reflecting the marital status of citizens (fig. 1). So according to Rosstat, 5,6% of marriages were registered in 2010. So in comparison with results of research, the indicator can be explained with different statement of a question. In author's research the respondents' relations to informal marriages in general, as a possible fact in future and as a fact that had already happened. Statistical data shows only the quantitative indicators reflecting a marital status of population.

Marital status of population*For 1000 people at the age of 16 and senior*

Never married	A number of unregistered marriages
Married	
Widows	
Divorced	

*Rosstat data***Fig. 1. Marital status of population (for one thousand people at the age of 16 years old and senior) [15]**

Taking into consideration the gender distribution of answers to this question women prefer such traditional forms of marriage as registration in the registry office and church wedding (63,8%), it is explained by social and economic protection of women in official marriage.

The ambiguous relation of spouses to a civil marriage was confirmed by results of censuses in 2002 and 2010 according to which the number of married women exceeds the number of married men (in 2010 – on 363 persons; 2002 – on 1400 people) [17].

The fact that a number of women who does not have an accurate position concerning the organization forms of family life (they answered, or "all the same" - 14,2%, or "I find it difficult to answer" - 5,7%) causes certain fears. At the same time traditionally a woman is a basis of the matrimonial relations. Her gender role assumes an orientation on strengthening and family preservation as independent micro-social structure with certain spiritual and moral values. Such a significant number of women who does not play this role (19,9%) serves as the indicator of family destruction.

According to N. G. Hayrullina for reproductive behavior of modern men and women, the role of psychological and subjective factors is extremely important [18]. The individual decision about the number of children in a family can be the result of influence of two opposite, but at the same time closely interconnected groups of factors – external and internal. As external factors in this case act supporting a possession of many children and norms stopping childlessness and sanctions. Certain motives at making decision on desirable and real number of children in a family are presented by so-called reproductive target – the peculiar condition of consciousness expressing readiness of the person to realization of a quite certain number of children (tab. 2) are internal.

Table 2. Reproductive targets of respondents, in % to the total number of answers [11]

Targets	Number of Children			
	1	2	3 and more	none
How many children do you want to have in a family?	4,3	69,1	26,5	0,0
How many children are you going to have?	16,3/4,4	54,9/22,8	23,5/18,5	5,2/21,2

Note. Answers of respondents are presented in numerator in 2009, in a denominator – in 2010.

Conclusion

Thus, dynamics of modern Russian society influenced on transformation of family and marriage values: the tendency of decrease in number of official marriages and increase in number of divorces is observed; the number of unregistered marriages and citizens consciously not wishing to establish a family and to have children grows.

Considering the results of author's research, it is obvious that the special role has to be given by our government to system impact on process of formation of valuable family and personality orientations with accent shift towards creation culture, strengthening of family and marriage values.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Ustinova Oksana Vyacheslavovna
Tyumen State Oil and Gas University
Volodarskogo Street, 38, Tyumen, 625000, Russia

References

1. Winch. R.F., 1958. Mate-Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs. N.Y.
2. Murstein B.I., 1976. Who Will Marry Whom? Theories and Research in Marital Choice. N.Y.
3. Lewis R.A., 1972. A Development Framework for the Analysis of Premarital Dyadic Formation. FAMILY PROCESS.
4. Center R., 1975. Sexual Attraction and Love: An Instrumental Theory. SPRINGFIELD.
5. Kluckhohn F.R. and Strodtbeck F.L., 1961. Variations in Value Orientations. N.Y.
6. Antonov A.I., 1980. Studying of reproductive installations as one of the most important problems of social and psychological research of a family. Sotsiologiya of birth rate. Moscow.
7. Borisov V.A., 1976. Birth rate prospects. Moscow.
8. Markov N. G., 1990. Mesto of a family in system of valuable orientations of the personality: Avtoref... edging. sociol. sciences. Moscow.
9. Olshansky V. B., 1996. Psikhologiya to praticians: to teachers, parents and heads. Moscow.

10. The Arkhangelsk V. N., 2002. Of relationship in a modern Russian family. Population. Moscau.
11. Khaiullina N. G., 2012. Indigenous people of the Tyumen region: look of the sociologist. - Tyumen. 476 p.
12. Becker G.S., 1981. A Treatise on the Family. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Univ. Press.
13. Kirkpatrick G., 1963. The Family as Process and Institution. N.Y.
14. Clupt M. A., 2008. Demografiya of Earth regions. St. Petersburg.
15. Borisov V.A., 2001. Demografiya. The textbook for higher education institutions. Moscau.
16. About results of the All-Russian population census of 2010. 2011. December 22. The Russian newspaper. pp: 4-5.
17. Khairullina N. G., 2010. Tatars of the Tyumen region: dynamics of a sociocultural situation. Tyumen, 208 p.
18. Khaiullina N. G., 2010. №4. Sotsialno-demograficheskaya situation: results of research. The Messenger of the Kazan state technical university of A.N.Tupolev. pp: 205-208.

5/23/2014