

Tatiana Klymenko¹

THE INFLUENCE OF MODERN MEANS OF COMMUNICATION ON INTERGENERATIONAL COMMUNICATION AND THE FORMATION OF NEW FAMILY TIES

ABSTRACT:

Family relations and family communication - are a complex socio-psychological fabric, which has always been the quintessence of culture, religion, psychology, economic and political relationships, dependent on migration and many others. The impact of technology has changed it. The purpose of this work is to study the impact of Internet communications on intergenerational communication and the formation of new family ties in society. There is exploratory-descriptive research which as well preliminary and based theoretical part for quantitative methodological design. Here we form hypotheses that technologies make it possible to create strong ties in groups of the grandfather-grandson / grandmother-granddaughter type, that is, in a generation, which for a long time was one of the most necessary elements of communication for the stability of nuclear families.

INTRODUCTION.

The family is one of the social institutions on which the stability of society, the hierarchy of its internal ties and values largely depend. The family plays a significant role in the primary socialization of a person, influencing the formation of his personality, values, attitude to cultural heritage, and much more. It acts as an intermediary between the individual and society, maintains a certain balance of public interests, helps to level social contradictions and tensions.

The family as a small group exists in the space-time continuum. The localization of the family, the duration and sequence of events in the life of its members form the foundation of the family structure. The appearance of the

¹ MA Political science
Tavrida National University, UKRAINE

This work has been republished [without change]. First publication: Klymenko, T. (2022). THE INFLUENCE OF MODERN MEANS OF COMMUNICATION ON INTERGENERATIONAL COMMUNICATION AND THE FORMATION OF NEW FAMILY TIES. *Grail of Science*, (16), 239–251. DOI 10.36074/grail-of-science.17.06.2022.042.

house, its fullness with things that make up the condition and content of human communication, depends both on the era (the level of development of economic, political and socio-cultural relations), and on the specific individuals living in it.

MAIN PART.

Modern typology suggests more than 40 types of family division. But for this work, it is important for us to understand the following typology.

- Nuclear family - a married couple and their children, if any, until they reach the age of majority,
- Extended family - other relatives of members of the nuclear family who live together or have a close family household,
- Big family - all relatives who can be named by the three main nuclear families (husband and wife, as well as husband and wife couples who are the parents of the first mentioned couple).

Here in the traditional social division one can often encounter the concepts of "family" and "household".

The terms "family" and "household" are often used interchangeably, but they have different meanings. The family is a universal social institution based on human needs and activities related to sexual life, reproduction and daily existence. Family members are connected by social relations of kinship, marriage and parenthood. The family is a microcosm of productive and reproductive relationships, with its own power structure, resource allocation system, and strong ideological and emotional components. Within the family there are common or collective tasks and interests, while its members also have their own differentiated interests related to their position in productive and reproductive relationships, as well as their place in the system of gender relations. In addition to actual social relations, the family essentially serves as "an ideology of kinship that explains who should live together, share income, and perform certain common tasks". A household is an economic unit consisting of one or more persons who live together and share resources related to daily life, including housing and food, and some social activities. Very often, people living together (in the same household) are related by kinship and marriage, and therefore are part of the family. Thus, according to population censuses and household surveys from 86 countries and areas, only 2% of households do not consist of family members, which indicates the importance of family and kinship relations in determining living conditions. However, family



members may also live in different households, sometimes separated by large distances, as is the case with transnational families. Census and household survey data and, as a result, the statistics that are reported in most studies and used for policy formulation, including in this report, usually refer to households, while qualitative studies, including ethnographic ones, are better able to reflect family relations, the boundaries of which do not coincide with the boundaries of households.

In our work, we will start from the concepts of a “nuclear” family, by which we mean a couple connected by matrimonial relations, and their children up to the age of majority, if any. And “Big Family” - all included family ties of a group of three nuclear pairs.

The key concept for classical studies in the family group - household - we will not use, due to its greater applicability in the economic sense, and insufficient applicability in the social, psychological, communicative and cultural context.

The communicative space of the family is an ideal model of communication, which allows us to consider its various aspects and aspects, manifestations and characteristics. This is a miniature model that embodies not so much the possibilities of combining and integrating different types of speech cultures, but rather the questions caused by their “junctions” and collisions. In this regard, the purpose of the study involves the study of intergenerational verbal interaction in the real conditions of everyday communication.

The unique combination of interpersonal and group types of intra-family verbal interaction determines and characterizes its essence, and determines the content of the verbal repertoire used in the family.

In terms of structure, the communicative space of the family represents a two-level organization: a closed intrazone (the inner space of interpersonal verbal interaction), in which only family members can contact; an open intrazone (external space of group interaction), reflecting various forms of communication between members of a particular family as a small group with society. The conditional delimitation of the inner and outer zones determines the choice of verbal (speech) means used in intergenerational family communication.

Intra-family interpersonal communication between representatives of different generations are characterized by an asymmetric ratio of basic constructive and destructive speech strategies: organizing the direction of intergenerational communication are constructive strategies focused on the harmonization of intra-family verbal relationships; destructive verbal behavior

as a manifestation of individual verbal aggression occurs in the family intrazone in depending on the dominant goal setting of the communicants, the type of communicative situation, thematic organization, tone, and other factors. Speech strategies and tactics are implemented in the sub-genre repertoire of everyday communication genres.

In the socio-psycholinguistic aspect, everyday communication is not differentiable from the point of view of the conditions for the functional and stylistic design of statements, since they can be produced by carriers of not only the literary language, but also colloquial speech, slang. At the same time, specific multi-level markers of language subsystems begin to acquire the status of stylistic resources.

In the communicative space of intra-family verbal communication, two opposite poles can be conditionally distinguished, around which the genres of everyday family communication are concentrated: at the highest level are speech genres that require minimal rhetorical knowledge, skills and abilities to implement them (greetings, farewells, praise, congratulations, etc.) at the lowest level - genres that are absorbed subconsciously and which the linguistic personality is not specifically trained in. In the intrazone of family communication, the components of medium-literary and literary-colloquial (with their familiar-colloquial and colloquial varieties) types of speech cultures closely interact, which are characterized by appropriate characteristics in terms of compliance with the norms of the language, the use of its style resources and speech etiquette.

All families can be divided into two main types: altruistic and corporate. In a corporate family, communication is carried out on a partnership basis. All family members try to come to an agreement among themselves. They have their own rules. As a result, duties are performed by one of the family members if they are performed by the rest. Communication in this family is quite open and relaxed, they do not have secrets and secrets from each other. Each family member is quite independent in his choice, there is little criticism. Therefore, they freely talk about their personal and intimate experiences. There are no prohibitions, your opinion constantly responds.

Members of this type of family freely adapt to the environment, are considered open.

Consider the altruistic type of family. Family members are used to worrying and taking care of others. All efforts go to the general well-being of each member. If there is a problem in the choice of personal interests or the interests of the family, then he will choose the latter because he lives according to the



principle “for others”. In this family, inalienable rules are defined. If a family member does not comply with these rules, then he does not move away from the family in any way, but rather enjoys the support and help of relatives. In a conversation in an altruistic family, one feels love, a good and warm attitude towards each other. But often secrets appear because they do not want to offend or disappoint others. In this case, not all problems are discussed, but if it is serious, they will make decisions together. The conversation is dominated by gentle and affectionate words, often in such a family they have their own names,

The style of communication in the family is divided into authoritarian, democratic, liberal-permissive, overprotective and aloof styles. The authoritarian style is presented as a strict declaration by parents of requirements that cover the entire life of children. A typical punishment for such a family is physical punishment, which expresses the power of an adult over children.

Democratic style is based on mutual interest and helping each other. A child who grew up in such a family adapts to life and society quickly and easily, does not often suffer from neuroses, unlike people who grew up in authoritarian families. In such a family, every problem and question can be discussed, any family member is accepted as a person with his own point of view and worldview.

The liberal-permissive style is characterized in the family by absolute indifference and connivance towards each other. Family members have their own separate concerns, thoughts and deeds. This style is followed by such parents who value freedom in education. A child who grew up in such a family can demonstrate his grievances, demand “Wishlist” in public places, and be capricious.

The alienated style of relationships implies the complete indifference of the elders to their child. In this style, the father and mother of the child prefer to keep him at a distance, do not want to communicate with him and generally interact somehow. The innocence of elders in the development of their child makes him feel lonely, detached and unhappy. Because of this, he may develop a hostile or aggressive attitude towards others.

A value-based approach to a child with high reflection and responsibility for him is a more productive style of education. In this case, the child is shown their love and friendliness, they talk to him and discuss his problems or topics of interest to him. But they do not overly patronize and offer to reckon with others.

It is important to understand that the types of communication can change within the family, both relating to certain members of it, and depending on the circumstances. However, it is customary to separate the types of communication that are typical within the family for a nuclear couple, within the generic vector (for example, the wife and relatives along her line), the inter tribal vector (between relatives of the husband and wife), and also by the level of generations in a large family.

It is also worth noting that the style of communication will depend on the cultural, economic and political context of family members, both in the form of individual experience and group experience.

The problem of interaction between representatives of different generations of the family has always existed, but in the conditions of the post-industrial, information society, it is undergoing significant qualitative changes. It seemed interesting to trace and analyze the relationship of young people with representatives of the older generations of the family, especially with representatives of the generation of grandparents - grandparents. Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to determine the role and significance of intergenerational solidarity for the younger generation as a factor in the stability of the modern family.

When analyzing the problems of relationships between generations in a family in a sociological aspect, researchers rely on the concept of intergenerational transfers, considering the exchange between generations as a fundamental process occurring within the family, and the basis of intergenerational solidarity. The subject of study is two forms of intergenerational solidarity: material (money, gifts, unpaid labor) and moral (support and care), types of material and instrumental transfers.

Special attention and study in the modern society of researchers requires the study of the influence of the intensity of the upward flows of intergenerational transfers (from the younger generation to the older one) on the stability of a large family and the determination of the role and significance of emotional ties in the process of intra-family interaction between generations.

In sociological studies, a real generation is distinguished, consisting of people who were born in a certain historical interval of 18 times, and a hypothetical generation - a collection of contemporaries of different ages (for example, the military generation, the generation of conquerors of virgin lands, etc.). The boundaries of such a generation are determined not only by age, but also by value and social role criteria.

Family communication shifts the research focus to everyday life, and



interactions typical of everyday communication are the most complex object of study, since real everyday communication is also the most difficult for real communicators to comprehend. In other words, since everyday life has only recently begun to be fully accepted as an object of scientific research, everyday communication is extremely heterogeneous and still very little studied both in general terms and in different cultural groups, which makes each study extremely valuable for the research community.

The generational approach in sociolinguistics involves the analysis of the coexistence of three life dimensions in a social situation: the generation of young people, the generation of mature people and the generation of old people. The existence of three different times represents progress, development. Otherwise, history would stop, the possibility of radical change would disappear.

The structure of a communicative act includes the following links: the emergence of a need and motives for communication; determination of communication tasks (information-cognitive, tasks of influencing the behavior and activities of a partner, confirming or changing the nature of interpersonal relationships, providing feedback to a partner about his personal characteristics and his attitude towards him, receiving feedback from a partner about himself and his attitude towards himself); transmission of information, including the choice of specific content (what I want to say) and the choice of coding method (how I want to say), considering the tasks of communication; obtaining information by the partner, including the processes of decoding the content, reconstructing the intentions and motives of the communication partner; analysis of the received information and decision-making on the content of the response act of communication; transfer of information

In the works of L.A. Petrovskaya, 1987; G.M.Andreeva, 1980; E.G. Eidemiller, 1999; Vatslavik, 1974; V. Satir, 1992; K. Rogers, 1996; T. Gordon, 1997 highlighted the conditions for effective interpersonal communication in the family, including both the general principles of organizing successful communication and specific norms and rules established relating to the family: openness of communication; high activity of communication, providing an intensive discussion of problems that are significant for family members. The rules of family life should provide for a special time and the creation of rituals for the possibility of such a discussion - an evening joint tea party, a ritual of speaking to children before going to bed, and so on; the necessary degree of self-disclosure in the process of communication, the congruence of communication; consistency of ideas about family life, commonality of family

values, the adequacy of family self-consciousness, the coordinated integrity of the "We" system; accuracy of non-verbal communication, consistency of verbal and non-verbal messages; sensitivity to the statements of the partner, the use of active listening techniques ("You-messages") with feedback; cluelessness and empathic acceptance of a partner as a condition for the positive development of emotional relationships in the family, creating an atmosphere of psychological security and harmonizing the image of the "I" of the partner; manifestation of love, mutual empathy and support, respect for a partner, which is especially important in crisis periods of the life cycle and in the event of stressful, frustrating and problematic situations; the formation of a family language - certain agreed and easily recognizable family symbols, traditions, norms. Special names, nicknames, symbols of significant events (anniversaries of acquaintance, first date, explanations, etc.). The presence of an agreed language of views, facial expressions, gestures, postures.

Interpersonal communication in the family meets the tasks of information exchange, coordination of efforts and fulfillment of roles in joint activities, establishment and development of interpersonal relationships, partner knowledge and self-knowledge. Distinctive features of interpersonal communication in the family are high emotional richness and intensity of communication.

Thus, we can highlight such important characteristics for family communication as:

- individual system (custom topics, dates, occasions, forms and symbols, intensity, participants),
- emotionality and empathy,
- life and everyday life in the subject, regularity.

Recently, communication in the form of virtual communication has increasingly become part of our lives and replaces real communication, forms a new sphere of information interaction, and leads to the emergence of new types of relationships. Communication ceases to be tied to the location of the interlocutors, there is a transition from a one-way to a two-way communication model. At the same time, Internet technologies make communication cross-border.

Internet communications are such methods of communication in which information is transmitted via Internet channels using standard protocols for the exchange and presentation of information in various forms - voice, video, documents, instant messages, files.



Internet communication has a number of characteristic features, both positive and negative. The positive ones include the possibility of simultaneous communication of numerous people from different parts of the world belonging to different cultures; the negative - the loss of the meaning of non-verbal means, a decrease in the emotional component and psychological risk in the process of communication, anonymity. The physical absence of communication participants leads to the fact that feelings can not only be expressed, but also hidden, as well as feelings that a person does not currently experience can be expressed.

Scientists distinguish several of the most common types of communication. These include:

- Man - computer: allows you to receive information regardless of the physical location of the source of information, send and store information on this computer. The Internet acts as a kind of information depository. A tablet or smartphone can act as a receiver and transmitter of information.
- Person to person: the user can communicate with any other user and carry out all types of information transfer: using text (e-mail), voice (Internet telephony) and image (videophone, conference or broadcast on the Web).
- One person, many people: in a traditional type of mass communication, information is sent to numerous people at the same time. The Internet globalizes and cheapens this type of communication. As a depository of information, the Internet introduces an "invitational" aspect, i.e. allows you to create archives that can be used if desired by a huge number of people.
- Many people - one person: allows you to collect information from many people and organize it.
- Many people - many people: the simultaneous communication of a huge number of people around the world effect of social mobilization. It is thanks to the Internet that communication of the form "one person - many people" has become popular and often used.

On the Web, it became possible to send a message not to a specific addressee, but to a group of people at once, using blogs, social networks and video hosting.

Modern technologies have penetrated the communication of every family, and continue to integrate with varying degrees of effectiveness.

The important factors here are - technology complexity and cost.

Foremost, it was these two factors that influenced the rate of penetration of technology into families: both by age (where it is more difficult for an older family member to use technology), and by the principle of technical education



and competence to use technology, as well as its cost and the economic factor of accessibility. for family members.

In the digital age before the pandemic, the situation looked like this.

ICT use in the family context Families with children are more likely to use ICT and have access to a greater variety of technology at home than families without children (Allen & Rainie, 2002; Kennedy, Smith, Wells, & Wellman, 2008). One study found that 93% of married couples with children under 18 reported having a computer in the home, 94% reported going online from home, and 95% reported using cell phones (Kennedy et al., 2008). Similarly, over 80% of parents in Europe reported using the Internet, and 58% reported owning a smartphone or tablet device (Mascheroni & Ólafsson, 2014). Parents are also more likely to have favorable attitudes towards the Internet than non-parents (Allen & Rainie, 2002). However, few studies have examined what parents are doing online specifically for parenting; we know even less about parents' use of newer ICTs such as video conferencing (e.g., Skype) and social networking sites (e.g., Facebook; Dworkin et al., 2013).

However, over the years, technologies for communication through Internet technologies are becoming more accessible, including in the post-COVID era, they are already talking about its massive penetration into society.

In smartphones, the cost of the Internet and communications have become more affordable, and the technology of using communication software has become easier to use and available not only on a computer, but also on a smartphone.

So, as of January 2021, the world population is 7.83 billion people.

Since January 2020, the number of smartphone users has increased by 1.8% (93 million). There are already more smartphones in the world than people. 8.02 billion active devices have been sold. This is since some users own two or more smartphones. The total number of smartphones in the hands of users increased by 0.9% (72 million) in a year.

In January 2021, the number of people using the Internet worldwide increased by 316 million (7.3%) compared to the same period last year. Currently, 59.5% of the world's inhabitants are Internet users.

There are currently 4.2 billion users worldwide. This number increased by 490 million (13%) in 2020. The number of social network users is currently more than 53% of the world's population. Interestingly, about 80% of Internet users use social networks.

The increase in the number of users is associated with the period of the covid pandemic.



Technologies for communication have made communication easier and stimulated not only its intensity, but also the creation of new traditions for communication.

Thus, the ability to use video and communicate with several users at once has the potential to create a new context in family communication.

Another important aspect is the pages on social networks, which allow you to form relationships, including between relatives, without additional efforts, creating the effect of being present in each other's lives.

We form a hypothesis that, in particular, modern means of communication help to maintain and intensify communication between generations of young people and their grandparents (through a generation, grandparents). The behavioral strategies of the younger generation of families are focused on maintaining fairly intensive communication with the generation of grandparents, which, in turn, seems to contribute to the formation of a positive image of young people according to the older generation. This is confirmed by the data of a study devoted to the study of the value characteristics of modern Russian youth, conducted by the All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center (VTsIOM) in June 2017, as well as the UN study "Families in a Changing World" 2019-2020.

Family communication continues to change with the rapid diffusion and expanded use of social and mobile media devices and communication formats, such as text message, email, Facebook, and videoconference services such as Skype. The broad term Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) refers to the technological devices individuals use, such as desktop or tablet computers, smartphones, and webcams, as well as the software and applications used on these devices. ICT offers families multiple formats for collaboration, information exchange, and spending time together, which contribute to feelings of family strength and closeness (Grant, 2009). Keeping in contact with family is vital for relationship maintenance, resource management, and fulfilling family responsibilities, and ICT allows for family members to stay in contact and connect over long distances at relatively low costs (Green, 2002; Kennedy & Wellman, 2007).

Increasing our understanding of how families are using ICT for communication enables us to better understand the impact these technologies are having on daily life and family well-being. The current research moves the field closer to uncovering implications for family well-being by expanding our understanding of technology selection beyond access, to specific devices and applications for communication with specific family members. This study



suggests that parents' selection of ICT to communicate with family members in ways that support parenting is a dynamic process. It is one that reflects developmental differences in the child, and it is one that reflects relational differences across the family system.

CONSLUSIONS.

Social research often focuses on Internet communications, which are used by families for the following purposes:

a tool for helping families, their adaptation and socialization. At the same time, they often lose one of the most important functions - communication.

Thus, we plan to start a survey of families that have experience of communicating via the Internet, do not have financial and technical problems with access to the Internet, we will pay special attention to booster groups of such families who have migrants, part of the family speaks different languages, and different people live in different time zones.

The survey is supposed to be conducted using an online questionnaire, the preliminary structure of the questionnaire will look like this.

1. Please mark your gender
2. Mark your age
3. Please indicate the highest level of education you currently have
4. Which income category/income group do you belong to?
5. What is your family of origin
6. How many people do you consider your family
7. Who in your extended family do you communicate with most often?
8. What is this frequency - Often this is for you
9. Who in your extended family do you communicate with least often?
10. What is this frequency - It is rare for you to
11. How do you prefer to communicate with your family, which of these and how often do you apply (scale from several times a day to never)
 - Personal communication, meetings at home
 - Personal communication, meetings in a public place (cafe, park)
 - Phone calls
 - Calls using video communication technology
 - Text messages
 - Messages in special applications
 - Communication in a social network (private messages)
 - Communication in a social network (comments, posts on pages)
 - Other - - what exactly



Let's think about relationships like grandfather/grandmother - grandson/granddaughter

Are there such connections in your family now?

12. Are you for someone part of such a connection

13. How many such connections do you have in relation to one generation (here give an example in a picture diagram, what is it about)

14. How many such connections do you have in relation to different generations (here give an example in a picture diagram, what is it about)

15. Mark the frequency of communication in such pairs of grandfather / grandmother - grandson / granddaughter

16. What types of communication do you use in these relationships between grandparents - grandson / granddaughter to communicate, how often and who is the most frequent initiator

- Personal communication, meetings at home
- Personal communication, meetings in a public place (cafe, park)
- Phone calls
- Calls using video communication technology
- Text messages
- Messages in special applications
- Communication in a social network (private messages)
- Communication in a social network (comments, posts on pages)
- Other - - what exactly

17. Are there any relatives in your family who live

- In another city
- Other country
- Another time zone

If there is, then did you include these people in your "big family" when you counted the participants in question 6

18. How often do you communicate with relatives living outside your city

19. How do you prefer to communicate with relatives living outside your city, which of these and how often do you use (scale from several times a day to never)

- Personal communication, meetings at home
- Personal communication, meetings in a public place (cafe, park)
- Phone calls
- Calls using video communication technology
- Text messages

- Messages in special applications
- Communication in a social network (private messages)
- Communication in a social network (comments, posts on pages)
- Other -- what exactly

20. Are there relatives in your family with whom you speak different languages?

If there is, then

did you include these people in your “big family” when you counted the participants in question 6

21. How often do you communicate with relatives with whom you speak different languages

22. How do you prefer to communicate with relatives with whom you speak different languages, which of these and how often do you use (scale from several times a day to never)

- Personal communication, meetings at home
- Personal communication, meetings in a public place (cafe, park)
- Phone calls
- Calls using video communication technology
- Text messages
- Messages in special applications
- Communication in a social network (private messages)
- Communication in a social network (comments, posts on pages)
- Other -- what exactly

Let's talk about your experience of communicating with several family members at once using Internet technologies.

23. Have you had such an experience when your family members communicated at the same time, and the number of participants was more than 2

If yes, then

24. How many participants did the last such meeting have?

25. How many participants usually have the most traditional such meeting

26. Who initiates such meetings most often

27. What technology is used for these meetings?

28. How long do they usually last

29. Why are these meetings taking place?

Please fill out the card

(write down family members, note how often they communicate, when they last



communicated, for how long, with what help, who initiated, what was the reason).

Thus, we intend to test the described hypothesis in a practical study and propose ways to introduce successful communication practices and create sustainable traditions to overcome intergenerational and other family communication problems. It is expected that the practices will be most applicable in multicultural families and in families that, due to various circumstances, live in different parts of the world.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Charles B. Nam (2004), "The Concept of The Family: Demographic and Genealogical Perspectives", Center for Demography and Population Health, Florida State University
- [2] Smith, James E. (1987). "The Computer Simulation of Kin Sets and Kin Counts," in Bongaarts, John, Thomas K. Burch, and Kenneth W. Wachter, eds., *Family Demography: Methods and Their Applications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [3] Yumkina Ye.A. (2014) "Intra-family communication in spatio-temporal aspect", ISBN 159.923.2 : 316.356.2
- [4] Smith, Ken R., and Geraldine P. Mineau (2003). "Genealogical Records," in Demeny, Paul, and Geoffrey McNicholl, eds., *Encyclopedia of Population*. New York: Macmillan.
- [5] Melford E. Spiro (1965), "A Typology of Social Structure and the Patterning of Social Institutions: A Cross-Cultural Study", *New Series*, Vol. 67, No. 5, Part 1 (Oct., 1965), pp. 1097-1119 (23 pages)
- [6] Aleti, T., Brennan, L. & Parker, L. (2015), "Family communication for the modern era: a typology", *Young Consumers*, vol. 16, issue 4, pp. 367-384
- [7] Eid, M., Langeheine, R., Diener, E. (2003). Comparing typological structures across cultures by multigroup latent class analysis: A primer. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 195-210
- [8] Moos, R. H., Moos, B. S. (1976). A typology of family social environments. *Family Process*, 15, 357-371
- [9] Jiwoo Lee, Martha Y. Kubik, Jayne A. Fulkerson, Nidhi Kohli, Ann E. Garwick (2019), "The Identification of Family Social Environment Typologies Using Latent Class Analysis: Implications for Future Family-Focused Research", PMID: 31874588, Volume: 26 issue: 1, page(s): 26-37
- [10] UN Women's flagship report (2021), "Progress of the world's women 2019-2020: Families in a changing world", ISBN:978-1-63214-156-9
- [11] Csikszentmihalyi M., Rochberg-Halton E. (1981), "The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols of the Self". NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Yumkina Ye.A. (2014), "Socio-Psychological Criteria Of Family Lifestyle Typology", *Modern Research of Social Problems*, №12(44)
- [13] Nilova K. (2015) "Intergenerational intrafamily communication: social and psycholinguistic aspect", Dissertation, "Bashkir State University" March 20, 2015
- [14] Salikhova E., Nilova K., (2016) "Intrazone of the family communication: sociopsycholinguistic aspect", *International Academy of Science and Higher Education (IASHE)*, ISBN 978-1-909137-85-1
- [15] Jensen E.W., James S.A., Boyce W.T., Hartnett S.A. (1983) "The family routines inventory: Development and validation" // *Social Science and Medicine*. Vol. 17 (4). 1983. pp. 201-211.
- [16] Churchill S.L., Stoneman Z. (2004) "Correlates of family routines in Head Start families" // *Early Childhood Research and Practice*. 2004. № 6.
- [17] Costa R.P. (2013) "Family rituals: Mapping the postmodern family through time, space and emotional" // *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. Vol. 43. Issue 3. 2013. pp. 269-289.

- [18]Timasheva L. (2017) "Features Of Communication In Modern Family", Department of Conflictology and Organizational Psychology, Astrakhan State University
- [19]Blinn-Pike, L. (2009). Technology and the family: An overview from the 1980's to the present. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45, 567–575.
- [20]Agafonov G. (2017) "Phenomenology Of The Social And Psychological Barriers In Intergenerational Relationships Of The Family", Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia
- [21]Miklyaeva A.V. (2014), "Personality as a subject of inter-age relations: socio-psychological analysis" // *Modern problems of science and education*. 2014. №3 P.637.
- [22]Doreva E. A., Koroleva E. M. (2015) 'Factors of preservation and completion (disintegration) of close relationships: a review modern psychological research" // *Bulletin KSU Nekrasova: Pedagogy. Psychology. Social work. Juvenology. Sociokinetics*. 2015. No. 4 S.112-116.
- [23]Salikhova E., Nilova K. (2013) "Particularities Infamily Verbal Contacts Through Generation: Grandmothers-Grandfather Vs Grandchildren", *Issn 1991-5497. The World Of Science, Culture, Education*. No. 1 (38) 2013.
- [24]Kitzmann K.M., Dalton 3rd. W.T., Stanley C.M., Beech B.M., Reeves T.P., Buscemi J., Egli C.J., Midgett, E.L. (2010) "Lifestyle interventions for youth who are overweight: a meta-analytic review" // *Health psychology: official journal of the Division of Health Psychology. American Psychological Association*. 2010. Vol. 29 (1). pp. 91-101.
- [25]Patrick H., Hennessy E., McSpadden K., Oh A. (2013) "Parenting styles and practices in children's obesogenic behaviors: Scientific gaps and future research directions" // *Childhood Obesity*. Vol. 9 (SUPPL.1). 2013. pp. 73-86.
- [26]Wolin S.J., Bennett L.A. (1984) 'Family rituals" // *Family Process*. Vol. 23 (3). 1984. pp. 401-420.
- [27]Efremova A. (2017) "Internet Communication As A Means Of Society Mobilization", *International Student Scientific Bulletin*. - 2017. - No. 1
- [28]Volodina O.V., Agababyan S.R. (2021) "The role and place of emoticons in modern intercultural Internet communication" // *Modern scientist*. 2021. No. 3. S. 262-266.
- [29]Ivanova M.V., Klushina N.I. (2021) "Creative possibilities of language in Internet communication" // *Bulletin of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research. Humanities and social sciences*. 2021. No. 1 (103). pp. 52-62.
- [30]Carvalho, J., Francisco, R., & Relvas, A. P. (2015). "Family functioning and information and communication technologies: How do they relate? A literature review". *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45, 99-108.
- [31]Man Ping Wang, Joanna TW Chu, Kasisomayajula Viswanath, Alice Wan, Tai Hing Lam, and Sophia S Chan, (2015) "Using Information and Communication Technologies for Family Communication and Its Association With Family Well-Being in Hong Kong: FAMILY Project", *J Med Internet Res*. 2015 Aug; 17(8): e207.
- [32]Aponte R. (2009) "The communications revolution and its impact on the family: significant, growing, but skewed and limited in scope", *Marriage & Family Review*. 2009 Oct 27; 45(6-8):576–586. doi:10.1080/01494920903396778
- [33]Kim H, Kim G, Park H, Rice R. (2007) "Configurations of relationships in different media: FtF, email, instant messenger, mobile phone, and SMS". *J Comput Mediat Commun*. 2007;12:1183–1207. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00369
- [34]Ramirez A, Broneck K. `IM me': instant messaging as relational maintenance and everyday communication. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2009 Jul 31;26(2-3):291–314. doi: 10.1177/0265407509106719
- [35]Quan-Haase, A., Cothrel, J., & Wellman, B. (2005). Instant messaging for collaboration: A case study of a high-tech firm. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10. Retrieved August 14, 200
- [36]Ramsey MA, Gentzler AL, Morey JN, Oberhauser AM, Westerman D. (2013) "College students' use of communication technology with parents: comparisons between two cohorts in 2009 and 2011". *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. 2013 Oct;16(10):747–52. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2012.0534
- [37]Valkenburg PM, Peter J, Schouten AP. (2006) "Friend networking sites and their relationship

to adolescents' well-being and social self-esteem". *Cyberpsychol Behav.* 2006 Oct;9(5):584–90. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2006.9.584

- [38]Rudi J., Dworkin J., Walker S. and Doty J. (2015) "Parents' use of information and communications technologies for family communication: differences by age of children", *Information, Communication & Society*, 2015 Vol. 18, No. 1, 78–93
- [39]Ana Catarina Canário, Sonia Byrne, Nicole Creasey, Eliška Kodyšová, Burcu Kömürçü Akik, Aleksandra Lewandowska-Walter, Koraljka Modić Stanke, Ninoslava Pečnik and Patty Leijten, (2022), "The Use of Information and Communication Technologies in Family Support across Europe: A Narrative Review", *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2022, 19, 1488
- [40]Lemy Bran Piedrahita, Karin Romero Ruíz, Laura Echeverri Sánchez, Juan Peña Plata, Stephanía Vásquez Giraldo, Milady Aguilera Cardona, Carolina Herazo Avendaño2 & Alejandro Valencia Arias, (2016), "Information and Communication Technologies Influence on Family Relationship", *Global Journal of Health Science*; Vol. 9, No. 6; 2017 ISSN 1916-9736