УДК 159.9:316.356.2

TYPOLOGY OF ROLE STRUCTURES OF A FAMILY

I. G. Doroshina
Penza State Technological Academy, Penza, Russia

Summary. The article deals with the problem role of family structure. Typology presented by various authors. Described by the patriarchal and egalitarian role structure.
Key words: role structure, family, spouse.

One of the major characteristics of a modern family is its role structure reflecting what duties in a family are carried out by each of spouses, how much they are connected with their gender, in what degree they are defined by will and desire of spouses, and in what –by traditions and other external factors.

A role is a social function of a person corresponding to accepted norms, a way of behaviour of people depending on their status or a position in a society, in system of interpersonal relations.

The role structure characterises system of interactions and relations of members of a family according to the role instructions proved on traditions and customs, existing in a society in the whole, nearest social environment and the members of a family fixed in personal experience. If some years ago the majority of family roles were connected with a gender now in city families in which spouses have education, this connection is lost. The basis for distribution of roles serve more often not social norms and stereotypes, but interests and preferences of spouses.

The structure of family roles regulates behaviour of the relatives entering the relations with each other. In normally functioning families the structure of roles complete, dynamical also allows to use alternative variants. Home life is successful, if spouses have come to the agreement concerning the mutual rights and duties. Each of spouses has the certain notion of what rights and duties should have «a wife», «a husband», what is «a good husband» and «a good housekeeper». Duties is that expects, and often demands the other marriage partner.

It is important to notice that key parametres of role structure of a family are character of domination and cast.

The analysis of family structure allows to understand, how the family realises the functions: who is at the head and who executes, haw the rights and duties are distributed. From the point of view of structure it is possible to allocate families where the management is concentrated in hands of one person, and families where equal participation of all members in management is expressed. According to R. Kettell's researches, in strong marriages husbands, as a rule, dominate, but if their power is too great, marriage pair turns to astable matrimonial group.

Types of family structures by criterion of the power divide on:

- patriarchal families where head of «the family state» is the father;
- matriarchal where mother uses the greatest authority and influence;
- egalitarian families in which there are no accurately expressed family heads and where situational distribution of the power between the father and mother prevails.

In a modern family the so-called diarchy when spouses are leaders by turns or in different fields of activity even more often takes place. At the same time it is shown that race for power often is at the bottom of divorces in modern families.

Ju. V. Fillipova [9] allocates:

- Families in which the management and the organisation of execution of all functions are concentrated in hands of one member of a family, as a rule,

mothers (matriarchal families) or the father (patriarchal families). The authoritative system of relations between family members is characteristical for the given type of family structure.

- Families, in which participation in management of family affairs of all its members (both parents and children) is obviously expressed – biarchal families. The power in such family is distributed in regular intervals, the democratic system of mutual relations between members of a family takes place.

The tendency of development of a modern family is transition from authoritative to democratic system of relations that is caused by reduction of gender asymmetry last years. Now the optimum form of a management is joint domination. Domination in a family is correct to define due to the performance of leading family functions: material maintenance, planning of the family budget, «psychotherapeutic» function of a family, education of children. Actual domination depends on a measure of participation of members of a family in distribution of functions and the decision of problems. However along with actual domination there is also a formal domination, that is attributed on certain rules. In Russia in most cases formal domination is attributed to a husband while actual or it is equally distributed between a husband and a wife, or belongs to a wife [8]. In this plan the saying is illustrative: «A husband is a head, a wife is a neck. Where the neck will want, there the head will turn». In the majority of modern families a wife is the organizer of house life, bears responsibility for the questions connected with education of the children, often has desiding vote at discussion of other problems though the majority of spouses considers that the husband should be the head of the family. Such situation – a divergence of expectations and a reality – quite often complicates mutual relations of spouses. The husband would like to be the head of the family, but in reality in a city family he has no reasons because the wife, protecting the household party of home life and regulating emotional relations, frequently becomes the leader. Position is aggravated with the low social status and small earnings of young men, and also intervention of parents of spouses, especially at joint residing. In turn young wives are not satisfied by own role and in the family, that they need to solve most, including material questions [3, 4]. Last years the increasing distribution receives new type of the family based on equality of spouses, the democratic family power and indistinct sexual-roles division of labour, at performance of various family functions.

In the scientific literature such family considered by the majority of researchers as perspective model, is called as «two-headed» or «matrimonial» [1, 2].

A variety of modern forms of a family and existence of traditional, egalitarian and some transitive types demands accurate differentiation or cultivation of these concepts. M. Ju. Arutyunyan [1] suggests to consider **traditional family**, in which:

a) there is a traditional division man's and a woman's role in sphere of «secondary» functions – based on objective complementarity of contributions of spouses;

b) it is expressed «the traditional concept of home life», that is position of division of responsibility for family functions;

c) the leading role in acceptance of family decisions accordingly belongs to the husband; the authority of the father who is carrying out social control of behaviour and education of children is high.

Then the **egalitarian family** model assumes:

a) egalitarian cast in the household sphere, based on equality of contributions of spouses in extrafamily activity. A position of combination of responsibility for performance of functions of a family;

b) democratic structure of leadership;

c) «the egalitarian home life concept», i.e. norms of equality of the husband and the wife in a family and out of it.

For realisation of a family role the same as and in general any social role, presence of norms and sanctions is necessary. Norms define, how family functions are played by role carriers. A sanction is a reaction to performance or role default.

Bybliography

1. Арутюнян М. Ю. Особенности семейного взаимодействия в городских семьях с различным распределением бытовых ролей: дис... канд. филос. наук. – М., 1984.
2. Гозман Л. Я. Процессы межличностного восприятия в семье / Межличностное восприятие в группе / Под ред. Г. М. Андреевой, А. И. Донцова. – М., 1981.
3. Голод С. И. Семья и брак: историко-социологический анализ. – СПб: ТОО ТК «Петрополис», 1998 – 272 с.
4. Дементьева И. Ф. Первые годы брака: Проблема становления молодой семьи. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 112 с.
5. Дорошина И. Г. Исследование особенностей супружеских отношений в семьях с разным уровнем образования // Сибирский психологический журнал. – № 37. – 2010. – С. 96–99.
6. Дорошина И. Г. Особенности супружеских отношений на разных этапах семейного цикла // Сибирский психологический журнал. – Томск, 2009 . – № 33. – С. 90–95.
7. Дорошина И. Г. Психологические особенности отношений супругов, ожидающих появления ребенка // Сибирский психологический журнал. – Томск, 2010 . – № 35. – С. 57–60.
8. Карабанова О. А. Психология семейных отношений и основы семейного консультирования: учебное пособие. – М.: Гардарики, 2004. – 320 с.
9. Филиппова Ю. В. Психологические основы работы с семьей: учебное пособие / Институт «Открытое Общество». Российское Психологическое Общество. Ярославль, 2003. – 103 с.
10. Кулиева Ш. Э. К проблеме исследования гендера в истории социальной мысли // Социосфера. – № 1. – 2010. – С. 28–41.
11. Бутаева М. А. Дискурс гендерного экстремизма // Социосфера. – № 2. – 2010. – С. 13–15.
12. Девятых С. Ю. Раздельнополость человека в контексте современных представлений о половой дифференциации // Социосфера. – № 2. – 2010. – С. 26–32.
13. Бутаева М. А. Формирование ценностных ориентаций в семейной жизни // Социосфера. – № 2. – 2010. – С. 55–60.
14. Попова Л. В. Влияние нарушений функциональной структуры семьи на социальную дезадаптацию несовершеннолетних // Социосфера. – № 2. – 2010. – С. 96–104.
15. Гаврилова Е. А. Психологическая категория «отношения» как основополагающая для изучения гармоничного брака // Социосфера. – № 2. – 2010. – С. 27–32.

Bybliography

1. Arutyunyan M. Features of family interaction in urban families with a different distribution of domestic roles: Dis ... cand. philos. science. – M., 1984.
2. Gozman L. Y. Processes of interpersonal perception in family / Interpersonal perception in a group / ed. G. M. Andreeva, A. I. Dontsova. – M., 1981.
3. Golod S. I. The family and marriage: historical and sociological analysis. – St. Petersburg: TOO TC «Petropolis», 1998 – 272 p.
4. Dementieva I. F. The first years of marriage: the problem of the young family. – Moscow: Nauka, 1991. – 112 p.
5. Doroshina I. G. Investigation of the features of the matrimonial relations in families with different levels of education // Siberian psychological journal. – № 37. – 2010. – P. 96–99.
6. Doroshina I. G. Features of matrimonial relations on different stages of the family cycle // Siberian psychological journal. – № 33. – 2009. –P. 90–95.
7. Doroshina I. G. Psychological characteristics of the relations of the spouses, awaiting the appearance of a child // Siberian psychological journal. – № 35. – 2010. – P. 57–60.
8. Karabanov O. A. Psychology of family relations and the foundations of family counseling: a training manual. – M.: Gardariki, 2004. – 320 p.
9. Filippova Ju. V. Psychological foundations of the family: a tutorial / Open Society Institute. Russian Psychology Society. – Yaroslavl, 2003. – 103.
10. Kuliev S. E. The problem of gender studies in the history of the social thought // Sociosphera. – № 1. – 2010. – P. 28–41.
11. Butaeva M. A. Gender Discourse extremism // Sociosphera. – № 2. – 2010. – P. 13–15.
12. Devjatyh S. Ju. Heterothallism of the human in the context of contemporary concept of sexual differentiation // Sociosphera. – № 2. – 2010. – P. 26–32.
13. Butaeva M. A. Formation of value orientations in family life // Sociosphera. – № 2. – 2010. – P. 55–60.

14. Popova L. V. Influence of functional disorders of family structure on juvenile social maladjustment // Sociosphera. – № 2. – 2010. – P. 96–104.
15. Gavrilova E. A. Psychological categories «relationship» as a fundamental for the study of the harmonious marriage // Sociosphera. – № 2. – 2010. – P. 27–32.

УДК 37.013.42

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ОБЩЕНИЯ СУПРУГОВ В СТУДЕНЧЕСКОЙ СЕМЬЕ

И. А. Гладковская
Кемеровский государственный университет культуры и искусств, г. Кемерово, Россия

THE PECULARITIES OF THE SPOUSES DIALOGUE IN THE STUDENTS FAMILY

I. A. Gladkovskaya
Kemerovo State University of Culture and Art, Kemerovo, Russia

Summary. the research of features of the dialogue between spouses in a student's family of high school is presented in this article The characteristic of a student's family is short presented. The forms of work directed on the improvement of the dialogue in student's families are recommended.
Key words: the dialogue in a family, a student's family, features of the dialogue of spouses.

Общение в семье рассматривается как регулятор межличностных отношений супругов через многие свои параметры и входит в характеристики, в наибольшей степени дифференцирующие успешные и неуспешные браки (семьи). Например, отсутствие налаженной системы межличностного общения в паре, скорее всего, свидетельствует о том, что этот брак неудачный.

Видные американские исследователи в области внутрисемейных отношений Р. Левис и Дж. Спаниер выделили восемь параметров межсупружеского общения, которые влияют на формирование успешных отношений между супругами: 1. Супружеские отношения тем лучше, чем больше самораскрытиесупругов в процессе общения. 2. Наличие у супругов возможно большего числа общих ожиданий и установок, проявляющихся в процессе общения. 3. Чем более точна невербальная коммуникациямежду супругами, тем успешнее межличностные отношения. 4. Важным фактором успешности межличностных отношений супругов является наличие в их общении общих символов.5. Чем чаще успешное межличностное общение между супругами, тем лучше их межличностные отношения в целом. 6. В успешных браках через межличностное общение супруги постоянно подтверждают своё сходство в восприятии супружеских ролей. 7. Важнейшей характеристикой успешных супружеских отношений является наличие между супругами глубокого взаимопонимания. 8. Межличностное общение супругов тем успешнее, чем больше взаимной эмпатии они проявляют в нём [1].

Особо привлекает внимание при изучении общения студенческие семьи. Студенческие семьи достаточно сложны в процессе работы с ними, это связано с характеристиками этих семей(супруги объединены общими интересами и взглядами, их действия направлены на учёбу; незначительное число конфликтов; большая значимость материально-бытовых и жилищных проблем; наличие специфических проблем: проблема трудоустройства и небольшие возможности для приработка, медицинские проблемы, психологические проблемы, проблема совмещения учебной и семейной ролей и пр.).